Spoken Argumentation in the Adult ESOL classroom

Michael David Hepworth

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Leeds

School of Education

August 2015

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is his own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

Acknowledgements

I am very grateful to Mike Baynham and James Simpson for their enthusiasm, patience, encouragement and advice. Their support and understanding along the difficult road I have had to walk when completing this thesis has been invaluable.

I dedicate this thesis to my daughter, Maya, who was born, on Father's Day, just before this thesis was begun.

And to the memory of my father, David, who died just before this thesis was begun.

"Life and death, so close together, both sides of the same thing really."
(The Grapes of Wrath by John Steinbeck)

I also dedicate this thesis to my mother, Margaret, without whom this journey would never have been completed.

Abstract

This thesis is a discourse analysis of spoken argumentation in the Adult ESOL classroom. It investigates the ways in which it emerges and unfolds and also how teachers and students position themselves and each other in argumentation and how they are positioned by pedagogy and policy as well as by their histories. The principal focus is on verbal argumentation but some attention is also given to a more multimodal analysis.

Argumentation is conceptualized in terms of competing and consensual voices (Costello and Mitchell, 1995). These voices are further conceptualized as situated speaking positions and, therefore, as identity positions. The study explores the ways in which argumentation unfolds, the ways it seeks to persuade and the identity work this involves. Argumentation is connected to wider questions of citizenship and democracy, with the Adult ESOL classroom seen as the agora for the wider enactment and modelling of full democratic citizenship.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Introduction

Argument or argumentation is, appropriately enough, a contested concept. It encompasses everything from a domestic row to a political debate. Even the word itself is slippery, difficult to pin down. Should it be "argument" or "argumentation"? The thesis will use "argumentation" because it emphasizes dynamic process not static product. However, like Andrews (2009), I will suggest that it is perhaps sensible to keep the aperture wide and to consider the ways in which the more popular senses of the word can inform academic research.

This study, then, explores argumentation in the Adult ESOL classroom. Its principal aim is to explore the ways in which it emerges and unfolds through language. Argumentation is conceptualized as a situated human practice (see 1.5 below) and as important to the business of thinking and to the business of identity work. It is also seen as central to the modelling and enactment of democratic citizenship. Thus, the study will explore issues around both argumentative form (how it emerges and develops) and function (how it persuades, how it does identity work).

The purpose of this introduction is to frame the thesis. In 1.2, I offer a rationale for the research, which connects to the research context of Adult ESOL, which I outline in 1.3. In 1.4 I begin to position myself in relation to the research process and, in Section 1.5, offer a working conceptualization of argumentation to begin to establish the scope of my study. I continue this process by outlining in 1.6 what is *not* to be expected from the thesis. In 1.7, I provide an overview of the way in which the thesis is organized.

1.2. Rationale for the research

The principal rationale for the research is that argumentation is a topic that has not been systematically researched in the Adult ESOL classroom. There has been little discourse analysis examining, for example, the ways in which it emerges and unfolds and little in-depth consideration of the identity work this involves on the part of both students and teachers. Similarly, there has been little examination of the role of the ESOL teacher in classroom argumentation or investigations into how they work with it pedagogically. This is surprising, given the importance of argumentation in the Adult ESOL classroom and beyond, something which the next section aims to establish.

More generally, argumentation is clearly important in cognitive terms and there is a tight and longstanding connection between its operation and the development of human thinking. Furthermore, it is also important in the expression of human emotions and identities. Its function is perhaps particularly important in education where developing the ability to engage in reasoned argumentation has traditionally been one of the aims of education in a liberal democracy (Coffin and O'Halloran, 2008). It is important, beyond this, for the operation of human democracy itself (Andrews, 2001; Habermas, 1984). In this way, it connects tightly to Citizenship.

Yet, despite this importance, the paradox is that little attention is paid to argumentation in the *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum* (2001) or the *Adult Skills for Life Learning materials* (2003). Indeed the term "argumentation," which, though nominal in form, might be taken to refer to the dynamic process of arguing, does not figure at all. Rather, it is conceptualized in more static nominal form, as "argument," or "arguments," a set of abstract individual competences, from which all human identities are bleached out. Indeed, "arguments" often seem to be synonymous with "reasons" and the emphasis is thus firmly placed on the connection with rationality. The focus is upon the more consensually-oriented term, "discussion". In terms of topic, the *Skills for Life learning materials* (2003) and more global English Language Teaching coursebooks generally avoid controversial material (Gray, 2002).

The multilingual classroom remains a key domain where multilingual migrants to the UK learn not only English but are socialised into new and potentially different communities of practice (Wenger, 1998) as potential or actual UK citizens. Here, argumentation skills have the potential to promote genuine integration and social cohesion by helping migrants to negotiate the everyday and institutional encounters where the potential for conflict exists. In doing so, migrants can be helped to negotiate difference when it opens up and take up more powerful speaking positions, and to develop the socio-cultural and linguistic "capital" (Bourdieu, 1991) they need to establish their place as fully participatory UK citizens.

In this way, then, argumentation is crucial to any meaningful understanding of citizenship, conceptualized here as the full and active democratic participation of a citizen in society. Such citizenship is predicated upon the idea of an informed citizenry and yet educational research has suggested that many peoples' skills in argumentation are "only of the most elementary sort" (Kuhn, 1991, p.264).

1.3 Research context

The rationale for the research has already drawn upon the research context of Adult ESOL. The study is situated in classrooms where English is learned by adults as a non-expert language. This is the educational sector known as ESOL (English to Speakers of Other Languages). In what follows, I position my classroom-based study within its social and political context. I also suggest that argumentation is important for issues of policy, pedagogy and practice in ESOL classrooms.

Today's world is superdiverse (Vertovec, 2006) and thus issues of migration, settlement, citizenship and national identities are crucial. This has made the teaching of ESOL central to the government's *Skills for Life* initiative in England, particularly in relation to the need to contribute to the economy and promote integration and social cohesion (Crick et al., 2003). Argumentation is important for both aspects of this agenda. In terms of employment, arguing effectively in job interviews can help migrants to the UK access the job market. In terms of social cohesion, there is a pressing need for integration in a post 7/7 Britain where migrants are often portrayed in a negative way in media and political discourse (Gabrielatos and Baker, 2008).

The ESOL sector is tightly connected to the immigration agenda (Cooke and Simpson, 2008). In such a climate, there is a need to understand the linguistic expression of migrant identities in order to promote genuine integration, not merely the assimilation implicit in current ESOL policy agendas on citizenship and cohesion. The ESOL classroom remains a key domain for the expression of such identities and argumentative discourse a key site, I suggest, for their expression.

The Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act of 2002 linked Citizenship to language and to knowledge about life in the UK. A Citizenship test was introduced in 2002. The ESOL classroom, within such a context, provides a public forum for the enactment of Citizenship.

The ESOL sector is a controversial one and subject to frequent government intervention and control. In the early 2000s, ESOL became part of the national *Skills for Life* strategy. A statutory *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum* was introduced (2001), as was a National Qualification Framework, the purpose being to incorporate ESOL within the mainstream curriculum. New learning materials were also introduced (*Skills for Life learning materials*, 2003). In this way, the ESOL sector was professionalized.

However, despite this professionalization, ESOL has often been regarded as the poor relation of its close cousins, Literacy and Numeracy. There is evidence that ESOL qualifications are not regarded as equivalent currency when seeking to access higher education or employment (Simpson et al., 2008). There is, for example, no equivalent to *National Literacy Test* for ESOL learners, meaning that they are disadvantaged through not having the necessary socio-cultural knowledge to perform successfully (Cooke and Simpson, 2009).

The sector remains a contested one. In November 2010, the government announced swingeing cuts in public funding for ESOL classes. This meant fee remission for many students was abolished or restricted. There was (and still is) a public debate about the right to language education and a national *Action for ESOL* campaign was set up to give a voice to students and teachers in the sector. As a result of this campaign, the government was forced into a partial U-turn but the battle for the survival of the sector still continues. We see something of this battle played out in Chapter 4 of the thesis.

1.4 The role of the researcher: My argumentation story

In the previous section, I began the process of positioning my research within its wider context. In this section, I continue this process, by beginning to position myself within the research. I do this by saying something about how I came to be interested in the topic of argumentation. The positioning I outline here is both personal and professional and in what follows I describe both in turn. I do so by way of vignette. The purpose of this vignette is to contribute to rendering explicit my position in relation to the study. Vignettes are defined by Creese (2015, p. 69) as:

> short accounts of ourselves in which we write about how our backgrounds shape data collection and analysis, in particular, in terms of the relationships we form

Here, then, is my vignette:

As a private citizen, I have always been fascinated by the process of argumentation. At the family dinner table, ideas and issues were always fiercely debated and an interest in what was going on in the world encouraged, especially by my father. Outside the family, this concern with social justice, the essence of citizenship perhaps, led to affiliation and activism in socialist politics. Marx's dictum, inscribed on his tombstone in Highgate cemetery, has always resonated for me: "Philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point is to change it" (Marx, 1845). The possibility of change and the vision of a more just world are important and touchstones for argumentation and, indeed, for citizenship.

Professionally, in both these sectors, I realised that opening up space for debate could promote language learning and democratic citizenship; indeed, the two were highly compatible. A concern with issues of social justice led me into state comprehensive schools and found children from all backgrounds ready to talk about the world, their place in it and how they wanted to change it, to make it better. I wanted to help them develop a voice, to help them to be heard. Opening up classroom space for debate was an integral part of this. It also led me into the Adult ESOL sector, where I worked with adult migrants from all over the world. In this way, argumentation has always been an important focus, professionally, as well as personally.

This professional positioning also included a research dimension. As a teacher, I had always had an interest in research and I got the opportunity to become involved in a national research project. This project was the *ESOL Effective Practice Project* (Baynham, et al., 2007) and, as the name suggests, was designed to identify and investigate good teaching practice within the Adult ESOL sector. One of its findings was that extended turns of talk by learners were not a common feature in the Adult ESOL classroom. This led to the launch of a research project investigating what teachers could do to encourage such extended turns. It became known as the *Turning Talk into Learning* project (Roberts et al., 2007).

The key point to make about the exploratory teaching I conducted on this project is that both the design and the conduct of the pilot and the main study were informed by it. In what follows, I outline the nature of the research.

In this research I chose to approach the research focus i.e. generating extended turns of talk in by investigating how students debate controversial issues in the classroom. I did this because this is a longstanding pedagogical practice for me and I wanted to investigate its effect on the production of extended turns of talk. I planned a series of lessons, recorded the classes and also kept field notes. In terms of research design, my exploratory research involved participant observation.

In terms of analytical frameworks, this project represented a first attempt to conduct a discourse analysis of argumentation in Adult ESOL classroom. I became interested in the ways in which the students were authorising argumentation and studied this by drawing upon the frameworks from classical rhetoric discussed in the literature review. Thus, the ways in which the students drew upon ethos, logos or pathos in argumentation was a focus. I also

analysed the way in which formal discourse markers, such as 'so' and 'because,' revealed argumentation to be a process of reasoning.

However, moving beyond reason, I became interested in the contribution a prosodic analysis could make to a study of argumentative discourse. Prosodic features such as intonation, pitch, rhythm and volume all became important. This led to an understanding of argumentation as situated human voices, both competing and consensual (Costello and Mitchell, 1995) and would later lead me to focus on the connection between argumentation and identities.

The ways in which the voices of argumentation were both competing and consensual (Costello and Mitchell, 1995) even within short argumentative exchanges was striking. Argumentation thus emerged collaboratively amidst more competitive voices, with students co-constructing argumentation and jointly building evidence towards a claim in competition with other students. In multi-party argumentation, I learned, the voices can be both competing and consensual (Andrews, 1989).

Pedagogically, I began to wonder if other teachers introduced potentially controversial topics into their classrooms, how they handled debate and how they worked with argumentation. These puzzles, a defining characteristic of exploratory teaching (Allwright and Bailey, 1997), informed the pilot study and the main study. They led, for example, to the teacher focus group in the pilot study, and to my focus on controversial topics in the main study. The pedagogical strategy of getting students to reflect upon their own performance was something that carried over into the teacher education sessions in the main study.

The research, though small-scale, pointed to the value of introducing potentially controversial topics, suggesting their usefulness as a pedagogical strategy for developing both fluency and extended turns of talk (Roberts et al., 2007). Beyond this pedagogical benefit, I also began to wonder what kind of argumentative space the classroom was. This, I now think, formed the genesis of my thinking about the classroom as a space in which democracy and citizenship is enacted. This is a link made by Andrews (1994) in relation to the mainstream English classroom, as the literature review discusses.

1.5 What counts as argumentation in this thesis?

Having suggested that argumentation is a difficult concept to define, the purpose of this section is to offer a working conceptualization. This conceptualisation is informed by both a reading of the literature on argumentation but also by a sense of what is revealed by the data on real argumentation in practice:

Argumentation is conceptualised in terms of different voices. These voices are aligned in different ways and can be competing or consensual (Costello and Mitchell, 1995). The metaphor of voice, as opposed to the more static, written "statement," is an apt one for the study in several ways. Firstly, it points to the primary focus of the study on the spoken mode. Secondly, the concern with voices emphasises the dynamic, dialogic nature of argumentation as a situated practice. Finally, voices foreground argumentation as a human practice, concerned with emotion as well as reason, with the expression and justification of opinions, with commitments and beliefs, not the static proofs of de-contextualised logic; in short, argumentation is linked-in with human identities and histories, both personal and social.

