COPYRIGHT AND CITATION CONSIDERATIONS FOR THIS THESIS/ DISSERTATION

This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyrighted and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

Please include the following information in your citation:

Name of author
Year of publication, in brackets
Title of thesis, in italics
Type of degree (e.g. D. Phil.; Ph.D.; M.Sc.; M.A. or M.Ed. …etc.)
Name of the University
Website
Date, accessed

Example
A critical exploration of argumentation in the texts that third-year Development Studies students interpret and construct

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a PhD degree in the Faculty of Education at the University of Johannesburg

Pia Lamberti

April 2013

Supervisors:
Professors Jennifer Clarence-Fincham and Elizabeth Henning
Declaration

I declare that this thesis is my own work. It is submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of the Johannesburg, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination at any other University.

(Pia Lamberti)

22 April 2013
Abstract

The purpose of the educational linguistic research represented in this thesis is to explore the construction of written argumentation in Development Studies and to establish the implications of the findings for higher education teaching and learning that provides students with epistemological access to powerful discourse (Morrow 2007; 2009).

The research is designed around analysis of the texts within the textual network that represents Development Studies in one case study: the final semester of a three-year undergraduate course in Development Studies. The textual network consists of texts from the fields of knowledge production, recontextualisation and reproduction (Bernstein 2000). Critical discourse analysis (Fairclough 2001; 2010) is used to explore how disciplinary and educational texts position students in ways that are enabling or constraining of the construction of argument.

The perspective on written academic argument is informed by discourse theory, specifically, systemic functional linguistics (Halliday 1978); discourse semantics (Martin 1992), genre theory, and different approaches to the study of textual interaction (White 2003; Hyland 2005; 2008; Martin and White 2005). The thesis identifies and extends an emerging dialogical perspective on argumentation that draws on Bakhtinian theory (1981; 1986) and rhetoric-based strands of argumentation theory from North America, Britain and continental Europe. A framework was developed and implemented for the analysis of argument in knowledge-focused texts as ‘positioning’ in three ‘levels’ of discourse.

In the research site, it was found that legitimate argumentation requires the production of a finely-balanced disciplinary discourse. This discourse involves negotiation of conflicting positionings of the writer in relation to the reader, and textual interaction with authoritative disciplinary voices and with competing discourses of inquiry and persuasion. Analysis of student texts in the dominant genre used for assessment, the multiple-source discussion essay, showed that few texts exhibit strong disciplinary argumentation. Argumentation in the majority of texts was cause for concern. Common problems that undermined students’ argumentation were: misunderstanding the prescribed texts, overreliance on sources, the use of inappropriate source texts and discourses, and underdeveloped discursive resources for the construction of argument.

It is concluded that weak argumentation is partly attributable to the following factors: the heterogeneity of discourses and genres in the texts that instantiate the knowledge domain, inadequate theorization of argument as a dimension of disciplinary discourse, limited
educational knowledge about written argumentation, conflicting discourses of argumentation and knowledge-making in the production and recontextualising fields, and confusion about the position students can take up in pedagogical discourse.
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'There can be no semiotic act that leaves the world exactly as it was before.'

Chapter one: Overview of the research

1.1 Introduction

As written argumentation in third-year Development Studies is the object of study, this research is located in the field of educational linguistics. However, since the design of the research is oriented to critical discourse analysis (see 3.2), there is also a sociological dimension to the design logic, which is realised in efforts to understand the ways in which the object of study is embedded in layers of context (Fairclough 2001; 2003; 2010). Therefore, the first part of this introductory chapter places the study in context by outlining some salient aspects of three contextual levels which inform the research: global higher education, South African higher education, and academic development at the University of Johannesburg. The second part of the chapter highlights the important role that academic/disciplinary discourse and argument play in higher education, providing some justification for structuring the research around the concepts of discourse and argument. It also indicates the gaps in knowledge which the study addresses. In the final part of the chapter, the research itself is introduced and the structure of the thesis is outlined.

1.2 The study in context

At the outset, it is acknowledged that the thesis was written in a “time of crisis”, which Norman Fairclough (2010: 14-20) suggests is precipitated by the failure of neo-liberal capitalism. The global economic and socio-political context, currently characterised by contracting economic opportunities, limited resources and uncertainty, is impacting negatively on higher education worldwide. In South Africa, where the history of racially-based educational deprivation lingers on in a tertiary education system that is under-resourced, the global challenges to higher education are intensified, making the need for solutions to the problems outlined in this chapter even more pressing.

1.2.1 Challenges in higher education: the global arena

The challenges of massification and increased student diversity have been widely noted in publications written over the last twenty years (Harvey and Knight 1996; Barnett 1997; Guri-Rosenblit, Šebková and Teichler 2007). While the perception that students are ‘under-prepared’ has resulted in a focus on learning ‘support’, the prevailing deficit view of students is strongly contested, both in the international context (Lea and Street 1998) and in the South African context (Boughey 1998; 2000; 2002; 2008). The argument that the pedagogical cultures of the disciplines may be creating conditions that hamper student
learning has been convincingly made (Haggis 2006). It can be concluded that the “traditional academic pedagogy of osmosis” (Turner 2011: 37) is serving neither the interests of students currently in the system nor those of future generations, thus confirming that the call for the “transformation” of higher education by improving learning and teaching is still relevant almost twenty years later (Harvey and Knight 1996). A relatively coherent body of research, now recognised as the “academic literacies” approach (Lillis and Scott 2007), has shown that institutional discourse and pedagogical practices position students disadvantageously, limiting performance and constraining identities (Lea 1998; Lea and Street 1998; Jones, Turner and Street 1999; Lea and Stierer 2000; Lillis 2001; Lillis and Turner 2001; Thesen and van Pletzen 2006; Paxton, van Pletzen, Archer, Arend and Chihota 2008). The research reported in this thesis, emerging from a specific South African context, is a response to these criticisms of higher education.

1.2.2 South African higher education in crisis

While there is global concern about the ability of higher education, as it is currently configured, to produce in sufficient numbers the kinds of graduates who can contribute to the fast-changing knowledge economy and “super-complexity” (Barnett 2000) and who embody “critical being” (Barnett 1997; 2011), in South Africa there is even greater concern about the effectiveness of higher education institutions (Scott, Yeld and Hendry 2007; CHE 2010). The damaging legacy of undemocratic government and Apartheid education has made the need for “transformation” (Department of Education 1997; Department of Education 2002; Van Wyk 2003) in higher education more urgent than it is in more developed countries. In this context, “transformation” refers to the material and conceptual changes in higher education in post-1994 democratic South Africa that were made to ensure more equitable distribution of educational resources across racial groups. This “entailed the merging of some higher education institutions and the widening of university access to a more representative proportion of the population” (CHE 2011: 13). High dropout rates and slow throughput rates (Scott, Yeld and Hendry 2007) are evidence of the need for change. Some consequences of unsatisfactory student performance at undergraduate level are inadequately prepared postgraduate students and relatively small numbers of students completing postgraduate studies, especially at doctoral level (CHE 2009). A related problem is limited capacity for research supervision, which is already threatening the state’s prospects for full participation in the global knowledge economy (Habib and Morrow 2006).
While South Africa is not immune to the problems that have emerged in higher education across the world (Bitzer 2009), specific historical and material conditions in the country present problems (Boughey 2003; Cloete, Maassen, Fehnel, Moja, Gibbon and Perold 2002) that dwarf the challenges of “supercomplexity” (Barnett 2000) and problems related to the commodification of knowledge that currently face higher education institutions in the developed world (Rowland 2006). South Africa’s history of racially-based educational inequity has resulted in a high proportion of students who are even more under-prepared for higher education than their counterparts in the developed world (Cross 1998), as suggested by the disturbing statistics on student throughput (Scott, Yeld and Hendry 2007). Currently, there is a strong focus on providing equal access to university education to all social groups. However, insufficient attention is paid to the factors that militate against student success once students gain access to higher education (Boughey 2003; Griesel 2004; Morrow 2007; 2009), especially “first generation” students (Heymann and Carolissen 2011), the majority of whom use English, which is an additional language, as the language of learning (Madiba 2010; Paxton 2009; Madiba 2010; Paxton and Tyam 2010).

Another serious problem is lecturers who are ill-prepared to provide such students with “epistemological access” to their areas of disciplinary expertise (Morrow 2007: 18; 2009). Concern about the transition from secondary to tertiary education and the high attrition rate in tertiary education deflects attention from the quality of teaching and learning for students who manage to stay in the system. Poor or mediocre final results are one indication that many students who persist with their university studies and graduate have not engaged adequately with disciplinary knowledge or developed the rhetorical flexibility and empowered identities they require for successful transition to postgraduate studies. Negative feedback on “graduate attributes” (Green, Hammer and Star 2009; Leibowitz 2011) from employers is an indicator of the failure of tertiary education to prepare students adequately for professional positions in the workplace (Griesel and Parker 2009).

The explicit inclusion of “critical thinking” (Kurfiss 1988) in the curriculation of all qualifications registered with the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA)¹ was seen as one of the ways to effect positive change on teaching and learning. References to critical thinking feature prominently in South African education policy guidelines and

---

curriculum documents in the form of a set of “Critical Cross-Field Outcomes”\(^2\), which are supposed to inform learning programme and curriculum design at all levels of study (Bitzer 2009). The introduction of the “learning outcome” in curriculum design was another policy-driven strategy to improve teaching and learning (Luckett 2000; Van Koller 2010; Boughey and Niven 2012: 650). However, since academic freedom is fiercely guarded in higher education, there was resistance to what was interpreted as a technicist approach to redesigning curricula in terms of learning outcomes (Luckett 2001). Consequently, in many cases, curricula were rewritten to conform on paper to a transformation\(^3\) agenda (Cloete, Maassen, Fehnel, Moja, Gibbon and Perold 2002), but teaching practice continues unchanged.

In South Africa, over the last thirty years, interest in the appropriateness and quality of teaching and learning practices in higher education has been closely related to “academic development” (Volbrecht and Boughey 2004; Scott 2009; Boughey 2007; Boughey and Niven 2012)\(^4\). To summarise briefly, academic development had its origins in historically advantaged, formerly ‘white’, universities when they were opened to significant numbers of ‘black’ students, who were conceived of as underprepared for higher education because of inferior schooling. Additional “academic support” (Volbrecht and Boughey 2004: 60; Boughey 2007) was offered to these students in the form of decontextualised academic skills courses and interventions, but there was no attempt to accommodate greater student diversity in mainstream curriculum design. The critique of the ‘deficit’ perspective on students that prevailed in South African higher education resulted in the development of more integrated academic development provision, mainly in the form of ‘foundational’ modules and ‘extended degrees’ (Scott 2009). Since this action did not affect mainstream teaching and learning, there were calls for “responsiveness” to the diversity of students in the form of overall curriculum change (Griesel 2004). Although compelling arguments, underpinned by social understandings of literacy and learning (Heath 1983; Street 1984; Gee 1996), have been made for changes in higher education curriculum and pedagogy (Boughey 2000; 2002; 2008; Scott, Yeld, and Hendry 2007), change has not been as substantive as critics might hope. The perception that a deficit view of students prevails is


\(^3\)In South Africa, the term ‘transformation’ has an additional layer of political connotation, being associated with post-Apartheid ‘social justice’ discourse.

\(^4\)Although the term ‘academic development’ is still used, the emphasis in South African higher education seems to be shifting to ‘mainstream’ learning and teaching, signaled, for example, by the name change of the South African Association for Academic Development (SAAAD), which is now called the Higher Education Learning and Teaching Association of Southern Africa (HELTASA).
also reflected in a recent publication, which criticises South African higher education for conservatism and a lack of critical reflexivity (Boughey and Niven 2012).

As teaching and learning is the focus of impending quality assurance reviews (CHE 2011), there is external government and internal institutional pressure for higher education managers and academic staff to pay more attention to the quality of teaching and learning. The crisis in South African higher education calls for more effective use of the limited intellectual and material resources currently available in the system. There is a need for research into teaching and learning in the disciplines which makes a contribution to the development of both “powerful” knowledge (Young 2008: 14, see 2.3.4) and empowered (authoritative) student identities (see 2.2.4.6).

1.2.3 Academic development at the University of Johannesburg

The research is located in the specific context of the University of Johannesburg. It has emerged directly from work in academic development at the institution, where unsatisfactory student performance, particularly in academic writing, has been the focus of increasing concern. Over a period of fourteen years, I have been involved in foundational language and literacies courses, projects to integrate academic literacies into ‘mainstream’ disciplinary teaching, and initiatives to develop the teaching, postgraduate supervision and research-writing capacity of academic staff. My interest in argumentation, as a pedagogical tool and research area in the academic disciplines, developed through informal collaborations with lecturers. These experiences led to a growing conviction that written argument – the ‘space’ where language, knowledge and thinking merge – is an important area for focused educational research. My commitment to contribute to the development of appropriate theory, and to produce empirical evidence that adds to knowledge about argument in the social sciences, resulted in my decision to make written argument in a specific knowledge domain the focus of doctoral research.

Typically, lecturers expect students to acquire the rhetorical knowledge and discursive resources required for legitimate participation in the disciplines (Lave and Wenger 1991) with limited or even no explicit instruction provided in their courses. The assumption is that as long as students engage adequately with the course ‘content’, they should be able to achieve discursive competence independently and without experiencing problems. Failure to produce written discourse acceptable in the discipline is seen as evidence that

---

5 More detailed description of the research site is provided in Chapter 3 (see 3.5).

6 This claim is based on my participation in numerous discussions over a number of years in the university’s Academic Development Division, and in other institutional structures, such as the Senate Language Committee.
the student should not have been allowed to register for study in the discipline. Increasing numbers of requests for the provision of interventions to help improve student writing, directed to academic development practitioners, and expressed in institution-wide forums, are evidence that student writing is constructed as a problem in institutional discourse, and that students who do not demonstrate the “academic literacies” (Lea and Street 1998) necessary for success are referred to additional ‘support’, such as consultations at the Writing Centre. Therefore, it appears that the dominant perception is that student writing can and should be remediated outside the bounds of disciplinary learning, in a writing centre or in general decontextualised academic writing courses. This perception, informed as it is by an “autonomous” view of literacy (Street 1984: 8) which has been discredited in educational linguistics, is cause for concern.

1.3 Written discourse in higher education

The belief that ideas pre-exist language and that there is a one-to-one correlation between the world and the language that represents it is still widely held (Lillis 2001; Turner 2011), even by academics who insist that knowledge is a social construction. Consequently, the role of writing in the creation, representation and communication of knowledge is underestimated.

The dominant conception of language as “a transparent and autonomous conduit” for knowledge provides a limited framework for teaching and learning (Lillis 2001: 168-169). This conception of language became entrenched in the Enlightenment, when language was subordinated to knowledge. In making knowledge ‘visible’, language was rhetorically suppressed to the extent that it became and, in many contexts, is still “invisible” (Turner 2011: 69, 81). The result is that the interdependent relationship between thinking and writing is rarely acknowledged (see 2.4.1).

The tendency to blame students’ poor academic performance on language deficit is related to the “conduit” view of language (Lillis 2001; Turner 2011) that still appears to dominate in higher education. The misconception about the relationship between language, knowledge and learning has serious consequences for teaching and learning. In the context of disciplinary learning, one of the most important aspects of pedagogic practice is the design and assessment of written assignments (Lillis 2001: 169). The

---

7 Recently, the problem was considered severe enough to be discussed at executive management level, where the possibility of separate compulsory academic writing modules for all qualifications was suggested.

8 See 2.2.4 for the distinction between “autonomous” and “ideological” views of literacy (Street 1984)
essayist literacy practice that still dominates in higher education, particularly in the humanities and social sciences, means that the essay is the “default” assignment form (Womack 1993: 42; Andrews 2007: 1; Andrews 2010). Despite its ubiquity as a form of assessment in both academic writing courses (Spellmeyer 1998) and in the disciplines, the academic essay (Dudley-Evans 2002) is a complex, multifaceted, and still misunderstood genre (see 2.2.4.9).

Rose argues that the language that lecturers use to discuss student’s writing is damaging, when it constructs students as “illiterate” (1998: 22-25). Haggis argues convincingly that the pedagogic discourse that frames writing tasks, and the tasks themselves (what students are asked to write) may “create impediments to students’ learning” (Haggis 2008: 7). The insight that all semiotic acts have an impact on the world (Halliday 2002) should not be underestimated in the academy. Because the disciplinary texts students write have real consequences, both in the present and in the future, the question of what students are asked to read and write, and how they write in response to essay prompts, is taken up in this research.

1.4 Argument in higher education

The place of argument in the academy is contentious, argument having both its supporters and its opponents in higher education. Nevertheless, from a philosophical perspective, argument is closely bound up with conceptions of the university, which is described as “an institution whose rationale is argument” (Myerson 1995: 134). Not only is argument seen as a precondition for higher education, it is also seen as essential for social criticism (229), and for the preservation of democratic values (Andrews 2010). The process of engaging in argument, being a way of developing “new selves, new modes of selfhood, new ways of being in and understanding the world” (Crosswhite 1996: 267), is also seen as contributing to personal development or, to use theoretical terminology, the “construction” of “identity” (Clark and Ivanič 1997; Ivanič 1998).

Since the common perception is that new knowledge is produced by research, the role that argumentation plays in research is generally overlooked. However, a number of scholars have recently reiterated the key role argumentation plays in knowledge construction and postgraduate research writing (Kamler and Thomson 2006; Andrews 2007; Metcalfe 2007; McLean 2010). Argument produces new knowledge because “argumentative

---

9 See the epigraph at the start of this thesis.
10 In South Africa, the term ‘postgraduate’ is equivalent to the term ‘graduate’ in the United States of America.
reasoning” generates ideas (Crosswhite 1996: 223), or what composition theorists refer to as “discovery” (see 2.4.3). While there is no doubt that higher education institutions are appropriate spaces for informed argument and debate aimed at producing new knowledge, whether or not the discussion generated helps to improve the world is contestable. Since “authority has often misappropriated the rational space and forged the outcomes of argument” (Myerson 1995: 132), it is acknowledged that argument is easily co-opted into the service of power to reproduce the status quo. However, without argument, change cannot take place. Therefore, even feminist and postmodern theorists who see argument as restrictive understand its inevitable place in the academy.

Since discursive resources for argument are an aspect of students’ “cultural capital”, and therefore an indication of their chances of becoming economically and culturally productive citizens (Bourdieu and Passeron 1990), an investigation of students’ written argument is an area worthy of research. Argument is an important dimension of all knowledge-focused texts, including the academic essay. Students who are able to produce good written argument are rewarded in higher education (Elander, Harrington, Norton, Robinson and Reddy 2006). However, few lecturers are able to articulate what exactly they mean when they refer to “good” writing in their own disciplines (Leki 1995), and therefore do not make expectations about argument explicit to the tutors and students with whom they work. In one instance, a lecturer who claimed s/he could recognise a well-developed argument, admitted: “it is difficult to say exactly what I am looking for, let alone describe a good argument more fully” (quoted in Crème and Lea 1997: 37). Academic argument is one of the most important aspects of what Lillis (1999) refers to as “the institutional practice of mystery”. Therefore, argument is underestimated as an aspect of writing in the disciplines, and further research on academic argument is warranted.

In South Africa, the majority of students have been offered, at best, limited opportunities to develop discursive resources for argumentation at school. Many of them come from authoritarian home and school cultures that are not conducive to the development of a critical “habitus” (Bourdieu and Passeron 1990), and therefore they may not be naturally inclined to engage in argumentation, even in an academic context (Hewlett 1996; Kapp and Bangeni 2005). Despite education policy changes designed to improve the quality of education (Van Koller 2010), the dismal performance of South African school children on standardized international tests (Van Staden and Howie 2010) suggest that discredited transmission-mode pedagogical practices continue in primary and secondary education practice, particularly in under-resourced state schools.
In the undergraduate years when humanities and social science classes are generally heavily-subscribed, classes are large\textsuperscript{11}. Curricula tend to be lecture-dependent and ‘content’-heavy, with limited opportunities for the discussion of ideas or the production of extended writing. Therefore, conditions for the development of argument competence are not ideal in undergraduate education either. Since the neglect of argument militates against the achievement of “academic depth” (Slonimsky and Shalem 2004: 81-82), students’ lack of experience in constructing and writing argument may be one of the major barriers to epistemological access in the disciplines they choose to study.

The necessarily general overview of the place of argument in higher education discussed above shows that while argument is considered vital, it is a neglected aspect of teaching and learning practice, particularly in South Africa. This can be seen as strong justification for research that explores South African students’ written argumentation.

1.5 Research on written academic argument

Having established that argument is a neglected aspect of higher education teaching practice, a discussion follows on what research has contributed to an understanding of academic argument. There is a substantial body of research on academic discourse that provides ‘incidental’ exploration of argumentation\textsuperscript{12}, some of the most notable examples being genre scholarship (see 2.2.4.5) in the Systemic Functional Linguistic tradition in relation to school subjects (Martin 1992; Coffin 1997; 2006; Martin and Veel 1998), and North American genre studies, which focus primarily on higher education and research writing (Bazerman 1988; Dillon 1991; Kaufer and Geisler 1991; Geisler 1994; Berkenkotter and Huckin 1995). Studies in composition and rhetoric (see 2.4.3) have produced an extensive body of work on argument in writing, but it has tended to centre on theorisation and pedagogy for ‘Composition/Rhetoric’, the generic, entry-level academic writing courses American students are required to complete (Crosswhite 1996; Emmel, Resch and Tenney 1996; Fulkerson 1996; Bloom, Daiker and White 1996). While there is some ‘English for Academic Purposes’ and academic writing research on aspects of written argument, it is generally focused on generic features of undergraduate writing (Belcher and Braine 1995; Helms-Park and Stapleton 2003; Ravelli and Ellis 2004). Aside from academic writing research focused on “interaction”, and “engagement” (Hyland 2000;

\textsuperscript{11}The term ‘large class’ in this thesis refers to groups of between 80 and 600 students, who, typically, are taught simultaneously in large lecture venues that limit interaction between lecturer and students.

\textsuperscript{12}In these instances, although argumentation is an aspect of the writing which is discussed, it is not the main focus of the research.
2004; 2008), “metadiscourse” (Hyland 2005) and “appraisal” theory (Hood 2004; 2007; Derewianka 2007; Swain 2007), which addresses argumentation to only a limited extent (see 2.2.4.3 and 2.2.4.4), there is little empirical research on written argument in specific disciplines.

Argumentation in academic disciplines is the focus of a limited amount of published research conducted in the United Kingdom. A project to investigate the teaching and learning of argument in sixth form and higher education focused on a wide variety of A-level subjects\(^{13}\), and university-level English, sociology and fine art (Mitchell 1994: 195), but it was pragmatic in its aims, resulting in a volume that concentrates on practical applications of argument pedagogies (Costello and Mitchell 1995). Contributions to a subsequent volume on argumentation are predominantly about entry level to higher education (Mitchell and Andrews 2000). A more recent study, investigating students’ and lecturers’ perceptions and uses of argument, focused on first-year courses only\(^{14}\) (Andrews, Bilbro, Mitchell, Peake, Prior, Robinson, See and Torgerson 2006). Some of the most interesting research on argumentation in the disciplines is focused on the use of new forms of communication, such as online conferencing (Coffin and Hewings 2005). One of the most recent explorations of argumentation in a specific discipline, from one of the authors at the forefront of research on argument in education and learning, addresses first-year level History only (Andrews 2009). There are few published studies of argument at third-year level in the humanities or social sciences\(^{15}\). Thus, research in written argumentation at undergraduate exit-level is a research area that has been underexplored. In sum, most of the research on written argument in higher education has been conducted at entry level, where students have not had sustained exposure to discipline-specific discourse. One of the consequences of the paucity of research on argumentation at higher levels of university study is that written argument has been insufficiently theorised as a dimension of discourse in the academic disciplines. Furthermore, since there is no accessible published research focused on written argument in the relatively new subject Development Studies (see 2.3.7) at any level of study, research on argument in this knowledge domain breaks new ground. Thus, not only does this study explore disciplinary

---

\(^{13}\) These were history, politics, sociology, communication studies, English, theatre studies, biology, mathematics and physics.

\(^{14}\) This covered biology, electronic engineering, and history in two universities in the United Kingdom and one in the United States of America.

\(^{15}\) In a literature search, one study on the learning of argument in third-year sociology was found (Mitchell 1995: 131-146).
argumentation, it also fills the considerable gap in knowledge about argumentation in the discourses of Development Studies.

In the South African context, empirical writing research has tended to concentrate on general academic literacies at the transition point between secondary school and higher education (Prince and Yeld 2012), and on student writing in the first year of study (Dison 2009; Seligmann 2009). While there is some “writing in the disciplines” (Deane and O’Neill 2011) research which touches on argument (Paxton 2007), academic argument has not been the specific focus of South African research on writing in the disciplines, nor has the academic writing of students who succeed in reaching the final year of undergraduate study. For this reason, little is known about South African students’ construction of argument in the discourses of their chosen fields of study at any level of undergraduate study, with third-year being the least explored undergraduate level.

1.6 Research problem and research aims

The problem addressed in the thesis is an aspect of a complex problem-nexus, especially when it is viewed through an interdisciplinary lens. Consequently, the problem is difficult to disentangle so that separate components are identifiable, and can be formulated in terms that are appropriate for research towards a thesis based in educational linguistics. In the broadest sense, the research presented in this thesis engages with the challenges and needs identified above (see 1.2), and the mismatch between institutional expectations of students and their actual performance. In higher education management discourse, the problem is most frequently viewed in terms of student deficit and generally, expressed as concerns about student under-preparedness, the inadequacy of students’ previous educational experience, or limited competence in the language of learning (Turner 2011). Framed as an appropriate problem in the field of educational linguistics, the problem is one of student writing (see 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 1.5). From the perspective of students, the problem is experienced as difficulty with the writing of essay assignments and, in many cases, disappointment in the final essay mark assigned by the assessor. From the perspective of lecturers, the problem is experienced as unsatisfactory student writing. From a university management perspective, the problem presents as unsatisfactory statistics on student retention, pass rates and throughput rates. From a social justice perspective, the problem is even more serious, as it impacts on the future (New London Group 1996) of whole cohorts of students and, by extension, the nation’s human capital.
Since my view of the problem is necessarily subjective, in the discussion that follows I present an argument about the problem which is also an attempt to formulate it as a research(able) problem. In higher education, argument is especially powerful because it is integral to the discursive production of knowledge. It is also integral to the recontextualisation and reproduction of knowledge in undergraduate learning (see 2.3.2 and 2.4.4). Since argumentation confers power on those who successfully engage in it (see 1.4), exploration of written argument is a justifiable starting point for addressing the problem of student writing. Systematic investigation of the relationship between argument and student writing will contribute to understanding of the problem of unsatisfactory student writing. One possible reason for poor written argument is students’ differential access to powerful discourses, and the discursive resources through which powerful discourses are realised. A high proportion of students in the South African higher education system have had restricted access to these powerful discourses and the related discursive resources (Henning, Maimane and Pheme 2001), as argued earlier in the chapter (see 1.4).

Thus, the problem, formulated as a \textit{research problem}, is that there is insufficient knowledge about the role argumentation plays in the knowledge-focused discourse of the academic disciplines. Researchers of academic discourse know very little about how the \textit{processes} of academic argumentation relate to the written \textit{product} that ensues. Consequently, there is a need for \textit{argument-focused} detailed empirical analysis of academic discourse that can be used to inform teaching and learning practices. By means of systematic analysis of the language used for argumentation in the texts that students read and write, the research offers insight into the discursive resources required for argumentation. In this way, it contributes to knowledge about how students learn to produce legitimate written disciplinary argument.

Therefore, the research aims to contribute to the development of a nuanced and critical understanding of written argumentation in the social sciences. It is assumed that new knowledge about written argument in a particular discipline, Development Studies, could be used to improve student learning in ways that would impact positively, both in the immediate teaching and learning context and afterwards, in terms of the skills, strategies and identities that graduates take on to further studies and/or the workplace.
1.7 Research Questions

The theoretical and methodological assumptions underpinning the formulation of the research questions are drawn from critical discourse analysis (see 3.2) and Bernstein’s (2000) conceptualisation of the “pedagogic device” to explain social reproduction (see 2.3.2 and 3.8.3). The question guiding the research reported in this thesis is: How is argument performed in the knowledge-focused texts that final-year undergraduates in Development Studies are required to interpret and construct, and what are the implications for transformative\(^{16}\) learning and teaching?

The overarching question was reformulated into a series of discrete but related secondary questions that facilitated a structured sequential approach to the research.

1. What is the nature of argument in the written texts that represent Development Studies knowledge?

2. How is argument represented and what explicit written guidance on argument is offered to students in educational texts?

3. What is the nature of the argument required in the texts that students write for assessment at the end of the undergraduate years?

4. How do students construct argument in the written products required for assessment in Development Studies, and what key discursive resources are required for legitimate argumentation?

5. What is the relationship between disciplinary argument in expert texts, representations and expectations of argument in educational texts, and students’ construction of written argument?

6. What are the implications of the findings of the above questions for transformative teaching and learning of disciplinary argument in Development Studies?

---

\(^{16}\) From a critical discourse perspective, ‘transformation’ is a term where ideology is seen at work in discourse. It has been co-opted by various, sometimes conflicting, political forces. In using the word “transformative”, I am referring to the to social justice project that attempts to address social inequity by challenging and changing pedagogic practices, given that it is acknowledged that “the social processes whereby consciousness and desire are given specific forms” can be “challenged and changed” (Bernstein 2000: xxvi).
1.8 Thesis structure

Chapter Two presents the theoretical and conceptual framework that underpins the analysis of the data used in the study. In Chapter Three the research design and methodology is discussed. The chapter culminates in a framework and methods for analysing argument in knowledge-focused texts. The ‘data presentation’ chapters that follow correspond with the sequence of the first four secondary research questions. Thus, the research ‘findings’ are presented in three consecutive chapters, each chapter corresponding to one of the three knowledge fields described by Bernstein (2000) in his model of the “pedagogic device”: knowledge production, recontextualisation and reproduction/transformation (see 2.3.2 and 3.8.3). In Chapter Four the nature of the discourses and argumentation that are used in the knowledge production field of Development Studies are explored, and the findings on the first subsidiary research question are reported. In Chapter Five, attention turns to the way argument is represented and explained in the educational texts generated in the field of recontextualisation of Development Studies knowledge as a university subject, and the findings on the second subsidiary research question are reported. Chapters Four and Five constitute an interpretation and re-inscription of the intertextual context in which student argumentation is constructed.

The analysis of argument in the students’ essays, reported in the final data presentation chapter, Chapter Six, constitutes the findings on the third and fourth subsidiary research questions. In the final chapter of the thesis, the relationships between the argumentation in each of Bernstein’s three knowledge contexts are discussed, with the students’ texts constituting the central point of the analysis and the texts from the fields of knowledge production and recontextualisation representing an aspect of the context in which student texts are created. The chapter offers interpretation and explanation of the findings by discussing relationships between the different ‘levels’ of the intertextual context (see subsidiary research question 5, 3.8.3, and Figure 3.3). The assessment of the contribution that the research makes to knowledge, the reflection on its limitations, and the suggestions for further research with which the chapter ends constitute some provisional answers to the last subsidiary research question.
Chapter two: Theoretical context and conceptual framework

2.1 Introduction

As the object of this research is argumentation in the written texts of a particular knowledge domain, theories of discourse, knowledge and argument form the foundation of the study. Although the three bodies of knowledge which are most important for this research obviously overlap, they are addressed in separate parts of this chapter. Since a ‘discourse’ perspective is the overall framing for the research, the first part (2.2) addresses discourse. The parts on knowledge (2.3) and argument (2.4) follow. The last part (2.5) offers a distillation of ideas about discourse, knowledge and argument that are relevant to an understanding of argument in the knowledge-focused texts of higher education. The theory explored in the chapter is integrated into a theoretical framework that constitutes a more encompassing theorisation of argument than the one that currently informs teaching and learning in higher education, which is referred to as “argumentativity” (Amossy 2009: 313-315). The framework for analysis of the data that is derived from the theoretical framework is discussed in the chapter that follows this one.

2.2 Discourse

The conception of discourse used in this research is informed by theorists who are interested in the relationship between language and society. The work of Michael Halliday is a major influence, as are developments of his ideas in the work of J. R. Martin and Gunther Kress. Norman Fairclough and the Bakhtin Circle\(^\text{17}\), and theorists who have interpreted their ideas, are also important sources of the theorisation in the thesis. The theories from systemic functional linguistics (SFL) and the Bakhtin Circle that inform the thesis are outlined in subsections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2. Definitions of discourse are discussed in subsection 2.2.3. A discussion of dimensions of discourse, especially as they apply in the teaching and learning of academic discourse, follows in the last part of the section on discourse (see 2.2.4).

\(^{17}\) I acknowledge that there has been debate about the authorship of texts written by Bakhtin and Vološinov. In this thesis, the general ideas common to these authors are referred to as those of the Bakhtin Circle, but where quotations are used, specific works of Bakhtin are cited.
2.2.1 Semiotics and systemic functional linguistics

As semiotics and systemic functional linguistics (SFL) are both major fields of study in themselves, with SFL being detailed and highly technical, only some of the concepts and terms that are most relevant to the research are discussed briefly below.

2.2.1.1 Semiosis

The theorisation of language used in the thesis draws extensively on the insights of sociolinguists and systemicists working in the Hallidayan tradition. The main argument, in a sentence, is that language is a semiotic system which offers a range of options in each of three functional meaning-making subsystems, the language user’s choice of wording being influenced by the social and cultural context. This argument is discussed in more detail below.

Language is viewed as a system of signs in which form is inextricable from content (Halliday 1978). This view of the relationship of form and content represents a profound insight that went against the prevailing thought at the time it was first presented. The idea that language is only one of many semiotic, ‘sign’, or ‘meaning-making’ systems is attributed to Ferdinand de Saussure, who used the word “semiology” to refer to “the life of signs in society”, which he saw as the superordinate category of which language was a part (de Saussure 1966, in Kress and Hodge 1979: 10). Semiotic systems are viewed primarily as social systems: “human semiosis [is] an inherently social phenomenon in its sources, functions, contexts and effects” (Hodge and Kress 1988: 261). ‘Semiosis’ is the abstract term used to refer to the construction of meaning using language and/or other semiotic systems. In this thesis, the concept (see also Hodge and Kress 1988; Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer 2010) is elaborated on in the discussion on the definition of discourse (see 2.2.3).

---

18 The fundamental concepts of SFL inform the theoretical foundation of the study, but traditional SFL analysis of grammar is not engaged in as, in this thesis, analysis is primarily at the levels of discourse, genre and semantics rather than at the level of lexico-grammar.

19 According to de Saussure, the “sign”, which refers to an aspect of or object in the world (the “referent”), consists of the “signifier” and the “signified” (Eagleton 1983: 96-97).
2.2.1.2 ‘Context of situation’ and ‘context of culture’

In Halliday’s (1978) theory, the terms ‘context of situation’ and ‘context of culture’ are used to indicate different levels of semiotic structure that are realised in text. The term “context of situation” refers to the relevant features of the “background of persons and actions and events from which the things that are said derive their meaning” (28). Halliday argues that all meaningful language is “language in use” (33), “functions in contexts of situation”, and is “relatable to those contexts” (32). The term refers to “an abstract representation of the environment in terms of general categories having relevance to the text” and, furthermore, can be “remote from what is going on round about during the act of speaking or writing” (109). The term ‘context of culture’ refers to the more abstract level of the range of potential options in language as part of the social system (147). The terms refer to key concepts in sociolinguistic theory, as they are used to make systematic links between linguistic interaction (text), the linguistic system and the social system (110-114).

Martin (1992) explains how Firth’s work from the 1950s and 1960s is a significant source in the development of SFL. Firth’s definition of meaning as “function in context” privileged “text”, or “actual”, over “system”, or “potential”, insisting that language is “multi-structural and polysystemic”. This view was in opposition to the then-dominant approach of Saussure (1974), who privileged langue over parole. According to Martin (1992: 574), the significance of the conceptualisation of the contexts of situation and culture is that “actual” and “potential” were placed “on an equal footing, related through the dialectic of realisation”. SFL has developed to the extent that both a “synoptic” perspective of “text as system” and a “dynamic” perspective of “text as process” are accommodated (Martin 1992: 574). The terms ‘context of situation’ and ‘context of culture’ have been used in the theoretical framework for the research, as is explained in the last part of the chapter (see 2.5).

---

20 The text in this subsection exemplifies the complexity that heteroglossia brings to the construction of knowledge-focused academic texts, where recontextualisation of ideas in different texts over time results in scholarly voices being so tightly interwoven that it is difficult to identify separate voices and cite texts and page numbers precisely. Therefore, in this sub-section, words that were first used by de Saussure, Firth and Halliday appear in single inverted commas when they refer to terms, and without inverted commas at all when they represent the concepts as they have been incorporated into more general linguistic study. Where it is clear that the wording encapsulates Martin’s interpretations of Firth and Halliday, double quotation marks are used, and the convention for attribution to a specific author is observed.

21 The term langue refers to the potential available in the abstract language system, and the term parole to actual instances of language use (Fairclough 2001: 17-18).
2.2.1.3 Language functions

The argument that language is shaped by its social functions has been profoundly influential. A key insight is the conceptualisation of text as multifunctional, particularly, the understanding that in addition to functioning to represent what happens in the world, offering a construction of ‘reality’, text also functions to construct relationships. The three “macro-functions” of language, “ideational”, “interpersonal” and “textual”, operate simultaneously (Halliday 1978: 112-113). At the lower ‘level’ of register, the macro-functions are matched by: “field”, referring to the subject matter; “tenor”, referring to the relationship between the interactants; and “mode”, referring to the realisation as a material spoken or written text (Halliday 1978: 33).

The ideational function of language allows the interactant to encode observations of the world as “experience” or “content” (Halliday 1978: 112). The textual component “expresses the relationship between language”, the “verbal environment”, and “the nonverbal, situational environment”. It provides the form which makes language meaningful, referred to as “texture” (113). Since a dialogical perspective on argument is taken in this research (see 2.5), interpersonal meaning is the main area of investigation. While the ideational component is “reflective”, the interpersonal component involves participation through linguistic action (112). The interpersonal function allows the interactant to intrude into the situation by expressing “attitudes and judgements and seeking to influence the attitudes and behaviours of others” (112). In a subsequent explanation of interpersonal meaning, the metaphor of performance is used, the language user being represented as an actor rather than observer:

Through the options in this component, the speaker adopts a role, or a set of roles, vis-à-vis the participants in the speech situation, and also assigns roles to the other participants, while accepting (or rejecting) those which are assigned to him; he expresses his own judgements, his own attitudes, his own personality, and in so doing exerts certain effects on the hearers. (Halliday 2009: 111)

2.2.1.4 Language as resource for meaning-making

Rather than seeing language as structure governed by rules, the conception of language as system allowed Halliday to view language as a “resource for meaning” (Halliday 1978: 17). This insight has been remarkably generative in critical linguistics and the sociology of education. One of the most powerful insights that critical linguists have developed from Halliday’s view of language as system is that the choices that language users make

---

22 These key terms from SFL are used without inverted commas from this point in the text.
inscribe subject positions within the social network. Potential options in the system that are not used are an important focus for analysis and interpretation (Kress and Hodge 1979; Hodge and Kress 1988), the omissions being particularly significant in terms of the workings of ideology and power (see 2.2.4.1).

Subsequent interpretations of the theory have allowed critical linguists to argue that different histories and, consequently, different repertoires of resources available to writers impact on “possibilities for self-hood” or “writer identity” (Clark and Ivanič 1997: 136-137). Kress (1982: 3, in Clark and Ivanič 1997: 41) argues: “those able to produce meanings and messages are few by comparison with those who consume [them]”. The implication of the unequal distribution of discursive resources for meaning-making is that some people are positioned as consumers rather than producers of meaning and, therefore, as less powerful. The ability to produce meaning in the form of written text that has the potential to affect others and thereby to effect change is a discursive form of power. Kress (1982: 10) is explicit about the link between writing and social power: “the ability to produce written messages is … necessary for sharing and contributing to knowledge and ideological activity, and for gaining a measure of power”.

The view of language as a resource has also been a pivotal influence on the design logic of the research reported in this thesis (see 3.2), as the use of discursive resources in students’ construction of argument is interpreted in order to draw conclusions about the extent to which students have developed identities that empower them as producers of social meaning.

2.2.1.5 Text as process

Halliday’s view of ‘text’ is one of the major influences on the paradigm shift from ‘language’ to ‘discourse’. Because it provides an essential foundation for understanding the theories of Fairclough and Bernstein that are used in the research design (see 3.2.1 and 3.8.3), Halliday’s conceptualisation of ‘text’ and its relation to social reality is discussed in some detail below. Text is a “semantic unit” that represents choices made “from the total set of options that constitute what can be meant”, and “can be defined as actualized meaning potential” (Halliday 1978: 109). It is “not composed of but is realized in sentences” (135). Text is described as “indeterminate”, as it can be “very long, or very short” and its boundaries may not be clear (141). While in traditional linguistics text is viewed as a static product (Titscher, Meyer, Wodak and Vetter 2000), Halliday (1978: 139-140) presents it as the exchange of meaning in sociosemiotic process. He argues that since the “exchange of
meanings is an interactive process”, interaction is the “essential feature of text” (139). As the concept of text as process is counter-intuitive, the explanation given is quoted in full:

The text is a continuous process. There is a constantly shifting relation between a text and its environment, both paradigmatic and syntagmatic: the syntagmatic environment, the “context of situation” (which includes the semantic context – and which for this reason we interpret as a semiotic construct), can be treated as a constant for the text as a whole, but is in fact constantly changing, each part serving in turn as environment for the next. And the ongoing text-creating process continually modifies the system that engenders it, which is the paradigmatic environment of the text. (Halliday 1978: 139)

Text is distinguished from non-text because it has “texture”23. In the light of recent discussions of the negative impact of the metaphor of language as “conduit” (Turner 2011: 55-56, see 1.5 and 2.4.1), it is interesting to note that Halliday's theorisation of text can be seen as a refutation of the “conduit” view of language:

Texture is not something that is achieved by superimposing an appropriate textual form on a pre-existing ideational content. The textual component is a component of meaning along with the ideational and interpersonal components. Hence a linguistic description is not a progressive specification of a set of structures one after the other, ideational, then interpersonal, then textual. The system does not first generate a representation of reality, then encode it as a speech act, and finally recode it as a text, as the metaphors of philosophical linguistics seem to imply (Halliday 1978: 134).

2.2.2 The Bakhtin Circle

Theorisation from Russia in the first third of the twentieth century complements the social semiotic theory discussed above.

2.2.2.1 Utterance

Like Firth and Halliday, the Bakhtin Circle resisted Saussure’s elevation of ahistorical language study above ‘diachronic’ language study that takes historical processes into account (see 2.2.1). Actual language use, referred to as the “utterance” in the literature of the Bakhtin Circle, is inscribed with history and therefore cannot be neutral: “The living utterance, having taken meaning and shape at a particular historical moment in a socially specific environment, cannot fail to brush up against thousands of living dialogical threads, woven by socio-ideological consciousness around the given object of an utterance; it cannot fail to become an active participant in social dialogue” (Bakhtin 1981: 276). For

---

23 “Texture” refers to the symbolic organisation of the text as a whole which is shaped by “mode”. It includes the textual systems that govern coherence, including “cohesion, and thematic and information structures” (J. Webster 2009: 55, in The Essential Halliday).
Bakhtin, all forms of communication, both oral and written, are always dialogical, since the basic unit of analysis is the “responsive” utterance (280). The utterance can therefore be seen as one conversational turn, which can be as short as one word or an exclamation in speech but, in writing, it can be a whole extended text.

2.2.2.2 Dialogism

Bakhtin (1981: 279) emphasises that all text is oriented to what has been said before, and that all discourse, “in any of its forms, quotidian, rhetorical, scholarly – cannot fail to be oriented toward the ‘already uttered’, the ‘already known’, the ‘common opinion’”. Furthermore, all discourse is also oriented to a response: “Forming itself in an atmosphere of the already spoken, the word is at the same time determined by that which has not yet been said but which is needed and in fact anticipated by the answering word” (280). He is most explicit about the interconnectedness between utterances: “what is heard and actively understood will find its response in the subsequent speech or behaviour of the listener” (Bakhtin 1986: 68-69). For any utterance, “its beginning is preceded by the utterance of others, and its end is followed by the responsive utterances of others” (71).

The counter-intuitive conceptualisation of written text as dialogue is an insight that has inspired the nature of the exploration of argumentation in this thesis: “All rhetorical forms, monologic in their compositional structure, are oriented toward the listener and his answer” (1981: 280). This means that all texts are seen as responding to previous texts and also anticipating other texts.

Since the work of the Bakhtin Circle became widely available in English, theoretical interest in the concept of dialogue has intensified, being taken up by theorists in a number of fields in various ways. Therefore, the term ‘dialogism’ has many referents, depending on which theorist is using it. In this thesis, the term is used to refer to the idea of communication as embodying reciprocal relationship (see 2.5, and Figure 2.8).

2.2.2.3 Heteroglossia

Another key insight from the Bakhtin Circle is that texts realise many “voices”. Since all utterances are always necessarily reformulations of previous utterances, they are multi-voiced or “heteroglossic” to a greater or lesser extent. A corollary of this is that utterances,

---

24 Such is the generative power of the concept of ‘utterance’ as dialogical that a number of different terms are used to refer to the idea. While ‘dialogism’ is common (for example, Amossy 2009), ‘dialogicity’ (Blommaert 2005: 43) is also used.
and therefore discourses (see 2.2.3), are also more or less reproductive or transformative, as Bakhtin asserts in the extract below.

Every concrete utterance of a speaking subject serves as a point where centrifugal as well as centripetal forces are brought to bear. The processes of centralization and decentralization, of unification and disunification, intersect in the utterance; the utterance not only answers the requirements of its own language as an individualized embodiment of a speech act, but it answers the requirements of heteroglossia as well; it is in fact an active participant in such speech diversity.

(Bakhtin 1981: 272)

In Martin’s interpretation of the key Bakhtinian concepts, a clear distinction is made between heteroglossia and dialogism. For Martin (1992: 574-5; see also note 30, 590), heteroglossia refers to the heterogeneity of speech communities, and is linked with the Hallidayan view of language as abstract “system”; dialogism refers to the manifestation of that diversity in text as (material) “process”. This distinction is used in the theoretical framing discussed at the end of the chapter (see 2.5), where dialogism is associated with ‘context of situation’, while heteroglossia is associated with ‘context of culture’ (see Figure 2.12).

2.2.2.4 Primary and secondary genres

The distinction that Bakhtin (1986) makes between primary and secondary “speech genres” has been generative in discourse studies. The primary genres are the everyday forms of communication that are embedded in concrete/material interaction, whereas the secondary genres are the decontextualized communication forms that are more complex, being removed in time and space from the human interaction in which they originate. Primary genres give rise to secondary genres, which “absorb and digest” the primary genres that develop in “unmediated speech communion”, thereby losing their “immediate relation to actual reality and to the real utterances of others” (Bakhtin 1986: 82). The claim that secondary genres “codify activity in situations occurring over time and in distant locales” (Berkenkotter and Huckin 1995: 7-8) is helpful for understanding the difference between written interaction in ‘context of situation’ and ‘context of culture’ (see 2.2.1.2). This insight is used in the theoretical and analytical framing developed in this research (see 2.5 and 3.9).

2.2.3 Defining discourse

As discourse is the central concept in discourse analysis, the term ‘discourse’ is over-determined, there being multiple and competing definitions. Only some meanings central
to the research are discussed here. Current views of discourse are linked to late twentieth century developments in the conceptualisation of literacy, particularly the shift from psychological to social views of literacy. This shift is represented by researchers who use empirical ethnographic research to argue that literacy is a ‘practice’ which is ‘situated’ in specific social contexts (Barton 1994; Barton and Hamilton 1998; Barton, Hamilton and Ivanič 2000). A distinction is made between an “autonomous” view of literacy, which does not acknowledge that literacy practices are multiple and complex, and an “ideological” view that does (Heath 1983; Street 1984). A result of this literacy research is the acknowledgment that there are multiple literacies, which made the use of the plural form of literacy, as exemplified in the term “academic literacies”, acceptable (Lea and Street 1998; Zamel and Spack 1998; Jones, Turner and Street 1999; Lea and Stierer 2000). The research reported in this thesis is informed by the ‘social practice’ view of literacy outlined above. In the context of discussion of academic writing, ‘literacies’ and ‘discourses’ overlap to an extent, but the term discourse is more expansive, as the discussion below shows.

The basic distinction is between ‘discourse’ as abstract noun and as countable noun. The most general meaning, where ‘discourse’ is an abstract noun, is “language-in-use or stretches of language” (Gee 2005: 26). Another way of distinguishing between the two meanings is to see the more general meaning as “action” and the other as “convention” (Fairclough 2001: 23). However, it is acknowledged that the abstract noun ‘discourse’ is “notoriously problematic and confusing” (Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer 2010: 220). ‘Discourse’ is seen as more encompassing than ‘language’, referring to “language as a form of social practice” (Fairclough 2001: 16), which is further glossed as “the whole process of social interaction of which a text is just a part” (20). It is also referred to as “discoursal action” in the form of “actual talk or writing” (24).

As a countable noun ‘discourse’ is defined by Fairclough as “a convention, a type of discourse” (24). This view is similar to Gee’s (1996) ubiquitous ‘capital D’ conception of discourse as:

a socially accepted association among ways of using language, other symbolic expressions, and ‘artifacts’, of thinking, feeling, believing, valuing and acting that can be used to identify oneself as a member of a socially meaningful group or ‘social network’, or to signal (that one is playing) a socially meaningful ‘role’. (Gee 1996: 131)

---

25 This seminal text was originally published in 1989, but all references are to the second edition, which appeared in 2001.
26 The text was originally published in 1990, but all references are to the second edition, which appeared in 1996.
In Gee’s (1996: 131) formulation, which is influenced by neo-Marxist and poststructuralist ideas, “it is not individuals that speak and act, but rather that historically and socially defined Discourses speak to each other through individuals”. The individual is seen as “the meeting point of many, sometimes conflicting, socially and historically defined Discourses” (132). The emphasis on discourses speaking “through” participants can be criticised for underplaying individual agency (Kress 1982; Ivanič 1998). Gee’s possibly overly deterministic view also de-emphasises ‘interaction’ (Paré 1992; Hyland 2005; 2008) and material ‘reality’ (Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer 2010).

In this thesis, Fairclough’s (2001: 21) conception of ‘discourse’ as text and interaction in context is used (see Figure 2.1, and Figure 3.1).

![Figure 2.1: Discourse as text, interaction and context (reproduced from Fairclough 2001: 21)](image)

In Fairclough’s model, the role of ideology is acknowledged, but it is not seen as determining social action. Discourse is seen as both enabling and constraining: “people are enabled to act within the constraints of types of practice” (Fairclough 2001: 23). There is a dialectical relationship between social structure and social practice/discourse, which means that the former both determines and is produced by the latter: “social structures not only determine discourse, they are also a product of discourse” (31). This theory is taken up in more depth in the next chapter (see 3.2.1).

---

27 Admittedly, a degree of human agency is acknowledged in some of Gee’s work: while culture/ideology is reproduced in individual utterances, “The individual instantiates, gives body to a Discourse every time he or she acts or speaks, and thus carries it”, but also, “ultimately changes it, through time” (Gee 1996: 132). It appears that Gee allows for collective rather than individual agency: the quotation discussed above implies that change can only be effected by individuals with common values and purposes over a period of time.
An extension of Fairclough’s (2001: 30-32) conception of discourse is that social action depends on the role that individuals can play, or the ‘subject position/s’ that they can take up. People are “passive” to the extent that they “are constrained to operate within the subject positions set up in discourse types”, however, they select creatively from the available discursive resources. Power relations influence whether discourse is “conservative” or “transformatory”. In continental European discourse theory, the dialectical relationship between social structure and social agents is expressed in the terms ‘performativity’ and ‘subjectivity’. The text producer not only acts on the world, but is acted upon: “the subject … both speaks and is spoken… the ‘I’ is partly constrained by the language she is immersed in, whether consciously or not” (Amossy 2009: 322). The concepts of performativity and subjectivity, are related to the debates about structure/determinism and agency (Giddens 1984; Bhaskar 1989). Subjectivity is strongly emphasised in poststructuralist theory, which foregrounds the power of structure/social institutions to determine the roles and relationships of human ‘subjects’ in ways that curtail their freedom to act autonomously. Thus, the individual is subject(ed) to social reality and social relations. In terms of textual analysis, subjectivity refers to social reality acting on text producers to place limits on the effectivity of the texts.

The key claim encapsulated in the term ‘performativity’ is that the utterance is performative; it is both verbalisation and action: “to speak is to act” (Amossy 2009: 314). This conception of utterance as action developed from speech act theory (Austin 1962; Coulthard 1977: 11-29) to become a more encompassing theory of semiosis as action, as formulated in Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer (2010: 203-204), who link semiotic action to effects: “semiosis has real effects on social practices, social institutions, and the social order more generally”, and claim that semiosis is not just “meaningful”, but also “causally efficacious”. Thus the text producer can be seen as acting directly on other individuals and groups, and indirectly on social and material reality. In the debate about structure and agency, performativity can be seen as the dimension representing the possibility of human agency in the face of seemingly monolithic social structures. In terms of textual analysis, the term performativity refers to text producers acting on social reality to effect change.

Given the growing emphasis on “multimodality” (Kress and van Leeuwen 1996), in this thesis the term ‘discourse’ is understood as encompassing more than verbal language and referring to all meaningful semiotic human activity. Language is seen as one aspect of a more overarching theory of discourse, or ‘semiosis’, which includes all forms of meaning-making through the medium of signs: “semiosis presupposes embodied, intentional,
practically-skilled social actors, social relations, material objects and spatio-temporality” (Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer 2010: 207). The use of the term ‘semiosis’ enables avoidance of the limiting sense of language being only verbal (see 2.2.1.1 above, and 3.2.3 for further discussion of semiosis). While it is acknowledged that all communication is multimodal (Kress and van Leeuwen 1996), the focus in this research is on verbal language as, even in the twenty-first century, verbal language continues to be the dominant meaning-making modality in the academic writing of the social sciences and humanities.

The confusion between the meanings of ‘discourse’ as an abstract noun used in a general sense, and as a ‘count’ noun, is avoided when the term ‘semiosis’ is used in place of ‘discourse’. The awkward distinction between ‘lower case d’ and ‘capital D’ versions of ‘discourse’ is avoided in this text. Generally, the lower case initial letter orthography is used, as the sense of the word can be derived from the context.

2.2.4 Dimensions of discourse

The dimensions of discourse which are most relevant to the research – ideology, text, context, intertextuality, interaction, genre, and voice – are discussed in more detail below. The concepts of ‘discourse community’ and ‘academic discourse’ are also discussed, as they are particularly relevant to research conducted on the communities and discourses associated with Development Studies. Since the academic essay is the most important genre analysed in the research, the essay is discussed in the sub-section that ends the part of the chapter that focuses on discourse.

2.2.4.1 Ideology and power

As a critical discourse perspective informs this research (see 1.7 and 3.2), ideology is a central consideration. The understanding that all language use is ideological is well-established in the work of theorists working in the critical tradition (Kress and Hodge 1979; Hodge and Kress 1988; Bernstein 2000; Fairclough 2001; 2003). Ideology is understood as “meaning in service of power” (Thompson 1984, in Fairclough 2010: 8). Fairclough’s most recent definition of ideology is: “ways of representing aspects of the world, which may be operationalized in ways of acting and interacting … that contribute to establishing or sustaining unequal relations of power” (Fairclough 2010: 8). The working of ideology is generally invisible, as it involves a process of ‘naturalisation’, which is the presentation of unequal relations of power as ‘natural’, obvious and unquestionable, or ‘common sense’ (Gramsci 1971).
The theorisation of ideology offered by Martin (1992; 1997) is discussed in some detail, as it informs the theoretical framing of argument presented at the end of this chapter (see 2.5). Martin (1992: 507) argues that ‘genre’ would be “too monolithic and rigidly deterministic” were it not for cultural/social diversity, which ensures there is “a dialectic of difference”, with tension between the discourses of competing groups. To account for both “systemic inertia” and change, he proposes another level, ‘ideology’ (575), which allows for explanation of diversity and change. This is conceptualised as a fourth “level” of meaning, which is superordinate to genre, register and language.

Ideas from Halliday, Bakhtin and Bernstein are integrated in Martin’s theorising of ideology in text. He offers two perspectives on ideology, one “dynamic” and the other “synoptic”. The latter is a view of ideology as “a system of coding orientations which makes meaning selectively available”, which means that texts “manifest, construe, renovate and symbolically realise ideology, just as they do language, register and genre” (Martin 1992: 581). Discursive resources (“meaning potential”) are “not evenly distributed”, since “[a]ccess to genres, registers and language … is mediated through discourses of ethnicity, class, gender and generation”, which “are in a continual process of negotiation with each other” (495). Because of positioning within the system of coding orientations (see 2.2.1.4), interactants have differential access to discursive resources, and therefore differential access to power: since “coding orientations distribute discursive power unevenly, there will always be semiotic tension in the community” (581). Social power is defined as “the range of options available, the extent to which options available can be used for control, submission or negotiation, and the degree to which options can be taken up to change the context making them available” (507). Since ideology is also involved in “the redistribution of power”, it is linked to discursive change (507-508).

In Martin’s (1992: 581-582) view, critical linguists focus on ideology “as process”. As coding orientations “focus attitudes in systematic ways”, ideology is indirectly impacted by affect/emotion. The system itself facilitates the stabilisation of power relations/inertia.

---

28 He points out that Bernstein relativised context by proposing that “divergent speech codes” or “fashions of meaning” are “an inherent feature of socially stratified speech communities” (Martin 1992: 577). Empirical research conducted by Hasan, among others, has since shown that “interlocuters construe contexts differently” depending on contextual factors, such as gender and class (578), and that these variations are “tendencies” that cannot be expressed as “rules” (580). This research draws on the argument that within the same society different material conditions give rise to social conditions which produce different forms of social interaction and, consequently, different forms of consciousness (Bernstein 2000: 4) which “find expression” in “different orientations to meaning” and, by extension, semantic variation (Hasan 1988, in Martin 1992: 580). Speech codes are “realised through contextually specific semantic styles” which vary according to the age, gender, ethnicity and class (1992: 507).
through processes of naturalisation. Therefore, critical linguists aim to deconstruct naturalisation (586-587).

In a later publication, Martin (1997) ruefully comments that his proposal that ideology be seen as another plane of meaning has not taken up by theorists. Over the last twenty years there has been a shift in the use of terminology, with the term ‘power’ taking the place of ‘ideology’ (Janks 2010). Therefore, reluctance to accept the formalisation of ideology as a superordinate level in discourse may have more to do with Martin’s use of the term ‘ideology’ than the idea itself. In the later work of critical theorists, more emphasis has been placed on agency and change, with the term ‘power’ used in preference to ‘ideology’, a development which Fairclough (2010: 27) explicitly acknowledges, explaining that the term ‘ideology’ suggests that social structure determines rather than shapes human action and social practice.

2.2.4.2 Text and context

The relationship between ‘text’ and ‘context’ is described as a “crucial problem” in the field of discourse analysis (Blommaert 2005: 17), and is therefore an important consideration in any discussion of discourse. The primacy of social interaction in SFL theory dissolves the boundary between ‘text’ and ‘context’, with text defined as “a continuous process of semantic choice” (Halliday 1978: 137), as discussed earlier (see 2.2.1.5). Fairclough draws on Halliday’s explanation of ‘context of situation’ and ‘context of culture’ in his conception of discourse. In his influential visual representation of the problematic relationship between text and context (2001), it is depicted as three ‘nested’ boxes, with ‘text’ in the centre, embedded in ‘interaction’, which is embedded in ‘context’ (see 2.2.3, and Figure 2.1). Since his model is used in the theoretical framework for the thesis, detailed discussion follows in the next chapter (see 3.2.1).

In a study of textual data items, which are discussed as discrete units of ‘text’ (see 3.8.3), it is necessary to have a clear definition of text and text boundaries. From a social semiotic perspective, ‘text’ refers to “a structure of messages or message traces which has a socially ascribed unity” (Hodge and Kress 1988: 6). ‘Text’ is “the concrete material object produced in discourse” (6). A distinction is made between ‘text’ and ‘discourse’, with ‘text’ being conceptualised as “embedded” in “social processes”, or ‘discourse’. In this formulation, the terms ‘social processes’, ‘context’ and ‘discourse’ are synonymous, and text can be seen as a product, while ‘discourse’ or ‘context’ can be seen as a process. The

---

29 I assume he was referring to those working within the SFL tradition.
value of the concept of text as *product* is that it makes possible the study of *processes* that are evanescent and intangible: “Text is only a trace of discourses, frozen and preserved, more or less reliable or misleading” (12).

2.2.4.3 Intertextuality

An aspect of context which requires a separate discussion is ‘intertextuality’, as it has been productive in composition and discourse studies. A simple view of intertextuality is that it is: “the concrete relations among texts and utterances” (Bazerman 2004: 61). However, since unravelling the intertextual webs in any text can be a complex task, a number of terms are used to refer to the different ways that texts are related to other texts, the one used most in this thesis being the term ‘recontextualisation’. In the context of applied linguistics ‘recontextualisation’ is glossed as, “the extrication of some part or aspect from a text or discourse, or from a genre of texts or discourses, and the fitting of this part or aspect into another context, i.e. another text or discourse (or discourse genre) and its use and environment” (Linell 1998, in Swales 2004: 22). The term has a related but different meaning in the sociological work of Bernstein (2000, see 2.3.2). Another term used in this thesis to describe relationships between texts is “genre network”, which is “the totality of genres available for a particular sector ... as seen from any chosen synchronic moment” (Swales 2004: 22).

Scholars have drawn on the work of the Bakhtin Circle for a deeply enriched understanding of the interrelatedness of texts. Because of Martin’s concern to integrate Bakhtinian insights with a systemic approach, his account of intertextuality is particularly important for this study. He argues that understanding of intertextuality grew out of the theorisations represented in the concepts of heteroglossia and dialogism (see discussion 2.2.2.2 and 2.2.2.3). He claims that the “most powerful account of inter-textual relations” has been developed in the socio-semantic model with which he works (Martin 1992: 575). As this model is drawn on to a limited extent in the thesis, it is worth quoting in full his reasoning for this claim:

> The register and genre theory ... represents systemic theory's attempts to model heteroglossia and dialogism; it does this by formulating register and genre as social semiotic systems realised through text, thereby providing an account not simply of how one text relates to another (cohesion across products) but in addition of how one text relates to all the texts that might have been (product in relation to system). (Martin 1992: 575)
Because texts exist in complex relation to other texts, intertextuality is a key dimension of discourse and, therefore, of writing research: “Our reading and writing are in dialogue with each other as we write in direct and indirect response to what we have read before, and we read in relation to the ideas we have articulated in our own writing” (Bazerman 2004: 53). Bazerman’s major contribution in relation to intertextuality is a deeper understanding of the role of authoritative texts in disciplinary writing. To the “traditional Aristotelian communication triangle” of author, subject and audience, he added “the literature” (61). The figure below illustrates how the ‘literature’ lies at the heart of knowledge focused text.

![Figure 2.2: The place of the ‘literature’ in the communication triangle](image)

This seemingly obvious insight is encapsulated in the following quotation, which highlights the complexity of the processes of academic reading and writing: “audience and author knowledge of the subject is built on prior texts; the audience knowledge and orientation is based on their reading; and the author’s authority, resources, interests, and current stance grow out of an engagement with the literature” (Bazerman 2004: 61). Bazerman’s recognition that academic writing is “writing about reading” (59) informs interpretations of students’ difficulties with the writing of “non-literary, knowledge-focused” texts (60).

Intertextuality, as a dimension of discourse, is closely related to ‘plagiarism’. One of the greatest challenges for student writers is finding an acceptable balance between acknowledgement of the words and ideas of the authoritative writers in the disciplines, and expression of ideas that they can ‘own’. Paradoxically, undergraduate students are told to
be “original and critical”, but are also required to demonstrate their acquisition of a “fixed canon of knowledge” and the discourse associated with it (Pennycook 1998: 276). Students from cultures that revere experience and authority, and those that do not have a strongly developed tradition of private ownership, may be less conscious of demarcating the boundaries between their own words and those of others. Therefore, what is labelled as ‘plagiarism’ is not necessarily a ‘crime’ (Pennycook 1998). Strong arguments have been made for a better informed understanding of the kind of intertextual ‘borrowing’ required in the development of disciplinary writing, which is often labelled as ‘plagiarism’. The “complexities of developing authorial voice whilst constructing a text based on the texts of others” are underestimated (Angelil-Carter 2000: 114). The use of the wordings of expert authorities is a necessary strategy for all students engaged in disciplinary writing; however, novices in the disciplines may need to engage in more extensive ‘borrowing’ from authoritative sources in order to express their meanings. On the basis of empirical study of the citation and referencing practices of students for whom English is an additional language, Angelil-Carter (2000: 114) suggests that “plagiarism should be viewed as primarily a developmental problem”.

In the development of the advanced academic literacies of disciplinary ‘insiders’ (see 2.2.4.8), students learn not only the appropriate conventions for acknowledging their use of the voices of the discipline (see 2.2.4.6), but also the discursive resources for positioning themselves in relation to the authoritative sources they use. “Appraisal theory” (White 2003; Martin and White 2005) draws on the concept of heteroglossia (see 2.2.2.3) to offer theory and analytical tools for analysing writers’ management of intertextual resources in the assertion of a ‘position’.

Appraisal theory is a development of Hallidayan interpersonal meaning at the level of discourse semantics, which is seen as a level above lexico-grammar (Martin and White 2005: 33-34). The appraisal system consists of three sub-systems: “engagement”, “attitude” and “graduation” (see Figure 2.3).
The sub-system of “attitude” describes the linguistic resources for inscribing evaluation and affect. The “engagement” sub-system consists of all the wordings that “provide the means for the authorial voice to position itself with respect to, and hence to ‘engage’ with, the other voices and alternative positions construed as being in play” (Martin and White 2005: 94). Since a “defining property” of all appraisal resources is “gradability”, the sub-system of “graduation” works with the other two sub-systems, offering resources for “up-scaling and down-scaling” (135).

In appraisal theory, a distinction is made between texts that acknowledge the diversity of “the text’s communicative backdrop”, which are termed “heteroglossic” texts, and those that do not explicitly reference “other voices” or acknowledge “alternative positions”, which are termed “monoglossic” texts, or “bare assertions” (Martin and White 2005: 99). Bare assertions (also known as categorical assertions) are considered to be, “just as intersubjectively loaded and hence ‘stanced’ as utterances including more overt markers of point of view or attitude” (94). Since monoglossic formulations exclude alternative voices, they are “heteroglossically disengaged” (White 2003: 262), or “undialogised” (Martin and White 2005: 99).

Heteroglossic formulations are divided into two broad categories, according to the extent to which the wording chosen “actively makes allowances for dialogically alternative positions and voices” (Martin and White 2005: 102). “Dialogically expansive” formulations
“open up the dialogic space for alternative positions”, whereas, “dialogically contractive” formulations “close down the space for dialogic alternatives” (103). See Figure 2.4 below.

![Diagram showing interaction and metadiscourse terms]

**Figure 2.4:** The ‘engagement’ system (reproduced from Martin and White 2005: 134)

### 2.2.4.4 Interaction and metadiscourse

In the theoretical sources drawn on for this thesis, there is marked convergence in the importance placed on the relationship between the writer and reader. The term ‘interaction’ is used to refer to the *textual* writer-reader relationship in some of the literature (Myers 1999; Thompson 2001, Hyland 2005), and in this thesis. The term refers to the complex reciprocal relationship between the writer and the reader which is instantiated in the processes of writing and reading. Awareness of this relationship can be traced back to the practice of rhetoric in the Classical Age (Bizzell and Herzberg 1990), where it was represented by two separate concepts, *pathos* and *ethos* (see 2.4.3). Current understanding of ‘interaction’ in writing acknowledges that it is inextricably linked to the impression of the writer created in the text.
In the context of higher education, reading and writing are activities that the individual typically engages in alone. However, working with text is a form of social interaction nevertheless. The dialogism of the Bakhtin Circle locates meaning in the exchange between addressee and addressee (see 2.2.2.2). The argument that the relationship between the writer and reader is reciprocal, or dialogical, is now widely accepted. In Halliday’s system, meaning in any text is understood as co-constructed in the process of interaction between interlocuters in a specific context of situation, rather than as pre-existing (see 2.2.1.2). In critical discourse analysis terms (see 3.2.1), the production of meaning is understood to be “intersubjective” (Fairclough 2010: 207). According to Fairclough, the “interpersonal” function of language encompasses two interrelated functions: “identity” and “relational”, with the former constructing “social identities or subject positions for both the writer and the reader”, and the latter constructing “social relations between people” (Fairclough 1992: 64).

Critical linguists argue that the ideological implications of the reciprocal nature of textual interaction are easily neglected, with theorists not taking into account the extent to which the values of participants are “rooted in their socio-political identity”, and therefore constrained by context (Clark and Ivanič 1997: 164). They assert that the writer-reader relationship should be seen as “dynamic” and “situated within structural relations of power” (172). Empirical research shows that students’ struggles with academic writing are just as likely to be caused by “the complexity of the writer-reader relationship as by the disciplinary content about which they are writing”. As the lecturer/reader has greater institutional power, students may experience conflict between writing what the lecturer expects and inscribing ideas and forms that interest them (163-164). There are many angles from which to view writer-reader interaction, and the range of terminology for discussing aspects of textual interaction is extensive. In this thesis only the work of Ken Hyland (2005; 2008) is discussed in detail, as his ideas have been most influential in the development of analytical tools for examining interaction in academic discourse (see 3.9.3). Although a ‘functional’ approach to language, which represents an extension of Halliday’s interpersonal function, underpins Hyland’s work, it is not located in the SFL framework, as appraisal theory is (see 2.2.4.3). His focus is primarily on ‘metadiscourse’, which is the collective term used for the discourse features that enables writers to “intrude into their unfolding text to influence their interlocuter’s reception of it” (Hyland 2005: 3)\textsuperscript{30}. Hyland argues that “all metadiscourse refers to interactions between writer and reader”

\textsuperscript{30} Hyland’s project to make metadiscourse studies into a theoretically coherent framework for research on interaction in writing is represented in his 2005 publication.
(45). He defines metadiscourse as: “aspects of a text which explicitly organize a discourse or a writer’s stance towards either its content or the reader” (14). For this reason “metadiscourse” can be seen as linguistic embodiment of dialogism (see 2.2.2.2).

While a distinction is made between propositions which refer to information about the world external to the text, and metadiscourse, which refers to the text itself, the propositional (reference to the external world, or ‘reality’, or what Halliday refers to as ideational/experiential meaning) and metadiscoursal elements of text are not separate levels that are independent of each other. Hyland (2005: 23-24) argues that metadiscourse “is an essential part of any text and contributes to the ways it is understood and acted upon. …Meaning is not synonymous with ‘content’, but dependent on all the components of a text”. Elaborating on this argument, he asserts that metadiscourse is “specialized” rather than “secondary” (his italics). Its role is not only supportive of propositional meaning; it “is the means by which propositional content is made coherent, intelligible and persuasive to a particular audience” (39). In this respect, metadiscourse represents a ‘material’ link between text and context (13). This perspective is crucial to understanding the demands of reading and writing academic discourse.

