



LEXICAL MARKERS WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY LECTURE

Maria CHRISTODOULIDOU*

Abstract: Scarce research relating the spoken lecture discourse and the correlation between meaning and interaction has been carried out to date. One aspect of the relationship between meaning and interaction is explored here by taking the Greek particles *lipón* ("well"), *ára* ("so"), *oréa* ("fine"), and investigating their use within a university lecture by using the tools of the conversation analytic tradition. The lexical items under study fit into the category of what has traditionally been framed as discourse markers. In this study we centre our attention on the lecture genre and we analyze the communicative purpose of the aforementioned discourse markers within spoken academic discourse.

Keywords: Discourse markers, *lipón*, *ára*, *oréa*, turn constructional units, Conversation Analysis, lecture discourse

Özet: Bugüne kadar üniversite derslerindeki söylemle anlam ve etkileşim arasındaki bağdaşıklığı ilişkilendiren kısıtlı sayıda araştırma yapılmıştır. Burada Yunanca'daki *lipón*, *ára*, ve *oréa* edatlarını baz alarak ve Konuşma Çözümlemesi ile bir üniversite dersindeki kullanımlarını inceleyerek anlam ve etkileşim arasındaki ilişkinin bir yönü araştırılmıştır. İncelenen sözcükler geleneksel olarak söylem belirleyicileri olarak anlandırılmış olan kategoriye girmektedirler. Çalışmamızda üniversite dersi türüne odaklanmakta ve adı geçen söylem belirleyicilerinin akademik konuşma söylemindeki iletişimsel amacını çözümlenmekteyiz.

Anahtar sözcükler: Söylem belirleyicileri, *lipón*, *ára*, *oréa*, söz sırası yapma birimleri, Konuşma Çözümlemesi, üniversite dersleri söylemi

1. Introduction

Classroom genres have aroused the interest of researchers, specifically the genre of lecture, being one of the most important genres, within spoken academic discourses. Specifically a great part of university discourse study focuses on the lecture comprehension process (Johs 1981; Richards 1983; Benson 1989). Waggoner (1984) characterises lectures as having "paradigmatic stature" and other authors such as Benson (1994) define lecture as "the central ritual of the culture learning".

The main purpose of this study is to analyse the occurrence of some specific lexical items, that is *lipón* ("so", "well"), *ára* ("therefore", "hence", "so"), *oréa* ("fine", "good") in a literature lecture in a private Greek Cypriot University. The method that is adopted in the analysis of the data is Conversation Analysis (CA), which has its origins in the pioneering work of Sacks (1992a, 1992b).

So far there are no studies in Greek Cypriot discourse markers in classroom/lecture interaction or in any other context. The lexical items under study could fit into the category of what has traditionally been framed as discourse markers (DMs). According to Schiffrin (1987:31), DMs are "textual coordinates of talk that bracket units of it". Examples of discourse markers include the particles "oh", "well", "now", "then", "you know", and "I mean", and the connectives "so", "because", "and", "but", and "or".

* Lecturer, The Department of Pre-primary Education, Frederick University, Nicosia, pre.mc@frederick.ac.cy.

DMs have attracted a lot of research, both in papers and in book-length studies. Some studies deal with a whole range of discourse markers (Schourup 1982, Schiffrin 1987, Watts 1989), while others concentrate on individual ones (Lakoff 1973, Svartvik 1980, Schiffrin 1985 etc.). Most available classifications of DMs are based on the core meaning of them as separate lexical items and/or their functions in discourse coherence. For instance, Schiffrin examines the functions of DMs in terms of conversational coherence. She claims that “conversational coherence is a cooperative enterprise in which the speaker and hearer jointly negotiate: (1) a focus of attention—referent; and (2) a response which further selects what aspects of the referent will be attended to” (Schiffrin 1985: 640). Her primary interest is how DMs function to add to discourse coherence. In fact, she tries to prove that one speaker’s utterance gains coherence through its relation to the immediately prior utterance of the other speaker. The unit talk that is first presented can be called a referent, while the subsequent unit of talk presented a response. She assumes that certain DMs are used for making referents (e.g., now, you know) and others for responses (e.g., well, okay). Redeker (1990) divides DMs into two categories, ideational markers which mark ideational structures, such as connectives and temporal adverbials (e.g., and, meanwhile, now) and pragmatic markers which mark pragmatic structures (e.g., oh, alright, well). Blakemore, who works within the framework of relevant theory, focuses on how DMs impose constraints on implicature. She claims that “a speaker may use a linguistic expression to indicate how the utterance it introduces is to be interpreted as relevant” (1992: 137). She suggests mainly four ways of classifying discourse connectives: (1) Discourse connectives introducing contextual implications (e.g., so, too, also); (2) Discourse connective concerned with strengthening (e.g., after all, moreover, furthermore); (3) Discourse connective introducing denial (e.g., however, still, nevertheless, but); (4) Discourse connective indicating the role of the utterance in the discourse in which it occurs (e.g., anyway, incidentally, by the way, finally).

Although a lot of research has been focused on the functions of DMs, one should keep in mind that DMs are very difficult to categorize in terms of their function. The term discourse markers is used only roughly in this study, because the aim is to uncover the meaning and use of these lexical items which on several occasions can function as discourse markers and on others as conjunctions, interjections, or adverbs. In this study the focus is on the position of the specific lexical items within the sequence and the composition of the turn where they occur, in order to uncover their use in context.

The components of a turn’s construction—at whatever level of linguistic production—are connected with the activity which the turn is being designed to perform in the unfolding interactional sequence of which it is a part, and to the further development of which it contributes (Drew and Holt 1998:497).