Argumentation will be discussed in terms of its unfolding, its emergence. It will not be conceptualised in the terms of structuralism. This post-structuralist conceptualisation, as already suggested, is dialogic, not monologic; even so-called "monologic" utterances contain other voices. In Bakhtin's (1981) terms, they are heteroglossic, containing many voices. These voices can be historical as well as of the moment. Argumentation can also be multimodal and emerge in the form of gestures and facial expressions as well as through language. Argumentation is also conceptualised in terms of its permeability. It is not a watertight mode; rather, it bleeds into other modes of discourse, like narrative.

Argumentation, like other forms of discourse, is context-sensitive. Who is arguing with whom? What are they arguing about? Where? (Costello and Mitchell, 1995) Thus, the question of how people are positioned within argumentation is a crucial one. This raises issues around power and ideology and the need for a political economy of voice (Gal, 1989). In this educationally-situated study, these questions implicate the students, the teacher, the educational institution and the wider socio-economic and political context. In the classroom, it is often the teacher who is in control of the discourse: introducing activities, prescribing topics, nominating speakers, asking questions, reformulating contributions, managing discussion and debate, beginning and ending the lesson etc. Any study of argumentative discourse in the classroom must take full account of this.

Argumentation is, above all, perhaps, concerned with *difference;* making it explicit, opening it up, exploring and, sometimes, resolving it. It is often, though not always, open-ended, containing within it the possibility of change. In this sense, argumentation is often about the difference between how the world is and how one feels it ought to be (Georgakopoulou and Goutsos, 2000). Thus, it is also a matter of making, authorising and challenging claims, or contestable propositions, about the world. Note, too, that implicit here is the fact that

argumentation can be co-constructed, as positions emerge in interaction. Here, argumentation, like its close cousin, explanation (Antaki, 1994) is expository in nature.

The metaphor of moves in argumentation will be used as well as that of turns as it emphasises the dynamic game-characteristic nature of argumentation, in the tradition of Wittgenstein's (1958) "language games"; that is, what it does, its function, as well as what it is, its form. This suggests that different moves can be made within apparently "monologic" turns. This game metaphor does not mean that argumentation is trivial. In Bourdieu's (1991) terms, students need to develop a "feel for the game" when learning how to argue appropriately both in and out of classrooms.

1.6 What <u>not</u> to expect from this thesis

Having begun to establish the way in which argumentation is conceptualized in the thesis, it is important to further establish the scope and focus of the study, to consider what is *not* part of the focus:

- This thesis is not a study of second language learning

The teaching and learning of argumentation is not the principal focus, although the implications for pedagogy and practice in Adult ESOL will be discussed.

- This thesis is not a study of written argumentation.

The study of written argumentation does not fall within the purview of this thesis, although, by implication, one of the findings is that a dialogic view of argumentation might inform and energize the study of written argumentation (Andrews et al., 1993).

- This thesis is not a study of online argumentation.

Research investigation into online argumentation is a fast-growing area of argumentation research (e.g. Coffin and O'Halloran, 2007). Although it is interesting in that, for example, it problematizes the relationship between spoken and written language, argumentation in digital talk is not the focus here.

- This thesis is not principally a thoroughgoing multimodal analysis of argumentation.

The investigation of spoken argumentation from a multi-modal perspective is in its infancy. The principal focus of the study here is on language, although multimodality will form part of the analysis.

1.7 Organisation of the thesis

The thesis is organised as follows:

Chapter 1 introduces the thesis. It comprises a rationale for the study, establishes its scope, and outlines the research context of Adult ESOL.

Chapter 2 critically evaluates the literature on argumentation, establishing the space the study will then inhabit. It also establishes the theoretical framework for the thesis.

Chapter 3 discusses methodological issues around research design, data collection and analysis and considers issues around researcher positioning, research ethics and validity.

Chapter 4 is the first data analytic chapter and frames what follows, conducting a fine-grained discourse analysis of classroom argumentation, highlighting the ways in which it emerges and develops and examines the teacher's role in this.

Chapter 5 focusses on language play and creativity in argumentation, connecting it to both identity play and identity resistance.

Chapter 6 examines the role of narrative in argumentation.

Chapter 7 discusses the contribution the thesis makes to the field of knowledge in argumentation in the light of the research questions. It draws out the implications of the study, moving it towards a conclusion.

Chapter 8 summarises the main findings of the thesis, foregrounds its contributions to knowledge, considers its limitations and highlights avenues for future research.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the relevant literature, creating the space for my research and establishing a coherent theoretical framework that supports the research questions investigated. It provides a robust approach to answering them and a rationale for the methodological approach. It will consider the key concept of argumentation. In doing this, the review aims to build upon the conceptualization of argumentation offered in the introduction to this thesis, in order to further establish its view of what counts as argumentation. The emphasis will be on establishing a situated, dialogical view of argumentation.

The review will begin, in Section 2.2, by considering the central concept of argumentation and will proceed as follows: Section 2.2.1 will consider its more popular meanings. Section 2.2.2 will consider argumentation from a rhetorical perspective whereas Section 2.2.3 will discuss the literature from the perspective of philosophy and logic. Then Section 2.2.4 will discuss the literature on argumentation in education connected most closely with these rhetorical and philosophical paradigms. Then, in 2.2.5, the different discourse analytic approaches to argumentation will be considered. Finally, in Section 2.3, I outline my own approach to the analysis of argumentation before concluding in Section 2.4.

2.2 Argumentation

2.2.1 Popular meanings

In his study of argumentation in education, Andrews (1995) begins by considering more popular meanings of the terms 'argument' and 'argumentation', attempting to connect these to more academic meanings. This is a useful move for the current thesis, which, in an ethnographic spirit, aims to get into the grain of argumentation as an everyday practice. A glance at the online Oxford English Dictionary (2013) is illuminating.

Argument is defined in the following terms:

(1) Proof; evidence.

(2) (in Astronomy and Maths) the angle, arc or other mathematical quantity from which another required quantity may be deduced, or on which its calculation depends.

(3) A statement or fact advanced for the purpose of influencing the mind; a reason urged in support of a proposition; *spec* in *Logic,* the middle term in a syllogism. Also *fig*.

(4) A connected series of statements or reasons intended to establish a position (and, *hence*, refute its opposite); a process of reasoning; argumentation.

(5) Statement of the reasons for and against a proposition; discussion of a question; debate.

(6) Subject matter of discussion in speech or writing.

(7) The summary or abstract of the subject matter of a book; a syllabus; *fig.* the contents.

*Argumentation i*s defined separately and as follows:

(1) The action or operation of inferring a conclusion from propositions premised; methodical employment or presentation of arguments; logical or formal reasoning.

(2) Interchange of argument, discussion, debate.

(3) A sequence or chain of arguments, a process of reasoning.

These definitions shed interesting light on the key term in this thesis. For example, there is the question of "proof" or "evidence," the emphasis on reason and logic, the connection with persuasion and the changing of mind. There is also the connection with the taking up of a position, and the inferencing process. Even the older meanings are suggestive. The final definition of "argument" suggests a connection between argument and narrative that is pursued in Chapter 6. It is common nowadays, in political discourse, to hear the word "narrative" used in a way that suggests argumentation and persuasiveness. As Andrews (1995, p. 3) notes, we used to speak of the argument of a narrative itself i.e. a summary.

He also observes that the more popular notion of argument i.e. a row or dispute is missing from the definitions. This is telling in that such argument or argumentation is often motivated by emotion as much as reason. Andrews (1995, p. 22) also observes that the popular notion of an argument, in the sense of a row or quarrel, is often regarded as the lowest form of argument and treated hierarchically by those working in informal logic (e.g. Walton, 1986). Like him, I find this approach unhelpful, as it offers no way of connecting more popular conceptualisations with academic ones. The definitions above which highlight persuasion point to rhetoric and we begin here.

2.2.2 Argumentation and Rhetoric

Persuasion is a major function of argumentation and was a central concern of classical rhetoric. Aristotle's *Ars Rhetorica* (1926 [4BCE]) identifies persuasively-oriented argumentation as a situated practice. Thus, its function is not: "so much to persuade, as to find out in each case the existing means of persuasion" (1926, p. 1354[4BCE]). He also

identifies the different ways in which argumentation is authorized in such cases; in other words, he focussed upon how to argue effectively in context. These ways of authorizing argumentation are still with us today and are visible in the analysis presented in this thesis.

Aristotle distinguishes three modes of persuasion: *ethos, pathos* and *logos*. *Ethos* is concerned with the speaker's capacity to be authoritative or credible; *pathos* is persuasion at the level of emotion, imagination and belief; *logos* is concerned with the role of logic and reason in the establishment of proof. Ethos connects with the identities of the speaker, as well as those of their audience; these identities can also be connected to pathos, as people argue about matters of belief and opinion, and imagination and emotion are implicated here, as, indeed, is morality.

In terms of *logos,* deductive reasoning in the form of the syllogism is the key strategy. Aristotle identified two forms of logical argumentation; these are: the example, and the syllogism. Crucial here is the type of syllogism known as the enthymeme, sometimes known as the "rhetorical syllogism." Here, the premises are a matter of probability, not certainty, and they can also be implicit, not explicit, to be retrieved pragmatically by the listener. Indeed, Aristotle recognizes that decision-making is a practical process that involves probabilistic reasoning in situations where there may well be alternative possibilities. This difference is at the heart of argumentation.

Logos connects argumentation to thinking, a connection also crucial within philosophy, as we shall see. Rhetoric encompasses the construction of sound argumentation through its counterpart, dialectic. This concept is discussed, for example, in *On Sophistical Refutations* (1928[4BCE]). Dialectics is the art of debate in which the opponents of the thesis advanced would seek to expose its contradictions and paradoxes. Van Eemeren and Grootendorst (2004, p. 43) assert that this strategy i.e. refuting a thesis, is the etymological root of the term dialectic and this strategy is known as a *reductio ad absurdum.*

The rhetorical perspective foregrounds dialogue and voices in ways that are central to argumentation as conceptualized in this thesis. Reaching truth through dialogue taps roots in philosophy, especially in relation to the work of Plato. In his dialogues (2002 [4BCE]), Plato, through the didactic figure of Socrates, attempted to uncover truth through spoken dialogue in a process which implied (see Andrews, 1995) mutual understanding and a common goal. In this way, then, the voices of argumentation are consensual as well as competing. In these dialogues, general issues are argued over in a form that is: "grounded

concrete and has implied narratives behind it" (Andrews, 1995, p. 60). The connection between argumentation and narrative is explored in Chapter 6 of the thesis and Aristotle recognized the power of example in argumentation.

However, the argumentative discourse that emerges in the Platonic dialogues connects to questions of power, as roles and relationships are not equal. It develops in a way that reflects their context and the fact that Socrates is in the powerful role. He is the didact, the teacher in control of the dialogues and this control is exercised through the use of questioning and, more generally, language (Andrews, 1995, p.60). The forum for such dialogues is the public square, the political domain. The classroom can thus be seen as a kind of classical agora, with the teacher in the more powerful Socratic role. Language (e.g. the use of questions) is an important part of this process and questions will form an important linguistic focus in this thesis too.

This dialogic conceptualization resonates for the study of spoken argumentation in the thesis. It also influenced Bakhtin (1981, p. 24), who hails the Socratic dialogue as "a remarkable document that reflects the birth of scientific thinking and a new artistic prose-model for the novel." The crucial point here is that this is one of the bases of his conceptualization of voice. It is as Mitchell (2000, p.15) observes:

> A rhetorical view of argument implies in a sense that all argument is dialogic, in that it orients to a position beyond itself and seeks to persuade. It operates therefore on a principle of *otherness*; the otherness of the person spoken to, other points of view, other positions.

Thus there is a close connection between a rhetorical and a dialogic view of argumentation. Mitchell (2000, p.13) offers a dialogic take on the enthymeme:

> The omitted premise, rather than indicating an incomplete argument or an attempt to hoodwink the audience, represents rather a point of contact or dialogue with the audience: in order to understand the argument it must-and is trusted to-supply what is inexplicit.

This is useful for the thesis in that it suggests the interpretive work to be done by the listener and again pushes argumentation in a dialogic direction. Argumentation is dependent upon the listener's sense of how things are, and on them providing or accepting implicit premises. These connections with the concept of the dialogic and the importance of the listener will be taken up later in the review.

Aristotle recognized that rhetorical persuasion through example emerges inductively. Indeed, modern scientific enquiry proceeds along these grounds. This focus on particular instances as opposed to the operation of rationality brings us later to consider further the role of narrative in classical rhetoric.

2.2.3 Argumentation and Philosophy

In the previous section, I observed that the roots of philosophy were dialogic and that the concept of the dialectic has a philosophical dimension in that it relates to argumentative thinking. As Kuhn (1991, p.2) observes, Plato, Aristotle and Socrates were all concerned with reasoned argumentation as the touchstone of thinking. In the section that follows, I consider the role of logic and language within philosophy.

2.2.3.1 Argumentation and Formal Logic

Work on argumentation within the philosophical tradition has emphasized the role of formal logic. For example, consider the conceptualizations below:

A set of propositions (called its premises) and a proposition (called its conclusion)

An argument is valid when its conclusions follow from its premises (other descriptions are "is deducible from" or "is entailed by"). It can be a good argument, even when not valid, if its premises support its conclusions in some non-deductive way, for example, inductively.