According to Hyland’s categorisation, metadiscourse is divided into two broad sub-categories of discursive resources: “interactive”, and “interactional” (Hyland 2005: 50-54). Interactive resources are reader-focused in that they help the reader to make meaning of the text (Hyland 2000; 2005) by guiding her or him through the stages and ‘moves’ in the argument (see ‘Genre’, 2.2.4.5). A summary of the sub-categories of interactive metadiscourse is represented below (see Figure 2.5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Specific functions</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>“help readers interpret pragmatic connections between steps in an argument” (50)</td>
<td>signalling relationships between stretches of discourse:</td>
<td>• and; furthermore&lt;br&gt;• because&lt;br&gt;• similarly; correspondingly&lt;br&gt;• but; however; on the other&lt;br&gt;hand; in contrast&lt;br&gt;• therefore; thus; in conclusion; consequently&lt;br&gt;• nevertheless; admittedly, of course; still</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>markers</td>
<td>(“logical connectors” in Hyland 2000)</td>
<td>• additive&lt;br&gt;• causative&lt;br&gt;• comparative similarity&lt;br&gt;• comparative contrast&lt;br&gt;• consequence (making or justifying a conclusion)&lt;br&gt;• counter-argument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame markers</td>
<td>“signal text boundaries or elements of schematic text structure” and “provide framing information about elements of discourse” (51)</td>
<td>• sequencing&lt;br&gt;• labelling text stages&lt;br&gt;• predicting and shifting arguments&lt;br&gt;• announcing goals&lt;br&gt;• indicating topic shifts</td>
<td>• first, then, next&lt;br&gt;• in sum&lt;br&gt;• I argue&lt;br&gt;• the paper proposes; my purpose is; there are several reasons why …&lt;br&gt;• let us return to …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Specific functions</td>
<td>Examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endophoric markers</td>
<td>“expressions which refer to other parts of the text” (51)</td>
<td>• supporting arguments</td>
<td>• see example; fig 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• facilitating comprehension</td>
<td>• as noted above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code glosses</td>
<td>words or phrases that indicate that additional information follows</td>
<td>• rephrasing</td>
<td>• in other words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• explaining</td>
<td>• for example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• elaborating</td>
<td>• this can be defined as; this is called</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidentials</td>
<td>“‘metalinguistic representations of an idea from another source’ (Thomas and Hawes 1994: 129) which guide the reader’s interpretation and establish an authorial command of the subject” (51)</td>
<td>• guiding the reader’s interpretation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• establishing authorial command of the subject, by distinguishing who is responsible for a position or stance reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• signalling support for arguments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.5:** ‘Interactive’ resources (based on Hyland 2005: 50-52)

Interactional resources focus on the reader and writer as *participants* in the interaction. The writer uses interactional resources for two different purposes: signalling identity and engaging with the reader (Hyland 2000). Hyland’s (2005) categorisation of interactional resources is summarised below (see Figure 2.6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Specific functions</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hedges</td>
<td>indicate the absence of full commitment to a proposition, and suggest that it is based on “plausible reasoning rather than certain knowledge” (52)</td>
<td>• indicating the writer’s recognition of “alternative voices and viewpoints” (52)</td>
<td>• possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• marking information as an opinion</td>
<td>• might</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• opening a position to negotiation by emphasising the subjectivity of the proposition</td>
<td>• perhaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• allowing the writer to be precise, and thereby, to demonstrate reliability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• indicating to the reader the degree of confidence to attribute to a proposition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boosters</td>
<td>indicate certainty about propositions</td>
<td>• emphasising certainty</td>
<td>• clearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• closing down alternatives or alternative views</td>
<td>• obviously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• confronting opposing views with a single voice</td>
<td>• demonstrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• suggesting writer authority and confidence</td>
<td>• show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• emphasising mutual experiences so that the reader is more likely to “draw the same conclusions as the writer (thereby strengthening argument)”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• constructing audience rapport by suggesting a “joint position against other voices” (53)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude markers</td>
<td>“indicate the writer’s affective, rather than epistemic, attitude to propositions” (53)</td>
<td>conveying:</td>
<td>• surprisingly, unfortunately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• emotions such surprise or frustration</td>
<td>• agree, prefer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• attitude such as agreement or disapproval</td>
<td>• important, appropriate, logical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• valuation, such as importance</td>
<td>• should, must</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• moral judgement or expectation, such as obligation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Specific functions</td>
<td>Examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-mention</td>
<td>refer to “the degree of explicit author presence” (53)</td>
<td>allowing the writer to project himself/herself into the text explicitly</td>
<td>• I, me, we (exclusive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• mine, our/s (exclusive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement markers</td>
<td>“devices that explicitly address readers” (53)</td>
<td>• acknowledging readers as discourse participants</td>
<td>• you, your, we (inclusive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• directing or focusing the readers’ attention</td>
<td>• you may notice; see …, note …, …?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• rhetorically positioning the audience by “pulling readers into the discourse at critical points” (54)</td>
<td>• consider ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• guiding readers to particular interpretations as a way of managing possible objections</td>
<td>• should, must, have to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• meeting reader “expectations of inclusion and disciplinary solidarity” (54)</td>
<td>• references to shared knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.6: ‘Interactional’ Resources (based on Hyland 2005: 52-54)

In a more recent representation of the discursive resources that writers use for argumentation in research writing, features that were previously represented as ‘interactional’ metadiscourse (see Figure 2.5 above), are referred to as resources for ‘interaction’ (Hyland 2008), and divided into two sub-categories, “stance” and “engagement” (see Figure 2.7 below). The sub-categories allow for differentiation between discourse features which are primarily “writer-oriented” (Hyland 2008: 9), and those that are primarily “reader-oriented” (11).
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**Figure 2.7:** Key resources of academic interaction (reproduced from Hyland 2008: 8)

In Hyland’s (2008: 7) scheme, the term, “stance”, “refers to the writer’s ‘textual voice’ or community recognised personality” and, specifically, to “the ways writers present themselves and convey their judgements, opinions, and commitments”. In an earlier text, Hyland (2004: 6) defines “engagement” as the features that writers use to “actively pull readers along or position them, focusing their attention, recognizing their uncertainties, including them as discourse participants and guiding them to interpretation”. In his journal article (2008) “engagement” is described as having “an alignment function”, and refers to “the ways that writers rhetorically recognise the presence of their readers”. There is some
continuity between the concerns represented in these two categories and those of rhetorical studies, with the conception of “stance” being similar to ethos, and that of “engagement” to pathos (see 2.4.3). Under the umbrella of “stance”, are the components “evidentiality”, represented by “hedges” and “boosters”; “affect”, represented by “attitude markers”; and “presence”, represented by forms of “self-mention” (9). Under the ‘umbrella’ of “engagement” are: “reader pronouns” (reader-mention), “directives”, “questions”, “personal asides” and “references to sharedness” (knowledge it is assumed the writer and reader share) (11).

In the analytical framework developed for this research, use is made of the categories that fall under the overarching category of “interactive” metadiscourse (Hyland 2005), as well as of those represented by “stance” and “engagement” (Hyland 2008). How they are used in analysis is discussed in the next chapter (see 3.5).

2.2.4.5 Genre

Consideration of text as interaction naturally leads to a discussion of genre. Since ‘genre’ is the construct which shapes the choice of discursive resources for writer-reader interaction, genre can be seen as an aspect of context (see 2.2.4.2) where the focus is on the interaction between text participants in pursuit of a communication goal. The overview that follows offers no more than a glance at the genre theory which has enriched understanding of academic writing. Three distinct, but relatively contemporaneous, genre schools are recognised. The one that developed in North American composition and rhetoric characterises genre as typical rhetorical action. It is represented in the work of Miller (1984; 1994), Bazerman (1988), Freedman and Medway (1994a; 1994b), and Berkenkotter and Huckin (1995). The North American genre movement has contributed substantially to understanding of the essential role written genres play in higher education. Berkenkotter and Huckin (1995: 24) assert that research is conducted and “codified” by means of genres, which function as “intellectual scaffolds on which community-based knowledge is constructed”. They caution that disciplinary genres, and “pedagogical” genres, genres based in practices of teaching and learning, have different rhetorical functions, and therefore different conventions and textual features (13).

The genre school that developed out English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and English for Specific Purposes (ESP) centres on the seminal work of Swales (1990; 2004), who claims that “communicative purpose” is the central feature of genre. His analysis of “rhetorical movement” in the text (1990: 140) has since had considerable uptake in writing
research as “move” analysis (Bhatia 1993; Lewin, Fine and Young 2001, see 3.9.3). A strand of genre theorising in the EAP/ESP tradition also draws on cognitive psychology to place more emphasis on the writer’s strategising to express “private intentions” in ways that stretch the bounds of genre (Bhatia 1993: 13).

In the Australian genre school that developed out of SFL (see 2.2.1), genre is defined as a “staged, goal-oriented social processes” (Martin 1997: 13). The SFL-based genre strand is underpinned by a robust and coherent theory of language as functional meaning-making. Martin characterises genre as, “concerned with systems of social processes, where the principles for relating social processes to each other have to do with texture – the ways in which field, mode and tenor variables are phased together in a text” (Martin 1997: 12). In SFL-based genre theory, genres “take more than a single phase to unfold” and “are addressed (i.e. formulated with readers and listeners in mind), whether or not the intended audience is immediately present to respond” (13). While Martin relates genre to the ‘context of culture’, it is arguable that genre relates as closely (if not more) to the “context of situation” (see 2.2.1.2). In the analytical framework developed for this research, the constructs of ‘genre’ and ‘interaction’ are seen as helpful for relating the text to the ‘context of situation’ (see 3.9.3).

Although differing in emphases, all three approaches share a view of genre as: “situated linguistic behaviour in institutionalized academic and professional settings” (Bhatia, Flowerdew and Jones 2008: 10). For this reason, all three genre schools are drawn on pragmatically in pedagogic research and practice (Johns 1997; 2002). As terms and concepts from all the genre schools are useful for the analysis of students’ disciplinary essay writing, this research draws to varying degrees on insights from all three schools.

2.2.4.6 Voice, identity and authority

Viewing text as interaction (see 2.2.4.4) also calls for discussion of ‘voice’, a highly contested term, which is central to an understanding of academic writing. The concept of voice came to prominence in writing theory in the 1980s. Although poststructuralist theorists are highly critical of the metaphor of voice, it continues to be pervasive in the theorisation of student writing. The concept of ‘voice’ was criticised for being apolitical and for the assumption that voice can be honest and authentic, as if underpinned by a stable self (Kamler 2001: 38). However, in the context of research on academic writing,

31 For an explanation of the terms: ‘field’, ‘tenor’ and ‘mode’, see 2.2.1.3.
conceived of as dialogue, it is difficult to move away from metaphors of embodied production of meaning.

Hyland (2008: 6) takes the view that voice is “essentially social rather than personal”, asserting that writing “always has voice … in the Bakhtinian sense of ‘voice types’ which locate users culturally and historically”. He argues that in the context of research writing, voice is an aspect of how writers position themselves in relation to discourse communities. He further claims that research writers use language in ways that are legitimate in the disciplinary communities with which they are affiliating, and that the construction of “disciplinary voice” is necessary for acceptable argumentation (5-7). The distinction he makes between resources for “stance” and “engagement” in his representation of the discursive resources used for interaction in research writing is particularly helpful for the analysis of voice (see 2.2.4.4, Figure 2.6). Hyland (7) uses the term “textual voice” in his analyses of text as an indication that ‘personal’ voice is not under consideration. Some theorists working in the SFL tradition (for example, Swain 2007) also use the term “textual voice”.

Since student texts are the central texts analysed in this study (see 3.8.3), it is also worth considering the view of researchers working in a critical paradigm who theorise voice in the context of novice writing. While acknowledging the importance for students of learning the discourses of the disciplines, the complexity of writing as a socio-political act should not be underplayed. Since writing involves the “indelible languaging of self” through the intertextual selection of discourse conventions that are enduring, it is a “powerful means for self-representation” (Clark and Ivanič 1997: 145). The conception of writing as self-representation makes it difficult to ignore the role that academic writing can play in the identity development of students.

Clark and Ivanič’s (1997: 137) representation of the relationship between writing and identity as a configuration of three aspects – “autobiographical self”, “discoursal self”, and “self as author” – is helpful for understanding student writing. The term “autobiographical self” refers to the life history of the writer, the term “discoursal self” to the writer’s representation of self in the text, and the term “self as author” to “authorial presence” (137). It seems that what Clark and Ivanič call “discoursal self” is referred to as ‘voice’ in much of the literature on writing pedagogy. In other words, making discursive choices is

---

32 Hyland’s conception of disciplinary voice seems to be similar to Bernstein’s use of the term voice, which relates it to disciplinary identity (see 2.3.5). Bernstein (2000: 12) suggests that “classification establishes voice”, and “provides us with the limits of any discourse”.
one aspect of the construction of voice. However, Clark and Ivanič problematise the term, arguing that the popular use of the term ‘voice’ conflates two different understandings, which they claim relate to form and content. “[V]oice as form”, refers to the linguistic form, or the discourse conventions, available to or chosen by the writer. This aspect of voice is not personal, but rather “an affiliation to or unique selection among existing discourse conventions” (151).

In the authors’ model of writer identity (Clark and Ivanič 1997: 151), “self as author” is the term used to refer to the other aspect of ‘voice’ that they identify, “voice as content”. The term refers to the presence of the writer in the text, the expression of the writer’s “own ideas and beliefs”. Some of the discursive resources used for establishing authorial presence that they identify are: the use of the first person pronoun, the positioning of the writer in relation to authorities, the expression of “relative certainty” (the use of modality), the extent to which the writer uses personal experience, the use of “reporting verbs”, and the extent to which the writer refers to or evaluates other texts (157-158). The resources they identify for inscribing “self as author” overlap considerably with the “stance” resources identified by Hyland (see 2.2.4.4).

In written argument, ‘authority’ is a particularly important aspect of self-representation. Although it is difficult for students to write with authority in the pedagogic context, which positions them as lacking in authority, effective argument requires the construction of an authoritative persona, and therefore students are required to find “an authoritative and critical position from which to speak” (Kamler 2001: 82). This involves negotiating an authoritative, empowered identity that is not challengingly impertinent, which is achieved largely through interpersonal positioning (Ivanič and Camps 2001: 21-28; Kamler 2001: 103-104). The linguistic and rhetorical resources for negotiating writer authority become a more significant factor as students progress in a discipline from first-year level to third-year level, which is the threshold of postgraduate level study.

Since students are expected to exhibit a disciplinary voice before they have learned the disciplinary discourse (Bartholomae 1985), one of the most challenging aspects of student writing is the negotiation of identity in their academic writing (Hamilton and Pitt 2009). As empirical research has shown, student writing exhibits the tensions between adherence to academic conventions and the expression of personal identities (Ivanič 1998) and desires (Lillis 2001). The concept of heteroglossia (see 2.2.2.3) has been drawn on to represent the challenge as a “struggle to achieve authorship” (i.e. write with authority) in the midst of “jostling voices” (Scott and Turner 2009: 159). The research of Scott and Turner shows
that students find it difficult to position themselves “in relation to the voices of the ‘others’”, and that, even at postgraduate level, writers struggle to integrate the voices of disciplinary authority into their own texts (154-157). From a “dialogic” perspective, it is argued that two key moves in the construction of authority in academic essays are: “assertion of a writer’s voice” and locating “that voice within the ongoing or past ‘conversations’ of [the] discipline” (Tang 2009: 181).

Disciplinary conventions also carry the values of the disciplinary community, which Ivanič (1998: 304) refers to as “ideologies of knowledge-making” (see figure 2.8 below). In this thesis, I draw on Ivanic's representation of tacit disciplinary values in the conception of ‘inquiry’ and ‘persuasion’ as ‘discourses of knowledge construction’ used in argumentation (see Figure 2.13).

![Figure 2.8](image)

**Figure 2.8:** Some alternative ideologies of knowledge-making in higher education (reproduced from Ivanič 1998: 304)

The discourses of knowledge construction are reproduced unconsciously in novice writing as an aspect of textual or disciplinary voice. Consequently, discursive resource use can be analysed to establish what discourses of knowledge construction are used, and how the resources used contribute to the argumentation (see 3.9.1).

### 2.2.4.7 Discourse community

The term ‘discourse community’ gained currency in academic writing research with Swales’ call for research on the discourse communities in which genres develop. Swales (1990: 8) defined discourse communities as “socio-rhetorical networks that form in order to
work towards sets of common goals”, and characterised them as having sufficient members with specialist expertise, commonly-held values and public goals, and mechanisms for members to communicate with each other, using specialised genres and lexis (24-27).

The term ‘discourse community’ is contested, questions being raised about how it should be defined, whether community is global or local, the extent to which a community can be seen as unified, and what the relationship is between it and genre (Johns 1997; Hyland 2009). Clark and Ivanič (1997: 69) prefer the term “context of culture” to discourse community, arguing that the latter term suggests communal purpose/norms and homogeneity, where there is actually a diverse “array of competing ideologies and practices”.

There is some overlap in meaning between the terms discourse community used in applied linguistics, and the term ‘community of practice’ used by learning theorists. The latter is used to refer to groups with common goals and practices where “situated” knowledge, which is “inextricably a product of the activity and situations”, is developed (Brown, Collins and Duguid 1989: 33). According to this theory, situated learning allows for gradual induction into a community of practice, with peripheral participation leading over time to full membership of the community (Lave and Wenger 1991).

2.2.4.8 Academic discourse

The institution of higher education is served by discourses that in part construct its disciplinary communities. Academic discourse “functions within disciplinary cultures to facilitate the multiple social interactions that are instrumental in the production of knowledge” (Berkenkotter and Huckin 1995: 24). Although the secondary discourses (see 2.2.2.4) of the academy are diverse, it is argued that they share certain basic characteristics. Study under the banner of EAP (see 2.2.4.5) found many points of commonality between the discourses used in different disciplines, particularly after making a split between science and technology, and the humanities and social sciences (Jordan 1997; Flowerdew 2002).

When the general features of the languages of the academy are discussed, an overarching category, ‘academic discourse’, is used to refer collectively to these discourses. Since the term refers to all the discourses, oral and verbal genres, and fields

---

33 Also see Lea’s (2005) critique of ‘community of practice’.
of knowledge (Flowerdew 2002), a recent inclusive definition of academic discourse is: “the way that individuals collaborate and compete with others to create knowledge, to educate neophytes, to reveal learning and define academic allegiances” (Hyland 2009: 2).

Academic discourse is characterised by a high level of abstraction (Martin 2002), and therefore participation in academic discourse demands “advanced literacy” (Schleppegerrell and Colombi 2002). Theorisation of ethnographic research has linked academic discourse to what is termed “essay-text literacy” (Scollon and Scollon 1981, in Gee 1996: 59-61), also known as “essayist literacy” (Lillis 2001). Essayist literacy is characterised as self-referential, the relationships between sentences or parts of the text being more important than the relationships between interactants producing the text. Gee (1996: 60) argues that it places more emphasis on “truth value” than “social or rhetorical conditions”, requiring linguistic explicitness about “logical implications”. The argument that this form of literacy is complicit with the values and ‘form of consciousness’ of Western culture, and one of the mechanisms for its reproduction is also made in the claim that literacy is “ideological” rather than “autonomous” (Street 1984, see 2.2.3).

Some of the conventions of the specialised and highly valued form of literacy referred to as academic discourse are: the use of Latinate vocabulary and abstract nouns, avoidance of the first person pronoun and extended sentences (Clark and Ivanič 1997:138-139). The description of academic discourse as highly “semioticized”, meaning that the weight of semiotic material in relation to materiality is great (Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer 2010), is more encompassing of the multimodal nature of some academic discourse. In the humanities and social sciences the relative semiotic weight is heaviest.

In terms of the widely-reported difficulties many students experience with academic discourse (see 1.2.2 and 1.2.3), the high degree of semioticisation of the institutions, practices and texts in the academy accounts in part for these difficulties. In their exploration of the implications of Bakhtin’s dialogism (see 2.2.2.2) for the learning of academic discourse, Berkenkotter and Huckin (1995: 10-11) claim that academic discourse is “on a ‘conversational continuum’” that involves “a transition from naturalistic conversational turns to turns that are extended and monological”.

While research shows that knowledge of professional disciplinary discourse is acquired through participation in knowledge-producing communities (Bazerman 1988; Berkenkotter and Huckin 1995), since the model of formal education at undergraduate level is different from the apprenticeship learning, it cannot be assumed that knowledge of disciplinary
genres is simply ‘acquired’ in the undergraduate years. Gee (2002: 174) argues that students are predisposed to acquiring the secondary discourses\(^{34}\) of the disciplines depending on the extent to which they have been “scaffolded” into the relevant discourses by means of parental and community “filtering”. Consequently, a growing number of secondary and tertiary educationalists argue for a stronger focus on “meta-awareness” about discourse which would entail explicit teaching of specific discourses and how they articulate with other discourses (Lillis 2001: 171)\(^{35}\).

2.2.4.9 The essay

In writing pedagogy, a distinction is made between “low stakes” (Elbow 1997) “writing for learning” tasks and “high stakes” writing for assessment. “Low stakes” writing is assigned frequently to keep students engaged with the subject ‘content’, but is generally not assessed. Since most “high stakes” writing tasks assigned to students in the humanities and social sciences require the use of some form of the essay genre, the ‘essay’ is still the “default” genre (Womack 1993: 42; Andrews 2007: 1) in higher education (see also 1.3). Despite it being an entrenched genre, some see it as a “stultifying” form (Andrews 2010: 160), and there are reservations about its usefulness in general education (Hamilton and Pitt 2009; Andrews 2010)\(^{36}\).

One of the essay forms, the “argument essay”, is a form so conventionalised that overall guidelines on the structure are offered in a textbook on academic writing for higher education teachers (Coffin, Curry, Goodman, Hewings, Lillis and Swann 2003). According to the authors, this form has three “functional stages”: the “introduction”, where an “overall position” is offered in the form of a “thesis statement/point of view”; a “body”, where “sub-arguments and supporting evidence” is provided; and a “conclusion”, where “reinforcement of the overall position/argument” is provided (22). This essay form, common in British universities, is also popular in the teaching of composition and rhetoric in North America (Bloom, Daiker and White 1996). The argumentative essay forms have a long history: the

---

\(^{34}\) The primary genres (Bakhtin 1986) and primary discourses (Gee 1996) are learned in childhood from interaction with care-givers. The nature of the students’ primary discourse impacts on their ability to participate in secondary discourses, as the primary discourse of socially privileged children facilitates access to powerful secondary discourses (Gee 1996). While participation in primary discourse requires no formal training, Australian genre theorists argue that in order to become active participants in the specialised secondary discourses of the academic disciplines, students require explicit instruction (Cope and Kalantzis 1993).

\(^{35}\) Gee (1996: 174) calls for the provision for students of, “embodied experiences within Discourses that offer them new and valued identities”. This is essential for “authentic beginners” who enter higher education without the benefit of exposure through parental and community scaffolding.

\(^{36}\) As suggested by the heading “The end of the essay?”, in Andrews’ (2010: 158) overview of argumentation in higher education.
form can be traced back to the conventional structure of the oral genres of classical rhetoric. In general terms, expectations of an essay introduction parallel those of the initial parts of a public speech: exordium, narratio, propositio and partito; the main body of the essay is expected to include both arguments for (confirmatio) and arguments against (confutatio) the issue under discussion; and the essay conclusion can be seen as matching the final part of the classical argument, peroration (Lindemann 2001; Ramage, Bean and Johnson 2001).

The essay is described by Andrews (2010: 158-63) as the “genre par excellence for assessment in the academy”, as it facilitates judgement of the extent of a student’s understanding. Both Womack (1993) and Heath (1997) have contributed to an understanding of the reasons for the essay being a favoured text type. Although their discussions of the historical emergence and ascendance of the essay form relate more directly to the literary essay, many of their insights are also applicable to the form used in the disciplines in higher education.

As a literary genre, the essay emerged in the West in the written reflections of Montaigne and Bacon, characterised as a formal written of thinking aloud in the informal but detached voice of a spectator (Womack 1993). The existence of privileged classes who had the leisure time to read extensively for pleasure, to reflect on ideas gleaned from reading, and to meet with like-minded companions to converse about these ideas allowed the essay to emerge as a genre (Heath 1997: 203). Having pointed out the mismatch between the bourgeois lifestyle which allowed the emergence of the essay form and contemporary conditions in education, Heath (211-212) wonders at contemporary educators’ “long-held faith in the essay as the favoured academic genre”.

It is argued that a reason for the essay’s popularity as an assessment genre is the perception that it is a form of thought in writing, accessible to anyone who can think and use English (see 2.4.1), which affords the examiner a view of the candidate’s mind (Womack 1993). Although Womack suggests that the essay form has been complicit with the promotion of the values of the privileged classes, he argues that the form should be taught, precisely because control of the genre continues to confer power. In a more recent study, the essay genre is acknowledged as, “a highly valuable pedagogical resource” because of its unique “affordances” (English 2011: 170). The use of the essay form in disciplinary learning is discussed again in the concluding chapter of the thesis (see 7.3.5).
From the perspective of critical theory, the essay genre in higher education has become naturalised (see 2.2.4.1 for a discussion of naturalisation as an ideological process). The essay can be seen as the ‘handmaiden’ of the autonomous approach to literacy which still dominates in the West (see 2.2.3). This ideology allows the essay to be used in education as an assessment genre which discriminates in both senses of the word: it ensures differential performance according to students’ mastery of essayist literacy and, in the process, facilitates the reproduction of inequality in society.

Unlike the relatively unstructured form of the literary essays discussed above, the academic essay as it is used in different disciplines is differently structured, depending on institutional context and departmental and disciplinary conventions. Research findings from both rhetorical studies (Spellmeyer 1998) and critical linguistics highlight the challenging nature of essay writing in the academy. The typical essay sub-genre in the social sciences, the essay ‘written from sources’\(^{37}\), requires students to write about “non-literary knowledge-focused reading” (Bazerman 2004: 60). The essay based on authoritative sources is a hybrid genre, involving writing to explore ideas and also to demonstrate understanding of subject content. One of the problems with the genre in higher education learning is the difficulty students experience with judging how explicit to be, given that the intended reader is the lecturer, who presumably knows more than the student about the discipline ‘content’ (Clark and Ivanič 1997: 164).

Bazerman (2004) argues that students are expected to show independent thought, but also to acknowledge the extent to which their thoughts are based on the ideas of others. The complex task must be achieved using conventional forms: the assertion of intellectual independence is expected to be “thoroughly permeated by signs of conformity to an academic code of practice”. Students are required to engage in “complex negotiation between individuality and authority, message and code, their own words and the words of others” (Bazerman 2004: 60). A symptom of this contradiction is students who make excessive use of unacknowledged quotation from sources. An understanding of the impact on students' writing practices of the paradoxes discussed above suggests that a less moralistic approach to plagiarism is required, as discussed earlier (see 2.2.4.3).

While rhetorical study has contributed to understanding of the emergence of the essay as a highly-valued textual form, the Australian genre school research has contributed to understanding of the essay as a pedagogical genre and of how the secondary genre

\(^{37}\) This is termed the ‘library research’ or ‘term paper’ in the United States, and loosely termed the ‘essay’ or ‘research essay’ in British and South African undergraduate social science classes.
relates to primary discourse (see 2.2.2.4 and 2.2.4.5). Genre learning is conceptualised as mastery of generic form in a progression from simple to more complex forms (Martin 1997; 2002). Since the theorisation of the genres in SFL (see 2.2.1) is based on school genres, it has limited value for analysis of instances of the more complex essay genres used in the disciplines in higher education. Nevertheless, the genres of primary and secondary schooling that are identified by systemicists can be seen as sub-genres embedded within the more complex essay forms used in higher education. The genres of “factorial explanation” and “consequential explanation” are used for discussion of cause and effect, with the former term being used for discussion of “multiple factors leading to some event”, and the latter for discussion of “multiple effects of some event” (Martin 2002: 99-111). The representation of cause and effect is an important dimension of the discourses of social science. “Exposition”, “challenge” and “discussion” are identified as the genres of argument, as all three are oriented towards a thesis (see 2.4.3). The genres of “exposition” and “challenge” are “one-sided”, the former functioning to promote a “[p]roblematic interpretation” or “thesis”, and the latter to rebut a thesis. Genre theorists see “discussion” as the most complex of the argument genres. Only after learning the simpler genres are students expected to acquire control of the “discussion” genre, which shares the language features of “exposition” and “challenge” but, in addition, requires that the writer choose between opposing points of view and argue for the choice that is made (Martin 2002: 99-111).

Of the SFL school genres discussed above, the “discussion” genre is closest to the multiple-source essay that is favoured in the disciplines of higher education. It involves consideration of opposing views on an issue and, ultimately, the construction of a position, expressed in writing as a thesis statement. However, the “discussion” genre, as it is described in Australian genre theory, is a simplification of the essay form required in higher education, which involves the integration of the expert voices of the discipline/s, consideration of multiple but not necessarily opposing perspectives, and the positioning of the textual voice in relation to disciplinary voices. Consequently, the term used in this thesis to refer to the essays analysed is the ‘multiple-source discussion essay’. The coinage is a combination of the terms ‘essay based on sources’ and “discussion”, as defined by Martin (2002). The first part of the term, ‘multiple-source’, refers to the requirement that students use a range of sources in order to write an essay on a question or issue. The second part of the term refers to the construction of an overall argument, or ‘thesis’, that represents and integrates different views on the topic addressed.
2.3 Knowledge

The extent to which argument is shaped by the knowledge domain is an important consideration in a study of disciplinary argument. This part of the chapter draws on higher education studies and the sociology of knowledge for theoretical resources for understanding the relationships between knowledge, higher education, social science knowledge domains and Development Studies. The exploration of concepts draws selectively from extensive bodies of literature, focusing only on ideas that have explanatory power for this study. The perspective on knowledge and disciplines in higher education presented in this section is informed mainly by Bernsteinian theorisation of knowledge structure, but also the partly empirical research of Becher (1989), Becher and Trowler (2001), and Trowler's recalibrations of earlier work (Trowler, in Kreber 2009; Trowler 2012).

2.3.1 Educational knowledge and cultural reproduction

Since Basil Bernstein has been influential in the conceptualisation of knowledge, his work is the compass for the theoretical exploration of knowledge structure and knowledge production as social reproduction that follows. Not only is Bernstein’s perspective congruent with the critical orientation of this research, but Bernstein’s work also complements Halliday’s work, which is the strongest influence on the perspectives on discourse discussed earlier (see 2.2). Bernstein (2000: 146) acknowledges that “[t]he Halliday/Hasan contribution to [his] development is incalculable”. Since his ideas are “dialogically in tune with Halliday” (Muller 2011: 15), the theoretical integrity of the study is strengthened.

The assumption underlying this research, that formal education plays an important role in the formation of consciousness and hence in the reproduction or transformation of social reality, is attributable to Bernstein’s theory of cultural reproduction. This theory is also congruent with the idea that discourse is the vehicle for the reproduction and transformation of social identities discussed earlier (see 2.2.1.3). Bernstein (2000: 4) argues that unequal power relations between social groups outside education are carried into education systems, and that “intrinsic stratification features” in education systems facilitate the perpetuation of inequities in society (xxv) by “differentially” regulating “forms of consciousness” (4). Power translates into “principles of communication”, expressed as pedagogic “codes”, which shape consciousness (4-22). In this theorisation, Bernstein
argues for the connection between, “macro structures of power and control” and the “micro process of the formation of pedagogic consciousness” (22).

2.3.2 The ‘pedagogic device’ in higher education

The “pedagogic device” is a theorisation of the relationship between three fields of knowledge: the field of “production”, or research, the field of “recontextualisation”, or curriculum development, and the field of “reproduction”, or teaching and learning (Bernstein 2000: 21-38). The device is a construct used to explain the processes by which society reproduces itself. Control of the device confers “the power to regulate consciousness” (38). However, the pedagogic device is not entirely “deterministic”; internal and external limitations allow for “challenge and opposition” (38).

Higher education, as one of the sites which produces forms of knowledge that are abstracted from the material world, is one of the main social institutions that controls the “unthinkable” (Bernstein 2000: 29-30). “Distributive rules” regulate access to the “thinkable and the unthinkable”. In Bernstein’s terms, each discipline or knowledge domain is “a specialised field of production of discourse, with specialised rules of access and specialised power controls”, and the researchers who produce new knowledge are “legitimately pedagogised” agents. However, because the construction of abstract knowledge necessitates “an indirect link between meaning and material base”, there is a “discursive gap” which makes change possible at the “outer limits of legitimate discourse” (31).

The pedagogic discourse produced in the field of recontextualisation contains two discourses: “instructional discourse”, which “creates specialised skills and their relationship to each other”, and “regulative discourse”, a “moral discourse which creates order, relations and identity”, with the latter being the governing discourse (Bernstein 2000: 31-32). Pedagogic discourse is seen as, “the principle by which other discourses are appropriated and brought into special relationship with each other, for the purpose of their selective transmission and acquisition”. It is therefore “a principle for the circulation and reordering of discourses”. “Recontextualising rules” apply when discourses are moved from one site to another. Moving a discourse to a pedagogic site abstracts it from “its social base, position and power relations” (footnote 38), creating “space in which ideology can play” (32).

Luckett’s (2011: 142) recent interpretation of the pedagogic device, in which it is transposed to higher education, is a helpful simplification of Bernstein’s complex
sociological theorising (see Figure 2.9 below). In the figure, the three fields of knowledge are "hierarchically nested", with the field of production at the top, recontextualisation in the middle, and reproduction at the bottom, with downward-pointing arrows indicating the sequence of processes of knowledge recontextualisation. The starting point is the “unthinkable knowledge” produced in universities and research institutes. This gives rise to “pedagogic discourse”, the conversion of “existing knowledge” into “pedagogised knowledge” which, in turn, gives rise to “pedagogic practice”, which refers to teaching and learning events. In the figure, the dynamic processes by which discourse is regulated by means of hierarchically related, power-inflected “distributive”, “recontextualising” and “evaluative” rules are represented by means of directional arrows (Luckett 2011: 142, based on Bernstein 2000: 37). In recent educational research, discourse produced in the field of recontextualisation is referred to as “educational discourse” (Shay 2012: 5), thus avoiding the confusion that can arise when using Bernstein’s terms.

Figure 2.9: A pedagogic device for higher education in South Africa (reproduced from Luckett 2011: 142)
In Bernstein’s (2000: 33) terms, academic subjects at university are “recontextualising fields” and lecturers are “recontextualising agents with practising ideologies”. The “recontextualising principle” determines disciplinary ‘content’, how it is taught, and how lecturers and students should behave (34-35). The state-dominated “official recontextualising field” (33) does not have as strong a hold in higher education as it does in primary and secondary education. Despite the South African state’s interventions in higher education, which form part of the government’s greater ‘transformation’ project (see 1.2.2), university departments and lecturers have considerably more autonomy in curriculum design than school teachers, as observed in the context of the case study (see 3.5.3).

2.3.3 Knowledge production and the ‘epistemic relation’

The concept of the “epistemic relation” (Maton 2010a; 2010b) can be seen as complementing and extending Bernstein’s theory (2000), as well as contributing to the analytical necessity of making a distinction between the social and the epistemological (Becher and Trowler 2001: 24, see 2.3.4). The introduction of the term “knower structure”, which refers to the subjective dimensions of knowledge, is an important contribution to the understanding that knowledge production is a social process. Legitimation code theory (LCT) is an attempt to explain in more detail the grounds on which knowledge claims are made (Maton 2010b). Maton argues that knowledge claims are legitimated on the basis of both “epistemic” and “social” relations. The “epistemic relation” (ER) is one where the knowledge claim is made on the basis of the relationship between the claim and its object of study. The “social relation” (SR) is one where the claim is made on the basis of the relationship between the claim and the “knower”, the person making the claim. The epistemic relation generates a “knowledge structure”, and the social relation generates a “knower structure”. The strength of the “classification” and “framing” (Bernstein 2000) of the knowledge (see 2.3.5) determines whether a “knowledge code” or a “knower code” dominates. If a “knowledge code” is dominant in a discipline, then the tendency is for claims about knowledge to be justified on the basis of possession of specialised knowledge, skills and procedures. In contrast, a dominant “knower code” means that knowledge claims are justified on the basis of the possession of specialised dispositions, attributes and social relationships (Maton 2010b). The extension of Bernstein’s theorisation of knowledge that LCT represents not only contributes to understanding of how knowledge is made, but also enriches understanding of disciplinary argument. In terms of argumentation theory, the “warrant” and “backing” (Toulmin 1958) for knowledge
claims (see 2.2.3.2, and Figure 2.11) can be better understood if consideration is given to whether knowledge or knower codes dominate. This idea is picked up again in relation to the authoritative texts in the field of Development Studies (see 4.4).

The development of Bernstein’s theory encapsulated in the concept of “knower codes”, discussed above, is of particular significance for this research as it places emphasis on the interactive discursive processes of knowledge production. Using less technical terms, discussion of the role of the “knower” in the development of knowledge continues in the next sub-section.

2.3.4 Conceptions of knowledge in the academy

Each knowledge domain has its own characteristic objects of study, research methods and values, but the extent to which the development of knowledge can be attributed to social interaction in and beyond disciplinary communities and how much to “the epistemological properties of the knowledge forms” (Becher and Trowler 2001: 24) is a contentious issue. The question of the extent to which knowledge structure is independent of social structure can be seen as a variation on the structure-agency debate (Giddens 1984). In education, the debate is currently played out in the discourses of social constructionism and social realism. The different positions in this debate can be represented along a continuum, with epistemological determinism at the one end and epistemological relativism at the other end. Research in the sociology of knowledge with a social realist orientation is critical of educational planning that underplays the intrinsic properties of knowledge structures, leading to curricula that mitigate against the cumulative development of knowledge. One argument in particular is that instead of focusing on “the knowledge of the powerful”, educationalists should be concerned with providing students with access to “powerful knowledge” (Young 2008: 14). It is argued that social inequity is being perpetuated by educational curricula with weak epistemological foundations (Wheelahan 2010).

Consequently, there is a growing movement for what Maton and Moore (2010: 1) refer to as the “recovery of knowledge”.

Becher’s (1989) influential comparison of disciplines to “territories” and disciplinary communities to “tribes”, suggests that knowledge structure shapes the knowledge community. Becher’s research has been criticised for simplifying the relationship between disciplines and their discourse communities, and for paying insufficient attention to the effects of social and material reality. In Becher and Trowler’s (2001) substantial revision of the work, the metaphor is retained, but greater emphasis is placed on the contexts and
relationships in which knowledge is embedded. They claim, “the structural force of the
epiphenomenological character of the disciplines” is in reciprocal relationship with “the agentic
capacity of individuals and groups for autonomous action”, and acknowledge that other
societal and structural factors do not allow for the assumption to be made that there is a
simple one-to-one correspondence in the relationship (23-25). Social context and power
relations are significant factors that contribute to the formation and development of the
disciplines. Global macroeconomics, the state and institutions impact on disciplinary
knowledge, as do departmental culture, individual experience and ideologies (37-39). They
conclude that, while interdisciplinarity is increasing, leading to the formation of new sub-
disciplines and knowledge fields, it is possible to refer to disciplinary knowledge as a
relatively “stable reality”, whilst acknowledging that it is also “mediated by social practices”,
and therefore subject to change over time (37). Trowler (2012) integrates insights from
Bernstein’s work, and distances himself from the essentialism of the tribes/territories
metaphor in his most recent publications, making a clear distinction between knowledge in
a discipline that is research-focused and knowledge that is recontextualised for teaching
and learning in a formal ‘subject’ in higher education. His distinction between knowledge
as discipline and as higher education subject is consistent with the argument embodied in
Bernstein’s pedagogic device, discussed above (see 2.3.2).

In the last twelve years there has been a strong reaction to the polarisation of disciplinarity
and interdisciplinarity. Bernsteinian sociologists of education have warned of the dangers
of unreflective support of interdisciplinarity (Maton 2010a; 2010b; Muller 2011; Wheelahan
2010). Maton argues that although disciplinarity and interdisciplinarity have been
represented as ideologically opposed ways of thinking about knowledge, they can be seen
as related or complementary processes in knowledge production. Disciplinarity and
interdisciplinarity are not necessarily different: “all knowledge formations … must have a
certain quality of disciplinarity in order to qualify as a knowledge region” (Muller 2011: 23).
A historical perspective on the development of the disciplines shows that interdisciplinary
activity is one way in which disciplines are formed (see discussion of the emergence of the
social sciences below (see 2.3.6). A distinction is made between “predatory or negational”
interdisciplinarity, which undermines disciplinary boundaries, and “productive”
interdisciplinarity, which is represented as a creative collaborative response to an
intellectual problem, which can result in the formation of a new “region”, or profession, and
ultimately a new discipline (16-23). Although disciplines are more fluid than convention
acknowledges (Manathunga and Brew 2012), for the purposes of this study, it is assumed
that they are relatively stable (Trowler 2009).
A key question is how both the knowledge base and disciplinary identity are developed and strengthened in the disciplines. A related question concerns the extent to which it is possible to make global or general claims about any discipline. However, no matter whether the growth of knowledge is attributed to intrinsic knowledge properties, knowledge communities, or to external contextual factors, the institutionalisation of knowledge relies on processes of consensus-seeking on the part of members of the discipline, and to regulation of the discipline by the social norms which ensure “continuity for grounds of judgement” of “veracity” (Muller 2011: 27). Muller’s point, in terms of argument, is that claims have to be argued before they are accepted as legitimate knowledge.

2.3.5 Knowledge structure

Bernstein’s (2000) terms “classification” and “framing” are used to explain how knowledge is structured in formal educational contexts. Classification refers to the extent to which discipline content is separate from that of other disciplines. Framing refers to the degree of consensus and clarity in the disciplinary community about the disciplinary ‘content’, and to the community’s control over the content. In Bernstein’s account of the development of the disciplines, strongly classified knowledge structures emerged in the nineteenth century, producing forms of knowledge, called “singulars”, that are “only about themselves”. In the second half of the twentieth century the classification of knowledge became weaker, the result of which was a “regionalisation of knowledge”. “Regions” are defined as “the interface between the field of the production of knowledge and any field of practice” (Bernstein 2000: 9).

Bernstein (2000: 157-161) refers to everyday “situated” knowledge as “horizontal discourse”, and decontextualized academic knowledge as “vertical discourse”\(^{38}\). The vertical discourses of academia are further divided into two broad categories.

“Hierarchical”\(^{39}\) knowledge forms are associated with the ‘hard’ sciences, and are characterised as “coherent, explicit and systematically principled” and “hierarchically organised”. “Horizontal” knowledge forms are associated with the humanities and the social sciences, and take the form of “culturally specialised segments”, which use “specialised languages with specialised modes of interrogation and specialised criteria for the production and circulation of texts”. Hierarchical structures are produced by “an

\(^{38}\) Bernstein’s use of the word ‘discourse’ appears to be consistent with the ‘language as social practice’ definition of discourse discussed above (2.2.3).

\(^{39}\) The term preferred in this thesis is “hierarchical”, as confusion with “vertical discourse” is avoided.
integrating code”, whereas horizontal structures are produced by “collection or serial codes” (162).

2.3.6 Social science knowledge

 Bernstein (2000: 161-162) uses the case of sociology to explain how horizontal knowledge forms are realised in specialised “languages”\(^4\). In this case, examples of specialised “languages” are theoretical paradigms, such as “functionalism, post-modernism, Marxism”. Each movement is a “broad linguistic category” that contains the theories of disciplinary authorities (in Bernstein’s terms, the “idiolects” of “favoured or originating speakers”). The growth of disciplines categorised as horizontal knowledge forms is represented as “an accumulation of language”\(^4\) (162). An important concept is that of legitimacy. The competing discourses in any one discipline are conceived of as having different underpinning assumptions and their “own criteria for legitimate texts, what counts as evidence and what counts as legitimate questions or a legitimate problematic” (162). A footnoted observation is useful for understanding the tensions that make argumentation so central to knowledge-building in horizontal knowledge structures, such as sociology:

> As languages are based on different, usually opposing, epistemological/ideological/social assumptions then the relations between them cannot be settled by empirical research. The relations can only be those of critique. Each specialised language, or rather their sponsors and authors, may accuse the other of failures of omission and/or epistemological/ideological/social inadequacies of the assumptions. (Bernstein 2000: 172)

In the field of knowledge production, researchers are specialists who challenge other competing discourses and defend the discourses they use in the representation of knowledge. New discourses offer “the possibility of a fresh perspective, a new set of questions, a new set of connections, and an apparently new problematic” (Bernstein 2000: 162). Thus engagement with a horizontal knowledge structure entails familiarity with a number of different discourses.

The concepts of “strong grammar” and “weak grammar” are introduced to explain differences between horizontal knowledge structures. Those with strong grammar, such as economics, “have an explicit or conceptual syntax capable of relatively precise empirical

---

\(^4\) In the context of an applied linguistics study, Bernstein’s metaphorical use of terms from linguistics is potentially confusing. As language is not the object of his theorising, the terms ‘discourse’, ‘language’, ‘syntax’, and ‘idiolect’ are parts of an extended metaphor. However, the metaphor is, paradoxically, also literal in that knowledge is constructed through semiosis, the system of language being the principle system used.

\(^4\) Where Bernstein uses the word “language”, I prefer to use the word ‘discourse’ (see 2.2.3).
descriptions and/or of generating formal modelling of empirical relations” (Bernstein 2000: 163-164). Those with weak grammar, such as sociology, are more difficult to learn, as “managing [canonical] names and languages together with their criticisms, becomes both the manner of transmission and acquisition” (Bernstein 2000: 163-164). Where knowledge structures have weak grammars, recognising and constructing legitimate texts is difficult, as “what counts in the end is the specialised language, its position, its perspective, the acquirer’s ‘gaze’, rather than any one exemplary theory” (165).

When knowledge is moved into the curriculum as a subject, the scope for choice is great. What lecturers teach depends on an ideological perspective, which is one factor that influences selections from the range of discourses available. Bernstein (2000: 164) emphasises that the choices made are contingent, in his words, “not rational”, because they are not based on the ‘truth’ of a single theory: “each language reveals some ‘truth’, although to a great extent this partial ‘truth’ is incommensurate and language specific”. Thus, an “invisible perspective” constructs the academic subject in the curriculum. Students have to acquire a way of “recognising and realising” what counts as legitimate knowledge, which is termed “the gaze” (164). Bernstein argues that since the mode of transmission of the horizontal knowledge is tacit, students find it difficult to recognise what is contextually legitimate (172-173).

2.3.7 Development Studies as a social science knowledge domain

Since the academic subject which is the site of this investigation of argument is Development Studies, the following discussion is an attempt to characterise it using some of the concepts discussed above, as well the Hallidayan-influenced perspective on social science subjects discussed below.

As already indicated, knowledge forms are more fluid than is generally acknowledged. However, for this study it is necessary to have some fixed ideas about Development Studies as a knowledge structure. Since Development Studies is a new discipline that emerged in the mid-twentieth century in response to the perceived need for development in the third world (Chari and Corbridge 2008a), and since it involves the application of knowledge based in social science theory, it fits the profile of what Bernstein refers to as a “region” (see 2.3.5).

While Bernstein (2000) represents the social sciences as having horizontal knowledge structures, Wignell’s SFL-based empirical research (2007) suggests that the picture is more complex. His study of the historical development of the social sciences, which is
based on analysis of key texts, shows that the social sciences are hybrid knowledge forms which represent combinations of horizontal and vertical knowledge structures (Wignell 2007). He argues that the early origins of the social sciences are in humanities-oriented moral philosophy, but their core development during the Enlightenment period was in political economy, which used a scientific discourse. Through linguistic analysis of the texts of Thomas Hobbes (1661), Adam Smith (1776), David Ricardo (1817) and Karl Marx (1867), Wignell shows how the social sciences developed, first as a unified knowledge domain with a hierarchical knowledge structure based on the “technical” framework established by Adam Smith. However, as a reaction to Marxist theory, the social sciences later became fragmented to form distinct disciplines: economics, sociology and political science. He concludes that social science disciplines can have either horizontal or vertical knowledge structures, or combinations of both, depending on the contexts in which they are realised (Wignell 2007: 186-200). In terms of SFL, social science discourses can be seen as permutations of both “abstract” and “technical” discourse (Wignell 1998).

Wignell (2007: 202) asserts that in social science discourse, “there is always a kind of dynamic tension between the science and the social”, and that the major factor determining the knowledge structure and type of discourse used to construct it is the way “dissenting voices” are managed. Strong disciplinary boundaries and consensus in the disciplinary community (in Bernstein’s terms, strong classification and framing) are likely to prevent unorthodox ideas from threatening the integrity of the discipline, allowing a hierarchical knowledge structure to develop. For example, mainstream Western economics, the form based in a capitalist/neo-liberal paradigm, has a hierarchical knowledge structure and uses a “technical” discourse characteristic of science (186-200). In contexts where disciplinary boundaries are weak, and where disciplines overlap, oppositional voices which could introduce new discourses are not as easily suppressed, resulting in either horizontal or hybrid knowledge structures (203).

In terms of the above discussion, Development Studies can be seen as a markedly hybridised form of knowledge. Not only does it draw on more than one of the social science disciplines that developed out of nineteenth century political economy, but it is also a knowledge “region” which developed from the application of social science theories.

---

42 In Hallidayan terms, the discourse of science is “technical”, meaning that scientific experience is reconstrued by means of technical terms which “are ordered taxonomically”. The discourse of the humanities is described as “abstract” because “it involves a number of progressive shifts in abstraction from context dependence to context independence” (Wignell 1998: 297). There is a high degree of congruence between Halliday’s and Bernstein’s ideas, “technical” discourse being associated with vertical knowledge structures, and “abstract” discourse being associated with horizontal knowledge structures.
in practices designed to address development-related problems in different contexts across the world. The extent to which the knowledge structures of economics, political science and sociology are used, and in what combinations, depends on their usefulness for different problems in different contexts of application. Different contexts for the development of knowledge also affect what counts as a “legitimately pedagogised” researcher of Development Studies. In addition, the knowledge that is constructed also depends on the ideological perspectives of the researchers. Thus, in the “field of knowledge production” (Bernstein 2000) for Development Studies, the potential for the generation of diverse knowledge forms is great.

In the “field of recontextualisation” (Bernstein 2000), when Development Studies is offered as a subject at university, the most significant “recontextualising agents”, the lecturers, make ideologically-inflected and personally fulfilling, interested (Kress and van Leeuwen 1996: 6) selections from an already fragmented and contingent knowledge structure. Consequently, over a three-year undergraduate major, there is substantial potential for incoherence in the curriculum (Muller 2000; 2009).

2.4 Argument

In modern history, the study of argument developed relatively independently in three different fields: philosophy, particularly logic; cognitive psychology; and communication studies, where the school of ‘pragma-dialectical’ argumentation has become well-established (van Eemeren and Grootendorst 2004). While these bodies of knowledge are relatively autonomous, more recently they have begun to acknowledge each other in citations, suggesting an integrating trend.43

The “pragma-dialectical” approach involves the “methodical reconstruction” of argument in relation to an “ideal model of critical discussion” governed by “a dialectical conception of reasonableness” (van Eemeren and Grootendorst 2004: 6-7). The problems these theorists are concerned to resolve centre on efforts to look beyond the materiality of the argument (words on the page) to the mental abstractions they represent. Analysing “argumentation structure” and “argumentation schemes”44 and reconstructing

43 An example of this widening of focus is the changes in orientation in the journal Argumentation, which has begun to publish the pedagogically-grounded work of argumentation theorists from the United Kingdom and from the Nordic states (for example, Andrews 2009).

44 The term “argumentation structure” refers to the way parts of an extended or complex argument are related to each other, while the term “argumentation scheme” refers to the “internal organization” of “the individual single argumentation”, which composition theorists often refer to as a ‘claim’ in order to distinguish it from the kinds of extended arguments found in texts (van Eemeren and Grootendorst 2004: 4-5).
“unexpressed premises” (2-3), as adherents of this school refer to the interpretive process of recovering aspects of the argument that are either unclear or implicit, entails imagining the cognitive processes behind the linguistic forms in which they are made manifest. This approach assumes that argument can be extracted from thought (see 2.4.5). It is also based on a limiting conception of reason (see 2.4.1). Although the “pragma-dialectical” school moves away from formal logic towards consensus-based rationality, its normative approach limits its value for the exploration of argument in real-world contexts. For these reasons, the “pragma-dialectical” approach is excluded from further consideration in this thesis.

In the field of psychology, argument is most commonly studied as if it is an internal phenomenon that exists in the mind, while in philosophy it is treated as pure abstraction. In this socially-oriented educational linguistics research, argument is treated as semiotically-mediated material interaction in the world, and is viewed in terms of discourse. However, since argument also falls into the realms of psychology and philosophy, particularly in its relations to reason and language, these relations are acknowledged and broadly mapped out (see 2.4.1), and the historical context for the research orientation chosen is provided in a discussion of how discourse theory is rooted in the study of rhetoric (see 2.4.2).

The strongest influences on the theorisation of argument developed in this thesis are the concepts of dialogism and heteroglossia, drawn from the Bakhtin Circle (see 2.2.2), and Halliday’s recognition that interpersonal meaning is integral to all discourse (see 2.2.1.3). The theory is further developed by drawing on an emerging holistic perspective on reason (see 2.4.1), and conceptions of argument from three separate strands of theoretical engagement which are linked by their common interest in rhetoric. These are: North American composition theory (see 2.4.3), theorisations of argument in the educational context of school and university subjects in the United Kingdom (see 2.4.4), and a recent thread of argumentation theory from continental Europe that represents argument as a dimension of discourse (see 2.4.5).

2.4.1 Reason, language and ‘dialogic rationalism’

As an aspect of cognition, argument is wholly bound up with ideas about what reason and rationality may be. The exact nature of the relationship between argument and reason remains an unsolved puzzle involving consciousness, cognition, social interaction and language. In this section, philosophical conceptions of reason are drawn on to consider this relationship. Since views on rationality are not neutral, ideas of what is rational being
shaped by social institutions and culture/s, this study explores ideas from ancient rhetoric, modernist scientific rationalism and postmodern relativism, in order to develop a conception of reason that has productive potential for theorisation of academic argument.

This exploration is inspired by a select group of texts which represent the “rhetorical turn” (Simons 1990). The striking similarities between the main arguments in the publications of two theorists from different continents who make no explicit reference to each other’s work, suggest an emerging orientation which is worthy of consideration in this thesis.

Myerson (1994: 146) urges “a re-imagining of reason”, and Crosswhite (1996: 260) calls for a “rhetorical conception of reasoning”. A similar approach is taken by the social psychologist, Michael Billig (1996: 29), who makes a strong case for “rhetorical rationality”. Although the texts selected for discussion are not new, their import for theorising reason and argument in knowledge production and pedagogy has not been fully explored in the literature on argument in academic writing. At the close of this sub-section, a recent discussion of reason and language in the academy is drawn on (Turner 2011) to complement and strengthen insights from the older texts.

In Western theorisations of rationality, two main conceptions of reason have existed: one rhetorical and the other logical or scientific. Only the latter has been seen as ‘genuine’ reason, resulting in distortions in the fields of rhetoric and philosophy, as well as damage to education (Crosswhite 1996). A significant move which severed reason from rhetoric in the sixteenth century was the categorisation of reasoning as belonging in the domain of dialectic. Dialectic was seen as a logical and scientific method for reasoning towards certitude. Only the non-rational features of discourse were seen as belonging to rhetoric. This placed reason and human communication in different domains, resulting in the attrition of a conception of reason as “dependent on the notions of voice and dialogue”.

What is referred to as the “abolition of voice” was concurrent with the elevation of “visual-

---


46 Interestingly, both Myerson and Crosswhite were located in departments of English at the time of publication in the mid-nineties, one in the UK and the other in the USA. Both use the work of Jurgen Habermas, though Myerson does so more extensively; both see argument as a form of dialogue; both are concerned with the role of argument in society, claiming it is important for democracy and citizenship; both see argument as central in higher education; both are critical of postmodernist dismissal of argument; both aim to reclaim reason from science (Myerson 1994; 1995; Crosswhite 1996).

47 Although Billig had not cited Habermas in the first edition of his book (1987), in the second he acknowledges the similarity between his own argument for “rhetorical rationality” (1996: 29) and Habermas’ argument for communicative reason to take the place of “the cold rationality of logic” (1996: 16).

48 In argumentation theory, the terms ‘dialectic’/‘dialectical’ and ‘dialogue’/‘dialogical’ are sometimes used interchangeably, which can result in confusion. Some philosophically-oriented argumentation theorists use the concept of ‘dialectic’ extensively, while others use both the terms ‘dialectic’ and ‘dialogue’ without making a distinction between them. In the discussion of argumentation in this study, ‘dialectic’ refers exclusively to the process of synthesis that results from the combination of opposing or different ideas, whereas ‘dialogue’, and variations on the word, refer specifically to the exchange of ideas in in the form of social interaction.
spatial thinking” and the creation of a “world of logical space” (Crosswhite 1996: 235). Thus, Crosswhite (1996: 234-235) argues, reason came to be represented by visual/spatial metaphors, “the visual space of reason”, whereas rhetoric came to be represented by metaphors of voice and dialogue.

Cartesian dualism required that the body be ‘disciplined’ so that the mind could perceive “clear and distinct ideas” (Crosswhite 1996: 242). With the rejection of inherited knowledge, which includes history and language, Crosswhite argues that ‘genuine’ reasoning and rhetoric became divided. The schism between reason and rhetoric can be seen in terms of the relationship between ‘content’ and language. In a similar argument, Turner (2011: 55) claims that Descartes’ creation of the “autonomous thinking subject” led to emphasis on reason at the expense of experience, and the belief that only through the exercise of reason could humans see clearly to pursue ‘truth’. Just as rhetoric was displaced by reason, so was language unseated by ‘content’. In the content-language dichotomy, language is placed in a subordinate position to knowledge. The privileging of knowledge over language required the foregrounding of knowledge and the effacement of language in discourse: “in terms of the communication of knowledge, language played the important role of making it visible, of being its visibilising force, but at the same time making itself, the medium of communication, invisible” (Turner 2011: 65). The influential language as “conduit” (Turner 2011: 56) metaphor carries the perception that language is merely a receptacle for ideas/knowledge. Turner argues that the conduit metaphor of language is underpinned by both rationality and empiricism. The resulting discourse of “transparency” (91) demands that correct methods be applied in scientific research and that clear and precise language be used to convey the process. Thus, rationality became associated with clarity of expression. Although the conduit view of language provides a “limited framework” for teaching and learning (Lillis 2001: 168-169), Enlightenment conceptions of reason and language continue to be powerful in higher education. The ways in which the “conduit” model remains embedded in the lexical resources of English (Turner 2011: 57) is explored in the analysis of student essays in Chapter Six (see 6.2.2.2 and 6.4).

“Dialogic rationalism”, an alternative to the Enlightenment views discussed above, is proposed by George Myerson. Since Myerson’s dialogic rationalism draws on the theory of

---

49 The metaphor has been traced back to Locke’s representation: “For Language being the great Conduit, whereby Men convey their discoveries, Reasonings and Knowledge, from one to another”, in Essay concerning human understanding Book III, Chapter II, Section 5 (1975 [1689], in Harris and Taylor 1997, in Turner 2011: 56).
communicative reason (Habermas 1984) as a foundation, Habermas’ theory is discussed in some detail below. Myerson credits Habermas for claiming rationality back from science, and thereby extending rationality to all fields. As Habermas was critical of enlightenment science, he redefined rationality in terms of argumentation that leads to consensus, and described reason as “intersubjective and relational, interactive and dialogic” (Myerson 1994: 42). The exercise of reason is linked to its origin in language. Language and rationality are so closely bound together that Habermas’ theory of rationality can also be seen as a theory of language. This theory “makes language itself determine some kinds of fundamental reasoning”, and therefore, “understanding is both rational and dialogic” (Myerson 1994: 47, his italics).

Although Habermas (1984) offers a dialogical conception of reason, dialogue is subordinated to reason, resulting in the exclusion of affect from the reasoning process. In the theory of communicative reason, emotion is presented pejoratively as bias, whereas “dialogical rationalism” integrates human emotion as an inevitable dimension of rationality. For this reason, Myerson’s (1994: 44) theorisation represents an important extension of Habermas’ ideas. Firstly, he argues that “many claims for attention and justice derive from feelings; they are presented emotionally, and rouse emotions”. Therefore, he argues, arguments contain emotions and “cannot be reduced to claims accompanied by reasons”. Secondly, the ideas of other philosophers are placed in dialogue with those of Habermas. The similarities between the ideas of Habermas and Hilary Putnam are highlighted: both see a role for reason in communication between people with conflicting views, in knowledge production and in making a better society; both present dialogical argument as a better model for reasoning than ‘science’, because it is more humane (Myerson 1994: 31-60). However, it is pointed out that their ideas diverge in that Habermas is more prescriptive, presenting reason as a “unifying force”, while Putnam argues that to define reason is to limit it. Myerson draws on Putnam’s position to develop a theory of reason that is more accommodating of affect than that of Habermas.

Dialogical rationalism can be seen as a significant contribution to the study of argumentation for a number of reasons. Firstly, language is presented as central to rationality. Secondly, reason is viewed as communicative activity, rather than an aspect of

---

50 Drawing on the work of the American sociolinguist, Mead, he describes language as an “antecedent and objective … structure that forges the conditions of possibility” for “speaking subjects” (Habermas 1992, in Myerson 1994: 49).
This is significant, because it moves reason from inner mental process to externalised action in the world. Lastly, dialogical rationalism represents a development of Habermas’ “communicative reason”, as it embraces unresolved argument, critical discussion and even emotion. In that dialogical rationalism incorporates experience, affect and imagination, it is a robust theory, able to accommodate “challenges from emotion and experience” (Myerson 1994: 147), which are even more insistent in the twenty-first century.

From the perspective of critical theory, “communicative reason” can be criticised for under-theorisation of power and difference. A problem with Habermas’ theory of reason is that it assumes that consensus is necessary and inevitable. The emphasis on reaching consensus does not take sufficient account of unequal relations of power and the potential for discursive domination in institutional structures (Fairclough 2001; 2010). Dialogic rationalism, however, is particularly suited to critical consideration of argument as knowledge (re)production in higher education, as it acknowledges power, emotion and “desire” (Lillis 2001). The assertion that the aim of argument need not necessarily be the achievement of consensus makes dialogic rationalism a theory which can withstand critique from both critical and postmodern positions. Therefore, this study draws on the theory of dialogic rationalism for an understanding of reason as a linguistically-embodied social activity and of argument as open-ended. This more encompassing theory of reason is illuminated by an understanding that reason is exercised in human communities, and therefore involves consideration of, and responsibility for, the well-being of others. Although this view is not prescriptive or definitive, it is positioned to accommodate the overall ethical aims of the study to contribute to social justice.

2.4.2 From ‘rhetoric’ to ‘discourse’

This section discusses how the study of ‘rhetoric’ overlaps with ‘discourse studies’, and how insights from rhetorical studies inform much of what is now referred to as discourse analysis, and more specifically, the approach underpinning the research design of this thesis, critical discourse analysis (CDA).

Rhetoric, originally defined by Aristotle as the art of finding the available means of persuasion on any subject in any situation, grew and flourished in the classical age (Lindemann 2001). But, the study of rhetoric began to wane after the Medieval period. As

---

51 In his later work, *Postmetaphysical Thinking*, Habermas (1992, in Meyerson 1994: 9). represents reason as having material form, describing it as ‘linguistically embodied’.
‘rhetoric’ became separated from reason, the study of rhetoric all but died out, being
superseded by Enlightenment rationality and science, as discussed above (see 2.4.1). By
the twentieth century, ‘rhetoric’ had become little more than a pejorative term referring to
communication that privileged style over content (Freedman and Pringle 1980; Andrews
1992; Crosswhite 1996). However, in the latter part of the century it was revivified in
response to broader intellectual developments. A key French text, seen as the beginning
of this revival, was published in English as The new rhetoric: a treatise on argumentation
(Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca 1969). The text challenged the emphasis on analytical
reasoning and formal logic that prevailed at the time, arguing that it deprived
argumentation studies of consideration of “probable” claims, which are the kind of claims
made in the arguments that matter in the world. A key insight from this text is that even
“epideictic” discourse can be seen as argumentative to the extent that it works to support
“common values” (Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca 1969: 5-10).

The revival of rhetoric is exemplified by two texts that are useful for understanding the
conceptions of academic writing and argument that have developed: Reinventing the
rhetorical tradition (Freedman and Pringle 1980) and Rebirth of rhetoric: essays in
language, culture and education (Andrews 1992). The authors’ claims to re-make rhetoric
by drawing on its resources creatively rather than reproductively are asserted in the first
words of the book titles, “reinventing” and “rebirth”53. Rhetoric is foregrounded, being the
substantive ‘content’ term in the titles of the books. The authors propose that rhetoric has
been unjustly neglected, and contribute to its revival by repeated references to the
classical tradition. Although the texts represent different continents (North America and
Europe) and are separated by twelve years, the similarities between them are striking
enough to suggest that they are representative of broader shifts in conceptions of rhetoric,
specifically, and textuality in general.

Both sets of authors present rhetoric as a resource which could potentially be used to
develop an overall theoretical frame for their disciplinary activities. Freedman and Pringle
(1980: 173) see rhetoric as a possible source for development which could give solidity to
the teaching of writing through what they describe as a “fully articulated, explicit theoretic

52 In Aristotle’s Rhetoric ‘epideictic’ discourse is one of the three types/genres of rhetoric, the other two being
‘deliberative’ and ‘forensic’. While the latter two terms refer to the more obviously persuasive genres
expected in politics and the making of judgement, the epideictic genre encompasses the ceremonial use of
language (Lindemann 2001).
53 Although the books are collections of articles, I refer to the editors as authors, as I use their editorial
contribution in this discussion, specifically Andrews’ introduction, and Freedman and Pringle’s epilogue,
which reflects on the article contributions in their book originating in a watershed conference in 1979 in
Canada.
system”, and “a systematic theory or metatheory consistent with [their] common assumptions and values” (177). Andrews (1992: 7) suggests that rhetoric offers an “overarching dialogic theory to frame knowledge about language and language use”, describing rhetoric as “a meta-disciplinary unity for the arts of discourse” (18).

Rhetoric is contrasted with pure linguistics, since rhetoric “is concerned with the arts of discourse and with context”, and offers a “frame” for investigating texts, the “cardinal points” of which are the writer, the “audience”, the “subject-matter” and the text (Andrews 1992: 2-12). The argument is made that writing should be considered “within a total rhetorical context which includes writer, audience, and world” (Freedman and Pringle 1980: 177). As the quotations above show, both texts remark on a shift in focus from autonomous text to context. A similar view of context as involving the relationship between writer and “audience” is held. The other contextual variable is referred to by terms that are almost synonymous in the context of writing, “subject-matter” (Andrews 1992) and “world” (Freedman and Pringle 1980). Both of these terms can be seen as referring to the ‘content’ of text, suggesting a constructivist conflation of the material world and the socially constructed representation of the world in discourse, or “social reality” (Fairclough 2001; 2010, see 3.2.1 and 3.2.3). Andrews’ (1992: 8) concept of context differs from that of Freedman and Pringle: rather than being conceived of as informed by context, text is seen as “acting within society, as part of a dialogue with other voices and texts”.

Since rhetoric is concerned with persuasion and the effects of text, it necessarily involves speakers/writers and audiences/readers, and therefore it is concerned with context as much as text. To this extent it is more obviously a precursor of discourse studies than linguistics. At its roots, rhetoric is concerned with speech, where the speaker and audience are firmly embedded in the same time-frame and physical space, making the context visibly ‘material’. Therefore, rhetoric is easily aligned with dialogical approaches to writing and discourse which foreground speech as the template for all forms of communication, including writing. However, cultural-historical/critical theory adds what is missing from the dominant paradigm in rhetorical studies: a fuller sense of context, which goes beyond the immediate ‘material’ context to encompass culture and history.

---

54 Paré (1992) argues that the use of the rhetorical concept of ‘audience’ is problematic in the teaching and research of writing, as it oversimplifies context by suggesting that the readers of the text are an undifferentiated group. This insight informs the view of context in this research, where a distinction is made between the actual reader/s in the immediate context (shared space-time), and potential interactants in the context of disciplinary culture (see 2.5 and 3.5.2).
Discussion of the link between rhetoric and discourse studies is not new. Over thirty years ago, Eagleton (1983: 205) defined rhetoric as the study of “the way discourses are constructed in order to achieve certain effects”. Arguably, discourse studies have taken over from rhetorical studies, as discourse theory offers greater theoretical scope and explanatory power, and also new analytical tools, hence the choice of CDA in the design of this research (see 3.2.1). Discourse studies has become a discipline in its own right (Bhatia 1993: 3), aspects of which are discussed above (2.2.4). However, the legacy of rhetorical studies continues to be influential in the theorisation of argument, as the discussion below shows.

2.4.3 Argument concepts from rhetoric and composition studies

As composition studies is an extensive field, only concepts that are used in this study are discussed in this section. The revival of rhetoric (Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca 1969; Freedman and Pringle 1980; Andrews 1992) resulted in renewed interest in argument. In North America the study of argument has been mainly confined to the foundational writing courses that come under the umbrella term of ‘composition and rhetoric’\(^{55}\). In composition/rhetoric studies, both rhetoric and logic are drawn on for understanding written argument. Ironically, these sometimes conflicting sources are based in the same source discipline, philosophy (as discussed in relation to conceptions of reason in 2.4.1).

Some of the concepts drawn from ancient rhetoric which continue to be useful are briefly discussed below. In the recovery and reframing of classical rhetoric, the “new rhetoric” (Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca 1969) brought concepts from the oratorical situation back into focus, with renewed interest in ‘audience’, ‘occasion’ and context.

2.4.3.1 ‘Invention’ and ‘arrangement’

What is termed “invention” or “discovery”, glossed as “ways of discovering arguments and supporting evidence”, is related to the concept of “inquiry”, which is seen as the “discovery” of new knowledge (Crosswhite 1996). Conventions developed by Aristotle and by Cicero, termed “arrangement” in composition studies, and glossed as the “ways of organizing the parts of a discourse” (Lindemann 2001: 42), still govern expectations of the structure of the ‘argumentative’ essay (see 2.2.4.9). This is evident in the commonly-held expectation that written argument should have the following components, usually in separate parts of the text: an introduction which states the issue, background information

\(^{55}\) More recently, interest has extended to include disciplinary argumentation at postgraduate level (Kamler and Thomson 2006; Andrews 2007; Metcalfe 2007).
to contextualise the issue, “proofs” (evidence) for the overall claim asserted, consideration of counter-arguments, and a conclusion that summarises the argument (43).

“Arrangement” can be seen as closely related to persuasion, since the rhetorical structure of argument (the organization of ideas in discourse) affects its impact on the reader.

An ‘inquiry’ orientation to argument can also be linked to the use of scientific method and logical reasoning as ways of producing knowledge, seen as objective/truth, which took hold during the Enlightenment, leading to the decline of rhetoric. A ‘persuasion’ orientation, on the other hand, can be seen as a reaction to the rejection of the substantive role that rhetoric/discourse plays in the production of knowledge (see 2.4.1). ‘Inquiry’, and its relation to ‘persuasion’, both key concepts in the discussion of argument, are discussed further at the end of this sub-section, and in Chapter Three (see 3.9.1).

2.4.3.2 Aristotle’s three ‘appeals’: logos, ethos, and pathos

Aristotle’s conception of the three “appeals”, or “means of persuasion”, provides a framework for analysing argument, popularly referred to as the rhetorical triangle, that is still widely used in the teaching of composition and rhetoric (see Figure 2.10 below).

Figure 2.10: The rhetorical triangle
The term *logos* refers to the discussion of the “subject matter”, or ‘content’, which is guided by logic; *ethos* refers to arguing in such a way as to “create a favorable impression”; and *pathos* refers to consideration of the “character or mental state of the audience” (Lindemann 2001: 42). In the use of the rhetorical triangle to teach academic writing, the focus has traditionally been on logical argumentation in relation to the ‘subject matter’ or content. However, there is growing interest in *ethos* and *pathos* among analysts of academic writing (e.g. Hyland 2004). The potential for the concepts of ‘writer’ and ‘reader’ to be given consideration that equally matches the attention given to subject content, makes the rhetorical triangle a viable socially-oriented model for understanding argument.

### 2.4.3.3 The Toulminian model of argument

Arguably, the model for analysing argument which has been most influential in composition and argumentation studies (see Figure 2.11) is the one developed by the philosopher Stephen Toulmin (1958; Toulmin, Rieke and Janik 1979).

![Figure 2.11: A model of argument structure (based on Toulmin 1958; Toulmin, Rieke and Janik 1979)]
Expressed most simply, there are two essential ‘surface’, or explicit, elements to an argument, the “grounds”\textsuperscript{56} and the “claim”, with “grounds” being information supporting the claim, such as reasons or evidence. The other essential elements, the “warrant” and the “backing” are more usually implicit, the former being the reasoning that links the “grounds” and the “claim”, and the latter being underlying assumptions that support the “warrant”. The “qualifier” and the “counter-claim” are additional optional components of argument, the “qualifier” functioning to weaken or strengthen the “claim”, and the “counter-claim” being acknowledgment of competing or opposing claims. The concepts of the “warrant” and the “backing” make a significant contribution to the understanding of argument in academic contexts where knowledge claims are underpinned by the (usually) implicit values of disciplinary culture (see 2.3.2). Toulmin himself acknowledged that the model was never intended to be used in the way it has been incorporated into American composition pedagogy, and it is generally acknowledged that the model is more useful for evaluating than for generating argument (Andrews 2010: 87). In comparison to the social process model of the rhetorical triangle, the model is static, suggesting a view of argument as a product of cognition. It is also suited to argument at the micro-level of the single claim. Argument in the extended knowledge-focused texts of the academy consists of macro-structures that are complex concatenations of micro-claims at different hierarchical levels. These patterns can be visualized as similar to the repetitive fractal patterns found in nature.

2.4.3.4 Four basic types of argument

Composition theorists have built on philosophical theory to categorise claims into groups. Four types of common recurring patterns have been identified as the basic types from which all arguments are constructed (Fahnestock and Secor 1983: 20-30). The first category of claim is an assertion that a phenomenon either falls into a particular group or has a particular quality. This is referred to as a “definition” claim. The second category of claim is an assertion that a particular phenomenon causes or is the effect of another, referred to as a “cause-effect” claim. Assertions of value judgement fall into the category of “evaluative” claims. Assertions that changes need to be made, fall into the category of “policy” claims. Fahnestock and Secor argue that most evaluative and policy claims involve the incorporation of definition and/or cause-effect claims. The claim categories identified by Fahnestock and Secor can be seen as meso-level semantic units contained within extended macro-level argument. In this thesis, the recurring semantic patterns in

\textsuperscript{56} In Toulmin’s original work, “grounds” were referred to as “data” (1958).
extended expository text are referred to as arguments of ‘definition/fact’, ‘cause’, ‘value’ and ‘policy’.

2.4.3.5 Argument as dialogue

The metaphor of writing as ‘conversation’ is attributed to Kenneth Burke, an influential theorist in composition study (see Freedman and Medway 1994b). However, the idea is similar to the Bakhtinian conceptualisation of the ‘utterance’ (see 2.2.2.1). Not only is the conversation metaphor apt for the dialogical approach to argument taken in this research, but since it also brings the meanings of argument from primary discourse, such as ‘dispute’, back into academic argumentation, it emphasises the interactional context that is ‘backgrounded’ by the abstract nature of academic discourse. Since this perspective on argument underpins the thesis, and it is discussed more thoroughly in other parts of the thesis (see 2.2.2.2 and 3.9), it is glossed over here.