Drew and Holt’s (1998) observation sheds light to the study of language use in proposing that the study of the components of a turn should be analysed by taking into consideration their place in the sequence and the construction of the turn. To this direction an important study is Clift’s (2001) investigation of the particle *actually* in interaction, because it shifts the focus from studies on the functions of DMs to investigation of the meaning of the particle *actually* in a range of interactional contexts.

Following the discourse classroom literature, researchers have suggested that an understanding of the role of discourse markers and the relationships between different parts of the text is fundamental for the comprehension of lectures (Coulthard & Montgomery 1981, Chaudron & Richards 1986). In her study Cook (1975) examines the functions of connectives, which serve as indicators of topic continuation. Other authors identify a number of markers of the rhetorical organization of lecture discourse (Murphy and Cadlin 1979). Chaudron and

Richards (1986) investigated the effect of pragmatic signalling devices on comprehension. Kintsch and Yarbough (1982) showed that the presence of rhetorical cues help the global comprehension and recall of information.

Scarce research relating the spoken lecture discourse and the use of discourse markers using Greek data has been carried out to date. Georgakopoulou and Goutsos (1998) and Archakis (2001) investigate conjunctions versus discourse markers based on Greek data. Archakis (2002) examines the discourse marker *diladi* ('that is') in classroom interaction. In this article we centre our attention on the lecture genre and we analyze the communicative purpose of *lipón*, *ára*, *oréa* within spoken academic discourse.

2. Data & Methodology

The extracts included in this article comprise transcriptions of approximately 2 hours of video-recorded University literature lecture in a private University located in the capital Cyprus, Nicosia. During the recording *lipón* occurred 21 times, *oréa* 16 times and *ára* 13 times.

The language spoken during the recorded lecture involves a combination of Cypriot Dialect and Modern Greek. The Cypriot Greek dialect spoken in Cyprus is an indigenous variety of Greek. Cypriot Greeks are bilingual in the Cypriot dialect and Modern Greek. The Cypriot Greek dialect is acquired naturally while Modern Greek is taught as the standard language (cf. Ferguson, 1959: 30). Recent years researchers like Davy, Panyiotou and Ioannou (1996), Papapavlou and Pavlou (1998) and Karyolemou and Pavlou (2001) have classified village Cypriot as the basilect and town Cypriot as the acrolect of the low variety. In addition, researchers like Karyolemou (1997; 2000a), Moschonas (2002: 917), Terkourafi (2004b) and Arvaniti (2002) have supported the creation of a Cypriot koine in urban centres, that is, a middle variety which is different from the local vernaculars incorporating important influences from Modern Greek.

The recording took place during a lecture of a free elective course attended by 40 students from various departments e.g., social work, business administration, nursing, engineering, computer science etc. All names of participants are replaced by pseudonyms in order to protect their privacy. For the transcription and analysis of the data we adopted the analytical tools of Conversation Analysis.

The transcription symbols used in this study —cited in Appendix I— are based on the transcription conventions developed by Jefferson for the analysis of conversational turns in Anglo-American conversation (cf. Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974). The transcription system is intended to capture in detail the characteristics “of the sequencing of turns, including gaps, pauses and overlaps; and the element of speech delivery such as audible breath and laughter, stress, enunciation, intonation and pitch” (Hutchby and Drew 1995: 182). Significant turns for the analysis are marked with arrows.

A powerful agenda for the analysis of talk-in-interaction is Schegloff, Ochs and Thompson's (1996) proposal that the study of linguistic structures could be richly informed by consideration of their place in the wider context of social interaction:

The meaning of any single grammatical construction is interactionally contingent, built over interactional time in accordance with interactional actualities. Meaning lies not with the speaker nor the addressee nor the utterance alone . . . but rather with the interactional past, current and projected next moment.

(Schegloff et al. 1996:40)

Sacks et al. identified components of the turn—the turn-constructive units (henceforth TCUs; Sacks et al. 1974:702–4)—as sentential, clausal, phrasal, and lexical units, which can constitute complete turns. On their potential completion, transition to another speaker turns out to be relevant. The turn is seen as “the habitat in which turn constructive units – henceforth TCUs– are housed” (Schegloff 1996: 56) and this reframing deepens our understanding of turns-at-talk. Schegloff et al. claim that “an important dimension of linguistic structures is their moment-by-moment evolving interactional production” (Schegloff et al. 1996:39). The shift of focus from sentences to turn constructive units proposed by Schegloff (1996) proves to be essential for this study. In what follows I explore the theoretical and methodological implications of this claim by taking the turn and its component TCUs as the frame of reference in examining the three lexical items under study (*lipón*, *ára*, *oréa*) in a literature lecture.¹ The DMs under study are left untranslated within the extracts in order to uncover their interactional meaning based on their sequential order within the conversational extracts.

3. *Lipón*

According to the Greek-English dictionary of Stavropoulos (1988: 119) *lipón* can be (a) a deductive conjunction translated as “so”, “then”, “therefore”, “consequently”, “hence” or (b) an interjection which is translated as “so”, “well”, “then”, “now” for the expression of surprise, relief, query, decision etc. As will be shown in sections 3.1. and 3.2, in the extracts under study, *lipón* occurs in turn-initial position in order to signal the beginning of the lesson or return into a lecture-oriented discussion after interruption by a parenthetical sequence.

3.1 Topic-proffering

A major sequential environment in which *lipón* (“now”, “so”, “well”) occurs is when the lecturer signals the initiation of the lecture. *Lipón*-prefaced turns are deployed to introduce new topics. In the extracts presented in this section *lipón* occurs in turn-initial position and is deployed by the lecturer in order to capture the students’ attention, signal the initiation of the lesson, and the termination any other interaction among the students.