(Honderich 1995, p. 48)

Here, argumentation is seen as a formal logical operation moving deductively from premises to conclusion through inference. The validity of argumentation turns upon internal structure and coherence and the logical process moves from the general to the particular; the goal is the establishment of a definitive truth or proof. This syllogistic reasoning is seen by many as central to argumentation in philosophy. The basic unit of argumentation is the proposition, premise, or assertion about the world. Argumentation is thus authorized (and evaluated) according to the principles of formal logic. Although deductive argument is judged in terms of its logical validity, it is acknowledged that good argumentation can be inductive.

There are many problems with this approach. Most importantly, generating argumentation from abstract, artificial, sentence-level propositions seals it off from both user and context. Thus, for example, the application of syllogistic reasoning can lead to nonsensical conclusions because of its blindness to propositional content (Antaki, 1994, p. 143).

Furthermore, the conceptualisation of truth it offers is too abstract and absolute and the language of formal logic (often expressed by mathematical symbols) is not appropriate for the discourse analysis of more everyday argumentation (Andrews, 1997; Antaki, 1994). Verbal language, in particular, does not emerge and unfold in the same way as the language of formal logic (Andrews, 1997). Its spontaneous emergence means logical consistency is often unlikely.

To summarise, formal logic has little to do with a situated view of argumentative discourse, one which takes account of human identities and there is little evidence suggesting that its operation underlies the way people, in this case, teachers and students, actually experience, engage in, or evaluate, argumentation in the classroom or indeed, beyond that, in their everyday lives (Kuhn, 1991, p.3).

This led to calls for a different, more situated approach to the study of argumentation. Toulmin (1958) criticized the reliance of philosophy upon formal logic, calling for: "The re-introduction of historical, empirical and…anthropological considerations into the subject" (Toulmin, 1958, p. 254). He characterises argument structure in terms of a claim, supported by data with a warrant linking data to claim. The warrant connects to the authorisation of argumentation. Truth and validity in argumentation are situated, or, in his terms, "field-specific." His term "practical reasoning" (Toulmin et al., 1984) helpfully suggests the need to see argumentation and rationality as a situated practice. Overall, his work pushes argumentation in a more empirical and ethnographic direction and thus towards the space inhabited by this study.

However, the Toulmin model is perhaps insufficiently dialogic in nature (Coffin and North, 2008; Andrews, 2005) and unable to account for the interdependent moves of participants in spoken argumentation. Andrews asserts that the metaphor underpinning the model is archaeological, the point being to unearth the basis for the claim (2005, p. 115). It is thus, he suggests, most useful educationally to judge the quality of existing argumentation (rather than to study the emergence of spoken argumentation), particularly written argumentation (Andrews, 2005). His view of argument structure is also one confined to the moment of interaction, rather than one which might draw upon more historical voices.

The second half of the twentieth century witnessed a revival of interest in rhetoric and this further undermined conventional philosophical conceptualizations. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's *The New Rhetoric* (1958) emphasised the importance of the audience in

argumentation and also began to focus on it as a linguistic activity. Furthermore, this new rhetoric began to break down the rigid distinction between rhetoric (as the art of persuasion) and dialectic (rationality in pursuit of truth). Van Eemeren (2011, p. 91) asserted that the principal contribution of this new rhetoric was: "to return argumentation to a context of controversy in which some audience is to be addressed" and highlights "the situated quality of argumentation and the importance of orientation towards an audience."

This shift away from philosophy and formal logic is captured well by O'Halloran:

> In the second half of the 20th century, there was a shift from a perspective on argumentation, rooted in logic and philosophy, where the emphasis was on putting forward logically valid arguments leading to "truth" to one on argumentation as the use of linguistic means to try to ensure agreement on what can be considered reasonable by a given group on a more or less controversial matter.

> O'Halloran, (2011, p 178).

The movement from formal logic to situated reasoning is promising, as is the role accorded to more everyday language within this process. O'Halloran (2011) cites Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) and Toulmin (1958) as influential here and also sees this as exemplified by current research in Informal Logic, to which I now turn.

2.2.3.2 Argumentation and Informal Logic

The problematic nature of formal logic and its language is also recognized by those working in informal logic who examine the nature and logic of argumentation as it emerges in more everyday language. This tradition (Govier, 1987; Blair and Johnson, 1983) aims to establish norms, criteria and methods for describing and evaluating argumentation that can account for the complexities of everyday argumentation. The focus on everyday argumentation is useful as is the recognition that argumentation which might be invalid in the terms of formal logic might be reasonable as the foundation for practical decision-making. It is also helpful in its focus on argumentation as dialogue.

Walton, (2006, p. 1) defines a successful argument in the following terms:

> it gives good reason, or several reasons, to support or criticize a claim … there are always two sides to an argument, and thus argument takes the form of a dialogue … The basic purpose of offering an argument is to give reason (or more than one) to support a claim that is subject to doubt, and thereby remove that doubt.

Argumentation here is a dialogue in which the participants reason on a disputed subject. The importance of this view lies in the way that it nudges argumentation into the realm of situated, dialogic practice and focuses on its instantiation in more everyday language. Walton characterises this move towards more natural language analysis as 'a welcome shift to the practical in logic and a resurgence of interest in the study of argumentation' (Walton, 1989: x).

However, in definitions like this, as O'Halloran (2011, p.179) observes, the implication is that the positions established are stable and not emergent or evolving. Moreover, the implication that doubt can be removed might not be sustainable when controversial topics are being debated, as they are in the analysis presented in this thesis.

However, informal logic originates in formal logic and both Antaki (1994) and Andrews (2005) observe that faith in rationality is still strong amongst informal logicians. This is even the case when work in this tradition explicitly examines the role of emotion in authorizing argumentation. Thus, Walton's work (1992) on everyday argumentation on controversial subjects acknowledges the role of emotion in argumentation, but is situated within a logical frame premised upon different kinds of fallacies. The very concept of a fallacy is rooted in formal logic. This emphasis upon the role of emotion is useful but it should again be noted (see Andrews, 1995) that such research often establishes an unhelpful hierarchy of argumentation, relegating quarrels or rows to secondary status.

Antaki (1994) also observes that informal logicians often focus on "argument" as a finished textual product, rather than its dynamic emergence and unfolding, and this makes it problematic for the study of spoken argumentation. This is well summarised by Antaki (1994, p. 150) below:

> Informal logicians are interested not so much in the unfolding process of argument or reasoning - that is to say, its progress from launch to arrival, its destination and its deviations along the way - as they are in its finished product, when it can be pinned down and its parts exposed to view.

Thus the attention is on argument as static product, not as a dynamic emergent process. Hence the more static nominal form "argument" is used. This textual emphasis is particularly problematic in a study that focuses on verbal argumentation and it is no accident that

informal logic often takes the written text as its point of departure. This textual bias is not a helpful one for a study concerned with the dynamics of verbal interaction.

To summarise the argument so far, both rhetoric and philosophy have some purchase for the conceptualization of argumentation operationalized in this thesis. Rhetoric informs a dialogic and situated view of argumentation in which speakers debate positions. Philosophy highlights the importance of rationality, though this rationality should itself be situated and not abstract in nature. The next section of the review explores the ways in which educational research has been influenced by these philosophical and, especially, rhetorical approaches.

2.2.4 Argumentation in Education

2.2.4.1 Argumentation and dialogue in English Studies

Much of the research on argumentation in primary, secondary and tertiary contexts originated from within what is broadly known as English Studies in the 1990s. This work is broadly rhetorical in orientation, emphasising argumentation as situated dialogue (Andrews, 1989; Andrews et al., 1993). It is not, generally speaking, linguistic in its approach, and is often concerned with written, or textual, argumentation, but there is much of interest here for the current study and this will form the focus of the section that follows.

In his position paper on educational argumentation at the end of the twentieth century, Andrews (1997) re-conceptualizes argumentation, identifying a shift away from approaches based on logic and philosophy towards those rooted in rhetoric. Indeed, Andrews himself (1992) edited a collection of essays (entitled *The Rebirth of Rhetoric*) exploring and illustrating what rhetoric can bring to English Studies in primary, secondary and higher education. Most importantly, he discusses the usefulness of the ideas of Bakhtin in developing a rhetorical approach to texts, focussing in particular on the 'internally dialogic quality of discourse' (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 269), in which all discourse is seen in terms of a dialogue between different voices. This concept here of argumentation as fundamentally dialogic in nature, that is, involving more than one voice.

This interest not just in argumentation, but in language itself, as dialogic is explored later in the review, when I set out my approach. Suffice to observe, for now, that Andrews (1992) suggests, drawing upon Maybin (1991), that a dialogic model provides a counterpoint to the official models of language within educational policy and practice (e.g. The *English National Curriculum*, 1989) which are monologic in nature, emphasising the individual speakers and not the collaborative, contextualised production of dialogue. Andrews also draws upon

another of Bakhtin's (1981) general observations about the complexity of speech genres and the ways in which they can be manipulated to creative and subversive effect, something that I explore in Chapter 5 of the thesis. More specifically, and also usefully for this study, there is work on narrative as a rhetorical resource in the authorisation of argumentation (Hesse, 1992) and on the complex inter-relationships between narrative and argumentation, which mean that there can be narrative in argumentation and that, conversely, narratives contain argumentation (Andrews, 1992).

This rhetorical dialogic approach (often linked with a socio-cognitive/socio-cultural approach) underpins a lot of the research on argumentation in the field of English Studies. Thus, Andrews et al., (1993) reported on exploratory teaching in mainstream primary and secondary English classrooms, examining the ways in which teachers supported the development of childrens' argumentation skills. The findings suggest that the clarification achieved through argumentation is akin to a kind of critical thinking, in that it is a process which helps to shape emerging thoughts and feelings (Billig, 1987; Vygotsky, 1986). Indeed, Billig suggests that: "the sound of argument is the sound of thinking" (Billig, 1991, p. 52). Similarly, Kuhn highlights the importance of argumentation in thinking through beliefs and opinions, asserting that: "Thinking as argument is implicated in all of the beliefs that people hold, the judgements they make and the conclusions they come to" (Kuhn 1991, p. 3).

This research suggests learning to argue is not simply a matter of individual cognitive development. The explicit connection with citizenship is also made. Andrews (1994) makes explicit connections between argumentation and democracy, connecting the classroom to the wider world of which it is a part. He suggests that the classroom is a microcosm of wider society and it too should be a democratic space. In making this move, he invokes the metaphor, the town square (Bakhtin, 1981), to emphasise the public nature of argumentation and to make a connection between argumentation and citizenship. Similarly, my research suggests that the classroom is a classical agora where citizenship can be enacted.

However, like Maybin (1991) above, he also observes that the ways in which teachers and learners are positioned by policy is problematic and often undemocratic (Andrews, 1989; Andrews et al., 1993). More precisely he examines the ways in which argumentation is treated in the in the *English National Curriculum* (1989), finding that little prominence is given to argument; argumentation as a collaborative process is hardly mentioned at all; rather, it is positioned as an individual competence. These findings resonate with my own findings, described in the pilot study, in relation to the *Adult ESOL Curriculum* (2001).

The ways in which argumentation connects to issues of power bear upon this question of citizenship and democracy. Mitchell (2001), for example, lays out how Foucault's (1981) concept of a 'regime of truth,' which enables and constrains what can and cannot be said, can be used to situate the process of arguing within wider questions of ideology and power. Baynham (1995) also draws upon this concept in his exploration of the ways in which argumentation can be authorised by narrative. I use this concept in the analysis presented in this thesis.

Importantly, he also observes that it is the rational dimension of argument that is foregrounded, at the expense of the moral, the emotional, and the imaginative. In response, his research (Andrews, 1989; Andrews et al., 1993) highlights the importance of the moral, emotional and imaginative dimensions of argumentation as well as its rational dimension. Thus, for example, intuition is seen as important and defined as a kind of "high speed reasoning" (Andrews et al., 1993). The importance of a "gut response," especially on contentious issues, is conceptualized in terms of a kind of "instinctive positioning on an issue" (Andrews, 1989, p. 116). Clarke (1995) further suggests that controversial topics can be handled in ways which are both playful and imaginative and that this is not incompatible with a high level of seriousness. This more balanced perspective informs my interest in argumentation which manifests itself in the form of play.

The connection between argumentation and human identity is also part of the research. Andrews et al., (1993, p.23) assert that the expression of identity is a major function of argumentation. Later, they make the following observation on the role of argument in the construction of adolescent identity:

> The formation of identity takes place…often through opposition to other positions and or trying out of other positions, either through fiction and imagination or in talk and action
>
> (Andrews, 2001, p. 108).

This construction of identity through argumentation is, I would submit, also important in the context of adult migrants to the UK. They are establishing different lives for themselves in a different country. The link between identity formation and dialogue and the role of positioning in this process is suggestive, even though the conceptualisation of identity presented is rather monolithic. However, the connection between positioning and identity is made and, elsewhere, Mitchell (2001, p. 137) draws more explicitly upon the concept of

positioning (Harre, 1983) in order to explore the ways in which identity is socially constructed in the Fine Art classroom. This connection between argumentation, positioning and identity is developed in the thesis and forms part of the approach I set out later in this chapter.