2.4.3.6 ‘Inquiry’ and ‘persuasion’

A relatively old, yet still ongoing, debate in composition theory centres on whether argument should be defined in terms of ‘persuasion’ or ‘inquiry’. Some composition theorists see argument primarily in terms of persuasion, following Burke’s view that “symbol-making is inextricably bound up with persuasion” (Freedman and Medway 1994b: 3)57. As discussed earlier in this section, inquiry is related to the rhetorical concept of ‘invention’, defined as investigation of “the dialectical field”, seen as “the web of arguments, objections, and replies which are relevant to the topic in question” (Meiland 1989: 194). Meiland argues for ‘inquiry’, treating the terms ‘argumentation’ and ‘inquiry’ as if they are synonymous. He criticises a trend in composition textbooks to present argumentation as persuasion. For him, in the context of the academic essay, argumentation is “a method of inquiry” and a “method of thinking” (186). Inquiry is defined as: “the process of discovering what (if anything) it is rational to believe about a topic” (187). He claims that the function of argumentation is to advance and test possible reasons for holding a particular belief by considering “objections” or counter-arguments (187-188). The importance of counter-arguments is highlighted in the assertion that “Western-type” rationality requires that opposing views be considered in argumentation (194). He argues that argument, conceived of as inquiry, can result in an “inconclusive” conclusion, due to there being equally compelling opposing views, or to the complexity of

57 Burke argued that language use is “symbolic action” that is “exercised about the necessary suasive nature of even the most unemotional scientific nomenclatures” (Burke 1950, in Freedman and Medway 1994b: 3).
the arguments: “argumentation can be successful even if the inquirer reaches no substantive conclusion and acquires no substantive beliefs about the topic” (192-193). He rebuts the view that argument is persuasion by reasoning that if argumentation has resulted in the inquirer establishing “the strengths and weaknesses of the relevant arguments and positions”, this cannot be understood as acquiring a “belief” and therefore becoming persuaded.

This debate is picked up by Crosswhite (1996: 252), who argues that the relationship between “discovery”/inquiry and “justification”/persuasion should not be seen as oppositional, contending that both inquiry and persuasion are aspects of argumentation. His argument is that inquiry depends as much as persuasion on there being an “audience”. In teaching students how to think like and identify with the disciplinary community, the teacher shows why particular claims are persuasive for a disciplinary audience and “persuades the students to think like that audience”. Thus the rhetorical concept of “audience” is used to argue that in the teaching and learning of disciplinary argument, “persuasion and inquiry enter into a complicated dialectic” (258). Recent contributions from continental European argumentation theory to the debate on the role of inquiry and persuasion in argument, which cast new light on the old debate, are discussed later (see 2.4.5).

2.4.4 Theorisation and research on argument in school and university subjects

Research on argument in academic contexts flourished in the United Kingdom from the last decade of the twentieth century, culminating in the publication of a definitive book on argumentation in higher education (Andrews 2010). Inspired by studies in rhetoric, Andrews’ (1989: 3) early research compared the narrative and argumentative writing of schoolchildren, concluding that instead of being at “opposite poles”, there is a relationship of “generative interdependence” between argument and narrative. The argument that the origin of academic argument is in spoken language (Andrews 1989; 1995) informs a substantial body of research, and also strategies for teaching argument. While the initial focus of this research was on argument at school level (Andrews 1995; Costello and Mitchell 1995), the research was later extended to include higher education (Mitchell 1994; Mitchell and Andrews 2000; Mitchell and Riddle 2000; Torgerson, Andrews, Robinson, and See 2006; Andrews 2005; 2010). In claiming that argument was taken for granted and that

---

58 The view that, even if the aim is not to persuade others of a proposition, argumentation can be seen as involving the persuasion of oneself, leading to the conclusion that all argumentation involves persuasion (191).
the teaching of academic argumentation is neglected (Mitchell and Riddle 2000), the 
research played a significant role in raising awareness of argument in formal education 
contexts.

As this body of research affirms the role of argument in the construction of the disciplines 
and learning in academic contexts (Andrews 1995; 2007; 2010; Mitchell 1995), some of 
the key insights are outlined below. Argument is characterized as an essential component 
of both knowledge production and learning: “at the cutting edge of all disciplines, argument 
… is engaged in as disciplinary boundaries are reinforced or shifted” (Andrews 1995: 152).

The major role that argumentation plays in building disciplinary knowledge is asserted:

> Argument is both a means by which discourses come to be established and shared and a process 
through which those discourses are constituted as dynamic, subject to modification and challenge. 
Through argument, stability is achieved by the establishing of a position; change by an identical 
process of exploiting difference. Within argumentative processes, as a result, are potentials for 
conflict and disintegration as well as construction and consensus. (Mitchell 1995: 132)

Argumentation is also recognised as a way of learning. It is represented as “a tool for 
enhancing students’ understanding of a topic or issue”, since “what happens in student’s 
heads as they participate in [argumentative] talk can be defined as the transforming moves 
we take to be learning” (Andrews 1995: 151-152). Argument is described as “what motors 
the cycle” of development, and as “a process of thinking which enables the individual to 
engage with the collective, to appropriate and transform it” (Mitchell 1995: 133).

While the Toulmin-based representation of argument identifies abstract components of a 
simple claim (see Figure 2.11, 2.4.3.3), Andrews (2007; 2010) contributes theory for 
analysing argument that can be applied to the extended texts of the academy. The 
“principles of argumentation” (2010: 198-199) that he identifies are: sustained authorial 
voice; balance between personal and impersonal resources; overall planning made visible 
in text structure, which he refers to as “vertical programming” (2010: 198); logical 
sequencing of ideas, or “horizontal articulation” (198); explicitness; adherence to 
appropriate discourse conventions; and “criticality”. Since these characteristics of 
argument are inscribed in the text in the linguistic and discursive selections the writer 
makes from available resources (see 2.2.1.4), identification of the discursive choices by 
which the principles are realised is useful in the analysis of academic argument.

Although the main thrust of the education-oriented research on argument has been on 
generic aspects of argumentation, the research acknowledges the need for applications of
generic understandings of argument to different disciplines and levels (Mitchell and Riddle 2000: 13, Andrews 2010: 89-91). Over time, the body of research represents a developing understanding that argumentation is different in each discipline: “there are significant differences between institutions, disciplines and individual lecturers in the interpretation of the nature and place of argument” (Andrews et al 2006: 5). This conclusion is reiterated in the definitive text on argument in the academy (Andrews 2010: 90-91).

This study acknowledges its debt to the research discussed above, but aims to provide a more detailed exploration of argumentation in one specific social science knowledge domain at the point where, having had three years of disciplinary ‘apprenticeship’ (Lave and Wenger 1991), students can no longer be considered uninitiated novices (see 2.2.4.7 and 2.2.4.8).

2.4.5 Theorisation of argument in continental European discourse studies

This sub-section offers a perspective on the problem of accessing argument that is faced by researchers of argument. While theorisation of academic writing as discourse is well-developed, only recently has argumentation theory drawn exclusively and explicitly on discourse theory (Amossy 2009; Micheli 2012). Since the majority of contributors to the journal *Argumentation* neglect the role of language in argument, viewing argument in terms of cognitive constructions, this approach represents a challenge to the historically dominant philosophical approach to argumentation studies in the journal, according to which “arguments are understood as formal patterns of reasoning” (Amossy 2009: 316), and argumentation is defined as “the art of putting forward formally valid arguments”, which “rest upon solid, immutable logical procedures” (317). In contrast to the definitions outlined above, and in line with the theorisation of “communicative reason” (Habermas 1984) and “dialogical rationalism” (Myerson 1994, see 2.4.1), the impossibility of separating reason from language/discourse is asserted. Using the etymology of the term *logos*, which “simultaneously means language and reason”, it is argued that “verbal exchanges are intrinsically linked to the practice of reason, just as argumentation is achieved by verbal means and cannot be realized outside of discourse” (Amossy 2009:

---

59 I refer primarily to contributions to the journal dedicated to theorising argument, called *Argumentation.*

60 See brief explanation of the reason for excluding the pragma-dialectical approach to argumentation from this study, in the introductory part of 2.4.
This argument, incorporated from Habermas into the theorisation of dialogic rationalism\(^{61}\), is central to the theorisation and research design of this thesis.

Since the assumption underlying Amossy’s assertion is that argument is a form of persuasion rather than inquiry, the old debate about whether argument should be defined in terms of inquiry or persuasion needs to be revisited (see 2.4.3.6). Argument is defined in terms of consensus: “the use of verbal means to ensure a partial and, by definition, fragile consensus on what is considered reasonable by a group of people, or by what a given society would define as a reasonable person” (Amossy 2009: 317). In Amossy’s text, the analysis of two contrasting texts, one overtly persuasive, and the other informative\(^{62}\), is used to conclude that “verbal exchanges” achieve consensus not only by means of argument structure, but also from “the global functioning of discourse” (323). Two aspects of this claim are significant for the theorisation of argument. First, the definition of argumentation as persuasion is extended to the most subtle form of persuasion, that of merely, increasing adherence to an idea (Amossy 2009: 314). Second, in a development of argument theory which is important for the theorisation in this thesis, it is asserted that argumentation is an aspect of all texts. It is claimed that what the author refers to as “argumentativity” is a “constitutive feature” of all discourse, and that it “pervades and partly regulates all verbal exchanges” (313). Unwieldy as the term “argumentativity” is, the term and the concept it represents are taken up again in the next sub-section (2.5).

A different line is taken in a more recent contribution to the question of whether argument should be seen primarily as inquiry or persuasion. Micheli (2012) argues that argumentation should not be defined in terms of persuasive ends. He argues that argumentation does not necessarily aim to persuade. Instead, a “non-persuasive conception” of argumentation which depends primarily on an understanding of discourse as heteroglossic (see 2.2.2.3) is offered. It is argued that an aspect of argumentation is positioning oneself in relation to the interlocutor. This argument is taken a step further in the assertion that positioning can also be “virtual”. Monological text contains “counter-discourse which is more virtual and which the speaker represents in his own discourse”

---

\(^{61}\) Habermas drew on different support for the claim, using his reading of the American sociolinguist, George Herbert Mead (Myerson 1994: 23-27).

\(^{62}\) One of the texts is a political campaign speech by President Sarkozy on the controversial issue of France’s membership of the European Union. The other text is a descriptive “personal testimonial” about life in the military hospitals in the First World War. Although the second text is not designed to “develop an argument or to take part in a controversy”, the discourse analysis conducted shows that it, “draws a meaningful picture of women in the life of a nation, re-orienting mistaken opinions on feminine capacities”. On the basis of the analyses, Amossy (2009: 321-323) argues that both texts have an “argumentative dimension”, which she terms, “argumentativity”. 
(Micheli 2012: 124). This entails the writer positioning herself in relation to the imagined positions of others. Thus argumentation is defined as "an activity through which one necessarily acts with respect to the Other" rather than acting "upon the Other" (124). There are strong Bakhtinian echoes in the language Micheli uses, and a theory of text as heteroglossic is used in the argumentation (see 2.2.2.3). Oddly, neither Bakhtin nor scholarly work associated with Bakhtinian theory is cited in the article.

A Bakhtinian interpretation of Micheli’s (2012) text allows for it to be seen as offering a significant redefinition of argument. Argumentation is presented neither in terms of persuasion nor of inquiry, but as a kind of ‘positioning’ in relation to other discourses in the context of culture (see 2.2.1.2). According to this definition, argumentation is found wherever “a discourse and a counter-discourse are opposed to each other on a given question, formulate different points of view in response to the question and are constructed with respect to one another” (124). Micheli claims that this theory accommodates the “dialectical dimension” of discourse: “argumentative discourse … is intrinsically dialectical in that it always implies the anticipation and the management of a counter-discourse”. He claims his definition of argument has greater “empirical adequacy”, since it allows a wider range of genres to be encompassed by argumentation, offering, “the lowest common denominator of various realizations of argumentation” (125). While persuasion is not seen as a defining feature of argument, it is not excluded from falling under the umbrella of argumentation, since it is acknowledged that persuasion is “a characteristic of certain discourse genres in which argumentation is liable to develop” (124).

Amossy’s definition of argument is criticised for being overly “accommodating”, thus blurring the distinction between argument and information (Micheli 2012: 122). However, if the Bakhtinian argument that discourse is heteroglossic is applied, then viewing argument in terms of “positioning” suggests that all discourse contains argumentation. Arguably, Micheli’s overall argument is as “accommodating” as that of Amossy. In an ironic twist, his critique of Amossy’s theorisation of argument can be seen to buttress her claim that argument is a constitutive feature of all texts.

Micheli’s argument is not new in discourse theory, where there is notable uptake of Bakhtinian theory, but it is new in the pragmatic strand of argumentation theory exemplified in the journal in which his article was published. Rather than being defined in terms of whether it functions as inquiry or persuasion, argument is redefined in terms of heteroglossic positioning (see 2.2.2.3). This move suggests a fundamental challenge to the long-standing conception of argumentation as primarily oriented towards either inquiry
or persuasion, and opens space for the position, taken in this thesis, that both inquiry and persuasion are aspects of all argumentation.

2.5 Theorising argument as discourse

A recurrent debate in the study of text concerns the nature of argument as a form of discourse, the central question being how argument should be categorised. The difficulty of resolving this question can be related to the possibility that argument is a constitutive feature of all discourse, discussed above (see 2.4.5). For this reason, some contributions to the debate on how to categorise argument are discussed below.

Argument is initially characterised as “a mode of discourse rather than a particular genre or form” (Andrews 1995: 4)\(^\text{63}\), and later as “a mode of thinking and composition or ‘metagenre’”, with argumentation as “the process of operating within that mode” (Andrews 2005: 108). In a recent publication, argument is again referred to as a “meta-genre” (Andrews 2010: 188). Clarification about the nature of argument is offered in a diagram on the “place of argumentation” in relation to those aspects of culture and human action with which it is associated (see Figure 2.12 below).

---

\(^{63}\) Following Kress, Andrews used the term ‘mode’ differently from the dominant Hallidayan use in the applied linguistics field (see 2.2.1.3).
In Andrews’ (2010) diagram, the relationship between argumentation and other cognitive and communication processes is represented by means of a set of hierarchically arranged categories, each level of which is interlinked. The overarching category is “rationality”, which is represented as both “theory and disposition”. Significantly, in the light of the still widely-held perception that rationality is purely objective, Andrews asserts that it also encompasses “passion, feeling, commitment, intuition”. Thus, there is conceptual alignment with the view of rationality as “dialogical”, outlined earlier (see 2.4.1). The category below rationality is “thought”, which is described as the “principal mode of operation”. The category includes “reflection” and is shown to be dialectically related to “critical thinking”, which is on the same level in the hierarchy. “Argumentation” is represented as below “thought” in the hierarchy as “the process via which the higher mental functions operate socially, as well as cognitively”. Since argumentation is represented as separate from thought, and is shown to occur at a level closer to the
material textual forms in which argumentation is embodied in one or more of the “modes of communication”\(^{64}\), argumentation is represented as \textit{action} which is both cognitive and social. In a significant shift in the terminology which had been used in previous publications by the author, argumentation is described as “not a genre in itself, nor a mode of communication” (Andrews 2010: 11). This shift allows for the possibility of seeing argumentation in cultural forms other than verbal text. Since, historically, argumentation study has been mainly focused on the verbal realm, limiting the reach of argumentation studies, this redefinition effectively extends the category by opening all cultural products to argument analysis. Although Andrews, unlike Amossy (2009), does not go as far as claiming that argument is a constitutive feature of discourse, his placing of argumentation as an overarching semiotic category, which is on a higher level than mode and genre, is consistent with the idea that argument is a constitutive aspect of discourse.

Although Kress’s (1989) first published exploration of the differences between narrative and argument is no longer new, the view of argument he offers is still generative for the theorisation of argument. Narrative and argument are seen as higher-level organising principles that give rise to the genres (Kress 1989: 13-14). Narrative and argument are described as fundamental “textual forms”, present in all cultures. His conception of narrative and argument as providing “institutionalized means” for society to manage the conflicting needs arising from the inevitable existence of “difference” is similar to the emphasis placed on “orientation to difference” in Fairclough’s (2003: 192) guide to textual analysis (see 3.9.2). Both narrative and argument are seen as ways of constructing or representing knowledge, each providing “a distinctively different mode of (textual) organization”. They are described as “modes”\(^{65}\) which structure text, serving to “code fundamentally different ways of organizing salient or problematic cultural materials” (Kress 1989: 14). Argument is represented as the textual form which acknowledges and explores difference. While narrative is represented as producing “closure”, argument is described as producing “difference”, “openness”, and “critique”. Narrative is represented as conservative, in that it facilitates “reproduction” or “stasis”. In contrast, argument is represented as “progressive”, and enabling of change, since it “provides conventionalized

\(^{64}\) The level below argumentation is termed “multimodality”, an umbrella term that refers to the various “modes of discourse”, which include words, images, concrete objects, music and other symbolic systems such as mathematics. In a departure from earlier formulations (e.g. 1995), in Andrews’ latest work his use of the term ‘mode’ has changed: argumentation is no longer directly described as a “mode” of discourse, being described as a “meta-genre” instead.

\(^{65}\) Kress’s use of the term “mode” to categorise narrative and argument proves to be problematic, since it conflicts with the Hallidayan understanding of ‘mode’ as referring to the medium or channel of communication, i.e. speech or writing, for example (see 2.2.1.3). This must partly account for the shift away from the use of the term in the later work of Andrews (2010). See note above.
textual forms not just for maintaining and tolerating difference”, but for “culturally productive use of difference” (11-12).

What follows to conclude this chapter is a formulation of a theoretical structure appropriate for the analysis of argument in the knowledge-focused discourse of higher education research and pedagogy. In the theoretical framework constructed, I build on the work of Kress (1989), Fairclough (2003) and Andrews (2010), as well as insights from discourse-based argumentation theory (see 2.4.5). I take up the idea that argumentation is one of the constitutive features of discourse, which Amossy (2009: 314) refers to as “argumentativity”\textsuperscript{66}. The concept of argumentativity can also be seen as a way of reconciling Andrews’ (1989) view that argument and narrative are not necessarily opposing forms with Kress’s (1989) idea that they represent different ways of managing difference. However, the emphasis on “group-consensus” in both Amossy’s and Andrews’ definitions of reason and argument is limiting\textsuperscript{67}, leaving the theorisation vulnerable to criticism from post-structuralist and critical theorists. For this reason, in the discussion below I connect the concept of “argumentativity” to threads in the work of Kress (1989) and Martin (1992), while also drawing on and accommodating a critical perspective, in particular, Ivanič’s (1998) discussion of “ideologies of knowledge-making” (see 2.2.4.6). By acknowledging the close relationship between argumentation, ideology/power and knowledge, a more explicitly critical view of disciplinary argumentation is developed.

Kress (1989: 12) argues that the “fundamental characteristic” of argument is “to produce difference”. Martin (1992) conceives of “ideology” as another constituent in his model of context, but later reluctantly abandons it (1997: 6). These ideas can be seen as related, both to each other and to wider concerns only partly expressed in Amossy’s (2009) conception of “argumentativity”. Closer reading of the texts of Kress and Martin allow the connections between their ideas to be made. Kress argues that argument brings difference into existence, “in culture specific textual forms” (1989: 12, my italics). Martin (1997: 6-7, my italics) sees “ideology” as “an additional layer of context” which would allow the analyst to “focus attention on the distribution of discursive resources in a culture, and the divergent ways in which social subjects construe social occasions”. The link between these ideas, marked by italics in the quotations, is a key concept in discourse analysis and argument: that of differing perspectives, which is related to ‘positioning’. I draw on the idea of

\textsuperscript{66} Amossy (2009: 314-5) argues that, along with “performativity”, “subjectivity”, “dialogism” and “interaction”, “argumentativity” is a constitutive feature of discourse.

\textsuperscript{67} The value placed on consensus is primarily evident in Amossy’s (2009) article, but is also residually present in Andrews’ recent theorisation of the “place of argumentation” where, in the representation, it is claimed that “rationality” is “action based on consensus” (see figure 2.12).
heteroglossic “positioning” (Micheli 2012), but view it as only one aspect of argumentation, which involves other forms of positioning in relation to difference. Therefore, as the basis of a theoretical framing for the research, I suggest that argumentativity involves the integration, or accommodation, of difference, which is achieved through a process of positioning on three different levels of semiotic interaction, governed by ideology/power, and the principles of dialogism and heteroglossia.

In this paragraph, the theoretical framing outlined above is explained in terms that are used in the next chapter for the construction of frameworks for analysing each of the three dimensions of argumentativity that have been identified. At the simplest, most concrete level, argumentation involves positioning of the writer in relation to the reader in the ongoing construction of the “textual voice” (Hyland 2008). Written academic argumentation can be seen in terms of the “context of situation” (Halliday 1978) as ‘material’ social interaction between a specific writer (or writers) and the anticipated reader/s to whom the text is addressed. Argumentation refers to the justification of a reasoned claim in terms that are understood by the interactants who are situated in a (possibly abstract/imaginary) shared space-time context. The roles and goals of the interactants are genre-related. On a higher level of abstraction, argumentation can be seen as a socio-historical phenomenon situated in the “context of culture” (Halliday 1978). It is a “virtual” (Micheli 2012: 124), or intertextual, form of interaction between the writer and the authoritative “voices” (Bakhtin 1981) from other texts which do not necessarily share a space-time frame. It involves the positioning of the textual voice in relation to voices from other texts. At the most abstract conceptual level, argumentation can be seen as the interplay of “difference” (Kress 1989) or diversity (Martin 1992) that occurs at the interface between social reality and material reality in representation/semiosis (Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer 2010). It can be seen as the text producer’s orientation, conscious or unconscious, to the social and material world. The “ideologies of knowledge-making” (Ivanič 1998) that writers draw on are inscribed in discourses of knowledge construction. In the texts of the academy, both writers and readers are positioned in particular ways, depending on the discourses of knowledge construction that are deliberately chosen or unself-consciously used.

Therefore, in this thesis, as represented in Figure 2.13 below, “argumentativity” is conceptualised as an overarching dimension of discourse which is oriented to the management of difference/diversity by means of positioning at three semiotic levels,

---

68 The conception of interaction at this level draws on a critical realist ontology which is explicated in the next chapter (see 3.2.3).
namely ideology or power, heteroglossia and dialogism. This conception allows the claim to be made that “argumentativity”, under which argument/ation is subsumed, is a constitutive feature of discourse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Underlying meta-concepts/ principles</th>
<th>Level of argumentation</th>
<th>Type of positioning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideology/power</strong></td>
<td>Argument as <strong>representation/semiosis</strong> at the interface between social and material ‘reality’</td>
<td>Positioning of the writer and the subject content through the meta-discourses of knowledge construction that are used in the text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heteroglossia</strong></td>
<td>Argument as ‘virtual’/abstract <strong>intertextual interaction</strong> between writer and authoritative voices</td>
<td>Positioning of the textual voice in relation to other voices, primarily the authoritative voices inscribed in source texts of the discipline, but also other voices from the wider ‘context of culture’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dialogism</strong></td>
<td>Argument as <strong>writer-reader interaction</strong> in which interactants have specific genre-assigned discourse roles</td>
<td>Positioning of the writer in relation to specific reader/s, who are located in the shared space-time frame of a ‘context of situation’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.13**: Argument as positioning in discourse

To sum up, in this chapter, three extensive bodies of knowledge, those centring on discourse, knowledge and argumentation, have been drawn on selectively to develop a conceptualisation of argument that is suitable for the analysis and understanding of the knowledge-focused texts of academic disciplines in higher education. Theoretical constructs from SFL and from the work of Bakhtin inform the view of discourse as social and dialogical that is developed in the thesis. Bernstein’s model of the pedagogic device is used to differentiate between the kinds of texts in the intertextual network that constitutes a university subject, or knowledge domain. Multiple perspectives on written argument are considered, resulting in a view of argumentation as positioning in discourse. In the chapter that follows this conceptualisation of argument is made more concrete by linking each of the three aspects of argumentative positioning to analytical processes that can be used to explore written argumentation in the texts that students interpret and create.
Chapter three: Research design and methods

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter the research design choices made are explained and justified by means of explicit discussion of the positions, assumptions and reasoning that underpin and guide the research. A discussion of the research site, the researcher’s perspective, and research ethics follows. Since data sampling and collection constituted an important aspect of the research, detailed explanations of sampling at different stages and levels of the research are provided.

The penultimate part of the chapter (see 3.9) returns to discussion of the theoretical framework, based on the definition of argumentativity as discursive positioning in relation to “difference”, which was presented at the end of the previous chapter (see 2.5). It provides discussion of how the theory was developed into a framework that integrates methods for analysing argumentativity in knowledge-focused discourse. The strategies and methods outlined guide the analysis of positioning in relation to three dimensions of discourse: the representation of ‘reality’, heteroglossia/intertextuality (see 2.2.2.3), and dialogism (see 2.2.2.2). Application of the methodology facilitates analysis of the discursive resources for knowledge construction, negotiation with authoritative voices and writer-reader interaction.

3.2 Choice of theoretical paradigm

This research is a response to one of the “great issues and problems” (Fairclough 2003: 203) in higher education at the start of the twenty-first century. The problem, discussed in Chapter 1, is most crudely summarised as ‘unsatisfactory student writing’ (see 1.2 and 1.6). As discussed in the first chapter, the problem was narrowed down to facilitate a focus on one of the most salient aspects of academic writing in higher education: argumentation in knowledge construction/representation.

The overarching research question is: How is argument performed in the knowledge-focused texts that final-year undergraduates in Development Studies are required to interpret and construct, and what are the implications for transformative teaching and learning? (see 1.7). Answering the first part of the two-part question entails engaging in language-focused textual analysis of argument in the written texts of the knowledge domain, while answering the second part of the question requires that the researcher make explicit and systematic connections between texts, social practices and institutions.
in higher education. The second part of the question, which places the study in the context of applied higher education research, governs the overall research design. The term ‘transformative’, used in the question to refer to pedagogic practice that makes possible more equitable outcomes for all students\textsuperscript{69}, positions the research in a ‘critical’ paradigm, because it implies that current pedagogic practice is reproductive of social stratification and inequity.

Answering the research question calls for a multi-dimensional interdisciplinary approach which encompasses linguistic-discursive\textsuperscript{70} analysis of text, as well as discussion of the processes of production and consumption of texts, and consideration of how the processes, and the social practices associated with them, are related to the wider sociocultural “institutionalized framing of activities” (Cicourel 1992: 294). Thus, an adequate response to the overall research question requires that the researcher draw on social as well as linguistic theories and methodologies.

As the starting point for the research was a social problem, critical discourse analysis (CDA) appeared to be the most appropriate paradigm to inform the overall research design. Since CDA is oriented to the production of knowledge that “can lead to emancipatory change” (Fairclough 2010: 209), it is suitable for generating deeper understanding about the writing of argument that can subsequently be used to improve teaching and learning in the context of the research site.

The need for a multi-dimensional approach that places sufficient emphasis on systemic functional linguistics (SFL)-influenced textual analysis (see 2.2.1) and on methodological flexibility led to the choice of the “dialectical-relational” (Fairclough 2010: 3-4) approach to CDA. Fairclough’s (2001: 21) approach to discourse analysis combines social (macro) and linguistic (micro) analysis in a systematic, unified methodological frame. Furthermore, CDA lends itself to combination with other theoretical and analytical resources (Fairclough 2003: 211). For these reasons, CDA was chosen as both the overall research design orientation and the primary methodological influence.

3.2.1 Critical discourse analysis (CDA)

In Fairclough’s seminal text (2001), the well-known three-layer model of discourse as the inter-relationship between text, interaction and context is presented (see Chapter 2, Figure

\textsuperscript{69} See Chapter One, footnotes 1 and 3.

\textsuperscript{70} While the word ‘discoursal’ appears to be used instead of the word ‘discursive’ in even the recent publications of Fairclough (2010), and in the work of Ivanič (Clark and Ivanič 1997; Ivanič 1998), in this thesis the word ‘discursive’ is more commonly used to refer to the adjectival form.
2.1). Greater explicitness about relationships among the elements of discourse is offered in the changed wording preferred in Fairclough’s more recent formulations of the dialectical relationships in discourse, as is made clear in the diagram on which wordings from Fairclough’s early and most recent publications are mapped (see Figure 3.1 below). The encompassing phrase, “social events and actions” (2010) supplants “text” (2001), since the latter term is only one manifestation of the former. “Social practices”, understood as “relatively stabilized” social processes (2010: 205), supplants the term “interaction” (2001). “Social structures” (2010) supplants the term “context” (2001), which was used in the original diagram of the model for overall reference to the “social conditions of production” and “interpretation” (2010: 163).

Figure 3.1: Fairclough’s model of discourse updated (based on 2001: 21 and 2010: 163)

In the earlier text (Fairclough 2001) the principles of “discourse as social practice” are established: that the relationship between language and society is “internal and dialectical”. This means that language and social processes and practices affect each other, that language is part of social process and that although language is socially conditioned, it is also affected by non-linguistic social factors (2001: 18-19). Using structuration theory (Giddens 1984), Fairclough argues that macro-level social structures “are in a dialectical relationship” with micro-level social action, “such that the former are both conditions and resources for the latter, and constituted by the latter” (Fairclough 1995: 208). More importantly, CDA goes beyond the analysis of texts to analysis of the “processes of production and interpretation” and the relationship between texts, processes, and immediate “situational” and institutional social conditions. In sum, the
research method Fairclough proposes involves a combination of description of the formal properties of the text, interpretation of the relationship between the text and the social practices to which it is linked, and explanation of the relationship between social practices and social structures (2001: 21-22; 2003: 209; 2010: 163).

3.2.2 The case for discursive/inter textual analysis of texts

A crucial insight for this research is that knowledge is “discourse-driven”, meaning that “knowledges are generated and circulate as discourses” (Fairclough 2003: 207).

Fairclough’s theorising is appropriate for a critical linguistic study of written text, since he makes a strong case for textual analysis that is attentive to both content (ideas) and form (the language in which the ideas are realised). He claims that textual analysis “is better able than other [social research] methods to capture sociocultural processes in the course of their occurrence, in all their complex, contradictory, incomplete and often messy materiality” (1995: 186). He argues that textual analysis is an important component of the “methodological armoury of social science” (208) because texts are “material forms” of social action, providing evidence of “social constructs” and, by extension, grounding for claims about social structures, relations and processes.

The textual analysis he advocates involves primarily linguistic and intertextual analysis. In addition to sentence-level analysis of grammar and semantics, analysis also includes supra-sentential level aspects, such as text structure. Intertextual analysis enables the gap between text and context to be closed because intertextuality is realised in linguistic features of text. Intertextual analysis can show “how texts selectively draw upon orders of discourse – (the particular configurations of conventionalized practices, genres, discourses, etc.) which are available to text producers and interpreters” and can illustrate “the dependence of texts upon society and history in the form of the resources made available within the order of discourse” (Fairclough 1995: 188-189).

The term ‘discourse’ embraces a view of text as a material ‘product’ (for example, words printed on the page), as well as text as realisation of ‘process’ (the processes of production and interpretation and the practices they represent in the broader context). Most loosely defined, ‘context’ encompasses everything outside and beyond the material text. Fairclough’s distinction between the level of processes of production and reception and the level of social conditions (of production and reception) closely parallels Halliday’s (1978) distinction between “context of situation” and “context of culture” (see 2.2.1.2). These constructs are helpful in providing for two broadly-defined levels of context, but they
do not altogether simplify consideration of context. The researcher has still to specify her own more specific framing within context of situation and context of culture, and to identify the salient area for focus within these framings of context. In this research the focus is on written argumentation. The research explores connections between the argumentation in student texts and the discursive/intertextual context in which the texts are situated. This exploration encompasses consideration of the relationships between students’ and lecturers’ texts, and the texts that represent the knowledge region known as ‘Development Studies’. It also attempts to take into account how these texts are situated within the institutional structures of higher education.

The role of argumentation in the academic disciplines is under-theorised. One reason for the limited knowledge about academic argumentation is that argument is a complex phenomenon that is inextricably bound up with discourse and internal cognitive processes that are difficult to access, which presents a challenge to researchers. Viewing argumentation as discourse provides a way of accessing argument for empirical study. Discourse, despite its permeable boundaries (see 2.2.4), is made manifest in ‘concrete’ texts (see 3.2.3) that can be analysed. Therefore, verbal argumentation is accessible to the researcher. Engaging in discourse analysis allows the researcher to access otherwise inaccessible aspects of argumentation, which are partly accessible in material form as the discursive resources used in written text. Constructs and techniques from applied linguistics can thus be used to analyse the language-dominant texts of academic discourse. Critical discourse analysis allows not only for the development of explicit knowledge about expert and novice argument in the disciplines, but also provides theoretical constructs the researcher can use to explain the relationships between expert and novice argument, the discipline, and the social institution of higher education. It allows for the exploration of discursive resources for constructing argument, and for consideration of the implications of resource-use for student learning and identity development. The explicit knowledge developed can be applied in the design of teaching and learning to improve written argumentation in the disciplines, and thus partly address the ‘problem’ of student writing. More importantly, applications of this knowledge could contribute to educators’ efforts to improve student performance, both in terms of students’ understanding of and engagement with disciplinary knowledge, and in terms of what learning may be transferred71 to other contexts which require the use of resources for

71 ‘Transfer’ of learning is a recurrent issue in the literature of academic development and writing research. The literature suggests that it is difficult to prove that learning in generic learning contexts (such as ‘adjunct’ classes for the development of ‘academic literacy’), or in specific disciplinary learning contexts, necessarily
written argument. In these ways the research can contribute to efforts to address some of the inequities in the South African higher education system that are related to students’ differential access to discursive resources.

3.2.3 CDA in dialogue with critical realism

Questions about what actually exists and how we come to know the answer to this question cannot be ignored in research that claims links between individual consciousness, texts as inter/action and social reality. Since in this thesis claims are made that ultimately connect students’ texts with student identities as “possibilities for self-hood” (Clark and Ivanič 1997: 136-137) and social transformation (Fairclough 2003: 208; 2010: 77), my position on these questions is stated below. In brief, the research is based on the following assumptions: firstly, that there is a material ‘reality’ which is external to and separate from human consciousness and social constructions; secondly, that material reality is related to social reality and social relations in complex ways; and lastly, that the knowledge produced in research about these phenomena and relationships is fallible, and therefore open to contestation. Since the foundation for this orientation is clearly argued in the work of sociologists and educationalists working in critical realist and social realist traditions (Maton 2010a; 2010b; Maton and Moore 2010; Muller 2011; Wheelahan 2010), it is discussed only in relation to CDA below.

Although a critical realist ontology underpins the research, the thesis does not offer a critical realist analysis. Rather, the research is coloured by the recent developments in CDA (Fairclough 2003; 2010) in which critical realism is brought into dialogue with CDA as part of the project to strengthen it theoretically (Fairclough 2010: 163)\(^\text{72}\). For this reason, discussion of how more recent theorisation informs CDA, drawing on Fairclough’s comments on this development, is included in this section. Firstly, as discussed above (see 3.2.1), the terminology used in his 2001 model is reformulated in a representation of “three levels of social life”, each of which “has a semiotic (linguistic-discoursal) element”: “text” is recast as “social events and actions”, “context” as “social structures”, and “interaction” as “social practices”, with the latter “mediating the relationship between

---

\(^{72}\) The dialogue between critical realism and CDA appears to have begun as a collaborative paper presented at an international critical realism conference, subsequently published in the journal *Critical Realism* (Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer 2002). It was later published as a chapter in an edited book (Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer 2004). Most recently, it appears as a theoretical chapter in the updated and extended second edition (2010) of Fairclough’s *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language*, which was first published in 1995. All references to the collaborative work in the thesis are to the recontextualisation of the work in the 2010 text.
(abstract) structures and (concrete) events and actions” (2010: 163). In this reworking of the theory, there is more clarity about the nature of semiosis, interaction between semiotic levels, and semiotic interaction with material, non-semiotic aspects of the world. Fairclough emphasises that CDA engages in “relational” analysis: “relations between semiotic and non-semiotic”, “relations between levels”, and “relations within orders of discourse and within texts”. These relations are viewed as “dialectical”, meaning that there are relations between elements “which are different but not discrete” (163-164).

In their collaborative work, Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer (2010) argue for an integration of semiotic analysis and critical realist analysis. They assert that post-structuralist-influenced discourse analysis ignores material reality to the extent that it idealises discourse/semiosis. In contrast to approaches that ignore the “dialectical interpenetration” (215) between semiotic and non-semiotic, or material, aspects of social events, they assert that social practice is not reducible to “semiosis alone” (206). However, they contend that critical realists have tended to underplay the importance of semiosis, which is always an aspect of social practice and therefore plays a role in effecting change: “semiosis is both meaningful and causally efficacious” (204). Integration of these two perspectives acts as a corrective to the weaknesses of both approaches. For this reason, the synthesis of critical realist philosophy and CDA offered by Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer (2010) is outlined below.

The semiotic analysis they propose uses the critical realist model of reality, which consists of three ‘layers’: the “real”, the “actual” and the “empirical” (Bhaskar 1979; 1986; 1989). The “real” encompasses “objects, their structures or natures and their causal powers and liabilities”. Social structures, political institutions, semiotic systems, including language, and also texts are all considered “real” objects, since they “pre-exist any given actor”, having “relative autonomy” (Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer 2010: 204). It appears that the “real” can be seen to refer to products of (inter)action, which can be conceived of as static, or ‘frozen’ in time/space. The “actual” is the layer that represents what happens when causal powers and liabilities “are activated and produce change” (204). This includes meaning-making or semiosis. The “actual” is a space of “emergent phenomena”, such as “meaning”. It can be seen as the process of (inter)action, which is continuous “flow” that cannot be fixed in time/space. This accounts for the view of meaning as co-constructed in discourse rather than as residing in the text itself.

---

As discussed in Chapter Two (see 2.2.3), the authors prefer the terms ‘semiotic’ and ‘semiosis’ to ‘discourse’ and ‘discursive’, but for the purposes of this research, the terms can be seen as almost interchangeable.
The “empirical” is defined as, “the subset of the real and the actual that is experienced by actors” (Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer 2010: 204), however, the authors caution that the “empirical” is an epistemological, not an ontological category (220). Since the focus of purely empirical research is “regular conjunction of cause events and effect events” (205), in other words, only observable, measurable change, it does not allow for a complete understanding of change (204-205). The conception of the other two tiers of reality, the “real” and the “actual”, allows for research interpretations that take account of what cannot be directly observed. Crucially, the “real” is not reducible to the “actual”, nor the “actual” to the “empirical”. There is always a “gap” between the productive potential of the “real” and the effects of particular semiotic acts, because the effects depend on how they are taken up in particular contexts. In other words, effects are produced by both the causal power of ‘real’ objects, such as reasons, and semiotic and social embedding in a specific context (205-206).

In a critical realist account, the concept of context is further enriched by the acknowledgement of the material world, which is often ignored in discourse analysis based in social constructionism (Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer 2010: 207). While all social events are partly “semioticized”, the existence of materiality, and the importance of acknowledging the referential function of language is highlighted. Signs may be conceptualised as the conjunction of signifiers and signifieds (Saussure 1974, see 2.2.1.1), but the existence of “referents” (Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer 2010: 209) must also be acknowledged, as must the embedding of texts and meaning-making in material practice:

... semiosis is an extreme case where concrete phenomena are the product of dialectically related elements, and hence whose interaction is non-additive. ... Concrete events have a more or less semiotic ('textual') character but even primarily semiotic events are co-produced by mental, social and material as well as specifically semiotic structures. (Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer 2010: 213)

Thus, in addition to the “intra-semiotic” flows, the analyst must take into account the extra-semiotic dimension, and the “dialectical interpenetration of semiotic and non-semiotic facets of social events” (Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer 2010: 215).

In terms of the theoretical framework for this thesis, the move that is significant is the authors’ claims of the connection between semiosis and materiality discussed above. By asserting the link between meaning-making and the material world, they are able to move beyond semiosis, thus avoiding being trapped with poststructuralists in the “play of differences among networks of signs”. They achieve this by placing semiotic processes in the context of “their necessary dialectical relations with persons (hence minds, intentions,
desires, bodies), social relations, and the material world – locating them within the practical engagement of embodied and socially organised persons in the material world” (Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer 2010: 206). Another important aspect of this move is their acknowledgement of the psychological phenomena of intention and desire. They point out that “there would be no performativity, no affect or expressive communication” if humans “were not intentional, desiring beings” (207). While the greatest emphasis is placed on the external social dimensions of semiotic events, space is made for an internal dimension, allowing for the possibility of a sophisticated analysis of “identity/ies” and “voice” (see 2.2.4.6) that is difficult to accommodate in classic materialist social theory. This move can be seen as a major contribution to the “problem of mind-body-semiosis-sociality-materiality” (203).

Another aspect of the work which has direct relevance and implications for this study is the conception of semiotic systems, such as language, and semiotic structures, such as discursive resources, as constituting the level of the “real”. Although they are “dependent on actors for their reproduction”, they are nevertheless ‘real’ objects, which exist, “even when not actualised”. These objects are conceptualised as “structured” and possessing “causal powers or liabilities” which enable them to act in particular ways and to change (Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer 2010: 204). This means that language, and the sub-set of language referred to in this thesis as “discursive resources”, have power to effect change.

However, the effects of linguistic resources cannot be predicted: “meaning” is an “emergent” phenomenon which requires “minds with certain capabilities to co-construct social action and interaction (and bodies to enact them)”. Thus meaning-making is “intersubjective” (Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer 2010: 207) and involves “interpretation”, which is “not only the attempt to understand what is meant”, but also making judgements about (often implicit) “validity claims” about the world (208). In other words, utterances/texts are not only “referential”, but also “social-relational” (213, see 2.2.1.3 for discussion of Halliday’s language functions). This means that human actors interpret texts, taking into consideration “motives” of “social agents” and the effects on texts of “less immediate social causes” (208).

In the authors’ confrontation with “truth, truthfulness, and appropriateness” (Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer 2010: 208), they raise issues which are central for this thesis, in which knowledge claims are seen as an aspect of discourse. An important insight is that “what gets constructed is different from how it is construed” (209). The process of construction is conceived of as having two stages, with “construal” preceding “construction”. The term
“construal” is used to refer to the ideas relating to both the material world and also “other semiotic phenomena such as feelings or states of mind”, which are necessarily fallible. “Construction” refers to material processes that may result from “construal” (209). Because meaning-making is intersubjective and dialogical (in the authors’ terms, “dialectical”), the effects of the construal depend on “how both it and the construction respond to the properties of the materials (including social phenomena such as actors and institutions) used to construct social reality” (209).

Critical realists’ concern to understand how change occurs involves a nuanced understanding of the relationship between events/texts, how and why they exist or occur, and what can be known about the causes of the events/texts. Discourse analysts working in the tradition of text-linguistics focus on text-internal issues only. Critical discourse analysts, on the other hand, are interested in the links between texts and the world, and therefore share the critical realists’ interest in effects. A vital issue for analysts working in a critical paradigm is showing that texts have effects. If texts can be shown to have effects, then critical discourse analysts can claim that their text-based research can contribute to changing unjust practices in society. A critical realist interpretation of ‘reality’ enables Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer to address these concerns.

Since this research is a response to a problem, understanding of which could result in changes to learning and teaching which promote more equitable outcomes for students, using critical-realism-infused CDA as an overarching research paradigm strengthens claims that link discursive resource use in texts to future outcomes. CDA not only allows for the development of explicit knowledge about expert and novice argumentation in the disciplines by means of analysis of language and discursive resource use in texts, but also provides theoretical backing for speculative discussion of the relationships between argumentation in expert and novice texts, recontextualised knowledge in educational texts, and the texts of the knowledge domain, Development Studies. Thus the critical realist orientation discussed above informs the claim made in this research that the texts that students read and write affect their life chances (see Chapter Seven).

3.3 A case study of written argument in the textual networks of Development Studies

The research is broadly-framed but, as a doctoral thesis, is necessarily specific in its aims. The potential scope of the investigation was scaled down significantly by using a case study (Yin 1984; Miles and Huberman 1994; Stake 1995), which limited the study to a
bounded context: one group of related texts from a specific discipline, Development Studies, situated in a specific pedagogically-fixed time-frame, the final semester of a third-year subject, in a specific “site” (Miles and Huberman 1994: 27), the Department of Anthropology and Development Studies at the University of Johannesburg.

A case study is an “empirical investigation that is defined by interest in a specific phenomenon” (Anderson and Arsenault 1998: 249). It is “the intensive (in depth and detailed) study of a bounded, contemporary phenomenon” (Knobel and Lankshear 1999: 95). In this research the phenomenon of interest is written argumentation. The “real-life context” (Anderson and Arsenault 1998: 249) is the final semester of study in a Development Studies major. The research thus constitutes a *bounded* study of written argument in a chosen discipline which is situated in a specific space-time context. The research questions prompt and guide exploration of complex relationships within the “bounded” system (Miles and Huberman 1994: 27). The micro-analytic work, represented by the six subsidiary questions derived from the research question, required the collection of “rich data to build a ‘full’ case” (Henning, van Rensburg and Smit 2004: 33). In this case, the collection of a wide variety of texts that represent different aspects of the intertextual context constitutes a “rich” repository of data that allowed for the generation of “thick description” of the phenomenon (Geertz 1973). Multiple methods are usually required in case studies (Yin 1884; Stake 1995) in order to achieve the level of analytic depth expected in this kind of research. Depth is achieved by using a form of CDA that mobilises methodological tools that are informed by intersecting theoretical positions to enrich the textual analysis. The identification of three levels of analysis of the texts (outlined in 3.9) allows for the exploration of multiple perspectives on the phenomenon which contribute to a more comprehensive picture of the construction of argument in the knowledge domain. Summarised representations of the methodological strategies and tools used in the analysis follow (see Figures 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6).

### 3.4 ‘Trusworthiness’ of the research

Since the terms ‘validation’ and ‘reliability’ are conventionally more strongly associated with quantitative research, in this thesis, the term used for discussion of the acceptability of the research is “trustworthiness”, which encompasses credibility, authenticity, transferability, dependability and confirmability (Denzin and Lincoln 2005). The credibility of the research is established by using multiple data sources, in this case, texts from three

74 The time period was the fourteen weeks of teaching and learning, the two academic terms of the second semester, between July and October 2008.
complementary contexts. The four-year engagement with the data, in the form of repeated readings of the texts collected, also confers credibility. Self-reflexive consideration of the research process contributes to authenticity and enhances credibility (see 3.6).

Transferability is ensured through detailed descriptions of the textual data, the inclusion of some of the ‘raw’ data and explicitness about the choices in research design and analytical methods. These descriptions provide the reader with sufficient information to “make decisions regarding transferability” (Creswell 2007: 209). Dependability and confirmability are established through having had a “member check” in the form of feedback on an oral presentation of the study from the lecturer research participants\(^\text{75}\), as well as from other students and lecturers from the department in which the research was conducted. In addition, a proportion of the ‘raw’ data, in the form of extracts from the texts that were analysed, is reproduced in the thesis, and some of the ‘working’ of the data is reflected in the linguistic-discursive analyses offered in the ‘data presentation’ chapters (Chapters Four, Five and Six), as well as in the appendices related to those chapters. Therefore, much of the analysis and resulting interpretation is open to readers’ scrutiny.

Since generalisations cannot be made on the basis of case study research, the conclusions produced in the research are not necessarily relevant or valid beyond the specific research case. However, research that deepens and develops understanding of the phenomenon examined (Wolcott 1994) has value. Case studies are acknowledged as “unique contributions” to incremental knowledge-building (Haas Dyson and Genishi 2005: 1). The “careful and detailed observation” required of case studies can be generative, as it is the source of “new ideas and hypotheses” (Terre Blanche and Durrheim 1999: 255). The framework and processes for analysing argumentativity developed in the research can be tested in new disciplinary and geographical contexts, using the protocol of research developed in this study. Therefore, the knowledge produced in this research has value beyond its immediate user community of a specific university. It could play an incremental role in the development of effective methodologies for researching written argumentation in academic discourse. Knowledge generated about key discursive resources used for argumentation in Development Studies can also be applied in the development of new pedagogical strategies designed to improve students’ interpretation and construction of argument in disciplinary learning.

---

\(^{75}\) These informants provided an essential check on the factual information, the interpretations made and the overall findings. Comments were carefully considered and integrated into the final draft of the thesis.
3.5 The research site

In this thesis the research ‘site’ is seen as both material and abstract/conceptual ‘space’. As a primarily abstract space, the site is a knowledge “region” (Bernstein 2000: 9) which is recontextualised as a subject in higher education called ‘Development Studies’ (see 2.3.2 for discussions of the “pedagogic device” and 2.3.5 on knowledge structure). The overview of the research site that follows below sketches aspects of the ‘material’ space in which the research is situated: the institution, the department, and the subject. While acknowledging the material reality of the site (see 3.2.3), the discourse-focused nature of the research pursued for this thesis means that the emphasis is on the abstract space, as represented by texts linked to each other in intertextual networks, as explained below (see 3.8.3). The data presentation chapters constitute a fuller description of the research site as abstract space.

3.5.1 The University of Johannesburg (UJ)

This brief overview highlights only some aspects of the research site which are relevant in the wider South African higher education context (see 1.2.2). The research was conducted at the University of Johannesburg, which is located in the major city after which it is named. It has a student body of almost 50 000 students, who are representative of the diverse South African population. As the university had recently experienced a merger of three institutions, the student demographic had changed dramatically over the previous ten years, with the majority of students not being first language speakers of the dominant language of learning, English. English is also an additional language for a significant proportion of the teaching staff. While there are four languages of learning and teaching recognised in university policy, English, Afrikaans, Sepedi and isiZulu, English is the preferred language of learning for the majority of students, with fewer than ten per cent of the students learning in Afrikaans and no ‘content’ (that is, non-language courses) courses offered in either of the African languages.

76 The number was 48 586 in 2012, but has been close to 50 000 since the merger.
77 The University of Johannesburg is the product of a merge between three institutions: the Rand Afrikaans University (RAU), a formerly whites-only university which, in the final years of its existence, taught students in separate Afrikaans and English ‘streams’; Vista University, a formerly ‘black’ institution; and Technikon Witwatersrand, an institution that offered diploma qualifications. In the first stage of the merge, RAU and Vista campuses in Gauteng Province were joined; in the second stage, the Technikon Witwatersrand was added, the name for the newly-merged institution changing to the one by which it is now known.
78 The Development Studies course in which the data were collected was taught entirely in English.
79 The University’s Senate-approved Language Policy (University of Johannesburg 2006/2009) is supportive of additive multilingualism, and makes theoretical provision for teaching and learning in all four of the chosen languages of learning. In practice, especially in the Faulty of Humanities, English is preferred by the vast majority of the student body, and is promoted by management.
Being a ‘comprehensive’ university, the institution offers a wide range of diploma and degree qualifications, with undergraduate teaching being a stronger focus than postgraduate research. The merger required that a new institutional culture be forged, resulting in major restructuring and a proliferation of new and revised policies. The university is perceived as being an open access institution\(^{80}\), attracting many more students than can be accommodated. While there is considerable commitment to the development of a culture that values diversity, the rapid rate and intensity of change has produced inevitable tensions and placed additional stresses on academic staff which may impact on their performance in the teaching and learning context.

### 3.5.2 The Department of Anthropology and Development Studies

More specifically, the site of the research is the Department of Anthropology and Development Studies, which is part of the university’s Faculty of Humanities. In the light of the theoretical inquiry into the nature of the knowledge region (see 2.3.7 for the discussion of the knowledge structure of Development Studies), the place from which the subject is offered is significant, as it supports the conclusions reached in Chapter Two that Development Studies is an unstable hybrid knowledge form (see 2.3.7) which is not necessarily easily integrated in the traditional disciplines and university structures. The logic in the institutional yoking together of ‘Anthropology’ and ‘Development Studies’ in one department is not clear, as the subjects are not closely related, the former being a primarily interpretative ‘pure’ discipline, and the latter an applied discipline focused on causal relationships, explanation and knowledge applications (Becher and Trowler 2001). As Development Studies is placed in a faculty that offers humanities and social science subjects, such as political science and sociology, it is distanced, in terms of institutional structuring, from one of the other core subjects on which it draws, economics\(^{81}\), which developed from political economy (see 2.3.7). Deliberation about departmental restructuring in order to separate Anthropology and Development Studies, which took place during the period in which the thesis was written, is but one indication that Development Studies at the University of Johannesburg is ‘misplaced’\(^{82}\). The institutional location of the subject discussed above may militate against there being a stable identity

---

\(^{80}\) One reason for this perception is that the study fees levied are lower than those charged at the other comparable institutions.

\(^{81}\) At the University of Johannesburg, the Department of Economics and Financial Sciences is housed in the Faculty of Economics and Management Sciences.

\(^{82}\) That the proposed division of the department into two separate entities did not come to fruition was a matter of institutional politics (information gleaned from one of the lecturer research participants).
for Development Studies, and could negatively affect curriculum coherence across a three-year major. This observation is addressed again in the final chapter.

In the year in which the data was collected there were over 700 students in first year, and approximately 90 in third year Development Studies. Development Studies is attractive to students who are under-prepared for higher education (see 1.2.3 and 1.6 for discussion of perceptions of student deficit), as it is perceived as an ‘undemanding’ subject. Given that Development Studies was well-subscribed at all years of undergraduate study, the teaching load of lecturers was substantial. While subject to the well-documented global changes in higher education, which require academics to accept more responsibilities and additional roles (see 1.2.1), the university was also in the process of engaging with processes of change resulting from the merge (see 3.5.1). Therefore, it can be concluded that lecturers in the department were experiencing conflicting demands which constituted considerable additional pressure. One possible consequence is that they did not have time to give individual attention to their students, over and above the limited time allocated for optional individual lecturer-student consultations.

3.5.3 Development Studies curriculum/‘content’

In the overview of the curriculum and course structure that follows only the parts that fall within the bounds of the case are discussed. The last semester of study in the third-year course consisted of two separate ‘modules’. “Development theory and policy in South Africa” was offered over seven weeks from mid-July until the end of August, and “Development: discourses and debates” over seven weeks in September and October. Formal teaching, or ‘contact’ time, as indicated on the university timetable, was a lecture session of two consecutive fifty-minute periods offered on Wednesday afternoons. In addition, a ‘tutorial’ period of two consecutive fifty-minute periods was offered on Fridays.

---

83 There were approximately 98 students at the start of the academic year, but only 90 by the end of the year, as some students de-register (or simply ‘drop out’) during the course of the year.
84 This claim is based on informal spoken communication with one of the lecturer research participants.
85 This conclusion is supported by the limited quantity of the lecturers’ written feedback that the researcher observed on the essays that were collected after they had been assessed. Although lecturer feedback was not part of the data collected, it proved difficult not to notice the feedback written on the student texts that were collected as data.
86 In this thesis the word ‘content’ is placed in inverted commas to problematise the term, as it is widely used to refer to a number of different aspects of curriculum in the disciplines in higher education. The unreflective use of this ubiquitous term is discussed further in Chapter Seven.
87 As the curricula at the university have been ‘modularised’, the seven-week divisions of subject content are referred to as ‘modules’. The term ‘module’ can be seen as equivalent to ‘course’.
88 The word ‘tutorial’ is placed in inverted commas to problematise the use of the term to refer to a class that was held in a large venue (a sloped lecture hall or a computer laboratory), rather than in smaller venues which allow for small-group interaction and intensive mediation from a lecturer or tutor.
Another aspect of the curriculum in the final year of study, which overlapped to a degree with the two modules, was a component devoted to practical engagement with the field. Students were required to choose for study an aspect of participation in local government. The task required them to engage with the literature on democratic/participatory processes, to make observation notes and to conduct in-depth interviews with research participants as a prelude to writing a "practical" essay, described as "an assessment of participation mechanisms at the level of local government in your specific residential neighbourhood" ("Development theory and policy in South Africa" Learning Guide 2008: 5)\(^89\). The final parts of the assignment fell due for submission within the second semester\(^90\), but since the task had been introduced in the previous semester, it fell outside the boundary of the case study. However, the existence of the task is noted, as it shows that the curriculum included a practical assignment which involved engagement with the kinds of communities and processes outside the university that a development practitioner would need to understand. It also shows that students had the opportunity to engage in practical research and extended writing that required them to construct knowledge claims based on ‘real’, as opposed to textually-mediated, experience. An overview of the structure and ‘content’ of the two modules follows.

### 3.5.3.1 “Development theory and policy in South Africa”

The course/module with which the second semester started, “Development theory and policy in South Africa”, was designed to scaffold students’ engagement with social and economic government policy in South Africa, and how it relates to development. The aims and "outcomes" (see 1.2.2) for the module are discussed in the analysis of the learning guide for the module (see 5.3.1). Coverage of South African development theory and policy required that students read widely on a number of relevant topical issues. Examination of the outline of the module in the learning guide shows issues explored in the first three weeks of the module were: xenophobia in relation to human rights, the contribution education policy makes to economic growth and social justice, and “land

---

\(^{89}\) Where it is unclear which learning guide is being referred to, the citation uses the name of the module instead of the lecturer who was responsible for the guide. In the interests of preserving confidentiality, the learning guides are not included as appendices.

\(^{90}\) The learning guide for “Development theory and policy in South Africa” shows that two components of the assignment fell due in the period in which the module was being taught, while the last component was due for submission during the “Development discourses and debates” module (4-5).
reform" as a possible solution to poverty. The last four weeks of the module were used for exploration of the design and implementation of the Child Support Grant.

Short written tasks had to be completed and submitted to the lecturer weekly. Although the tasks were presented as mandatory, they were “low stakes” writing tasks (Elbow 1997, see 2.2.4.9), as they were not significantly weighted in the overall coursework mark. Only essay questions were set in the year-end examination, the students being able to choose one of three questions. Analysis of the questions showed that students were required to use the multiple-source discussion essay sub-genre (see 2.2.4.5). Questions posed for examination essays addressed the same ‘content’ as the coursework essay tasks (see 5.4) and were similarly worded.

3.5.3.2 “Development: discourses and debates”

The module that constituted the final part of the third-year course was taught by a newcomer to the department. Rather than using or adapting the course material of the lecturer who was to have lectured the third year students, the lecturer who took over the teaching offered new curriculum ‘content’ in a module entitled, “Development: discourses and debates”. The last-minute substitution of a new module for the one which was to have been offered is an indication of the flexibility of the curriculum, which allows lecturers the freedom to determine subject ‘content’. The module focused on historical and current development issues that have generated conflict and debate. Debate and argumentation are highlighted as an important aspect of the module. The contestation that surrounds development and the role of power is acknowledged:

Development ideologies and policies are, after all, the essence of politics in the ‘third world’ – the struggles over wealth accumulation and distribution that go on as societies undergo the most profound political-economic transformations known to mankind – and thus are contested concepts and practices. (“Development: discourse and debate” Learning Guide 2008: 1)

91 After the election of a democratic government in South Africa in 1994, the Child Support Grant (CSG) replaced the State Maintenance Grant, as one of the measures to address the inequity and injustice that had existed in the Apartheid welfare system (Lund 2008 – see List of Primary References/Sources).
92 The term ‘mark’ is equivalent to the term ‘grade’ used in the USA. Students who submitted the weekly assignments received them back with an ‘impression’ mark out of a possible total of ten. The marks given were not reflected on the lecturer’s formal mark-sheet, which indicated only whether the task had been completed or not. There was a poor response to the one task I had asked the lecturer to assign, a reflection on the multiple-source discussion essay students wrote. The task required students to reflect on the process of writing the essay and to offer an evaluation of their essay. Approximately a quarter of the students submitted the assignment, of whom only fourteen were research participants.
93 The new staff member had worked as a lecturer in a cognate discipline at another South African university before joining UJ in the week prior to the start of the last term.
94 I became aware of the unforeseen change of ‘content’ only in the week prior to the commencement of the module.
Development Studies is represented as the “study of real problems facing the policy makers and activists – from the World Bank to Oxfam to members of African governments to the radical critical movements criticising them” (“Development: discourse and debate” Learning Guide 2008: 1). The aims and outcomes for the module are discussed in the analysis of the learning guide that follows in Chapter Five (see 5.3.2). The conception and design of the course closely followed the only prescribed text, The Development Reader (Chari and Corbridge 2008a). In the learning guide it is asserted that since the prescribed text is “structured around arguments and debates”, engaging with it will refine students’ “skills for critical analysis” and help with the “construction of arguments” (“Development: discourse and debate” Learning Guide 2008: 1).

The “low stakes” (Elbow 1997) coursework writing took the form of online discussion postings on topics drawn from the texts in the Reader. Each set of questions posed for online discussion was closely linked to sections of the Reader. For the year-end examination, students had to write one essay from a choice of two questions which were both linked to the eight readings in the final part (Part 9) of the Reader. Both of the examination questions were formulated as a series of linked questions on the theme, “the future of development”\(^\text{96}\). The expected sub-genre for the response was also the multiple-source discussion essay.

3.6 Researcher’s position: outsider/insider perspectives

Gaining access to conduct research in a course that was not my teaching responsibility entailed a process of negotiation with the lecturer participants. My role, as initially agreed with one of the lecturers, was to be a participatory researcher who would provide input into the design of the modules as part of my work as an academic development practitioner. The subsequent substitution of that lecturer by the new staff member, and my transfer to another department in the institution, resulted in my role shifting from that of “participant researcher” (Carr and Kemmis 1986: 149) to ‘interested’ observer. However, given that I needed to know how the modules would be taught in order to plan the research, there was inevitably an element of mutual learning with, and limited influence on, the participating lecturers in the period before the data was collected. As the lecturer who originally agreed to participate in the research had planned for asynchronous online discussion as part of coursework writing tasks, the lecturer who took over the module agreed to continue with

\(^{95}\) For the sake of brevity, the text is referred to as ‘the Reader’ from this point on.

\(^{96}\) In the paper, the texts students had to read as preparation for the examination were significantly foregrounded, being listed before the essay questions, with each question starting with the reference to the readings in theme position in the first question posed: ‘Which reading or readings of the above …’.
this plan. The lecturer who taught the other module included a homework assignment I had formulated (see footnote 3.5.3.1)\textsuperscript{97}. Also, since I had informed research participants that the research was focused on argument, both the design and teaching of the modules and the students’ texts may have been affected to some extent by my having drawn explicit attention to argument. Thus, my role was not that of an entirely neutral observer.

Never having studied Development Studies or any one of its closest ‘allies’ (sociology, politics or economics), I had outsider status in the knowledge domain. While my lack of disciplinary knowledge made analysis and interpretation of the data more challenging than it would have been for a disciplinary expert, it was also an advantage. As Development Studies was a new subject for me, my experience of the discourse closely approximates the experience of the students who, even at third-year level, are relative novices in the academy. It also allowed me to observe, and to make explicit through analysis, aspects of disciplinary practice that have become “naturalised” (see 2.2.4.1), and which therefore tend to remain implicit for both lecturers and students of the subject. International and local applied linguistic research argues for the contribution that research by disciplinary outsiders can make to understanding of disciplinary discourse (Candlin and Plum 1998; Jacobs 2005; 2007).

While being a disciplinary ‘outsider’, I was an institutional ‘insider’, having held various academic development posts within the University of Johannesburg over 14 years (see 1.2.3). My familiarity with the institution places me in a position to interpret the data within its broader institutional context. Although all the data are in the form of texts, and the focus is on a theoretical construct (argument) in highly mediated ‘virtual’ written interactions, my material ‘situatedness’ in the university functions to anchor and ground the research.

### 3.7 Consideration of research ethics

Widely-accepted principles of ethical research guided the research process. Permission to conduct the research was obtained from the Faculty of Education’s Ethics Committee\textsuperscript{98}. Lecturer and student research participants were fully informed of the nature of the research and those who agreed to participate in the research signed consent forms (see student and lecturer participant information documents, and consent forms, Appendices

\textsuperscript{97} Ironically, much later, it proved unfeasible to use either the online discussion or the essay reflection texts as data, as originally planned. Problems with the functioning of the electronic learning management system made it difficult to access online discussion for textual analysis and, since not all research participants submitted the reflection task, it was not used.

\textsuperscript{98} The Ethics Clearance Number is: 2011-044.
As I was neither teaching the student research participants, nor involved in the assessment of their work, they were not prejudiced by my having access to their written texts. Since student texts are referred to in the thesis by means of the numbering system used to organise them, students’ identities remain confidential.

The original focus of the study was students’ texts, not the lecturers. My concern that teaching should not be negatively affected by the research was one of the reasons for not using ethnographic methods: researcher observation of classes is intrusive and could have had a constraining effect on the lecturers. However, the choice of CDA to guide the research entailed paying attention to the context (see 3.2.1), of which the teaching is a significant part. For this reason, the written texts produced by the lecturers, the ‘learning guides’ (see 5.3), were analysed as an important aspect of the intertextual context for students’ texts. Thus, in the way the research process developed, a stronger focus was placed on the lecturers than I had originally intended. Since the names of the lecturer research participants are not used in the thesis, their identities are not disclosed. However, I underestimated the personal ethical conflict, and the resulting social discomfort that accompanies research on the practice of colleagues. Lecturers represent the institution and the knowledge domain, and are in unequal power relationships with students. Since CDA is critical of institutionalised power, it was inevitable that observations that reflect negatively on lecturer research participants would be made. However, critical analysis of the learning guides should be seen in the context of the overall theoretical orientation of CDA, which acknowledges the dialectical-relational interaction between the three levels of social life (see 3.2.1), and therefore the complexity of the context, in which both students and lecturers, while having some ‘agency’, are positioned within powerful institutional structures which impose a degree of constraint (see 2.2.3).

### 3.8 Sampling and data collection

The research involved a number of different sampling strategies, since sampling took place at different levels, those specified by Creswell (2007: 126) being, “site level”, “event or process level” and “participant level”.

---

99 Separate informed consent was obtained for collection of the written data, for interviews and for audio-recording of the interviews. Although interviews were conducted with the two lecturers and eighteen of the student research participants, the interview data were not used subsequently, as the research became strongly focused on written texts in the intertextual network of Development Studies 3.
3.8.1 Choice of research site

At site level, sampling was both “opportunistic” and “purposeful”. The choice of the University of Johannesburg as the institution, and Anthropology and Development Studies as the department, where the research was conducted can be described as “opportunistic” (Miles and Huberman 1994: 28). My professional position within a centralised academic development structure (see 1.2.3) provided convenient access to the academic community of the university and, specifically, to the Department of Anthropology and Development Studies.

The choice of academic subject was “purposeful”. Social science was chosen as the broad field in which to conduct the research because social science knowledge is highly contested (see 2.3.5 and 2.3.6), and therefore argument plays a central role in these knowledge domains. The specific social science domain chosen, Development Studies, is a relatively new field of knowledge production and therefore less established, with more disciplinary space for conflict and contestation. The knowledge domain itself is centred on solving the challenges presented by development practices. As a subject offered in the higher education curriculum 100, Development Studies requires students to engage with complex issues, to consider diverse and conflicting alternatives and perspectives, and ultimately to take an informed position on these issues. Thus, Development Studies is a particularly appropriate site for the investigation of the “central phenomenon in the study” (Creswell 2007: 125), written argumentation.

The choice of the last semester of a third-year course as the period of focus was also purposeful, as it allowed for analysis of the texts read and written by students who, having had nearly three years of engagement with the subject, can no longer be seen as initiates to the discourse of the knowledge domain. As there were only two lecturers teaching the third-year students in the last semester, the lecturer participants constitute part of the purposeful sampling of the research site, conceptualised as the final part of the third year of the subject ‘Development Studies’.

3.8.2 Sampling of student research participants

The participation of students in the research was voluntary. Since the object (and thus also the construct) of the study was written argumentation rather than student performance per se, any reasonable proportion of the total number of students participating in the course

---

100 For an explanation of the distinction between ‘subject’ and ‘discipline’, see 2.3.7.
would constitute an adequate sample. The sampling strategy is best described as “random purposeful” (Miles and Huberman 1994: 28), since all of the third-year students who attended the first two Development Studies lectures in the second semester of 2008 were invited to take part in the research. In total, thirty of the approximately ninety students enrolled agreed to be research participants. Only the students who attended the first two lectures in the second semester were invited to become research participants. This decision was made on the assumption that students who attend the first lectures in a semester are more likely to engage fully with the course.

3.8.3 A Bernsteinian frame for selecting and categorising the textual data

Since the performance of argumentation takes place within an institutionalised pedagogical context, and since the orientation of the research is critical, Bernstein’s (2000: xxvi) theory of how “power relations are transformed into discourse and discourse into power relations” through “pedagogic process” was used to conceptualise and categorise the data. The three categories of discourse that were selected for analysis are derived from the concepts of “fields” of “production”, “recontextualisation” and “reproduction” of knowledge used in theorisation of the “pedagogic device” (Bernstein 2000: 21-38). As discussed in Chapter Two, the “field of production” is the source of the “unthinkable” knowledge of the disciplines (see 2.3.2), which in this thesis is referred to as ‘expert knowledge discourse’. The field of “knowledge recontextualisation” is the source of “educational” discourse (Shay 2012: 5). The “field of reproduction” is the source of “pedagogic practice”, which is constituted by pedagogic discourse, one aspect of which is the ‘novice knowledge discourse’ (the term coined for use in this thesis) which students produce. Students’ texts are referred to as ‘novice knowledge texts’ in the thesis.

In this research, ‘knowledge discourse’ was accessed in the form of the ‘concrete’/material written texts that were produced in the three knowledge “fields” discussed above. Figure 3.2, below, is a visual representation of the relationship between the kinds of discourses

---

101 I assumed that at least 25 per cent of the whole group enrolled would constitute a sufficient number, providing sufficient texts for conclusions to be made about the nature of student argumentation in the context.
102 The lecturer informed me that full attendance of lectures is not typical. Subsequent discussion with other lecturers in the Faculty of Humanities confirmed the common perception that a relatively high proportion of registered students either do not attend lectures or attend irregularly.
103 It can be argued that this assumption was subsequently confirmed. Reference to the final mark-sheet for the semester showed that the research participants constituted almost forty per cent of the students who were eligible to write the final examinations. Thus they represented a relatively high proportion of the group of students who completed the final year of study.
104 In this thesis, unlike in Bernstein’s (2000) theorisation of the pedagogic device, the term ‘pedagogic discourse’ refers to discourse that instantiates “pedagogic practice” (see 2.3.2).
and texts examined in this research, which is based on Luckett’s (2011) visual representation of the pedagogic device in higher education (see Figure 2.9). Texts from each of the three types of discourse were selected for analysis. One category of texts represents the knowledge domain of Development Studies. The other category represents the recontextualisation of this knowledge as the academic subject, ‘Development Studies’, and the third category of texts represents the reproduction of the educational knowledge in pedagogic discourse.

![Figure 3.2](image)

**Figure 3.2:** ‘Knowledge discourse’ (based on Luckett’s (2011: 42) representation of Bernstein’s pedagogic device in higher education)

The data that were used are a selection from a richly populated intertextual “genre network” (Swales 2004, see 2.2.4.5), consisting of expert knowledge texts, educational texts and novice knowledge texts (see Figure 3.3 below). The depiction of three distinct groups of texts represents a ‘mapping’ of the relationships between the texts, in terms of both Fairclough’s model of discourse (see Figure 2.1) and my text-focused and discourse-focused interpretation of Luckett’s (2011) representation of the pedagogic device in higher education (see Figure 3.2 above). The decision to place the lecturers’ texts with published textbooks as an aspect of educational discourse rather than of ‘pedagogic discourse’ (that is, in the field of recontextualisation rather than the field of reproduction) is based on a pragmatic decision to separate the texts written by educational experts from those written by novices and to discuss them in separate chapters, and is thus not theoretically-
motivated. Educational texts are discussed in Chapter Five, while the novice knowledge texts written by students are discussed in Chapter Six. It is acknowledged that the unpublished texts of the lecturers (that is, the learning guides and essay prompts) constitute “pedagogic practice” and are situated with student texts in Bernstein’s model. Placing the educational texts at a level between the expert and novice texts (see Figure 3.3) is more in line with the middle layer, the “social practice” level of discourse, in Fairclough’s model (see Figure 3.1), which does not overlap exactly with the “field of recontextualisation” as represented in Bernstein’s (2000) model of the “pedagogic device”.

![Figure 3.3: The intertextual system in the case study](image)

**Figure 3.3:** The intertextual system in the case study

The selection of texts for analysis constituted “purposive” sampling (Miles and Huberman 1994: 27) of the texts prescribed for the modules. Only texts used within the boundaries of the case study were selected for analysis, both to preserve the integrity of the case study, and also to construct the intertextual context, or background, which would support informed discussion of each of the three categories of texts explored in the data presentation chapters. Since the texts are too long to reproduce in their entirety in the thesis, only parts of the texts selected are reproduced in the thesis as text extracts. Text extracts are analysed in detail to illustrate the nature of micro-level argumentation, while the texts as a whole are discussed to illustrate the macro-level features of argumentation, and in some cases the overall impression created by examination of the public ‘front’ of the texts, such as the covers, is also discussed.
The criteria for selection of texts and text extracts for analysis are discussed in the subsections that follow. At this point, however, it must be stated that in the process of analysing even short extracts from the texts collected in the case study, it became evident that analysis of the data reached ‘saturation’ point very quickly. Since similar findings were generated from analysis of texts in each category, it appears that the selection of texts, and of text extracts for detailed analysis, was not particularly significant. The texts selected are listed in the list of primary references/sources at the end of the thesis.