Extract 1

(L: Lecturer; A: Andreas. There is a lot of noise and confusion outside the literature classroom because the opposite class is locked and students are waiting outside. In the first turn the lecturer comes out and invites students that are attending literature to come in.)

1. L o::si e ja ellinici loyotexnia peraste MEsa::
 tho::se that are for Greek literature please come I::n
2. (2)
3. L → LIPO::N=
4. A =kontefkume na tejiosume tunto vivliu su:: oksa koma?
 =are we close to finishing this bookie of you::rs yet or not?
5. L to vivliui:: MU::? E::xo akoma llio na telioso.
 the bookie:: of MINE::? I still 've got some.

¹ The lecture under study is recorded on the fourth week of the semester. The lesson is about Cavafy’s poem “The god forsakes Anthony” that they started analysing the previous week.

In extract 1 after the request of the lecturer to the students to come in the classroom (1:1), students enter the seminar room and sit. The lecturer (1:3) with a loud “**LIPÓ::N**” launches a new interactional project, recognizable as an attempt to invite the student to stop any other activity and take control of the situation. The loud voice in proffering a stand-alone *lipón* which is stretched in the last syllable, frames it as emphatic and this shifts the footing (cf. Goffman 1974; 1979) signalling the lesson’s initiation. The invitation for lesson initiation is resisted as illustrated by the deployment of a shift of topic inquiry in turn 4 (“are we close to finishing this bookie of you::rs yet or not?”).

Extract 2

(L: Lecturer; M: Michael; N: Nikos)

1. L e::: elate mu llio pco konda Kosta ke £si::a::£.
e:: Costa and £the:: company::£ come and sit closer.
2. ((to M)) mprosta, mprosta na katsis, £kamno ena pirama::£
((to M)) sit in front, in front, £I’m doing an experiment£
3. M enna katso dame:::
I’ll sit here:::
4. L ntaksi:::
okay:::
5. N £enna mas Kamis piramatozoa::?£
£are you making an experiment on us?£
6. L ((she nods ‘yes’ with her head smiling))
7. (3)
8. L → **LIPÓ:::N**, tin proigoumeni fo::ra::n (.) i::xame::n kami:: to:: s-
LIPÓ:::N, the previous ti::me:: (.) we:: ha::d ana::lyze::d the:: s-
9. ((xtipa ena kinito)) e vallumen ta kinita aθoriva:::
((a mobile rings)) e we all set mobiles into quite mode:::
10. (2)
11. e::kamname::n to apoli::pi::n t£e prospathu::me::n na to:::
we were analysi::ng the god forsa::ke::s² and we are:: tryi::ng
12. olo::kliro::sume::n ja na pame parakato:::
to:: fi::ni::sh it in order to move o::n.

In extract 2, while the students are entering the seminar room, the lecturer (2: 2) invites them to sit in front, smilingly warranting her request by giving an account: “I’m doing an experiment”. The students’ responses vary from consent (turn 3: “okay”) to proffering a joking inquiry (turn 4: “£fare you making an experiment on us?£”). The lecturer (2: 6) smilingly responds to the joking inquiry by nodding affirmatively. After this scene which occurs in the first minutes that the students enter the seminar room, the lecturer (2: 8) launches the beginning of the lecture through the deployment of *lipón*. The loud, stressed and stretched intonation in proffering *lipón*, shifts the footing from talk about procedural issues related with the sits of students to lecture-oriented talk being launched with *lipón* which prefaces a soliciting of *reminiscence recognition* (cf. Lerner 1992: 250) about the previous lesson: “the previous ti::me:: (.) we:: ha::d ana::lyze::d the::”. Thus with the *lipón*-prefaced solicit of reminiscence recognition, the lecturer signals termination of any other activity or interaction by taking control of the situation and orienting the discussion into a course-related topic.

² A shorter version of the title of the poem “the god forsakes Anthony”.

As it is illustrated in the extracts analysed, *lipón* is a free-standing marker that occurs in turn-initial position. Its position in the turn, as well as its delivery —proffered with loud, stressed and stretched intonation— signal termination of any prior general talk and shift the footing from non-lecture related talk into initiation of the lecture.

3.2 Return to an interrupted action

In the extracts presented in this section the discourse marker *lipón* occurs after the interruption of a course-related discourse by a general discussion or argument between the lecturer and the students. The use of freestanding *lipón* in turn-initial position is recurrently deployed to signal return to a lesson related topic that was in progress before the interruption.

Extract 3

(L: Lecturer; A: Andreas. The following conversation comes after a long discussion about what ‘Anthony’ represents in the poem. In turn 1 the lecturer summarises the discussion about ‘Anthony’, and proceeds with a new question in turn 4)

1. L ine ena::n epitiçimmeno::n atomo:: pu meta ta xani o::la, ðilaði apo
he:: is a successful::l perso::n who then looses e::everything, so
2. petiçimmenos ksafnika jinete apotiçimmenos
he suddenly becomes unsuccessful.
3. (2)
4. L to:: o θiaso::s?
the:: the theatre::?³
5. (.) ((Andreas is talking and laughing with another classmate.))
6. L ti en t' onoma:: su::?
what's you::r na::me?
7. A emenan?
mine?
8. (5)
9. A £Antonio::s£
£Anthony::£
10. L ti en t' onoma su::?
what's you::r name?
11. A Andreas
Andreas
12. L Andrea en esi pu sun tin alli fora:::n pu kaθesun t£ame::?
Andrea were you sitting there last time::?
13. A ↑oi:↓,
↑no::↓
14. (3)
15. A en eksanairta ciria::
I' haven't come before misse::s
16. L proti fora ercese maθima::?
is this the first time you come to the cla::ss?
17. A oi, ðefteri::, ekaθθumun se t£ini ti mplevra
no, seco::nd, I was sitting to that side
18. L xmm