Thus, argumentation is not so much a linear process of reasoning (Andrews, 1989) but more a dynamic dialogic exchange, which is both linguistic and, as the discussion in Section 2.2.5.4 suggests, increasingly multimodal in nature (Mitchell and Riddle, 2000; Mitchell, 1994; Andrews, 1993). Moreover, this involves conceptualising argumentation in consensual as well as more traditionally adversarial terms. Andrews (1997) captures this metaphorically, identifying a movement away from adversarial metaphors of war (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980) towards more consensual ones of dance (in which people take-up positions and make moves in interaction) and construction.

Similarly, in their position paper on the theory and practice of argumentation in educational contexts, Coffin and O'Halloran (2008, p. 220) characterize contemporary argumentation research in terms of: "the refocusing of attention on the dialogic dimension of argumentation, and the coming together of argumentation, problem-solving and collaborative learning." They too connect the return to the dialogic with largely constructivist, socio-cultural and socio-cognitive orientation.

In summary, the research just surveyed has informed the thesis in its emphasis upon argumentation as a situated dialogic process, and one, furthermore, which is as much about morality, emotion and the imagination, as it is about reason, and one which implicates issues around both power and identity. The conceptualisation of identity acknowledges the fact that it is socially constructed. The focus upon the role of argumentation in relation to citizenship is also moot as is the fact that much of the research has an ethnographic flavour, emphasising the need for a situated approach.

However, the principal focus of the research is not a thoroughgoing linguistic one as such, though some attention is given to the role of questions and the ways in which they position teachers and learners (Mitchell, 2001) and also to formal markers of reasoning. Moreover, much of the research focusses on improving argumentation skills in writing, not speech.

2.2.4.2 Argumentation, dialogue and cognitive development

From a socio-cultural and socio-cognitive perspective, argumentation in the form of dialogue is seen as a means of cognitive development. This derives from the work of Vygotsky (1978)

who, citing Piaget as the author below, highlighted the intrinsically social nature of cognitive development:

> 'Reflection' says this author 'may be regarded as inner argumentation'....all that is internal was at one time external…the relations between the higher mental functions were at one time real relations between people.'

(Vygotsky, 1991, pp. 32-41).

Vygotsky observes that the internalisation of social dialogue leads to the development of higher level thinking skills, such as reflection, critical thinking and reasoning (McAlister, Ravenscroft and Scanlon, 2004). Andrews (2009, p. 7) suggests that this process is essentially dialogic in that it involves dialogue both with the outside world and within the mind.

Similarly, Mercer (2009) explores the importance of argumentation in the cognitive development of primary school children. His earlier research (Mercer, 1996) distinguishes between disputational talk, cumulative talk and exploratory talk. Disputational talk involves disagreement, and is typified by short exchanges and patterns of assertion and counter-assertion. Cumulative talk involves the co-construction of shared knowledge and features like repetition, confirmation and elaboration. Exploratory talk involves constructive critical engagement with ideas of others, with a view to achieving consensus. For Mercer, exploratory talk is the kind of talk where reason is most visible and where knowledge is at its most accountable. Wegerif, Mercer and Dawes (1999) found evidence, in an intervention-based study, that exploratory talk can be taught and, furthermore, that it can improve individual cognitive reasoning. This is because, following Piaget (1932), conflict is seen as a catalyst for cognitive development.

This is also the approach that underpins major school-based science projects such as 'Enhancing the Quality of Argument in Science lessons' and 'Ideas and Evidence in Science Education' (Driver, Newton, and Osborne, 2000; Erduran, Simon, and Osborne 2004; Simon, Erduran, and Osborne 2006). The focus is on examining different positions in order to develop argumentative reasoning. The role of evaluating the competing accounts on which science is constructed is seen as central to the development of subject knowledge. This work is interventionist in nature and argumentative dialogue is consciously introduced into the classroom. The analytical approach taken in this research is informed by philosophy, most notably the Toulmin (1958) approach discussed earlier in the review. However, as both Andrews (2005) and North et al., (2008) observe, this approach is insufficiently dialogic to

capture the interdependent moves in spoken argumentation. Indeed, Simon (2008) acknowledges the need to modify Toulmin's ideas, developing the Toulmin Argument Pattern (TAP) in order to account for spoken discourse. However, the difficulty of establishing clear functional categories based on the Toulmin model renders it problematic for any attempt to capture the dynamic and situated complexity of spoken argumentation.

This research also revealed the different stances adopted by teachers on the role of competing voices, or counter-argumentation, in the classroom. The researchers were keen to encourage this, as analysis revealed it to be an important constituent of sustained scientific thinking (Erduran, Simon and Osborne, 2004, p. 921). However, the teachers' views were more mixed, with some encouraging debate and others discouraging it (Simon et al., 2006, pp. 253-6). The sample of teachers is a small one but the findings here resonate with my study, which also reveals different stances towards encouraging students to take up opposing positions in the classroom.

2.2.4.3 Argumentation, dialogue and problem-solving

In this section, I focus on argumentation as problem solving within the broad paradigm of collaborative learning (Dillenbourg, 1999). This is a broad term, encompassing approaches in which students work together to reach a consensus or to solve a problem (Littleton et al., 2000). Here, argumentation here is tightly connected not just to dialogue but to problem-solving. Once again, explicit attention is given here to the role of difference, in the form of conflict (Coffin and O'Halloran, 2008).

In the 2000s, Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning (CSCL) used technological spaces to facilitate the co-operative attempt to resolve differences of viewpoint (Wasson, Ludvigsen and Hoppe, 2003). Within this paradigm, there are different research strands, such as Collaborative Argumentation-Based Learning (CABLE) e.g. Baker et al., 2002.

Argumentation is viewed in largely collaborative terms, although, again, the role of competing voices is acknowledged and seen in terms of the confronting of cognitions and their foundations. However, this occurs within the framework of a co-operative attempt to resolve difference and is more than the 'mere incidence of conflicts.' (Andriesson, Baker and Suthers (2003, pp. 3-4). In this way, learners construct and consider arguments and counter-arguments in order to resolve problems (Weinberger and Fisher, 2006). It is possible, then, as Coffin and O'Halloran (2009) observe, for consensus-building to be oriented towards

integration. So, students might 'operate on the basis of the reasoning of their learning partners' (Weinberger and Fisher, 2006, p. 79).

On the other hand, it is perfectly possible for it to be more conflict-oriented, where learners do not simply accept the contributions of their peers but actively interrogate them, forcing them to develop their argumentation. This was indeed a finding from a pan-European project on a CABLE project in school science lead Baker et al., (2002, p. 12) to point to the role conflict plays in forcing students to clarify their positions on a particular issue.

Nonetheless, the researchers characterise argumentation here as a "co-operative exploration of dialogical space" (Baker et al., 2002, p. 2) and as more a matter of the collaborative exploration of the pros and cons of issues (in this case genetically-modified organisms) rather than the confronting of committed viewpoints.

Indeed, Baker et al., (2002) observe that school science students are not likely to have 'the kind of coherent and firmly entrenched and points of view that lead to dialectical confrontation' (Baker et al., 2002, p. 2) and suggest that this is why argumentation is not easily generated in this kind of classroom. This is clearly not the case in this thesis, which deals with adults and with more contentious issues where the competing voices of argumentation are much more likely to emerge.

However, a view that sees argumentation simply in terms of problem resolution is limiting for the current thesis, which is concerned with debating ideas that are often controversial. It is as Coffin and O'Halloran (2009, p.310) observe:

> Not all discussions, particularly those that concern the exchange of ideas rather than solutions to problems, require the dissolution of difference or shared action through consensus.

They suggest closer attention needs to be paid to the pedagogical affordances for the stimulation of debate in the classroom and for a close examination of the ways in which such argumentation emerges linguistically. The current thesis begins to conduct just such an analysis. Coffin and O'Halloran also suggest that the role and value of conflict or counter-argumentation is often underplayed in a problem-solving approach and observe that some teachers view the deliberate introduction of competing voices into the classroom as damaging in terms of the overall classroom ecology.

2.2.5 Argumentation and Discourse Analysis

Discourse Analysis is a highly interdisciplinary field. In this section, the main discourse analytic approaches to the study of argumentation are surveyed. Section 2.2.5.1 begins by considering pragmatics. In Section 2.2.5.2 I consider Conversation Analysis and Section 2.2.5.3 focusses on Critical Discourse Analysis. Following this, Section 2.2.5.4 takes multimodal approaches to argumentative discourse as its point if entry, before Section 2.2.5.5 considers the role of narrative in argumentation. In a final section, 2.3, I set out my approach to the discourse analysis of argumentation. The purpose of this is to establish the theoretical framework within which I will analyse argumentative discourse.

I begin by ground-clearing, establishing what argumentation is *not* taken to mean, before moving on to research into argumentation at discourse-level. The conceptualisation of 'argument' in cognitive linguistics is not helpful for the thesis. This is because, following Chomsky (1972), it views argument structure as innate competence, seeing it in phrase, clause or sentence-level terms (Grimshaw, 1992; Pinker, 1989). Here, argument structure is a matter of the relationship between verbs and their semantic participants e.g. subject, direct object etc. The emphasis is upon syntactic relations at the level of the sentence and this is problematic when accounting for argumentation at the level of discourse. As Andrews observes:

> It is now understood in linguistics that formulations at phrase, clause or sentence level do *not* translate neatly to the discourse level….That is to say, syntax-based linguistics cannot account for the complexities or even the basic nature of discourse.

(Andrews, 1997, p. 261).

The emphasis on logical form and relations and on first language acquisition is problematic. Comparative work on argument structure often falls within this paradigm too and makes comparisons between languages not cultures (Bowerman et al., 2008). Indeed, the whole approach is analogous to the approach of formal logic in philosophy, considered and critiqued earlier.

2.2.5.1 Argumentation and Pragmatics

2.2.5.1.1 Argumentation as a Speech Act

In Western philosophy, language in logic and philosophy was often seen as a vehicle for the expression and communication of propositional thought (Lyons, 1982, p. 102). Here

argumentation expresses propositional truths about the world. This has its value and the role of language in making argumentative claims about the state of the world is important. However, it is a limited view of language and it was countered from within philosophy by those working in Speech Act Theory, who criticized the assumption that: "The sole business.....of any utterance....is to be true or at least false" (Austin, 1979, p. 263).

According to Speech Act Theory, when we are saying something, we are always doing something. This is operationalized in terms of a theory of meaning that characterizes the speech acts that a person intends to perform in uttering something (Labov and Fanshel, 1977; Searle, 1975). This is known as the illocutionary force of the utterance (Austin, 1975). Speech Act Theory (Searle, 1976) suggests that utterances can be classified in terms of speech act verbs, of which 'to argue' might be taken to be one. Indeed, Searle (1969, p.66) suggests that the verb 'argue' is an assertive i.e. a speech act which asserts that something is the case, and that it is tightly connected to the attempt to convince the addressee. This, in the terms of speech act theory, would be its illocutionary force i.e. its intended function as well as its ideal perlocutionary effect on the addressee.

The idea that argumentation can be expressed linguistically through a particular kind of speech act is found in other research. It certainly seems possible to identify terms in ordinary language that point to this ('arguing that' or 'making an argument') as O'Keefe (1982) observes. Like Searle, cited above, O'Keefe (1982, p. 14) assumes a single speech act that conveys argumentation, labelling it 'making an argument' and defining its essential characteristics in terms of a claim and accompanying reasons which are 'linguistically explicable.' The idea of a speech act of 'making an argument' is to be found elsewhere in the research (e.g. Burleson, 1979; 1981; Wenzel, 1980) and Jacobs and Jackson (1980; Jacobs, 1987) view arguments as subordinate speech acts offered to support or refute a superordinate claim. However, as we will see shortly, they move beyond this view and foreground the management of disagreement as the key characteristic of argumentation.

The role of context is also important in speech act theory and jointly constitutive of meaning. The contextual conditions for the performance of speech acts such as argumentation, known as felicity conditions (Searle, 1969), need to be taken into account as they are part of the meaning of the utterance and required for the successful authorisation of the speech act of argumentation. In addition, the attitudes and beliefs that the speakers commit themselves to in the act of arguing must be considered. These are known as sincerity conditions and are derived from the work of Grice (1975). The most important of these for argumentation

concern the assumptions that participants (here participants in argumentation) will be truthful, sincere, rational and co-operative.

These kinds of assumptions are also visible in the writing of Habermas (1984), whose work is similarly premised upon the notion of an ideal speech situation, in which the principal purpose of dialogue is the reaching of consensus. According to Habermas, rationality is the central process of argumentation and there is a normative standard against which claims to validity can be judged. Argumentation is defined as a key speech activity and highlights its centrality to the democratic process. This is important for the thesis, which also connects argumentation to issues of democracy and of citizenship.

How, then, is pragmatic work on argumentation as a speech act operationalised in research? Labov and Fanshel analysed the role of narratives as argumentation in therapy interviews, observing that narratives: "play a tightly-integrated role in conversation, and they function as equivalent to such single speech acts as response, putting off a request, challenge and so forth" (Labov and Fanshel, 1977, p. 105). Their observation is that crucial speech acts are

> not such speech acts as requests and assertions, but rather challenges, defences and retreats, which have to do with the status of the participants, their rights and obligations, and their changing relationship in terms of social organisation

> (Labov and Fanshel, 1977, pp. 58-59).