3.8.3.1 ‘Expert knowledge’ texts

The selection of ‘expert knowledge texts’ was driven by the intention to use only texts that students should have consulted for the three questions on which they wrote essays (see 5.4 for discussion of the essay tasks). Since Development Studies is a knowledge “region” (Bernstein 2000: 9, see 2.3.5 for discussion of on knowledge structure), ‘expert knowledge’ is produced in two relatively distinct, yet linked, fields of knowledge production: the academy and sites of knowledge application. For this reason, the data categorised as ‘expert knowledge’ was divided into two sub-categories: academic research texts and practitioner research texts.

The category referred to in the thesis as ‘academic research texts’ includes texts published in academic journals, book chapters in edited collections and monographs. For analysis of texts in this category, it was decided to confine analysis to the texts prescribed for the “Development: discourses and debates” module. Since The Development Reader (Chari and Corbridge 2008a) was the only prescribed text, and as it is very long, only one of the nine parts of the Reader was made the focus of analysis. It was decided to analyse all the texts which appear in Part Eight of the Reader, entitled “Globalisation, security and well-being”, since they are taken from academic sources, and they were the only texts that students were allowed to consult for the coursework essay assignment on globalisation (see 5.4.3). Three of the texts were chosen for detailed linguistic analysis. Two texts were selected because they can be seen as in dialogue with one another. One text is an excerpt from a full length book written by Martin Wolf, entitled “Why Globalization Works” (see 4.2.1.1). The other text is a journal article, originally published in 2004 in World Development (see 4.2.1.2). The third text, originally published in 2002 in Anthropological...
Quarterly\textsuperscript{106}, was chosen because it is markedly different from the other two texts (see 4.2.1.3). The other four readings were analysed for an overview of content and for overall argumentation strategies (see 4.2.2).

The other category, in the thesis referred to as ‘practitioner research texts’, includes texts produced by government-funded and non-government-funded research institutes or bodies. A representative proportion of the texts prescribed for the “Development theory and policy in South Africa” module (see 3.5.3.1) was selected. Since one of the two assignment essay topics students could choose between for the coursework essay assignment was on the Child Support Grant, the prescribed text, published by the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC), \textit{Changing social policy: the child support grant in South Africa} (2008) was analysed. Two key text-types prescribed for the essay on the developmental state (see 5.4.3) were chosen for analysis: the HSRC-produced \textit{State of the Nation} publications, and the \textit{Economic Transformation Audit}, published by the Institute for Justice and Reconciliation (IJR). Having examined some of the texts produced under the auspices of the HSRC, the other texts analysed were selected from texts published by the Institute for Justice and Reconciliation (IJR)\textsuperscript{107}.

3.8.3.2 Educational texts: expert knowledge recontextualised

Two distinct sub-categories of texts produced in the field of recontextualisation of knowledge were identified: published and unpublished texts. The distinction is based on analysis of the nature and role of the “recontextualising agents” (Bernstein 2000: 33) who produced the texts.

In material terms, one group of recontextualising agents (see 2.3.2) can be seen as working at the global or national level (rather than at local level) and, in conceptual terms, as working in the institutional context of the “order of discourse” in Fairclough’s terms, or the culture of the knowledge domain in Bernstein’s terms. The texts they produce are published for textbook consumers (lecturers and students). Two published texts were selected for analysis, a textbook and a ‘reader’. The textbook is the obvious text-type to investigate, but the reference lists in the learning guides (see Primary References under the References section of the thesis) showed that very few books with educational goals are used in the third-year level of study. The textbook was listed as recommended reading

\textsuperscript{106} An extract from this text appears in Chari and Corbridge (2008: 465-471).

\textsuperscript{107} The IJR was established in 2000 to continue the work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), and aims to contribute to the development of justice, fairness and inclusivity (http://www.ijr.org.za/index.php, accessed 19 July 2012).
for the essay on the ‘developmental state’ in the module on development policy. Since there were no books prescribed for the module on development debates, other than the Reader, parts of the Reader that have an explicit pedagogical function were analysed. As both the Reader and the textbook are edited books, being compilations of chapters and articles by other authors, the excerpts chosen for analysis were written by the editors, who play the most significant pedagogical role in the texts.

Excerpts from the entry-level textbook, and the Reader, which is aimed primarily at postgraduate level study, were selected purposively in order to examine how argumentation is mediated in texts aimed at students at opposite ends of the spectrum: novices and readers who are more deeply initiated into the knowledge domain. It may be argued that students are unlikely to read the editors’ introductions but, since they provide access to the ways that the editors, as the ‘directors’ of the texts, mediate argumentation processes, the written editorial contribution can be seen as offering significant insight into the argumentation strategies used in the recontextualisation of knowledge. While editorial text may not be valued by students, it is likely to be highly valued by lecturers, particularly for making decisions about which published texts to prescribe.

As the editors’ introduction that precedes the first Part of the Reader sets the tone for the book as a whole, and as the content of Part One functions to delimit the knowledge domain of Development Studies, providing the editors’ perspective on what the object of study should be in Development Studies, it was deemed a particularly appropriate text for analysis.

In material terms, the other group of pedagogic recontextualising agents are the lecturers working at the local level in the department chosen as the site of the case study (see 3.5.2). In conceptual terms, the lecturers are interactants in the “context of situation” (see 2.2.1.2). The unpublished texts that were chosen for analysis are key texts: those written by the lecturers to guide the students’ learning, which are termed ‘learning guides’ in the context.

In addition, another sub-genre that plays a key role in the recontextualisation and reproduction of knowledge, is that of the essay prompt, or question. Consequently, all three essay questions which fell within the bounds of the case study were analysed.
3.8.3.3 ‘Novice knowledge’ texts

As it was initially unclear exactly what kind of writing students would be required to produce for the course, and which text types would be most suitable for the research, a number of kinds of student writing were collected to be used as data. However, ultimately only one text-type was selected for analysis. During the research period, it was established that the most highly valued text was the “high stakes” writing\(^\text{108}\) based on disciplinary sources, referred to as the “research essay” in the context of situation, and as the “essay from sources” in composition theory (see 2.4.3). The choice to analyse only this distinctive, highly valued text type can be seen as a form of “purposive” sampling (Miles and Huberman 1994: 27), grounded in a growing understanding of the importance of the essay in disciplinary learning and assessment, and also of the value ascribed to the essay in the institution of higher education.

The genre of the ‘multiple-source discussion essay’ (see 2.2.4.9) is used in assessment for the coursework ‘term’ mark, written over a period of weeks in students’ own time, as well as for the year-end examinations, when a strict time limit applies. I decided to use only the “high stakes” texts written in conditions more closely approximating those of ‘real’ research writing; in this case, the essays written for the ‘term’ mark.

The essays were submitted in the second-last week of each seven-week module. They required students to engage with the prescribed literature through a process of reading the source texts and writing an essay response to a question posed by the lecturer. The prescribed length of the essays was approximately ten typed pages. Two essays from each research participant were collected, one written for assessment in each of the two modules. A total of 57 essays were analysed, two from each of 27 participants, and one from each of the other three research participants\(^\text{109}\). The core of the research is the analysis of these essays, which is discussed in Chapter Six.

3.9 Data analysis: a multi-dimensional framework for analysing argumentativity in knowledge-focused discourse

The theoretical framework on which the analytical framework is based is directed by the view of discourse as fundamentally dialogical (see 2.2.2.2) and heteroglossic (see 2.2.2.3),

\(^{108}\) I use Peter Elbow’s terms, “high stakes” and “low stakes” writing (Elbow 1997, see 2.2.4.9) to refer to the relative weighting of the writing tasks, ‘high-stakes’ writing referring to a task that is heavily-weighted in terms of the proportion of marks allocated to it and whether it is the text type required in examinations.

\(^{109}\) Three of the essays proved difficult to procure for analysis.
and inscribed with ideology/power (see 2.2.4.1). An argument for using a broader theorisation of argument, termed “argumentativity” (Amossy 2009), is made in the previous chapter (see 2.5), and a theoretical framework for considering argumentativity as ‘positioning’ in discourse is suggested (see Figure 2.13). This more encompassing conceptualisation of argument as argumentativity is used in the framework for analysing knowledge-focused disciplinary discourse that was developed in the research process. Argumentativity is defined in terms of different kinds of positioning in discourse. The principle of dialogism governs positioning between writer/s and reader/s, the principle of heteroglossia governs positioning in relation to authoritative voices, and ideology/power governs positioning in relation to the representation of ‘reality’ (or ontological positioning) that occurs in the construction of knowledge. Thus argumentativity can be analysed as positioning at three distinct ‘levels’ of textual meaning. For the sake of analytical clarity, the three types of positioning are represented as discrete processes; however, it is acknowledged that argumentativity is a complex integration of inseparable processes that has been simplified for analytical purposes.

Since all the data are in the form of written texts, forms of textual discourse analysis are used. Although the theoretical framing outlined above informs all of the analyses, the three relatively distinct sets of texts (see 3.8.3) are analysed at varying levels of generality. Across the three thesis chapters that present the findings of data analysis, there is a movement from general, less systematic analysis to detailed systematic analysis. The last data chapter, Chapter Six, offers the most systematic analysis of all three ‘levels’ of argumentativity. The most fine-grained analysis is devoted to the “thesis statement”, the most important part of the argumentation in the multiple source discussion essay (see 6.3.2, and Appendix 6.2).

Given the multi-layered structure of text (Martin 1992), the difficulty of isolating for analysis distinct features is a recurring theme in similar research (Lewin, Fine and Young 2001; Martin 2002). The discursive resources identified for analysis are at different levels of textual meaning: some are at the macro-level of the text as a whole and others are at the micro-level of lexico-grammar. The discursive resources chosen for analytical focus represent a pragmatic selection and should not be seen as representing all the discursive resources that are used in argumentation in similar text types.

Since CDA necessarily appropriates other methods (Fairclough 2003: 210), and the aim is to focus on “argumentativity”, a number of different analytical categories and methods are identified for use in analysis. In the three sub-sections that follow, these are discussed in...
terms of: positioning in relation to the representation of ‘reality’, authoritative voices and writer-reader interaction.

3.9.1 Representation of ‘reality’

“Ideologies of knowledge-making” (Ivanič 1998: 304) are drawn on in the representation of ‘reality’ and, specifically, in the construction of “disciplinary voice”, as discussed in Chapter Two (see 2.2.4.6, and Figure 2.8). An ongoing debate in composition and rhetoric (see 2.4.3.6), and in argumentation theory (see 2.4.5), has centred on whether argument should be defined in terms of inquiry or persuasion. In the context of knowledge production and dissemination, argumentation is linked to processes of inquiry and persuasion that draw on what Ivanič (1998: 304, see Figure 2.7) refers to as the “ideologies of knowledge-making in higher education”. Since the discourses of knowledge construction derive from particular ontological and epistemological orientations that experts in the knowledge field could be expected to have developed along with acquisition of the disciplinary subject content, the authoritative texts they write, presumably, are underpinned by self-conscious negotiation of the (meta)discourses for knowledge construction that are used in the representation of ‘reality’.

All knowledge-focused texts rely to an extent on discourses of knowledge construction, whether the texts are written by researchers or students. The disciplinary authorities whose voices are inscribed in expert texts generally have full control and reflexive understanding of the discourses they use, whereas relative novices in the knowledge domain may be unaware that they are drawing on these discourses in their use of lexicogrammatical and discursive resources to construct a legitimate ‘disciplinary voice’. Thus, while the producers of knowledge use the discourses of knowledge construction to consciously position themselves and their readers in relation to ‘reality’, novice writers are less likely to be sensitive to the ways that the discursive and linguistic choices they make position them in relation to reality and knowledge.

Viewing argument primarily in terms of inquiry is closely related to the idea that there is an objective reality that can be made known through either scientific methods or clear thinking (Turner 2011). This perspective is inscribed in what I refer to as a ‘discourse of inquiry’ in this thesis. Unsurprisingly, the discourse of inquiry is extensively used in the hierarchical knowledge forms of ‘hard’ science and some social sciences (see 2.3.5). On the other hand, viewing argument as persuasion is closely related to the idea that knowledge is primarily a social semiotic construction and therefore open to contestation. This
perspective is inscribed in what I refer to as a ‘discourse of persuasion’ in this thesis. The discourse of persuasion is more commonly used in the horizontal knowledge forms of the humanities and some of the social sciences (see 2.3.6). It is constructed, in part, from the resources of ‘stance’ and ‘engagement’, and a form of metalanguage used for explicit reference to aspects of argumentation, which I refer to as ‘argument metadiscourse’. Argument metadiscourse and the discourse of persuasion foreground the contestability of knowledge claims, whereas the discourse of inquiry allows the writer to present claims to knowledge as if they are fact or ‘truth’.

The arrangement of the thesis statement in the overall structure of the essay is one indicator of the dominant discourse used for knowledge construction. In this research the term ‘front-loaded’ is used to refer to the foregrounding of the thesis in the introduction stage of the essay, and the term ‘back-loaded’ is used to refer to the presentation of the thesis statement only in the end stage of the essay. The staging of the thesis was identified as an important aspect of the argumentation that can be analysed by first identifying the thesis statement and then noting its position in the overall schematic structure. When the thesis statement is foregrounded, a discourse of persuasion is indicated, whereas placement of the thesis in the concluding stage of the essay indicates a stronger orientation to inquiry.

In terms of the four common patterns of argument, the allocation of a high proportion of the text to discussion of causation (see 2.4.3) – in SFL terms, use of the genre of “explanation” to govern sub-sections of the essay (see 2.2.4.9) – indicates an inquiry orientation to knowledge. The use of the language of logical entailment and/or a high proportion of “transition markers” associated with logical relationships (Hyland 2005: 50) also indicate an inquiry orientation. The inscription of objectivity, described as the “discourse of transparency” (Lillis and Turner 2001; Turner 2011, see 2.4.1), is a strong indicator of an inquiry orientation. Objectivity is inscribed in the use of passive forms and nominalisations, and the use of impersonal constructions to effect the effacement of “self” (Clark and Ivanič 1997: 137). Inscription of objectivity is also achieved by the metaphorical use of the lexis of observation, particularly in the ‘dead’ metaphors common in essayist literacy, which are conveyed in words such as ‘see’, ‘show’ and ‘demonstrate’.

---

110 In SFL, the term used to refer to the representation of a “process” (verb) as a “participant” (noun) is referred to as nominalisation (Halliday 1985). I acknowledge that in academic writing the use of nominalisations and passive forms function not only to convey objectivity, but also to facilitate dense abstract argumentation.
that construct “the visual space of reason” (Crosswhite 1996: 235) that developed with the Enlightenment (see 2.4.1).

In contrast, the use of metaphors of voice and dialogue indicate a persuasion orientation. Initial analysis showed that the greater the emphasis is on the discursive construction of knowledge, the closer a text is to a persuasion orientation. The greater the proportion of the lexis of embodied vocalisation in relation to the lexis of objective observation/cognition, the more persuasion-oriented is the text. In other words, the use of terms that are associated with the processes of argument and persuasion indicates an orientation to persuasion rather than inquiry in the construction of knowledge. Since the use of self-reference in the pronoun ‘I’ draws attention to the subjectivity of the writer, and underlines the impossibility of being objective, the use of personal constructions and first person pronouns position the writer in a context where persuasion is acknowledged as a significant dimension of the argumentation. More detail about analytical strategy and discursive resources selected as salient features for analysis follows in Figure 3.4 (see the next page), which draws extensively on Fairclough’s (2003: 191-194) “checklist” for textual analysis. The categories that are drawn on for analysis of the representation of ‘reality’ come from Fairclough’s categories of: “social events” (191); “representation of social events” (193); “assumptions”, particularly the concepts of existential (“what exists”), propositional (“what is or can be or will be the case”) and value (“what is good and desirable”) assumptions (55 and 192). I also draw on his discussion of the categories: “discourses” (193); “modality” and “evaluation”, from which the references in Figure 3.4 to “epistemic modalities” (authorial commitment in terms of truth) and “deontic modalities” (authorial assertion of obligation or necessity) are derived. His category of “semantic/grammatical relations between sentences and clauses” (192-193) informs ‘rhetorical structure’ as a dimension of text referred to in Figure 3.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension of text</th>
<th>Analytical focus</th>
<th>Analytical strategies and ‘tools’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>The event (or chain of events) in which the text participates, including the social practice (or network of social practices) that frames the event</td>
<td>1. Identification of the elements of the event/s which are included/excluded, foregrounded/backgrounded. 2. Analysis of the “existential, propositional and value assumptions” that are made in the text (Fairclough 2003: 192), and the ideological function of the assumptions. 3. Analysis of how “social actors” and time and space are presented in the text (Fairclough 2003: 193).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>The modalities that are used for representation</td>
<td>1. Where salient, identification of different “technologies” for representation, e.g. the use of space in the page and font size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension of text</td>
<td>Analytical focus</td>
<td>Analytical strategies and ‘tools’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the main discourse/s on which the text draws</td>
<td>1. identification of main or salient discourses/“orders of discourse”, e.g. the order of discourse referred to as Development Studies; explicit reference to argumentation, i.e. <em>metalanguage of argument</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. identification of semantic/grammatical features that make the discourses identifiable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the values that are represented or realised in the text</td>
<td>1. identification of values in evaluative assertions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. analysis of explicit/implicit form in which values are realised (note overlap with “epistemic” and “deontic” modalities – see 2 below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. consideration of how values are “inculcated” as discourses (see Fairclough 2003: 208)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(meta)discourses of knowledge construction</td>
<td>1. identification of main discourses for representing knowledge: inquiry/scientific-oriented and persuasion/discourse-oriented, e.g. passive voice, nominalisations, lexis of objective observation, or embodied vocalisation (see 2.4.3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. analysis of how claims to truth are realised by means of “epistemic” modality and claims of obligation/necessity are realised by means of “deontic” modality (Fairclough 2003: 219)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. possibly, also consideration of how this relates to resources for construction of “stance” and “engagement” in writer-reader interaction - see Figure 3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical structure/“texture”</td>
<td>macro-level meaning relations</td>
<td>1. identification of arguments the argument “types”: fact, cause, value and policy (see 2.4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. analysis of hierarchical levels of argumentation (identification of overall claim/thesis in relation to sub-claims), including the position of the thesis in text structure (<em>front-loaded/back-loaded</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interactive metadiscourse</td>
<td>1. identification of “interactive resources” used to ‘signpost’, or label, the overall argument structure, some “transition markers”, and especially “frame markers”, e.g. <em>The purpose of this essay is to define …</em>; including headings/sub-headings (Hyland 2005, see Figure 2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meaning relations between sentences and clauses that contribute to argumentation</td>
<td>1. identification of lexical resources for marking causal reasoning processes, e.g.: <em>because…, in that…, which, in turn, results in…</em>, or speculative reasoning processes, e.g.: <em>if…, then…</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. identification of common textual patterns, such as contrastive/concessive meaning relations, e.g. <em>but, although, on the other hand,…</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. (note overlap with resources for managing different voices– see ‘heteroglossia’, Figure 3.5 below)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.4:** A framework for analysing positioning in the construction of reality
3.9.2 Intertextuality and authoritative voices

The heteroglossic nature of texts means that they are necessarily combinations and reconfigurations of parts of other texts to which they are related in complexes of intertextual networks (see 2.2.2.3 and 2.2.4.3). Consequently, the use of other texts and voices as sources of ‘content’ is an essential aspect of the argumentation in knowledge-focused discourse. Signs of interaction with the texts and voices of the knowledge domain are inscribed in the ‘expert texts’ which are constructed. Demonstration of negotiation with authoritative voices involves writing into the text the processes of interpreting and evaluating other texts. The most obvious sign of this negotiation is direct intertextuality, indicated by citation and referencing, an apparently ‘technical’ aspect of academic writing which is bound by conventions to which the ‘disciplined’ subject (Foucault 1977) must adhere, and which are strictly ‘policed’ (see 2.2.4.3).

Consultation of Figure 3.5 shows that analysis of intertextuality is guided by the questions in Fairclough’s (2003: 192) checklist under the heading “intertextuality”. As there are multiple intertextual connections between the network of texts analysed for this research, intertextuality and interdiscursivity are discussed in relatively broad terms in the chapters that follow on ‘expert knowledge’ texts (Chapter 4) and ‘educational texts’ (Chapter 5), with special note being taken of how texts are ‘recycled’ and recontextualised. Since the research is oriented to pedagogical application of knowledge, the students’ essays are the focus of the most detailed systematic analysis of intertextuality and positioning in relation to authoritative voices. The reasoning process behind the analysis of the essays is discussed in the paragraphs that follow.

As argumentation in disciplinary texts entails making claims about ‘reality’ that are represented as knowledge, the ‘content’ of the texts is more important than many generic studies of argument suggest. However, in this study the concern is to shift the gaze from disciplinary ‘content’ to discourse. As reliable disciplinary knowledge is represented in published sources, effective exploitation of the textual (re)sources is important for the construction of argument. Two issues relevant to use of ‘expert texts’ are: the degree to which the writer complies with disciplinary norms by using texts produced within disciplinary boundaries, and the extent to which the text reproduces existing knowledge or ‘transforms’ it.

In the early stage of the research process, overview analysis of students’ use of ‘expert texts’ was conducted. The whole essay text, including the reference list, was considered.
Notes were made on the following aspects of the use of textual sources: first, understanding of key texts, concepts and issues, particularly in terms of whether the essay question was 'answered'; second, whether the sources used were appropriate; third, the extent to which students relied on the source texts when integrating them into their own texts; and last, citation and referencing practices. The overview findings (see 6.3.1) provide a context for the detailed findings on the management of heteroglossia (see 6.3.2).

Since any text is conceptualised as a response to existing texts (and discourses), the overarching argument, or thesis, emerges from the interaction with the disciplinary ‘content’/voices (Bakhtin 1981; Bazerman 2004). The act of constructing an overall argument, or ‘thesis’, in a disciplinary text shows that the writer is able to engage appropriately with the discipline by producing a response that can be seen as an extension or development of knowledge, however slight or incremental the contribution. Therefore, the existence of an identifiable thesis statement is evidence that the writer has engaged with the ‘expert texts’ (the voices of the discipline), and with the questions or debates that they address, to produce a substantive textual response. Generally, ‘novice knowledge’ texts are reformulations rather than new contributions to knowledge; however, they play an important role in the “inculcation” (Fairclough 2003: 208) of disciplinary discourse, allowing for the development of a “legitimate” (Bernstein 2000) “disciplinary voice” (Hyland 2008).

The multi-voiced nature of discourse is more obviously marked in academic knowledge-focused texts because the voices and discourses that are used are conventionally directly linked to previous texts by means of attribution, reference to authoritative sources being a characteristic of academic discourse. In disciplinary argumentation, managing the multiple voices in expert texts is a major challenge. Not only do the authoritative voices need to be included and acknowledged, but also the writer has to include/manage the authoritative voices while simultaneously asserting and maintaining a distinct “authorial voice” (Andrews 2010: 198, see 2.4.4) which should, ideally, also be a legitimate “disciplinary voice” (Hyland 2008: 6, see 2.2.4.4).

Academic convention requires that impartiality and criticality be inscribed in the text (Andrews 2005; 2007; 2010). The theory developed in Chapter Two suggests that ‘criticality’ is realised in the way in which ‘difference’ is managed in the text (see 2.5). One means of constructing criticality is through engaging with perspectives and positions that differ from those advocated in the text. Conflicting positions on an issue are integrated into the text using strategies or “moves” (Swales 2004), which typically include concession and counter-argument (see 2.4.3). In the sub-genre of the multiple-source discussion essay,
the novice writer has to integrate, not only different voices, but also voices which may conflict with each other. Managing heteroglossia in the argumentation in the “monological” textual form of the essay (Andrews 2010) requires the use of a wide range of discursive resources. The SFL-based appraisal system developed by White (2003) and Martin and White (2005) provides the concepts and terms most helpful for analysis of management of heteroglossia in written text (see 2.2.2.3). Although the appraisal system may be seen as competing with Hyland’s (2005; 2008) typologies of resources for reader-writer interaction (see 2.2.4.4), in this thesis the different frameworks are treated as complementary, with the resources for “stance” and “engagement” described by Hyland more appropriate for analysis of writer-reader interaction in the ‘context of situation’, and appraisal resources more appropriate for analysis of negotiation of voices in the ‘context of culture’, the most salient aspect of which, in this research, is the knowledge domain of Development Studies.

As mentioned in the introductory part of this section (see 3.9), for the analysis of students’ management of heteroglossia, it was decided to focus primarily on the thesis statements of the essay texts. The decision was justified on both theoretical and pragmatic grounds. The thesis statement can be considered the core of the argument in the essay text, and thus the most appropriate part of the text to analyse in a study of argumentation. Since the thesis statement represents a fragment of the whole essay text, it was possible to perform detailed linguistic analysis of all the identifiable thesis statements in the data set (see Appendix 6.2, ‘Thesis Statement Analysis’, where the thesis statements are reproduced and analysed). Analysis, conducted in terms of the positioning of the ‘textual voice’ in relation to the voices of the discipline, required a focus on the discursive resources for heteroglossic engagement (see 2.2.2.3) which fall under the sub-system of “engagement”, which is part of the more encompassing appraisal system (Martin and White 2005). The linguistic categorisations from the “engagement” system were ‘mapped’ onto the sociological insights about orientations to “difference” in Fairclough’s checklist (2003:192) to facilitate analysis (see “heteroglossia” in Figure 3.5 below).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension of text</th>
<th>Analytical focus</th>
<th>Analytical strategies and ‘tools’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intertextuality</strong></td>
<td>the intertextual context/s</td>
<td>identification of the location of the text in a wider network, or chain, of texts in which the text is situated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the selection of texts and ‘voices’ on which the text draws, and the attribution of voices</td>
<td>1. identification of the texts and voices that are included, and excluded voices where significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. analysis of the “texturing” (Fairclough 2010: 10) of other voices, and of relative weighting of different voices in relation to the textual voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. analysis of attribution: lack of attribution to sources, specific or non-specific attribution, direct or indirect quotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heteroglossia</strong> (orientation of the textual voice to the diversity of voices in discourse)</td>
<td>openness to /exploration of difference</td>
<td>1. identification of dominant orientation to diverse voices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. identification of specific strategies used for heteroglossic engagement in different stages of the text:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• inclusion of other voices in the form of direct quotation and reported speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• use of lexical resources for representing recognition/acceptance of difference, e.g view/position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• use of resources for dialogical expansion by entertaining other voices (the “entertain” move), such as expository questions and wordings like: it seems that...; it/this may be...; or attribution of other voices (“attribute: acknowledge” or attribute: distance”), in wordings such as: Wolf claims that....; policy analysts think that...*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• accentuation of difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• use of lexical resources for representing conflict/struggle over meaning, such as words associated with argument: for example: contend, debate, champion, evidence, Wade argues that...., the neo-liberal argument, the anti-neoliberal camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• use of lexico-grammatical resources for dialogical contraction (resources for the “disclaim: deny” moves), such as: not, never, or for “disclaim: counter” moves, such as: but, although)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• negotiation of difference (attempt to resolve/overcome difference)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• use of dialogically contractive concession move (“concur: concede”), effected by use of lexico-grammatical resources such as: even though....; even if....; although....; at most....; but....; however....)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• focus on commonality or solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• use of the dialogically contractive consensus-seeking move (“proclaim: concur: affirm”) effected by use of lexico-grammatical resources such as: obviously... *)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• normalisation of difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• use of dialogically contractive obfuscatory moves which hide or minimise difference (the move “proclaim: pronounce”), signalled by wordings such as: the fact that...., and the endorsing move (“proclaim: endorse”), signalled by wordings such as: the essay shows....; the research proves that....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• suppression of difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• exclusion of other voices (undialogised, or monoglossic discourse)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In this section, bracketed text refers to terminology used in the “engagement” sub-system of appraisal theory represented in Figure 2.3 (Martin and White 2005: 134)

**Figure 3.5:** A framework for analysing intertextual positioning in relation to authoritative voices
3.9.3 Analysis of positioning in writer-reader interaction

Analysis of writer-reader positioning encompasses two inseparable dimensions of the co-construction of meaning (see 3.2.1): relations of power between the interactants and the construction of writer identity in “authorial voice” (Ivanič 1998; Andrews 2010) or “textual voice” (Hyland 2008). Examination of writer-reader positioning is usefully framed by genre theory, since genre shapes many of the choices about discursive resources in the text (see 2.2.4.4 and 2.2.4.5). A wide range of genres populate the textual network (see Figure 3.3) explored in the case study, as can be inferred from the description of data types (see 3.8.3). The texts collected as data are not all easily categorised in terms of genre, particularly the hybrid forms produced outside the academy that have not been codified by genre analysts.

Discursive resources for ‘interaction’ (see 2.2.4.4) are used extensively across the range of genres, and are therefore the main discursive resources identified for focus in analysis of the data presented. “Interactive” and “interactional” discursive resources (Hyland 2005) were identified as most appropriate for analysis of reader-writer interaction (see 2.2.4.4, and Figures 2.5 and 2.6). “Interactional” discursive resources are divided into two broad categories of “stance” and “engagement” in Hyland’s later work (Hyland 2008, see 2.2.4.6 and Figure 2.7). In the texts analysed, the use of “stance” resources was examined for the inscription of writer identity and, specifically, for the construction of “disciplinary voice” (Hyland 2008). The use of “engagement” resources was examined for the various positionings for the writer and the reader/s inscribed in different parts of the text.

The multiple-source discussion essays represent a distinctive sub-genre within the genre of the academic essay (see 2.2.4.9). Since the genre was identified as the most highly-valued text-type in the research site, and 57 exemplars of the genre were procured for analysis, the multiple-source discussion essay was submitted to detailed systematic analysis of the discursive resources used (see Chapter 6). The overall goal of “high stakes” student writing (Elbow 1997) is to satisfy the assessor that the student has engaged adequately with the course content, and can be deemed worthy of a passing grade for the course and of moving on to the next part of the learning sequence in the curriculum. Consequently, the multiple-source discussion essay is expected to be clear and explicit. Explicitness, the term used to refer to the “display and demonstration of thoughts”, is also identified as one of the seven “principles of argumentation” (Andrews 2010: 198). For this reason, the genre features which were chosen for focused attention in
analysis are some of those that contribute most to the clarity and explicitness of the argumentation.

Schematic structure is a key feature which aids the assessor to identify parts of the argument. In simple terms, schematic structure refers to how a text is arranged in ‘stages’, the term used in the definition of genre as “a staged, goal-oriented social process” (see 2.2.4.5). The term refers to the structure of the text (Martin 1992: 505) and the “sequential unfolding of the text as process” (506). The basic schematic structure of the macro-genre of the academic essay is so well-known it seems unnecessarily obvious to point out that the minimum components of the essay form, as taught from school level on, are: an introduction, a body and a conclusion (see 2.2.4.9).

The structure of the text is an aspect of the “vertical programming” of the argument (Andrews 2010: 198, see 2.4.4). The planning of the structure is made visible in the ‘contents’ page/s, headings and sub-headings, enabling the reader to interpret the text, even when applying skimming and scanning overview reading strategies. Thus, headings and sub-headings can be seen as a form of “interactive” metadiscourse resource, specifically, the “frame marker”, that provides “framing information about elements of the discourse” (Hyland 2005: 51, see Figure 2.5). Preliminary analysis of the essays in the data set showed that they conformed to the conventions of basic essay structure, and that the ‘body’ section of the essays were divided into clearly demarcated sub-sections with headings which provide an indication of the overall structure and ‘content’ of the text. Consequently, it was decided that an overview impression of the structuring of the overall argument in the essays could be gained by analysis of the structuring of the sub-headings (see Appendix 6.1). Other interactive metadiscourse, particularly lexical “frame markers” and some “transition markers” (50) were also identified as resources student writers use to achieve explicitness. Another significant aspect of the argumentation is the degree to which the thesis is explicitly signalled in a “thesis statement” (Coffin, Curry, Goodman, Hewings, Lillis and Swann 2003: 22), therefore analysis focused on the interactive metadiscourse that was used to draw the reader’s attention to the thesis (see Appendix 6.2).

More recent published research, which builds on the work of Swales (1990) and Bhatia (1993; 2004) uses the term schematic structure more inclusively to refer also to stages 111  

---

111 This preliminary finding is consistent with published research findings that 41 per cent of social science essays in a data set of 437 texts had headings and “ideational sub-headings” (Gardner and Holmes 2009: 266).
(and “moves” within stages) of the text. Schematic structure is defined as: “the sequential patterning of communicative acts within genres into moves and steps” (Flowerdew and Forest 2009: 15). Preliminary reading of the essays showed identifiable patterns of “moves” in the introductions. The majority of the introductions were constructed across more than one paragraph, with many running into several paragraphs, suggesting that students made a considerable investment in the writing of the introduction stage of the essay. Initial analysis showed that students appeared to be less reliant on authoritative sources in the introductory stage of the essay, as they tended to use their own wordings rather than cite or quote expert texts. Consequently, it was decided to focus on the essay introductions for analysis of both writer-reader positioning and ‘voice’ (see 2.2.4.6). In the first stage of analysis, patterns in the form of commonly used moves were identified. The second stage involved analysis of the “stance” and “engagement” resources (see Figure 2.7) used in the construction of voice. An overview of the process and ‘tools’ for analysing positioning in writer-reader interaction in the context of situation is represented in Figure 3.6 below. The findings of the application of the analytical frameworks described in this chapter are discussed in the three chapters that follow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension of text</th>
<th>Analytical focus</th>
<th>Analytical strategies and ‘tools’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Genre             | text type and macro-structure | 1. identification of text-type, overall goal/s and text participants  
2. analysis of how goals are achieved using: visibilised schematic structure (partially visual/multimodal resources): *spacing of paragraphs and sub-headings*; “transition markers”, which signal relationships between stretches of discourse, e.g. *furthermore, similarly, consequently, nevertheless*; and “frame markers”, which signal elements of schematic structure and text boundaries, e.g. *firstly, in sum, my aim is…, the reason for the choice…* |

112 In a number of studies the move is divided into smaller units of meaning, the “act”, and optional “pre- and post-head” components (for example, Lewin, Fine and Young 2001: 36). In this study, while it is recognised that moves can be multi-functional, with more than one function realised by the same set of discursive resources, since the focus is on macro-level meaning, and the *discursive resources realising moves* rather than on the moves themselves, moves are not subdivided into smaller units.
3.10 Summary of research design and methods

In brief, the research was conceptualised as a qualitative case study of argumentation, which makes use of theory from CDA and a wide range of analytical techniques used for linguistic and discourse analysis. Since argumentation was viewed as positioning in relation to “difference” in each of the three ‘levels’ of discourse that were identified in the theoretical structure (see 2.5), different constructs and techniques were appropriate for analysis of each level. Positioning of the writer in relation to the reader was analysed using constructs taken primarily from applied linguistic research on academic writing. In particular, genre and ‘move’ theory (Swales 2004) is used. Analytical tools developed by Hyland are used, with particular emphasis on his representation of “interactive” metadiscourse (2005: 50-52) and “stance” and “engagement” resources (2008: 7-12).

Positioning of the textual voice in relation to the authoritative voices of the knowledge domain was analysed using constructs taken from appraisal theory, which facilitate examination of the resources used for “dialogistic positioning” (Martin and White 2005). The analysis of positioning of the textual voice in relation to ‘reality’ draws primarily on Fairclough’s (2003: 191-194) “checklist” for textual analysis, because it accommodates analysis of power and ideology in the representation of knowledge. Since all the key

---

The constructs referred to in this figure are terms relating to “interactive metadiscourse” (Hyland 2005: 50-52), and terms relating to “stance” and “engagement” (Hyland 2008). For more detail, see Figures 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7.
theorists who have influenced the analytical framework are familiar with SFL, and draw on Hallidayan analysis to some extent, some of the analytical constructs from SFL were also used in analysis of the data. The mapping of analysis on to the theoretical frame developed in the previous chapter is represented in Figure 3.7 below.

Figure 3.7: The relationship between theoretical and analytical frameworks
Chapter four: Argumentativity in ‘expert knowledge’ texts

4.1 Introduction

This chapter represents the findings generated from the first subsidiary research question, which inquires about the nature of argument in the ‘expert knowledge’ texts of Development Studies (see 1.7). Critical discourse analysis was used to explore the sample of texts selected for the case study (see 3.8.3.1). In terms of the design of the research, the ‘expert knowledge’ texts that are investigated are viewed in relation to ‘novice knowledge’ texts (see Figure 3.3). The ‘expert knowledge’ texts embody the knowledge domain, which is a “social structure”, conceived of as belonging in the outer box, or layer, of Fairclough’s (2001; 2010) model of discourse, which is represented in Figure 2.1. The texts also embody the “field of knowledge production” in Bernstein’s modeling of the pedagogic device (Bernstein 2000; Luckett 2011, see Figure 3.2).

A more encompassing conception of argument than is currently dominant in the academy, termed “argumentativity” (see 2.5), guided the choice of analytical strategies and tools that were used for the textual analysis (see 3.9). In terms of the representation of ‘reality’ in knowledge construction (see 3.9.1), the texts were analysed to establish the extent to which argumentation features, whether argumentation is explicit or implicit, what argument “types” (Fahnestock and Secor 1983) predominate and what argument meta-language is used (see Figure 3.4). In terms of intertextuality (see 3.9.2), some of the most notable appeals to authoritative voices that function to strengthen the overall argumentation were noted. Bakhtin-informed (1986) understanding of “heteroglossia” was taken into account in analysis; however, given space constraints, only limited discussion of the management of “difference” (Kress 1989; Fairclough 2003) in the integration of voices (Martin and White 2005) from the knowledge domain was possible (see Figure 3.5). Discussion of how argumentation is enacted in writer-reader interaction entailed discussion of genre, positioning, attitudes, values and voice in relation to the construction of argument (see 3.9.3). For a summary of analytical strategies used, see Figure 3.6.

As discussed in Chapter Three, in this chapter the discussion of analysis of texts from the knowledge domain is structured in two main sections which represent a broad division in the kinds of knowledge production within the field (see 3.8.3.1). In the first sub-section (see 4.2), academic research texts produced in the academy are discussed, while in the following sub-section (see 4.3) the ‘practitioner research’ texts produced in contexts of knowledge application are discussed. Analysis of academic research texts was limited to
the texts prescribed for the module, “Development: discourses and debates”. Analysis of the practitioner research texts was limited to a selection of the texts that were prescribed for the module, “Development theory and policy in South Africa”.

4.2 Academic research texts from “Development: discourses and debates”

The primary readers of the research texts written by university-based academics are the “legitimately pedagogised” agents (Bernstein 2000: 31) of the discourse communities with which the writers are affiliated, the foremost of these being the critical readers and journal editors who fulfil the role of disciplinary ‘gatekeepers’. All three of the common forms in which academic knowledge is represented and communicated are analysed in this section: journal articles, book chapters in edited collections/readers, and monographs. Many highly regarded academic texts appear in different incarnations over a period of time, first as articles in journals and subsequently as chapters in edited books and/or as excerpts in the compilations termed ‘readers’. For this reason, the texts are not discussed in separate sub-sections according to text type. The texts discussed in this section constitute the whole of Part Eight of The Development Reader (Chari and Corbridge 2008a), which is entitled “Globalisation, Security and Well-Being”. The first part of this section (see 4.2.1) discusses detailed analysis of three of the texts from the Reader. The second part of the section (see 4.2.2) provides an overview of the other academic research texts selected for analysis.

4.2.1 Fine-grained analysis of three authoritative texts

The first two texts from the Reader can be seen as in dialogue with each other, since the writer of the second text (see 4.2.1.2) alludes to the position of the writer of the first text, discussed below (see 4.2.1.1). Both of the texts were originally published in 2004 and address the important question of how globalisation impacts on poor and marginalized global citizens. The other academic text which is discussed in this section contrasts markedly with the other two texts in terms of content and style (see 4.2.1.3).

4.2.1.1 Extract from Why globalization works


---

114 The text is the first ‘reading’ in Part 8 of the Reader (2008: 401-409). The extract is entitled: “The Market Crosses Borders”.
title for an academic book – even one that verges on the genre of popular economics texts read by the general public\textsuperscript{115}. It is bold because it asserts uncompromising confidence in globalisation and the ability to explain such a complex phenomenon; provocative, because it is an unequivocal assertion of support for globalisation at a time when there is also strong criticism of globalisation. The dialogically contractive (Martin and White 2005, see 2.2.2.3) title takes the reader to the core of an ongoing argument about globalisation. Carrying the residue of the converse claim, that globalisation does not “work", it suggests that the text challenges the criticisms of globalisation that have been voiced in public and academic debate.

The first three paragraphs of the extract are reproduced below. Each paragraph is analysed in detail to illustrate the nature of micro-level argumentation in the text, before some of the macro-level features of argumentation in the text as a whole are discussed.

What is prudence in the conduct of every family can scarce be folly in that of a great kingdom. If a foreign country can supply us with a commodity cheaper than we ourselves can make it, better buy it of them with some part of the produce of our own industry, employed in a way in which we have some advantage.

\textbf{Adam Smith}

\textbf{[1]} I perform a specialized function – commentary on the world economy – within the global division of labour. I work for a publication that sells more than three-fifths of its copies outside what was once its home market. These copies are published on the same day in some twenty different places around the world. It is also possible to subscribe to the Internet version of the newspaper. Moreover, my personal transactions do not stop at the seas surrounding Britain. I am not limited to British cameras, computers and vegetables or to sightseeing and investing only in Britain. I, as is true of the \textit{FT} itself, am part of an internationally integrated economy. Here then are two realities of the contemporary marketplace: it crosses borders, ably assisted by modern technology; and it allows people to perform specialized functions.

\textbf{[2]} Behind these realities is a more important one: I make my transactions because, given my resources and opportunities, I expect to benefit from them. As Adam Smith said more than two centuries ago, what is beneficial within a country is also beneficial for a country. People buy and sell with residents of their country because they expect to be made better off. They buy and sell with non-residents for the same reason.

\textbf{[3]} When the statisticians add up transactions with non-residents, they call these a country’s external transactions. But these are not a country’s transactions except statistically. Other than where a government is directly involved, a country’s transactions are the aggregate of individual transactions

\textsuperscript{115} The text can be seen as an example of the increasing hybridisation of genres, since there is evidence in the text that it is aimed at both a scholarly readership and the general public.
by its residents. Moreover, because the motivation for such transactions is the same as for transactions with fellow residents, they are just as likely to contribute to the welfare of those who undertake them. This, in a nutshell, is the logic of global integration. (Wolf 2008: 402)

The text begins with a quotation from a classic economics text, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, bringing in a voice that has survived two centuries (see 2.2.2.3 for discussion on “heteroglossia”). The invocation of a monumental authority in the field of economics can be seen as a textual statement of affiliation with the tradition of economic liberalism rooted in Adam Smith’s work. The citation of Adam Smith also works as a writer strategy to ‘engage’ more intimately with the reader, referred to as “knowledge reference” (Hyland 2008: 8, 12). In the very next sentence of the text that follows the quotation, the author confidently inserts himself into the forefront of the debate by means of “self mention” (Hyland 2008: 8, 10); in this instance, the use of the first person singular pronoun ‘I’, which is placed in theme position in the sentence. The use of this resource for the construction of “stance”, claims for the textual voice the authority to converse with a revered author in the economics field.

While the first paragraph may appear to be merely anecdotal, two key claims that contribute to the overarching argument in the text as a whole are presented: that people and institutions are already integrated into the global economy, and that human agents specialise to perform very specific labour functions within the economic system. The author relates how he performs a specialised function by writing articles for the *Financial Times*, and how his articles are accessible across the globe. The personal narrative serves to establish the writer as an authority on global economic affairs as well as to contextualize and concretise the argument, while also personalising the text by using the author’s own experience to exemplify the argument that “the market crosses borders”. The concepts from economics discourse, ‘specialisation’ and ‘global economic integration’ are made accessible by the use of a simple example from lived experience. Significantly, it is difficult to separate the knowledge claims made from references to the writer’s role as commentator on the global economy. In the very act of writing, the author highlights the authoritative identity and powerful role that enable him to make knowledge claims that readers are likely to accept. This example illustrates that it is possible for the “knower”

---

116 In SFL terms, the “theme” is the part of the sentence that comes before the verb (Halliday 1985: 39; Eggins 1994: 274-275). In critical discourse analysis, which draws on SFL, the entity in the clause which comes before the verb is referred to as being in “theme position”, and is considered to be “foregrounded” (Janks 2010: 76).

117 In their introduction to the text, the editors of the Reader identify Wolf as “chief economics commentator” for the *Financial Times*, an “expert on international trade policy” and a fellow of the World Economic Forum (Chari and Corbridge 2008: 401).
(Maton 2010b) to be as important as the knowledge structure in the making of knowledge (see 2.3.3 for discussion of Legitimation Code Theory). Smith’s theory, a pillar in the vertical knowledge structure of economics, is used as a resource for supporting the author’s claims, but his ethos (see 2.4.3.2), being recognized as a global authority in his field, is also used to strengthen the argumentation. The analysis of only the first paragraph of the extract shows that argument is more complex than consideration of propositional claims alone suggests, and that a theory of argumentativity allows for more comprehensive analysis of argument in the text.

The main claim made in the second paragraph is that all transactions, whether within or between countries, happen because those involved perceive benefits for themselves. This accounts for the introduction to the argument at the start of the extract being the epigraph from Adam Smith’s argument for international trade, in which a country trading with another country is compared to a family buying, rather than making, items because it is cheaper. The comparison between a personal transaction and a transaction between countries implies that personal transactions and impersonal macro-level transactions, such as trade between countries, are equivalent. However, a critical reading requires one to consider whether transactions involving groups of people who, it must be acknowledged, have different or even conflicting needs and desires, are the same (or as simple) as transactions where only the individual’s needs and motivations count. The writer invokes disciplinary authority by using Smith’s argument by analogy: “what is beneficial within a country is also beneficial for a country”, with italics highlighting the prepositions which are central to the meaning within the parallel construction. The use of analogy is a strategy for illustrating a point, but the comparison of incommensurable phenomena to support an argument does not constitute valid reasoning. In Wolf’s text, it is a persuasive strategy used in the place of empirical support. The analogy is presented in the text as if it is conclusive proof of the argument, while the question of whether transactions are always equally beneficial for both sides is glossed over.

The repeated reference to “realities” (paragraphs 1 and 2) function in a similar way as references to ‘fact’, suggesting that the claims made are beyond question. Lexical choices from the discourse of rationality function to bolster the overall argument: the use of the transition marker indicating cause or reason, “because”, is used twice in the short paragraph, as well as the phrase “for the same reason”. The lexical resources chosen suggest that the argument presented is reasoned and objective, rather than motivated by neo-liberal values or flawed by moral blindness (see 2.4.1).
The third paragraph is constructed to strengthen the argument that trade is always to the mutual benefit of transactants. Spurious argument is used to present all trade as the action of willing individuals: “because the motivation for such transactions is the same as for transactions between residents, they are just as likely to contribute to the welfare of those who undertake them”. However, the pithy assertion that follows illustrates the central role that the representation of reality plays in argumentation: “This, in a nutshell, is the logic of global economic integration.” Through the use of the phrase “in a nutshell”, and the word “logic”, it is implied that the highly questionable representation of trade presented is the only rational way to view trade. Despite the explicit inscription of a discourse of inquiry in the text (see 3.9.1), persuasion is a major dimension of the argumentation in the first three paragraphs. The main argument, that trade is always beneficial to transactants, is only one aspect of the ideational content (see 2.2.1.3) of the three paragraphs; propositional information, such as that the writer is an economics journalist, is used to construct the interpersonal relationship between writer and readers, an important dimension of which is the textual identity of the writer.

As the detailed textual analysis above has demonstrated, in the text the “order of discourse” of economics (Fairclough 2003: 24, see 2.2.3) is mobilised: the classic economics theory of Adam Smith and economics discourse is used to argue the overall benefits of globalisation. The use of a compelling blend of media discourse and rational ‘inquiry’ discourse contributes to the power of the arguments.

In the text as a whole, the overall thesis, or framing argument, is policy argument. All sub-claims work together to support the thesis that greater global economic integration should be promoted through trade liberalisation and free flows of capital, particularly in the form of foreign direct investment. The argument has a complex structure in which sub-arguments are woven together in a number of ways. Sub-headings and paragraphing are key resources used for writer-reader interaction, functioning to make the structure of the overall argument visible and to show how the minor claims relate to each other and the argument as a whole (see Figure 3.6). Fact, value and causal argument feature strongly (see Figure 3.4); however, the purpose of the text determines a hierarchy of argument types within the overall argument, with causal and evaluative arguments being at a level below the policy argument, and functioning to support the policy claims.

Factual claims are generally at the lowest level in the overall argument, with some ‘facts’ helping to establish context or used as departure points for argumentation. For example, the claim that states are “unequal” (Wolf 2008: 402) is both ‘factual’ in that it is established
empirically, being supported with reference to global statistics about income, population size and purchasing power, and evaluative, in that it is also supported by reasoning that shows how states are qualitatively unequal in terms of government and state power. Other claims are presented as if they are factual, although analysis shows that they are masquerading as ‘fact’. The example which follows illustrates how contestable claims are presented as factual: “Behind these differences between domestic and international transactions is one of the most obvious facts about the world: markets want to be cosmopolitan; states do not” (402). This claim is formulated as a general truth, but the citation attached to it shows that it is an argument, supported by a classic monograph about the “Atlantic community”, published in 1968. Presenting an argument as a fact is a rhetorical move designed to disguise the subjective nature of the claim. Furthermore, the personification of the abstract concepts, “markets” and “states”, imbuing them with ‘wants’ or intentionality, is obfuscatory. The ‘factual’ discourse positions the reader as sharing the neo-liberal values of the writer, and therefore functions to suppress criticism of the argumentation.

The text exhibits well-developed awareness of argumentation as a significant mode of thinking and communicating ideas in which the text participates. Metadiscourse associated with argument is used to refer to the co-existence of different or even conflicting views, some examples being: “current debate” (Wolf 2008: 402); “critics of globalization” (402, 405, 406); “western leftists” (404); and “From this point of view” (405). There are also claims explicitly labelled as argument: “The argument for trade is that …” (403); “Against this should be set the strong arguments in favour of …” (404); “one of the best-known arguments for protection – the infant-industry argument” (407); and “There are also arguments for …” (408). The word ‘argue’ is also used (403, 404) as an “evidential”, which Hyland views as a category of “interactive” metadiscourse (see 2.2.4.4).

The text exhibits heteroglossic engagement in frequent references to other ‘voices’ in the debate. The voices are authorities in the field of economics, with the source of their authority foregrounded in the text by epithets or qualifiers attached to the citation, for example, “Nobel-laureate Paul Samuelson” (Wolf 2008: 404); “Professor Irwin” (404); and “Ronald Jones of the University of Rochester” (405). Knowledge claims are explicitly built on the cumulative work of earlier scholars: “As Douglas Irwin of Dartmouth University argues, John Stuart Mill, one of the intellectual giants of the nineteenth century,… ” (403). The collective weight of past scholarship in the classical economics paradigm is used as support for the claims that trade liberalisation correlates with economic growth (403-404).
The principles of economic theory referred to, such as “comparative advantage” (405), are the “warrants” (Toulmin, Rieke and Janik 1979: 45, 49), and “Ricardian theory” is the “backing” for the argumentation (Toulmin, Rieke and Janik 1979: 57-58, see 2.4.3.3).

Academic argumentation demands more than dialogical engagement with the classic and current authoritative voices who share the writer’s perspective or theoretical paradigm. Researchers develop a credible ethos (see 2.4.3.2) by engaging with ideas that conflict with their own arguments. Although the text is heteroglossically-engaged, the voices that are entertained (see 2.2.2.3 on “heteroglossia”) and named are those whose theories support globalisation, as noted in the paragraph above. In the text under discussion, engagement with critics of globalisation is relatively superficial, as their criticism is not integrated into the argument in a balanced and fair way. While dissenting voices are acknowledged, they are not named and thus have less weight in the text. Authoritative voices are also carefully positioned in the broader rhetorical structure so as not to undermine the authorial voice. This claim is illustrated in the extract quoted below.

Recently, people have tended to argue for capital controls on the view that capital mobility has proved problematic for national economic management. Against this should be set the strong arguments in favour of capital mobility. The most important of these is personal freedom. Controlling the ability of people to export their capital has been among the first steps of despotic or economically destructive regimes. (Wolf 2008: 404-405)

The argument of voices in opposition to the free flow of capital appears first, followed immediately by conflicting claims that are presented as stronger arguments. Critical linguistic analysis of this short extract shows that neo-liberal values play a central role in the argumentation. The entirely subjective attitude marker, “most important”, a “stance” resource (Hyland 2008), is used to place a high valuation on “personal freedom”. Since the values are only implicit, they are less likely to be challenged. States that attempt to control capital mobility are discredited through the use of negatively evaluative language: “despotic” and “economically destructive regime”. The manipulative moves used in the extract above show how strategic choices and omissions, driven by particular sets of values, are used to strengthen the argumentation. Rather than inscribing a process of inquiry about what is correct or ‘true’, rhetorical manipulation is used for the purposes of persuasion.

There is a strong sense of the reader/s in the text. While the conventions of academic argument are generally observed, ensuring that an expert audience is not alienated, a heterogeneous audience, with different levels of disciplinary understanding, is
accommodated. Economics terminology is used, but simplification strategies make the discourse accessible to a more general readership, the most obvious example being the use of lived experience to illustrate the concept of economic globalisation in the extract discussed earlier. Discursive resources for writer-reader interaction are used extensively. The author writes as if speaking to a real interlocutor, which is in itself a persuasive strategy. An analysis of the metadiscourse in the text shows a substantial proportion of both “interactive” resources (Hyland 2005) and resources for “stance” and “engagement” (Hyland 2008, see 2.2.4.4). Effective use is made of “reader pronouns” (Hyland 2008: 11). The inclusive first person plural pronouns, are used to direct readers to imagine a world in which, “we had to grow our own food, make our own clothes and shoes, build our own houses, …be our own doctors and dentists” (Wolf 2008: 403), and to identify both the writer and the readers as concerned to help the poor: “The simplest thing we can do to alleviate mass poverty is…” (406). The reference to shared knowledge of poverty positions readers as having the same concerns and values as the writer. “Directives” (Hyland 2008” 11) and “attitude markers” (Hyland 2008: 10) are used extensively, functioning to underline the authority of the writer and to engage the readers by positioning them as sharing the attitudes, values and concerns of the writer (see 2.2.4.4). Some examples of attitude markers are: “Against this should be set the…” (Wolf 2008: 404); “These should be treated as constraints…” (406); “…It is also important to remember…” (406). Some examples of directives are: “if, say, American banks lend to…” (406); “Assume the increasing-returns story is right. …Assume also that…” (407); “Consider, for example,…” (407); and, “Think of a simple example of a car export company that is enticed by protection against imports into…” (408).

Although an ‘inquiry’ discourse (see 2.4.3.6) dominates, the text is more persuasive than it appears to be. While seeming to be objective, the text is not impersonal or devoid of emotion. On the contrary, parts of the text convey strong feelings and attitudes, as the following examples show. The exclamation, “Alas”, prefacing Wolf’s (2008: 403) observation that many countries cannot provide for their citizens’ basic needs suggests (admittedly detached) sympathy for the poor. The implications of poor countries’ unexpectedly low returns on capital are described as “disturbing” (406). At the end of a highly abstract theoretical discussion of how “capital mobility” changes the analysis of trade, the textual voice moves beyond rational inquiry to indicate affect in an aside: “(and, with the welfare of the poor countries at heart, also hope)” (405). Evaluative and metaphorical wordings are mobilised in powerful imagery which has persuasive force: states that mismanage their finances are described as “black holes in the world economy”
from which “desperate people and capital flight emerge” (403). The text is weighted with “stance” resources, some of the attitude markers inscribing authorial presence being: “The most important of these” (404); “Last and most important” (405); “This is an important point” (405); “worst of all” (406); “The big question then is…”; and, “…two other seriously negative side-effects” (407).

Neo-liberal values are also more insidiously encoded in persuasive strategies, as illustrated in the extract below, which subtly implies, rather than asserts, that there is a causal link between free trade and benefits, such as democracy:

To the extent that trade facilitates growth, for example, as it has done in the most successful post-war developing countries, it has made a powerful contribution to the arrival of democracy. One of the most encouraging developments of the past two decades is that South Korea, Taiwan and Chile, all of which began their rapid outward-looking development under dictatorships, have now become stable and vibrant democracies. (Wolf 2008: 404)

The extract also illustrates the use of evaluative language, or “attitude markers” (Hyland 2008), for persuasive purposes. The positive lexis (“growth”, “most successful”, “powerful contribution”, “outward-looking development”, “stable and vibrant democracies”) conveys the writer’s support for free trade, as does the pre-modifying evaluative phrase in theme position in the second sentence: “One of the most encouraging developments in the past two decades”. An authoritative textual voice is constructed through minimal use of “hedges” and the use of “boosters” (Hyland 2005, 2008: 9-10), one striking example of the latter being the dismissal of “infant-industry” practices as “an often repeated case of stupidity” (Wolf 2008: 408), which also strongly inscribes attitude. Dialogically contractive strategies function to strengthen the authorial voice in the text and, by extension, to make the pro-globalisation argument more convincing. Where the question form is used, it has a rhetorical rather than an expository function, for example, the question: “Is an intervention at the border ever the most direct one?”, is immediately followed by a decisive answer, “The answer is yes” (408). The strategies of rhetorical closure used demand readers’ assent.

4.2.1.2 “Is globalization reducing poverty and inequality?”

Another text from the category ‘academic research’ that was analysed in depth is the article by Robert Wade which was originally published in the journal World
Since the article challenges proponents of economic globalisation, including Martin Wolf, the contrast between the text discussed in this section and the one discussed in the previous section (see 4.2.1.1) is particularly illuminating in relation to the focus of the study, argumentation. The “Introduction” (Wade 2008: 411-412) and the “Conclusion” (421-424) are discussed in detail, as the beginning and end stages of the text are explicitly formulated as argument and amply represent the argumentational strategy of the writer in the article. Brief extracts from the article are reproduced in this text where it is appropriate for the reader to have access to the original text. The whole “Introduction” section is reproduced below.

Over the past 20 years the number of people living on less than $1 a day has fallen by 200 million, after rising steadily for 200 years.

(James Wolfensohn, president of the World Bank, World Bank, 2002)

The best evidence available shows … the current wave of globalization, which started around 1980, has actually promoted economic equality and reduced poverty.

(Dollar and Kraay, 2002; emphasis added)

Evidence suggests the 1980s and 1990s were decades of declining global inequality and reductions in the proportion of the world’s population in extreme poverty.

(Martin Wolf, The Financial Times, 2002)

(G)lobalisation has dramatically increased inequality between and within nations.

(Jay Mazur, US union leader, 2000)

Introduction

The neoliberal argument says that the distribution of income between all the world’s people has become more equal over the past two decades and the number of people living in extreme poverty has fallen for the first time in more than a century and a half. It says that these progressive trends are due in part to the rising density of economic integration between countries, which has made for rising efficiency of resource use worldwide as countries and regions specialize in line with their comparative advantage. Hence the combination of the “dollar-Wall Street” economic regime in place since the breakdown of the Bretton Woods regime in the early 1970s, and the globalizing direction of change in the world’s economy since then, serves the great majority of the world’s people well. The core solution for lagging regions, Africa above all, is freer domestic and international trade and more open financial markets, leading into deeper integration into the world economy.

[1]

118 It is the second reading in Part 8 of the Reader (Chari and Corbridge 2008: 411-426). It appears in the Reader almost in its entirety, with only one omission of a section of text, indicated by ellipsis markers on page 419.
Evidence from the current long wave of globalization thus confirms neoliberal economic theory – more open economies are more prosperous, economies that liberalize more experience a faster rate of progress... The world economy is an open system in the sense that country mobility up the income/wealth hierarchy is unconstrained by the structure. The hierarchy is in the process of being flattened; the North-South, core-periphery, rich country-poor country divide is being eroded away as globalization proceeds. The same evidence also validates the rationale of the World Trade Organization (WTO), the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and other multilateral economic organizations as agents for creating a global “level playing” field undistorted by state-imposed restrictions on markets. This line of argument is championed by the more powerful of the centers of “thinking for the world” that influence international policy making, including the intergovernmental organizations such as the World Bank, the IMF and the WTO, also the US and UK Treasuries, and opinion-shaping media such as The Financial Times and The Economist.

The standard Left assumption, in contrast, is that the rich and powerful countries and classes have little interest in greater equity. Consistent with this view, the “anti-globalization” (more accurately, “anti-neoliberal”) argument asserts that world poverty and inequality have been rising, not falling, due to forces unleashed by the same globalization (for example, union leader Jay Mazur’s quote above). The line of solution is some degree of tightening of public policy limits on the operation of market forces; though the “anti-neoliberal” camp embraces a much wider range of solutions than the liberal camp.

The debate tends to be conducted by each side as if the case was overwhelming, and only an intellectually deficient or dishonest person could see merit in other’s case. For example, Martin Wolf of The Financial Times claims that the “anti-globalization” argument is “the big lie”. If translated into public policy it would cause more poverty and inequality while pretending to do the opposite.

This paper questions the empirical basis of the neoliberal argument. In addition, it goes beyond the questions to suggest different conclusions about levels and trends, stated not in terms of certainties but stronger or weaker probabilities. Finally, it explains why we should be concerned about probably-rising world inequality, and how we might think about the neglected subject of political economy.

(Wade 2008: 411-412)

A strategy of heteroglossic engagement which is atypical in an academic journal article marks the beginning of the text: the authoritative voices of others in the broader debate on globalisation are represented in four quotations, set out one after the other as epigraphs. Significantly, an unusual range of voices is brought in, with the last quotation contradicting the pro-globalisation views expressed in the other three quotations. Whereas the first text discussed (Wolf 2008) begins with a quotation from Adam Smith, a dominant voice in economic theory, Wade brings together diverse voices representing a wide spectrum of positions: a president of the World Bank, academic authors of an article in Foreign Affairs, Martin Wolf in The Financial Times and, significantly, a voice from outside the academy who is not necessarily “legitimately pedagogised” (Bernstein 2000, see 2.3.2), a trade
union leader quoted from *Foreign Affairs*. While the first three quotations are claims that poverty and inequality are declining, the latter is a conflicting claim that inequality has increased. The quotations represent conflicting perspectives on the relationship between globalisation and inequality.

The text demonstrates a highly developed awareness of, and skilful engagement with, the processes and discourses of argumentation. From the very first words in the text, “The neoliberal argument says that…” (paragraph 1), knowledge claims are represented as contestable, therefore the focus is on argument rather than on presenting knowledge claims as facts. In two long paragraphs a summary of the key aspects of the “neoliberal argument” is presented (paragraphs 1 and 2), followed by a paragraph that briefly summarises what the textual voice refers to as the “anti-neoliberal” argument (paragraph 3).

In the “Introduction”, two perspectives on globalisation are presented objectively. The textual voice is distanced from the claims that are outlined. One distancing mechanism used is the labelling of the different perspectives as ‘neoliberal’, ‘Left’ and ‘anti-neoliberal’. Another distancing strategy is the use of metadiscourse markers that function as evidentials and/or frame markers in theme position in the sentence (that is, ‘fronted’, coming before the verb). They signal that the view represented is not that of the author, for example: “The neoliberal argument says that…”, “The standard Left assumption, in contrast…”, “This line of argument”, and “The line of solution is…”. Another distancing device is the use of the word “assumption” in the wording quoted above, which carries with it doubt or implicit criticism. The use of the word “camp”, in the references to “the ‘anti-neoliberal’ camp” and the “liberal camp”, suggests a sceptical and dismissive view of both groups, and scorn for unacademic polarisation and adversarialism.

The two perspectives are explicitly presented as being in contention in the reference to “[d]ebate” between them. Critical distance is inscribed in the textual voice in the claim that both sides interact as if “only an intellectually deficient or dishonest person could see merit in the other’s case”. Significantly for this analysis, in which texts by Wolf and Wade are placed in antagonistic relation to each other, the claim that is singled out in the text as an example of dogmaticism – “the ‘anti-globalization’ argument is ‘the big lie’”, which, “if translated into public policy … would cause more poverty and inequality while pretending to do the opposite” (paragraph 4) – is one made by Martin Wolf. Although the textual voice appears to be impartial, the selection of Wolf’s arrogant (verging on bombastic) claim is
strategic, as it positions the textual voice to challenge both Wolf’s authority and the claims of other supporters of globalisation.

In the first four paragraphs of the “Introduction”, Wade provides sufficient contextual information as background for his argument. The presentation of the issue as a battle site also functions to create intellectual anticipation, drawing the reader into the text, which is a persuasive strategy that dates back to early rhetoricians’ concern with audience, represented in the concept of *pathos* (see 2.4.3.2). The final paragraph of the “Introduction” functions as a forecasting “frame marker” (Hyland 2005: 50) for the article as a whole (see 2.2.4.4 and 3.9.3): the textual voice announces the goals and stages of the text, predicts critique of the neoliberal argument, promises critical examination of the empirical base for neoliberal claims, as well as a challenge to the neoliberal argument in the form of a counter argument (“different conclusions”) which will be presented as debatable (“stronger or weaker probabilities”). There is also a promise that explanation will be offered as to why readers should be aware of and even concerned about “world inequality”. The phrase, “the political economy of statistics”, functions to introduce the academic discipline where the warrant and backing for the argumentation lies.

Skilful use is made of the resources for “stance” and “engagement” (Hyland 2008, see Figures 2.7 and 3.6). The trustworthy *ethos* of the writer is established in the hedged phrase, “stronger or weaker probabilities” (paragraph 5). The use of “epistemic modality” (Fairclough 2003: 219) signals that instead of incautious categorical assertion, carefully judged conclusions will be offered. The use of “reader mention” (Hyland 2008: 8, 11), the first person plural pronoun “we”, positions readers as sharing the same values as the writer, and as interested in issues, such as “the political economy of statistics” that they might never have considered.

In the “Conclusion” section of the journal article, the dominant economic order, popular global media discourse on globalisation and economic liberalisation, and the powerful institution of the World Bank are challenged. Consequently, the argumentation is complex and great rhetorical skill is inscribed in the text, as the extracts and analysis below demonstrate.119

119 Only selected excerpts from the “Conclusion” section of the journal article are reproduced in the thesis; however, understanding of the analysis that was conducted requires that the reader have an overview of the structure of the relatively long conclusion. The “Conclusion” consists of four general paragraphs (two of which are reproduced above) which provide an overview. It is then divided into two sub-sections, too long to reproduce in the thesis, with the first sub-heading formulated as a question, “(a) Should we worry about
It is plausible, and important, that the proportion of the world’s population living in extreme poverty has probably fallen over the past two decades or so having been rising for decades before then. Beyond this we cannot be confident, because the World Bank’s poverty numbers are subject to a large margin of error, are probably biased downward, and probably make the trend look rosier than it really is. On income distribution, several studies suggest that world income inequality has been rising during the past two or three decades, and a study of manufacturing pay dispersions buttresses the same conclusion from another angle. The trend is sharpest when incomes are measured at market-exchange-rate incomes. This is less relevant to relative well-being than PPP-adjusted incomes, in principle; but it is highly relevant to state capacity, interstate power, and the dynamics of capitalism. One combination of inequality measures does yield the conclusion that income inequality has been falling – PPP-income per capita weighted by population, measured by an averaging coefficient such as the Gini. But take out China and even this measure shows widening inequality. Falling inequality is thus not a generalized feature of the world economy even by the most favourable measure. Finally, whatever we conclude about income inequality, absolute income gaps are widening and will continue to do so for decades.

If the number of people in extreme poverty is not falling and if global inequality is widening, we cannot conclude that globalization in the context of the dollar-Wall Street regime is moving the world in the right direction, with Africa’s poverty as a special case in need of international attention. The balance of probability is that – like global warming – the world is moving in the wrong direction. (Wade 2008: 421)

In the first part of the extract, the complex, empirically-supported ‘factual’ arguments that are made in the body of the article, which centre on whether poverty and income inequality are rising or falling, are summarised. The discourse of economics dominates, as problems with measuring income and GDP comparatively across states are discussed. The text begins with a concession move which acknowledges the claim that global economic well-being is improving.

A discourse of inquiry (see 2.4.3.6) is mobilised to construct a rational textual voice through the use of linguistic resources for hedging: “It is plausible”; “Beyond this we cannot be confident”, and the repetition of the word, “probably” (used three times in the first two sentences of paragraph 1). The markers of rational discourse, which include the “transition markers” (Hyland 2005) “because” and “thus”, are carefully balanced with wordings used for persuasion in argumentation. An example of the latter is the transition marker of contrast, “but” (used twice), which is a discursive resource for interaction with “difference” (see 2.5). The metaphorical wording, “butress[ing] the same conclusion from another angle”, can also be seen as part of a discourse of persuasion, since it explicitly rising inequality?”}, and the second in conventional truncated sub-title form, “(b) The political economy of statistics”.
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acknowledges the argumentation. Thus the discourses of both inquiry and persuasion are combined in the first paragraph. Explicit consideration of the evidence from all sides establishes fairness, which contributes to the construction of an acceptable *ethos* in the text. However, the conclusion of the opening paragraph contradicts the arguments of “the neoliberals” in the confident assertion that “absolute income gaps are widening”.

With the empirically-supported claim that income gaps are widening established in the first paragraph, the second paragraph constitutes the next move in the argumentation, which is the assertion of a causal argument: that there is a link between income disparities and globalisation. The language of rational speculation (“If… and if… we cannot conclude that…”) leads to an argument of ‘value’ (see Figure 3.4): the claim that the “balance of probability” is that globalisation “is moving [the world] in the wrong direction”. Claims that globalisation drives economic growth in all contexts are refuted by means of reasoned argumentation about relevant statistics (discussed in detail in the body of the article). The claim that the statistics used to support economic globalisation are underpinned by false assumptions allows the argument to be made that there are flaws in the reasoning behind the measurement of economic growth.

The two paragraphs that follow (not reproduced above) contain detailed argument which illustrates how statistics are manipulated. In the context of this study the author’s treatment of statistics is significant: as concepts, reasoning and strategy always precede statistical analysis, the trustworthiness of statistics as evidence for knowledge claims can always be questioned. The claim that India and China are “globalizers”, despite their employment of “substantial trade protection and trade controls”, is questioned. Since statisticians categorise the two large states as “globalizers”, the claims for the positive relationship between globalisation and economic growth, based on their calculations, are shown to be unreliable. The inclusion of the countries in the category of “globalizers” distorts the figures and misrepresents the influence of globalisation on economic performance by making it appear that openness to the global marketplace leads to economic growth. The claims of statisticians and those of the theorists (such as Wolf) who rely on their calculations are shown to be erroneous, if not dishonest.

An overview of the argumentation in the last two sub-sections of the “Conclusion” follows to illustrate the complex multi-layered structure of the arguments. In the first sub-section, headed, “Should we worry about rising inequality?” (Wade 2008: 421-423), the main argument is that the “prosperity gap” between the North and the South is a “structural divide” that will only be reduced if “international public policy” engages with the issue and
ensures “[s]ustained preferences for the South” (423). Because this policy argument is likely to be unpopular with the economic power-brokers of the world, the language of argument frames the discussion, and a number of persuasive strategies are used. The structure of this part of the conclusion initially mirrors that of the “Introduction”, as the same distancing technique is used to present the argument that there is no reason to be concerned about inequality as it “provides incentives for effort” (421).

At this stage of the overall argumentation it becomes evident that the textual voice is more closely aligned with the anti-neoliberals than the neo-liberals, as the distancing technique is not used to frame the presentation of the counter-argument, which is that inequality acts as an incentive only when inequality levels are “moderate” (Wade 2008: 421). The argument made, that high inequality is associated with “social costs”, is supported by complex causal argumentation, which is reproduced below, followed by detailed critical discourse analysis.

Higher income inequality within countries goes with: (i) higher poverty (using World Bank data and the number of people below the Bank’s international poverty line); (ii) slower economic growth, especially in larger countries such as China, because it constrains the growth of mass demand; (iii) higher unemployment; and (iv) higher crime. The link to higher crime comes through the inability of unskilled men in high inequality countries to play traditional male economic and social roles, including a plausible contribution to family income. But higher crime and violence is only the tip of a distribution of social relationships skewed toward the aggressive end of the spectrum, with low average levels of trust and social capital. In short, inequality at the national level should certainly be a target of public policy, even just for the sake of the prosperous. (Wade 2008: 422)

Both inquiry and persuasion discourses are skilfully woven together in this section. The discourse of rational inquiry dominates the first half of the paragraph. The analytical nature of the argumentation is inscribed in the following ways: the ordering of ideas by numbering points with roman numerals; the use of the marker of reason, “because”; the explanation of a causal claim: “The link to higher crime…”; and reference to empirical research, “using World Bank data”. The discourse of the second part of the paragraph is markedly different. The shift in orientation is signalled discursively by the use of the marker of contrast, “But”, in sentence-initial position. Metaphorical language (“only the tip”, “skewed” and “low levels”) is coupled with negative emotive lexis, “crime”, “violence”, “aggressive”, to conjure a disturbing scenario of mistrust, threat and danger. The reasoning having been established, the paragraph ends with dialogically contractive discourse: a confidently asserted normative claim, signalled by “should”, which is a “deontic modality” resource (Fairclough 2003: 219, see Figure 3.4). The claim is strengthened by the decisive
introductory phrase, “In short”, and the resource used for the construction of “stance” (Hyland 2008), the booster, “certainly”120. The final phrase, “even if just for the prosperous”, echoes the end of the previous paragraph: “inequality ... creates a kind of society that even crusty conservatives hate to live in, unsafe and unpleasant”. These wordings inscribe an important persuasive tactic, strategic consideration not to alienate the (almost certainly) prosperous readers, some of whom may have the power, if not the will, to address the problems highlighted in the text. The even-handed attention to the needs of the prosperous and the poor contributes to the construction of a pragmatic textual voice, and distances the writer from the ‘bleeding heart’ identity that might be attributed to argumentation that focuses exclusively on the suffering of the disenfranchised in the context of disciplinary discourse.