³ The ‘theatre’ is a symbol in the poem.

hmm

19. A £paw na rtw alla ksianno pu prepí na pao:: tfe::£
£while I'm coming I forget where I should go:: a::nd£
20. (2)
21. L proseçe na me sse ksixaso tfe yo:: omo::s.
be careful because I might forget you:: thou::gh.
22. (.)
23. L → lipo::n e:: pu eminame::n? eleamen ja to θiason.
lipo::n e:: where were we::? we were saying about the theatre.....

In the extract above, it can be observed that the argument between the lecturer and a student, Andreas about the latter's behaviour has prompted a cessation of the lesson-oriented interaction then in progress (3: 1-4). Notice how the poem-related discussion is interrupted in 3: 5, 6. In 3: 21 the lecturer closes the argument she has with the student, with a rebuke ("be careful because I might forget you:: thou::gh") which signals topic closure. With the deployment of *lipón*, the lecturer (3: 23) initiates topic-movement. *Lipón* prefaces a *resumption search* ("where were we::?"), a common occurrence after interruptions have run their course (cf. Schegloff 2007:24). With the *lipón*-prefaced resumption search, the lecturer takes a tack of returning to the lecture interaction that has been in progress before the interruption by the argument between the lecturer and the student. Thus the argument is framed as parenthetical to the ongoing lesson interaction.

Extract 4

(L: Lecturer; A: Andreas; C: Christopher; M: Michael. Before this extract, L was dictating to the students the symbolism of 'theatre' as it occurs in the poem. This was interrupted when she noticed that A was drinking coffee and started an argument. C took his classmate's side by asking if there is a regulation saying that they are not allowed to bring drinks in the classroom. 'This' in turn 2 refers to bringing drinks in class. In turn 6 C brings about a previous argument he had with L who asked him why he came without pen and sheet of paper.)

1. L ...tfe si Xristofore:: annen ja na petassese ja etsi
..and you Christophe::r if you intend to pop up for this kind
2. loyu::s stama::ta. eθθa mu leis emena an iparçi tapellua tʃ' an
of reasons sto::p it. stop asking me if this is written somewhere and
3. IPArçi TA[PELLua. AFTI:: i::ne I KANONISMI::
if it IS WR[Itten somewhere. THE::SE a::re the
REGULATIO::NS.
4. C [(na su po?) en etsi o kanonimos?
[(let me tell you) is this the regulation?
5. L en tus kseris tus kanonismus tu collejiu?
don't you know the university's regulations?
6. C o kanonismos en na fernis kolla tfe penna mazi su?
does the regulation say you have to bring sheet of paper and pen?
7. L fisika::! En to kseri::s? intalos kamnis maθima::?
of course::! Don't you know:: that? how do you attend classes?
8. C eyo irta proti fora na do inta mpu θelis,
I came first time today to see what you need to bring with me,
9. (inta mpu mou lalis?)
(what are you saying?)

10. L >tetarti evdomaða irtes na ðo-- ðis? ntaksi<
>**on week four you came see-- to see? okay**<
11. C e tora irta eyo::
but I just came today::
12. L → Lipo::n pu eminame::?
Lipo::n where were we::?
13. M pros timin kapcu ðeu::
in honour of a go::d
14. L ((to A)) men ton prokalis tje tse si:: ΘIASOS ine omaða
((to A)) and you, stop provoking him. THEATRE is a troupe of
15. anθropon pu xorevan ce trayuðusan pro timin kapcu ðeu::....
people who were dancing and singing in honour of a go::d.

In the extract above after a long argument between L and C about the college's regulation, L cuts off the argument with a stressed and stretched *lipón* which emphatically shifts the topic into a lecture-oriented discussion followed with the soliciting of resumption search (4:12) "Lipo::n where were we::?". That way she redirects the discussion to the ongoing lesson-related discussion that was interrupted by the argument between L and C. M (4:13) responds to the resumption by reading the last thing they wrote about the theatre.

In the extracts examined in this section, an argument between the lecturer and a student or students results to an interruption of the flow of the lecture. *Lipón*-prefaced turn frames the argument as parenthetical to the lecture interaction and invites return to the lecture topic. This is also signaled with the resumption search that follows *lipón*.

4. *Ára*: Making inferential or causal connections

Under the entry *ára*, Babiniotis (1998: 272) notes that it is a deductive conjunction. The translations given in the Greek-English dictionary of Stavropoulos (1988: 119) are "then", "therefore", "consequently", "hence". In extracts 5 and 6 that follow, *ára* occurs as the second TCU of a turn, in TCU-initial position. A schematic representation of the pattern that occurs in the data might look like Table 1.