This has resonance for a situated dialogical view of argumentation and, as Grimshaw (1990, p. 12) notes: 'challenges (and counter-challenges), defences and retreats' are the essence of conflict talk. However, despite the fact that their analysis is expressed in terms of a strong version of speech-act theory, its value lies in the fact that they assert that narrative has an implicit argumentative function; it is a move in a dialogical argumentation sequence (Baynham, 1995, p.37).

2.2.5.1.2 Argumentation Theory

Perhaps the most systematic attempt to analyse argumentation as a speech act is to be found in argumentation theory, also known as the pragma-dialectical approach. The alternative description points to both its debt to pragmatics and its debt to the concept of argumentation as dialectic. Researchers in this tradition (Van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 2004) conceptualize argumentation as a complex illocutionary speech act:

> Argumentation is a verbal, social and rational activity aimed at convincing a reasonable critic of the acceptability of a standpoint by putting forward a constellation of propositions justifying or refuting the proposition expressed in the standpoint.
>
> (Van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 2004, p. 1)

The move they make here, as Antaki (1990) observes, is to scale speech act theory up from sentence to discourse level in order to accommodate a definition of argumentation. This allows them to circumvent the problem of traditional speech act theory i.e. the fact that its traditional focus is at sentence, and not discourse level. Thus, as Jacobs (1989, p. 348) observes, the 'constellation' is a combination of 'one or more component elementary assertives that together form the illocution of argumentation.'

Argumentation theory offers a normative model for argumentation as a 'critical discussion', insisting that generalizations can be made. Like informal logic, discussed earlier, it describes and evaluates argumentation without appealing to formal logic or using the internal structure of argumentation to assess its quality (Van Eemeren et al., 2011). Following Searle's (1969) framework, argumentation theorists specify the felicity conditions necessary for the successful authorisation of argumentation.

The concept of strategic maneuvering in argumentation theory (developed by Van Eemeren and Houtlosser, 1990) is an interesting one, designed to capture the ways in which those who argue strive to negotiate a path between reasonableness and effectiveness. As they explain, it is a matter of the arguer taking up the best possible position to achieve their goals in the context in which they are arguing. The concept of positioning in argumentation is a crucial mid-level concept operationalized in this thesis and will be developed later on in the review, although it will not be used in the same sense as the argumentation theorists use it here.

There are, however, ways in which argumentation theory is problematic. To begin with, and perhaps most importantly, it is problematic in its generalizing orientation. What constitutes a 'reasonable critic'? Is persuasion the sole aim of argumentation and rationality the sole means of its authorisation? Are Grice's (1975) assumptions of a desire for both co-operation and sincerity in communication universally applicable in the context of argumentation?

There is evidence from research within the broad tradition of speech act theory that persuasion and the rational resolution of differences are not always possible when debating controversial issues. Liddicoat et al. (1994), working with a similar definition of argumentation as a complex illocutionary speech act, examined how callers to a talk back

radio show in Australia presented, authorised, and were challenged on, their point of view, finding no movement towards the resolution of argumentation, partly because the topics debated were often controversial in nature.

Similarly, Jacobs (1982; 1983) found, in his study of a fundamentalist evangelist and his secular audience, that there is what he terms a 'radical incommensurability,' where the differences in standpoint between those arguing are so great it not only precludes rational resolution but leads to confrontation as they feel morally bound to express and display their differences. This speaks to the role of emotion, as well as reason, in argumentation. Jacobs (1989, p. 361) asserts that such demonstrative argumentation represents 'a radical denial of the universalisation of reason' and roots his analysis in empirical data.

This kind of argumentation for display is less concerned with rational convincement and more about the demonstration of one's own standpoint. It is, I will suggest, also to be found in Chapters 5 and 6 of the thesis, in the form of language play, such as irony, parody or devil's advocacy. The function here is not to convince the addressee but, rather, to demonstrate difference or, in the case of devil's advocacy in Chapter 6, to explore and test out ideas.

2.2.5.1.3 Communication Studies: The structure of conversational argumentation

The approach of researchers working broadly within the speech act tradition in the area of communication studies (e.g. Jacobs, 1982; Jacobs and Jackson, 1982) provides a bridge between speech act theory/ argumentation theory and conversation analysis. Thus, as well as recognising argumentation as an 'expanded speech act sequence' (Jackson and Jacobs, 1983), they also conceptualise it as involving forms of 'conversational repair' in the context of disagreement. They are less interested in the quality of argumentation *per se*, and more in it as a natural interactive feature of conversation. They engage directly with real-world argumentation and shifted the focus from the sometimes rather idealised process of arriving at truth through argumentation, towards a concern with how people manage the disagreement that is often one of the hallmarks of argumentation.

Thus, they looked at the structure of conversational argumentation in terms of adjacency pairs. These, as we will see in the next section, are structural pairings, or regularities, in conversation and the concept originates in the work of Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974). For Jackson and Jacobs (1980) argumentation has a very particular relation to this structural patterning. If the response to the first speech act does not express the required agreement,

there is the potential for argumentation. They also observe that argumentation in the form of disagreement is not simply the result of an explicit disagreement over the propositional content of an utterance, as Van Eemeren & Grootendorst, (2004) assert. Rather, it might be a matter of the pragmatic failure of an indirect request and Jackson and Jacobs root their analysis in real, not idealised, examples. All this, in addition to their overall emphasis on the management, rather than the resolution, of disagreement pushes at a more conversation-analytic focus, a tradition they readily acknowledge.

In sum, how might we evaluate the approach to argumentation as a speech act? It is valuable in that it focusses upon the functional dimension of argumentation and it is compatible with a view of argumentation as a dynamic process. As we have just been discussing, recent work within this broad tradition is more empirical in nature and more oriented towards everyday argumentation.

However, there are limitations of speech act theory as an approach to the discourse analysis of argumentation? To begin with, it roots both the structure and function of argumentative intentions in the isolable speech act (Schegloff, 1988). As a consequence, it fails to account for different contexts in which argumentation emerges and also the variety of forms its linguistic expression takes (Jacobs and Jackson, 1983). Put simply, it does not offer a sufficiently situated account of argumentation.

Furthermore, as we have seen, it is problematic in terms of its focus on sentence-level propositions and also in its rather simplistic view of the relationship between linguistic form and function. It is also problematic in its insistence that we can unproblematically infer speaker intention and, as Goodwin (1990, p. 85) observes, analysing the moment-by-moment unfolding of discourse is problematic as soon as we label a turn of talk as a particular type of speech act. Summarising his critical evaluation of the problem of speech act theory, Jacobs (1989, p.360) observes that its fundamental weakness is in the suggestion that argumentation is constituted by 'a homogeneous class of utterances definable by a common force and a common set of felicity conditions.'

2.2.5.1.4 Argumentation and politeness

Argumentation, and the differences it opens up, clearly implicates issues around politeness and it is necessary to establish the ways in which this bears upon the analysis presented in this thesis. The discussion will centre on the face-based politeness theory developed by Brown and Levinson (1978; 1987) out of the work of Goffman (1955).

Goffman characterised face as 'the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself' (Goffman, 1955) and face is the image of yourself that you present to other people. A face-based theory of politeness theory was developed out of Goffman's work by Brown and Levinson (1978; 1987). According to them, a person's face could be threatened by various speech acts (argument being an example). They described face threatening acts in terms of threats to positive face, a person's need to be accepted or liked by others, and threats to negative face, a person's need to be independent. In this way, Brown and Levinson (1978; 1987) conceptualise politeness as ways of mitigating the threat to face in spoken interaction, identifying the different strategies used to save face and some of these (e.g. the use of irony to save negative face, giving sympathy to save positive face) are visible in the argumentation presented in this thesis.

The concept of face-work is used by some researchers (e.g. Muntigl and Turnbull, 1998) in order to explain the tripartite structure they identify as characteristic of conversational argumentation. They suggest that the greater the perceived threat to the positive face of the person making a disputed claim, the more likely they are to respond by further supporting their initial claim. Other research (O'Donnell, 1990; Vuchinich, 1990) also draws upon the concept of face to explain the ways in which argumentation emerges, unfolds and ends in a variety of different contexts. This research is often broadly conversational analytic in approach and it is to this that we now turn.

2.2.5.2 Argumentation and Conversation Analysis

In Conversation Analysis, which originates in the work of Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) the emphasis is on a close empirical analysis of the structure and sequence of conversation as it unfolds in the moment of interaction. Its focus is on the ways in which the conversational moves made by the participants, in this case moves in argumentation, constitute identifiable sequences and structures of exchange.

A lot of conversation analytic work on argumentation takes direct disagreement or dispute as its focus. These are the competing voices of argumentation. Thus, Maynard (1985) and Coulter (1990) analyse quarrels by identifying a tripartite structure and sequence of assertion, followed by agreement (and thus no dispute) or disagreement and then counter-assertion. Similarly, Muntigl and Turnbull (1998), for reasons discussed above, also identify a tripartite structure of exchange, where a speaker responds to their claim being challenged by adducing further support for it or by disagreeing with the challenge made.

This is sometimes expressed in Conversation Analysis in terms of preferred and dispreferred responses. This kind of structure is what Hutchby (1996, pp.22-24) calls the 'action-opposition' sequence, what he takes to be the principal sequential unit of argumentation. Here, an utterance is construed as arguable and opposed, with the opposition also open to dispute.

Hutchby (1996) explores the ways in argumentation emerges and unfolds in British talk radio shows and distinguishes between first and second positions in argumentation, claiming they bring different sets of resources with them. Those who go first i.e. the callers are required to set out their position (Hutchby, 1991). The talk show host has the first opportunity to oppose the position set out. In this way, institutional constraints serve to shape the unfolding of the argumentation that follows. This positional asymmetry was first remarked upon by Sacks (1992, pp. 348-353) who observed that those who go first put their opinions on the line while those who follow can simply attack them.

It is interesting to consider this in relation to the institution of the classroom, where the teacher is often in a position analogous to the host when classroom debate is unfolding. That is, the students are required to put their opinions on the line and the teachers are often in a position where they can choose whether to express a view. However, callers can turn the tables on the host by asking them to disclose their own position. We see this strategy in Chapter 4 of the thesis, where the students ask the teacher to disclose and, subsequently, defend their position.

The other point of interest in Hutchby's (1991; 1996) research is that he focusses on the issue of who sets and controls the argumentative agenda. Paradoxically, he observes, although callers can often (though not always) set the agenda, they are not always subsequently in control of it. Similarly, in the classroom, it is often teachers who set and control the argumentative agenda and, in Chapter 4 of the thesis, we see a struggle for what can and cannot be said i.e. a struggle over the argumentative agenda. In this way, Hutchby argues that we see the operation of power, and resistance to it, emerging in the grain of everyday discourse in a way that Foucault (1977) suggests.

The struggle for power discussed above is visible in the conversational turn, or the struggle for what is known in conversation analysis as the conversational floor. In the context of an activity such as argumentation, the breakdown of turn-taking i.e. interruption is clearly salient and it is here that a situated analysis is necessary. As we shall see, interruption in

argumentation can be a sign of conversational involvement and suggestive of sociability (Schiffrin, 1990); it need not be a negative feature of argumentative interaction.

Before going further in the review, it is also important to note that a lot of the research on conversational argumentation as dispute focuses on children, not adults (Corsaro and Rizzo, 1990; Goodwin, C., and Goodwin, M. H, 1990). The thesis is concerned with adults and not children.

The focus on sequence and structure is also characteristic of research that takes a more rhetorical approach, focussing on the ways positions are authorised in argumentation. Antaki and Wetherell (1999) identify a tripartite structure of proposition-concession-reassertion, highlighting the ways in which speakers use concessions as a deliberate rhetorical strategy to strengthen their claims. Like Schiffrin (1984), they analyse the role of discourse markers (such as 'but' for the reassertion stage) in signalling the structural stages through which argumentation passes.

The emphasis in Conversation Analysis (Antaki and Wetherell, 1999; Muntigl and Turnbull, 1998; Hutchby, 1996; Antaki, 1994) is on the ways in which the participants consciously orientate towards each other through argumentative talk rather than upon the analytical inferences the analyst draws post-hoc about its unfolding. It also aims to describe and account for how the competing claims that characterize argumentation are displayed and managed and in the conversational resources deployed by speakers in this process (Antaki, 1994; Goodwin, 1983).

However, there are a number of ways in which a strong conversation analytic approach is problematic. Most importantly, in its focus on the moment of interaction, Conversational Analysis neglects the richness of context. If argumentation is a situated practice, we must not neglect the ways in which the participants in the moment of interaction are also situated within wider socio-cultural contexts.

It is for this reason that some researchers working within the broad framework of conversation analysis also bring an ethnographic dimension into their research. This kind of approach is to be seen in the research of Goodwin and Goodwin (1990; 1982). They draw upon the tools of conversation analysis to offer a detailed picture of the ways in which childrens' arguments are structured and sequenced. In Goodwin's research into the disputes of adolescent African American girls (Goodwin, M.H., 1980), this includes an examination of

the ways in which reporting the voices of others functions in argument, a dimension of analysis pursued in this thesis.