It is also worth discussing the use of support for the arguments made in the paragraph discussed above. In the section dominated by rational discourse, evidence is marshalled by academic citations121. Consultation of the “Notes” and “References” sections of the text under discussion (Chari and Corbridge 2008a: 424-426) reveals that while the prestigious academic publication, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, is cited twice, authoritative sources from outside the bounds of the knowledge domain of Development Studies and the discipline of economics are used to support the claim that domestic inequality is linked to crime, as indicated by citation of articles from *Deviant Behaviour: an Interdisciplinary Journal* and *Criminal Justice Review* (425). In contrast, in the persuasive section (the second half of the paragraph), authoritative sources are not used to support the claims, as the authority to make personal evaluative claims has been established already in the first part of the paragraph by means of analytical argumentation.

The next stage in the overall argumentation is a causal argument that inequality can lead to conflict or political instability when individuals compare themselves to their wealthier neighbours, particularly since “prevailing norms” increasingly affirm equality. The writing is unusually speculative for an academic text, even for one in the Development Studies domain, with the hedges, “perhaps”, “may” (used four times), and “can be expected to”, modalising the claims made. The argument is carried by reasoning, as indicated by the discourse of reason, which is inscribed in the use of the transition markers for reasoning,  
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120 In Fairclough’s terms, the adverb indicating certainty is labelled a resource for “epistemic modality” (see Figure 3.4).
121 In the reproduction in this thesis of the original text, the numbering indicating citations in endnotes, and the endnotes themselves, were omitted.
“as” (used three times), “since”, and “because”; and markers for inscribing comparison, “… where … than where …” (Wade 2008: 422).

Three of the four paragraphs at the end of the section of text that focuses on income inequality are reproduced below, with the omission of the middle paragraph, indicated by ellipsis markers122. This is followed by close critical linguistic analysis.

[1] Rising inequality may generate conflict between states, and – because the *market-exchange-rate* income gap is so big – make it cheap for rich states to intervene to support one side or the other in civil strife. Rising inequality in market-exchange-rate-terms – helped by a high US dollar, a low (long-run) oil price, and the WTO agreements on intellectual property rights, investment, and trade in services – allows the United States to finance the military sinews of its postimperial empire more cheaply. …

[2] In the end, the interests of the rich and powerful should, objectively, line up in favor of greater equity in the world at large, because some of the effects of widening inequality may contaminate their lives and those of their children. This fits the neoliberal argument. But the route to greater equity goes not only through the dismantling of market rules rigged in favor of the rich – also consistent with the neoliberal argument – but through more political (non-market) influence on resource allocation in order to counter the tendency of free markets to concentrate incomes and power. This requires international public policy well beyond the boundaries of neoliberalism.

[3] The need for deliberate international redistribution is underlined by the evidence that world poverty may be higher in absolute numbers than is generally thought, and quite possibly rising rather than falling; and that world income inequality is probably rising too. This evidence suggests that the income and prosperity gap between a small proportion of the world’s population living mainly in the North and a large proportion living entirely in the South is a structural divide, not just a matter of lag in the South’s catch-up. Sustained preferences for the South may be necessary if the world is to move to a single-humped and more narrowly dispersed distribution over the next century. (Wade 2008: 422-423)

Summed up, the ideational content of the first paragraph is a generalised observation about what could happen in the future, given global inequality between states. In terms of argument, there is what can be seen as a main claim, which is that inequality between states can lead to conflict between them, in which wealthy states are able (and apt) to interfere. This claim is ‘fronted’ in the first sentence of the paragraph. However, the discourse also functions at an ideological level to offer critique of the United States which is most powerfully conveyed in the metaphorical wordings, “military sinews” and “postimperial empire”. The lexis signals the writer’s critical position on the history of US

122 The numbering of the paragraphs is mine, since the omitted paragraph is not included in the numbering.
intervention in wars where it benefited by gaining key resources and power over regions beyond its jurisdiction.

In the second paragraph, the claim that it is in the interests of the wealthy that there is less inequality is presented as objective and logical through the use of the attitude marker, "objectively", and the marker of reason, "because". There is an echo of the pragmatic 'bracketing' of moral issues seen earlier in the text, "Aside from the moral case against it" (Wade 2008: 422). In explicitly excluding morality, the alienation of readers who may see discussion of values as irrelevant in the academic context of a journal article is avoided. In this formulation, academic objectivity is inscribed while, simultaneously, the moral case against inequality is asserted. The critique of inequality is supported by the reiteration that it is dangerous for the rich, but the reader is left to consider the case without any further explicit direction from the textual voice. Despite the invocation of objectivity in the use of a discourse of inquiry, "stance" resources are used to construct a strong authorial voice (Hyland 2008). Attitude markers and critical lexis are used to convey critique of wealth and power exercised without conscience, as is seen in the representation of American military interventions discussed above, and in the use of one pithy word, "rigged", in the second paragraph, which carries connotations of injustice, criminality and deceit. These lexical choices position the textual voice on the side of the political left.

In paragraph 3 (the final stage of the section on rising inequality), the argumentation becomes increasingly speculative, with claims supported by hypothesising and reasoning more than by reference to empirical research. In consideration of the global future, claims are made using the modal adverbs, "possibly" and "probably", and the modal auxiliary, "may". The modalised formulations function to limit the force of the claims, in keeping with the academic ethos expected of the textual voice in this context. Significantly, they also facilitate the expression of what is referred to as "the unthinkable" and "the impossible" (Bernstein 2000: 30, see 2.3.2). This is an aspect of academic argumentation that has been underestimated in a climate which tends to favour empirical above speculative claims.

The final part of the article conclusion, "The political economy of statistics" (Wade 2008: 423-424), uses equally persuasive rhetorical techniques to assert the fallibility of the World Bank statistics used by neoliberals to support globalization, and the need for an "independent auditor" to "verify" them. The text as a whole contains an intricate combination of different kinds of argumentation, including empirical 'fact', cause, value and policy arguments (see 2.4.3). Statistics that suggest global poverty is declining are
challenged, and the counter-argument that poverty is rising is presented. An argument of value, that poverty is a problem, is introduced from a pragmatic rather than a moral perspective. This argument is made in order to make a policy claim, a call for a change in the methods used to calculate poverty statistics which would reduce error and bias. The text concludes with reiteration of the overarching policy claim: a recommendation that economic inequality should be addressed by “deliberate international redistribution” (423).

Extensive use is made of the discursive resources of “stance” and “engagement” in the construction of writer-reader interaction (Hyland 2008). The engagement resources of the first person plural pronouns, “we” and “us”, are used to forge an alliance with the reader. The text is more heteroglossically engaged (Martin and White 2005) than the one written by Wolf (see 4.2.1.1). It not only includes many voices, but it also explicitly sets up a dialogue between the conflicting ideas of the neoliberals and the left. This claim is supported by the titles of the texts from which the extracts come. The title of Wolf’s book is a dialogically contractive assertion (Martin and White 2005), “Why globalization works”, while the title of Wade’s journal article is a dialogically expansive form, a question, “Is globalization reducing poverty and inequality?” (see 2.2.2.3). However, as has been shown in the analysis above, while the Wade’s article is more dialogically expansive than the extract from Wolf’s book, Wade’s text is no less positioned or persuasive. It makes extensive use of strategies to position the reader in ways that make the arguments more convincing. While Wade’s argument is based on statistics produced in empirical research conducted by the World Bank (Chari and Corbridge 2008a: 413, 417 & 420) and contributors to the Global Poverty Workshop (414-416), his reasoning about the validity and reliability of the statistics is the key aspect of the overall argument, which is persuasively presented using a wide range of rhetorical strategies.

4.2.1.3 “Feminism, the Taliban, and the politics of counter-insurgency”

The article by Hirschkind and Mahmood123, published in 2002 in Anthropological Quarterly, contrasts with the other two texts discussed (4.2.1.1 and 4.2.1.2) in terms of both content and argumentation. The title of the article inscribes ideational content which is tangential to the dialogue on globalisation represented by the other two texts, and the discourses and argumentation used also differ markedly, as discussion of the analysis that was conducted shows.

---

123 An extract from this text appears in Chari and Corbridge (2008: 465-471).
The text draws primarily on media discourse, but in asserting oversimplification in the attribution of the cultural meaning/s of the veil, it also draws on conceptually demanding analysis of symbolism and the discourses of cultural studies. It begins in the narrative style that is characteristic of magazine journalism: “On a cool breezy evening in March 1999, Hollywood celebrities turned out in large numbers …” (Hirschkind and Mahmood 2008: 465). Three paragraphs of anecdotal description of a social event which was part of a high-profile campaign against the Taliban are used in the build-up to the authors’ statement of the issue that sparked the article, American military intervention to ‘liberate’ Afghan women from the oppression of the Taliban.

The writers’ interest is in exploring “key factors” underlying the difficult relationship between the United States (US) and Afghanistan: “silence” about the US role in the suffering of Afghan women, and the “questionable assumptions, anxieties, and prejudices embedded in the notion of Islamic fundamentalism” (Hirschkind and Mahmood 2008: 466). Their “main concern” is “to address the larger set of assumptions and attitudes” which gave strength and legitimacy to the feminist campaign to ‘liberate’ Afghan women. The article concludes with a policy argument, calling for a more complex reading of the interplay between religion and contextual factors such as culture and politics, and for a more nuanced understanding of both the Muslim religion in general and, specifically, the wearing of the veil.

To support their thesis, they offer two main arguments. The first is that the US is partly responsible for the suffering of Afghans, both through its contribution to the militarisation of Afghanistan, which resulted in the innocent being subjected to violence (Hirschkind and Mahmood 2008: 468), and through the subsequent campaign against the Taliban, which resulted in the reduction of humanitarian aid to the region when it was most needed (469). The second main argument, in a section with the sub-heading, “public religion”, is that the meaning attributed by observers to the wearing of the veil – female submission to male and religious authority – is a reductionist simplification, and that the veil is not necessarily a symbol of female oppression.

In comparison to the other academic research texts discussed in this chapter, the argumentation is unusual in two main respects: the kinds of support used for claims made and the sources of information. Support for claims is less scholarly than in conventional social scientific research, there being less rigour in the choice of information sources that are cited. For example, the authors quote the voice of an unnamed CIA official who, when questioned about why the US was funding extremist groups, said, “Fanatics fight better”.

This single example from unofficial non-academic discourse presents the US in an unfavourable way, and it could be argued that the use of the quotation shows that the authors are biased against the US. Support for the authors’ claims that Cold War counter-insurgency is a cause of Afghan suffering come mainly from the narration of recent history as reported in the news media. Rather than coming from peer reviewed research articles or scholarly monographs, the sources of claims that are represented as facts are mainly newspapers, such as New York Times and Washington Post, popular periodicals, such as Christian Science Monitor, The Village Voice and The New Yorker, and press releases. Analysis of the reference section showed that only two of twenty-two citations in the article are from academic journals.

Argumentation is not foregrounded by the writers. The meandering introduction stage of the text is a description of a celebrity event that functions interactively to draw the reader into the text. Even where there is substantive discussion of the issues in the text, the discourse of inquiry (see 2.4.3.6) dominates in the text. No argument meta-language is used. Instead, reference is made to two “key factors” that the writers “wish to explore” (Hirschkind and Mahmood 2008: 466), and later to the “main concern” that they “address” (467). These phrasings suggest a spirit of inquiry and a preference for impartial discussion. Despite the absence of explicit reference to argument, the text contains contentious claims that challenge the powerful official American discourses of “imperial militarism” and “liberal feminism” (465). In effect, the authors argue what was unsayable for most American citizens at the time the article was published in 2002: that the US was complicit in the very suffering they ostensibly acted to stop. Thus it may be that the absence of explicit argumentation is itself a rhetorical technique used to lull the reader into an uncritical state of mind which is likely to be more accepting of the unpalatable claims made in the text. Despite attention not being explicitly drawn to argumentation, the text exhibits rhetorical techniques used to persuade the reader to accept the claims and overall argument. The most striking aspect of the text is the extensive use of resources for writer-reader “interaction”, particularly the use of “stance” and “engagement” resources for positioning the reader (Hyland 2008). Attitude markers are used to signal the writers’ expectations, for example, “Not surprisingly” (Hirschkind and Mahmood 2008: 466), and what they see as noteworthy, for example: “this remarkable consensus”, “It was striking how…” (466), “It is striking that…”, “the stunning history of the conflict in Afghanistan” (467), “The most striking example”, ”The point is that…”, and “It is interesting that…” (470).
The wording of propositional claims functions to convey the authors’ criticism or disapproval. Their attitudes are conveyed through the use of adjectival attitude markers, intensified by boosters in the second, fourth, fifth and sixth examples that follow: “narrow focus”, “dangerous simplification of a vastly more complicated problem”, “dramatic reduction”, “the most destitute”, “One of the many problems with such a formulation…”, and “the question is far more complicated than suggested here” (Hirschkind and Mahmood 2008: 469-470). The choice of strong adjectives and adverbs negatively colours the representation of what the reader is positioned to perceive as the ‘antagonists’, Americans who are ignorant of the contextual differences between the US and Afghanistan. The “Feminist Majority” are “stubbornly focused” on the problems of Taliban rule, US bombs “severely restricted” food aid (466), the US-funded arms pipeline into Afghanistan was “notoriously corrupt” (468), and the feminist campaign resulted in “the dramatic reduction of humanitarian aid” (469). Powerful imagery and emotive language is used to elicit readers’ sympathy for the Afghans, as demonstrated in the examples selected below: “…from the rubble left behind by the game of super power politics played out on Afghan bodies and communities” (467) and “catastrophic situation” (468). Irony is used to highlight the absurdity of US action: “In the crusade to liberate Afghan women from the tyranny of Taliban rule, there seemed to be no limit of the violence to which Americans were willing to subject the Afghans” (466). In the quotation that follows, the innocuous adjective, “neat”, functions ironically to subtly suggest a convenient narrowness of vision: “It is striking that even among many of those who came to acknowledge the US involvement in the civil war in Afghanistan, the neat circuit of women’s oppression, Taliban evil, and Islamic fundamentalism remains largely unchallenged.” (467). The use of sensational detail is another manipulative device used in the text, which is exemplified in the mention that one of the groups supported by the US was led by a man, “known for throwing acid in the faces of women who refused to wear the veil” (467).

“Engagement” resources are also used extensively in the text (Hyland 2008, see Figure 2.7). The most common engagement markers used are the inclusive first person plural pronouns. A sense of solidarity with the reader is created by reference to shared knowledge, for example, “It has been common knowledge for anyone interested in the region…” (Hirschkind and Mahmood 2008: 468). Directives function in a number of ways: they suggest the authors are engaged in a mutual task with the reader, for example, “Let us consider each of these” (467), they suggest specific action, for example, “…we need to put to question the idea…”, “Think of the very different contexts…”, and “Note that…” (470). Finally, a mild form of obligation modal, “need to”, functions as both an attitude
marker and a directive that is used to urge a more considered approach to the issues: “We need a way to think about...”, and “We need to recognize that...”. The conclusion is highly rhetorical, with the repetition of the formulation, “We need...”, conferring a sonorous quality that is characteristic of hortatory rather than analytical argumentation (Martin 1992: 563).

4.2.2 Overview of other prescribed academic research texts

The discussion now moves on to provide an overview of the focus of the argumentation and the type of arguments used in some other academic research texts. The extract from Partha Dasgupta’s 2001 book, Human Well-Being and the Natural Environment, uses statistical information about the world’s poorest regions to critique and extend the arguments about “genuine savings” by World Bank economists in order to make the claim that the Indian subcontinent and sub-Saharan Africa have become even poorer over the last thirty years. His key argument is that taking account of “human and natural capital” in the calculation of countries’ “genuine investment” can make for substantial differences in the conceptualisation and evaluation of development.

The 1990 article by Amartya Sen concerns “what is clearly one of the more momentous, and neglected, problems facing the world today” (Sen 2008: 439): millions of women have died due to neglect and unequal access to resources and medical care. The first part of the argument is factual: population statistics and calculations of the average ratio between men and women in any population group are used to support the claim that more than a hundred million women have “disappeared” in China, South Asia, West Asia and North Africa. The second part of the argument engages with causal arguments by questioning the two common explanations for the neglect of women, one being a cultural argument about gender inequity between East and West, and the other being an economic argument about underdevelopment. While conceding that “there might be elements of truth” in both these explanations, Sen dismisses both as unconvincing “as a general thesis” (434). Eastern countries where women are not discriminated against are cited as counter-examples which show that there are many exceptions to the simplistic generalisation that Eastern countries are biased against women, resulting in a disproportionate female death-rate. Similarly, with the economic argument, poor countries where women have equal status with men are cited as counter-examples which disprove the claim that underdevelopment is responsible for the disproportionate female death-rate. Sen argues
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124 These are the other texts which constituted Part 8 of the Reader (Chari and Corbridge 2008).
125 This information is presented in a table entitled: “Genuine investment and capital deepening in selected regions, 1970-1993”, which is discussed in depth in the article.
that a far more complex and nuanced explanation for female neglect is required, which
takes into account “economic, social and cultural factors”, as well as regional differences.
Empirical evidence is used to show that female employment outside the home is strongly
associated with female life expectancy. He demonstrates that “gainful employment”
outside the household is one of the most significant factors in accounting for female well-
being (436-437). He concludes by making a plea for better understanding of the problem if
it is to be addressed by means of “political action and public policy” (438-439). Although
causal arguments are used, the text functions overall as a persuasive policy argument. It
demonstrates a fine balance between inquiry and persuasion (see 2.4.3.6), drawing
equally on rational claims based in empirical research and on rhetorical techniques which
highlight the plight of women in societies where they are neglected. Although the
knowledge claims are ‘objectively’ presented, and very adequately supported with
scholarship (seventeen sources are cited) and empirical evidence, the argumentation has
an interpersonal dimension. Analysis of “engagement” and “stance” (Hyland 2008, see
2.2.4.4) shows how these resources are used to persuade the reader of the seriousness of
the problem addressed in the text. Just two examples from the text exemplify this claim. In
a sentence from the introductory section the first person plural pronoun is used to involve
the reader in the issue addressed in the text, and attitude markers are used to construct
the author’s stance: “These numbers tell us, quietly, a terrible story of inequality and
neglect leading to excess mortality of women” (Sen 2008: 434). The same discursive
resources are used with similar effect in the concluding sentence: ‘We confront here what
is clearly one of the most momentous, and neglected, problems facing the world today’
(440).

The extract (Chari and Corbridge 2008a: 442-450) from a journal article by Bina Agarwal,
originally published in 2000 in the Cambridge Journal of Economics\(^{127}\), draws on the
author’s fieldwork in India to make an argument about communal forest protection and
gender in India and Nepal. The text functions as a warning that the future of the forests is
compromised by the absence of gender equity in the management of community forestry
groups.

Before being included in the compilation edited by Chari and Corbridge\(^{128}\), Brooke
Grundfest Schoepf’s article appeared in two other incarnations: first in 1988 in the

\(^{127}\) The extract appears under the same title as it had when it was published in journal article form,
‘Conceptualising environmental collective action: why gender matters.’

\(^{128}\) The extract discussed can be found in the Reader (Chari and Corbridge 2008: 452-463).
Feminism: The Politics of Survival in Sub-Saharan Africa, the re(con)textualisations of the text suggesting its value in a number of different academic contexts. The text is based on five years’ research in Zaire in the “transdisciplinary” action-research-based “CONAISSIDA Project”. Discussion of micro-level empirical research in the ethnographic tradition, supplemented by theoretical discussion of “macrolevel political economy”, is used to make the overarching argument that poverty, gender inequality and gendered perceptions of AIDS hamper prevention of the disease.

4.3 Practitioner research texts from “Development theory and policy in South Africa”

In contrast to research texts produced in the academy (see 4.2), practitioner research texts are generated in contexts of application and evaluation, primarily government departments, private consultancies contracted to government projects, or civil society organisations. It is arguable that the kind of knowledge produced in these texts is different to that discussed in the previous section, as it addresses concrete local and national problems. The texts are produced relatively quickly for use by a more diverse readership than the academic texts. Not being peer-reviewed, the texts represent a less highly respected form of knowledge production which is not as highly codified, and is therefore less bound by academic and generic conventions.

The first group of texts discussed in this section (see 4.3.1) are published by the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC), a government-funded body tasked with producing knowledge that is relevant in the South African context. Documents produced by the HSRC are of public interest, and are generally freely available on the HSRC website, and published in hard copy by the HSRC Press, a non-profit company. In the second sub-section (see 4.3.2), analysis of excerpts from a text produced by the Institute for Justice and Reconciliation (IJR) are discussed.

4.3.1 Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) texts

Changing Social Policy: The Child Support Grant in South Africa is a 118-page account of how the State Maintenance Grant (SMG) was replaced by the Child Support Grant (CSG), and of the production of the report in which the recommendation to change the policy was made. The author, Francie Lund, was a key decision-maker in the conceptualisation and implementation of the CSG. She discusses the evidence used, the findings of the report

129 These texts dominated the list of prescribed and recommended reading for the Development Studies module on theory and policy in South Africa which students engaged with in the third-last semester of 2008.
and, with ten years’ hindsight, comments on the subsequent implementation of the policy. Ostensibly a research publication, the text is an unusual hybrid mix of writing genres and discourses, which exhibits traces of investigative report, historical and personal narrative, reflection, and advocacy. It is described as being of interest “across disciplines”, and is in effect transdisciplinary, drawing on the “orders of discourse” (Fairclough 2003: 24) of a number of knowledge domains and disciplines, including, “political science, economics, sociology, anthropology and administrative law” (Lund 2008: ix-x). The text functions both as a history of the making of a particular policy and as a justification of personal and politico-economic choices. It represents an attempt to be fair and “even-handed” (xiii), but is also a highly rhetorical text in which the ethos of the writer features strongly in the argumentation. Clashing discourses are drawn on in the text as different identities are asserted: activist, scholar and functionary in the post-Apartheid government. The discourses range across the spectrum, from bureaucratic to postcolonial discourse. Consequently, the text is an unusual blend of narrative, reportage, reasoning and argumentation. The text appears not to feature argument, there being no argument “framing” (Hyland 2005: 51), with the author explicitly labelling it as “narrative” (Lund 2008: x). Analysis of the text as a whole, however, shows that substantial portions of the text involve argumentation, as the author reports on arguments and debates, problematises the use of particular terms and justifies decisions. Despite the predominance of inquiry-oriented factual narrative (see figure 3.4), the text contains a less visible but (for this very reason) subtly persuasive kind of argumentation.

Analysis of the author’s reflections shows that argumentation in policy development affects all dimensions of being, and can give rise to powerful emotion. Her affective investment in the process of changing South Africa’s social grant policy is inscribed in the text in references to “moments of real despair and sadness” and “acute embarrassment” (Lund 2008: 116). The text shows that the kind of argumentation involved in policy-making is different from academic argumentation, as it is not limited to the abstract realm of the intellect. More is at stake, as policy arguments have more direct material effects in the world. Government policy is linked to conflict and contestation over material and social ‘goods’ (Gee 1996). Policy-making involves ‘real’ debates in which differing opinions are expressed from the “positions of different individuals and interest groups” (Lund 2008: x). Argumentation in the form of debate within the committee, and in the public sphere, is represented as a natural and essential part of policy-making. The ideational content of the text shows that policy-construction involves choices that ultimately affect people’s lives. Making changes to public policy often requires consideration of the conflicting needs of
different social groups, compromise decisions, and justification in public forums. Obviously, argument is a central dimension of both the material processes of policy construction and the constitutive discursive representations of the processes.

Lund emphasises that her views are partial and incomplete, describing the text as, “only [her] version” and as her “story”. At the end of the “Preface”, she urges others to write their own accounts of events to serve as “[c]omplementary narratives, especially conflicting ones”, in order to “deepen understanding” (Lund 2008: xiii). Since the expression of different, even conflicting, views is acknowledged to be valuable and productive, and as there are no claims to “truth” or even comprehensive representation, a constructivist epistemology is inscribed.

The other HSRC text which was analysed was a State of the Nation publication (Buhlungu, Daniel, Southall and Lutchman 2006). According to the Foreword of the 2005-2006 edition of the State of the Nation, which was the third published annual collection of, “original essays upon the politics, economy, society and international relations of contemporary South Africa” (Orkin 2006: xi), it draws on analysis from academics, civil society organizations, journalists and private consultants. The text is prescribed at university and is also a general interest text, bought by “ordinary South Africans … to find out more about the complex and fascinating country we live in” (xi). It appears to be written primarily for academics, researchers and policy-makers. From that volume, Roger Southall’s introduction (2006: xvii-xliv) is analysed more closely below.

Southall’s text is challenging reading for anyone without solid background knowledge of South African politics, and familiarity with both political and economic trends and the associated discourses. It assumes knowledge of recent texts of national importance – the previous State of the Nation publication (2004-2005) and the 2005 annual Presidential State of the Nation speech – and familiarity with the debate on the question of whether or not South Africa is becoming a developmental state. While the textual voice appears to be objective, the author’s views not being foregrounded, energetic debate among the proponents of the different positions, who “repudiate criticism” and argue “vigorously”, is reported (Southall 2006: xxiv). Extensive use of the words “argument” and “debate” highlight the contentiousness of the issues.

An outline of relevant recent history is provided as background to the topic, the question of whether South Africa is becoming a ‘developmental state’, is provided in the first five pages of the text. Speculation and arguments that the ruling political party, the African
National Congress, and the South African government support a developmental state approach are summarised with “rigour” and “evidence-based scrutiny” (Southall 2006: xi). Support for claims come from the authoritative voices of official discourse (government speeches and documents) and media discourse (editorials in reputable newspapers). In terms of type of argument used, this part of the text functions as an argument of definition/‘fact’ (see 2.4.3.4) that South Africa is in the process of becoming a developmental state. In the second stage of the text (from xxii) the question of whether a developmental state approach is likely to be successful is addressed. Three positions are outlined. The first is that of “economic liberals”, who are wary of a developmental state, fearing it will hamper economic development and serve the interests of the ruling party’s elite (xxii-xxiv). The second is that of “Jacobins” (xxiv), who aim to develop a strong national base of black capitalists. The third is that of “developmentalists”, who believe the state should intervene to protect and develop business in order to promote economic growth (xxvii-xxx).

Overall, Southall’s introductory article functions as a heteroglossically-engaged (see 2.2.2.3) argument of inquiry (see 2.4.3.6), which provides an exposition of the issues and an argument that the concerns and insights of each group can contribute to the creation of a unique kind of developmental state in South Africa that integrates democratic values and economic growth. The conclusion is that there are no simple “right” answers, and an assertion of the value of differing views: “Our three schools of thought tend to provide different answers, but it is in their clash of ideas that innovative and productive solutions may emerge” (Southall 2006: xliii). This assertion is an affirmation of the value of argumentation in the development field.

4.3.2 The Institute for Justice and Reconciliation (IJR) texts

The back cover of the 2005 edition of the Economic Transformation Audit, sub-titled “Conflict and Governance” (Brown 2005), highlights its social justice agenda. Standing out from the rest of the text in large bold font are quotations from two South Africans who are strongly associated with the fight for social justice. Mamphela Ramphele describes the Audit itself as “revolutionary” because it “questions how we, the South African society, are doing”, and Archbishop Desmond Tutu hails the Audit as “an essential contribution to the search for economic justice”. On the back cover of the text the verbs used to describe the role of the series of which the publication is a part, “interrogates” and “scrutinises”, draw on the discourse of inquiry, and suggest a critical perspective on South Africa’s economic transformation agenda. The text that is analysed in depth, the introduction, sub-titled
“Growth is not enough” (Brown and Folscher 2005: x-xvi), highlights the overall argument: that economic growth that does not result in the improvement of the lives of the poor is unsatisfactory because it does not necessarily include human transformation.

In contrast to the overtly polemical oppositional discourse mobilised on the back cover of the publication, academic discourse predominates in the “Introduction” stage of the text where the aims of the publication are stated. The use of the words “reasoned and systematic” represents the content of the publication as reliable, drawing on the scientific-oriented discourse of inquiry. The repetition of the word “analysis” (it appears four times in three consecutive paragraphs, Brown and Folscher 2005: x) highlights the value placed on analytical mental processes. However, in the same paragraph, it is claimed that the publication, “aims to challenge existing rhetorical wisdom”, and to stimulate “national dialogue”, which suggests that argumentation plays an important role in the text. Analysis of the “Introduction” as a whole proves it to be persuasive as well as analytical. Manipulation of both typography and semantics strengthens the argument. For example, a key claim, that “transformation” will occur only if the economy grows enough to enable “inclusiveness and productive redistribution”, is highlighted, standing out on the first page of the text in large typeface and surrounded by blank space. The voice of Amartya Sen is drawn on as a resource in the choice of a definition of poverty as a lack of independence and freedom of choice, rather than as a lack of material necessities (xii). The appropriation of Sen’s arguments suggests that a human rights perspective on development predominates in the publication.

In keeping with the stated aim of providing “an interdisciplinary and holistic” picture, the text draws on a variety of academic “orders of discourse” (Fairclough 2003: 24), including economics and politics, as well as the discourses of governance, human rights and justice. “Engagement” resources (Hyland 2008: 8) are used extensively. The first person pronoun “we” is used throughout the text to position the reader as sharing the values of the writers. In the concluding section of the introduction, concession-counterargument resources are used for dialogical contraction (Martin and White 2005, see figure 2.4). The voices of those who do not prioritise social justice goals, which conflict with those of the authors, are acknowledged in the concession that equality and human and social rights may be “expensive” (Brown and Folscher 2005: xvi). The concession is followed by the counter-argument that South Africa’s Constitution protects human rights. The unstated implication is that obstruction of social justice is opposition to the law. While it is acknowledged that there is “space for contestation”, the discourse of constitutional law is drawn on in the
confident assertion: “we cannot find a way to our optimum growth path without working within our democratically chosen framework.” (xvi). The use in the wording of the auxiliary verb form “cannot” to effect dialogical contraction, and the use of positive evaluation in the wordings “optimum growth” and “democratically chosen” as qualifiers, have persuasive force.

A number of recommendations follow on the same page (Brown and Folscher 2005: xvi), which are effectively arguments of policy. The importance of minimizing regulations that hamper small businesses is underlined by the repeated use of the attitude marker “urgent”. The recommendation that the education sector be reformed is represented persuasively as a “need”. The booster “all” and the negative evaluations contained in the wordings “failed” and “downward slide” are used to emphasise the widespread problem of managerial incapacity. The precarious position of women is highlighted with the emotive phrases “right at the bottom of the pile” and “worsening inequality”. The section is concluded with the use of the emphatic attitude marker, “It is important to remember…”, the “stance” resource (Hyland 2008: 8) functioning to construct an authoritative textual voice.

From the perspective of critical discourse analysis, the use of the first person plural pronoun in the last paragraph is worthy of examination as a rhetorical strategy: “While we acknowledge our achievements, we must also candidly admit that it is increasingly part of popular public perception that policy is made and implementation managed from behind closed doors, often on the basis of internal party politics, involving political connections, favouritism and power trade-offs” (Brown and Folscher 2005: xvi). The meaning of the pronoun subtly shifts across the sentence, moving from inclusive reference to all South Africans to a necessarily veiled reference to the South African government and the ruling political party. The strategic “move” (Swales 2004), which allows the text to give voice to mild reproach, underlines the rift between informed popular opinion and government.

The “briefing” text from the same publication selected for analysis, “Divisions about the Developmental State” (Joffe 2005: 27-30) is explicit about the controversial debates centred on the policy shifts in the South African government. That the developmental state is a contested concept is signalled by the first word in the title, “Divisions”. That the debates are rooted in material conflict between different political and economic interest groups is explicitly stated: “Such debates have not been merely academic but tie into more overt conflicts over the presidential succession…” (27).
The metalanguage of argumentation provides one of the strongest cohesive threads in the text. The words “debate”, “question” and “challenge” are used repeatedly, and “interactive” transition and frame markers (Hyland 2005: 50-52, see Figure 2.5) associated with argument and reasoning abound throughout the text. In addition, the voices of key sources are acknowledged, their major arguments being incorporated into the text. The author acknowledges that the view presented in the text is partial, and therefore contestable: the word “arguably” is used explicitly to signal this heteroglossic orientation twice in the text (Joffe 2005: 28-30). However, the textual voice is reasoned and authoritative. The skilful use of resources for “stance” and “engagement” strengthens the credibility of the textual voice, suggesting that the author has the requisite knowledge and experience to make valid judgements. A delicate balance between “hedges” and “boosters” (see Figure 2.7) is achieved: there is sufficient use of hedging for the text to be credible as scholarship to an academic audience, but boosters are also used to convey certainty and to construct authority. ‘Factual’ description and narrative are blended with informed speculation, leading up to a proposal outlining a course of action. The policy argument offered is, effectively, an authoritative challenge to government policy.

4.4 The nature of argumentation in the ‘expert knowledge’ texts of Development Studies

Analysis of the texts selected allows conclusions to be made about the nature of argumentation in the knowledge domain of Development Studies as it is represented in the case study. The analysis showed that argument is the feature that all the texts have in common. Furthermore, across the range of texts that were selected, argument is not only present in the texts; it is at the core of each text. The co-existence of competing perspectives and knowledge claims in other social science knowledge domains (see 2.3.6) lead to the expectation that argumentation is important in Development Studies texts. The findings in this chapter not only confirm the centrality of argumentation in Development Studies, but also provide support for the claim that, as a dimension of the texts that are produced in the field of production in the knowledge domain, the importance of argumentation is underestimated. In terms of Maton’s legitimation code theory (see 2.3.2), it seems that “knower codes” rather than “knowledge codes” may dominate in the legitimation of Development Studies knowledge.

It was found that there was a significant degree of generic variation across the texts in the sample. Since the texts embody a wide range of text participants and role relationships, as
well as a variety of goals (see 2.2.4.5, and Figure 3.6), there is also wide variation in the “grounds” (see Figure 2.11) or kinds of support, that are used to justify the claims that are made. Forms of support range from empirically-grounded statistics and research-based factual information to rhetorical strategies. In the academic research texts, support for claims is primarily citation of authoritative sources in other published research (but see 4.2.1.3 for an exception). However, in the practitioner research texts, texts from the media are frequently cited as support for claims.

The extraordinary variety of discourses used in the texts analysed are evidence of the “weak grammar” (Bernstein 2000: 163-164) that allows the coexistence of incommensurable discourses, or competing “idiolects”, typical of a “horizontal” (162) knowledge structure (see 2.3.6). The dominant knowledge structures and discourses on which the academic texts draw fall mainly into the broad domain of economics, but anthropology, a wide range of sub-disciplines, from political economy (see 4.2.1.2) to medical anthropology (see 4.2.2), and some interdisciplinary study areas, such as cultural studies (see 4.2.1.3) and gender studies (see 4.2.2), are also used. Consequently, there is marked variation in the kinds of reasoning, or “warrants” that are used (see Figure 2.11). Since underlying values and assumptions, the “backing”, function to support the “warrants”, there is also variation in the knowledge that underpins the argumentation. The underlying reasoning and theoretical underpinning in texts are most often not made explicit. In practitioner research texts, where discipline-specific values cannot be assumed, the warrant and backing for arguments can be related to any number of implicit knowledge structures, and also to moral or political ideologies. Consequently, the underlying argumentation in these texts is likely to be more difficult to interpret.

All the texts analysed exhibit a mix of the four argument types that have been identified: fact/definition, cause, value and policy (see 2.4.3.4). However, a consistent overall pattern was noted: in the sample of both the academic and practitioner research texts of Development Studies, there appears to be a hierarchy among the argument types, with claims about policy being at the top of the hierarchy. Policy arguments are generally overarching, serving as the main organising principle in the argument macrostructure, and governing the subordinate-level arguments of fact/definition, cause and value. Analysis of a much larger, more representative, sample of texts would be necessary to establish whether policy arguments are typical of the knowledge constructed in the field of knowledge production. However, since Development Studies is primarily an applied knowledge domain where knowledge is used to inform practice, it would not be surprising
if policy arguments feature most prominently in other text samples. A related observation from analysis of the practitioner research texts is that the application of Development Studies knowledge is primarily discursive, the applied aspect of Development Studies being primarily policy-making, advocacy and/or critique. Since these activities require critical understanding of discourse and skilful manipulation of language, it appears that highly developed discursive awareness is an important attribute for those who construct the texts that represent the knowledge domain.

The finding that argument is a significant feature of all the texts analysed should not be interpreted as a claim that the arguments in the texts are obvious or easy to identify. While analysis of extracts from the texts showed that the metalanguage of argument is used in some texts to foreground argument, it was noted that in some texts the argumentation is oblique or invisible. Therefore, it can be assumed that implicit argumentation can have the effect of making the argumentation more persuasive, in which case implicit argumentation, and the use of the discourse of inquiry, can be seen as a rhetorical strategy. Analysis of the discursive resources that embody scientific inquiry/reasoning and those that embody persuasion (see 3.9.1) in the data showed that both ‘inquiry’ and ‘persuasion’ resources are essential for argumentation in the knowledge domain of Development Studies. This finding accords with Wignell’s (2007: 202) observation that in social science texts there is a “dynamic tension between the science and the social” (see 2.3.7).

More importantly, in this chapter discussion of detailed linguistic analysis of text extracts has conclusively demonstrated that “ideational” (Halliday 1978: 112) claims, the observations about ‘reality’ that, in academic research writing, are claims to knowledge, are only one dimension of the overall argumentation, which draws as much on “interpersonal” and “textual” meanings as it does on “ideational” meanings (see 2.2.1.3). All knowledge claims are arguments that are inextricably intertwined with the writer-reader interaction that is embodied in the array of discursive resources for self-representation and positioning. Thus, analysis shows how “interpersonal meaning” (112) is mobilised in the service of argumentation. Furthermore, “textual meaning” (112-113) or, in different terms, the rhetorical structure which “textures” the argumentation in the text, has a significant effect on the interpretation of knowledge claims. In other words, the textual embodiment of argument impacts on its effectivity (Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer 2010). The findings discussed in this concluding section provide evidence to confirm the claim that what in conventional academic discourse is termed ‘argument’ is only one dimension of a broader perspective on argument in knowledge-focused texts which, following Amossy (2009), is
referred to as “argumentativity” in this thesis (see 2.4.5). The implications of these findings for students are discussed in the final chapter of the thesis.

The following chapter explores argumentativity in the educational texts that textbook writers and university lecturers construct from the available ‘expert knowledge’ texts and then recontextualise by reconfiguring them for use in formal educational contexts.
Chapter five: Argumentativity in educational texts

5.1 Introduction

While the ‘expert knowledge’ texts, discussed in the previous chapter, are important, educational texts (see 3.8.3.2) are, at least, equally important in research that is designed to examine argumentativity as it is realised in the intertextual networks of Development Studies (see Figure 3.3). As outlined in the discussion of Bernstein’s pedagogic device, the recontextualisation of knowledge involves the production of educational discourse that embodies the curriculum design processes that transform knowledge from the field of production into forms that are appropriate for use in education (see 2.3.2).

In terms of the design of this research, educational texts are conceived of as representing the higher education subject called ‘Development Studies’, and therefore embodying aspects of both “context”/“social structure”, represented in the outer layer of Fairclough’s (2001; 2010) model of discourse and “interaction”/“social practices”, represented in the middle layer of his model of discourse. The educational context is instantiated in diverse text types, from departmental meeting minutes to lecture notes; however, the focus of analysis in this chapter is on the highly-valued texts that offer insight into the way that argumentation is conceptualised and represented in the recontextualisation of knowledge from the field of production. In this case, the focus is on the recontextualisation of knowledge in the modules that form the final stage of the third-year course in Development Studies (see 3.5.3). The texts that were selected for close analysis provide access to different dimensions of the educational context within the bounds of the case study. A brief discussion follows on how published and unpublished educational texts, the two dimensions that were chosen for closer exploration for this chapter, are conceived of in terms of Chapter Three’s discussion about the attempt to integrate Fairclough’s (2001; 2010) model of discourse (see Figure 3.1) with Bernstein’s (2000) model of the pedagogic device (see 3.8.3).

Published texts are one of the two types of educational text chosen for analysis (3.8.3.2). The texts are written by educationalists whose work is available in the global arena. The texts can be seen, in Halliday’s (1978: 122-124) terms, as part of the “context of culture” (see 2.2.1.2), and in Fairclough’s (2001; 2010) terms, they come into the outer layer of the three nested boxes, representing an aspect of social context/structure (see Figure 3.1).
Unpublished texts, which are produced in the specific local “context of situation” (Halliday 1978: 122-124), can be seen as falling into a different category of educational texts (see 3.8.3.2). The unpublished texts chosen for analysis are the ‘learning guides’ produced by the lecturers for the students they teach in their courses. The essay tasks that, generally, are embedded in the learning guides can be seen as separable micro-genres. The texts that represent the multiple-source discussion essay assignment prompts are discussed in a separate sub-section below (see 5.4). Unlike the published educational texts, the unpublished texts, produced in the “context of situation” (see 2.2.1.2), can be seen as embodying an aspect of “interaction”/“social practices”, Fairclough’s ‘middle’ layer of discourse (see Figure 3.1), and as embodying an aspect of the field of reproduction in Bernstein’s (2000) conceptualisation of the pedagogic device (see Figure 2.9). The similarities and discontinuities between the models of Bernstein and Fairclough were discussed in relation to the categorisation of the data in Chapter Three (see 3.8.3).

The published and unpublished educational texts were analysed in order to explore the second subsidiary research question: “How is argument represented and what explicit written guidance on argument is offered to students in educational texts?” (see 1.7). The multidimensional framework for analysing argumentativity, discussed in Chapter 3 (see 3.9, and Figures 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6), was used for the analysis.

5.2 Published texts

As discussed in Chapter Three, the two published educational texts selected for analysis are an introductory textbook and a ‘reader’. Since the reader is aimed primarily at postgraduate students, the two texts complement each other in that they are addressed to readers at opposite ends of the spectrum of students of Development Studies, neophytes and seasoned novices of the subject.

5.2.1 Introductory textbook

The introductory textbook that was chosen for analysis is: Development: Theory, Policy, and Practice (Coetzee, Graaff, Hendricks and Wood 2001a). Since it is described on the back cover of the book as, “the first stop for students of development” and “crucial reading”, it is an accessible text that is suitable for first-year university students. The wording on the back cover of the book suggests that readers are decision-makers who “plan to make a difference”. Even at this entry-level ‘bridge’ to the knowledge domain, Development Studies is presented as a subject requiring that participants not only observe
the world from a detached academic perspective, but also use their subject knowledge to engage with the world to bring about change. Development Studies is represented as a recognized field of action, rather than as a domain solely focused on the generation of knowledge. Thus, readers are taken beyond the text and positioned as highly agentive in the world (Giddens 1984; Bhaskar 1989; Fairclough 2003).

Substantial learning support is provided for students, as each of the six sub-sections of the book has a separate introduction that summarises the main ideas. At the start of each chapter there is a visual ‘mind-map’ of the relationship between the key ideas. On the first page of each chapter there is a brief clearly marked separate section, in which the questions or issues addressed are noted, and the main argument is summarised. A hierarchical system is used with the numbering of headings and sub-headings, which also functions as an aid for learning. Unfamiliar concepts and knowledge-domain-related terms, such as “structuration theory” (Coetzee, Graaff, Hendricks and Wood 2001a: 196), are explained by means of an in-text glossary, which is made distinguishable from the rest of the text through the use of spacing, solid horizontal lines and different fonts. In addition, a “Revision” section, with separate sub-sections, headed “key words”, “questions” and “further reading”, follows at the end of each chapter. The sub-section on additional texts is annotated, providing an evaluation of the place of the recommended texts in the knowledge domain and their comprehensibility for novice students. The accessible language and the features that facilitate understanding of and engagement with the text function to empower the reader as a participant in the debates represented in the text.

Argumentation is foregrounded throughout the book, as is evident from the two short extracts discussed below: the overall “Introduction” to the book (Coetzee, Graaff, Hendricks and Wood 2001b: 1-4), and the “Introduction” to a sub-section of the book, which is entitled, “Neoliberalism and Keynesianism in macro-economic policy” (191-192). Argument is referred to twice in the first short paragraph of the book’s introduction. That argumentation is seen as a core activity in the study of development is shown in the description of the textbook as the culmination of the editors’ previous textbooks, in which they claim that they conclude the “arguments” in the forerunner texts (1). The introduction provides a persuasive argument for a different perspective on development. The editors acknowledge that development is “a contested concept” (1), and assert an Afrocentric position on the conflict surrounding the term. They position themselves and the study of development as, “critical of the existing circumstances of the world” (2). Using a critical postmodern sociological discourse, they claim that the textbook addresses a need for a
changed perspective that takes account of, “historical particularity, micro-perspectives and individual actors” (1). Through the use of discourses which oppose dominant neo-liberal economics discourse, the editors criticise “macro-structural theories” and “transnational corporations and agencies” (1–2).

The textbook introduction can be seen as a sub-genre, which is in similar relationship to the content of the book as the editorial is in relation to the news articles in a newspaper. For this reason, a degree of subjectivity and an evaluative authorial voice is expected. To use Hyland’s (2008: 7–8) terms, the use of “stance” resources in the text is likely 130. Even taking this reasoning into account, however, the introduction is unexpectedly polemical. As will be shown in the discussion of the excerpt that follows, the editors use an arsenal of persuasive techniques to convince the reader of the rightness of their perspective on Development Studies:

Driven by macro-agencies like governments and the World Bank, development initiatives had too frequently failed to engage the people on the ground. They had been marked by stunning condescension, violence to both people and the environment, and ultimately by failure. The (only slightly exaggerated) image we have is of blue-suited, laptop-toting, razor-sharp young development economists, trained at the best American Ivy-league universities dropping (quite literally) out of the sky, to dispense their wisdom to open-mouthed locals at their feet. These self-appointed “developers” then position themselves to offer largess to the needy. The transaction is manifestly unequal. (Coetzee, Graaff, Hendricks and Wood 2001b: 1)

That the discourse is highly rhetorical is most evident in the proliferation of evaluative terms, intensifiers and stance resources, particularly attitude markers. Excoriating criticism of externally-imposed development initiatives is offered in the negative lexis: “stunning condescension … violence … failure”. Rhetorical strategies more common to narrative discourse and satire are used to construct a negative image of American development economists. The inverted commas used with the term “developers” convey ironic questioning of the value of this kind of developer, and also calls conventional global development discourse into question. At the interpersonal level of meaning, the use of the evaluative term “self-appointed” is tantamount to sneering. The use of the archaic Victorian term, “largess”, provides added critique, the term itself carrying echoes of colonialist voices (in the Bakhtinian sense, see 2.2.2.3) from the historical period when the West was constructed as a benefactor on whom colonised regions were dependent for European-style charity, while it simultaneously exploited and appropriated their material resources.

130 For a discussion of the resources for the construction of “stance”, see 2.2.4.4, and Figures 2.6 and 2.7. To avoid unnecessary repetition, all further references to “stance” in this chapter are not referenced, and neither the term, nor the terms associated with it are marked as formal terms by means of inverted commas.
Discursive resources for “engagement” (Hyland 2008: 11-12)\textsuperscript{131} are used to position the reader as sharing the editors’ perspective. The first person plural pronoun, “we”, functions to position readers as sharing the authors’ negative view of development processes that are externally imposed. The two comments in parenthesis are engagement markers that construct intimacy in writer-reader interaction, thus strengthening the sense of shared values and collusion against what is represented as misguided action that occurs in the name of development.

The rest of the introduction is as polemical as the short extract reproduced above. Strongly emotive metaphorical language is used: the behaviour of multinational companies is described as “bullying” (Coetzee, Graaff, Hendricks and Wood 2001b: 3), and the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund are represented as, “dangerous … financial juggernauts” (3). The negative discourse used in the representation of Africa is contested in the text, the attitude marker, “supposedly”, being used to call into question the view that Africa is doomed to failure (1-2). The concession: “No one can deny that there are monumental problems in Africa”, has persuasive force, especially since it is followed by refutation, in the form of criticism of claims that only “an outside infusion of capital and values” could address Africa’s problems (2).

Significantly, whereas reference to morality is often avoided in the social science domains which strive to appear scientific or objective, in this text morality is referred to as a dimension of discussions about development that is as important as theory, policy and practice: “in its foundations, development studies is a moral enterprise” The editors’ plea for “a shift in development thinking” extends to the “moral level” (Coetzee, Graaff, Hendricks and Wood 2001b: 2). They argue that Development Studies should improve the lives of the poor and weak and promote “greater sensitivity” toward them (2). Their assertion that Development Studies should work to critique and transform society to achieve social justice is, effectively, an argument of policy.

The textbook introduction discussed above provides insight into a particular overall perspective on Development Studies, recontextualised as a knowledge domain for study at university. In the discussion that follows, analysis extends to the sub-section of the book which covers South African macro-economic policy, as it is directly relevant to the essay topic on the developmental state that was assigned (see 5.4.1). The introductory

\textsuperscript{131} For a discussion of the resources for the construction of “engagement” see 2.2.4.4 and Figures 2.6 and 3.6. To avoid unnecessary repetition, all further references to “engagement” in this chapter are not referenced, and neither the term, nor the terms associated with it are marked as formal terms by means of inverted commas.
commentary (Graaff 2001: 191-192) indicates that the key issue around which the sub-section is structured is the role that the state can play in socially-responsible development. An overview of the chapters that follow, with a clear focus on the broad arguments, is provided. The engagement resource of the question, which invites the reader to consider possible responses, is used to launch the discussion: “Can the state make a difference in promoting development and reducing inequality?” (191). This strategy, used frequently in other parts of the book, immediately draws the reader into the heart of the debate in this sub-section, which is represented as involving two opposing groupings: those who support state intervention in the economy, and those against it. Although the dualistic representation of the global economic context is an oversimplification, it helps to establish a foundation on which understanding of the complexities can be built. This debate is linked to the conflict between the supporters of the policies of the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) and Growth, Employment and Redistribution (GEAR) in South Africa. In rhetorical discourse similar to that used in the introduction to the book, negative imagery and evaluations are used to criticise top-down development approaches and the World Bank and IMF: “Behind local national institutions looms the shadow of the World Bank and IMF”. Development projects sponsored by these institutions are described as “spectacularly misguided” (191).

Although it is made clear that the chapters that follow are critical of neo-liberalism – “In all of the chapters in this section there is a powerful current of critique against neo-liberalism” (Graaff 2001: 191) – any notion of the answers being simple is dispelled as attention is drawn to the different perspectives of the chapter authors on what might be considered acceptable alternatives to neo-liberalism. In the editor’s summary of the chapters that follow, words that explicitly highlight argument, such as ‘argue’, ‘criticise’ and ‘debate’, and transition markers associated with argumentation (see Figure 3.4), are used extensively, emphasising that the texts function primarily to make argumentative claims (192).

The editor’s brief overview of each chapter at the end of the introduction provides a sense of the argument types (see 2.4.3.4) that are drawn on in macro-level meaning relations in the text (see 2.4.3). The first chapter (Le Roux and Graaff 2001: 195-211) is an evaluation of competing economic theories, in which the authors suggest that Giddens’s structuration theory may be most useful, because it allows for a degree of state agency. Whereas the argument in the first chapter is theoretical, the second chapter (Le Roux 2001: 213-229) functions as an argument of value, which works in combination with an argument of policy: South African macro-economic policy is evaluated, leading to a call for the state to address
socio-economic problems. Argument is foregrounded in the third chapter (Bond 2001: 231-249). It offers “a strong argument” (Graaff 2001: 192) against the Bretton Woods institutions and the World Bank. This argument, broadly categorized, is one of value. Since the textual voice urges greater national autonomy and regional collaboration, the overall thesis of the chapter also functions as a policy argument. The next chapter (Adler and Webster 2001: 251-267) offers a politico-economic policy argument: the authors counter the argument that post-apartheid South Africa needs the stability of a pact of the capitalist elite by proposing instead a “class alliance” (Graaff 2001: 192). The final chapter in the section (Fine and Paddyachee 2001: 269-281) is also a policy argument, in which the authors conclude that GEAR failed and should be replaced by “a policy of public growth led by the public sector”, which they concede needs to be reformed for their recommendation to be successful (Graaff 2001: 192).

5.2.2 The Reader

Analysis of the back cover of The Development Reader (Chari and Corbridge 2008a) provides insight into the editors’ orientation to Development Studies as a knowledge domain and a university subject. The Reader is described as having “broad appeal across the humanities and social sciences” and as “essential reading” for “students … practitioners and campaigners”. With fifty-four “key readings”, which span two and a half centuries, and 555 densely printed pages, it is a sophisticated, conceptually demanding text, more suitable for readers already familiar with the discourses of Development Studies than for undergraduates (see 3.8.3). The heteroglossic engagement (Martin and White 2005, see 2.2.2.3) that characterises the reader is proclaimed in statements such as, “Adam Smith and Frantz Fanon meet”, which inscribe a strategy to bring conflicting voices into productive dialogue (see Figure 3.5).

Analysis of the editors’ introduction to Part One (Chari and Corbridge 2008b: 3-7), entitled, “The object of development”, leaves no doubt that ‘development’ is an issue that has always attracted and continues to elicit diverse views and even conflict. The editors themselves describe the word ‘development’ as one of the “most contentious” terms of the time (3). One would expect, therefore, to find argumentation in the texts generated around what the editors refer to as “the development business” (7). This is certainly the case in the editors’ representation of their subject: the words ‘argue’ or ‘argument’ appear seven times, and the word ‘debate’ is used six times in the space of less than five pages, and that is without counting the words and phrases associated with argument and debate, of which just a few of those used in the introduction are: “contested”, “core points”, “take
issue”, “challenged”, “thesis, “dispute the idea” (5); “propose”, “claims” (6); and “dissenting voices” (7). Nor does it take into account the contrastive “interactive” discourse markers (Hyland 2005: 50), or, to use terms from “appraisal” theory, the engagement resources associated with presenting different viewpoints or arguments (Martin and White 2005), such as “yet” (Chari and Corbridge 2008b: 3, 5), “however”, “nevertheless” (4), and “but” (5, 7).

Although the subject matter, development, is contentious, the discourse of rational inquiry is used, with reasoning and critical distance being emphasised (see 2.4.1 and Figure 3.4). As selectors and mediators of texts about development, the editors present themselves as ‘exploring' the issues: they use the verb “explore” twice on one page (5) to represent the action they are engaged in. The engagement resource of the appeal to “shared knowledge” (Hyland 2008: 12) is used to position the reader (see 2.2.4.4 and Figure 3.6) as sharing with the authors an informed interested in development: “Most of us have given some thought to the matter of development… But even a few moments’ thought shows this can’t be right. …When most of us think of… And yet another moment’s thought tells us…” (Chari and Corbridge 2008b: 3). Critical reasoning is highlighted and ‘modelled' in the commentary: in the inclusion and explanation of the “data” provided by economists that support the foundational claims on the opening page that the populations of Africa and Asia have been “left behind” by “Big-D Development” (3); in the way that causation is problematised (5); and in the use of linguistic markers of reasoning, such as, “It follows that…” (5). The textual voice is reasonable and measured. Where the resources for stance are used, it is to underline the importance of critical thinking, for example, “The first point we wish to make here is that maps of the world need to be read with care” (6).

Language associated with logical reasoning and hypothesising is used extensively. The objectivity or, more accurately, epistemic caution characteristic of academic discourse is inscribed in the use of discursive resources for constructing tentative hedged statements, such as the phrase, “if true” (5), and the modal auxiliary, “might”: for example, “…s/he might reasonably deduce… But s/he might also be wrong” (6). The “evidential” (Hyland 2005: 52, see Figure 2.5), “suggest”, which functions to hedge claims, is used to refer to the conclusions that have been drawn from the data. Epistemic caution is inscribed in the authors’ perspective that, in the social sciences, conclusions, or knowledge claims, are interpretations that are open to contestation.

Question forms are used extensively instead of assertions. In keeping with a spirit of argument as inquiry, multiple – even divergent – viewpoints are presented. Furthermore, it
is stated explicitly that differences in ways of seeing the world and, therefore, differences of opinion, are inevitable: “...we all have different ideas about the good life” (Chari and Corbridge 2008b: 4). The complexity of making judgements about development issues is highlighted; knowledge is represented as contingent on framing and perspective, and open to contestation and change.

However, while appearing to be objective, and not to be supporting any particular position explicitly, the textual voice is nevertheless positioned. An “anti-neoliberal” position (see 4.2.1.2) is subtly inscribed, for example, in the dialogical contraction (Martin and White 2005) in phrasing such as: “Still, the development economist and Nobel Prize winner, Amartya Sen, is surely not wrong to insist that meaningful definitions of development must stretch to include the basic capabilities and freedoms that people need to lead satisfying lives” (Chari and Corbridge 2008b: 4, see 2.2.2.3 and Figure 3.5). In terms of writer-reader interaction, the foregrounding of Sen’s prize (which is mentioned in theme position in the sentence, even before his name appears), the use of the contrastive marker “still”, the booster “surely”, and the evaluation “not wrong”, all inscribe endorsement of a social justice view of development that looks beyond empirically-measurable increases in GDP (see 2.2.4.4 and Figure 3.6). Since there are very few direct quotations in the “Introduction to Part One”, quotation (as opposed to paraphrase) is a marked form that is worth noting.

Of the voices who are allowed to speak for themselves in the text, only two are those from the selection of texts in the Part One. Both quotations are critical of the dominant global economy. The first quotation questions “why some countries [are] stupendously rich [while] others [are] horrendously poor” (Sachs, Mellinger and Gallup, quoted in Chari and Corbridge 2008b: 4). The second carries the argument that the textile industries of India and China were destroyed by the selfishness and violence of imperial power rather than market competition: “The looms of India and China were defeated not so much by the free market as they were forcibly dismantled by war, invasion, opium and a Lancashire-imposed system of one-way tariffs” (Davis, quoted in Chari and Corbridge 2008b: 6). The only other two voices that are directly quoted are more unconventional in that they are not academic sources. The authors’ use of John Donne’s line of poetry: “No man is an island, entire of itself” (quoted in Chari and Corbridge 2008b: 3) emphasises the interdependence of human beings, while their quotation from the Beatles’ anti-establishment message, “money can’t buy you love”, contrasts strikingly with the discourse of economics which pervades the text. Despite the scholarly expository style, the writing is highly rhetorical. The readers are constructed as companion-explorers of the issues with the authors. Throughout the introduction, the engagement marker ‘we’ is used. It functions to flatter the
reader by constructing a collegial relationship between authors and readers. It also functions to defuse or obscure unequal power relations between the eminent scholar-authors and student readers. The rhetorical strategy positions readers as sharing the editors’ perspective and values.

Although the text is persuasive, an aspect of the overall rhetorical strategy is to convey the impression of not openly supporting any one view or position on the issues, but rather to appear to promote the values of open-mindedness and scepticism. However, despite the presentation of the issues being scholarly, the textual voice is far from dispassionate or disengaged. Rather than presenting academic argument as a succession of dry claims, argumentation is characterised as an activity as natural as conversation. It is represented as involving “captivating” questions (Chari and Corbridge 2008b: 4), and “fascinating” arguments (5), which are at times even charged with emotion, with interactants “strongly” agreeing, “speaking back … sharply” (4), and expressing “scorn” (5). Furthermore, argumentation is represented as not only an intellectual activity, but also as a personal and social process in which the hopes, dreams and feelings of participants are invested. For example, regret that money and “concerted economic growth” are necessary is inscribed in the authors’ wording, “much as we might wish it otherwise” (4), and hope is inscribed in their description of the arguments that a small increase in donor funding would improve the lives of the poverty-stricken as “quite encouraging” (5). These inscriptions of human emotion suggest that academic debate is not only abstract, but also embodied.

A diverse combination of discourses are used in the text, including both the science-oriented discourses of statistics – “median”, “mode” (Chari and Corbridge 2008b: 3) – and economics – “GDP per capita”, “purchasing power parities” (3) – and the discursively-oriented discourse of critical theory – “There is a politics to these claims – and vested interests, …which needs to be rendered visible, thought through and challenged” (6). Examination of the list of “References and further reading” at the end of the introduction shows that fourteen texts are referenced (7-8). Thus many voices are represented. Some are authoritative voices from classic mainstream texts and dominant development discourse, but unconventional voices are also included, such as that of Laylard, who proposes that the aim of development should be maximising global happiness (4). Other unexpected voices woven into the text through indirect referencing are those of Robert Kennedy and the King of Bhutan. The interweaving of different voices enacts argument about development as heteroglossic engagement (see 2.2.2.3 and Figure 3.5). The authors explicitly state their intention to be inclusive of difference and marginalised or
oppositional views: “We want to open up a space for those dissenting voices, like Ghandi, who call into question assumptions about the rightness of development as material progress” (7).

5.3 Unpublished texts for Development Studies 3B

“Learning guide” is the term used at the University of Johannesburg to name the document that provides students with information on the “modules” that make up academic courses. The university’s teaching and learning policy requires that learning guides be made available to students at the start of a module and stipulates that in addition to practical arrangements made for teaching the course, the learning guide should include information on the content to be covered, the “outcomes” that students should attain (see 1.2.2), the prescribed and recommended reading, learning activities, assignments, and assessment processes. It should also guide and support students’ learning, and therefore may also contain glossaries, formal assignments, exercises for self-study and examples of examination questions. Since the production of the learning guide is regulated by university policy, it is a highly valued text, which can be seen as instantiating institutionally-sanctioned practices and relationships in the teaching and learning context.

While much of the information about teaching and learning in the third-year Development Studies course (see 3.5.3) was extracted from the learning guides, only the parts of the learning guides that are most salient to the discourses, strategies, values and identities associated with argumentation in Development Studies are analysed in depth below. In discussion of the guides, the word ‘writer’ is used in preference to ‘lecturer’ to refer to the producer of the text.

5.3.1 Learning guide for “Development theory and policy in South Africa”

The learning guide for “Development Theory and Policy in South Africa” is a twenty-page text, which exhibits a wide range of discourses, from the informal colloquialisms of tutorial talk to the formal legal discourse invoked in the portentously-headed “Declaration” section (8). That the module covers contentious issues is revealed in the use of the words “debate” and “position”, which appear more than once on the first page alone. The text

---

132 Although the learning guide is written by the lecturer who is responsible for the module in question, in reality the guide is often a palimpsest text, with the lecturer’s commentary laid down upon other learning guides that were written previously, either by the same lecturer or by other lecturers in the department.

133 In the discussion of the learning guides only the page is cited, the absence of information about the author and year of publication being the result of a decision not to compromise the confidentiality agreement with the lecturer research participants.
starts with a one-page introduction to South African development policy. The introductory section of the guide is a representation of the way the module content, the course, and the discipline itself, is conceptualised by the lecturer and then mediated for students. Although the introduction contains hardly any of the markers of explicit argumentation, the discourse is argumentational. For this reason, the analysis of first four paragraphs of the section with the heading, “Introduction”, reproduced below, is discussed in detail.

[1] The changes that have occurred in South Africa after the political transition of 1990-1994 have enormous theoretical significance. South African development policy is perhaps more representative of what is possible today than that found in other countries, by virtue of our leading position in Africa, and the absence of major economic crises in the country (I hope!). We are able to develop policy with much greater autonomy than say, a country like Zimbabwe or Iraq. Our currently strong economic growth also contributes to this autonomy in policy-making. In this course the interaction between policy and theory will be investigated, and we focus on two broad sets of issues: The social grants in South Africa – specifically the development and introduction of the Child-support Grant as a case-study of policy-making in South Africa, and a general look at pertinent issues in transformation in the country.

[2] Many have thought the broad contours of policy development concern the adoption (or not) of neo-liberal development policy. The reason this is such an issue in South Africa, is because neo-liberal policy holds relatively little potential for social and economic transformation in South Africa. Thankfully, many commentators have recognised that we have moved beyond this dichotomy, and there are more alternatives than the neo-liberal available to policy makers and commentators in South Africa.

[3] In order to make an informed contribution to the debate on development policy in South Africa, we need to understand that much more is at stake than only the principles of private ownership. Focusing on neo-liberalism only would thus distract our gaze at the real alternatives available, and give it a pride of place in analysis that it does not deserve. We need to know how compromises between the ruling authority and groups in society influence the direction of policy. This might influence policy in atheoretical ways. Theory has to incorporate such political influence on the technicalities of policy. There is much to theorise about.

[4] My own position (at the moment, but speak to me next year again!) is that the contours of a true alternative and its material is already available. It is up to us to know what of this available material is relevant and appropriate to the challenges facing us today. Sometimes it helps to think through things as an academic and not as an ideologue. After completion of this course, you should be able to at least think of the possibility of such an alternative.

[5] We will accomplish the above by reading widely on development policy and theory, in South Africa, and internationally. (“Development Theory and Policy in South Africa”: 2)
Analysis of this extract provides surprising insights about the way argumentation can be conducted in educational/pedagogic texts. The first half of the first paragraph functions as an implicit argument for the value of examining South African development policy in an academic context, the opening sentence making a strong evaluative claim about the significance for development theory of post-democratic-election changes in South Africa. As there is no overt conjunctive link to the claim that follows, which appears to be elaborative, the reader has to infer how “development policy”, the theme of the sentence, is related to the previous claim. It seems the claim functions as a positive evaluation of post-1994 development policy, seen as an attempt to achieve what had hitherto proved unrealisable in other countries. The argument that policy-making in South Africa may be a noteworthy case is extended with the claim that South Africa has greater autonomy in policy-making than other countries.

In the second and third paragraphs the use of terms from the discourses of neo-liberalism and of the political left sets up a conflict between them, but this conflict is not clearly outlined for the reader. Although reference to “dichotomy” is made at the end of the second paragraph, it not explained. The vagueness of the formulation suggests that by the third year of study the values that underpin the discipline in the department are assumed to be common to all, and are therefore not made explicit. For an outsider to the knowledge field, it takes some reconstruction to determine that the “dichotomy” can be assumed to refer to the opposition between advocates of neo-liberalism and those of “social and economic transformation”, who are likely to be politically positioned left of centre.

The overall argument in the third paragraph is also not clearly articulated. It appears that the main claim is that theory plays a limited role in offering an understanding of policy formulation, as the balance of power between “ruling authority” and “groups in society” also has to be taken into account. Although the goal of being “informed” is highlighted at the start of the paragraph, the discursive resources drawn on are not those of explicit reasoning, or inquiry, but rather the rhetorical resources of persuasion.

Analysis of the use of resources for writer-reader interaction (Hyland 2008) shows that the writer has drawn extensively on the discursive resources for constructing stance and writer-reader engagement (see 2.2.4.4 and Figures 2.7 and 3.6). The use of the attitude marker “significance” in conjunction with the intensifier “enormous” in the first sentence of the first paragraph constructs a portentous opening claim that functions rhetorically to draw
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134 As noted in previous chapters, in SFL the “theme” is the part of the sentence that comes before the verb (Halliday 1985: 39; Eggins 1994: 274-275).
the reader into the text. Thus, as analysis shows, the text begins with an argument of value (see 2.4.3.4) which functions at the level of interpersonal meaning to justify the educational decision to devote a course to South African policy-making, and to motivate the student reader to engage with the course content. The writer’s critical attitude to neoliberalism is inscribed in the second paragraph, where the claim that alternatives to neoliberalism are available is modified by the sentence adverb which inscribes attitude, “thankfully”.

The use of the first person plural pronoun, ‘we’, is highly rhetorical. In the first two paragraphs of the “Introduction”, it is used for general reference to all South Africans, functioning as an engagement marker referring to shared experience. In the third paragraph the attitude markers, “we need to understand” and “we need to know”, seem to function also as an indirect form of “reader mention” (Hyland 2008: 11), taking the place of the plural form of the pronoun ‘you’, since it must be assumed that the writer already has understanding about the topic which she or he wishes to impart to the readers. This could be a strategy to avoid the inscription of the unequal power relations between lecturer and students. By the final paragraphs in the extract, the use of the inclusive first person pronouns in the formulations, “It is up to us…” and “We will accomplish the above by…”, function to assert shared values and goals. However, use of the resource for writer-reader engagement appears artificial, or even condescending, given that the relationship between the students and their lecturer is unequal. The number of “personal asides” (Hyland 2008: 11-12) used is also an indication of the extent to which discursive resources for engagement are used. For example, the comment in parenthesis, “I hope!”, intensified by the use of the exclamation mark, constructs a sense of shared intimacy between the writer and the reader. The reader is positioned as a discourse participant who shares the attitudes and values inscribed in the text, such as the ideological distance from neoliberalism.

As the discussion below shows, while the discourse of rational inquiry is used (see Figure 3.4), it exists in uneasy tension with some of the other discourses that are used in the text. The discourse of rationality is invoked in the explicit reference (in the second paragraph) to the “reason” for neo-liberal policy being a contentious topic, followed unnecessarily (and ungrammatically) by, “is because…” It resurfaces in the use of the “interactive” transition marker, “thus” (Hyland 2005: 50), used unnecessarily in the second sentence, where it suggests that a conclusion is being justified. Rational discourse is expected in the
disciplinary context; its use shows the writer engaged in the processes of reasoning, thus contributing to the construction of the *ethos* (see figure 2.10) of a disciplined scholar.

Significantly, however, the text is neither entirely rational nor objective. Much of the argumentation remains hidden because a number of claims are “monoglossic” (Martin and White 2005) in formulation (see 2.2.4.3), and because some of the arguments are not explicitly marked with interactive “transition markers” of logical connection (Hyland 2005: 50, see Figure 2.5) or with the metalanguage of argument (see Figure 3.4). Because much of the argumentation is implicit, it appears not to be argumentation at all, and is therefore ‘invisible’ until it is analysed.

The parenthetical reference to hope, discussed above (see the first paragraph of the extract), functions also to demonstrate the writer’s affective investment in the issues of policy-making that the module addresses. It suggests that while the study of policy is an intellectual pursuit, emotions are not irrelevant; emotion can and does emerge in written argumentation, even in the academic context. Furthermore, rational discourse is interspersed with highly rhetorically persuasive language, such as the attitude markers, “much more is at stake” and “does not deserve”. While the writer’s position remains implicit in the first three paragraphs, linguistic clues suggest a left-aligned ideological position. Only in the reference to her or his “own position” (in the fourth paragraph) is attention explicitly drawn to a subjective view. Ironically, the writer’s position is discursively inscribed in the preceding paragraphs.

Since the first three paragraphs function as highly positioned (but invisible) argumentation, the explicit presentation in paragraph four of an open-minded approach seems inconsistent. In the personal aside “(at the moment, but speak to me again next year!)” the textual voice acknowledges that discursive positioning is contingent and, by implication, that knowledge is always partial and open to contestation. It appears that self-awareness, intellectual curiosity and honesty are considered to be important qualities in argumentation in this context and that what is valued in the course is the demonstration of flexible thinking and willingness to consider different positions. However, the assertion in the text that it is helpful to consider issues “as an academic not an ideologue” is puzzling. In the juxtaposition of the words ‘academic’ and ‘ideologue’, an opposition is constructed suggesting that rationality is valued above ideological commitment. The claim may be difficult to interpret, both for students who do not know the meaning of the word ‘ideologue’ and for those who do, given the rhetorically-effected, left-aligned positioning in other parts of the text analysed above.
Following on from the five introductory paragraphs reproduced and discussed above, the “objectives” of the module are outlined in bold font, as reproduced below. The technocratic discourse expected in the then-current “outcomes”-based approach in South African education (see 1.2.2) is used.

The objectives of this course are the following:

- To enable students to formulate a defendable and informed position on development policy and its potential for South Africa;
- To enable students to understand different approaches and positions in the current debate about development policy in South Africa;
- To enable students to develop and analyse a case study of social, economic or developmental policy in South Africa and make an informed contribution to its further development. (*Development Theory and Policy in South Africa*: 2-3)

The term “position” is a component of argument metalanguage that is used repeatedly in the guide, both in the writer’s reference to her or his perspective, “My own position”, and also in the formulation of two of the three module objectives. The explicit foregrounding of positioning in relation to difference (see 2.5) in the learning guide suggests that argumentation is an important aspect of public policy-making, and therefore of the Development Studies course.

The last “objective” listed above, that students be able to, “develop and analyse” a policy case study, and contribute “to its further development” suggests that the Development Studies curriculum has an applied dimension, and that the practical argumentation required for policy-making is as important as academic argumentation. This requirement inscribes the expectation that after graduation students could be employed in workplace contexts involving policy formulation and/or critique, where competence in different kinds of spoken debate and written argumentation would be necessary for effective performance.

Another part of the learning guide that is worthy of close analysis is a three-paragraph section that explicitly addresses argumentation under the heading, “The Essay”:

[1] How do you write an argumentative essay? What is an argument and how do you make one? What is distinctive of an academic argument? How should an academic essay approach a problem? What is distinctive of an argumentative essay?