Table 1: *Sequential pattern of the occurrence of ára*

1. L:	Question
2. S:	Answer
3. L: →	Evaluation, <i>ára</i> + inferential conclusion
4. S:	Agreement

Extract 5

(L: Lecturer; S: Sophokles; P: Petros)

1. L sto piima::n o Kavafis ti ton protrepi:: jenika::?
in the poe::m what does Cavafys advi::ses in genera::l?
2. ton kaθe anθropo::?
each perso::n?
3. S na min ta parata:: tje na proxora::
not to give u::p and move o::n
4. P na proxora::
to move o::n

5. S na min ta parata:: tje na proxora:: (efthia)
not to give u::p and move o::n (straight)
6. L → orea::, ara na staθi me aksioprepia::, etsi::?
orea::, thus to have dignity::, right?
7. P ne
yes
8. S ne
yes

In extract 5 the discussion about the poem leads to the question “what does Cavafys advise in general? each person?” (5:1-2). Students respond (5:3-5) to the question and the lecturer (5: 6) rewords their responses with the evaluation “orea” (‘good’). The *ára*-prefaced question in the second TCU is deployed as an inferential conclusion of the students’ response, setting the preference (cf. Pomerantz 1984) for ‘yes’ response as it is illustrated by the attached “right?” at the end of the question.⁴ Students (5: 7-8) respond with agreement. It seems that *ára* is used rather late in the progress of a lecture topic-discussion providing a clarifying paraphrase of the students’ answer. Thus, it is actually leading the specific topic to closure.

Extract 6

(L: Lecturer; F: Fevos, A: Andreas, S: Sophocles)

1. L en ipamen oti jenika o Kavafis stin piisi tu:: xrisimopii prosopa::
didn't we say that generally Cavafy's in his poetry:: uses people::
2. ce:: jeyono::ta:: pu ta aksiopii san simvola ja na mas δixi:: ka::ti::?
a::nd eve::nts as symbols in order to show:: somethi::ng?
3. to proto::
the fi::rst
4. F i Aleksanðria::
Alexandria::
5. L I Aleksanðria:: en to e::na::
Alexandria:: is the fi::rst
6. A θarraleos en to dio::
brave is the seco::nd
7. L pco::?
wha::t?
8. A θarraleos
brave
9. L θarraleo::s en to δεftero simvolo::?
brave:: is the second symbol::?
10. A ne::
ye::s
11. L θelo prosopo:: i jeyono::s
I need a perso::n or eve::nt
12. S o θiasos?
the theatre?

⁴ Pomerantz is concerned with “the preference status of second assessments” (1984: 64). As she shows, in proffering a first assessment the speaker may invite one next action over its alternate (*ibid.*: 63). A next action that is “oriented to” the talk “as invited” is called a “*preferred next action*”; a next action that it is not “oriented to” the talk as “invited is called a “*dispreferred next action*” (*id.*).

13. L o θiasos en to allo, ne::
the theatre is the other one, ye::s
14. F o Antonios
Anthony
15. L → ce o Anto::nio::s to trito::. ara:: exume tria simvola
and Anthony:: is the thi::rd. ara:: we've got three symbols
16. mesa sto pi::ma::n
in the po::e::m
17. (3)
18. L °en to θimaste:: pu milusamen ja ta simvola::°?
don't you remembe::r what we said about the symbols?
19. F ne
yes

In 6 the discussion is about the symbols in the poem. The lecturer's (6: 3) numbering ("the fi::rst") shows that the symbols are more than one. After the students' correct responses (6: 4, 12, 14), the lecturer (6: 15) expresses agreement/acceptance as illustrated with the repetition of the response given in 6: 14. The *ára*-marked second TCU (6: 15) prefaces an inferential conclusion that closes the discussion about the symbols. The absence of agreement from the part of students is marked by the 3 second pause that follows and triggers another question designed to elicit agreement as indicated by the tentative "don't you remember..." (6:18). One student, F (6:19), responds with agreement.

Extracts 5 and 6 reveal a striking pattern of TCU-initial *ára* which prefaces a conclusive remark on the previous discussion. *Ara*-prefaced TCU recurrently occurs as the second TCU after agreement/acceptance of the prior turn has been expressed in the first TCU. In the next turn students respond with agreement.

5. *Oréa*: Sequence-closing third

Some mention about the occurrence of *oréa* within lecture discourse has already been made in the previous section. In Stavropoulos dictionary *oréa* is defined as an adverb with the meaning "fine", "well" (1988: 994). In this study *oréa* occurs after a question-answer as a "sequence-closing third" (cf. Schegloff 2007:118)

According to Schegloff (2007:118) minimal post-expansion involves the addition of one additional turn to a sequence after its second pair part. The import of "minimal" is, rather, that the turn which is added is designed not to project any further within-sequence talk beyond itself; that is, it is designed to constitute a minimal expansion after the second pair part. It is designed to move for, or to propose, sequence closing. Given its position after a second pair part, and that the move is made by a form of turn which can embody the sequence closure if sustained by coparticipants, we can refer to it as a "sequence-closing third" (SCT). Sequence-closing thirds are found after both preferred and dispreferred second pair parts.

Whether a question (for instance) prefers a 'yes' or 'no' response is a matter of its speaker's construction of it . . . the preference is built into the sequence.

(Schegloff 1988:453).

SCTs take a number of forms or combinations of them, such as "oh," "okay," and assessments. An assessment in third position articulates a stance taken up – ordinarily by the

first pair part speaker – toward what the second pair part speaker has said or done in the prior turn (Schegloff 2007: 118).

Mehan (1985) showed that sequence-organizational third position appears to a recurrent locus of variation in classrooms. According to Schegloff (2007: 224) in classroom setting the assessments (or evaluations) which known-answer question sequences take in third position are of different character, and embody a very different stance in and to the interaction than the third position assessments in most other adjacency pair sequences. Whereas in other contexts it makes analytic sense to ask what the addition of a third-position turn is doing (e.g., moving the sequence to closure), with known-answer question sequences, the more cogent analytic issue often appears to be what the withholding of a third-position evaluation is doing.

In the extracts presented in this study, *oréa* occurs as a SCT in the pattern of known-answer question sequences. A schematic representation of the sequential position of *oréa* is illustrated in table 2.