This analysis is informed by detailed ethnographic information on urban African American children in the United States. Thus, Goodwin, M.H. (1982) demonstrates the ways in which the social order of the conversational moment is constructed, disputed, and reconstituted through talk. The focus is on both sequence and structure and on ethnographic information about the participants, their peer culture and their wider community. These perspectives are seen as complementary, the one enriching the other. This blend of linguistic and ethnographic analysis is also characteristic, as we have seen, of the work of Schiffrin (1990) on argumentation. She brings ethnographic knowledge about her participants and their lower middle-class Jewish community to her linguistic analysis.

Goodwin and Goodwin's (1990) research suggests the need to attend to the ways in which the moment of argumentative talk positions its participants vis-à-vis each other and also the ways in which it allows participants to create both context and individual and social identities. This emphasis on the identity work that argumentation can do is discussed later in the review.

2.2.5.3 Argumentation and Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis is a multidisciplinary approach to discourse analysis which foregrounds questions of power and ideology. It draws upon critical theory, in order to situate its discourse analysis within wider power relationships. Thus, as Cameron (2001) observes, it analyses discourse (in terms of language in use) and discourse in the slightly different sense of a practice that functions to construct and authorise social reality. The way in which this has informed the thesis will be discussed with reference to the literature on argumentation. It will consider linguistic and textual discourse analysis before considering the influence of critical theory.

Critical Discourse Analysis has its origins in Critical Linguistics, and most would concur with Habermas's claim that:

> language is ..a medium of domination and social force. It serves to legitimize relations of organized power. Insofar as the legitimizations of power relations ... are not articulated,…language is also ideological'

> (Habermas, 1967, p.259)

There is therefore quite a lot of research within Critical Discourse Analysis which is explicitly concerned with argumentation, in the rhetorical sense of the authorisation of a position. So, Van Leeuwen (1995) for example, posits a grammar of legitimation and uses this concept to uncover the ways in which dominant positions are legitimized by linguistic (and more widely semiotic) strategies. This is often connected to the issue of racism. Thus, Richardson (2004) uncovers anti-Islamic rhetoric in the UK media and Van Leeuwen and Wodak (1999) expose the racist ideologies that sometimes underpin immigration policy. Van Djik (1996) analyses the ways in which migrants are presented in the press, pointing to a range of rhetorical strategies, including metaphor, and passivisation.

There is research into argumentation within CDA that takes the concept of genre as its point of entry. Within Systemic Functional Linguistics, genre is defined as a 'stage, goal-oriented social process' (Eggins and Martin, 1997, p.243). In these analyses, the functional stages through which argumentation moves, Issue, Position, Argument, and Claim are identified (Coffin et al., 2005). This kind of approach is analogous to the Toulmin approach, discussed earlier, and is perhaps particularly applicable to canonical written argument genres, such as the IELTS essay (Coffin, 2004). Unlike the Toulmin approach, though, it focusses on the linguistic realization of genre.

There is also research analysing the argumentation emerging in Computer Mediated Communications. These are increasingly widespread in secondary and higher education, especially in distance learning contexts. In higher education, both synchronous and asynchronous argumentation in text-based computer conferencing has been the subject of research (e.g. North et al., 2008; Coffin et al., 2005, Coffin and Hewings, 2005).

However, there are ways in which this kind of genre analysis is problematic in the context of researching everyday spoken argumentation. Both Coffin et al., (2005) and North et al., (2008) observe that the text-based nature of CMC argumentation means that it exhibits features of both spoken and written discourse and this hybridity is problematic for a study of spoken argumentation, which emerges in a more dynamic, interactive and dialogic manner. For example, features of spontaneous argumentation, such as the breakdown of turn-taking, the co-construction of claims in argumentation and multimodal features (e.g. gesture, facial expression) can be difficult to deal with, as they are more "chat-like" (Eggins and Slade, 1997) in nature (Coffin, 2009, p. 7) and less amenable to a conventional text-based genre analysis.

The problematic nature of a text-based approach to spoken argumentation is precisely why North et al. (2008) draw upon exchange structure analysis (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975) in order to develop a fine-grained analytical framework to capture the more fluid, dynamic and dialogic nature of spoken argumentation.

Having expressed these reservations, there are ways in which this text-based approach is germane to the current study. This is now illustrated with reference to the concept of intertextuality. Fairclough (1992) refers to CDA as a 'textually-oriented' discourse analysis and suggests that what is missing in a purely linguistic analysis is the ways in which texts weave together. To account for this, he uses the concept of intertextuality, which he draws from Kristeva, who asserted that intertextuality is a matter of 'the insertion of history (society) into a text and of this text into history' Kristeva (1986, p. 39). Fairclough (1992) defined intertextuality as;

> the property texts have of being full of snatches of other texts, which may be explicitly demarcated or merged in and which the text may assimilate, contradict, ironically echo and so forth.

Most importantly for the thesis, intertextuality includes what Fairclough (1988) calls 'discourse representation.' This he defines as:

> a form of intertextuality in which parts of specific other texts are incorporated into a text and are usually (though not as we shall see always) explicitly marked as such, with devices such as quotation marks and reporting clauses

> (Fairclough, 1992, p. 273).

This process is not neutral; rather it involves a rhetorical framing of one voice by another. It is evaluative. Fairclough (1992; 1995, pp. 79-85) analyses the ways in which discourse representation in a variety of media texts privileges certain voices and subordinates others. In this way, the practice of speech reporting can be understood as a rhetorical resource in argumentation. It therefore involves the recontextualisation of voices. One dimension of intertextual analysis is what is sometimes known as interdiscursivity. This is a matter of the ways in which different discourses interweave. Thus, Fairclough (1992) offers a detailed re-analysis of data by Liebes and Riebek (1991) to illustrate the ways in which narratives and argumentation interweave in Israeli TV reports about the Palestinian intifada. He uses the concept of intertextuality to show how the argumentative proposition that religious Jews are

more dangerous than the Arabs is authorised by a complex texture of small narratives, both personal and hypothetical.

Recent approaches have combined insights and methods from Critical Discourse Analysis with argumentation theory, discussed earlier in the review. This, again, has often focussed on political and/or media discourse (e.g. Ietcu-Fairclough, 2008; Wodak, 2008). Thus Fairclough and Fairclough (2014) examine the ways in which values enter into practical arguments, which they define as arguments about what people ought to do. In doing this, they draw upon Walton (2006) and Searle (2010), both of whom have been discussed in this review. From Walton (2006), they take the basic structure of practical reasoning, concerned with the values in arguments, the goals and the means to achieve them, and the contexts in which the argument takes place. However, unlike Walton, they suggest that premises in arguments can be factual and circumstantial and that they are not simply a matter of the concerns of the individual. To do this, they draw upon Searle's (2010) distinction between 'desire-dependent' reasons (what people actually value) and 'desire-independent' reasons (duties, obligations, socially-recognised moral values). For them, the latter are crucial to authorising argumentation without recourse to coercion or direct force. They lie at the interface between individuals and wider social structures. To illustrate their approach, they investigate the arguments around the controversial issue of bankers' bonuses in the St Paul's debate hosted by St Paul's cathedral in 2009. The connection with social justice and wider power structures forms a strand of the analysis presented in this thesis.

Where CDA does deal with spoken discourse, it usually explores high status political discourse, such as political speeches. Thus, Cameron (2001), drawing data from Montgomery (1999) investigates the ways in which various kinds of argumentative (and highly ideological) positions are rhetorically authorised by the queen and Tony Blair in tributes following the death of Princess Diana. The focus is on the ways in the linguistic choices (lexical and syntactic) made by speakers serve to construct and authorise argumentation and identity positions. Thus, Blair is able to present himself as a private individual but also as a Prime Minister and a man of the people. This connects to the performance of identities through argumentation to be discussed in the section in which I set out my approach. These choices encompass a range of rhetorical strategies (e.g. syntactic parallelism, metaphor) and some of these are visible in the argumentative data presented in this thesis. However, just as importantly, they also include reference to the prosodic features of the discourse, such as the rhetorical power of rhythm and repetition.

Finally, then, we come to critical theory and its influence on the analytical framework being established for this thesis. Within critical social theory there is a different understanding of discourse. Foucault (1972, p. 49) refers to discourses as: 'practices which systematically form the objects of which they speak.' These discourses play their part in constructing and legitimating social reality. In order to explain how this happens, Foucault introduces the concept of a 'regime of truth,' explaining it in thus:

> Each society has its regime of truth, its "general politics" of truth; that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish between true and false statements; the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedure accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true.
>
> (Foucault, 1980, p. 131).

He uses this concept to account for how discourses around truth, and how it is authorized, are inextricably linked to power. The existence of these regimes of truth means that: 'not everything can be said at any time' (Foucault, 1972, p. 5). Truth, in these terms, is a matter of situated practice and there are hierarchical 'orders of discourse', with some discourses assigned a higher status than others.

Within these regimes of truth, political orthodoxy often comes to be perceived as the natural order of things. This brings us to Bourdieu's concept of doxa, defined as a state of affairs where: "cosmological and political order is perceived not as arbitrary, that is, as one possible order among others, but as a self-evident and natural order" (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 166). In this kind of society: "what is essential goes without saying because it comes without saying: the tradition is silent, not least about itself as a tradition" (Bourdieu, 1977, p.167).

This connection between language and power is made by Bourdieu (1991, p. 37), when he observes that: "linguistic exchanges are also relations of symbolic power in which the power relations between speakers or their respective groups are actualized." Here, we move away from a 'free-for-all' speaking zone towards a theoretical orientation based on the concept of speaking rights, including the right to be heard. This is what Bourdieu described as "audibility" and achieving such audibility is not simply a matter of being able to speak a particular language i.e. of having the linguistic capital. It is also a matter of possessing the

right social and cultural capital to be considered a legitimate speaker. This social and cultural capital can include educational and employment qualifications and experiences.

To summarise the argument in this section of the review, both Conversation Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis bring insights to the discourse analysis of argumentation. In Conversation Analysis, the concept of the turn allows me to trace the ways in which argumentation unfolds. In Critical Discourse Analysis, the concept of intertextuality and insights from social theory, allow insights into both the nature of argumentation structure and the ways in which argumentation is situated within wider power relations.

However, Conversation Analysis, in its exclusive focus on the moment of interaction, misses the richness of context, the ways in which voices are re-contextualized in argumentation, for example. Similarly, Critical Discourse Analysis, in focussing on written text, especially high-prestige media texts, misses more everyday spoken argumentation. In contrast, the current study focuses upon the ways in which argumentation operates in the grain of more everyday spoken discourse, examining what Foucault (1980) referred to as the "capillaries of power" and examines its more spontaneous emergence.

2.2.5.4 Argumentation and Multimodal Analysis

In this section of the review, I introduce the concept of multimodality, identifying a space in the research field of argumentation but also contributing to a theoretical framework within which the research questions (especially the question of how argumentation emerges and unfolds and how people position themselves and others in this process) can be addressed. However, before we begin, it should again be stated (as it was in the introduction) that the analysis conducted in this thesis is *not* primarily multimodal, in nature. Nevertheless, at various points, I have introduced a multimodal dimension. The section will begin by defining the concept of multimodality more broadly and then the focus will be narrowed to consider its relevance to the discourse analysis of argumentation. The methodological implications of a multimodal approach will be considered in the next chapter.

Semiotics is, fundamentally, concerned with signs and the ways in which they make meaning. Language is but one of those signs. In Britain, the concept of multimodality is informed by Systemic Functional Linguistics and especially by the research of Kress (2001). Drawing on but expanding the work of Halliday (1977) he suggests that the modes, what he defines as resources for meaning-making, are not simply verbal but multiple:

There is a potent point to multimodality as such, namely the assertion that 'language' is just one among the resources for making meaning; and that all such resources available in one social group and its cultures at a particular moment ought to be considered as constituting one coherent domain, an integral field of nevertheless distinct resources for *making* meaning; all equal, potentially, in their capacity to contribute meaning to a complex semiotic entity, a text or text-like entity.

(Kress, 2011, p. 242).

These modes inter-penetrate in complex ways and provide different resources for meaning-making. These include: speech, writing, images and, importantly for the analysis presented here, gesture and facial expression. However, his words at the end suggest his focus is largely textual in nature, and not concerned with speech. It is for this reason that we need to look elsewhere for the theoretical background to underpin the preliminary work on multimodality undertaken here. I do this by drawing upon the work of Goodwin, C. (2000), which comes out of a tradition that is broadly conversation analytic.

Goodwin, C. (2000) and Goodwin (2006) deepen and extend the insights of conversational analysis, discussed earlier, exploring the ways in which body language interacts with speech in the making of meaning. For him, participation frameworks (most relevantly, those of Goffman, 1981) are bodily as well as verbal. Positioning thus has a bodily dimension, unfolding in space as well as time. Goodwin uses the term 'embodiment' to capture the ways in which the body, as well as speech, carries meanings and is also (along with speech) a resource through which speakers position themselves and each other. In this sense, he observes, all actions, including speech, are 'embodied.'