[2] These questions do not have easy answers. From my experience, it would be unusual for anyone to give specific answers to these questions. The reason for this is that academic arguments never follow standard formats. The format of academic argumentation is such that it could change with
every attempt at argumentation. On the other hand a certain form of writing has become accepted as academic prose, without anyone determining what is should be. What is at stake thus is for you to participate in this process of academic argumentation. You are thus free to present your argument as you see fit, but remember that only exceptional work succeeds in breaking conventions. It is thus best to follow convention and in this way bring about change from within – model your essay on an established format.

Nevertheless, what then is an argumentative academic essay? The chapters in your textbook are examples of it. Articles in academic journals are good examples as well. At time, the arguments made and style of writing of newspaper editorials are also of an academic character. What all this is about, however, is to make an original argument that strives to rationally convince and persuade the reader of a certain opinion. In broad outline, the following applies: You have to be sure of your own convictions about a particular issue. Then you have to construct an argument why this is the case (Many already change their opinions at this stage). This is only one part of the process of academic discourse, and do not make the mistake to think that because you feel in a particular way about an issue, it has to be the case. The central characteristic of academic writing is the ability to present the other side of the issue. The central competence necessary for this is the ability to question and doubt your own presuppositions. The ability to doubt is many a times the path to the truth. The assignment is thematised in such a way that you have to be able to illuminate both sides of an issue and from both draw a conclusion. The best thinkers and researchers are those who are able to change their opinions. (“Development Theory and Policy in South Africa”: 9)

This section begins engagingly with expository questions, including: “How do you write an argumentative essay?”, that give expression to students’ practical concerns about the nature of written academic argument. Since few lecturers offer students guidance on how to write argument, this series of questions in the context of an educational text creates the expectation that the text that follows will provide explicit answers to demystify written argumentation. That the six consecutive questions constitute a paragraph on their own, is testimony to the well-documented lack of clarity in the academy about academic argument (Andrews 1997; Crême and Lea 1997; Mitchell and Andrews 2000; Andrews and Mitchell 2001; Andrews 2005; Andrews 2007; Coffin and O’Halloran 2009; Andrews 2010). The follow-up to these questions in the next paragraph must have been disappointing for students, as it merely confirms what students already must have known: that there are no “easy answers”. The reference to the writer’s personal experience of it being “unusual” to be given “specific answers” is indicative of the experience of many students at university, where lecturers tend not to give explicit direction about the writing of argument, thus perpetuating confusion about academic argumentation (see 1.4 and 1.5).
The reason given in the learning guide for not providing clear guidelines on academic argumentation is that “academic arguments never follow standard formats”, and are subject to great variation in structure: “could change with every attempt at argumentation”. There are no examples in the text to illustrate the above claims about argument structure, which are as dogmatic as they are mysterious. Since the sentence that follows begins with a “transition marker” of contrast (Hyland 2005: 50), “on the other hand”, the expectation set up in the text is that the sentence that follows will relate contrastively to academic argument. Instead, what follows is another vague assertion: “a certain form of writing has become accepted as academic prose, without anyone determining what [it] should be”. The unhelpful conflation of argument and writing and the lack of clarity in the discussion of the nature of argumentation (under the misleading heading, “The Essay”) exemplify the confusion about academic argumentation that can occur when lecturers try to explain it.

A key issue in both argumentation and writing pedagogy is raised in the same paragraph: that of whether the conventions of academic discourse are unnecessarily restrictive (see 2.2.4.6), or function as a necessary foundation from which students can liberate themselves: “You are thus free to present your argument as you see fit, but remember that only exceptional work succeeds in breaking conventions”. Students are advised to “bring about change from within” by “follow[ing] convention”, and modelling the essay “on an established format”. The latter suggestion conflicts with the dogmatic point made earlier in the same paragraph that academic argument “never follows standard formats”.

The sweeping generalisation made in the third paragraph that textbook chapters and academic journal articles are “examples” of argument is further evidence of the confusion about argument. Since textbooks and journal articles are substantially different generic forms, which inscribe different goals and different social relationships, as argued in previous chapters (see 2.2.4.5 and 3.8.3), listing them together as if the kinds of argumentation they exemplify are the same, reveals a lack of knowledge about the differences between forms of discourse. Even within the overarching genre of the social science journal article, argument is instantiated in a wide variety of ways in different disciplines (see 4.2) and, even, in different parts of one journal article. Since no detail is provided about how the genres that are referred to constitute or exemplify argument, the claim inscribes the lack of knowledge about the nature of argumentation in written academic discourse. The claim, “the arguments made and style of writing of newspaper editorials …also of an academic character”, again inscribes the conflation of different
genres, as well as confusion about the ways in which argument, “academic” style and writing are related to each other.

As if in acknowledgement that the preceding claims are opaque, the “code gloss” (Hyland 2005: 51, see Figure 2.5), “what all this is about”, signals another attempt to explain with more clarity. The transition marker of contrast, “however”, which follows the phrase, creates the expectation that a different explanation that simplifies the preceding text follows. But reader expectations are not met, as new ideas are introduced in the succeeding text. The importance of making “an original argument” that aims to “rationally convince and persuade” is foregrounded by means of bold font. Two aspects of the assertion are worth discussing. The first is the use of the word ‘original’ to qualify the kind of argument expected. Given that students are required to construct an argument using the knowledge claims of the voices in the prescribed texts, rather than based on empirical research, there is no possibility of their making an argument that is ‘original’ (Angelil-Carter 2000; Clark 2006: 56, see 2.2.4.3). The second aspect worthy of discussion is the linking of apparently opposing concepts in wording suggesting that ‘rationality’ and ‘persuasion’ are both aspects of argumentation, and can be used in combination (see 2.4.3 and 2.4.5). The necessity for persuasion is acknowledged: “you have to be sure of your own convictions”. But, seemingly in contradiction, a high value is placed on an ‘inquiry’ orientation: “The best thinkers and researchers are those who are able to change their opinions”. Bold font gives weight to the claim that the “central characteristic” of academic writing is the presentation of “the other side of the issue”. Students are encouraged to be sceptics, who are able to “question and doubt [their] own presuppositions”. The emphasis on the recognition of conflicting views and on impartiality and fairness is an important aspect of the values promoted in the social sciences, where the impossibility of establishing incontestable truth is accepted (see 2.3.6). However, how students can inscribe in their writing both impartiality, engagement and positioning in relation to the issues and problems of development is a question that is not explored.

Interestingly, the writing in the part of the guide that focuses explicitly on argument uses, in comparison to other parts of the guide, a disproportionately high number of argument and reasoning markers, particularly the “transition marker” (Hyland 2005: 50) ‘thus’, which is used for making or justifying a conclusion. This suggests that consciously thinking about argument directs language choices to the discursive resources typically used in reasoning and argument. However, the range of meta-language used to construct and discuss argumentation is limited. As illustrated in the previous paragraph, some transition markers
– those signalling contrast, in particular – are used so loosely that they obfuscate rather than clarify the ideas. Even basic terms that are helpful for reading or constructing argument, such as ‘evidence’ or ‘support’, are not used in the guide, and those terms that are used, such as ‘position’, are not defined. The argument has been made that the use of argument metalanguage confuses or alienates students. For example, Giltrow (2000) is critical of the explicit use of argument metalanguage in the teaching of written argument. However, given that the context is a knowledge domain characterised by contestation, and that one of the goals inscribed in the text was to offer guidelines on the production of argument, the use of more appropriate metalanguage and explanation of the terms used could have been expected.

Also worthy of attention in the light of the expectation that students produce “original argument”, discussed above (and see 2.2.4.3), are the claims made under a sub-heading which stands out in bold font: “How must I write? Avoiding plagiarism”. The wording of the sub-heading misleadingly suggests that avoiding plagiarism is the most important aspect of academic writing. Three pages of the guide offer information about plagiarism and detailed guidance on paraphrasing, citing and referencing (“Development Theory and Policy in South Africa”: 9-12). In addition, one whole page (8) with the heading, “Declaration”, is designed to be detached and appended to assignment submissions. It requires the student to sign four times on one page to confirm, under separate subsections, that: the work is their own; they have not quoted, cited or referenced inaccurately; they have both paraphrased acceptably and acknowledged the sources; they know what plagiarism is, and how to avoid it, and have made “all possible effort to present ideas and material” in their “own words”. Since the discourse of law is inscribed in the unnatural formal phrasing, “I herewith declare that…”, and the word “guilty” (9), the student is constructed as a potential criminal. One-fifth of the learning guide\textsuperscript{135}, a significant proportion of the text, is focused on plagiarism. The technical conventions for acknowledging sources are emphasised at the expense of providing crucial educational guidance on how to use the authoritative voices represented in source texts to develop and construct a position in relation to them. Consequently, the disproportionate concentration on plagiarism and the ‘technology’ for acknowledging sources may discourage the effective engagement with authoritative voices that is essential for the construction of argument in the multiple-source discussion essay.

\textsuperscript{135} Approximately five of the twenty pages of text (the cover page excluded) treats plagiarism, citation and referencing.
Analysis of the use of discursive resources for writer-reader interaction (Hyland 2008) shows how unequal power relations between lecturer and student, and conflicting positionings for writer and reader, are inscribed in the text. This observation is well-illustrated in the use of stance and engagement resources (see Figure 2.7) in the extract below, reproduced from page seven of the guide.

Please consult these, and the other prescribed sources first, before looking for and reading other literature for the essay. I want you to base the essay on familiar work, so that we can all have a focussed discussion on the prescribed work. Only after you have consulted these sources, will you be allowed to consult other sources. … I only accept essays with a less than 30% plagiarism report. ("Development Theory and Policy in South Africa": 7)

The use of bold font, which makes the extract selected stand out from the rest of the page, can be seen as a stance resource because it functions as a visual attitude marker which signals the writer’s evaluation that the textual content that is printed in bold is important for the reader. Another stance resource, self-mention, is also used: the pronoun ‘I’ appears twice in theme position, contributing to the construction of an authoritative textual voice that inscribes the agency of the lecturer.

Conflicting writer-reader positionings are inscribed in the use of resources for engagement. The polite “directive” (Hyland 2008: 11), “Please consult…” (which incorporates “reader mention” in the implicit second person pronoun form, ‘you’), inscribes the authority of the textual voice and the lecturer’s role as director of the interaction, thus highlighting the difference between interactants, and effecting distance between writer and reader. In the phrasing “I want you” the unequal relationship between the interactants is grammatically inscribed, with ‘I’ (reference to the lecturer) as the grammatical subject and ‘you’ (reference to the reader) as the grammatical object of the clause. The switch to the use of the first person plural pronoun ‘we’, briefly positions the student as an equal participant in the discussion. However, the dominant use of the second person pronoun form ‘you’, particularly its combination with the conditional expression – “Only after you…, will you be allowed…”, which has “deontic modality” (Fairclough 2003: 219) – inscribes the institutional power of the lecturer, and the obligation of the student to defer to the lecturer’s authority.

5.3.2 Learning guide for “Development: discourses and debates”

The rationale for a focus on argumentation is established in claims on the first page of the guide that development “concepts and practices” are “contested” (see 3.5.3.2). The
numerous explicit references to argumentation in the text as a whole (the use of metalanguage associated with argument) confirms that argument is an important aspect of the course as it is represented to students in the learning guide.

Analysis of the list of expected learning “outcomes” (see 1.2.2) for the module confirms the high value placed on argumentation in the course. The wordings that explicitly refer to argument are: “develop the essential skills needed for argument and debate”, “developing and defending/debating positions that take into account opposing perspectives”, and “incorporating others’ interventions in debates to further develop your arguments”\(^{136}\). Other outcomes related to argumentation are the analytical skills of comparing and contrasting, and the ability to “critically analyse” development policy. An outcome not conventionally associated with academic argumentation is, “sensitivity to non-Western and non-Eurocentric views and practices”. This explicit expectation of learning gives expression to the inclusive democratic values that underpin South African curriculum transformation (see 1.2.2), but also suggests awareness of the emerging orientation that acknowledges the importance of values and dispositions, such as empathy, as dimensions of argumentation (see 2.4.1). Another outcome that is not explicitly linked to argumentation is: “Critical knowledge of the intellectual basis of development thinking today”. However, since the “warrant” and the “backing” (Toulmin 1958; Toulmin, Rieke and Janik 1979) underpinning a claim often remain unstated in disciplinary argumentation, being assumed to be common knowledge shared by writer and reader (see 2.4.3.3 and Figure 2.11), the “powerful knowledge” (Young 2008: 14) at the core of Development Studies (see 2.3.7) is essential for the construction of legitimate argument. In the text discussed above, the use of the word ‘critical’, to qualify the reference to ‘knowledge’, and used in the phrase “critically analyse” inscribes the high value placed on a questioning, open-minded disposition as an important aspect of academic argumentation in the context. The emphasis on attitudes and values in the list of learning outcomes shows the extent to which “instructional” and “regulative” discourse (Bernstein 2000: 32) is merged in educational texts\(^{137}\) (see 2.3.2). A corollary of this observation is that legitimate disciplinary argumentation requires more than the ability to make rational claims to knowledge: it requires the performance of specific disciplinary identities and the development of textually-mediated social relationships.

\(^{136}\) As noted in the description of the module (see 3.5.3.2), since students were expected to engage in asynchronous online discussion as the “low stakes” (Elbow 1997) writing for the course, some of the outcomes are worded to accommodate the genre of the online message posting.

\(^{137}\) Discourse which “creates specialised skills and their relationship to each other” is called “instructional discourse”, and “the moral discourse which creates order, relations and identity” is called “regulative discourse”, which is the dominant discourse in which the other is embedded (Bernstein 2000: 32).
Some explicit guidance on argument is provided in the text. The explanation of argument offered is reproduced in the extract below.

Arguments are based on a thorough reading of contending perspectives and the opinions you gain from them – based somewhat on your own ideology and values. Remember, when you argue your own position you must be equipped with the arguments of the proponents of other perspectives. Of course, your position might change too! ("Development: Discourses and Debates": 10)

In the text quoted, it is assumed that the metadiscourse used to explain argument is common knowledge. However, it is unlikely that the student reader shares with the writer the same understanding of the term “ideology”, for example. Even terms that are familiar in primary discourse (see 2.2.2.4), such as “position”, may not be understood because another specialised meaning of the word is harnessed in the text. The formulation “based somewhat on your own ideology and values” assumes that the reader has reached a high level of intellectual and moral development and self-awareness. The use of the vague word “somewhat” inscribes the difficulty of precise articulation of the processes that are involved in the construction of argument.

Explicit definitions are not provided for other specialised terms for discussing argumentation in other parts of the learning guide, such as “thesis”, “anti-thesis”\(^\text{138}\), “empirical examples” (5), “proponent” (10), “angle” (12), and “thesis statement” (13). Presumably it is assumed that the reader is familiar with the terminology. In most cases the meaning of the terms can be recovered from the surrounding text, but the absence of clear definitions of the metalanguage of argument denies readers full control of terminological resources that would enable them to read critically or use the terms and concepts they represent in the construction of their own written arguments.

Argumentation is represented as closely linked to “debate”\(^\text{139}\). There are at least five instances of the terms argument and debate appearing in the same phrase or clause complex (“Development: Discourses and Debates”: 1, 2, 6, 9, 13). However, as there is no explanation of the ways in which spoken debate differs from written debate, such as online discussion and argumentation in the essay form, students may remain ignorant of the different ways in which argument is constructed in different genres and communication modes.

---

\(^{138}\) This outmoded term, which is strongly associated with dialectical materialism, inscribes the authoritative voices of Marxist theorists who have contributed to critical theory and the knowledge structure of Development Studies.

\(^{139}\) As mentioned previously, the major focus of the “low stakes” classwork writing was asynchronous computer-mediated discussion, which is more closely linked to spoken debate than the essay form.
There are no guidelines in the learning guide on how to write the essay, but there are suggestions on how to write an online discussion posting, appearing under the sub-heading, “Notes for your discussions”, which are reproduced below and followed by discussion.

- Familiarise yourself with the key theorists, fact, positions, arguments and counter-arguments, politics and policies concerning your topic.
- Analyse the information you’ve gathered.
- Decide where you stand on the issue. An argument is a personal perspective derived from the existing corpus of debate. Although you have the freedom to think what you like on a topic, your readers should have a good idea of why you feel that way. With whom do you disagree, and why? Is there an angle that has been missed? What do you have to add to the discussion/debate?
- You might start with an introduction to your argument, basing it on the chapter you find compatible with your personal perspective. Then you must content with the opposing view and arrive at a revised – or refined – conclusion. …
- An opinion piece requires a lead. It should resemble the introduction of an essay, indicating the relevance of the topic to the reader. Consider starting with a provocative statement or story to get your reader’s attention. Try using a question; a striking quotation or a strong statement that your essay will either support or dispute. Include your thesis statement toward the end of the lead (the first section of the opinion piece). This will signal to the readers where you are going with the piece, and help them to follow your argument through to its conclusion.
- In the body of your argument you present and argue the ‘flesh’ of your thesis. Each of the countering arguments (both form the literature and the group discussion) needs to be examined and interpreted through the lense of your thesis statement. …
- In the conclusion you summarise the argument you have made, ending with your thesis statement.
- Criteria considered when reading your contribution to the debates will be appropriateness of arguments, logic, clarity, clear structure, accuracy, no repetition of ideas/arguments, no rhetoric, critical and reflexive thinking, substantiation of arguments and persuasiveness in presentation. (“Development: Discourses and Debates”: 12-13)

The short extract provides a small ‘window’ through which to view how argument was conceived of and taught in the module. Argument is succinctly defined as “a personal perspective derived from the existing corpus of debate”. While intellectual freedom is affirmed, the obligation to develop and justify a point of view is asserted: “Although you have the freedom to think what you like on a topic, your readers should have a good idea of why you feel that way”. The interrogative forms used at the end of the third bullet function as engagement resources used to encouraged students to consider arguments that conflict with their own views, and to consider different perspectives on the issues.
The interpersonal dimension of argumentation is acknowledged (see the fifth bullet point). Students are given clear instruction about how to consider the motivations and needs of the reader. They are directed to write the thesis statement in the introductory section of the text, the reasoning being that readers should be helped to anticipate and understand the argument. Thus the ‘front-loaded’ thesis is presented as an appropriate model for structuring the overall argument.

The evaluation criteria given (see the last bullet point in the extract above) are also worth discussing, as they highlight the qualities that are valued in argumentation in the particular context. The first criterion, “appropriateness of arguments”, relates to the implicit disciplinary assumptions about the issues that are debatable and worthy of argument, and what are considered legitimate “grounds” (Toulmin 1958; Toulmin, Rieke and Janik 1979) for making claims (see 2.4.3.3 and Figure 2.11). This would be judged on the basis of how the prescribed readings are used as a resource for students’ own arguments. The criteria that are listed, “logic, clarity, clear structure and accuracy”, inscribe the Enlightenment heritage of scientific writing, which placed emphasis on clear thinking conveyed by clear writing (see 2.4.1). Two related contradictions emerge in the criteria that follow. The first contradiction is between the instruction to avoid repetition, and the expectation that there be “persuasiveness in presentation”, since repetition can be used as a device for persuasion. Furthermore, in the second-last bullet point in the extract above, the direction is given that the thesis statement should be repeated in the conclusion, which is an example of how repetition can be used for persuasive purposes. The second contradiction is between the ban on “rhetoric” and the requirement of “persuasion”. Presumably, rhetoric is understood in the pejorative sense of manipulative or meretricious writing rather than in the positive sense of skilful strategising about how best to communicate with the reader in a specific context. The contradictory guidance inscribes a degree of confusion about the role of persuasion in argumentation.

In a section with the sub-heading “Prescribed reading” a number of guiding questions place the focus on argument. The questions model a strategy for approaching the arguments in the expert texts they read: students are asked to identify “the arguments for… a position”, the “weaknesses and limitations” of the arguments, how the arguments relate to real events, and to compare arguments. The last question, “what do I make of all of this?”, represents an unthreatening way of encouraging students to articulate their own views in relation to the readings and, in doing so, to take a position. The emphasis placed
on reading prescribed sources is an indication of the importance in argumentation of management of multiple authoritative voices (see 3.9.2).

Although the term “debate” is used repeatedly to refer to online discussion, this form of written interaction is framed as “constructive dialogue” (“Development: Discourses and Debates”: 6) rather than conflictual interaction. An inquiry orientation to argument is inscribed in the emphasis on “thorough” reading of “contending perspectives” before forming an opinion, and in the acknowledgment that a student’s position may shift, with changing one’s mind being positively evaluated. However, the role of the writer’s “own ideology and values” is also acknowledged. Therefore, although academic argument is represented as rational inquiry, there is some acknowledgement that taking a position in written text is also an act of personal commitment.

Interaction between lecturer and students is established by means of direct address, the first word in the Introduction being, “Welcome…”, phrasing that is drawn from spoken discourse. The engagement resource (Hyland 2008: 11-12) of “reader mention”, in the form of the second person pronoun, ‘you’, is used throughout the text, often in conjunction with another engagement resource, the “directive”, as exemplified in the wording: “you should draw on your understanding and learning in the previous modules”. The use of directives highlights the unequal nature of the pedagogic relationship, as students are positioned as novices in relation to the expert lecturer. However, the repeated use of the interrogative form is an engagement resource that is used frequently in the text to promote learning. Since questions are also used in the formulation of the essay task for the module (see 5.4.3), it appears to be a preferred strategy of the writer that, arguably, inscribes an inquiry-oriented argumentational “style” (Fairclough 2003: 223). Questions are also used to validate the student reader. For example, the question, “What do you have to add to the discussion/debate?” (“Development: Discourses and Debates”: 12) inscribes the assumption that the student has ideas worth contributing. The “authorization” (Tang 2009: 171) of student voice (see 2.2.4.6) functions to encourage participation in the disciplinary debate.

5.4 Multiple-source discussion essay tasks

As previously discussed, all the essays students were required to write in the two modules examined in the case study, including the essays required in the final examination, fall into the sub-genre that I call the ‘multiple-source discussion essay’ (see 2.2.4.9 and 3.8.3.3). In the module on development policy (see 3.5.3.1), students were given a choice between
two essay tasks. One task required students to apply the concept of a ‘developmental state’ to the South African context (see 5.4.1). The other required students to consider the efficacy of the Child Support Grant (CSG) as an aspect of development policy in South Africa (see 5.4.2). No essay topic choices were offered for “Development: discourses and debates” (see 5.4.3.).

Since the multiple-source discussion essay was the most highly valued generic form students were required to produce, the essay task formulations themselves are important. The question formulation enables and constrains students’ responses in specific ways. Analysis of the essay assignments are discussed below.

5.4.1 South Africa as a ‘developmental state’

The essay question on the ‘developmental state’ is introduced over the span of four pages in the learning guide (“Development Theory and Policy in South Africa”: 3-7). Not only is information on the essay assignment dispersed across the pages, it is also interspersed with general information on academic writing, argument, and formal presentation of the essay. Thus the representation of the essay task is potentially confusing for students. Detailed analysis of parts of the text which represent the essay task shows how fragmented presentation and lack of precision in the formulation of the essay task placed students at an unnecessary disadvantage even before they had begun writing the essay.

The first reference to the essay is under the sub-heading “Assessments”, where the topic is formulated as follows: “A critique of the concept of a developmental state in South Africa” (“Development Theory and Policy in South Africa”: 3). Detailed information about the essay task appears under the sub-heading, “The Research Essay”. The formulation of the essay assignment is reproduced in the extracts below. Discussion of the analysis of the essay task follows.

One of the most important skills you have to master in your undergraduate studies is the ability to write original academic prose. The research essay you have to complete is not based on original fieldwork, and is then classified as an argumentative essay. You have to construct an argument in which you analyse the success of South Africa’s development efforts, policies, and programmes. These have been cast as part of what we call a “developmental state”. It is important to be able to understand what the historical phenomenon of a ‘developmental state’ is, as well as knowing how to write academic prose correctly. Both these requirements are intertwined, but in many respects, we can approach them separately. What a developmental state is, as a theoretical question, and will be discussed in class. You also have to make sure you complete the necessary reading to know what such a thing is. Then you should try to compare current development efforts with what you have read
in order to form and substantiate an opinion on the state and its development efforts in South Africa. ("Development Theory and Policy in South Africa": 5-6)

More information on the assignment is provided under a separate sub-heading, “The Literature”.

To form an opinion on South Africa as a Developmental state, take a look at the following literature (some of which were prescribed in previous years in this course):

- The chapters in Section B and in Section D in Coetzee, JK et al. 2001 Development Theory, Policy and Practice Cape Town: Oxford University Press, discuss models of the state, the state of South Africa c2000, industrial strategy and alternative models of growth. These could help you answer the question: Is SA a developmental state, or a neo-conservative state, or are we seeing the emergence of a state built on the ideas of sustainable development? ("Development Theory and Policy in South Africa": 6)

Coming at the end of commentary on the prescribed readings, the potentially helpful (re)formulation of the essay task as a question is ‘backgrounded’. Therefore, it is badly-placed to fulfil the supportive function it should serve.

In the discussion that follows, the demands of the essay task are discussed before attention is given to the written formulation of task. The production of a legitimate response to the essay task entails a number of essential “moves” (Swales 2004) in the essay text: definition and historical contextualisation of the key term, ‘developmental state’, the presentation of a theoretically-informed perspective on the concept of the developmental state, discussion of what kind of state is appropriately termed a developmental state, evaluation of South African government policy to establish the extent to which it matches the theoretically-informed conception of a developmental state and, finally, an evaluative assertion that the term either does, or does not, apply to South Africa, which would constitute the main argument or thesis. As evaluative argument is the type of argument for which the essay question calls, a thesis that does not contain an explicit evaluation would not be considered a legitimate text. The question is cognitively demanding because, in effect, two levels of value argument are needed. The question requires: meta-level engagement with discourse about development, specifically, conflicting conceptualisations of the developmental state; the application of theory to reports on policy effects in the source literature (in order to evaluate state policy); as well as judgement about whether the term is applicable to South Africa. In terms of types of argument (see 2.4.3.4), the task required a combination of fact/definition and value arguments.
Given the high degree of cognitive challenge the essay assignment presents, clarity and precision in the formulation of the task is an important pedagogical responsibility. In this respect, the formulation of the essay task falls short. Students are presented with the additional cognitive demand of interpreting what is required of them by following directions in unbounded representation of the task that is scattered across a number of pages of text. The formulation of the task is potentially confusing in a number of respects. First, there is conflation of two types of text, the research essay and the argumentative essay. The essay task is introduced under the heading “Research essay”, but the reason given for why the essay is “classified as an argumentative essay” is that it “is not based on original fieldwork”. The wording used in the text suggests that the terms are interchangeable, and refer to the same genre. The opposition set up between “original fieldwork” and the “argumentative essay” is unhelpful as an explanation of the latter term. Second, in the wording of the question there is conflation of writing process and the written product that is expected. This unintentional conflation undermines the writer’s attempt to provide students with guidance about the processes or steps they should follow in order to produce a legitimate essay ‘product’. Third, in the formulation, “You have to construct an argument in which you analyse the success of South Africa’s development efforts, policies, and programmes”, the use of ‘task’ words is potentially confusing. The term “argument” refers to a product, while the term “analyse” refers to a cognitive process. The term ‘argument’ generally refers to an integrative process resulting in the expression of an opinion supported with reasons, while the term ‘analyse’ generally refers to a process of breaking down available information into smaller categories in order to understand it better. Argument is associated with persuasion, and analysis with inquiry. The use of these terms in the essay rubric assumes a sophisticated understanding of the cognitive operations required for the production of the essay, knowledge of the terms used to describe these processes, and the ability to differentiate between them. An explanation of the relationship between analysis and argument would preclude the possibility of students confusing or misunderstanding the terms. More importantly, the use of the word “analyse” is inappropriate and potentially seriously misleading. The term that should have been used in the place of ‘analyse’ is ‘evaluate’, as analysis of the demands of the essay task has shown that students are required to provide an overall argument entailing evaluation. The confusion surrounding the use of the term ‘argument’, evident in this analysis is an important issue, which is discussed further in the following chapters.

Lastly, the wording, “Then you should try to compare current development efforts with what you have read in order to form and substantiate an opinion on the state and its
development efforts in South Africa”, conflates discourse with ‘reality’. The careless confusion between ‘reality’ and the texts that represent it is not helpful to students who may not yet have developed the sophisticated discourse awareness which would help them to distinguish between “current development efforts”, an aspect of social reality, and the discursive representations and evaluations of that reality that are inscribed in the prescribed readings (see 3.2.3).

5.4.2 The Child Support Grant as a poverty alleviation mechanism

As the essay on the Child Support Grant (CSG) was offered as an alternative essay topic and the essay task does not appear in the learning guide, the formulation of the topic discussed below is based on the students’ representation of the task, as inscribed on the front cover of their essays. The students were required to write an essay on the CSG as a poverty alleviation mechanism and to include discussion of alternative poverty alleviation mechanisms.

Only one text, the publication by Lund (2008, see Primary Sources), is listed as prescribed reading on the CSG. Analysis of the text showed that it is reflective, personal and positioned (see 4.3.1). Since the author explicitly stated that the text provided only one perspective on the CSG, the text was inadequate as a source for responding to the essay question, as it does not provide the kind of critique and information about alternative or competing strategies for addressing poverty that would enable students to effectively compare and evaluate the CSG as a poverty alleviation mechanism.

A satisfactory response to the task involved: discussion of the aims of the CSG, assessment of the challenges that implementation of the policy presented, discussion of how the challenges impacted on the effectiveness of the grant in achieving poverty alleviation goals, and comparison of the CSG with other (actual or potential) poverty alleviation mechanisms. Preliminary analysis of successful essays showed that a key consideration in discussion of poverty alleviation is how government aid grants compare with strategies for facilitating beneficiaries’ access to paid employment and independent income generation. The thesis offered in response to the question would need to be an overall evaluation of the success, or effectiveness, of the CSG in alleviating poverty. Thus, the main argument type (see 2.4.3.4) required for a legitimate response to the essay question was an argument of value.

140 This insight was confirmed by examination of the reference lists from successful essays on the topic, the most successful of which also referred to relevant journal articles.
5.4.3 The impact of globalisation on the human security of the third world majority

The sole essay topic for the course “Development: discourses and debates” is formulated in the learning guide as follows:

The question to be interrogated is:

What is globalisation? What is human security? Is the globalisation process beneficial for the security of the third world’s majority?

The readings that must be read and understood for this section are the following: …

(“Development: Discourses and Debates”: 13)

The topic is worded as a series of closely-related questions. The three-stage formulation of the essay topic clearly outlines different components of a satisfactory essay response: a discussion of definitions of globalisation, and a discussion of definitions of human security, culminating in the main task, an evaluation of the impact of globalisation on the security of the Third World majority. Students were confined to using only the texts in the prescribed Reader (see 3.8.3.1 and 4.2). Analysis of the readings showed that the first two were key readings for an adequate response to the question posed and, presumably, more important than the other texts (see 4.2.1.1 and 4.2.1.2). The readings function as essential context for the question, providing an overview and two conflicting perspectives on the effects of economic globalisation. Since the argumentation in both texts builds on understandings of concepts in economics, students needed to understand the specialised discourse of economics, which proved to be a factor that constrained the responses and limited the success of the essays written by research participants, most of whom appeared to be unfamiliar with economics discourse (see 2.3.7)\textsuperscript{141}.

5.5 Findings: the nature of argument in educational texts

Excerpts from three sub-categories of pedagogical texts were analysed: a textbook, a prescribed Reader, and the more explicitly pedagogical texts written by the lecturers in the research site, the learning guides and essay prompts. These are all tertiary texts, as they mediate the primary and secondary texts that constitute the knowledge domain to facilitate students’ understanding of the issues.

The textbook that was analysed, being an introductory text, is designed to give first-year students access to the debates and discourses of the Development Studies field, and to

\textsuperscript{141} Economics is not a compulsory course in the curriculum of students who take Development Studies as a major.
introduce students to the subject content, practices and values. Consequently, the editors play a strong mediating role, both in the selection and structuring of the contributing texts around particular themes and in the introductions to sections and chapters. The lines of argument are clearly summarised at the beginning of each section/chapter to help students identify the key ideas in each contribution. The sections of the textbook that were closely analysed revealed that substantial attention is focused on argumentation. Argument metalanguage is used extensively and knowledge is represented as contingent and contestable. The ideological position of the editors is strongly foregrounded.

In the Reader (Chari and Corbridge 2008a), the editors also play a strong mediating role. As the book is aimed primarily at (post)graduate students, mediation is at a higher conceptual level and assumes advanced academic literacy. The introductions to the each of the nine parts of which the book is comprised and the brief introduction to each reading provide compass points for the navigation of the arguments. It was shown that marked awareness of argumentation is inscribed in the editorial text and extensive use is made of argument meta-language to explicate the issues and positions put forth by contributors. In both the textbook and the Reader argumentation is presented as using a combination of discourses of inquiry and persuasion.

Examination of the two learning guides shows that argumentation is seen as important in both modules. With regard to values, the approach in both guides is very similar: an open-minded, yet critical attitude is encouraged, and the values of tolerance for diversity and empathy are emphasised. Thus it appears that having an open mind is a highly valued disposition required for legitimate argumentation. In neither of the learning guides is the writer’s ideological position on the issues covered in the course content presented explicitly to the readers, although it can be inferred from the text. For example, although in the one guide the writer refers to her or his “position”, it is not an ideological standpoint, but rather a critical orientation supporting the belief that the knowledge (“material”) is available for the development of an “alternative” approach.

In comparison to the published pedagogical texts discussed, in both learning guides argumentation as inquiry is emphasised, and the role of persuasion and rhetoric is downplayed. In the learning guide for the development policy module (see 3.5.3.1), although substantial attention is devoted to argumentation in the essay, academic writing is conflated with argument. The lack of clarity about argument is likely to confuse students, rather than to help them write effective argument. In the learning guide on development debates (see 3.5.3.2), although less space is devoted to explicit direction about
appropriate argumentation, and the emphasis is placed on the kind of argument required in asynchronous online discussion, the conception of argument is coherently presented. In both the learning guides, generic guidance about argumentation is given, with no reference being made to discipline-specific or field-specific aspects of argument.

As the discussion above has shown, while the published educational texts use the meta-language of argument extensively to deconstruct or explain the key arguments in the content areas of the knowledge domain, the more informal and idiosyncratic unpublished texts produced in the context of situation use less argument meta-language, and with less precision and definition of the meanings of terms. Although the one learning guide provides some guidance about how to construct written argumentation in Development Studies, the attempts in the other to demystify academic argument are more likely to further confuse students than to help them.

In both of the learning guides, there is some congruence in the representation of argument and the important role it plays in the subject of Development Studies. However, the inconsistencies and contradictions that were identified suggest limited understanding in the context about the role of argument in the construction and reproduction of knowledge in Development Studies. Implicit ambivalence about the relationship between persuasion and inquiry in legitimate argument is inscribed in both texts. This ambivalence appears to be related to the subject being recontextualised from a social science knowledge “region” (Bernstein 2000: 9, see 2.3.5) that readily accommodates the accumulation of incommensurable “languages” (Bernstein 2000: 162) or discourses. The tension between the discourses of inquiry and persuasion observed in the texts that were analysed appear to constitute linguistic inscription of the instability of the knowledge structure (see 2.3.7).

In the chapter that follows, the final chapter presenting the findings of data analysis, the texts at the core of the textual network examined in the case study (see Figure 3.3) are discussed.
Chapter six: Argumentativity in multiple-source discussion essays

6.1 Introduction

The findings on the nature of argument in students’ high stakes disciplinary writing and the resources used for the construction of legitimate argumentation in their essays are presented in this final data chapter (see 1.7 for research questions 3 and 4). As discussed earlier (see 3.8.3.3), the decision was made to use only the students’ multiple-source discussion essays as data for critical investigation of the two related secondary research questions. Thirty students agreed to participate in the study, providing 57 essays – two per student, except for three who provided only one. The analytical framework discussed in the research design chapter (see 3.9) was used not only to guide the analysis, but also to guide the structure of the representation of the findings. Therefore, the findings on how argument is constructed in students’ essays are presented in the three major sub-sections in this chapter that focus on different dimensions of argumentativity: positioning in writer-reader interaction (see 6.2), positioning in relation to authoritative voices (see 6.3), and positioning in the representation of knowledge of ‘reality’ (see 6.4). Since findings from detailed analysis of all the essays in the data set are reported, they provide a reliable indication of the nature of the arguments that the research participants constructed, and an overview of the conventions and discursive resources that were favoured in the essays, making it possible to identify what appear to be key discursive resources for legitimate student argumentation in the context of the case study.

While the components that contribute to argumentativity in the essays are discussed in discrete sub-sections, the presentation of the findings belies the interdependence of the different components and levels of argumentation, which are intricately interwoven and inseparable. To underline this point, the different levels of analysis are brought together and integrated in discussion of the analysis of extracts from one essay text (see 6.5). The text is an ‘outlier’ (Lewis-Beck 2004), which stands out from the others for two reasons. First, the writer’s use of discursive resources differs from the dominant pattern of choices observed in the data set. Second, the ‘outlier’ text received the highest rating from the assessor. The analysis of the atypical essay is used to call into question what analysis of the other texts in the data set suggests about legitimate argumentation in the context. Consequently, in the last part of the chapter (see 6.6.2) the nature of legitimate argumentation in Development Studies at third-year level is discussed.
6.2 Positioning in writer-reader interaction

In the analysis of argument as positioning in writer-reader interaction, the “context of situation” (Halliday 1978: 122) shapes the nature of the interaction, and therefore, the kinds of positionings that are possible. The context is that of a writing task for assessment of disciplinary learning, the interactants being the student and the lecturer-assessor. In this material context, the student writer is positioned as a novice, however well-seasoned, who must respond appropriately to the task. The discourse roles in the interaction are relatively fixed, with the lecturer acknowledged as an authority in the knowledge domain and in the institution of higher education, which is represented by the specific university where the data were collected. Therefore, the lecturer is in a doubly powerful position in relation to the student. Both the task formulation, in the form of the essay prompt, and the discourse roles constrain the possibilities for student positioning in the discourse. The expectation that the student should expose the thinking-in-writing process and ‘display’ learning requires explicitness. It is in the interest of the student to ensure that the reader-assessor is able to ‘follow’ the argument. The links between stages of the text as parts of the overall argument need to be clearly signalled if misinterpretation of the writer’s position is to be avoided. Therefore, the most important discursive resources used to meet the expectation of explicitness in the extended argument of the essay (see 2.4.4) are discussed in the first part of the sub-section (see 6.2.1). Since writer-reader interaction is inseparable from the construction of voice (see 2.2.4.6 and 3.9.3), issues of voice, identity and authority are discussed in the second part of the sub-section (see 6.2.2), which reports on analysis that focused exclusively on the use of “stance” and “engagement” resources (Hyland 2008, see Figure 2.7) in two components of the essay that are particularly important for successful argumentation: the introductory moves and the thesis statement.

6.2.1 Meeting reader expectations of explicitness

The reader’s comprehension of the “vertical structure” and “horizontal articulation” that are essential features of argument in linear academic prose needs to be foregrounded by means of explicit connections (Andrews 2010: 198). In writing, “interactive” metadiscourse (Hyland 2005, see 2.2.4.4 and Figure 2.5) is an important resource for achieving explicitness about the structure of the overall argument. “Frame markers” (Hyland 2005: 51), the specific discursive resources that are used to guide the reader through the text and to ensure that the argument is clear to the reader, are therefore the focus of analysis in this sub-section. The different kinds of frame markers students used to make explicit the
stages of their essays, and, in particular, to draw the reader’s attention to the most important stage of the essay, the thesis statement, are discussed below.

6.2.1.1 Headings as a form of frame marker

One of the first indications of whether a student has produced an acceptable argument is clear signs of the underlying macrostructure of the text. In social science disciplines, there is an expectation that the argument in the essay ‘unfolds’ in an organised way across the stages of linear text. This organisation is conventionally indicated by discernibly separate ‘blocks’ of text, sub-sections and paragraphs, which are marked out by means of headings and spacing on the page.

Analysis of the essays in the data set showed that they have a highly ‘visibilised’ schematic structure, which is strictly governed by the discourse conventions of the disciplinary culture that is cultivated in the context of the case study. As the headings in each sub-section of an essay highlight the content focus of the text that follows, headings function as frame markers that explicitly announce the topic, or purpose, of each stage of the essay (see Figure 3.6). Thus, headings and sub-headings can be considered as a form of multimodal frame marker that enables the writer to display for the reader the overall “vertical programming” of the argument (Andrews 2010: 198, see 2.4.4 and 3.9.3).

The department that offers the subject Development Studies requires that assignments be submitted with a cover page exhibiting information that allows for quick identification and sorting of student scripts, and also a ‘contents’ page that indicates the headings and sub-headings used in the essay text. The contents page functions to give the reader an overview of the text structure, thus making the “vertical programming” of the argument visible at a glance (see Appendix 6.1: essay headings analysis).

Almost without exception, the essays in the data set conform to the expectation that headings be used as a resource for writer-reader interaction to make the essay structure explicit. Essay sub-sections labelled as ‘introduction’ mark the first stage of the essay in 49 of the 57 essays. Sub-sections with a ‘conclusion’ heading mark the final stage of the essay in 51 of the essays. In the essay data set, the essay ‘body’ is the most substantial part of the text, extending over between five and twelve pages. In almost all of the texts, the body is divided into clearly demarcated sub-sections by means of “ideational” sub-headings that inform the reader of the content/field, rather than the rhetorical structure, of the sub-sections of the text (Gardner and Holmes 2009: 265). The vast majority of the essays in the data set (53) have ideational sub-headings. This finding is consistent with
the findings of other research on the use of sub-headings in social science essays (Gardner and Holmes 2009: 266).

Despite this apparent uniformity, significant differences emerge when examining the sub-headings more closely. One difference that enables distinctions to be made about the use of headings as a resource for making the underlying structure explicit, and thereby the vertical programming of the argument, is whether or not hierarchical numbering is used with the ideational headings. In science-oriented academic writing, decimal numbering is typically used to indicate different levels of organisation of ideas in sub-sections of the text. For this reason, the use of numbering in sub-headings as an interactive resource for the display of “vertical programming” (Andrews 2010: 198) was investigated.

In the essays analysed, there is an almost equal split between the use of numbered sub-headings and those without numbering, with just over half (30 of the 57) using numbered sub-headings. However, a decimal numbering system is used in only half (15) of these thirty texts. Analysis of the headings used in the fifteen essays that use the decimal numbering system shows that in just under half the texts (7 of the 15)\[142\] is the resource used effectively to mark the hierarchisation of ideas within a sub-section of text (see Appendix 6.1: essay headings analysis). For example, the use of a first-level number for ‘definition’ and, within that section, a second-level number for each of the terms to be defined is an effective way of organising ideas (see Appendix 6.1, Essay 28.2).

In less successful examples of decimal numbering, the use of different levels to indicate hierarchisation of ideas may be partially successful, but reveals poor conceptualisation of the issues (see Essay 12.2) or breaks down at some point due to inconsistency or carelessness (see essays 22.2 and 26.2). The wording of ideational headings provides an indication of whether students have an adequate overall grasp of the concepts. Where the headings do not convey a logical progression of ideas, the use of decimal numbering tends to fail (see Essay 5.2).

Since in only seven of the essays is the decimal numbering of headings used effectively and consistently to signal hierarchical organisation of ideas in the macrostructure of the essay, the evidence suggests that students are unaware of the value of using decimal numbering as a resource for explicit display of sequential organisation and relationships between ideas within the overall argument.

\[142\] In seven of the essays hierarchical numbering is used relatively effectively (essays 2.2; 3.1; 6.2; 26.1; 27.1; 28.1; 28.2). In eight of the essays hierarchical numbering is less effective in conveying the relationships between key ideas or central claims in the argument (essays 3.2; 5.2; 8.2; 12.1; 12.2; 17.1; 22.2; 26.2).
6.2.1.2 The use of ‘prerevealing’ frame markers in opening moves

The convention of using frame markers in the introduction of the essay as a discursive resource for explicitness is well-established, with “prerevealing” moves typically being recommended to academic writers (Johns 1997: 120-121). Frame markers ‘prime’ the reader, facilitating the recognition of different stages in the succeeding text and, therefore, comprehension of the argument. They play an important role in the interaction between writer and assessor, signalling the writer’s understanding of the genre-assigned discourse role of ensuring the reader is able to follow the writer’s line of thinking.

Analysis of the introductions across the essay data set showed that in all 57 essays writers explicitly announce strategy and the structure of the essay, making extensive use of frame markers. The most commonly used frame markers are formulations for announcing goals, and for previewing or ‘forecasting’ the stages of the argument that follow. Other commonly used frame markers are those that refer to strategies the writer used for arriving at an ‘answer’ to the question posed by the lecturer, and for indicating the sequence of stages in the process of writing the essay (the product). In a substantial proportion of the essays, the introductory stage consists almost exclusively of frame markers. It appears that the use of frame markers for forecasting the content of the essay is an obligatory minimal requirement of the introductory stage. Frame markers are used in the introduction of even the weakest essays, where students use formulaic frame markers as a resource to support their writing\textsuperscript{143}, as exemplified in the extract from an introduction to an essay on the CSG (see 5.4.2):

In this essay I will discuss the Child Support Grant (CSG) on its own, then I will assess whether it is an adequate tool for poverty alleviation. I will compare it to the Foster Care Grant (FCG) and then I will consider whether it encourages greater economic activity. (Essay 18.1)\textsuperscript{144}

In the extract, common “instructional verbs” (Johns 1997: 96) used in the formulation of essay questions (“discuss”, “assess”, “compare” and “consider”) are combined with phrases from the lecturer’s formulation of the specific task in the learning guide to indicate aims, strategy and sequence in the essay. The introduction from an essay on globalisation (see 5.4.3.), illustrating how some students rely excessively on instructional verbs as support in frame markers, follows below. While this introduction is verbose, with unnecessary repetition and duplication of ideas, it functions adequately to announce the

\textsuperscript{143} In this discussion, essays categorised as ‘weak’ are those in which there is evidence of a high proportion of unacknowledged borrowing from sources in the essay text as a whole.

\textsuperscript{144} This was one of eight essays in the data set in which the proportion of illegitimate ‘borrowing’ from sources was so high that there was no discernible thesis statement in the text (see 6.3.1.4).
aims of the essay and a strategy for achieving them, thus meeting the minimal expectation of the introductory stage of the essay:

This essay aims to investigate and elaborate on the nature of globalisation and human security in the Third World countries. It will achieve this by exploring the benefits and shortcomings accompanying the process of globalisation in the Third world countries. It will also examine and explain factors that shape the nature of human security in the Third World countries. The focus on the above-mentioned core areas is primarily important to assist in establishing the contribution of the process of globalisation in the Third World countries. (Essay 10.2)

Although frame markers function primarily as resources for explicitness in writer-reader interaction, the formulation of the frame marker also functions to position the writer in relation to the reader, as illustrated by the extract below, from the last part of a much longer essay introduction:

... The purpose of this essay is to interrogate the process of globalisation and the notion of human security. This essay will answer whether globalisation is beneficial to the security of the majority of the “Third World’s” populace. In order to interrogate this topic fully the literature will focus on various aspects of globalisation such as nation states trade through their various markets, poverty, inequality and gender as well as disease and how these elements have affected the human security of people in developing countries. (Essay 25.2)

The frame marker, “The purpose of this essay is to interrogate”, announces the goal. Appearing late in the introductory stage, the move comes in a rhetorically weak position, the reader in all likelihood having already formed a negative impression of the essay145. The move, signalled by the frame marker, “This essay will answer whether”, is a promise to respond to the reader-assessor’s question. The use of the word “answer” followed by the lecturer’s wording of the task, brings the “context of situation” (Halliday 1978: 122) explicitly into the text, and positions the writer as a dutiful student who is complying with the lecturer’s requirements. The last move in the introduction functions both to confirm that the thesis statement will be delayed, as well as to announce the strategy that will be used in a later stage of the essay to provide the promised answer to the question. This introduction is discussed in more detail later (see 6.3.1.4).

In the majority of the essays there is evidence of moves other than the basic moves for explicitly framing the essay, discussed above, and a wider variety of discursive resources are used for interaction between writer and reader. Discussion of the impact of what

145 The first part of the introduction from Essay 25.2, which shows evidence of heavy reliance on source texts, is reproduced later in the discussion of students’ management of heteroglossia (see 6.3.1.4).
Hyland refers to as “interactional” (2005: 52-54), or “stance” and “engagement” resources (2008: 7-12, see Figure 2.7) on the textual voice follows later (see 6.2.2).

6.2.1.3 The use of frame markers to direct attention to the thesis statement

Convention dictates that essays in the sub-genre of the multiple-source discussion essay require argumentation that culminates in the pronouncement of an overall position in relation to the issue nominated by the lecturer for ‘discussion’ (see 2.2.4.9). Analysis of the thesis statements, represented in Appendix 6.2, confirmed that in the majority of the essays (49 of the 57), a response to the question posed in the essay task (see 5.4) is represented in an identifiable “thesis statement” (Coffin, Curry, Goodman, Hewings, Lillis and Swann 2003: 22) that asserts a position on the topic of the essay. It also showed that, generally, the thesis statement is not placed in the body of the essay, but either in the introductory or the concluding stage of the essay.

Analysis showed that the thesis statement generally consists of the integration of two identifiably separate parts: a frame marker, followed by an overall claim or position, the thesis. Frame markers which function to ‘point to’ the writer’s overall thesis, are used in the majority of the essays. In three-quarters of the essays in the data set\(^{146}\), frame markers explicitly signal the location of the thesis statement in the essay text. The high proportion of essays with “interactive” metadiscourse (Hyland 2005: 50-52) marking the presence of a thesis statement suggests that frame markers are a significant resource used to draw the reader-assessor’s attention to the overall position presented in the text, which constitutes the core stage of the writer-reader interaction, being a response to the question posed in the essay assignment prompt. Consequently, the use of discursive resources to highlight the position of the thesis statement in the essay text was analysed in detail.

The most common pattern observed in the essay data set was the use of impersonal constructions, such as: “It is/was/has/can be… that…” These constructions were combined most often with “mental process” verbs (Halliday 1985: 106-112), such as “conclude”, “find”, “establish”, “infer”, “determine”, “deduce”, and “prove”. These verbs, being associated with reasoning and legal process, explicitly signal that an evaluative or judgemental statement follows. Another common pattern observed was the combination of an impersonal formulation with metadiscourse for representing claims as self-evident observable ‘reality’, as exemplified in the following extracts: “It is clear that…” (Essay 6.1),

\(^{146}\) Frame markers were used in 37 of the 49 essays (the total not including the eight essays that were excluded due to plagiarism).
“It is therefore clear that…” (Essays 13.1 and 13.2), “It is evident that…” (Essay 34.1), and “It is evident to see that…” (Essay 9.1). The most common verb forms that were used as a resource in this “visibilising” discourse (Turner 2011: 65, see 2.4.1) are ‘show’ and ‘demonstrate’, which were used in combination with third-person subjects: “The above-mentioned… show that…” (Essay 10.1), “The literature has shown that…” (Essay 17.1), “This shows that…” (Essay 24.2), and “The essay has also shown that…” (Essay 30.2). A construction that represents arguable claims as if they are factual, and therefore not to be challenged, was used in one essay with similar effect: “The fact remains that…” (Essay 3.1). All the frame markers discussed above are resources for effecting dialogical contraction (see 2.2.2.3 and 3.9.2). Thus, the evidence suggests that resources for dialogical contraction are an important component of the thesis statement in this context. This point is discussed further in the section on positioning in the knowledge domain (see 6.3.2.2).

In some essays, the thesis statement was marked by metadiscourse indicating a concluding stage in the text rather than the culminating move in an argument, some examples being: “In conclusion to this essay…” (Essay 22.2) and, “To conclude…” (Essay 23.1). Transition markers of consequence used in sentence initial position, such as “thus” (used in Essay 6.2) and “therefore” (used in Essays 2.2, 23.2 and 29.2), were also used to draw attention to the thesis statement. Less successful in fulfilling the function of signalling the position of the thesis statement were metadiscourse markers more conventionally used for summation in non-argumentative expository text: “Summing up” (Essay 20.2), “In brief” (Essay 21.2) and, “The main idea that can be taken from this is that…” (Essay 3.2). The markers that label the text stage discussed in this paragraph are less effective as explicit markers of the thesis statement, as they are not associated with argumentation and, therefore, do not function to alert the reader to the writer’s assertion of a position. In addition, unlike the more explicit markers of the thesis statement, discussed above, they do not effect the dialogical contraction that is expected at the culminating point of argumentative text (see 6.3.2.2).

6.2.2 Writer-reader positioning and the construction of voice and authority

While the “interactive” metadiscourse discussed above is a necessary resource for writer-reader interaction in the essay text, the use of other discursive resources is important for effecting the kind of writer-reader positioning that is appropriate in academic argumentation. Writer-reader positioning is inseparable from the construction of voice. The discursive resources that are most useful for writer-reader positioning and the construction
of voice are the “interaction” resources of “stance” and “engagement” (Hyland 2008: 7-8, see 2.2.4.4). Consequently, it is these resources that are the focus of discussion in the two sub-sections that follow. Two stages in the text where voice is a particularly important aspect of reader-writer interaction are the introductory stage and the stage in which the thesis statement is offered. The discussion below focuses on writer-reader positioning and voice in the introduction (see 6.2.2.1) and in the thesis statement (see 6.2.2.2).

6.2.2.1 The construction of voice and authority in opening moves

Move analysis is a logical first step for the analysis of positioning and voice (see 3.9.3 and Figure 3.6). Analysis of the introductions across the essays in the data set showed that, typically, a contextualising move that provides background information on the essay topic is used in the introductory stage of the essay. The conventional contextualising move is executed with varying degrees of fluency and confidence. Unlike frame-marking moves, which position writers as novices lacking in disciplinary authority, the contextualising move offers student writers an opportunity to affiliate themselves with the community represented by the reader-assessor. This move also provides opportunities for the construction of an authoritative textual voice. In some of the essays, the use of an authoritative or a “disciplinary voice” (Hyland 2008: 6-7) is used in the assertion of a position to strengthen the argumentation. To illustrate this point, extracts from four essay introductions in which the construction of an appropriate textual voice is relatively successful are reproduced and discussed below.

A current debate in development is one that is concerned with the role that the state should play in the development process, with the “left” and the “right” views as the competitors in this debate. Those on the left side of the debate support the state as being an important and beneficial actor in the development process, while those on the right see the state as a despot, which should therefore be kept as far away as possible from the development process (Rapley 2002:1). The focus of this essay will be on the left side of this debate, as it is here where the notion of the developmental state has won a lot of approval. (Essay 2.1)

In the example above, most of the paragraph functions to contextualise and justify the subject content discussed in the essay. The use of lexico-grammatical discursive resources enables multiple functions to be performed simultaneously in one move. In the first move the writer shows awareness that the concept of the ‘developmental state’ is a specific concern in the development field. By referring to “current debate”, the textual voice

---

147 Three of the introductions are to the essay on the developmental state (see 5.4.1) and one introduction is to the essay on globalisation (see 5.4.3).
draws the reader's attention and highlights the contested nature of the discussion that follows (government intervention in national economic and social development). Affiliation with the academic discourse community, specifically the Development Studies field, is signalled in a number of ways. The reference to “development” debate, in theme position as the subject of the opening sentence, the naming of two opposing perspectives and the indication of the different positions on the issue contribute to the construction of an authoritative voice that is poised to participate in the disciplinary debate. The use of formal lexis from Development Studies, such as “state” and “actor”, signals familiarity with field-specific academic terminology. The use of scare quotes for the use of the terms “left” and “right” signals that they are contestable terms with different meanings in different discourses, and shows awareness of the necessity of cautious distancing of the textual voice when using the terms. The citation of Rapley as support for the claims made indicates familiarity with an appropriate expert text and deference to disciplinary authority. The reader’s interest is drawn and held by the use of lexical resources for reference to difference and the resulting discursive tension: the repetition of the word “debate”, the metaphorical use of the word “competitors”, and the use of the terms “left” and “right” in balanced constructions that also outline the conflicting positions.

The second broad move is an indication of the left-leaning orientation of the essay. In this move the textual voice shows awareness of the divisions in the development field, and also simultaneously signals cautious affiliation with the “left”, or progressive, side of the field. The use of the interactive transition marker “as” to introduce a reason for the expression of a left-leaning position acknowledges the convention in the academic context of providing explicit reasons for claims that are made. This move shows that the student is familiar with and intends to fulfil the expectations of the discourse community represented by the reader-assessor.

In the one-paragraph introduction below, similar moves are performed, resulting in the construction of an authoritative voice.

There is a lively debate on whether South Africa can be called a ‘Developmental State’. The term was first used to refer to Japan, and later applied to other rapidly developing East Asian countries, namely South Korea, Singapore, and Taiwan. Throughout the essay when discussing East Asia, it is specifically these four countries that are being referred to. The term has been revitalised and applied to other developing countries (Calvert, 2005: 55). The aim of this essay is to determine whether the concept of the development state can accurately describe South Africa. To achieve this, the experience of the East Asian countries peak in development during the post-war era will be compared to state of South Africa’s development in their current democratic period. (Essay 7.1)
In the first move, the assertion of the existence of a debate secures the reader’s interest. In the same move, affiliation with the development field is signalled by the use of the appropriate discourse: the key term, “developmental state”, is introduced, and there is acknowledgement that the debate centres on the use of a term to describe a domain-specific concept. Thus, the contextualising move centres on the key term: its origin and current use of the term. A move is made which specifies how the term “East Asia” should be understood in the text as a whole. Lexical and orthographic discursive resources, as well as metadiscourse markers, are used in the first part of the introduction, which consists entirely of moves related to the disciplinary discourse. The word “debate” signals different points of view, while “whether” and “can be” function to modalise the construction, signalling a dialogically expansive approach to the issue which is appropriate in the introductory stage of the essay. The use of the present tense form, “There is…”, signals that the contested issue is current. The use of the verb “called”, as well as the inverted commas enclosing the term “developmental state”, signal the highly-developed discursive awareness that characterises disciplinary voice. In what can be seen as the second part of the introduction, the moves to achieve explicitness more common across the data set (see 6.2.1.2) are seen: the “aim” is clearly stated, followed by a forecasting move about the strategy to be used to achieve the aim. The economy with which the moves in the brief opening paragraph are achieved suggests that the writer is in control of the text, thereby also contributing to the construction of an authoritative voice.

The third example of an introduction on the same question follows below.

South Africa has engaged in different programmes to ensure well-being of its citizens. It has engaged in developmental projects to increase economic growth and to provide basic services to the population at large. It is a developing country, which is trying to establish itself within the global markets. This essay aims to establish whether South Africa can be classified as a developmental state. This will be done by first discussing the origins of the concept. That will be followed by a description of a developmental state. Thereafter South Africa’s developmental efforts will be discussed, focusing on the two policies. These two policies are RDP and GEAR, with a specific focus on government programmes on development of the economy and provision of basic services. This discussion will give an indication as to whether South Africa can be classified as a developmental state. (Essay 14.1)

The essay begins with a number of claims about South Africa that constitute a contextualising move providing background for the discussion that follows. In this move, the textual voice confidently positions the text and, by extension, the writer as participating in wider development debates. This move shows awareness of the concepts that concern
practitioners and academics in the development field, and familiarity with the terminology that is central to participation in their discourse. Consequently, it can be seen as effectively constructing an appropriate disciplinary voice. The next move is a statement of the aim, which is linked to the essay question that was posed, followed by a move that simultaneously forecasts the strategy to be applied in answering the question, and the sequence that will be followed. The use of the word “classified” twice in the introduction signals awareness that knowledge is represented in discourse. However, it must be noted that discourse awareness would have been more clearly signalled had the writer used inverted commas to mark out the contestation that exists in the Development Studies field when the term “developmental” is used (see extract from Essay 7.1 above). The final move both indicates that the thesis is to be delayed and creates the expectation that the question will be adequately addressed by the end of the essay.

The introduction to the second essay written by same student who wrote the introduction that is discussed first above (see beginning of this sub-section) follows.

[1] Discussions about globalisation and its effect on the world have been at the forefront of development debate and discourse since the early 1990s. Many of these debates are concerned with the relationship between globalisation and development with focus being paid to globalisation and its effect on human security as well as the effect of globalisation on the third world, with the major point of contestation being whether the globalisation process is beneficial for the poor of the third world or not.

[2] This essay will discuss the relationship of the globalisation process with the third world by firstly examining the origins of globalisation as well as the meaning and definition of globalisation. This will be followed by an investigation into the meaning and significance of human security in terms of the globalisation process. The focus will lastly fall on how globalisation has affected the third world by examining the opposing views with regards to the globalisation process and looking at whether the globalisation process can be viewed to be beneficial for the third world or not. (Essay 2.2)

The most notable aspect of this introduction is the broad move constituted in the first paragraph in which the question posed by the lecturer is reformulated as an important and debatable issue in the field of development. This strategy not only introduces all the key terms for discussion in the essay but, more pertinently, also positions the textual voice and, by extension, the writer, in the debate within the development field. The expectation of explicitness is fulfilled in the second paragraph through the use of frame markers to announce the goal of the essay, as well as to forecast the writer's strategy, the delay in offering a thesis and the sequence of the argument. The explicit outline of the essay,
represented neatly in a separate paragraph, suggests an author who is in control of the text, and thus also contributes to the construction of authoritative voice.

While the texts discussed above show the emergence of the disciplinary voice required for legitimate participation in the debates of Development Studies, the majority of texts in the essay data set provide abundant evidence of what research has confirmed: that students have difficulty with the construction of appropriate textual voice (Scott and Turner 2009, see 2.2.4.6), and that their formulations often detract from the argument (Andrews 2010). To illustrate this claim, extracts from two essays that exemplify the difficulty of constructing authoritative, or disciplinary, voice are discussed below.

The introduction that follows is from one of the weakest essays in the data set, which relies on extensive borrowing from inappropriate sources. Although the focus of this research is not on the linguistic resources of generic academic discourse it might be assumed students possess if they reach the end of the undergraduate years of study (see 2.2.4.8), it can be noted that the essay from which the introduction is extracted, unacknowledged borrowings excepted, is a combination of primary discourse and the monoglossic discourse (Martin and White 2005: 99, see 2.2.4.3) typical of entry-level textbooks.

In this assignment I will explain and discuss globalisation and the impact it has on countries of the world. The assignment will look at human security on the global scale. I will also look at the process of globalisation as a beneficiary for the security of the third world countries. There are various types of globalisation processes that are taking place in the world. There is globalisation of culture, consumption, telecommunications, economy, corporations, investment, and local specialisation of work services, tourism and technology. Globalisation plays a major role in the development of the world and human security. There are different human securities that need to be taken into consideration such as food water and shelter which falls under human security. The assignment will look at different types of human security in different places in the world especially in the third world countries. (Essay 12.2)

In the first three sentences of the introduction, there is evidence that the writer attempted to perform the conventional moves for achieving explicitness that are expected in an essay introduction. Two moves can be said to have been performed: the announcement of an aim that is related to the essay ‘topic’ and a preview of the writer’s strategy for achieving the aim. However, given the awkward formulations in the text, extracting the moves identified requires effort from the reader. Although some interactive metadiscourse is used, it appears that the needs of the reader are not considered in the textual interaction, with the text functioning more as a writing-for-learning process than as a product for assessment that requires the assertion of a position.
Close analysis of the formulations suggests that the writer is confused about the nature of the task that the essay embodies. Since the “instructional verbs” (Johns 1997: 96) used suggest that the writer is a detached observer, there is no indication that the essay task requires the writer to take up a position in a debate within the knowledge domain. Although the word “discuss” is used, the sense of the word as ‘engaging in written argumentation’ is undercut by its being preceded by the word associated with pedagogical exposition, “explain”. The laboured progression of monoglossic claims, none of which bring the key terms in the essay prompt, ‘globalisation’, ‘human security’ and ‘third world’ (see 5.4.3) together in one formulation, suggests a struggle to make the conceptual link between the key terms that is necessary for an adequate response to the question. The three references to the “assignment” clearly position the textual voice as a novice-student who is fulfilling a course requirement. The provision of obvious information in eternal present formulations, introduced by “There is/are…”, position the writer as outside the substantive debates of the knowledge domain. The alternating use of first-person and impersonal third-person resources in theme position in the paragraph is an inconsistency that undermines the textual voice, setting up negative expectations of the performance that follows.

In research writing, as exemplified in this thesis in the ‘expert texts’ analysed in Chapter Four (see 4.2), resources for the expression of “stance” (Hyland 2008, see 2.2.4.4) are used in the construction of an authoritative textual voice. However, in pedagogical discourse the use of stance resources puts novice writers at risk of alienating the reader-assessor, as analytical focus on the stance resources used in the introduction below shows.

It is essential that countries progress in order for them to develop their economies and reduce poverty and inequality as these are some of the major challenges that are facing underdeveloped and developing countries. Globalisation has been an ongoing process that it has been happening gradually throughout the years but with the current technological inventions it is easily said that globalization is inevitable and is beneficial to the third world. Although there are challenges that face globalization there are benefits as well that overshadow the challenges, these will be critically discussed relating them to how they affect the third world. It should also be considered that globalization is working but it is not working perfectly and there are areas where it can be improved upon. The paper will briefly define the terms globalization, third world and human security to give a clearer understanding of the terms. Lastly a critical analysis will be done on whether globalization is beneficial for the third world. (Essay 28.2)

In the very first sentence of the introduction, the textual voice confidently asserts claims about the relationship between poverty, inequality and progress. The use of the
“causative” transition markers (Hyland 2005: 50, see Figure 2.5), “in order for” and “as”, suggest that poverty and inequality can be explained in terms of simple causal relationships. In combination with the naive choice of the word “progress” to represent the solution to the problems of poverty and inequality, the wording in the first sentence reveals basic misconceptions about the field of Development (see 5.3.2). It appears from the text that the writer had engaged only superficially with the sources or had misunderstood them. The propositional claims made position the textual voice as speaking from outside the knowledge domain. The questionable nature of the ideational content represented in the first sentence of the text suggests that the writer’s knowledge of the development field is inadequate to justify the assertion of such sweeping claims. Furthermore, conventional student writer-assessor interaction is disrupted in the use, in text-initial position, of the attitude marker, “It is essential that”. The use of the stance resource conventionally inscribes writer authority and confidence but, since it is not supported by adequate disciplinary knowledge, it has the opposite effect. In the context of the essay, it is an inappropriate choice of discursive resource, and marks the faltering of the textual voice. The use of the attitude marker, “It should also be considered that…”, has a similar effect, projecting a textual voice with the authority to direct the reader’s thoughts. Given the positioning of the student writer as a novice, and that the ideational content of the text confirms the novice status of the writer, the overall effect is of an inappropriately authoritative and, therefore, unconvincing textual voice.

In the final introductory move (see the last two sentences of the essay introduction above), the pedagogic context is acknowledged in the promise to define the key terms and to perform “critical analysis” in order to determine the answer to the question posed in the task. In terms of interaction with the reader, the writer’s choice of wording in the phrase, “to give a clearer understanding”, is awkward. It seems to imply that the reader-assessor requires assistance to understand the key terms, rather than that, as part of the assessment task, the writer is obliged to provide clear definitions in order to demonstrate that she/he understands the terms. The wording suggests writing-as-thinking-tool in a writing-for-learning process, rather than writing as a product that demonstrates learning. Some of the formulations used to create the impression that the writer has the discursive resources required at this level of study, such as “critical analysis”, appear to be “mushfake” resources (Gee 1996: 147). In this case, the choice of discursive resources,

---

148 Where in a more accomplished text, which reveals deep engagement with the source texts of the knowledge domain, the use of the term “paper” to refer to the essay would convey an authoritative textual voice, in this text it also appears to be “mushfake” (Gee 1996: 147).
rather than working to construct an authoritative textual voice, function instead to undermine it.

6.2.2.2 The construction of voice and authority in the thesis statement

Analysis of the frame markers used to signal the presence of the thesis statement (see 6.2.1.3) showed that writers typically chose impersonal resources. However, in some essays, “stance” and/or “engagement” (Hyland 2008: 7-12) resources were used in the frame marker that introduces the thesis, with negative consequences for the construction of appropriate voice, as the following brief discussion shows. (Analysis of the thesis statements in the data set is represented in Appendix 6.2.)

The use of the attitude marker as a stance resource is illustrated with reference to three very similar examples from the data set: “It is important to understand that…” (Essay 5.2), “It is important to note that…” (Essay 6.2), and “It is vital to understand that…” (Essay 28.2)149. Given the unequal relationship between writer and reader, the use of attitude markers that function to direct the thinking of the reader appears to be impertinent and could also function to alienate the reader.

In a very small proportion of the thesis statements, the stance resource of ‘self mention’ is used150, and in an even smaller proportion is it used effectively to strengthen the argumentation. In two texts the unnatural form, “this author”, which has a distancing effect, is used. This awkward form also suggests an unnecessary disconnection between the textual voice and the author. One student used, “…in me [my] personal view…”, which is a discourse marker more typically used to introduce assertions of personal opinion in spoken discourse. The first person singular pronoun ‘I’ is used in only two texts. Given that the thesis statement is an assertion of the writer’s position, the effacement of self at this stage of the essay is noteworthy. This finding is discussed further later in the chapter (see 6.4.2 and 6.5).

In very few cases, the engagement resource of “reader mention” (Hyland 2008: 8, 11) terms was used in the thesis statement. The first person plural pronoun ‘we’ was used in combination with “mental process” verbs (Halliday 1985: 106-112) in both essays written by one of the research participants, the formulations being: “So we know that…” (Essay 11.1) and, “We looked at… we determined that…” (Essay 11.2). In the context of situation,

---

149 In the uses of interactional metadiscourse discussed above, it appears the students were using the oral discourse that is used by their lecturers when teaching classes.
150 A form of self-mention is used in only eight of the 57 texts.
the positioning of the reader-assessor alongside the student writer as an equal or compliant text participant is a risky move. In these two texts, not only is the reader explicitly drawn into the text at the point of the essay where the textual voice is expected to assert an independent position, but the reader is positioned as sharing the views asserted. Given that both essays showed insufficient interaction with authoritative sources, being constructed with an unacceptable number of monoglossic assertions that are questionable in terms of the ideational claims that are made, the use of the engagement resource is presumptuous. It shows a lack of reader awareness that is likely to alienate the reader and, therefore, to have a negative effect on the overall argumentation.

6.3 Positioning in the knowledge domain

As full exploration of positioning of the textual voice in the knowledge domain as an aspect of argumentativity in students’ essays is beyond the ambit of this study, only an overview of issues raised by consideration of interdiscursivity and intertextuality as an aspect of students’ argumentation is provided (see 6.3.1). It is intended that the overview functions as a context for interpretation in the discussion of the detailed analysis of dialogistic positioning in thesis statements that follows it (see 6.3.2).

6.3.1 Intertextuality and interdiscursivity: an overview

The most obvious resource to which all students should have access are the prescribed texts that represent both subject content and disciplinary discourse. Arguably, it is through reading and engaging with prescribed texts, over an extended period of time, that students are able to appropriate disciplinary discourse to the extent that they can draw on it in the construction of their own texts. Presumably, students who have been reading in Development Studies for almost three years should have appropriated some domain-specific discourse.

As noted in previous chapters (see 2.4.3.3 and 4.4), the warrant and backing for arguments in the knowledge domain are located in the texts to which lecturers direct the students. However, even in the disciplinary sources, the warrant and backing of arguments often remain implicit. Having been established in the discourse community over time, it is assumed that the warrant and backing of the arguments are common knowledge that the reader shares (see 2.4.3.3). For this reason, students who stray from within the boundaries of the prescribed sources for the ideational content of their essays are likely to make claims that are underpinned by reasoning and theories that are not acceptable in the
knowledge domain. If sources from other disciplines are used, it is likely that their arguments will not be recognised as legitimate products of engagement with the knowledge domain (see 2.3.2 and 2.3.6) and, therefore, will not be highly rated by the reader-assessor. The use of inappropriate sources exposes students to non-disciplinary discourses, increasing the likelihood of their using inappropriate discourses in their own texts. It is not surprising, therefore, that the lecturers placed great emphasis on students adhering to the prescribed readings (see 5.3.1).

6.3.1.1 Selection of texts and discourses

Given the proscription on the use of texts other than those prescribed for the course, it is significant that a high proportion of texts in the data set drew on other sources for the claims that were made. In at least one quarter of the essay texts, some of the sources used were inappropriate, with consequent use of illegitimate discourses. The most strikingly inappropriate incorporations were those of images (Essays 12.1 and 12.2) and graphs (Essay 9.1) copied from the internet, which suggest the two students were not familiar with the basic conventions of the essay genre in Development Studies, which does not make use of visual material as support for argumentation.

The majority of inappropriate sources of information appear to have been accessed on the internet, with journalistic or government-sponsored public information texts being most favoured. Consequently, voices from outside the academy were incorporated into the student texts. The incorporation of the discourse of popular journalism is exemplified in an essay with the sub-heading “Gogo Sibeko’s tuckshop” (see Appendix 6.1, Essay 24.1). The integration into the essay texts of the voices of the popular or educational media, as well as the use of primary discourse (see 2.2.2.4), disrupt the impression students strove to give of having appropriated the discourse of the knowledge domain.