Table 2: *Sequential pattern of the occurrence of oréa*

Conversants	Sequential Position	Activity
Lecturer	First Pair Part (FPP)	Question
Student	Second Pair Part (SPP)	Answer
Lecturer	→ Sequence Closing Third (SCT)	Evaluation

Extract 7 (from 5)

(L: Lecturer; S: Sophokles; P: Petros)

1. L sto piima::n o Kavafis ti ton protrepi:: jenika::?
in the poe::m what does Cavafys advi::ses in genera::l?
2. ton kaθe anθropo::?
each perso::n?
3. S na min ta parata:: tje na proxora::
not to give u::p and move o::n
4. P na proxora::
to move o::n
5. S na min ta parata:: tje na proxora:: (efthia)
not to give u::p and move o::n (straight)
6. L → orea::, ara na staθi me aksioprepia::, etsi::?
orea::, thus to have dignity::, ri::ght?
7. P ne
yes
8. S ne
yes
9. L → orea:: (2) θelo:: mesa:: sto pi::ma:: na:: vrume ta simvola::.
orea:: (2) I wa::nt u::s to find the symbol::s in the poem..

As can be seen in the extract above the lecturer proffers a question (7: 1-2), the students respond (7: 3-5) and the lecturer assesses their responses as correct with the evaluation *oréa*. Based on the position of *oréa* (7: 6) after a known-answer question sequence, the lecturer

orients to its use as a sequence-closing third. *Oréa* is followed with a paraphrase of the students' answers that has the form of question. The right-attached question sets the preference for agreement. The students (7: 7-8) respond with agreement. This leads to expansion of the sequence as it is illustrated in 7: 6-9. Thus after establishing the agreement of the students, the lecturer (7: 9) evaluates their responses as being correct with the deployment of *oréa* which again functions as a SCT that closes the sequence. *Oréa*-prefaced turn is followed with a topic shift. Thus the topic is actually closed with the second occurrence of *oréa* within the sequence. Evidence for the claim, that evaluation expressed with *oréa* is usually followed by topic shift comes also from extract 8.

Extract 8 (from 6)

(L: Lecturer; F: Fevos, A: Andreas, S: Sophocles)

15. L ce o Anto::nio::s to trito::. ara:: exume tria simvola
and Anthony:: is the thi::rd. ara:: we've got three symbols
16. mesa sto pi::ma::n
in the po::e::m
17. (3)
18. L °en to θimaste:: pu milusamen ja ta simvola::°?
don't you remembe::r what we said about the symbols?
19. F ne
yes
20. L → ore::a::
21. (4)
22. L e:: pco::s ipe::n tin Aleksandria::?
e:: who:: sai::d Alexandria::?

As shown in the longer extract 6 (here 8), after a long discussion, the lecturer (8: 15,16) proffers a conclusive remark on the specific topic. The absence of agreement from the part of students triggers another question by L designed to elicit agreement as indicated by the tentative “don't you remember...” (8: 18). One student, F (8: 19), responds with agreement. L (8: 20) rewords him with the assessment “*orea*”: “good” and moves on to another topic (8: 22).

In table 2 we have shown the sequential pattern of the occurrence of *oréa*. The extracts analysed provide us with more details of the sequential pattern of *oréa*. A schematic representation of the larger sequential context of the occurrence of *oréa* would look like table 3.

Table 3: *Sequential pattern of the occurrence of oréa*

1.	L:	Question
2.	S:	Answer
3.	L: →	<i>Oréa (or assessment)</i> , <i>ára</i> + conclusive summary
4.	S:	Agreement
5.	L: →	<i>Oréa</i> + topic shift

6. Conclusion

This study aimed at identifying the meaning of three lexical markers in academic discourse and in particular within lecture interaction. In their introduction to a collection of papers on the intersection of grammar and interaction which have provided the conceptual coordinates for the current study, Schegloff et al. (1996) set a powerful agenda for the study of language use in proposing that the study of linguistic structures could be richly informed by consideration of their place in the wider context of social interaction.

In the data *lipón*, *ára* and *oréa* are used in specific sequential positions within the wider interactional context and they occupy specific positions within the construction of the turn where they occur. Hence their position within the sequence as well as their position in the turn and composition of the turn –that is their relationship with the other elements of the turn, whether they proceed or follow them, whether they are freestanding, or parts of a TCU– enabled us to unfold their meaning within lecture interaction. A simple schematic representation of the position that the lexical items under study take in the turn and the actions they accomplish as revealed in the data might look like table 4.

Table 4: *The position and composition of the lexical items and the actions accomplished.*

DMs	TCU-Position	Composition of the turn	Action
Lipón	Turn-initial; freestanding	<i>Lipón</i> + reminiscence recognition	Topic-proffering
Lipón	Turn-initial; freestanding	<i>Lipón</i> + resumption search	Return to an interrupted action
Ára	Second TCU	Assessment/agreement + <i>ára</i> prefaced TCU	Make inferential conclusions; lead the topic to closure
Oréa	Turn-Initial; freestanding	<i>Oréa</i> + summarizing conclusion <i>Oréa</i> + topic shift	SCT; Assessment/agreement

In sum table 4 represents two uses of freestanding *lipón*, and the use of non-turn initial *ára* and free-standing *oréa*. The schema of course provides only the most general representation of observed usages in the specific context of lecture discourse; it is intended to be neither predictive nor prescriptive.

The most general but also important observation that could be made about the lexical items under study is that although two of the lexical particles *lipón* and *ára* have similar meanings, their investigation in context revealed great differences between the two, both on their position in the sequence as well as on their position within the turn. This proves that the meaning of even a single particle lies within the context of its occurrence.