Like Kress, Goodwin argues for an approach that doesn't assume that language is either 'primary or autonomous,' one that 'accounts for the 'simultaneous use of multiple semiotic resources' (Goodwin, C., 2000, p. 1450). He uses the term 'semiotic fields' in order to refer to the different ways in which meaning can be made e.g. talk, gesture, posture etc. In this way, meaning is 'accomplished through the temporally unfolding juxtaposition of quite different kinds of semiotic resources' (Goodwin, C., 2000, p. 1492). This approach has the merit of focussing on spoken, as opposed to textual, discourse. Furthermore, research in this paradigm has begun to focus on argumentation and the ways in which it emerges and unfolds; this is a key research question in this thesis and will be considered shortly. Deepening and extending the concept of positioning to include a bodily as well as a verbal dimension allows

for the possibility of considering, for example, the relevance of gesture, body posture and facial expression in argumentation. These concepts are operationalized in relation to argumentation that emerges in the form of competing voices, in both serious (Chapter 4) and more playful (Chapter 5) form.

The principal multimodal focus in this thesis is gesture. Research has established that gestures often relate closely to accompanying speech (Schegloff, 1984) and thus can serve to offer further support for interpreting the meaning of an utterance (Kendon, 1995; 2001). So, an analysis of how gestures emerge in concert with speech can offer a way of triangulating data and this will be discussed again in relation to research validity later in the Methodology chapter. However, this is not simply a matter of the methodological triangulation of data. It is also a matter of capturing the fine-grained detail, the 'thick description' (Geertz, 1973) of the ways in which argumentation emerges and unfolds and the ways in which speakers position themselves in this process. It is to this that the review now turns.

Here I review the literature on multimodality with specific reference to argumentation, with a view to staking out the space for the preliminary analysis presented within the pages of this thesis. I begin by observing that a socially-oriented view of argumentation, such as the one taken in the thesis, needs to account for a multimodal dimension. This focus is not a new one and has emerged from within existing research approaches.

The more exclusively rational and logical approaches to argumentation (e.g. formal and informal logic, argumentation theory) considered earlier in the review define it in almost exclusively linguistic terms and view its unfolding in largely linear terms, as a process (or chain) of logic or reasoning. However, there are dissenting voices. Thus, for example, Willard observes that:

> I do not see how one can take the notion of argument as interaction seriously, and yet still maintain that arguments are uniquely or exhaustively linguistic communications.

> (Willard, 1981, p.191)

In other words, there is a need to move beyond the verbal (as well as the rational) when analysing argumentation. Similarly, Gilbert (1994) observes that argumentative discourse as it unfolds in practice is neither linear nor exclusively rational. He sees it as encompassing both physical and emotional dimensions. This emphasis on the importance of the emotional and physical dimension in the emergence, unfolding and indeed, authorisation, of argumentation is important for the thesis.

This, clearly, is particularly germane to the study of argumentation, where the emotional dimension is often crucial. Goodwin et al., (2002) explore the role of multimodal features such as gesture and body positioning in the emergence and unfolding of adversarial argument (or disputes) amongst children in playground games. Crucially, they conceptualise stance and positioning in multimodal and not simply linguistic terms and begin to connect this to intonation. This is a move I begin to make in Chapters 4 and (especially) Chapter 5.

Goodwin (2000) observes that the concept of 'embodiment' can encompass different phenomena. Thus, the body functions in one way when the prosodic features of voice are used to take up particular stances or positions (Goodwin, 1998) and in another when gestures can function as individual actions or multi-modally, in concert with speech. Posture is yet another way of establishing the context for meaning-making.

The connection of voice to the body seems particularly salient when approaching talk, or here argumentative talk, as a situated practice. By this, I mean to suggest that the voices of argumentation are embodied ones. Goodwin and Goodwin (2000) highlight the connection between a strong affective stance (often, of course, characteristic of argumentation) and prosodic features such as word stress, raised pitch and loudness. Tannen (1984) suggests that silences and pauses are indicative of high emotion, if not tension and Sandlund (2004, p.36) notes that sighing is a sign of frustration.

However, strong emotional orientations can also be communicated multimodally. Biber et al., (1999, p.967) note that ''emotive and attitudinal stance meanings can be conveyed through a number of non-linguistic means, such as body posture, facial expressions, and gestures.'' Goodwin and Goodwin investigate embodied arguments in the context of everyday encounters, largely centred on play, both in the context of girl's hopscotch (Goodwin, M.H., 2001) or boys playing slingshot games (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1990). However, as Argaman (2009) observes, there is very little research into embodied practices in more institutional contexts. She therefore focusses upon the ways in which embodied argument emerges in asymmetrical power encounters within an institutional setting, specifically that of a high school staff meeting, concluding that the multimodal emergence of argument (in the form of gestures, gaze, posture etc.) is an important component of interaction and serves to reproduce existing hierarchies within the institution.

Similarly, Yu (2011) examines adversarial argumentation and demonstrates the ways in which both verbal and non-verbal features of argumentation can display emotion and, more

specifically, frustration. Interestingly, she suggests that non-verbal displays of frustration are often the most powerful. Yu (2013) also explores the ways in which self-mockery emerges, explaining its functions with reference to face-based politeness theory. This is interesting in that it foreshadows the work on parody in Chapter 5 of the thesis, although my focus there is more on the mockery of others, rather than self-mockery. However, Yu's suggestion that the use of gestural exaggeration is important in humour is something I observe in Chapter 5 in relation to stylization.

The dimension of multimodality focussed upon in this discourse analysis is largely that of gesture and it is considered largely in relation to playful argumentative discourse, especially parody. This is suggestive when it comes to the gesture, the principal focus of the preliminary multimodal work in this thesis. In Yu's view, this multimodal dimension pushes the study of argumentation in the direction of rhetoric not logic and this is the approach taken in this thesis. Retzinger (1991) for example, studies the ways in which marital arguments emerge and unfold both linguistically and multi-modally, focussing upon the emotional dimension, and foregrounding shame and anger.

To sum up, and to re-emphasize, although the approach to argumentation in this thesis is not principally multimodal, concepts such as 'embodiment,' particularly in relation to the concept of participation frameworks, and voices, are particularly helpful in accounting for the ways in which argumentation emerges and unfolds or the ways in which speakers position themselves and others, both research questions posed in this thesis. Positioning theory (discussed a little later in the review) needs to account for the multimodal nature of meaning-making. As well as establishing this theoretical foundation, there is a research space that needs filling out here; as yet, there is no thoroughgoing investigation of multimodal argumentation in the Adult ESOL classroom. Thus, while it is not a major focus, this is the space that the research presented in this thesis begins to inhabit.

2.2.5.5 Argumentation and narrative discourse

If discourse is multimodal, then we should expect a certain degree of 'permeability' between modes. This section of the review will focus upon the research into the role of narrative in argumentation. It does so in order to establish a theoretical frame for the research questions: What is the role of narrative in argumentation? How is argumentation authorized? The principal focus, therefore, is not on narrative *per se,* but, rather, on the role it plays in

argumentation. To be more precise, the focus here is on narrative as a resource for the authorization of argumentation and the performance of identities.

The section aims to establish a dialogic approach, in which narrative is conceptualised in terms of a move in unfolding argumentation. Baynham (2011a), in his position paper on narrative studies, identifies space for the study of the role of narrative in argumentation. Chapter 6 of this thesis situates itself in this space.

Narrative and argumentation are clearly distinct modes of discourse (Andrews, 1995; Kress, 1989). Kress conceptualises argument and narrative as two distinct modes of dealing with difference. Narrative, for him, is a closed, conservative form, one which resolves difference and reproduces the status quo. Argument, on the other hand, is open, and generative of change. Whilst this is a helpful starting point, framing the distinction in these terms reveals a rather text-oriented approach, as Andrews points out, one which ignores the fact that argument can be closed and conservative when there are power asymmetries (Andrews, 1989, p.171).

In the Adult ESOL policy discourses e.g. *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum* (2001), these two modes of discourse are rigidly demarcated and no real connections are established between them. The situation here is the same as it is in the *English National Curriculum*, where, as Andrews (2001, p. 99) observes: "There is no understanding that narratives can contribute to arguments, or, indeed, be arguments." Moreover, there is no awareness of the ways in which these modes of discourse may have permeable boundaries and inter-penetrate in complex ways, as suggested by Chapter 6. Whilst an awareness of such complexity is perhaps not to be expected in a curriculum document, it constitutes an interesting focal point for research.

This is because research increasingly suggests that the two modes of discourse are indeed permeable (Baynham, 1995; Andrews, 1991; 1989); metaphorically, it might be said that they bleed into each other in various ways like the colours of a dye (Baynham, 2012, pers comm.) This concept of permeability will be taken up in Chapter 6 and again in the thesis discussion. However they blend or bleed into each other, and whether one talks in terms of embedding (see Ochs and Capps, 2001) or permeability, research suggests that, as Parret (1987, p. 165) states: "argumentation and narrativity overlap in many sequences of discourse."

Aristotle acknowledged that the use of example was one way in which argumentation could be authorized, although his view of the evidential status of narratives of personal experience in rhetoric, though, is clear: "The educated reason with axioms and universals the uneducated

on the basis of what particulars they know and instances near their experience" (1926[4BCE, p. 1395]). The evidential superiority attributed to logical reasoning here and the downplaying of personal experience are still visible in the way that "anecdotal" is sometimes used pejoratively when connected with the providing of evidence. This is despite the fact that, as Andrews (1995, p.116) observes, witness testimony is important in many contexts e.g. in court. Furthermore, Aristotle's view of narrative is mono-logic, emphasising the unity of time and place and a view of narrative as an event that happens to one person on a single occasion in the past. Baynham (2003) asserts that, in such a view, narrative is often seen simply as a means of bringing vividness to argumentation, whereas he suggests assigning it a more important and integral role both in and as argumentation.

In the context of spoken discourse analysis, the modern descendent of the Aristotelean narrative is arguably the narrative structure identified by William Labov (Labov and Waletsky, 1967; Labov, 1972). These narratives emerged from sociolinguistic interviews and consist of the temporal stage-by-stage unfolding of a past event, told and, crucially, evaluated by a single speaker. These generic stages consist of: an abstract, orientation, complication, resolution and a coda. This approach to discourse analysis is structuralist, in that it analyses narrative in terms of its internal structures or stages. This is what is often seen as the 'canonical' conceptualisation of narrative (Georgakopoulou, 2007; Baynham, 2011b). This is also the conceptualization of narrative that informs the *Adult ESOL Curriculum* (2001). This conceptualization is, as we shall see, useful in the context of a policy document but not sufficient to capture the ethnographic texture and variability of narratives in unfolding argumentation.

Indeed, Labov revised his ideas about narrative structure, moving away from seeing evaluation as a separate stage towards an idea of it as something that permeates the narrative. He also acknowledged the rather decontextualized and monologic nature of the narratives he elicited in interview, in words which resonate for a study of narratives in argumentation:

> They exhibit a generality that is not to be expected in narratives that sub-serve an argumentative point in a highly interactive and competitive situation. Such narratives are highly fragmented and may require a different approach.

> (Labov, 1997, p.397).

Similarly, Georgakopoulou (2007, p. 86) observes that there is a need to move away from a conceptualization of narrative as a "finished" and "detachable" structure with a "beginning,

middle and end" and towards a "pluralized view of structure as variable and potentially fragmented that hinges on a view of narrative as consisting of a multitude of genres."

To account for this, she introduced the concept of 'small stories.' This she uses to capture:

> A gamut of under-represented narrative activities, such as tellings of ongoing events, future or hypothetical events, shared (or known events), but also allusions to tellings, deferrals of tellings, or refusals to tell. These tellings are typically small when compared to the pages and pages of transcript of interview narratives.

> (Georgakopoulou, 2006, p.123).

She offers the concept of 'small stories' as both a description of their size and as a counterpoint to the 'grand narratives' of Lyotard (1984). In ways that resonate for the current study, Georgakopoulou examines the ways in which small stories (e.g. what she refers to as shared stories) function as argumentative devices, providing evidence in support of argumentation and opportunities for speakers to position themselves and each other in displays of identity work.

There is other research examining the rhetorical role of different types of narrative in argumentation. Baynham's (2011b) research on teacher interviews suggests that different kinds of narrative (e.g. personal, generic, hypothetical) bring with them different evidential claims to truth, authorizing positions in argumentation in distinctive ways. Thus, the evidential claim of a particular type of narrative, the personal or generic narrative, is that it is factual, rooted in the speaker's own experience. In these circumstances, challenging the argumentation amounts to challenging the experience (Baynham, 1995, p.42). The suggestion is that narrative adds evidence and authority to argumentation because it is more difficult to dispute the truth of a narrative, grounded in notions of consent, than it is to dispute the truth of an explicit argumentation proposition. In these terms, narrative thus becomes a strategy for closing down argumentation, for presenting an argumentative proposition, in effect, as fact.

Given these observations, it is perhaps unsurprising that what gets argued over is not the truth of the narrative itself; rather, it is the *point* of the narrative in relation to the issues debated, the positions taken up. This is an assertion that both Schiffrin (1990) and Georgakopoulou (2001) make in relation to the role narrative plays in more everyday argumentation. This will be taken up in the analysis presented in Chapter 6.

There is also research focussing on the rhetorical effects that can be achieved through the practice of speech reporting. Hill and Zepeda (1993, p. 212) suggest it is a practice which enables the narrator to take up complex positions in relation to others, including themselves as figures in a narrative. This can serve a number of rhetorical purposes: distributing responsibility for events, distancing the author of the narrative from their claim, thus creating the illusion of objectivity, drawing in the listener, making them complicit with what is expressed, with the result that the argumentation becomes more difficult to counter. For similar reasons, Schiffrin (1990) also suggests that narratives can widen the base of support for the argumentation claims being made.