Even when authoritative voices from inside the academy were used, some students drew on texts produced by specialists in other disciplines, with consequent selection and integration of inappropriate authoritative voices. Students who used sources for the essay on globalisation (see 5.4.3) other than those from the prescribed reader were particularly likely to use illegitimate voices as a resource in their texts. Since ‘globalisation’ is a concept that is used in a range of diverse knowledge domains, with different meanings and underpinning theories, depending on the disciplinary contexts, some students used concepts located in cultural studies or business studies, with serious consequences for the argumentation in their essays (for example, Essays 8.2 and 21.2). In two particularly
notable cases, the incorporation of the discourse of business studies contributed to the construction of an inconsistent and inappropriate textual voice (Essays 9.2 and 16.2). Since the values implicit in academic business studies discourse tend to be aligned with those of the dominant global economic system of capitalism, the discourse conflicts with that of Development Studies. Particularly where the subject is offered in an African context, the disciplinary discourse inscribes a critical perspective on economic globalisation and the discourses that drive it (see 4.3 and 5.3.2). Thus, a notable feature in some essay text data is the combination of incommensurate discourses (Bernstein 2000: 162-173). The use of illegitimate voices undermined students’ attempts to construct disciplinary voice, leading to unreflexive incorporation of illegitimate discourses that detracted from the overall argumentation.

6.3.1.2 Representation of authoritative voices

Even students who used only the prescribed texts did not necessarily use them effectively as a resource. This is more evident in the essays on globalisation (see 4.3), where a number of essays reveal fundamental misunderstanding of the source texts and/or misrepresent authoritative voices. The two texts that are most often misrepresented are the extracts written by Wade (see 4.2.1.2) and Hirschkind and Mahmood (see 4.2.1.3). Both texts present a high degree of reading challenge. The aspect of the latter text that contributed to misrepresentation by students was the humanities-oriented cultural studies discourse that was used in analysis of the meanings of Muslim women wearing the veil, which differs markedly from the social science discourse of the other prescribed readings. The text written by Wade embodies sophisticated argumentation, which is partially carried by means of extensive use of the metadiscourse of argument. Wade’s overall argument is completely misrepresented in a number of the essays. Detailed comparative analysis of the essays and the source text shows that in all the cases the introduction of Wade’s text was misunderstood. It seems that students did not recognise the metadiscourse used to distance the textual voice from the pro-globalisation position that the author summarises for the purpose of challenging it at a later stage in the text. An example of a formulation that students did not interpret correctly is: “The neoliberal argument says that…” It seems students did not recognise the labelling of the position as a way to distance the authorial voice from the claims that followed. Instead of the more conventional foregrounding of the author’s position in an upfront thesis statement in the early stage of the text, Wade’s introduction begins with a summary of the position on globalisation that is criticised at a later stage. The rhetorical structure of the introduction may also have contributed to
students misinterpreting the text, as reader expectations of a preview of the thesis statement are not met until the end of the introduction, and at that stage in the text, the writer’s position is carefully hedged.

Since there is evidence of misunderstanding and misrepresentation in a high proportion of the essays that used only prescribed sources\textsuperscript{151}, it seems that many of the students did not fully understand the argumentation in the source texts. As a result, they were poorly placed to weigh the different positions offered in the source texts, and to offer considered opinions in their own thesis statements.

\textbf{6.3.1.3 Acknowledgment of authoritative voices}

Adherence to the conventions of citation and referencing are important for argumentation. The consistent use of appropriate conventions contributes to the rhetorical effectiveness of the writing by providing the reader with assurance of the trustworthiness and reliability of the author, thereby strengthening the \textit{ethos} of the author and the credibility of the author’s claims. In other words, disciplined use of the conventions for acknowledging authoritative voices affects writer-reader interaction in the text in ways that impact on the argumentation. Cursory examination of citation and referencing in the student essays shows that the majority of the students cited sources and had references at the end of the essay. However, close examination shows that, in most cases, the texts met the exacting demands of accurate citation and referencing conventions only superficially. In very few instances was the acknowledgement of sources consistently appropriate and correct. More detailed support for and discussion of this observation is beyond the ambit of this research.

\textbf{6.3.1.4 Integration of authoritative voices}

In relation to argumentation, one of the most important aspects of the use of sources is the extent to which students integrate the voices of the source texts into their own texts. Despite the marked emphasis on the appropriate use of sources and on avoiding plagiarism (see 5.3.1), it appears that the proscription of the use of unacknowledged sources was ineffective. There is evidence of fairly extensive unacknowledged borrowing from sources in approximately two-thirds of the essay texts. In the analytical process of identifying a thesis statement, eight essays were found to have such a high degree of plagiarism that not only was the essay body entirely a ‘cut and paste’ construction, it was

\textsuperscript{151} There are instances of mis-readings of texts written by Wolf, Schoepf and Agarwal as well (see 4.2.2).
impossible to reconstruct a thesis statement from either the introductions or the conclusions of the essays\(^\text{152}\).

Analysis of the essays shows that a wide range of strategies and resources was used by students in their attempts to incorporate authoritative voices from the source texts. Some of the student texts suggest that a degree of duplicity characterises student practices. In some of the texts there is evidence that a thesaurus was used for systematic substitution of content words in chunks of text that were copied verbatim from the source text (for example, Essay 4.2). In other essays, the omission of inverted commas, which conventionally signal the reproduction of exact wording in the original, made text that had been copied verbatim appear to be acceptable acknowledged paraphrase of the source (for example, Essay 15.2). The extent to which such practices are intentionally dishonest cannot be established by textual analysis alone.

The use of a single term, ‘plagiarism’, to refer to a number of different practices, ranging from unconscious appropriation to deliberate dishonesty, misrepresents the complexity of the process of drawing on authoritative sources in argumentation. The data supports the view that, in many instances, what lecturers refer to as plagiarism is a necessary, rather than intentionally dishonest, “borrowing” (Pennycook 1998) of discursive resources from authoritative sources to construct an authoritative or “disciplinary” textual voice (see 2.2.4.3). This point is exemplified in the analysis of the first part of the introductory stage of the essay reproduced and discussed below, which inscribes both the writer’s awareness of the reader’s expectation that her “own words” (see 5.3.1) be used, and her lack of confidence about meeting this demand\(^\text{153}\).

> “Globalisation has been variously conceived as action at a distance (whereby the actions of social agents in one locale can come to have significant consequences for ‘distant others’; time-space compression (referring to the way in which instantaneous electronic communication erodes the constraints of distance and time on social organisation and interaction); accelerating interdependence (understood as the intensification of enmeshment among national economies and societies such that events in one country impact directly on others); a shrinking world (the erosion of borders and geographical barriers to socio-economic activity; and, among other concepts, global integration, the reordering of interregional power relations, consciousness of the global condition and the intensification of interregional interconnectedness” (Held and McGrew, 2003: 3). According to Scott and Marshall (2005: 249) “globalisation is a social process in which the constraints of

\(^{152}\) For this reason these eight texts were excluded from the calculations made based on analysis of the thesis statement (see Appendix 6.2).

\(^{153}\) The essay represents a marked improvement on the student’s performance in the previous essay, which was characterised by such extensive ‘cut and paste’ borrowing from unacknowledged sources that no thesis statement could be found.
The writer’s first move was to absent herself entirely from the discourse by starting off the text with half a page of quotation from two expert texts. The use of quotations in the first stage of the essay allowed the writer to stand behind the authoritative sources, delaying interaction between the writer and the reader. The move is rhetorically weak, as it positions the writer as a neophyte rather than an experienced undergraduate. The “code gloss” (Hyland 2005: 52), “To put the above mentioned into simple terms”, indicates that the move that follows was an attempt to paraphrase the two quotations. However, the ineptness of the paraphrase suggests that the writer either did not fully understand the ideas inscribed in the quotations or did not have the linguistic resources to provide clear reformulations of the wording in the source texts. It appears that lack of familiarity with the discourse prevented the student from manipulating the wording in the expert texts to produce a paraphrase of the ideas.

The use of the inappropriate word “emanates” shows the writer aiming for a higher register by using formal diction in place of the discourse of the knowledge domain, which she does not control. This word choice, considered together with the two long quotations, suggests an under-developed textual voice. It appears that the writer used academic-sounding diction and quotations from authoritative sources in order to produce text that seems authoritative. The use of the dialogically contractive phrase, “it is clear that”, is another example of the writer’s attempt to construct an authoritative voice. However, use of a “stance” (Hyland 2008: 7-8) resource that conveys epistemic certainty is inappropriate in the text of a novice. The use of dialogically contractive phrasing in the introductory part of the essay is also a rhetorically weak move, since the conventional opening moves in the multiple source discussion essay are typically dialogically expansive (see 2.2.2.3). For these reasons, the extract discussed above appears to represent another example of “mushfake” discourse (Gee 1996: 147) that fails to construct effective argumentation.

To sum up, the above discussion has shown that argumentation in terms of what Martin (1992: 590), following Bakhtin, refers to as “heteroglossia” is relatively weak in the majority of the essays in the data set. In the majority of the essay texts, at the level of intertextuality in discourse (see Figure 2.13), the authoritative voices available to students in expert texts...
are not adequately appropriated and integrated into students’ texts in ways that strengthen their argumentation. In the discussion below, detailed analysis of students’ thesis statements, using appraisal theory, offers a more nuanced picture of how students incorporate some of the different authoritative voices represented in the disciplinary sources to position themselves in the knowledge domain. Analysis shows that students’ success in seamlessly integrating authoritative voices into their own texts is a major determinant of whether the argumentation is judged to be legitimate and convincing.

6.3.2 Positioning in relation to authoritative voices

For an examination of how the textual voice in student texts is positioned in relation to the authoritative voices in expert texts, attention is focused on the most crucial part of the essay text, the thesis statement. An effective thesis statement is a direct and concise response to the essay question. It functions to assert a position on the essay question, using the voices of the prescribed texts as a resource. The challenge for novice writers is to establish an authorial presence (Clark and Ivanič 1997; Ivanič 1998) while simultaneously incorporating some of the voices of the knowledge domain. In the multiple-source discussion essay, the construction of an acceptable voice requires that the writer achieve this balance. Analysis of the use of discursive resources for heteroglossic engagement at this significant stage in the essay text proves to be particularly illuminating with regard to argument as positioning in relation to the authoritative voices of the knowledge domain, as is shown in the discussion that follows. For the analysis of the thesis statements of all the essays in the data set, see Appendix 6.2.

6.3.2.1 Monoglossia

As discussed above, the use of disciplinary sources is essential for legitimate argumentation (see 6.3.1). In the extract below, limited engagement with both the voices of the sources and with the lecturer’s task formulation (see 5.4.3) is evident.

Globalisation is essential as it aids the third world in different ways to develop. Although there are challenges that can still be addressed with globalisation such as culture and religions being compromised it is vital to understand that the benefits are more rewarding such as reduction of poverty and equality. (Essay 28.2, par 11, lines 6-10)

Although the thesis statement is discussed in isolation from the rest of the text in the discussion below, in the first stages of the analytical process, consideration was given to the relationship between the thesis and text as a whole (see 3.9.2).
The first short clause, “Globalisation is essential”, appears to be a response to the question posed in the task, and therefore to seems to be the first part of a thesis statement. The assertion is an evaluative claim which, not being formulated in terms of positioning in relation to an authoritative source, is what Martin and White (2005: 98-100) refer to as a “bare assertion” or monoglossic text (see 2.2.4.3). Coming from a novice, the use of the evaluative word, “essential”, constitutes an unauthorised expression of “stance” (Hyland 2008: 7-8), which cannot be linked to the ideas of any of the authoritative prescribed sources (see 4.2.1 and 4.2.2). The choice of wording is inappropriate as it is makes use of deontic rather than epistemic modality (Fairclough 2003: 219), and consequently, the argumentation is hortatory rather than analytical (Martin 1992: 563). The claim that follows in support of the evaluation, “…it aids the third world in different ways to develop”, is as vague as it is monoglossic. It shows that the writer has not engaged with one of the key source readings, in which it is argued that, on the contrary, globalisation does not necessarily help the developing world (see 4.2.1.2).

Despite the use in the sentence that follows of the resources for concession, “although” and “still”, which are conventionally used to achieve dialogical contraction, the formulations that follow are also monoglossic. The attitude marker used for the construction of “stance” (Hyland 2008: 7-8), “It is vital to understand that”, is followed by an awkwardly expressed claim that the benefits outweigh the “challenges”, which are evaluated as “more rewarding”. Since the claims made in the thesis statement cannot be substantiated with reference to the source readings, the dominant pattern is monoglossic. The result is that the textual voice is not positioned in relation to the authoritative voices and the argument fails at the level of intertextual interaction.

Another example of failure of the argument at the intertextual level, from the final part of the concluding paragraph of an essay on the CSG, is reproduced and discussed below.

> The Child Support Grant has had and still has a lot of positive effects on the children and mostly on households that are in need of it. This grant has help families to be sustainable and most importantly it [h]as help families to move away from poverty in a sense that these families are now better off than before. (Essay 16.1, par 26, lines 6-10)

In this extract, there is no substantial evidence that the writer had engaged with the voices in appropriate source readings, in which evaluation of the CSG is not unqualified (see 4.3.1). Consequently, the overall impression is of monoglossia. Even had there been support from authoritative sources, such an unqualified positive evaluation of the CSG is uncharacteristic of academic writing. In the phrasing, “a lot of positive effects”, the use of
an evaluative term, combined with the graduation resource, “a lot of” (see Figure 2.3), which amplifies the positive evaluation, constructs the voice of a novice. This impression is strengthened in the use of wording more typical of primary discourse than the secondary discourse of academia. The attitude marker, “most importantly”, suggests authorial presence. However, taking the thesis statement as a whole into account, the use of the resource for the construction of authorial stance is undermined by the failure to incorporate the voice of an authoritative source into the textual voice and the weakness of the ideational content of the text. The resulting effect is of unconvincing argument.

6.3.2.2 Assertion of a position through dialogical contraction

The discussion above shows that thesis statements that do not incorporate legitimate authoritative voices are unconvincing: strong disciplinary argument requires the textual voice to be engaged with the voices of authoritative sources. Heteroglossic engagement is inscribed in the use of the resources for dialogistic positioning described in Martin and White’s (2005) appraisal theory (see 2.2.4.3, and Figure 3.5). Conventional patterns of heteroglossic engagement differ across the stages of the typical multiple-source discussion essay text. Analysis of the essays in the data set showed that introductions tend to draw on the resources of dialogical expansion (see Figure 2.4). In the more successful introductions discussed above (see 6.2.2, Essays 2.1, 7.1 and 2.2), the existence of other voices was acknowledged in explicit references to conflicting perspectives and debate. Generally the moves employed for this purpose are dialogically expansive.

In the thesis statement, however, the assertion of a position is strengthened by construction of an authoritative textual voice. One of the means by which textual authority is constructed is the use of discursive resources for dialogical contraction (see Figure 2.4). The high proportion of essays in which dialogically contractive frame markers are used in the thesis statement has already been noted (see 6.2.2.2). The first extract chosen to illustrate the importance of dialogical contraction in the thesis statement comes from the final paragraph of a three-paragraph conclusion.

There are contrasting views as to whether globalisation is beneficial to the third world or not. Globalisation has brought benefits to developing countries, but it has not succeeded in bringing about a massive decline in poverty or inequality. Therefore, even though globalisation has the potential to improve the lives of those in the third world, thus far it has not succeeded in doing so as there are still a number of challenges to overcome in order to achieve this. (Essay 2.2)
The thesis statement begins with a reassertion of the claim made in the introduction about the contestation that surrounds the question of the impact of globalisation (see 6.2.2 for the discussion of the introductions). While functioning at the level of writer-reader interaction to reintroduce the question to which the essay constitutes a response, the opening sentence also inscribes dialogical expansion. The clause that follows is a claim that functions as a concession, which is quickly undercut in the claim that follows the “but”. It is a resource that signals that a counter-argument move follows. Negation, signalled in the use of the word “not”, allows the writer to deny that globalisation is beneficial in any substantial sense. Thus, the use of “but”, a linguistic resource for the “disclaim: counter” move (see Figure 2.4), functions as more than a “transition marker” in the argument, as it would be categorised in terms of “interactive metadiscourse” (Hyland 2005).

The transition marker, “Therefore”, in clause-initial position in the following clause, functions to signal that a conclusion has been reached only at the end of a process of reasoned consideration of conflicting views. This is followed by the phrase, “even though”, which is another resource for effecting a “disclaim: counter” move that inscribes concession: the writer concedes that processes of globalisation are not necessarily negative. Again, however, the concession is undercut by a denial move that is effected by negation, “thus far it has not succeeded” (my italics).

Another effective thesis statement comes at the end of the one-paragraph conclusion section of an essay on the CSG (see 5.4.2), the first part of which is a summary of the steps taken to develop an answer to the question. The thesis statement follows:

… The main conclusion of the study was that while the CSG does provide short-term poverty relief, the grant has only a limited role in that broader society (specifically care-givers) are not benefited, nor are the poverty alleviation effects long lasting. Crucially, there are also no links or exit strategies from the CSG beneficiaries to the formal job market. (Essay 29.1)

The “frame marker” that introduces the thesis, “The main conclusion of the study was that”, is impersonal, but the use of the word “main” to qualify the word “conclusion”, the use of the past tense instead of the present tense, and especially the use of the word “study” confers on the phrasing an authoritative ring. In the next move the dialogically contractive resource “while”, which falls into the category “concur: concede” (Martin and White 2005, see Figure 2.4) is used to make a concession. In the phrasing, the grammar of ‘do support’ implies the writer is in dialogue with a claim that the CSG provides relief from poverty. The use of lexical resources for negation in the clause that follows constitutes a “disclaim: deny” move (see Figure 2.4), which introduces a counter-argument. In the counter-move
the lexical resources for “graduation” (see Figure 2.3), “only” and “limited”, allow the textual voice to weaken claims that the CSG provides poverty relief. The phrase “in that” is used to introduce a reason for the counter-claim, in the expression of which there is strong dialogical contraction through repeated negation (the use of both “not” and “nor”). The only attitude marker used in the conclusion, “Crucially”, stands out in the sentence-initial position. Its use is rhetorically effective, as it introduces the most convincing reason for the writer’s critical evaluation of the CSG. The claim is also dialogically contractive, since the lexical resource for negation, “no”, effects the “disclaim: deny” move (see Figure 2.4). Analysis of this example suggests that the more resources for dialogical contraction that the writer uses, the greater the weight of authority that is inscribed in the textual voice.

It difficult to identify the thesis statement in essays that are poorly structured, or in which conflicting positions are not successfully integrated in a statement of the author’s position, the thesis statement (Essay 5.2). It would be a misrepresentation to suggest that the thesis statement necessarily is, or should be, encapsulated neatly as an integral formulation in only one part of the text. Particularly in essays with a front-loaded thesis, which generally repeat the thesis statement in the conclusion of the essay, it can be difficult to establish whether the thesis statement is in the introduction or conclusion, as analysis of Essay 28.2 proved (see 6.2.2.1 for a discussion of voice in the introductory moves, and 6.3.2.1 for a discussion of monoglossic qualities in the conclusion of the same essay)\textsuperscript{155}. A shorter extract from the introduction is reproduced below.

\begin{quote}
... it is easily said that globalization is inevitable and is beneficial to the third world. Although there are challenges that face globalization there are benefits as well that overshadow the challenges, these will be critically discussed relating them to how they affect the third world. It should also be considered that globalization is working but it is not working perfectly and there are areas were it can be improved upon. (Essay 28.2)
\end{quote}

Although the overall impression in the essay conclusion is of monoglossia, as argued earlier (see 6.3.2.1), there is evidence in the introduction that the writer was experimenting with the resources for incorporating authoritative voices into the text. The formulation, “it is easily said”, is conventionally followed by a counter-argument (commonly preceded by ‘but’). Therefore, it may appear to the reader that the writer is making a dialogically contractive concession-counter move. In this case the reader’s expectations are not met. The use of dialogically contractive resources in the introduction stage of the essay creates the expectation that the thesis statement will appear upfront, and confusion arises for the

\textsuperscript{155} The conclusion of analysis was that the thesis statement was in the concluding section (see Appendix 6.2).
reader because it becomes impossible to identify a formulation that conveys a clear position. Coming after the use of resources for dialogical contraction, the reference to conflicting views on the effects of globalisation constructs an inconsistent textual voice. Lack of consistency is evident also in the choice of contradictory lexical resources. Globalisation is evaluated positively as “beneficial” for the third world, but the word that follows, “challenges”, suggests a negative evaluation. Another resource for dialogical contraction used is the “disclaim: counter” move, effected in the wording, “Although there are…[.] there are…”, which, since it appears to be closing down further dialogue, might be taken as the thesis statement. However, the contradictory claim that follows, “globalization is working…”, undercuts the previous claims. Instead of directing the reader to an expression of the writer’s position, the writer uses an authoritative voice, which is not acknowledged in the essay text. This rhetorically weak move confirms that the writer has not yet formed a clear position on the question posed in the task, the consequence being an under-developed thesis statement.

An example of a recognisable thesis statement that is dispersed across one long concluding paragraph is from another essay, the introduction of which was discussed earlier in the chapter (see 6.2.2.1). The final ten lines of the conclusion are reproduced below.

… What can be deduced from the discussion is that this country is more democratic than developmental in that it has focused on redressing the injustices of the past. However this does not mean that nothing has been done to ensure economic development. Government has a strong role in the economy. But this role is more about ensuring the wellbeing of all its citizens other than only to drive economic development. An investment in education and provision of basic services shows government commitment to bringing about development. Developing the economy is also a priority for government. Provision of welfare services at a larger scale is also another developmental commitment. South Africa can be called a developmental state but a little different from the classical example of East Asian Tigers. (Essay 14.1, par 29, lines 7-17)

In the extract, the clause, “What can be deduced from the discussion is that”, functions as the frame marker signalling that the thesis follows. It represents a cautious mix of dialogical expansion and contraction. The objectivity suggested by the impersonal construction, and the use of the “mental process” verb, “deduce”, suggest that the claims that follow are reasoned, necessarily logical, and therefore valid, conferring on the

---

156 The reader-assessor would recognise the wording from the editors’ summary of Wolf’s overall argument, “Globalisation might be working, … but it is a long way from working perfectly” (Chari and Corbridge 2008: 401).
157 Voice in introductory moves is discussed.
phrasing a degree of dialogical contraction. However, the use of the modal auxiliary, “can”, signals a degree of dialogical expansion in the form of an “entertain” move (see Figure 2.4).

Analysis of the text suggests that the writer engaged with the appropriate sources, grasped the essential content for responding to the question, and constructed a position in the disciplinary debate. Two claims in the text, if seen in combination, most closely approximate a thesis statement. The first claim is, “…this country is more democratic than developmental in that it has focused on redressing the injustices of the past.” This claim shows understanding of the more complex aspects of the debate about the “developmental state”, which centre on whether the term “developmental” refers primarily to the state having a focus on economic development at the cost of democratic values, or its focus being on the well-being of the population at the expense of developing the economy. In the formulation of the claim, the lexical resources of the field (the terms “developmental” and “democratic”) are used for evaluation, coupled with the comparative form, “more”. The use of these discursive resources enables the textual voice to assert a clear position in terms that are legitimate in the context of the discipline. Further strengthening the authority of the textual voice, reasoning for the evaluation is provided in the same move, signalled by the phrase, “in that”. The next move, signalled by “however”, is a dialogically contractive move that functions as a concession. The inclusion of this move signals that the writer is aware of the policies designed to ensure the country’s economic development. The claims which follow function to elaborate on the claims discussed above and are not discussed in this analysis. The concluding claim can be seen as the second part of the thesis statement, “South Africa can be called a developmental state but a little different from the classical example of East Asian Tigers”. In this move, specifically in the use of the “verbal process” (Halliday 1985: 129-130) verb, “be called”, the textual voice is explicit about the claim being about the discourse of the discipline, rather than about the ‘reality’ it attempts to describe. The final move, introduced by a resource for making a “disclaim: counter” move, “but”, offers the counter-argument that, if judged by the standards of the East Asian “Tigers”, South Africa cannot be considered a developmental state. Overall, the writer has used resources for the construction of a legitimate disciplinary voice. Although, there is a degree of rhetorical weakness in that the sequencing of claims in the conclusion could be more carefully considered in terms of persuasive effect, the writer shows a mature grasp of the disciplinary content and expresses a carefully modulated position.
In some of the essays, it is possible to see that the root of the resources for heteroglossic engagement is in spoken language. Some of the resources for dialogical contraction that students use are conventionally used in speech, but are inappropriate in written text. This is illustrated in the extract from the thesis statement below.

Therefore in answering the question of this essay it can be inferred that globalisation has not provided populations of developing countries with any form of human security. Yes, globalisation has brought about a number of benefits and improved the lives of these people but, with it has come a great number of human insecurities.’ (Essay 25.2, par 10, lines 10-14)

The frame marker used to signal the presence of the thesis statement explicitly refers to “the question” that constituted the essay task, which suggests the writer’s dependence on the lecturer’s formulation. The use of the “disclaim: deny” resource for effecting dialogical contraction, which is emphasised by the use of the graduation resource, “any”, authoritatively denies that globalisation has positively impacted on human security. In the move that follows, “yes”, a word that is used only in speech, is used as a “proclaim: concur” resource instead of the lexical resource, ‘admittedly’ that would be used in conventional academic discourse. The concession it effects is followed immediately by the “disclaim: counter” resource, “but”, which effects the dialogical contraction expected in a thesis statement that has persuasive force.

When all the thesis statements had been analysed, a number of clear patterns in the management of the authoritative voices from the prescribed sources emerged. In the essays that exemplified strong argumentation, heteroglossic engagement was strongly evident in the thesis statement, whereas the thesis statements of the weakest essays tended to be primarily monoglossic formulations. In the thesis statements, the least successful pattern is characterised by the absence of a frame marker to signal the presence of a thesis statement, or the use of an attitude marker in the place of a frame marker at the beginning of the thesis statement. This is followed by a monoglossic formulation which, in many cases, is an affirmative proposition using the present tense verb forms of eternal truths. The use of attitude markers, or strongly evaluative language, appears to be risky, since the use of stance resources can undermine the construction of disciplinary voice.

The pattern that appears to be most persuasive is the use of a dialogically contractive frame marker (see 6.2.1.3) that not only draws the reader’s attention to the thesis statement, but also contributes to the construction of authorial authority in the textual voice. In strong argumentation, this is followed by the assertion of a position on the issue
or question that includes at least two of three dialogically contractive moves described by Martin and White (2005). The first of these moves is a concession that is effected by means of lexical resources described as “proclaim: concur”. The second of these is a denial move, effected by means of “disclaim: deny” resources. The two moves allow the writer to position the textual voice in relation to specific claims of the authoritative sources. The third move is the introduction of a counter-argument that requires the use of the lexical resources labelled “disclaim: counter”. This move allows the writer to oppose the claims of some of the authoritative sources. Since the texts in which these resources were used are generally those showing stronger argumentation, there appears to be a positive relationship between the use of these resources in the thesis statement and effective argumentation. Therefore, it appears that the lexical resources for effecting concession and counter-argument are key resources used in thesis statements for the inscription of the writer’s position in relation to the perspectives of authoritative sources. Analysis showed that the resources used to effect the moves, “proclaim: concur”, “disclaim: deny” and “disclaim: counter”, are used in just over one-third of the thesis statements (see Appendix 6.2: Thesis Statement Analysis). Therefore, only a minority of the research participants used these resources at the most crucial stage of the argumentation, while the majority of students did not use these important discursive resources. These findings suggest that, even by the end of their years as undergraduates, some of the students had not learned how to use discursive resources that support legitimate argumentation, and consequently that they did not yet have access to key resources for effective participation in disciplinary debate.

6.4 Positioning in the representation of ‘reality’

In terms of the debate on whether argument should be defined in terms of inquiry or persuasion (see 2.4.3.6), it was argued that all academic argumentation draws on both inquiry-oriented and persuasion-oriented discourses for knowledge construction (see 3.9.1). Since Development Studies is a hybrid social science knowledge domain (see 2.3.7), a combination of the discourse of science-oriented inquiry and the discourse of persuasion (see 2.4.3) can be expected in the texts that represent it. In the essay texts of students who can be considered relative novices in the discourses of Development Studies, the use of the (meta)discourses of knowledge construction is more likely to be unself-conscious, being based on their exposure to the discourse conventions of the textual forms that are favoured in the subject context. Discussion follows of the lexical and

159 Nineteen of the 49 essays (excluding the eight heavily-plagiarised essays) used these resources.
discursive resources that are used for the construction of ‘reality’ in the pedagogical texts that students produce.

6.4.1 The linguistic inscription of inquiry and persuasion

Analysis showed that across the essay data set the majority of students write as if there is an observable unquestionable reality that can be known and that they assume is represented in a body of texts that ‘contain’ or represent incontestable facts. This is exemplified in the following idiosyncratic formulation, in which contingent argument is collapsed into the certain world of fact: “This essay is comprise of an argument over the fact that…” (Essay 22.1). Language that naturalises (see 2.2.4.1) opinion as fact draws on the discourse of inquiry. Some examples are: the use in the thesis statement of the formulation, “The fact remains that…” (Essay 3.1), and language that oversimplifies causation (see 6.2.1.1, Essay 28.2). The most commonly used discursive resources of the discourse of inquiry are “instructional verbs” (Johns 1997: 96). Analysis of essay introductions and conclusions showed that two categories of these ‘task’ words are favoured: words associated with the physical manipulation and scrutiny of scientific processes, such as ‘examine’, ‘investigate’ and ‘explore’, and “mental process” (Halliday 1985: 106-112) words, such as ‘determine’, ‘compare’, ‘establish’, ‘consider’, ‘analyse’, ‘deduce’, ‘infer’ and ‘conceive’. Metaphorical expressions relating to vision are a favoured resource in the frame markers introducing the thesis, as illustrated by the two examples below: “When looking at the above discussion it is clear that…” (Essay 6.1) and, “From the information given in the essay; it is evident to see that…” (Essay 9.1). These resources from the discourse of inquiry embody the “visual space of reason” (Crosswhite 1996: 235) and realise a “discourse of transparency” (Lillis and Turner 2001; Turner 2011: 81, see 2.4.1). The lexical resources discussed above are typically used in combination with grammatical resources for suggesting objectivity and impersonality. The use of these grammatical resources is discussed in the following section (see 6.4.2).

While in a small proportion of the essays the discourses of inquiry and persuasion are used in careful combination to construct an approximation of disciplinary voice and legitimate argument, in most of the essays the inconsistent and inappropriate use of discursive resources for knowledge construction is evidence that students are insufficiently aware of the discourses on which they draw. There are numerous examples in the data of students who appear to be confused about argument and unsure of what constitutes legitimate argument in the domain of Development Studies. It has already been noted in the discussion of one of the essay introductions analysed, that the student appeared
confused about the nature of the task (see 6.2.2.1, Essay 12.2). The choice of lexis in the introduction below also reveals confusion about argument. The content of the text and (language flaws aside) the unreflective mixing of the discourses of persuasion and inquiry result in an inconsistent textual voice and, consequently, the first stage of the argumentation in the essay is rhetorically weak.

The central argument of this paper is on the analyses of the success of South Africa’s development efforts, policies, and programmes. It is the author’s intention to define the term ‘developmental state’, its historical phenomenon and characteristics. In effect, the author will compare current development efforts with the articles that have been researched for this essay in order to form and substantiate an opinion on the state and its development efforts in South Africa. This will be clearly motivated with statistics, arguments on the concept of development by other literatures. … This essay will elucidate on the several definitions of developmental states. Following this, the essay will look at different aspects of South Africa between the years of 1994-2007. Thirdly, the role of the government will be explored and following that the essay will examine certain challenges that the government faces. Following that this essay will make tentative suggestions and conclude with a possible solution. (Essay 20.1)

The use of the frame marker, “The central argument of this paper”, at the start of the opening sentence promises a confident response to the task using the discourse of persuasion. The expectations set up by the use of a frame marker that signals an upfront thesis statement are not realised in the wording of the text that follows, which shows that the formulation merely introduces the topic, or task, which is entirely dependent on the exact wording used in the learning guide (see 5.4.1). The move that follows is a statement of the writer’s strategy for responding to the task, which is also dependent on the formulation of the task in the guide. The promise in the final part of the introductory paragraph, to “make tentative suggestions” and to “conclude with a solution”, indicates that the writer is planning to use a problem-solution textual structure, which would result in recommendations or policy argumentation. However, policy argument is a type of argument that does not match the lecturer-assessor’s specification of the task, which requires evaluation of the positions of the authoritative sources. Furthermore, the number of “instructional verbs” used that are associated with pedagogical exposition – “define”, “compare”, “elucidate on”, “look at”, “will be explored”, and “will examine” – typically used in the discourse of inquiry, conflict with the promise of the opening sentence that an argument will be constructed in the text.
The use of the markers of attitude and engagement (Hyland 2008) are an aspect of the discourse of persuasion. In four of the essays in the data set, wording such as, ‘it is important/vital to note/see/understand’ is used in the thesis statement. These formulations seem to function as both markers of attitude and engagement. They signal that a claim that is deemed significant follows, but the use of a directive resource which is conventionally used by an authoritative textual voice is inappropriate in a text that exists to be graded by the lecturer-assessor who has greater authority than the student. Thus the reader is inappropriately positioned by the student as needing epistemic direction from a novice.

All of the essay topics involved evaluation (see 5.4.1), and required students to construct a thesis statement centring on an argument of value. The evaluative word “effective” was used in the CSG essay topic formulation (see 5.4.1), and the evaluative word “beneficial” was used in the essay topic on the impact of globalisation on the security of the third world’s majority (see 5.4.3). As analysis showed, the unbounded topic formulation of the essay on the developmental state made it difficult to interpret (see 5.4.1), however, the essay also required an argument of value in that students had to assess the extent to which the term “developmental state” applied to the South African state.

Lexical resources for intensifying or ‘softening’ evaluative words seem to be of central importance for the construction of a legitimate textual voice. “Graduation” resources (Martin and White 2005: 154, see Figure 2.3) were crucial for adjusting value claims in the thesis statement. In some evaluative claims, the evaluative word is combined with resources for dialogical contraction. For example, “…the globalisation process is [in fact], not beneficial for the security of the third world majority” (Essay 17.2). Where resources for dialogical expansion are used, they are combined with resources for concession in combination with lexical resources for delimitation or restriction of meaning, as in Essay 22.2: “globalisation does to an extent benefit the third world countries however in terms of security globalisation seems to benefit the developed countries more”. Analysis (see Appendix 6.2) shows that in relatively successful thesis statements the lecturer’s

---

160 These resources overlap with aspects of the appraisal system (Martin and White 2005).
161 These are essays 3.1, 5.2, 6.2 and 28.2.
162 Evaluation is inscribed in the writer’s choice of the stance resources that Hyland (2008: 10) terms “attitude markers”. In relation to the appraisal system of Martin and White (2008: 42-91), evaluation is achieved by means of the sub-system “attitude” which, in comparison with Hyland’s categorisation, makes finer analytical distinctions that are not required for this research.
163 These resources are generally words or phrases that are used for quantification and intensification, which in the appraisal system are termed “graduation” resources (Martin and White 2005: 154).
evaluative term (used in the task formulation) is used in combination with “graduation resources” to indicate the writer's position on the question posed in the task.

In many of the thesis statements, the use of evaluative lexis other than, or in addition to, the terms used in the task formulation marks weaker essays. In these cases, the use of inappropriate evaluative terms is combined with a tendency to use intensifying lexical forms, such as boosters, which inscribe epistemic certainty, resulting in claims that are unjustifiable generalisations, as the following examples show. In two of the weakest essays, sweeping statements are made about the CSG. It is described as, “the most effective and practical method of controlling the poverty crisis…” (Essay 12.1). Essay 16.1 claims that the CSG, “has a lot of positive effects”. The following examples illustrate how the use of words such as ‘all’ and phrases such as ‘a lot of’ seriously undermines the credibility of the textual voice: globalisation is described as, “good for people in all countries” (Essay 4.2), as “creating a better life for all” (Essay 5.2), and as bringing “a lot of positive change” (Essay 16.2). In these examples the claims made bear no relation to the arguments in the source texts, therefore it appears that the position taken by the students who used these resources was due either to inadequate reading and/or lack of understanding of the source texts. However, the examples below suggest that even when the conclusions in the thesis statement correlate with the readings and the student has taken up a justifiable position, the use of intensifiers and evaluative terms as resources for meaning is risky. The examples below show how evaluative lexis and intensifiers introduce affective meaning, which can undermine the overall argumentation: human security is described as, “threatened in every possible way” (Essay 19.2), and as, “desperately needed” (Essay 24.2). In these two examples, the argumentation in the essays from which the thesis was extracted is not strong, so the overall effect of the emotive language is negative. However, an unusually high degree of emotive language is used in Essay 7.2 (see 6.5) without undermining the overall argumentation. The question of whether the introduction of an affective dimension to the argumentation necessarily weakens it is taken up later in the chapter (see 6.6.2).

6.4.2 Effacement or assertion of self as author

Another aspect of the discourses of knowledge construction, which is closely related to the focus of the above discussion, is the extent to which the writer – the “self” (Clark and Ivanič 1997: 137, 151), or what Kamler (2001: 50) describes as “the personal” – is inscribed in the text. One of the strangest aspects of pedagogical essay genres is the expectation that the writer remove all traces of personhood or presence (see 2.2.4.6). The
essays in the data set suggest that the student writers expend great effort excising themselves from their texts, making extensive use of lexico-grammatical resources for impersonality, as if they were not involved in making the claims in the text. The use of impersonal discursive resources in the introductions and the conclusions of the essays is noted in the discussions above. A striking aspect of the introductions and conclusions analysed is the absence of first person pronouns, although there are a few notable exceptions. The use of the pronoun 'I' is avoided in most of the essays. Instead, student writers use artificial constructions such as, “The literature has shown” (Essay 17.1), “All the readings read … prove” (Essay 17.2), “It is the author’s intention”, “the author argues that” (Essay 20.1) and, “it is this author’s opinion” (Essay 29.2). While the use of the passive voice in the first two constructions listed above allows the student to highlight the literature, however awkwardly, the artificiality of the other constructions, where the use of ‘I’ or ‘my’ would be more natural, creates the alienating effect of disengaged writers and disembodied texts.

In the majority of the introductions and conclusions of the essays, the personal pronoun, ‘I’, is avoided by using the lexico-grammatical resources of passive formulations and impersonal third person entities, the most common being, ‘the essay’, as the subject of sentence. While in some essays the use of these resources results in the construction of a legitimate voice, as in essays 2.1, 7.1, 14.1 and 2.2 (see 6.2.2.1), in most others the use of discursive resources for impersonal interaction is less successful, resulting in awkward author-evacuated texts. In some essays, the odd formulation, “the author”, is used. This unnatural form of self-mention has the distancing effect of producing a stilted or pompous textual voice that militates against appropriate writer-reader interaction in this context (see 6.4.1, Essay 20.1). In other essays, the weight of the voices of authority is inscribed in formulations in which the writer is entirely effaced, as exemplified below. The example is from an introduction: “In order to interrogate this topic fully, the literature will focus on various aspects of globalisation…” (Essay 6.2, see 6.2.1.2). A more appropriate use of the phrase appears in a thesis statement: “The literature has shown that…” (Essay 17.1). These examples show students’ awareness of the importance of the literature, and underline the extent to which it can overwhelm “self as author” (Clark and Ivanič 1997: 137).

In most instances the avoidance of ‘I’ is unconvincing, suggesting a writer who is disengaged from the claims made in the text. However, when ‘I’ is used, the textual voice tends to diverge from the disciplinary voice (‘voice’ used in the Bakhtinian sense) that
confers legitimacy on the argumentation. While the use of the first person pronoun may work in the introductory stage of the essay when writer-reader interaction is more direct, its use in the thesis statement, where disciplinary voice is important, seems to be particularly risky, as the example discussed below illustrates:

To conclude I would say that child support grants are on the right path of alleviating poverty therefore I fully agree with the statement that child support grants must and should be used as programmes of alleviating poverty in South Africa. (Essay 23.1, par 13, lines 16-19)

The repetition of "I", in combination with the idiomatic expression, "on the right path", is more appropriate in primary discourse. The inscription of attitude in, "I fully agree", and the deontic modality (Fairclough 2003: 219) in the wording, "must and should", indicate certainty and possibly even affective investment in the claims. The unqualified evaluation of the CSG as positive suggests that the writer has not engaged with the disciplinary authorities in appropriate sources, but is instead expressing an opinion, as if in the context of casual spoken interaction. This was one of only two instances where 'I' was used in the thesis statement. The other essay in which it was used is among the four essays with a front-loaded thesis statement, and the only one of these in which the first person pronoun is used in the thesis statement (see 6.5).

Analysis of essay texts as a whole showed that very few students were consistently able to restrict themselves to impersonal resources throughout the text. It appears that most students have learned to use the formulaic impersonal expressions used in introductions and the conclusions. However, in almost all cases, in the middle or end stages of the body of the essay texts, there was slippage into the use of personal constructions which suggest that writers were uncomfortable with the injunction on the use of first person pronouns. In some of the weaker essays this slippage is evident even in the conclusion. Where impersonal constructions were used in the introductory part of an essay, the use of personal pronouns at a later stage had a disruptive effect on the textual voice, as exemplified in the concluding sentence: “We are no longer where we used to be meaning that these policies have been successful in changing the country” (Essay 19.1). In this instance the use of the first person plural pronoun can be seen either as an inclusive reference to all South African citizens, or as an engagement marker used to refer to knowledge shared with the reader and mutual concern for the plight of the country. The shift from impersonal language to language that suggests personal investment in the very last sentence of the text is inconsistent and, consequently, undermines the textual voice.
6.4.3 Place of thesis statement in overall rhetorical structure

One of the most striking findings about the essays in the data set was the dominant pattern with regard to the place of the thesis statement in the overall rhetorical structure (see Appendix 6.2). The low percentage of essays that have a thesis statement in the introductory stage of the essay runs contrary to the preference for the front-loaded thesis statement in academic writing pedagogy (Coffin, Curry, Goodman, Hewings, Lillis and Swann 2003). Of the four essays with a front-loaded thesis statement, three were written for the module on development debates (see 3.5.3.2). As two of these (essays 7.2 and 29.2) were among the most successful of those in the data set, the use of the front-loaded thesis statement is discussed in the concluding section of this chapter (see 6.6.2).

In the vast majority of the essays, the thesis statement comes only at the end of the essay, in the concluding stage. Thus, the back-loaded thesis is favoured by the vast majority of the students. The strongly marked preference for a delayed thesis suggests that the essay task is seen as a process of discursive inquiry which leads to the discovery of knowledge, rather than the creation of a text that is designed to persuade the reader of a position on a question or issue by using the authoritative voices of the knowledge domain (see 2.4.3.6). The overall rhetorical structure of almost all the essays in the data set suggests that there is a pronounced inquiry orientation to argumentation, and that, from the students’ perspective, the dominant discourse of knowledge construction in Development Studies is that of scientific inquiry. In discussion in the final chapter of the thesis, the mismatch between the inquiry discourses that appear to be favoured in the construction of the students’ essays and the more persuasive discourses used in expert and educational texts is extended.

6.5 The construction of argument in an ‘outlier’ text

One essay in the data set stands out from all the others. The text, Essay 7.2, is worth discussing, as it can be seen as an exceptional or “politically important” (Miles and Huberman 1994: 28) case within the case study. While the essay is an atypical example from the data set (and numerous careless superficial errors and some infelicitous phrasing detract from the overall impression) the discursive choices made served the writer well.

---

164 There is a delayed thesis statement in 45 of the 49 essays considered in this regard. The eight ‘cut and paste’ essays were excluded from quantifying calculations (see 6.3.1.4).

165 The positive evaluation of this essay from my perspective as analyst is bolstered by the evidence that the reader-assessor also rated the essay highly: the mark on the front cover of the text is 84%. It is accompanied by the comment, “Excellent!”. The mark list, obtained from the lecturer who coordinated the course, shows that the essay was awarded the highest mark/grade in the class.
For this reason, discussion of the essay is used to illustrate how the three levels of argumentative positioning are integrated in the construction of argumentation in the multiple-source discussion essay genre. In keeping with the strategy used in the discussion of the analysis of the other essays in the data set, only the introduction and conclusion stages of the essay are reproduced below and discussed in detail.\footnote{I acknowledge that it is possible for students to write impressive introductory and concluding stages for the essay, but for the body of the essay not to match the standard of the introduction and conclusion. In order avoid criticism for appearing to have made the assumption that the essay introduction and conclusions are representative of the essays as a whole, it must be reiterated at this point in the discussion that although only the introduction and conclusions of the essays are discussed in this chapter, the complete essay texts were analysed and taken into account in the interpretation of the extracts that are reproduced and discussed in the thesis.}

The essay was one of the four essays with a front-loaded thesis statement, and the only one in which an extended metaphor was used as a rhetorical device to frame the text. It is also the only essay in which there is strong authorial presence in both the introduction and conclusion.

These days it is impossible for one to look at their lives without considering the processes of globalisation. Business men, politicians, environmentalists, feminists, poor rural farmers, and victims of poverty, are link[ed] as their current and future prospects are affected by the events occurring around the world. To some, globalisation offers opportunity, while to others it is a threat to their security. As Koenig-Archibugi (2003: 7) states, “Globalisation generates losers as well as winners. Often the losers are those who are already disadvantaged for other reasons.” In this paper I argue that the losers are those in Third World countries and their disadvantaged position is the result of their colonial histories. Those who benefit from globalisation are known as the ‘West’ and through international organisations: they make the rules of the game and ensure their winning position. I admit that I approach this study with this biased point of view and a set of assumptions to be weakened or strengthened. The assumptions that outline the paper are:

- the direction and agenda of globalisation are designed by the west for the west,
- in theory and under certain circumstances globalisation has the potential to improve human security,
- in reality and in many Third World condition, globalisation has worsened human security,
- The negative will outweigh the positive on moral and ethical grounds. (Essay 7.2)

The first move functions to contextualise the topic for discussion, link academic concerns with everyday life-world issues that affect and connect all social groups and, in so doing, draws the reader into the discussion. In the next move, conflicting claims about the effects of globalisation are held in uneasy heteroglossic tension. This is achieved through the use of the balanced grammatical construction: “To some…, while to others…”, and the lexical opposites, “opportunity” and “threat”. A negative evaluation of globalisation from an
authoritative source is used as an intertextual resource to introduce a critical perspective on globalisation. The quotation functions as support for the risk the writer takes in the bold move that follows. An upfront thesis statement is asserted: “In this paper I argue that the losers are those in Third World countries and their disadvantaged position is the result of their colonial histories”. The wording coming before “that” functions as the frame marker introducing the thesis. A confident stance is constructed through the use of the first person singular pronoun in theme position. The formulation, “I argue…”, constitutes the dialogically contractive move of “proclaim: pronounce” (Martin and White 2005, see Figure 2.3). In the atypical thesis statement (see lines 6 to 10 of the extract above), the writer’s position is confidently asserted; there is none of the hedging seen in other thesis statements from the data set that were identified as successful (see 6.2.2.2). The construction of an unexpectedly authoritative authorial voice is effected through citation of the authoritative voice of Koenig-Archibugi. His metaphor of globalisation as a game with winners and losers is not only appropriated as a discursive resource, but creatively extended and woven into the whole essay text. The extended metaphor functions as a framing device, but also provides coherence and lexical cohesion throughout all the stages of the text. The confident construction of authorial voice is achieved even in the writer’s use of the word “paper” instead of ‘essay’ to describe the text. In making this choice s/he is positioned as a contributor to debate in the Development field rather than as a student fulfilling the coursework demands of the lecturer. The thesis statement is a sweeping generalisation which, paraphrased, is a claim that multinational organisations manipulate the global economy to ensure the continued hold of the “West” on global power. The claim constitutes a surprising move that flouts the academic discourse convention requiring cautious precision in the making of claims to knowledge. It can be seen as inscribing opinionated, possibly arrogant, disregard for the knowledge field. However, it makes a strong impression on the reader.

The self-reflexive move that follows can be seen as an elaboration on the thesis statement that ensures the writer does not alienate the marker-assessor and the discourse community s/he represents. The writer’s admission of subjectivity and positionality, by referring to his/her own “biased” perspective, is arresting. The statement that the assumptions listed are “to be weakened or strengthened” signals inquiry-oriented openness to adjust the position asserted in the introductory stage of the essay but, at the level of writer-reader interaction, it is also a rhetorical device that constructs an apparently objective textual voice. Paradoxically, the strategy inscribed in the text is one of persuasion. The foregrounding of assumptions suggests that the writer has a sophisticated
understanding of the implicit layers of argumentation that are seldom acknowledged in student writing. The stance resource of self-mention, used again in theme position in the sentence, “I admit, …”, highlights the performative force of the move. The use of the orthographic resource of ‘bullets’ to list points also challenges one of the most important conventions of essayist literacy, that ideas be expressed in linear prose in complete sentences. However, it is rhetorically effective in that it draws the reader’s attention to the four sub-claims offered as reasoning for the thesis statement. The incisively-expressed claims function as a summary of key claims in the overall argument and, consequently, to deflect criticism of the generality of the initial formulation of the thesis statement. It is also noted that the front-loaded thesis statement and the outline of assumptions that underpin the essay also fulfil the basic requirement for writer-reader interaction, that of explicitness (see 6.2.1).

The unusually long and dense concluding paragraph of the essay, which follows the sub-heading, “Conclusion: The Score”, is reproduced in its entirety below.

In the realm of economic globalisation, the rules [of] the international trading game has been set out by WTO, the UN, and the World Bank. It seems they are on ‘Team West’, and although they offer advice and financial aid to the South, rules hardly ever work to their advantage. If the playing field was entered into on equal grounds between countries it is possible for everyone to be a winner. This is evident in the East Asian example where the governments of these countries set the restrictions on when and how they would enter the game. Africa, on the other hand, stood little chance of winning. Structurally and politically they were full of gaps, which were filled by corrupt and greedy actors trying to get their piece of the global fortune. The real losers are the majority of the Third World poor. The losses they have incurred are devastating. Their living conditions have been reduced to poverty as rural resources are channelled in the opposite direction to where they stand. The subsistence strategies they have relied on have been made more difficult to access due to [global] what is on the global agenda. Their luck did not change much when they follow[ed] the resources. Lack of state capacity made them vulnerable to violent, coercive regimes. Lack of state capacity diminished national control and handed it over to international agents of globalisation, who are less responsible and receptive to the needs of the people in countries other than the ones on their team. At most, global GDP has increased, but I beg the question if it is worth it? To eliminate the daily fears and threats to security the Third World poor majority, the global agenda needs to be re-examined. Systems that impact the entire globe should work in the interests of the entire globe. I feel that new global governance is needed one that place[s] human security before economic concerns. (Essay 7.2, par 12, lines 20-25)

The thesis having been announced in the introductory stage of the text, the conclusion offers an elaborate reiteration of the writer’s negative evaluation of the effect of globalisation on the Third World poor. The whole of the long final paragraph is an integral
part of an impassioned argument. An unambiguous answer to the question posed by the lecturer can be identified in one sentence in the middle of the concluding stage of the essay, where the overall thesis is repeated, the textual voice being seamlessly combined with the lecturer’s voice from the task formulation, “The real losers are the majority of the Third World poor”. The conclusion as a whole is an unusual blend of heteroglossically engaged formulations and stance resources more characteristic of monoglossic text. As befits a text in which a position is asserted, ‘upfront’, dialogical expansion is kept to the minimum, with only the formulation, “It seems”, functioning to hedge the claim that follows (see line 2 of the conclusion). The resources of dialogical contraction are used extensively to make space for the authorial voice, but a balanced perspective is constructed by means of concessive moves that are used to acknowledge the importance of addressing arguments that conflict with the writer’s position. The dialogically contractive move that Martin and White (2005: 134) label “concur: concede” is effected in the formulations: “…although they offer advice and financial aid to the South, rules hardly ever work to their advantage”, and “At most, global GDP has increased, but…”

The phrase, “This is evident…”, is used to indicate epistemic certainty, which contributes to the effect of an authoritative textual voice. A surprising number of resources are used for evaluation. When the context of the text and the source readings are taken into account, the adjectives “corrupt”, “greedy” and “devastating” vary in the extent to which they inscribe affect rather than epistemic judgement.

There is a shift from analytical to hortatory argumentation (Martin 1992: 563) in the latter part of the conclusion. This is marked by the concessive move discussed in the previous paragraph (“At most…, but…”), which ends in the rhetorical question, “…I beg the question if it is worth it?” The attitude markers, “needs to” and, “should”, clearly inscribe a moral judgment, which aligns the writer with the arguments made by Wade in the source text (see 4.2.2). In the final move, “self as author” (Clark and Ivanič 1997: 137) and the textual voice merge in the use of the affective process verb and the first person singular pronoun, “I feel” (see 2.2.4.6), which is in theme position in the sentence. As the use of this formulation indicates the expression of unsubstantiated opinion or affect, it is proscribed in academic discourse at this level. However, in this case, given the strong argumentation that precedes this assertion in the body of the essay, the writer can afford to take the risk of inscribing affective investment in the text. S/he succeeds because the formulation inscribes a moral judgment that is aligned with the well-supported arguments made by a legitimate authoritative voice, that of Wade in the source text (see 4.2.1.2). The conclusion
is the culmination of carefully developed analytical argumentation across the whole text, which uses as a resource claims to knowledge made in legitimate disciplinary source texts. Without having established grounds for making the claims in the conclusion in the body of the essay, the effect would be of bare assertion. In weaker essays, the last part of the conclusion, in which numerous dialogically contractive evaluative claims are made, would appear to be unacceptably subjective. In this text, since the essay as a whole is deeply heteroglossic, the evaluative claims function to construct an authoritative textual voice.

In using stance resources and rhetorical strategies, such as placing the thesis statement ‘upfront’, flouting discourse convention and using the extended metaphor of globalisation as a competitive team sport, the writer powerfully asserts “self as author” (Clark and Ivanič 1997: 137). Although unconventional choices are made, the text as a whole shows evidence of extensive engagement with appropriate arguments from the prescribed source texts as well as other appropriate authoritative sources. These observations go some way in explaining the power of the text, but the issues raised by the success of the ‘outlier’ text are discussed further in the final sub-section of the chapter.

6.6 Summary of findings: students’ construction of argument

In the final part of this chapter, the findings with regard to subsidiary research questions 3 and 4 are summarised. First, the nature of the argumentation in students’ texts is discussed in terms of the discursive resources that are used to construct argument in the majority of the essays (see 6.6.1). Second, the conventions of legitimate argumentation in Development Studies are questioned in relation to the success of the ‘outlier’ text that was analysed in the previous sub-section (see 6.5).

6.6.1 Key discursive resources used in the multiple source discussion essay

A summary of the most significant conclusions about students’ construction of argument are grouped according to the three dimensions of argument as positioning that were the focus of analysis.

6.6.1.1 Interaction with the reader

In the majority of essays, a wide range of discursive resources for inscribing explicitness are used. Thus, it appears that most of the students had developed the discursive resources that appear to be the minimal requirement for effective construction of argument in the context of situation. The majority of students do not challenge the status of relative
novice conferred on them by the essay task assigned. Analysis of the essays showed that in a number of texts, stance and engagement resources are used in ways that undermine the construction of an appropriate relationship between the student writer and the lecturer-assessor. The use of stance resources to construct an authoritative textual voice appears to be particularly risky. In some cases, the use of these resources not only undermines attempts to relate appropriately with the lecturer, but also positions the writer as outside the discourse of the knowledge domain, and therefore puts the students at risk of being judged not yet ready to move on to the next stage in the learning sequence (that is, of the essay being graded as a fail). Only a small proportion of students successfully construct what might be seen as “disciplinary voice” (Hyland 2008: 6-7), and even fewer sustain “disciplinary voice” consistently throughout the essay text.

6.6.1.2 Negotiation with authoritative voices

In a surprisingly large proportion of the essays, poor use is made of the authoritative voices, which are a key resource for the production of legitimate argumentation in the context. Evidence in some of the essays discussed shows that engagement with appropriate authoritative voices is superficial. Thus, it appears that while most students were aware of the importance of basing responses on authoritative sources and of acknowledging the sources by means of citation and referencing, some of the students did not effectively appropriate voices from texts that would confer legitimacy on their claims. The widespread use of inappropriate texts and of sources from other knowledge domains suggests that a significant proportion of the students were unaware of the necessity of strictly adhering to the prescribed texts in their selection of knowledge resources. The use of ‘illegitimate’ sources can be partly attributed to students’ use of the Internet, which gives them access to other texts that appear to be relevant, based on content key words, and enables them to direct their own learning paths. However, it can also be attributed to a lack of awareness of how knowledge is constructed, an issue that is discussed in the next sub-section and in the final chapter.

Students’ over-dependence on other texts for the production of written text is a significant constraining factor. The high proportion of unacknowledged borrowing of whole tracts from source texts is a cause for concern. It suggests that students lack confidence or writing experience, or that some students are not prepared for the high level of reading challenge of the source texts. The latter interpretation is supported by the evidence that significant numbers of students misrepresented central claims made in some of the source texts.
The high level of challenge in the task of integrating the voices of authoritative sources into a consistent textual voice cannot be underestimated. A number of patterns are discernible in the analysis of the thesis statements in the data set, with some showing sophisticated integration of the source texts, and others showing none at all. Not only do students need to use the discursive resources for dialogical expansion and contraction, they also need to know which moves are most effective in the different stages of the text. It is evident from analysis of the essays that a characteristic of effective argumentation is movement from dialogical expansion in the introductory stage of the essay to dialogical contraction in the thesis statement which, in the most of the essays, is placed only in the essay conclusion.

6.6.1.3 Appropriation of discourses of knowledge construction

The predominance in the data set of the back-loaded thesis statement suggests that in the context of the case study the multiple-source essay is seen as primarily involving inquiry, with persuasion not strongly foregrounded. Analysis showed that the discourse of inquiry dominates in the majority of essays: task words relating to objective or ‘scientific’ investigation and linguistic resources for impersonal expression and authorial absence, such as third person and passive formulations, are used extensively.

Another significant conclusion is that in very few texts is there evidence that students had developed the degree of discursive awareness that might be expected after three years of university study in a domain characterised by the contestation of knowledge claims. Few of the essays demonstrate awareness of the ways in which the knowledge claims that constitute the course content are mediated in different discourses and genres, and of how discursive mediation of ‘reality’ impacts on the knowledge claims that can be made in the knowledge domain.

Overall, analysis shows that very few texts in the data set exhibited appropriate use of the full range of discursive resources required for effective argumentation in Development Studies. Furthermore, in none of the texts are the resources used appropriately and consistently throughout the essay.

In the above discussion of the analysis of the essays, conclusions are made about the discursive resources that are favoured in students’ construction of argument and areas of strength and weakness in students’ performance of argumentation. The analysis also allows for tentative conclusions to be drawn about what constitutes legitimate argumentation in the context of the case study, which are discussed in the following sub-section.
6.6.2 Questioning the nature of legitimate student argumentation in Development Studies

The dominance of the multiple-source discussion essay in the high-stakes tasks set for students and the formulation of the essay tasks shows that the ability to engage in argumentation using disciplinary sources is highly valued. Only students who engage appropriately with disciplinary sources produce legitimate argument. The resources for expressing heteroglossic engagement are key to the formulation of responses that are acceptable. A key move in legitimate argumentation is acknowledgment of difference in the form of concession and counter-argument, using “engagement” (Martin and White 2005) markers as a resource for effecting these moves.

While argument in the essay texts is constructed using both discourses of argument and persuasion, the dominant patterns in the use of discursive resources suggest that argument is viewed as a form of disciplinary inquiry rather than as persuasion, and that strategies and resources for persuasion are not recognised as legitimate in argumentation in the context.

However, not all successful essays follow conventional patterns. Since two of the front-loaded essays were among the most successful of those in the data set, it appears that students who have full access to discursive resources used for persuasion construct successful essays despite disrupting expectations. A few students effectively use rhetorical resources, such as instructional verbs that foreground argumentation, other ‘argument’ lexis, strong dialogical contraction in the thesis statement, and resources for counter-argument.

The success of the ‘outlier’ text (see 6.5) provides evidence that rhetorical resources, such as extended metaphor, rhetorical questions and even emotive language, can be used to strengthen the argumentation. Analysis of the text showed that a wide range of rhetorical strategies and discursive resources are used and that both the discourses of inquiry and persuasion are used at points in the text where they contribute strategically to the overall argument. In comparison with some of the other essays, not only is the essay superficially flawed, but ‘disciplinary voice’ is less pronounced. Nevertheless, the text is successful in terms of the mark it earned. The text engages convincingly with disciplinary authorities, including those who use the ‘powerful’ economics knowledge base (see 4.2.1.2). In the use of discursive resources, such as the first person singular pronoun, the front-loaded thesis and the discourse of persuasion, the text pushes both disciplinary and generic...
boundaries. Therefore it appears that, provided hortatory argumentation is balanced by rigorous analytical argumentation, engagement with source texts and reflexive discourse signalling criticality, students at third-year level can break with convention to express “private intentions” (Bhatia 1993) and to inscribe “self as author” (Clark and Ivanič 1997: 137). Furthermore, it seems that students who use the range of resources for analytical and hortatory argumentation may be more successful than those who use only the discursive resources for analytical argument that are conventional, or sanctioned, in the pedagogical context. Discussion of author agency (Swales 2004: 3) and the constraints of the pedagogical genre of the essay continues in the final chapter of the thesis, which represents some provisional answers to the subsidiary research questions 5 and 6 (see 1.7), which inquire into the relationships between the texts in the textual network of the case study (see Figure 3.3), and the implications of the findings for transformative teaching and learning of disciplinary argument.
Chapter seven: Towards transformative argumentation for writing in the disciplines

7.1 Contextualising student essays in textual networks

I have used CDA in this research to argue that the knowledge-focused texts of researchers, lecturers and students are all forms of social action that are shaped by, and contribute to shaping, social practices and, ultimately, social structures (Fairclough 2010, see 3.2.1). While pedagogic practice, by its very nature, is generally reproductive of social interaction, identities and structures (Bernstein 2000, see 2.3.1), even Bernstein in his later work insists that there is nevertheless potential for change. In line with the overall critical aim of the exploration of argumentation in Development Studies texts reported in this thesis, the research findings are used to consider the implications of current practices, and to suggest changes that could contribute to transformative teaching and learning of disciplinary argumentation.

The findings discussed in Chapters Four, Five and Six describe and interpret argumentation in the texts of the field of production (texts that represent the knowledge domain of Development Studies), the field of recontextualisation (educational texts that represent the curriculum) and the field of reproduction (pedagogic texts), respectively (see 2.3.2 and 3.8.3). Since in this research the essay texts written by students are situated within the networks of texts on which they draw, there is textual evidence for making explanatory observations about the relationships between the students’ essays, Development Studies as a knowledge domain and as a subject taught at university, and the institution of higher education, lecturers and students. Consequently, it is possible to engage in consideration, informed by empirical research, of the extent to which institutional structures and pedagogic practices are enabling or constraining of students’ written argumentation (see 1.3).

Discussion, in isolation, of any one aspect of the intertextual network within which students’ essays are located, belies the complexity of the textual interpenetrations within the network. As the attempt to ‘map’ texts in relation to each other and the educational context using concepts from Bernstein’s (2000) pedagogic device and Fairclough’s (2001, 2010) model of discourse showed (see Figures 2.9, 3.1 and 3.2), the contexts are overlapping and the boundaries are blurred. Therefore, the following discussion of the texts from the field of reproduction/ transformation (the essays) cuts across the fields of knowledge production and recontextualisation into educational knowledge, the latter which
encompasses the *material* context, Development Studies in the research site, and the *abstract* context represented by the published educational texts.

### 7.2 Interpretation of the findings

The extreme heterogeneity of the prescribed texts was one of the key findings of analysis of the texts that represent the knowledge domain (see 4.4). Across only two of the modular components of the overall Development Studies curriculum, the wide-ranging subject content and the diversity of genres and discourses that are used are striking. Analysis of the small sample of disciplinary source texts (see 4.2 and 4.3) confirmed theoretically-informed conclusions that Development Studies has an unstable hybrid knowledge structure (see 2.3.7). Particularly notable was the contrast between the cultural-studies-oriented text, which has a horizontal knowledge structure characteristic of the humanities (see 4.2.1.3), and the texts that draw primarily on economics, which have a vertical knowledge structure (see 4.2.1.1 and 4.2.1.2). The picture is further complicated by the practical problem-solving nature of Development Studies (see 3.5.3.1), which is oriented to the ‘real’ world of development practices and policy development. As a knowledge “region” (Bernstein 2000: 9), Development Studies necessarily has a public ‘face’, and the communication modes of the media and the Internet are used extensively in the production and dissemination of knowledge, which adds to the textual heterogeneity that students must negotiate. The textual heterogeneity is a constraint on both the students’ comprehension of prescribed texts and their production of legitimate written texts.

An unusually high degree of textual heterogeneity and particularly the availability of some of the prescribed texts on the Internet (see 4.3) may, in part, account for a number of students selecting voices from inappropriate sources in place of legitimate authoritative sources for use in their arguments. The reading demands of the subject present a high degree of challenge, both in terms of breadth (the range of topic content and discourses that are appropriated in the construction of Development Studies knowledge) and depth (the cognitive challenge presented by the need to interpret the texts of both vertical and horizontal knowledge structures).

As student performance suggests (see 6.3.1), comprehension of the prescribed texts is a problem for many students. Doubtless, the discursive variety of the prescribed reading presents a degree of challenge for all undergraduate students. However, those students for whom English is an additional language and, particularly, students who have not had
the benefit of “filtering” (Gee 2002: 174) in their formative years are at a greater disadvantage (see 2.2.4.3).

As the published texts of the knowledge domain represent “powerful knowledge” (Young 2008: 14), the importance for students of accessing, reading and understanding prescribed texts cannot be underestimated. Since the discursive and generic diversity of Development Studies texts also increases the variety of forms and conventions of argumentation employed in the texts, the implications for students’ understanding of the argumentation in the texts are great. Therefore, it is not surprising that analysis showed that there were some students who misrepresented central argumentative claims and key concepts used in the arguments of the source texts.

Not fully comprehending the prescribed reading has serious implications for students’ academic writing. The evidence of a high proportion of plagiarism in at least one-third of the essays in the data set suggests that, although most students used appropriate texts, they did not necessarily interact appropriately with authoritative voices. Analysis of the texts exhibiting the most extensive plagiarism shows that they are composed of an assembly of text fragments from the sources that have not been transformed into coherent text by means of an integrating textual voice. In other terms, the essays are evidence that some of the students who produced the essays did not have “epistemological access” (Morrow 2007: 39-47) to the subject by the end of the major.167

The infelicities of genre and style observed in many of the essays suggest that by the end of the undergraduate years of study only a small number of the research participants had developed the consistent textual voice required for the construction of convincing argumentation. Disciplinary argumentation requires that the writer construct a textual voice that is positioned in relation to the voices of authority (see 3.9.2). Analysis of thesis statements, using appraisal theory, suggests that this positioning is effected primarily by the use of resources for dialogical contraction, which is generally used in combination with evaluative terms used in the discipline (see 6.3.2 and Appendix 6.2). It appears that appraisal analysis provides a strong indication of whether the student has gained epistemological access, since it enables simultaneous examination of both the content and the discourse of the subject. As fewer than one-third of the research participants used these resources appropriately and consistently, it appears that it cannot be confidently

---

167 The term ‘major’ refers to study of a subject across the three years of a first (undergraduate) degree.
claimed that more than a small proportion of them had gained epistemological access to Development Studies by the end of their undergraduate years.

The implications of the recontextualisation of research-generated knowledge as educational knowledge are not yet fully understood (Shay 2012), particularly with regard to knowledge regions such as Development Studies. The theoretically-informed speculation about the possibility of incoherence in the Development Studies curriculum, voiced earlier in the thesis (see 3.5.2), is supported in the evidence of the heterogeneity of the texts used for educational purposes. Given that the field of recontextualisation in higher education in South Africa is relatively unregulated, offering lecturers considerable agency in their construction of the subject Development Studies (see 5.3), the discourses used in the instantiation of the subject are particularly diverse (see 3.9.1). The absence of factors that would support coherent curriculum design and strategic sequencing of concepts and skills presents another constraint on student performance of written argumentation.

In the field of pedagogic practice, boundaries and role relationships are necessarily established within the broader institutional context that includes the policy frameworks of South African higher education (see 1.2.2) and the specific institution (see 3.5.1). The compartmentalisation of the curriculum in seven-week ‘modules’, in combination with the university’s assessment policy, imposes constraints on the amount of time that students and lecturers have to produce or assess written assignments. Limited time and large classes impact negatively on the amount and quality of formative feedback that students receive. Limited feedback on students’ writing represents another serious constraint on the development of the discursive resources that they require for the construction of effective written argumentation.

In the pedagogic relationship, the fixed roles of the assessor and the assessed set up an inevitably unequal interaction which imposes constraints on the texts students write in the context of that relationship. By designing the essay assignment task, the lecturer establishes the terms of written interaction. The main role that students are positioned to play is that of responder to the assessor’s assignment prompt. This positioning constructs students as novices. The unequal power relationship between students and their lecturers impacts on the “tenor” (Halliday 1978: 33) of the texts (see 2.2.1.3). Generally, deference and self-effacement (see 6.4.2) is inscribed in the essays of research participants. The absence, in the majority of the student texts, of “engagement” (Hyland 2008: 8) resources (see Figure 2.7) suggests that students avoid direct written interaction with the assessor. Instead of using argumentation ‘performatively’ by enacting agency through asserting a
position using resources for expressing “self as author” (Clark and Ivanič 1997: 137), the majority of the students put on a dutiful staged ‘performance’ of learning for the assessor, who remains a distant but powerful observer in an imaginary ‘audience’.

It is not only the pedagogical relationship that constrains student argumentation; it is also the favouring of the academic essay genre, which is weighted with an institutionalised history of authorial effacement that imposes the use of resources for inscribing objectivity (see 2.2.4.9). Generally, the fiction of objectivity is maintained in the essays in the data set. The preference for impersonal interaction may be explained by the need for the preservation of “face” (Scollon and Scollon 1981): the lecturer’s role as evaluator and assigner of a grade categorises students as acceptable or unacceptable participants in the disciplinary conversation.

In the context of social science writing, the highly-valued sub-genre of the essay that I call the multiple-source discussion essay places even more constraints in terms of the discursive resources that students can legitimately use. In addition to being restricted to impersonal written communication, student writers of the sub-genre face a paradoxical challenge. As a satisfactory response to the essay question entails asserting a position in relation to the authoritative voices in the source texts, they need to use discursive resources for the expression of “stance” (Hyland 2008: 7-8). However, as analysis of thesis statements has shown, the use of self mention and attitude markers, which are important resources for the construction of stance, can make the textual voice ‘sound’ inappropriately authoritative and impertinent (see 6.2.2). The resources convention makes available to students for the construction of voice are limited. Analysis of the data showed that the use of evaluative words in the students’ thesis statements (other than the evaluative words used in the authoritative source texts or the essay prompt) presents a high degree of risk. The data showed that a small proportion of the students inscribed attitude and/or affect in their texts. In almost all instances, the assertion of authorial voice in the inscription of authority and stance failed, either by undermining or by contributing to inconsistency in the textual voice. Data analysis also showed that students needed to use resources from the engagement system (Martin and White 2005) to effect dialogistic positioning. Very few students have the rhetorical knowledge and discursive flexibility exhibited in the ‘outlier’ text (see 6.5). Thus, the expression of self as author, or authorial voice, is severely constrained within the sub-genre.

The extent of plagiarism in the case study is cause for serious concern, as it suggests that a substantial proportion of the research participants completed their studies without
developing *productive* access to the discursive resources required for the construction of textual voice. It can be argued from the findings that a significant number of students in the research site may not reach the stage of development of advanced literacy that enables them to use writing to represent empowered identity and to voice agency in further studies or the workplace.

These observations call into question the potential the pedagogic context offers for agency and creativity in student writing. As analysis revealed, only one essay among fifty-seven in the data set stretched the boundaries of convention without compromising the legitimacy and persuasiveness of the argument (see 6.5). It is the only text in the data set in which the inscription of both self as author and “disciplinary voice” (Hyland 2008: 6-7) is combined successfully. Not only does the text demonstrate that the student engaged with the powerful knowledge of disciplinary authorities but, in the inscription of authorial presence, it also provides evidence of an empowered identity. Students who have full control of the range of discursive resources used for positioning themselves in relation to the reader *and* in relation to the authoritative voices of the knowledge domain are able to construct an acceptable textual voice (which generally draws on disciplinary voice), and thus to assert themselves as legitimate participants in the debates of the discourse community.

Given the constraints of the essay genre, it is not surprising that students experience problems writing the essay (see 1.8), that lecturers may become demoralised and demotivated (Morrow 2007: 43), or that the genre is viewed as producing sterile writing (Andrews 2010). The flawed and inconsistent performance of argument in the majority of multiple-source discussion essays in the data set calls the value of the multiple-source discussion essay into question. The question of whether the essay genre is outdated remains to be answered in the next sub-section.