The first lexical particle examined, *lipón*, is used in turn-initial position as a freestanding particle and has two different uses in the context. The first use of *lipón* is proffering a new topic. In the data *lipón* is deployed by the lecturer at the first minutes of the lesson as a frame which signals lesson's initiation. It is proffered in loud and stressed voice as well as with stretched intonation. The emphasis in its delivery enables students to hear and see that the lecture is about to begin. It is usually followed with reminiscence recognition in the second TCU creating connection with the lecture delivered the previous week. The second use of free-standing *lipón* is signaling return to a lecture topic that was in progress before the interruption by a parenthetical discussion or argument between the lecturer and students. In this case *lipón* is followed with a resumption search.

The other two markers under study, *oréa* and *ára* are often used within the same turn, at the end of a lecture topic. Compared to *lipón*, *ára* has a quite different role to play in the data. It occurs as a preface on the second TCU of a turn in which the first TCU performs the activity of a SCT. That is what precedes it is a sequence of known-answer question followed by agreement/assessment. The SCT expresses agreement or assesses the students' response. *Ara* prefaces a TCU that makes an inferential conclusion or summarises the topic discussed. With it the topic is moved to closure. Thus contrary to the use of *lipón* which is deployed at the initiation of the lecture, *ára* is used at the end of a lecture topic.

The free-standing *oréa* is used as SCT after a known-answer question sequence, leading the sequence to closure by assessing the response of the students and moving the topic to closure. As was mentioned above *oréa* is followed with a shift to another lecture topic or with a conclusive summary on the on-topic talk.

Methodologically, the findings presented here underscore the importance of examining discourse markers within interactional sequences as well as within institutional discourse such as classroom and lecture interaction. Analyzing some of the uses of three lexical particles within the lecture discourse, the current study has revealed that the placement of each lexical particle in the turn and its component TCUs is highly consequential for the activities being undertaken in the sequence to which its turn belongs. Its placement not only characterizes as a particular type of activity—topic introducing, say, or implicative—the turn which contains it but also the turn to which it is responsive. To conclude with, the use of discourse markers has a significant role to play in the structure and coherence of lecture discourse and thus it should be further examined by focusing on the relationship between meaning and interaction.

References:

- Archakis, A. (2001). On discourse markers: Evidence from Modern Greek. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33 (8), 1235-1261.
- Archakis, A. (2002). Information management in discourse: Evidence from the analysis of the discourse marker *diladi* in classroom interaction". *Pedagogikos Logos*, 2, 201-209 [in Greek].
- Arvaniti, A. (2002). The maintenance of diglossia in Cyprus and the emergence of Cypriot Standard Greek. MS
- Babinotiis, G. (1998). *Leksiko tis neas Ellinikis glossas (Dictionary of the Modern Greek language)*. Athens: Kentro Lexikologias.
- Benson, M. J. (1989). The academic listening task: a case study. *TESOL Quarterly* 23 (3), 421-445.
- Benson, M. J. (1994). Lecture listening in an ethnographic perspective. In J. Flowerdew (Ed.), *Academic English: research perspectives*, 181-198. Cambridge: CUP.
- Blackmore, D. (1992). Understanding utterances. An introduction to pragmatics. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Chaudron, C. & Richards, J. C. (1986). The effect of discourse markers on the comprehension of lectures. *Applied Linguistics*, 7 (2), 113-127.
- Clift, R. (2001). Meaning in interaction: The case of *actually*. *Language*, 77 (2), 245-291.
- Cook, J. R. S. (1975). *A communicative approach to the analysis of extended monologue discourse and its relevance to the development of teaching materials for ESP*. Unpublished M. Litt. Thesis. Edinburg: University of Edinburg.
- Coulthard M. & Montgomery, M. (1981). The structure of monologue. In Coulthard M. & M. Montgomery (eds.), *Studies in discourse analysis*, 31-39. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Davy, J., Ioannou Y., and Panayiotou A. (1996). French and English loans in Cypriot diglossia. *Travaux de la maison del' Orient méditerranéen 25: Chypre hier et aujourd'hui entre Orient et Occident*, 127-136. Lyon: Maison del' Orient méditerranéen
- Drew, P & Holt, E. (1998). Figures of speech: Idiomatic expressions and the management of topic transition in conversation. *Language in Society*, 27, 495-522.
- Ferguson, A. C. (1959). Diglossia. In P. P. Giglioli (1982) (ed.), *Language and Social Context*, 232-251. London: Penguin Books.
- Georgakopoulou, A. and Goutsos, D. (1998). Conjunctions versus discourse markers in Greek: the interaction of frequency, position, and functions in context. *Linguistics*, 36, 887-917.
- Goffman, Erving (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Goffman, Erving (1979). In *Semiotica* 25, 1- 29. Reprinted in E. Goffman and D. Hymes (1981) (eds.), *Forms of talk*, 124-161. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hutchby, I. & Drew, P. (1995). Conversation analysis. In Verschueren, J, J.-O. Östman, J. Blommaert and C. Bulacaen (eds.), *Handbook of pragmatics*, 182-189. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Johs, A. M. (1981). Necessary English: A faculty survey. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15, 51-57.
- Karyolemou, M. (1997). Accommodation theory and the use of the aorist in the Cypriot variety. In G. Drachman, A. Malikouti-Drachman, J. Fykias and C. Klidi (eds.), *Greek Linguistics: Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Greek Linguistics* 2, 707-726. Salzburg: W. Neugebauer Verlag GmbH.

- Karyolemou, M. (2000a). Le chypriote: dialecte ou idiome. In A. P. Christides (ed.), *La langue grecque et ses dialects*, 111-115. Athens: Greek Republic, Direction of International Relations and Centre for the Greek Language (bilingual edition).
- Karyolemou, M. and Pavlou P. (2001). Language attitudes and assessment of salient variables in a bi-dialectal speech community. In J. Fontana et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the first International Conference on Language Variation in Europe*, 110-120. Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra.
- Kintsch, W & Yarbrough, J. C. (1982). Role of rhetorical structure in text comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74 (6), 828-834.
- Lakoff, R. (1973). Questionable answers and answerable questions. In. Kachru, B., R. B. Lees, Y. Malkiel, A. Pietrangeli, and S. Saporta (eds.), *Issues in linguistics. Papers in honor of Henry and Rente Kahane*, 453-467. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Lerner, G. (1992). Assisted storytelling: Displaying shared knowledge as a practical matter. *Qualitative Sociology*, 15 (3), 247-271.
- Mehan, H. (1985). The structure of classroom discourse. In T. A. Dijk (ed.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, vol III, 120-31. New York: Academic Press.
- Moschonas, S. (2002). Koini glossa kai dialektos: To zitima tis glossikis dimorfias stin Kipro (Common language and dialect: The issue of the linguistic diglossia in Cyprus). *Nea Estia*, 151 (1745), 898-928.
- Murphy, D. F. & Candlin, C. N. (1979). Engineering lecture discourse and listening comprehension. *Practical papers in English Language Education*, 2, 1-79. Lancaster: University of Lancaster.
- Papapavlou, Andreas and Pavlou P. (1998). A review of the sociolinguistic aspects of the Greek Cypriot dialect. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 19 (3), 212-220.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*, 57-101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Redeker, G. (1990). Identical and pragmatic markers of discourse structure. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 367-381.
- Richards, J. C. 1983. Listening comprehension: approach, design, procedure. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17 (2), 219-239.
- Sacks, H. (1987). On the preference for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In G. Button and J. R. E. Lee (eds.), *Talk and social organization*, 54-69. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Sacks, H. (1992a). *Lectures on conversation, [1964-1968]*, volume I. Edited by G. Jefferson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Sacks, H. (1992b). *Lectures on conversation, [1968-1972]*, volume II. Edited by G. Jefferson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696-735.
- Schegloff, E. (1988). On an actual virtual servo-mechanism for guessing bad news: A single case conjecture. *Social Problems*, 32, 442-57.
- Schegloff, E. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis, Volume I*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Schegloff, E., Ochs, E. & Thompson, S. (1996). Introduction. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff & S. A. Thomson. (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar*, 1-52. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Schiffrin, D. (1985). Conversational coherence: The role of 'well'. *Language*, 61 (3), 640-667.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schourup, L.C. (1982). *Common discourse particles in English conversation*. New York: Garland.
- Stavropoulos, D. N. (1988). *Oxford Greek-English learner's dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Svartvik, J. (1980). 'Well' in conversation. In S. Greenbaum, G. Leech and J. Svartvik (eds.). *Studies in English linguistics for Randolph Quirk*, 167-177. London: Longman.
- Watts, R. J. (1989). Taking the pitcher to the 'well'. Native speakers' perception of their use of discourse markers in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 13, 203-237.
- Waggoner, M. (1984). The new technologies versus the lecture tradition in higher education: is change possible? *Educational Technologies*, 24 (3), 7-12

Appendix I

Transcription Conventions

[Separate left square brackets, one above the other on two successive lines with utterances by different speakers,
[indicates a point of overlap onset, whether at the start of an utterance or later.
[[Double separate left square brackets, distinguish pairs of
[[overlapped utterances.
=	Equal signs ordinarily come in pairs – one at the end of a line and another at the start of a next line. If the two lines connected by the equal signs are by the same speaker, then there was a single, continuous utterance with no break or pause, which was broken up in order to accommodate the placement of overlapping talk. If the lines connected by two equal signs are by different speakers, then the second followed the first with no discernible silence between them.
(2)	Numbers in parenthesis indicate silence.
(.)	A dot in parentheses indicates a micropause.
.	The period indicates a falling or final, intonation contour, not necessarily the end of a sentence.
?	A question mark indicates rising intonation, not necessarily a question.
,	A comma indicates continuing intonation, not necessarily a clause boundary.
::	Colons are used to indicate the prolongation or stretching of the sound just preceding them. The more colons the longer the stretching.
-	A hyphen after a word or part of a word indicates a cut-off or self-interruption, often done with a glottal or dental stop.
<u>word</u>	Underlining is used to indicate stress or emphasis.
Word	Capital letters indicate louder than the rest talk.
° °	Two degree signs indicate that the talk between them is markedly softer than the talk around it.
↑	The up arrow indicate a segment starting on sharper rise.
> <	The combination of "more than" and "less than" symbols indicates that the talk between them is compressed or rushed.

.hhh	The dot followed by “h’s” indicates inbreath
(h)	The letter “h” in parentheses inside the boundaries of a word indicates laughter.
(())	Double parentheses are used to mark transcriber’s descriptions of events, e.g. ((telephone rings)), ((sniff)) etc.
(word)	When all or a part of an utterance is in parentheses, this indicates uncertainty on the transcriber’s part, but represents a likely possibility.
£word£	Word or Words enclosed by pound sterling signs indicate the word is articulated through a hearably smiling voice.
()	Empty parentheses indicate that something is being said, but no hearing can be achieved.
→	An arrow marks significant turns.