The relationship between student texts and educational texts is encompassed in both the field of recontextualisation and the field of reproduction (the pedagogic context). Analysis of the data from the educational and pedagogical contexts shows that the written texts that lecturers give their students have considerable impact on student writing, with some being more enabling than others. This conclusion provides some confirmation for the argument that lecturers of large classes who want to ensure that their students have epistemological access to their disciplines (Morrow 2007: 47-50) should provide them with “interactive” *written* texts that are explicit about the “underlying conceptual organisation” of the subject and lead students though the subject content and arguments. A number of different
reading positions and potential identities are available in the pedagogic texts students are required to read. The introductory-level textbook positions students as agentive and offers an ‘activist’ identity (see 5.2.1). The Reader positions students as self-reflexive fellow members of the discourse community, with whom they are invited to identify (see 5.2.2). The learning guide for the module on development debates represents students similarly, as self-reflexive, culturally ‘sensitive’ and critical. A question-rich ‘invitational’ discourse solicits the student’s point of view, affirming the value of students’ responses and positions students as co-constructors of knowledge (see 5.3.2). While the learning guide for the module on development policy also represents students as critical, open-minded independent thinkers, analysis showed evidence of a contradictory underlying authoritarian discourse of deficit that constructs an alternative representation of the student as incompetent, potentially dishonest, or even ‘criminal’ (see 5.3.1). Thus, the unpublished educational texts differ markedly from the published texts in the reading positions and identities that are made available.

The formulation of the prompts for writing assignments, particularly the high stakes tasks, is another factor that is more or less enabling or constraining of student performance of argument. There is evidence in the analysis of the data that some students rely on the exact wording of the question as a component in their essay responses. The echoing of the lecturer’s formulation of the question may be strategic, in that it is both ‘safe’ and a subtle affirmation of the lecturer. However, analysis of the essays showed that many of the essays that relied on verbatim ‘chunk’ formulations of the essay task were reliant on the lecturer’s wording because they had not yet developed the full set of linguistic/discursive resources of advanced academic literacy (see 2.2.4.8). The diffuse presentation of the essay assignment on the development state and the imprecision in the wording of the question (see 5.4.2.1) was a constraint that put such students at a disadvantage.

Different emphases are placed on the main discourses of knowledge construction (see 3.9.1) used in the instantiation of the knowledge domain of Development Studies. Analysis of the learning guides showed that there are differences between the knowledge construction discourses used in the pedagogic texts of the two lecturers. In the learning guides, although the discourse of inquiry – underpinned by the ‘conduit’ view of language – appears to dominate, the discourse of persuasion is also represented. This suggests that the university subject of Development Studies is not ‘contained’ in a stable ideologically-coherent framework. Discursive tension is particularly notable in the guide for the policy module (see 5.3.1), since there is evidence of confusion about the use of inquiry and
persuasion discourses in knowledge construction and argumentation (see 5.4.1). There is potential for student confusion in the co-existence of conflicting direction in the two Development Studies modules about the use of the discourses for arguing and constructing knowledge. The differing emphases in the two modules on the appropriate mix of the discourses of inquiry and persuasion in written argumentation is another constraining factor that may account, at least partially, for poor student performance of argument.

The strong orientation to inquiry discourse that was noted in the majority of the essays in the data set (see 6.4) suggests that students respond to the dominant inquiry orientation in the educational texts, and/or that inquiry discourse dominates over the three years of study in the subject of Development Studies. However, it is possible that the preference for a discourse of inquiry may be a feature of other subjects offered in the degree programme. Since the third-year students had been temporary apprentices in a number of knowledge communities over the course of their studies (see 2.2.4.7), they would have been exposed to a number of different disciplinary discourses, each which has its own legitimate voices. It is also possible that inquiry discourse is the dominant discourse in the faculty of humanities where all the research participants were registered.

Argumentation is both performed and commented on in the published pedagogic discourse, but only in the learning guides is explicit instruction on argument provided. Analysis of the learning guides showed how explicit instruction on argument differs in the two ‘material’ pedagogic contexts that were studied, with the direction offered in one of the guides being more enabling than that offered in the other, in which argumentation and writing are confusingly conflated (see 5.4.2.1). It may be unfair to make comparisons in terms of the possible effects of the two learning guides, however, there is some evidence in the analysis that there may be a relationship between the, comparatively, more helpful direction on writing argument in the guide for the module on development debates and the strong argumentation in the ‘outlier’ essay that was written (see 6.5).

Contextual factors relating to the institution of higher education, the knowledge domain and the discourses used in the texts that represent it, the recontextualisation of knowledge as an academic subject, and the discourses, positionings and identities made available in pedagogic discourse have been shown to have a constraining impact on students’ performance of argumentation. To sum up, potentially conflicting roles and textual identities are made available in both educational and pedagogic discourse, making it difficult for students to know how to position themselves in relation to the reader. It is even
more difficult for relative novices to construct a textual voice that is effectively positioned in relation to the authoritative disciplinary voices. In addition, the (generally unconscious) use of the discursive resources for knowledge construction positions students in particular ways, of which the majority of students are not even aware. Since all three kinds of positioning required in the multiple-source discussion essay impact on the argumentation, it is not surprising that so few students write essays that demonstrate satisfactory argumentation.

7.3 Recommendations for transformative teaching and learning of argumentation in Development Studies

In this thesis, the assumption is made that poor argumentation in Development Studies in the last half of the third-year of study is evidence that students have developed neither the advanced academic literacy for academic success, nor the related empowered identity that would support their making agentive contributions in the workplace and as global citizens. The corollary is that strong argumentation is evidence that students have acquired powerful knowledge and important skills, values and dispositions, and that they have developed the literacies and associated identities that are desirable in university graduates who have majored in the subject. This stated, the understanding of written argument in Development Studies that has been built through the educational linguistic research reported in this thesis is used to make specific recommendations that could be implemented to improve student argumentation and, consequently, to effect transformation within the context of university learning and beyond. Ideally, two preconditions for developing pedagogy that provides students with equitable epistemological access to Development Studies by the end of the undergraduate degree should be met for the suggested changes to the teaching and learning of written academic argumentation to be effective. They are outlined under the first two sub-headings below.

7.3.1 Higher education policy and pedagogy for epistemological access

In this research, the language deficit perspective on student writing (see 1.3) is rejected in favour of the view that unsatisfactory student writing is a ‘symptom’ of systemic problems in higher education, and that institutional deficit is the problem that requires solution. While acknowledging that the problem is related to those in the wider socio-political and socioeconomic systems, the research supports the arguments that higher education institutions need to look for ways to address deficiencies and contradictions within higher

The absence of authorial presence, inconsistent or inappropriate textual voice, as well as the use of inappropriate sources, and misrepresentation of and overreliance on sources – all problems observed in the students’ essays – are inscriptions of the general widespread ‘problem’ of student writing (see 1.8). The research conducted suggests that the globally-recognised problem of student writing, rather than centring on either linguistic or cognitive deficit, centres on the neglect in the teaching and learning context of two closely related constructs: discourse and argument.

Particularly in the context of large classes (see 1.2.2), reflexive teaching practices, informed by educational scholarship, need to be encouraged. The role of lecturers as educationalists needs to be acknowledged as central. If excellent teaching were recognised and rewarded, lecturers would be more willing to challenge the institution-sanctioned mystification of higher education subjects by making the knowledge structure of their subjects intelligible, systematically introducing the subject content and leading students through the arguments, and encouraging students to actively engage with discursively mediated course content (Morrow 2007: 47-50).

7.3.2 Curriculum coherence in Development Studies

Since types of knowledge driven by an “integrating code” and those driven by a “serial code” (Bernstein 2000: 162) are both drawn on in Development Studies, consideration should be given to the best ways to introduce different types of knowledge, and how key concepts relevant for an understanding of development can be introduced across the years of undergraduate study in a sequence that shows understanding of the primarily vertical knowledge structure of the powerful subject of economics. A coherent curriculum would provide a solid foundation for the changes to teaching practice that are suggested below.

7.3.3 Development of discursive awareness: discourse and argument

Since the theorisation of discourse occurred relatively recently, after the formation of the disciplines, there is insufficient awareness that disciplinary content is discursively mediated. Both discourse and argument are insufficiently understood by institutional managers, curriculum planners and teachers alike. It appears that currently the focus is on primarily on the ‘content’ of the prescribed texts. Therefore, there needs to be an
institutional focus on the concepts of discourse and argument and their interrelationship in higher education. Consideration of the significant differences in the discourses of the knowledge domains and disciplines, and a perspective of subject content as discourse is recommended. Students need to be guided to read source texts as discourse. This means that what is presented at undergraduate level study as objective subject ‘content’ should be presented instead as contested claims to knowledge. Students should be made aware of how researchers use authoritative ‘voices’ and linguistic/discursive resources to assert their claims to knowledge and, specifically, how the resources work to persuade the reader to accept the claims. This approach would help students to use the source texts as a resource for argumentation in writing, instead of as mere containers of ‘content’ that are then reproduced in the students’ texts.

In practical terms, this means: either using more formal ‘contact’ time for close reading/analysis of the discursive resources used in key parts of important texts or greater focus on the development of pedagogically sound educational material that students can access in their own time. Although either strategy would be time-consuming and would slow the pace of content coverage, sacrificing breadth of subject content coverage in favour of depth of understanding of the discourses and argumentation conventions of the knowledge domain would facilitate the development of more conscious awareness of the discursive resources used in disciplinary argumentation.

7.3.4 The centrality of authoritative texts in disciplinary argumentation

The evidence that some students misunderstood key texts, and the negative impact this had on the argumentation (see 6.3.1.2), highlights the importance of the reading for the production of legitimate argument. The essays show not only that students are not on the same reading level, but also that some students would benefit from written guidance on how to approach the prescribed readings and on what texts they should focus. Even at third-year level study, the provision of a staged reading path, with an indication of the order in which to read key texts so that simpler texts are read before more challenging texts, may be a necessary strategy. With regard to concerns about plagiarism, a focus on supporting students to engage with authoritative voices may be more effective in decreasing the level of plagiarism than a focus on avoiding plagiarism.
7.3.5 The multiple-source discussion essay and the development of disciplinary voice

Despite the constraints and challenges presented by the essay genre, there are compelling arguments for retaining it as one of the key genres in disciplinary learning in the social sciences (see 2.2.4.9). Poor performance of argument in the multiple-source discussion essay is not necessarily a good reason for not including it in the kinds of writing assignments that are used. The research suggests that the sub-genre has particular value in preparing students for the writing demands of research that contributes to ‘powerful’ knowledge. Analysis has shown that the generic form obliges students to construct a textual voice that is aligned with the voices of disciplinary authority and, in so doing, students learn to share the values of the discipline. The construction of a textual voice that inscribes affiliation with the voices of the knowledge domain results in the effect described as “disciplinary voice” (Hyland 2008: 6-7) that is required in the writing of research. Only students who have developed a disciplinary voice by the end of the undergraduate years are likely to succeed in entering and completing postgraduate studies, which, both in the dissertation/thesis and in the published texts of the wider community of the knowledge domain, requires argumentation that builds on disciplinary knowledge. For this reason, rather than being a useless anachronism, the genre “affords” (English 2011: 170) opportunities for transformative learning that have yet to be fully explored.

However, support for the multiple-source discussion essay needs to be qualified. The exacting demands of the sub-genre cannot be underestimated. While it is an appropriate genre for students’ disciplinary writing in the final year of the major, the use of the multiple source discussion essay for high stakes assessment at the end of the major should be supported by a curriculum in which the type and sequence of writing tasks and the forms of argumentation required across the three years of the degree are carefully considered. Other more explicitly dialogical forms of writing (Mitchell and Andrews 2000; Mitchell and Riddle 2000, English 2011) need to be built into the curriculum before the more challenging monological forms of the academic essay can be expected. Furthermore, task formulation needs to be enabling: it is essential that there is clarity in the design of writing tasks, both in terms of the cognitive demands of the task and in the actual wording of the task. Confusion can arise when the purpose of writing is not clearly defined and communicated. Therefore, it is important that lecturers and students have awareness of whether the focus for the writing task is on the process or on the written product. Writing as ‘process’ is used for learning/inquiry/discovery’ (see 2.4.3.6), and writing as ‘product’,...
for example, the kind of hortatory argument that is used by development activists, is used for effect on specific readers. In writing for assessment in the educational context, consideration needs to be given to the unique demands of representing writing as both process and product, and also to the different dimensions of persuasion that may be required in the argumentation.

7.3.6 Authorial presence and positioning in discourse

Since the construction of argument requires taking a position, particular attention could be focused on facilitating students’ construction of authorial presence. The imposition of a blanket prohibition on the use of the first person singular pronoun most often results in lifeless disengaged writing. Given the disembodied writing produced when students use impersonal third person constructions (see 6.2.2.2), the prohibition on using ‘I’ should be reconsidered. If the first person pronoun is seen as a special resource to be used, cautiously and strategically, perhaps fewer students will write the voiceless essays that are the despair of lecturer and student alike.

It appears that students need to be shown how to use the discursive resources of “stance” and “engagement” (Hyland 2008: 8) for appropriate interaction with the reader, and for representation of self. Conscious knowledge of interaction resources may help students position themselves in disciplinary discourse.

7.3.7 Writing about experience and writing with/about texts

The evidence in student texts that discourse is often conflated with reality is another issue that should be addressed. Writing about ‘reality’ involves writing about experience that is mediated by the senses. In comparison, writing about texts is mediated by language and is more demanding. Specialised linguistic and discursive resources are required for the integration of the ‘voices’ in the heteroglossic source texts. Since different demands are made on the writer when writing about other texts, the implications for teaching and for the formulation of student writing tasks need to be considered.

In the case study, the marginal presence of a practical writing assignment that allows undergraduate students to write about experience based on observation and interviews in the field (see 3.5.3) suggests that the practical research essay is undervalued and, consequently, is not fully exploited as an opportunity for students learning to write

---

168 I describe the assignment as ‘marginal’ as it appears that more time is needed for it and it is not well-integrated into the modular structure of the year-long course.
academic argument. The side-lining of the practical research essay belies its importance for students, since it affords them the opportunity of engaging in some writing tasks that are not constrained by their having to include other voices in the text. Such writing tasks may contribute to creating conditions for the development of student agency that can be inscribed in the text as authorial voice.

7.3.8 Inquiry and persuasion in the making and representation of knowledge

In the research site, the multiple-source discussion essay is characterised by many of the conventions more typical of the ‘hard’ sciences. Typical student argumentation is weighted on the side of inquiry. However, the most successful of all the essays in the data set\textsuperscript{169} flouted the conventions of scientific writing and made effective use of strategies of persuasion. This anomaly suggests that it is worth considering the overall inquiry orientation to knowledge observed in the majority of student essays. To what extent does the focus on objectivity serve the developmental needs and interests of students? Analysis of the prescribed texts clearly showed that rhetorical techniques for persuasion are used in even the most analytical argumentation. The second module constituted an invitation to debate development issues (see 5.3.2) but, other than the outlier text, there is very little evidence in the essays that students accepted the invitation. Thus, there is a mismatch between the intertextual context (see Figure 3.3), which embodies debate, and the voiceless essays that many students wrote. It is possible that giving more pedagogical attention to persuasion as a dimension of argumentation in the essay form is a way of facilitating students’ investment in the texts they write.

7.3.9 Argument as dialogical interaction

This thesis is testament to the development of a revised understanding of academic argument as dialogical interaction. This developing perspective is part of broader and complex ideological shifts in views of knowledge construction. Rather than nullifying the current dominant cognitive perspective on argument that developed from the Enlightenment, the social perspective of argument as dialogical, which includes key insights from the cognitive perspective, functions to broaden and enrich the debate. A multidimensional understanding of academic argumentation that acknowledges the embodied being and creativity of students (and lecturers) could extend the boundaries of

\textsuperscript{169} The mark-sheet generated at year-end shows that Essay 7.2 was assigned not only the highest mark amongst the research participants, but also in the whole class.
current knowledge construction and educational practices in ways that are more enabling than constraining of student performance and student identities.

7.3.10 The use of metalanguage for discussing and understanding argumentation

Currently, in the context of the case study, a limited number and range of terms are used for the explicit discussion of argument. With the holistic understanding of academic argument that is developing in a wide range of scholarly contexts (see 2.4 and 2.5), new terms are being added to the metalanguage for analysing and understanding argument. Despite the reservations some educationalists have expressed about the value for students of argument metalanguage (Giltrow 2000), naming concepts relating to argumentation is a strategy for development of a metacognitive understanding of argument. Making visible argumentation practices that have remained implicit in mainstream teaching and learning in higher education would be a contribution to an explicit pedagogy that challenges what Lillis (1999) refers to as “the institutional practice of mystery” and what Turner (2011: 37) labels the “traditional academic pedagogy of osmosis”. Therefore, consideration should be given to how much of the terminology is useful to lecturers for developing a pedagogy of access and to which terms would be most useful for students at different stages of their learning.

The provision of opportunities for students to write drafts of essays and receive constructive formative feedback that makes precise and consistent use of the metalanguage of argument would be beneficial for students’ argumentation. For students who have not had the advantage of the “filtering” (Gee 2002: 174) of powerful discourse, the strategies discussed above would contribute significantly to the development of the flexible discourse competence students require in order to produce successful written argumentation.

7.4 Some implications of the research for higher education policy

Since the research was framed in relation to complex problems in higher education that tend to be constructed in terms of student deficit, rather than in terms of deficiencies in the institution of higher education itself (see 1.6), I briefly address some of the more obvious implications of the findings for higher education policy.

In relation to the higher education challenges, experienced both in South Africa (see 1.2.2) and globally (see 1.2.1), that have been linked to perceptions of student language deficit, and the widespread tendency at institutional management level to assume that
decontextualised ‘academic support’ is an appropriate response to the problem, the research strengthens educational linguistic arguments that such responses are inadequate and short-sighted (see 1.2.3). While I am not suggesting that the academic support strategies that are currently in place in universities are without value, I am arguing that they are inadequate, in themselves, as measures for addressing the wider problems it may be assumed they address. The broader problems in higher education, of which perceptions of student deficit are only a symptom, need to be addressed systematically at the level of higher education policy. The extent to which such policy is informed by empirical research on the specific discursive practices of the disciplines/knowledge domains of higher education will impact significantly on its value.

From the understanding developed in this research, two related recommendations that can be seen as a contribution to national and institutional higher education policy development are briefly outlined. First, despite the human-resource implications, more attention needs to be given to creative ways in which appropriate student literacies (and related identities) can be developed through learning in the disciplines, rather than through the provision of generic development opportunities offered outside the discipline. Second, the importance of lecturers having both knowledge of their fields/specialisms and educational knowledge cannot be underestimated if students are to have epistemological access to powerful knowledge. For this reason, more attention needs to be focused on making a higher education teaching qualification mandatory for lecturers and for incentivising effective teaching practice and engagement with the scholarship of learning and teaching.

7.5 Significance of the research

The subsections that follow detail how the research contributes to new understandings of argument, at the theoretical and methodological levels, and also to empirically derived knowledge that can be applied in practical contexts. In these ways, and by suggesting how more equitable outcomes in higher education can be made possible, it contributes to the broader project of social transformation (Fairclough 2010).

7.5.1 Theoretical contribution

In the thesis a theory of argumentation in knowledge-focused texts is offered. It builds on the emerging dialogical perspective on academic argument by integrating insights from different fields of knowledge. The integration of “dialogic rationalism” (Myerson 1994), continental argumentation theory (Amossy 2009; Micheli 2012), theorisation of argument in
higher education (Andrews 2007; 2010) and critical discourse studies (Kress 1989; Fairclough 2003; 2010) is used in the extension of the theory of “argumentativity” (Amossy 2009: 313-315), which in this research is conceived of as dialogistic positioning in discourse in relation to reader/s, authoritative voices and discourses of knowledge construction. Furthermore, this theory is applied and tested in the analysis of the data, providing some evidence of the usefulness and robustness of the theory.

The research also develops discourse theory by empirical demonstration of the inextricability of argumentation from discourse, particularly in knowledge-focused discourse. The comparative ‘mapping’ of Fairclough’s (2001, 2010) model of discourse on Bernstein’s (2000) theorisation of the pedagogic device reveals discursive gaps/incompatibilities that allow for deeper understanding of the theoretical limitations of any discursive modelling of text/knowledge (see 3.8.3).

The research contributes to overall theory of knowledge in higher education programmes, in terms of the place of Development Studies in formal knowledge structures, both as a knowledge domain and as a subject in higher education.

7.5.2 Methodological contribution

The selection of analytical tools for use in the framework developed for analysis is a contribution to the development of research methods that can be used in the study of argumentativity in discourse in higher education. The research contributes to the testing and further development of analytical tools for analysing interaction in writing (Hyland 2005; 2008) and to the application of appraisal theory in using it in the analysis of positioning of the textual voice in relation to authoritative voices in academic discourse. The grids for analysis (see Figures 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6) constitute eclectic but principled combinations of the different discourse analysis tools that are used to focus on three different dimensions of argumentation.

The selection of discursive resources on which to focus in each of the three analytical frameworks represents a contribution to understanding of the ways in which the discursive resources identified by Hyland (2005; 2008), which overlap with those identified in the appraisal system (White 2003; Martin and White 2005), have different affordances for analysis of different levels of discourse. Similarly, the integration of resources identified by Fairclough (2003: 192) with those from Hyland (2005; 2008) and Martin and White (2005) suggest ways in which tools developed for critical discourse analysis and those developed for linguistic discourse analysis can complement and enrich each other.
7.5.3 Empirical contribution

An empirical contribution is made to the field of educational linguistics in the development and implementation of ‘tools’ for analysing the construction of written argument in higher education. The analysis of disciplinary argumentation provides an indication of what discursive resources for argumentation are used and the extent to which it can be assumed that students have control of these resources by the end of the undergraduate social science degree. The empirical findings add to the minimal knowledge currently available on how students who are on the point of completing an undergraduate degree perform argument in a specific discipline. The findings on students’ use of discursive resources for argumentation also contribute to knowledge about the resources that this group of students take with them as graduates.

The contribution to the field of Development Studies is the empirical evidence of the knowledge structures, discourses and genres that are used in the construction of the knowledge domain and that provide insights into the complex nature of argumentation in the domain.

7.5.4 Practical contribution

The analytical framework, which consists of analytical ‘grids’ for analysing the three dimensions of argumentativity identified in knowledge-focused texts (see Figures 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6), can be used for analysis of argumentation in the research, educational and pedagogical texts of other higher education knowledge fields. It can also be adapted for analysis of argumentation in texts produced outside the academy. The methodological tools can be used for analysis of argumentation in other types of texts, including everyday texts that use primary discourse, literary/artistic texts, and media texts, including those that use multimodal communication forms extensively. The tools developed for analysis of discursive resources used in written academic argumentation can be also be adapted for use in research on the student identities, as they are inscribed in written texts. Another possibility is the use of the analytical base developed in this research for measuring some graduate attributes.

The knowledge developed as a result of this research can be applied in higher education contexts to inform policy, curriculum development and pedagogy. Some of the policy implications of the empirically-supported arguments in this research are outlined above (see 7.4). With regard to curriculum development, the deeper understanding of Development Studies as a subject offered in the undergraduate degree can be used to
inform the selection of texts, the implications of the recontextualisation of texts, and the sequencing and pacing of learning over the three years of study. This knowledge can also be used in pedagogy; specifically, the extension of understanding of the resources students use in written argument can be used to inform the design of learning tasks that give students access to “powerful knowledge” (Young 2008: 14) and the discourses related to it. The analytical grids that were developed can be adapted and simplified for use in the development of detailed assessment criteria that can accompany assignment prompts. The assessment criteria developed can, in turn, inform lecturers’ feedback to students. Students can use the detailed argument-focused feedback to improve their written argumentation in future essay assignments. The possibilities discussed above are only some of the ways that the knowledge developed in the research could be used to demystify argumentation practices in higher education.

7.5.5 Political contribution

The thesis makes a contribution to understanding that can inform academic writing in the higher education transformation project. The knowledge developed in the research is available for critical application in contexts where change is desirable in order to serve political justice ends of equity of outcomes in education. Therefore, it can contribute to the design of transformative teaching and learning that offers students epistemological access to the knowledge domain, and thus the access to powerful knowledge that is the essential precondition for the development of the empowered identity and communicative competence required for full participation in both academic and democratic public discourse.

7.6 Limitations of the study

It is acknowledged that one case study allows only a glimpse into the disciplinary practices that are relevant to the construction of written argument in the Department of Anthropology and Development Studies at the University of Johannesburg, and that the findings cannot be used to make generalisations about argumentation practices or products in similar contexts beyond the research site.

Another limitation relates to my outsider status in the knowledge domain. As this research contends, the ‘content’ in argumentation is inextricable from its embodiment in discourse. While it is acknowledged that certain aspects of argumentation are generic (Andrews 2010), the arguments in the texts that students in the third year of study of a subject at
university are required to interpret and construct enact disciplinary argument. Research that aims to demystify disciplinary argument needs to avoid the simplification that allows for generic understandings of argument. Therefore, disciplinary argument needs to be viewed in all its multidimensional complexity. The implication for the researcher of disciplinary argument is that, in Halliday’s (1978) terms, ideational, interpersonal and textual meanings need to be considered. Recognition of my outsider status in the knowledge domain (and my consequent limited appropriation of the topics and problems specific to the knowledge domain) led me to avoid extensive engagement with the ideational content of the argumentation; however, for the reasons discussed above, ideational meaning (content) could not be entirely ignored in evaluating strengths and weaknesses in the argumentation. The limitations of my conclusions about the strengths and weaknesses of the ideational content of the essays (see 6.2.2.1 for example) are acknowledged.

Since the study is centred on analysis of discourse and relies only on textual evidence, assumptions are necessarily made about the processes that informed the products of argumentation that were analysed. It is therefore acknowledged that the interpretations made in the research are fallible and open to critical scrutiny and challenge. From a critical realism perspective (see 3.2.3), the material, situated and embodied factors that impact on written student argumentation could not be considered, given the design logic of the research, and consequently are not factored in to provide a holistic representation of the problems addressed in the research. Ways in which some of the lacunae in the knowledge developed in this research could be filled are discussed in the next section.

7.7 Opportunities for further research

Since the research suggests many paths for further investigation, only the more obvious and interesting possibilities are discussed. Some of the limitations of the study, discussed above, could be addressed in future research. Understanding of what is more widely considered as legitimate argumentation in the three fields of knowledge identified by Bernstein (2000, see 3.8.3) could be developed by making the research more representative using multiple cases from a range of other institutions where Development Studies is offered as a major subject or at postgraduate level.

The circumscribed nature of the research, which was limited to analysis of discourse, obviously does not provide a holistic picture and leaves many unanswered questions, which subsequent research can take up. The question of the ways in which the students’
written performance of argument may have been impacted by their previous educational experiences, linguistic background and access to material resources could be considered by including data from questionnaires and interviews\(^\text{170}\). The unused data that were collected could be revisited in further research, or similar research could be conducted which includes a component that enables the researcher to link written performance in specific texts with individuals’ material circumstances. Similar research could also be conducted that incorporates ethnographic methodologies, such as observation of classroom practice and other forms of ‘real’ lecturer-student interaction.

The theory of argumentativity in knowledge-focused discourse, and the analytical framework that was derived from it, can be used to analyse the textual networks of other knowledge domains and disciplines in order to deepen understanding about the nature of knowledge and knowledge construction.

If specific recommendations made in the thesis are implemented, there is substantial scope for practical application of the knowledge developed in this research in comparable higher education contexts. Such evaluation research could contribute to further development of the theory of argumentativity, as well as confirmation or disconfirmation, and refinement, of the recommendations made in the thesis.

\(^{170}\) Although interviews were conducted with both lecturer research participants and eighteen of the student research participants, and biographical information on the student interviewees was collected, the data did not fit in with the design logic of the research as it developed, and therefore was not included in the thesis.
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Appendix 3.1:
Participant information and consent form for lecturers

As you know, I am about to start conducting research for the purpose of obtaining a PhD degree in the field of educational linguistics from the University of the Witwatersrand. My research will focus on your students’ experience of writing academic argument in your Development Studies modules. I am grateful for the time you have already spent helping me to design the research process, and for your understanding that the research should make a contribution to knowledge about teaching and learning academic argument. I would now like to invite you formally to participate in this study.

The research will be conducted in the two modules offered in the second semester 2008. It will involve my having electronic access to, and using as data, the module assignments and tasks that students are required to submit, and their completing a short biographical questionnaire on Edulink. As discussed, I plan to invite purposively selected students for half-hour interviews towards the end of the semester, and hope to conduct approximately ten interviews. Only data from students who have signed consent separate forms agreeing to take part in the interviews, and to be audio-recorded, will be used in the study.

Your contribution to the research will be negotiated with you before and during the research process. I will invite your comments on the draft of the formal research proposal before it is finalised and sent to the Higher Degrees Committee. As already discussed, the main forms of involvement from you will be the following. Firstly I will need you to ‘upload’ on to Edulink the biographical questionnaire, and to give me electronic access to all the data for the research participants so that I can download it and save it in Microsoft Word. Secondly, as I have already mentioned to you, I would appreciate your meeting with me, at a time and place that suits you, to discuss the research participants’ assignments when you have marked them. Should you agree, I will be using your learning guides as a data source, as well as notes I make in any classes you agree to my attending, and in the meetings that we set up to discuss and compare our evaluations of the students’ writing. All raw data will be destroyed five years after completion of the research.

Pseudonyms will be used to keep your identity and that of the student participants confidential. Actual names will not appear in the thesis, or any related published research. When the thesis is in draft form, you will be invited to comment on it. Any comments you may wish to make, or information you think should be represented, will be incorporated and acknowledged in the final draft.

Your participation in this study is greatly appreciated. As a formality, please detach and keep this sheet, and sign the attached consent form. Should you at any point wish to reconsider your involvement, you have the right to withdraw from the study.
DECLARATION OF INFORMED CONSENT TO BE A RESEARCH PARTICIPANT

I ________________________________ ________________________________ (print first name surname)

- I hereby confirm that I have read and understood the attached information sheet.
- I agree to participate in the research project which is designed to contribute to the understanding of students’ written academic argument.
- I understand that my students’ biographical questionnaire responses and the writing that they submit in the module I offer in the second semester of Development Studies this year will be used for educational purposes and research.
- I agree to collaborating with the researcher as she conducts her research in my module.
- That the terms of the collaboration will be negotiated with me, and mutually agreed at each stage of the research process.
- I understand that my name will not be revealed in discussion and publication of the research.
- I may, at any stage, without prejudice, withdraw my consent and participation in the study.

My contact details are:

telephone number/s ________________________________
e-mail address ________________________________

Date:_________________________ Place: University of Johannesburg

Participant’s signature: ________________________________
Appendix 3.2:
Participant information and consent form for students

My name is Pia Lamberti, and I am a member of staff at the University of Johannesburg. I am about to start conducting research for the purpose of obtaining a PhD degree from the University of the Witwatersrand. My research will focus on your experience of writing academic argument in Development Studies. I hope that the research will make a contribution to knowledge about teaching and learning academic argument at university. I would like to invite you to participate in this study.

The research will be conducted in the second semester 2008 in the Department of Anthropology and Development Studies. It will involve my having access to, and using as data, the module assignments and tasks that the department requires you to submit on Edulink (the Web/CT Blackboard Learning Management Programme), and your completing a short biographical questionnaire on Edulink, which will take a few minutes.

As I plan to interview about ten students towards the end of the semester, I may also invite you to attend a half-hour interview on this campus, which will be audio-recorded. If this is the case, I will call you and invite you to the interview. For this reason I have asked for your contact numbers on the consent form. You will not be penalised in any way should you choose not to be interviewed.

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary and if you choose not to participate there will be no negative consequences. If you do choose to participate, you can still change your mind and withdraw from the study at any time by calling me at one of the telephone numbers below. You can also call me if you are considering withdrawing from the study and would like to know more about the research process.

Pseudonyms (false names) will be used to keep your identity confidential, so your name will not appear in the thesis, or any published research. All raw data will be destroyed five years after completion of the research.

Your participation in this study would be greatly appreciated. The research will help academics to design learning experiences which are informed by deeper knowledge of the way students like you use and understand academic argument. If you do choose to participate in the study, please detach and keep this sheet, and sign and hand in the attached consent form.

With thanks

Pia Lamberti
A Ring Bridge
plamberti@uj.ac.za
011 559 3649
084 770 8799
DECLARATION OF INFORMED CONSENT TO BECOME A RESEARCH PARTICIPANT

I (print first name) (print surname)

- I hereby confirm that I have read and understood the attached information sheet.
- I agree to participate in the research project which is designed to contribute to the understanding of students' written academic argument.
- I understand that my biographical questionnaire responses and the writing that I submit in the two modules offered in the second semester of Development Studies this year will be used for educational purposes and research.
- I understand that I may be invited to attend an interview with the researcher, which will be audio-recorded, and that I do not have to accept the invitation.
- I understand that my name will not be divulged.
- I may, at any stage, without prejudice, withdraw my consent and participation in the study.

My student number is: ___________________________

My contact details are:

  telephone number/s _______________

  e-mail address ____________________

Date:_______________________     Place: University of Johannesburg

Participant's signature: ___________________________
DECLARATION OF INFORMED CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN AN INTERVIEW

I………………………… (print first name) …………………………… (print surname)

consent to being interviewed by Pia Lamberti for her study on students’ written academic argument for the purposes of educational research.

I understand that:

- taking part in this interview is voluntary;
- the interview will take about thirty minutes;
- I may refuse to respond to any questions I would prefer not to answer;
- I may withdraw from the study at any time;
- My responses are confidential;
- no information that might enable me to be identified will be included in the published research.

Date:………………………………………

Place:……………………………………………

Participant’s signature …………………………………………………………….

Researcher’s signature…………………………………………………………….
DECLARATION OF INFORMED CONSENT TO BE AUDIO-RECORDED

I………………………… (print first name) …………………………… (print surname)

consent for the interview that I have agreed to participate in will be audio-recorded.

I understand that:
• the recording will not be heard by any person other than the transcriber/researcher;
• I will be given a pseudonym (false name), which will be used in the transcription of the interview, and that my name will not be revealed in the discussion of the research.
• I may, at any stage, without prejudice, withdraw my consent and participation in the study.

Date:……………………………………

Place:…………………………………………

Participant’s signature ……………………………………………………………

Researcher’s signature…………………………………………………………
### Appendix 6.1: Essay headings analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essay no.</th>
<th>Intro. heading (√ or X)</th>
<th>Sub-headings</th>
<th>Concl. heading (√ or X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Legal framework behind the child support grant</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The impact of the child support grant on children development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CSG alleviating poverty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The importance of the CSG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Problem with child support grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perception about the child support grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Child support grant and the state maintenance grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Job creation as a long term solution and child support grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary School Nutritional Programme and the CSG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Early Childhood Development Programme and the CSG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>X No sub-headings in body 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>2 A state for development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Developmental state: meaning and components</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Historical origins of the developmental state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 South Africa’s state of development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>2 What is globalisation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 The origins of globalisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Defining globalisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Human security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Globalisation and the third world</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>2 What is the Developmental State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 The Developmental State examples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 The first of the Developmental states</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.1 Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.2 The Asian Tigers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 The less successful developmental states</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.1 Brazil and India</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.2 Africa’s attempts to be developmental states</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 South Africa as a developmental State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.1 The democratic developmental state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.2 Policy and actions taken by the South African government to become a Developmental State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Conclusion: South Africa the developmental State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>2 The Process of Globalisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 Trade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 People</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Is globalisation beneficial to the security of the third world people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 Women and their problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Changes that have taken place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Conclusions and implications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>2 Definition of globalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Definition of human security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Effects of globalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Beneficial of Globalization process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Since the essay data was collected in different ways (some being accessed electronically, and others as ‘hard copies’), not all the scripts analysed were complete. The scripts that were electronically accessed did not contain the cover and ‘contents’ pages which should precede the actual essay text. For this reason, the observations made are based on the headings that are inscribed in the essay texts themselves.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essay no.</th>
<th>Intro. heading (√ or X)</th>
<th>Sub-headings</th>
<th>Concl. heading (√ or X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5.1      | √                       | 2 Defining poverty  
3 Millennium Goal: Eradicate Extreme Poverty and Hunger  
4 Current state of families  
5 Welfare policy  
6 Social security  
7 Child Support Grant  
8 Limitations of the Child Support Grant  
9 Case Study  
10 Education  
11 Mini-Conclusion  
12 Child Support grant and Economic Activity  
13 Solution  
14 Direct Measures Supporting the Unemployment Problem  
15 Linking Social question with Economic Activity | | √ |
| 5.2      | √                       | 2 Definitions  
2.1 Globalisation  
2.2 Human Security  
2.3 Third World Majority’s  
3 Globalisation and Human Security  
3.1 is Globalisation Mutually Beneficial?  
3.12 Why globalization works  
3.2 Human Well-Being and the Natural Environment  
3.3 Development and Human Well-being  
4 Mini Conclusion  
5 Globalisation  
6 Globalisation and Human Security of the Third World | | |
| 6.1      | X                       | X 2 Paragraph divisions are not clear due to typographical set up of text. | X |
| 6.2      | √                       | 2 Defining Globalisation  
2.1 Globalisation as a Beneficial Process  
2.2 Globalisation as a Non-beneficial process (exploitation)  
3 What is Human security  
3.1 Inequality and Human security  
3.2 Health and Human security  
3.3 Freedom and Human security  
4 Is globalisation beneficial to third world majority?  
‘Is globalisation beneficial to third world majority?’ | | X |
| 7.1      | √                       | The Developmental State  
Investments  
Democracy in South Africa  
Industrial Policy  
Exports | | |
| 7.2      | √                       | The process of Globalisation: The Game  
The Winners and the Losers  
‘Conclusion: The Score’ | | √ |
| 8.1      | √                       | The Origins of a Developmental State  
Defining a Developmental State  
Adopting the Status of “Developmental State  
Gear Policy  
Economic Growth and Unemployment  
Redistribution and the Poor  
Crime and Safety | | X |
| 8.2      | √                       | 2.1 What is Globalisation?  
2.2 End of the Cold War and Globalisation  
2.3 Human Security and Globalisation  
2.4 The Benefits of Globalisation to Third World countries | | √ |
| 9.1      | √                       | What is a developmental State?  
Which countries clarify to be a developmental state?  
Is South Africa a developmental state?  
South Africa Developmental efforts, policies and programmes | | √ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essay no.</th>
<th>Intro. heading (√ or X)</th>
<th>Sub-headings</th>
<th>Concl. heading (√ or X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>What is Globalization? Types of Globalisation Globalisation and the third worlds majority What is Human Security? Is Globalisation beneficial for the security of the third world’s majority?</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X 3</td>
<td>X The last two paragraphs function as a conclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>2 The Nature of globalisation 3 The nature of human security 4 Process of globalisation and security of Third World countries</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Historical Background The Child Support Grant Benefits Shortfalls Concerns Economic Activity Poverty Alleviation</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>2 Globalisation 3 Human Security 4 The Third World 5 The Benefits of Globalisation 6 The Security of the Third world</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>2 Child support grant in South Africa 3 Poverty in South Africa 3.1 Child poverty 3.2 Child support grant as poverty alleviation system 3.3 Other poverty alleviation in South Africa 3.4 Comparison of the alternatives poverty alleviation 3.4.1 Child support grant and other government grants 3.4.2 NGO’s 3.4.3 Skills development 4 Economy and the budget for South Africa 4.1 Economically active poor people 4.2 The positive and negative effects on the economy caused by child support grants 4.3 Myths about child support grants Teenagers get pregnant to receive grants. Government is giving too much or too little: The money is not spent on children: Men are not as supported as women 5 The most important poverty alleviation in South Africa 6 Complications and challenges facing child support grants</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>2 Globalisation 2.1 Globalisation of culture 2.2 Globalisation of consumption 2.3 Globalisation of telecommunications and investment 2.4 Globalisation of the economy Transitional corporations 2.5 Globalisation of tourism and services 3 Human Security 3.1 Food security 3.2 Water security 3.3 Shelter security 3.4 Environmental security 4 Globalisation and poverty 5 Globalisation and inequality</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>2 The Background and Description of the Child Support Grant 3 Implementation problems of the CSG 4 Impact of CSG on the child and the household 5 The link between the CSG beneficiaries and poverty alleviation 6 CSG versus other poverty alleviation mechanisms</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay no.</td>
<td>Intro. heading (✓ or X)</td>
<td>Sub-headings</td>
<td>Concl. heading (✓ or X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2 Globalisation defined&lt;br&gt;3 Different perspectives on globalisation&lt;br&gt;3 The impact of globalisation on the Third World&lt;br&gt;4 Human Security&lt;br&gt;5 Globalisation and its impact on Third World Security</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2 Origins of the term developmental state&lt;br&gt;3 Description of developmental state&lt;br&gt;4 South Africa’s Developmental efforts and their compliance with developmental states’ characteristics</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2 Globalisation and human security&lt;br&gt;3 Globalisation processes</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The first paragraph functions as an introduction.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Globalisation&lt;br&gt;Human Security&lt;br&gt;Globalisation processes and their benefit for the security of third worlds</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The first paragraph functions as an introduction.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Only the first paragraph functions as an introduction, although the following three paragraphs look like part of the introduction stage, as they come before the first sub-heading.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Definition of human security&lt;br&gt;Reasons for international trade&lt;br&gt;Instruments of trade policy&lt;br&gt;Advantages of globalisation</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2 Defining a Developmental State&lt;br&gt;3 Characterizing a Developmental State&lt;br&gt;4 Can the Southern African Region become a Developmental State?&lt;br&gt;4.1 The trouble with Africa&lt;br&gt;4.2 South Africa, A developmental State?&lt;br&gt;4.3 Democracy versus a Developmental State</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Globalisation&lt;br&gt;The Relationship between Globalisation and Economic prosperity&lt;br&gt;Human Security&lt;br&gt;Globalisation as Beneficial Security for the third world majority</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>The Child Support Grant&lt;br&gt;Background of the Child Support Grant&lt;br&gt;Reasons for Implementing the Child Support Grant and Poverty alleviation&lt;br&gt;Economic activity of the Child Support Grant&lt;br&gt;Comparison between the CGS and the Foster Care Grant (FCG)&lt;br&gt;Comparing the economic activity of both the CSG and FCG 'Conclusion and Recommendation'</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay no.</td>
<td>Intro. heading (✓ or X)</td>
<td>Sub-headings</td>
<td>Concl. heading (✓ or X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 18.2 | ✓ | Why globalisation works: The interlinked economy  
Consequences of globalisation  
Globalisation as a poverty and inequality mechanism  
Human Security explained  
How beneficial is globalisation for Third World Security | ✓ |
| 19.1 | ✓ | The apartheid era  
The economic background  
A developmental state  
Economic progress  
Government’s initiatives JIPSA and AsgiSA  
Educational Programmes  
Youth programmes  
The Reconstruction and Development Programme  
Growth, Employment and Redistribution  
The Cooperative Organization | ✓ |
| 19.2 | ✓ | Globalisation  
Effects of globalisation  
Human security  
Economic insecurity  
Employment and Income insecurity  
Personal and community insecurity  
Health insecurity  
Environmental insecurity | ✓ |
| 20.1 | ✓ | 2 The concept, definition and characteristics of Developmental state  
3 The state of the nation (South Africa)  
4 The analyses of the success of South Africa’s developmental efforts, policies, and programmes  
5 The possible way forward | ✓ |
| 20.2 | ✓ | 2 Globalisation  
3 Human security  
4 Globalisation process and benefits to third world majority  
5 Way forward | ✓ |
| 21.1 | X | On the contents page the heading: ‘Introduction to the history of South Africa’ is indicated.  
The theory behind the developmental state of SA  
Contrasted view of developmental state’s Principles of development and growth  
Democracy, institutions and Autonomy  
Developmental policies  
Goals for development and conclusion  
*This the only heading in the body of the essay | ✓ |
| 21.2 | X | But, on the contents page the heading: ‘Introduction to globalization’ is indicated.  
Global Institutions  
Human security  
The benefits of globalization to the third world  
Globalization and financial markets | X |
| 22.1 | ✓ | The Developmental State  
  ● The Origin and Definition  
The Developmental State  
  ● In the context of South Africa  
South African Policies put in place, from the past to the present  
  ● The past  
From failure to success  
  ● Readjusting, re-evaluating and implementing of Policy  
Optimistic Adjustment of Policy  
  ● The Present | ✓ |
| 22.2 | ✓ | 2 What is Globalisation?  
2.1 The Objectives of Globalisation  
3 Human Security  
4 Rwanda and Burundi  
5 South Africa | ✓ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essay no.</th>
<th>Intro. heading (✓ or X)</th>
<th>Sub-headings</th>
<th>Concl. heading (✓ or X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 23.1     | ✓                       | Child Support Grant  
Addressing Poverty  
Impact of CSG and DG  
Is CSG and DG useful | ✓                      |
| 23.2     | ✓                       | Defining Globalization  
Impact/benefits of Globalization for 3rd world cities  
Third world cities responding to Globalization  
Debates and Theories  
Human Security | ✓                      |
| 24.1     | ✓                       | The child maintenance grant where did it all begin  
The child support grant, a means to an end of poverty  
Gogo Sibeko and her tuck shop | ✓                      |
| 24.2     | ✓                       | What is globalisation  
What does globalisation have to do with human security?  
How can globalisation be beneficial to the security of the third world? | ✓                      |
| 25.1     | ✓                       | 2 History of the Child Support Grant  
3 The Impacts of the Child Support Grant  
4 Limitations and criticisms of the Child Support Grant | ✓                      |
| 25.2     | ✓                       | 2 Globalisation and the Market  
3 Globalisation, Poverty and Inequality  
4 Globalisation, Gender and Disease | ✓                      |
| 26.1     | ✓                       | 2 The Theory of Developmental State  
2.1 Definitions  
2.2 Developmental State and Democracy  
2.3 Developmental state in East Asia  
3 The rise and fall of the Developmental State  
3.1 Is the developmental state any longer appropriate?  
3.2 Does the Developmental State have a future?  
4 Developmental States in Africa  
5 Developmental state in South Africa | ✓                      |
| 26.2     | ✓                       | 2 Definition of Globalisation  
2.1 Globalisation and Poverty  
3 Definition of Human Security  
4 Is the Globalisation process beneficial for the security of the Third World? | ✓                      |
| 27.1     | ✓                       | 2 The history of child support grant  
3 Implementation of child support grant  
4 Constitutional and international obligations  
5 Child support grant within poor society  
5.1 The child support grant and teenage pregnancy  
5.2 Child support grant as safety net for HIV/AIDS-affected households in South Africa  
5.3 Unemployment  
6 Comments | ✓                      |
| 28.1     | ✓                       | 2.1 South Africa since the transaction to democracy  
2.2 Efforts taken by the government  
2.3 Poverty in South Africa  
3.1 The Child Support Grant  
3.2 The objective of the Child Support Grant  
3.3 Is the means test adequate?  
3.4 Is the child support achieving its goal?  
4 Other grants that are available  
4.1 The disability grant  
4.2 The war veteran grant  
5.1 Alternative tools of alleviating poverty  
5.2 Employment | ✓                      |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essay no.</th>
<th>Intro. heading (√ or X)</th>
<th>Sub-headings</th>
<th>Concl. heading (√ or X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 28.2      | √                       | 2 Defining terms  
2.1 Globalisation  
2.2 Human Security  
2.3 Third World  
3 The role of the state  
4 Advantages of globalization  
4.1 Reduction of poverty  
4.1 Recognition of women  
5 Challenges of Globalisation  
5.1 Globalisation and disease  
5.2 Globalisation and religion |             | √                      |
| 29.1      | √                       | 2 The Child Support Grant – history, aims and objectives:  
3 Assessment of Child Support Grant –success and challenges:  
4 The Child Support Grant as a tool for poverty alleviation:  
5 Other mechanisms of poverty alleviation:  
6 The Child Support Grant and economic activity: |             | √                      |
| 29.2      | √                       | 2 Globalisation:  
3 Human security:  
4 Human security and globalisation: |             | √                      |
| 30.1      | √                       | Globalization:  
History:  
Globalization in the modern day:  
Poorer Nations:  
The rise on inequality:  
Exploitation:  
Human Security: |             | √                      |

14.03 % (8) essays have no intro. heading in essay text

92.98 % (53 of 57) of essays have ideational sub-headings
7.01 % (4 of 57) essays have no ideational sub-headings in the body
40.35 % (23 of 57) essays have unnumbered sub-headings (including 1 with bulleted sub-headings)
52.63 % (30 of 57) essays have numbered sub-headings
50 % (15 of 30) essays have diff levels of numbered headings
46.66 % (7 of 15) essays use different levels of numbering successfully
53.33 % (8 of 15) essays use different levels of numbering less successfully

10.52 % (6) essays have no concl. heading in the essay text
### Appendix 6.2: Thesis statement analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essay no.</th>
<th>Use of meta-discourse to mark the thesis</th>
<th>Frame marker signalling thesis (^{172})</th>
<th>Thesis</th>
<th>Front-loaded thesis (F); back-loaded thesis (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Under conclusion heading: \textit{This assignment has proved in various ways that} \ldots \textit{It is therefore conclusive that} \ldots</td>
<td>the child support grant is an \textit{effective} mechanism for poverty alleviation' \textit{par 17, line 1-2} the child support grant is an \textit{effective} mechanism to poverty alleviation' \textit{par 17, line 14-5 (note repetition)}</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>Under conclusion heading: \textit{It has also been found that} \ldots \textit{... it has been concluded that} \ldots \textit{It has finally been found that}</td>
<td>globalization has \textit{great advantage} for the development of the third world.' \textit{17: 2-3} their effect are \textit{very marginal} compared to the \textit{advantage} of globalization.' \textit{17: 4-5} globalization can lead to the security of the population in the third world.' \textit{17: 7-8}</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Under conclusion heading: \textit{It was then established that} \ldots</td>
<td>even though South Africa encapsulates many features of a \textit{developmental} state there are \textit{still a number of} challenges for the government to overcome for South Africa to become an \textit{effective} \textit{developmental} state.' \textit{Par 22, lines10-3}</td>
<td>B3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>M4</td>
<td>Under conclusion heading: \textit{There are contrasting views as to whether} \textit{globalisation is beneficial to the third world or not.}</td>
<td>Globalisation has brought benefits to \textit{developing} countries, 	extit{but} it has \textit{not} succeeded in bringing about a \textit{massive} decline in poverty or inequality. 	extit{even though} globalisation has the potential to improve the lives of those in the third world, \textit{thus far} it has \textit{not} succeeded in doing so as there are \textit{still a number of} challenges to overcome in order to achieve this.' \textit{19: 4-6}</td>
<td>B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>M5</td>
<td>Under conclusion heading: \textit{It is important to see}</td>
<td>that South Africa is between being a \textit{developmental} State and being \textit{democratic developing} country with a \textit{liberal} drive. \textit{The fact remains that} the lack of economic growth and \textit{wide spread} employment is a problem \ldots each year.' \textit{29: 5-9} South Africa is not a \textit{developmental} State but makes policy to be one.' \textit{29: 9-10}</td>
<td>B5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{172}\) \textit{indicates dialogical expansion}; \textit{indicates dialogic contraction}; \textit{indicates dialogically contractive concession and/or counter-move}; \textit{evaluation indicated by attitude markers/the lexical resources of adjectives \\& adverbs}; \textit{bold font}: graduation resources
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essay no.</th>
<th>Use of meta-discourse to mark the thesis</th>
<th>Frame marker signalling thesis</th>
<th>Thesis</th>
<th>Front-loaded thesis (F); back-loaded thesis (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>M6</td>
<td>Under conclusion heading:</td>
<td>The main idea that can be taken from this is that …</td>
<td>B6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'The main idea that can be taken from this is that …'</td>
<td>the influence of globalisation has to be taken in the correct way and not seen as something that will challenge the ability of some to hold on to power.' 23: 3-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under conclusion heading:</td>
<td>'Since globalization has taken place the level of poverty has been decreasing gradually and it's good for people in all countries as their standard of living are being satisfied.' 10: 8-11</td>
<td>B7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under conclusion heading:</td>
<td>This grant has given many parents the support they need to improve their children as well as their own lives, by empowering them to support their children and in many ways improving their own status. This grant as discussed above has caused many controversies as young women who fall pregnant are accused of abusing this grant and thus causes these women and children to become vulnerable.' 24: 12-17</td>
<td>B8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under sub-heading '4. Mini Conclusion': 'It is important to understand that …'</td>
<td>Globalisation can impact positively on the security of third worlds majority by creating a global division of labour can cause the decrease in unemployment and lessen poverty in third worlds.' 16: 3-5</td>
<td>B9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under Sub-heading '7. Conclusion':</td>
<td>'Globalisation is better for human security as discussed above globalisation transcends boundaries providing a global division of labour, reducing poverty by creating job opportunities. Globalisation unifies human security and is intertwined in creating a better life for all. Globalisation is mutually beneficial to both the developed and the developing countries, it forces developed countries to stop exploiting developing countries which directly effects the majority of third world countries, for example cheap labour and poor conditions are then eradicated ensuring a better life for all.' 21: 1-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>M7</td>
<td>NB no ‘conclusion’ heading</td>
<td>'When looking at the above discussion it is clear that …'</td>
<td>B10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'With that in mind ….'</td>
<td>South Africa cannot be said to be a developmental state in the classic sense (Japan). 21: 1-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The country can be said to be a Democratic Developmental State, …’ 21: 6-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NB for the whole argument see whole of conc par 21: 1-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay no.</td>
<td>Use of metadiscourse to mark the thesis</td>
<td>Frame marker signalling thesis (^{172})</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>Front-loaded thesis (F); back-loaded thesis (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>M8</td>
<td>NB no ‘conclusion’ heading</td>
<td>… the majority of people due to their informal status do not benefit adequately from globalisation. Thus globalisation has an inherent tendency to benefit the elite in the third world.’ 19: 5-8</td>
<td>B11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Under conclusion heading:</td>
<td>‘South Africa … developmental in character, but they remain broad, many, and in need of clarification. Although the country has experienced economic growth, the weak capacity of the state has failed to bring about real democratic development and shared growth. The policies are aimed in the right direction, but defining South Africa as a Developmental state would be a premature statement.’ 19: 3-6</td>
<td>B12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>M9</td>
<td>Under introduction heading:</td>
<td>the losers are those in Third World countries and their disadvantaged position is the result of their colonial histories.’ 1: 8-10</td>
<td>F 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under conclusion heading:</td>
<td>‘In this paper I argue that …’ 1: 8-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|          |                                        | ‘In the realm of economic globalisation, the rules [of] the international trading game has been set out by WTO, the UN, and the World Bank. It seems they are on ‘Team West’, and although they offer advice and financial aid to the South, rules hardly ever work to their advantage. If the playing field was entered into on equal grounds between countries it is possible for everyone to be a winner. This is evident in the East Asian example where the governments of these countries set the restrictions on when and how they would enter the game. Africa, on the other hand, stood little chance of winning. Structurally and politically they were full of gaps, which were filled by corrupt and greedy actors trying to get their piece of the global fortune. The real losers are the majority of the Third World poor. The losses they have incurred are devastating. Their living conditions have been reduced to poverty as rural resources are channelled in the opposite direction to where they stand. The subsistence strategies they have relied on have been made more difficult to access due to global what is on the global agenda. Their luck did not change much when they follow the resources. Lack of state capacity diminished national control and handed it over to international agents of globalisation, who are less responsible and receptive to the needs of the people in countries other than the ones on their team. At most, global
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essay no.</th>
<th>Use of metadiscourse to mark the thesis</th>
<th>Frame marker signalling thesis</th>
<th>Thesis</th>
<th>Front-loaded thesis (F); back-loaded thesis (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>NB no ‘conclusion’ heading</td>
<td>‘Fighting apartheid seemed to be an aimless battle, if freedom was achieved through the perseverance of the current government, then surely some of the goals of becoming a developmental state can be labelled as a realistic.’ The thesis emerges in the final par (20) with a wistful rhetorical question.</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>B13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>M10</td>
<td>‘Human beings and their state of security in the third world have definitely proved to be more detrimental than beneficial, just by observing the trends of the world.’ 21: 4-6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>B14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>M11</td>
<td>South Africa can not yet be considered as a developmental state.’ 24: 3-5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>B15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>M11</td>
<td>‘Globalisation has some positive and some negative aspects for third world countries and this essay explained the differences. It could be positive in that it could create jobs in poorer countries when big international firms invest in third world countries. It could also [be] negative because globalization could spread harmful diseases that could have a deadly effect on populations.’</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>B16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>M12</td>
<td>the government has a good strategy to develop this country… the government is experiencing some difficulties in its efforts to transform the socioeconomic make up of the country.’ 16: 2-6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>B17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>M13</td>
<td>the process of globalisation tends to influence social inequalities which in turn results in civil disturbances and criminal activities. … This could also trigger an uneven distribution of resources within societies and across the world.’ 15: 8-9, 12-13</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>B18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay no.</td>
<td>Use of meta-discourse to mark the thesis</td>
<td>Frame marker signalling thesis</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>Front-loaded thesis (F); back-loaded thesis (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>Paragraph/sentence preceding conc heading&lt;br&gt;So we know that…&lt;br&gt;Under ‘conclusion’ heading:&lt;br&gt;Note the unstrategic placing of part of the thesis statement above the section marked as conclusion.</td>
<td>... the Child Support Grant assists many children, but it is also not enough to even meet the most basic of needs. So it can alleviate dire poverty but it is not a complete and comprehensive tool that can stand-alone.' 11: 1-3&lt;br&gt;The Child Support Grant is making great steps into alleviating child poverty but cannot stand alone as a fully functioning poverty alleviation mechanism.' 12: 1-2</td>
<td>B19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>M14&lt;br&gt;Under ‘conclusion’ heading:&lt;br&gt;‘We looked at … we determined that … (see in context)</td>
<td>... what human security means and how beneficial the process of globalisation is, ... human security is essential and that globalisation increases human security in all countries especially those in the Third world.’ 17: 1-5</td>
<td>B20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>Under ‘conclusion’ heading:&lt;br&gt;‘In conclusion … NB writer uses the convention, but not in the appropriate place – The marker is not placed immediately in front of the thesis – appears to be functioning as ‘mushfake’ (Gee 1996) discourse</td>
<td>... South Africa has come a long way from the apartheid era to the democracy. The apartheid came up with the state support grant that did not include black people one hundred percent. The child support grant is the most effective and practical method of controlling the poverty crisis in South Africa.’ 16: 1-9</td>
<td>B21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>Under ‘conclusion’ heading:&lt;br&gt;Globalisation can be the reason why the developing countries will never be able to compete and catch up with the developed countries. Globalisation will lead to over exploitation of countries for the benefit of another country. 30: 7-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>B22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>M15&lt;br&gt;Under ‘conclusion’ heading:&lt;br&gt;‘It is therefore clear that&lt;br&gt;an insufficiently elaborated. contractive move?’&lt;br&gt;the CSG is an effective poverty alleviation mechanism, however it has some limitations …’ 20: 2-4&lt;br&gt;‘The impact of the CSG in encouraging economic activity is minimal in that the grant is not adequate to be used for other things, however in meeting subsistence needs money is bumped back into the economy.’ 20: 8-10</td>
<td>... there is an important relationship between globalisation and the security of the Third World. The extent of how good or bad this relationship is depends on the specific context of separate states and regions’ 18: 1-4&lt;br&gt;globalisation is beneficial to some areas but detrimental in others.’ 18: 4-5</td>
<td>B23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>M16&lt;br&gt;Under ‘conclusion’ heading:&lt;br&gt;‘It can therefore be concluded that…&lt;br&gt;The use of ‘therefore’ functions to effect contraction, as it suggests the conclusion is necessary if reasoning is applied. &lt;br&gt;It is therefore clear that … It’s difficult to judge if ‘but’ functions here to effect a concession or counter move</td>
<td></td>
<td>B24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay no.</td>
<td>Use of meta-discourse to mark the thesis</td>
<td>Frame marker signalling thesis</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>Front-loaded thesis (F); back-loaded thesis (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>M17</td>
<td>Under ‘conclusion’ heading: 'What can be deduced from the discussion is that …'</td>
<td>this country is more <em>democratic</em> than <em>developmental</em> in that it has focused on redressing the injustices of the past. <em>However</em> this does not mean that nothing has been done to ensure economic development.' 29: 7-10 'South Africa <em>can</em> be called a <em>developmental</em> state <em>but a little</em> different from the classical example of East Asian Tigers'. 29: 15-17</td>
<td>B25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under ‘conclusion’ heading: '… can be beneficial… can be detrimental …' 19: 3 'Some of its processes … are beneficial to the third world. It therefore helps to reduce poverty, enhance economic development and guarantee human security. <em>However</em> there are some instances whereby globalisation tends to benefit the global north <em>more</em> than the global south. In these instances it is <em>not</em> beneficial for human security in the third world.' 19: 4-10</td>
<td>B26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>NB no ‘conclusion’ heading (no headings at all) Under introduction heading, towards end:</td>
<td>'South Africa <em>can be said</em> to be working towards becoming a <em>successful developmental</em> state. This essay will therefore emphasise this point in depth with insight as to <em>whether or not</em> the policies and programs are in accordance with the developmental state.' 1: 15-18</td>
<td>Exclude 1 extensive plagiarism; no conclusion or thesis offered as expected in the last paragraph, despite an ‘in conclusion’ frame marker</td>
<td>B27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>M18</td>
<td>NB no ‘conclusion’ heading 'In conclusion this essay emphasises on the current long wave of globalisation as a process that with its different processes in place, developing of third worlds majority are deeply integrated in to the world of economy and are proving to be …' more <em>prosperous</em> by escaping oppression and liberalising economically through a global economic integration. Globalisation and human security have resulted in the reduction of the number of people living in extreme poverty and globally reduced inequalities.' 14: 1-7</td>
<td>B27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under ‘conclusion’ heading: 'The Child Support Grant has had and still has a lot of <em>positive</em> effects on the children and <em>mostly</em> on households that are in need of it. This grant has help families to be sustainable and <em>most importantly</em> it as help families to move away from poverty in a sense that these families are now <em>better off</em> than before.' 26: 6-10</td>
<td>B28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay no.</td>
<td>Use of meta-discourse to mark the thesis</td>
<td>Frame marker signalling thesis</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>Front-loaded thesis (F); back-loaded thesis (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>M19</td>
<td>Under ‘introduction’ heading: 'This essay will be demonstrating how …' Under ‘conclusion’ heading: 'It would be concluded that … perhaps the writer meant ‘can’ instead of ‘would’?'</td>
<td>globalisation <em>positively</em> affects human security …' … globalisation has brought <em>a lot of positive</em> change in the world and they world is able to work as one in areas such as …' 18: 1-4</td>
<td>F 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>M20</td>
<td>Under ‘conclusion’ heading: South Africa’s programme and policies were also analysed to conclude whether South Africa is a Developmental State. The literature has shown that… although South Africa has <em>some correct</em> characteristics economically to become a Developmental State … <em>still leave South Africa a long way off</em> from being a Developmental State. Until such time that South Africa can address these issues, it is <em>still not a Developmental State.</em>’ 25: 9-17</td>
<td>B29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>M21</td>
<td>Under ‘conclusion’ heading: 'All the readings read, except for Wolf, prove that … the globalisation process is <em>infect, not beneficial</em> for the security of the third world majority. … <em>Rather, it has allowed for those who have benefited from globalisation to only regulate those who aren’t able to help themselves.</em> It is in this way, that <em>one can clearly see</em> the inequality that globalisation has created. And that it has provided security for those who <em>can afford to take advantage</em> of it and <em>sidelining those who cant,</em> and those <em>predominantly being the third world.</em>' 24: 7-19</td>
<td>B30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under ‘Conclusion and Recommendation’ heading: <em>There is no ref to CSG in relation to poverty alleviation, therefore no thesis at all. NB the genre confusion indicated by the use of ‘recommendation’ in the heading</em></td>
<td><em>While the third world is …being marginalised in terms of the benefits of globalisation.</em>’ 19: 5-7</td>
<td>Exclude 2 extensive plagiarism Q has not been answered &amp; essay mainly ‘cut and paste’ plagiarism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under ‘conclusion’ heading: <em>NB whole conc clearly “borrowed”</em></td>
<td><em>The government has worked hard to improve the situation and has proven to the world that it’s possible to change a hopeless situation. Most of these policies have been successful and thousands of lives have been changed. We are no longer where we used to be meaning that these policies have been successful in changing the country.</em></td>
<td>Exclude 3 extensive plagiarism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under ‘conclusion’ heading:</td>
<td></td>
<td>B31 The text shows no evidence of engagement with the prescribed authoritative voices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay no.</td>
<td>Use of meta-discourse to mark the thesis</td>
<td>Frame marker signalling thesis (^1/2)</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>Front-loaded thesis (F); back-loaded thesis (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>M22</td>
<td>Under ‘conclusion’ heading:</td>
<td>globalisation did not affect everyone equally. The minority did benefit but the majority especially in the developing world suffered the most. As globalisation increased so did the level of poverty. The impact of globalisation has resulted in human security being threatened in every possible way.' Etc 10: 1-4</td>
<td>B32 Poorly structured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>M23</td>
<td>Under ‘conclusion’ heading:</td>
<td>in a whole South Africa is a developmental state, similarly, emerging as a country trying to maintain a sustainable growth. Sociologically it is a weak developmental state, and an emerging Neo-conservative.’ 22: 8-14</td>
<td>B33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>M24</td>
<td>Under ‘conclusion’ heading:</td>
<td>globalisation has proven to be effective what ever direction it takes building of the countries economy or worsening or slow growth of the economy in majority of the third world countries. As incalculable persons and clusters are becoming universal actors along with states, insecurity and weakness are expanding.' 14: 1-7</td>
<td>B34 thesis is inconclusive, since the Q is side-stepped; Exlude 4 extensive plagiarism; no clear thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>NB no ‘conclusion’ heading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exclude 5 extensive plagiarism; no clear thesis; poor integration of ideas from sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>M25</td>
<td>NB no ‘conclusion’ heading</td>
<td>globalisation is a phenomenon that represents the present and the reality of the future. The interconnectedness of the world although still with inequality and power struggles, globalizations has factors which harm and some built the third world and its people. Autonomy is one main ingredient still needed in globalisation.’ 14: 1-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>M26</td>
<td>Under 'Introduction' heading:</td>
<td>South Africa as a post-apartheid and democratic state has succeeded in achieving effective policies and programmes to achieve a level of progress known as the developmental state. ' 1: 1-4</td>
<td>F3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'This essay is comprise of an argument over the fact that ... reiterated under conc heading: In conclusion to this essay ...</td>
<td>addressing the social issues of a country is a very wise yet very challenging way of attaining the sustainable and stable developmental state. ... The rethinking and readjusting of policy in Post-apartheid South Africa is evident throughout this essay. Examples are also present to support the arguments in South Africa being able to succeed in attaining key targets in policy. 25: 1-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay no.</td>
<td>Use of metadiscourse to mark the thesis</td>
<td>Frame marker signalling thesis</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>Front-loaded thesis (F); back-loaded thesis (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>M27</td>
<td>Under ‘conclusion’ heading:</td>
<td>globalisation does to an extent benefit the third world countries, however in terms of security. Globalisation seems to benefit the developed countries more…. Thus the first world… dominate the third world or developing countries.’ 19: 1-8</td>
<td>B35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>M28</td>
<td>Under ‘conclusion’ heading:</td>
<td>child support grants are on the right path of alleviating poverty therefore I fully agree with the statement that child support grants must and should be used as programmes of alleviating poverty in South Africa.’ 13: 16-19</td>
<td>B36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>Exclude 6</td>
<td>Under ‘conclusion’ heading:</td>
<td>globalization has been nevertheless revolutionary even if there are still questions raised about its uneven impact. The problem to why third world cities are struggling with globalization is because it means that the capacity of individual states to manage economic life and deliver prosperity is limited.’ 13: 16-20</td>
<td>Exclude 6 extensive plagiarism; inconclusive thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>M29</td>
<td>Under ‘conclusion’ heading:</td>
<td>… children that receive the grant are more likely to attend school… and education is one of the sure tickets out of poverty and will provide some relief 24: 1-5</td>
<td>B37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>M30</td>
<td>Under ‘conclusion’ heading:</td>
<td>… human security is non-existent even with robust global development many third world countries are far away from being able to finding the human security that they not only deserve but they desperately needed.’ 27: 1-9</td>
<td>B38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>NB the whole 8 line conclusion consists of ‘cut and paste’ - This wording from a journal article (Surender and Ntshongwana 2007) cannot be considered a thesis statement at all.</td>
<td>Under ‘conclusion’ heading:</td>
<td>‘Access to cash transfers however small, empower their beneficiaries and alter the poverty cycle within society.’</td>
<td>Exclude 7 extensive plagiarism; too much ‘borrowing’ for a thesis statement to emerge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay no.</td>
<td>Use of meta-discourse to mark the thesis</td>
<td>Frame marker signalling thesis(^{172})</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>Front-loaded thesis (F); back-loaded thesis (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>M31</td>
<td>Under ‘conclusion’ heading:</td>
<td>globalisation is both a companion and adversary of the people of the “Third World.” 10: 1-2</td>
<td>B39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Having taken the above-mentioned into consideration it can be concluded that …’</td>
<td>… globalisation has not provided populations of developing countries with any form of human security. Yes, globalisation has brought about a number of benefits and improved the lives of these people but, with it has come a great number of human insecurities.’ 10: 10-14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>M32</td>
<td>Under ‘conclusion’ heading:</td>
<td></td>
<td>B40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘…This bought about a question. Can South Africa produce a developmental state? However, the answer to the question depends on …’</td>
<td>whether South Africa is able to master the challenges it faces and those likely to face in becoming a developmental state.’ 28: 5-10</td>
<td>Q is side-stepped; B structurally, but inconclusive as a thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>M33</td>
<td>Under ‘conclusion’ heading:</td>
<td>inequality makes the benefit uneven. This suggests that the globalisation process may be beneficial to the Third World majority but to a certain extent as there is inequalities between First and Third World and they cannot be eroded easily. “Globalisation might be working, but it is a long way from working perfectly.” 17: 1-15</td>
<td>B41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘To conclude, the above paper has produced an exposition on globalisation human security and a brief encounter on whether globalisation is beneficial for the security of the Third World majority. This question, is the Globalisation process beneficial for the security of the Third World is a debatable one as various thinkers give different opinions in the subject. It has been argued that …. However, in contrast it was argued that … thus, …’</td>
<td>relies too heavily on authoritative voices in the thesis statement?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under sub-head ‘Comments’:</td>
<td>the child support grant is the alleviation to poverty …’ (20: 1-8) ‘The child support grant is not merely the poverty alleviation in South Africa but I believe that the government is trying to reduce it, but it cannot reduce poverty.’ 25: 1-3</td>
<td>Exclude 8 extensive plagiarism; there is no overall thesis statement: analytical work required to retrieve a position in the thirty-paragraph essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The use of ‘but’ does not effect a concession-counter move here?</td>
<td>… the child support grant had played an important role in reducing poverty in the children of South Africa.’ 27: 1-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{172}\) NB coding tricky here – elements of dialogical expansion and contraction, due the tentativeness of ‘can’ Therefore in answering the question of this essay it can be inferred that … Note: positive evaluation, conveyed in the use of the noun ‘benefits’ and verb ‘improved’; and negative evaluation conveyed in ‘insecurities’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essay no.</th>
<th>Use of meta-discourse to mark the thesis</th>
<th>Frame marker signalling thesis</th>
<th>Thesis</th>
<th>Front-loaded thesis (F); back-loaded thesis (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>M34</td>
<td>Under ‘conclusion’ heading: The question still lies as to whether this grant is actually helping with alleviating poverty 15: 3</td>
<td>Although relevant issues are discussed in essay body, the provision of a thesis statement in response to the Q is avoided</td>
<td>B42 no clear thesis statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under ‘conclusion’ heading:</td>
<td>‘Globalisation is essential as it aids the third world in different ways to develop. Although there are challenges that can still be addressed with globalisation such as culture and religions being compromised it is vital to understand that the benefits are more rewarding such as reduction of poverty and equality.’ 11: 6-10</td>
<td>B43 A poorly structured essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>M35</td>
<td>Under ‘conclusion’ heading: The main conclusion of the study was that…</td>
<td>… while the CSG does provide short-term poverty relief, the grant has only a limited role in that broader society (specifically care-givers) are not benefited, not are the poverty alleviation effects long-lasting. Crucially, there are also no links or exit strategies from the CSG beneficiaries to the formal job market.’ 19: 7-12</td>
<td>B44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>M36</td>
<td>Under introduction heading: There are equally strong arguments on both sides of the debate as to whether globalisation is beneficial or not…. While both sides of the debate are presented, the essay sways more towards the argument that… Under ‘conclusion’ heading: ‘… the author has provided substantial support on various issues… that show that… Therefore, it is this author’s conclusion that… NB repetition a rhetorical strategy?</td>
<td>The thesis is strongly reiterated in the conclusion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>M37</td>
<td>Under ‘conclusion’ heading: In conclusion the essay has looked at … The essay has also shown that…</td>
<td>globalization at times seems to benefit those within the first world countries more than those who are encompassed by poverty and hardships within the developing countries.’ 14: 1-6</td>
<td>B45 thesis statement does not answer the Q as there is no reference to human security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of findings:

- 8 of 57 essays excluded due to extensive plagiarism
- 37 of 49 essays have “interactive” “frame markers” that signpost the thesis statement (other than the ‘conclusion’ sub-heading)
- 12 of 49 essays do not have “interactive” “frame markers” that signpost the thesis statement (other than the ‘conclusion’ sub-heading)
45 of 49 essays have a back-loaded thesis statement; 4 of 49 essays have a front-loaded thesis statement.

19 of 49 essays use resources for dialogical contraction in a concession or counter move.