To summarise, research suggests that different types of narrative play an important role in the emergence, unfolding and authorisation of argumentation. Narratives also contribute to the display of identities. Different types of narrative make different rhetorical claims to truth. They perform a powerful rhetorical function. Thus, when we are considering how narrative functions in argumentation, what kind of claims it makes, we need to be clear about what kind of narrative it is e.g. personal, generic etc. These claims to truth are also visible in the form of different types of speech reporting. This last point is taken up in the next major section where I set out my analytical approach to the thesis.

2.3 My approach: A linguistic ethnographic approach to argumentation

In this section, I outline the approach taken to the study of argumentation in thesis. That is to say, I make it explicit, as what has gone before has been part of the process of creating a space for the research and a theoretical framework within which my research questions can be addressed. As a way of staking out a position here, the research approach will be characterised as both linguistic and ethnographic in nature, locating itself under the umbrella term linguistic ethnography. It will consider the nature of ethnography, before moving on to consider the nature of ethnographically-informed approaches to the study of language and discourse. It concludes by discussing linguistic ethnography. I will finally introduce in turn a number of key constructs that are central to my analysis: the dialogic, identity, and positioning.

2.3.1 Ethnography: Principles and practice

In what follows, then, I lay out some of the foundational principles of ethnography. Ethnography is a broad term and there is disagreement about what precisely characterises it. Many researchers (Hammersley, 2006; Hymes, 1996) have highlighted the absence of

consensus around the term and Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) also observe there is a degree of overlap between ethnography and other labels such as qualitative enquiry or case study. So, for the purposes of clarity, I begin by identifying characteristics about which there is broad agreement. In doing so, I draw upon the work of Hammersley (1992), Rampton et al., (2004) and Hammersley and Atkinson (2007), who all attempt to distil its core characteristics. In doing this, I begin to establish the theoretical and methodological approach I take in the current study. I follow the approach of Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) in that I attempt to outline what it is that ethnographers do, how they collect, handle and analyse data.

Ethnography is usually held to be broadly naturalistic in orientation and the aim is study what people do and say in everyday settings, and not in conditions set up by the researcher. Methodologically, Rampton et al., (2004), identify 'the commitment within ethnography to particularity and participation, holistic accounts of social practice and openness to reinterpretation over time.' The principal emphasis is on collecting empirical data from everyday settings, on a small-scale, using relatively unstructured methods, such as interviews or participant observation (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). These methods allow the researcher to capture the complexity of the moment-by-moment unfolding of experience. This is what Geertz refers to as "thick description" (Geertz, 1973) and these descriptions are important for the "delicacy of their distinctions rather than the sweep of their abstractions" (Geertz, 1973, p. 25). However, at the same time, it is also important to note that, although it is possible to analyse human social experience, it is ultimately complex and irreducible.

This emphasis upon 'thick description' means the research focus is usually small-scale, and centres on the detailed description and analysis of a small number of cases or settings. Because of this, it is often said that ethnographic analysis attempts to identify 'telling' rather than 'typical' patterns in situated human practices. Mitchell describes a 'telling' case as one in which: 'the particular circumstances of a case serve to make previously obscure theoretical relationships suddenly apparent' (Mitchell, in Ellen, 1984, p. 239). The researcher infers theoretical connections between events and phenomena and such 'telling cases' provide a way of developing theory.

The principal methods of data collection within ethnography are observation, especially participant observation and interview. These are often said to be relatively unstructured (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007) in the sense that the research design is exploratory rather than fixed. Ethnography is therefore characterised by what Maxwell (2004) terms an open-

ended approach. Moreover, analytical categories are generated out of the data, rather than imposed in advance by the researcher. Other sources of data, such as documentary evidence and vignettes, are also drawn upon for the light they shed on the research issue being investigated.

There is also an emphasis on collecting data to try to understand the perspectives of the participants themselves. This is known as the emic perspective. There is often a tension in ethnography between trying to understand this emic perspective and viewing the participants and their behaviour from a more distant, analytical perspective, known as the etic perspective. Indeed, this is seen by Hammersley (2007) as a central tension in ethnographic research.

Finally, ethnography emphasizes the need for reflexivity on the part of the researcher. This is because they are positioned within the research, actively involved in it. As Hymes (1996, p. 13) puts it: "there is no way to avoid the fact that the observer herself or himself is a factor in the enquiry." The researcher is also positioned and there is no god's eye vantage point from which to view the research process. This, it should be noted, is also the case for quantitative research. Ethnography accepts that the researcher is intimately, and of necessity, involved in the research process.

It is because of this that ethnographic research emphasizes the need for reflexivity on the part of the researcher (Hymes, 1996, p. 13). Essentially, this notion of reflexivity involves:

> a rejection of the idea that social research is, or can be, carried out in some autonomous realm that is insulated from wider society and from the personal biography of the researcher, in such a way that its findings can be unaffected by social processes and personal characteristics.

> (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007, p. 15).

All researchers are positioned and it is necessary to be explicit about the nature of this positioning. Indeed, Maybin and Tusting (2011) argue that making assumptions explicit and working through the possibilities and limitations of the data collection process serves only to strengthen linguistic ethnography. So instead of trying to eliminate researcher-effect, we should seek, rather, to understand it; or even, as Hammersley and Atkinson suggest (2007) productively exploit it.

This is why it is necessary to acknowledge that the personal characteristics of the researcher have an impact upon the research process. These include ascribed identities such as age, gender, race and ethnic identification (Hammersley, 2007, p. 73). Thus, I am a white, middle-

aged British male. These personal characteristics include the beliefs that I hold and this is especially important when such beliefs pertain to controversial topics, such as capital punishment, as they do in this thesis.

This positioning is also visible at a political level. I have already explained how my interest in argumentation and the research approach I have taken to its study has been shaped by my life history. This is not untypical within linguistic ethnography more generally, as Rampton (2004) observes. More specifically, research within this tradition is often informed by a critical orientation and a desire to address perceived inequalities within the field of multilingual education (Roberts, Davies and Jupp, 1992; Creese, 2003). However, although it is necessary to acknowledge such positioning, it does not automatically invalidate the research.

2.3.2 Ethnographic approaches to discourse analysis

Traditional approaches to language often viewed it in very abstract terms. Perhaps most famously, Saussure (1983) conceived of language as a system of signs. He distinguished between the signifier, the thing that signifies, and the signified, the object or concept referred to. Moreover, he distinguished between langue, the abstract system of language, and parole, actual language use. Sassurean linguistics, and subsequent structuralist approaches, have typically focussed on the study of linguistic signs within the abstract language system.

Ethnographic approaches to the study of language pit themselves against such a view, shifting the focus from langue to parole. Hymes criticised Chomsky's (1972) view that language could be studied in terms of abstract competence, arguing for a situated approach to language study, which emphasised communicative competence, or the ability of the speaker to use language in ways which are appropriate in different communicative contexts (Hymes, 1972). He attacked linguistics for what he saw as its Garden of Eden view of language, one which consists of an idealised, competent speaker: 'an unmotivated cognitive mechanism …not a person in the social world' (Hymes, 1972, p. 273). In making this move, Hymes advocated and developed the 'ethnography of communication' (1974) or the 'ethnography of speaking' (1968) as a response to a linguistics which focussed on the formal structural properties of language, arguing that:

> It is not linguistics, but ethnography, not language, but communication, which must provide the frame of reference within which the place of language in culture and society is to be assessed"

Hymes (1974, p. 4).

This meant situating language use within power relations. Hymes drew upon the concept of voice, defining it not in abstract idealised terms but in terms of audibility, as the: "freedom to have one's voice heard; freedom to develop a voice worth hearing" (Hymes, 1996, p. 64). He saw it as intimately bound up with issues of power, more specifically, inequalities of power and was conscious of the fact that some voices are less audible than others.

How, then, does language point to its social context? The concept of indexicality can help to describe and explain the ways in which language does this. This pointing includes but is not limited to simple referentiality (Silverstein, 1973). Indexicality, as a theory of signification, draws upon the ideas of Pierce (1955), who distinguished between the sign, the object and the interpretant. He argued that meaning is not immanent in the sign itself but emerges in its interpretation. Pierce distinguished between iconic signs, such as onomatopoeia, where the sign sounds like the object it is representing, indexical signs, where the object is signposted in some way, and symbols, where the sign connects to its object by drawing upon conventions.

Indexicality calls up social knowledge in the local context. Silverstein (1973) distinguished two dimensions of indexicality; 'appropriateness to' existing contextual parameters and 'effectiveness in' bringing about new ones. It is thus constitutive of, as well as reflective of, context. Maybin and Tusting (2011, p.523) assert that indexicality is a concept that serves to create a synergy between linguistic and ethnographic analysis, between language and context. De Fina & Bamberg (2006, p. 5) capture its complexity, observing that:

> The idea that signs are indexical goes beyond simple referential anchoring to encompass the ability of linguistic expressions to evoke, and relate to, complex systems of meaning such as socially shared conceptualizations of space and place, ideologies, social representations about group membership, social roles and attributes, presuppositions about all aspects of social reality, individual and collective stances, practices and organization structures.

Silverstein (1976; 2003) also introduces the concept of 'indexical order' to refer to the ways in which the sign is not randomly connected to its context but is patterned according to the wider social and cultural characteristics of groups. This encompasses power relations, hence the mention of ideologies in the quote just cited. Blommaert (2008, p. 73) invokes Foucault's (1982) concept of 'orders of discourse,' in which certain discourses are privileged over others. He observes that indexicality embodies a hierarchy of value judgements, suggesting

that indexicalities are ordered, or stratified, into 'regimes' in ways which connect tightly to issues around power and the ways in which it is exercised, authorised and maintained. This relates to the concept of a regime of truth discussed earlier in the review.

2.3.2.1 An interactional sociolinguistics approach to discourse

The discourse analysis in this thesis is best described as a linguistically-informed discourse analysis rather than a purely linguistic analysis. Therefore, in order to further establish the approach taken in this thesis, I now establish and justify the linguistic approach that most closely informs the discourse analysis in this thesis.

Interactional sociolinguistics has its origins in anthropology and sociology, and draws upon the research of Gumperz (1982) and Goffman (1981) to investigate situated interaction. It focusses on 'the importance of small and subtle variations in the way people use and interpret spoken discourse' (Cameron, 2001, p.106), connecting the micro and the macro and is thus consistent with the linguistic ethnographer's desire to connect local language use to wider domains. Interactional sociolinguistics is often concerned with spontaneous spoken data and with prosody features. Furthermore, it has often conducted research on argumentation.

In his research, Gumperz (1982) explored the ways in which speakers create the grounds on which their utterances will be understood. A key concept here is that of a contextualization cue. This is a verbal sign that serves to: 'construct the contextual ground for situated interpretation (Gumperz, 1982). These cues are various but the ones most relevant to the thesis are prosodic in nature e.g. stress, rhythm and intonation. Importantly, he also focussed on the ways in which speech reporting served as a contextualisation cue to challenge the assertions of the defence attorney in a rape trial (Gumperz, 1996).

The research of the interactional sociolinguists Deborah Schiffrin (1987; 1990) and Deborah Tannen (1987) has investigated argumentative discourse in everyday conversation amongst friendship groups. Tannen, (1984; 1989) explores the ways in which ritualised opposition, or agonism, emerges as an important feature of conversations, focussing on the ways in which speaker involvement in conversational discourse is realised through a variety of linguistic means, such as repetition, rhythm, and "constructed dialogue", or reported speech. For her, this involvement is evidence of a friendly combativeness, which serves as a co-operative, rather than a disruptive, conversational strategy.

In later work (1994) Tannen examines the ways in such verbal aggression or conflict, serves to negotiate power or solidarity, emerging as power play (or a desire to get 'one-up' on

someone) or as a linguistic means of creating solidarity, even intimacy. This focus on ritualised opposition emerges elsewhere, in the research of Cook (2000) who uses the term 'verbal duelling' to capture the ways in which speakers engage in ritualistic argumentation. What these two researchers have in common is a focus the ways in which language can function playfully in argumentation.

A focus on verbal disagreement as a strategy that both reflects and constitutes solidarity and intimacy among friendship groups is also a feature of the research of Deborah Schiffrin (1984) as she investigates the conversation of her Jewish friends. She defines argumentative talk as sustained disagreement and describes its emergence prosodically, in terms of features such as: exaggerated intonation, increased volume and tempo of utterances, and competition for the conversational floor. These she sees as contextualization cues (Gumperz, 1982) for the presence of argumentative talk.

Her close focus on the unfolding of argumentative discourse also highlights the role of formal discourse markers of reasoning, such as 'so' or 'therefore.' Indeed, she pays close attention to argument in her book on discourse markers (e.g. Schiffrin, 1987, pp. 17-19), where she identifies the need for a situated analysis and cautions against generalization, insisting that all analyses should be locally situated. This close focus on discourse markers is also a feature of my analysis in Chapter 4 of the thesis.

Moreover, the emphasis on the need for a situated analysis, which includes, but moves beyond the linguistic, is also helpful. This means drawing upon ethnographic knowledge. So, Schiffrin's analysis is informed with by her detailed knowledge of the participants and their lower-middle class Jewish community in Philadelphia (Schiffrin, 1984; 1987). Such knowledge includes topic knowledge; for example, she observes that the topic of inter-marriage in Jewish communities is a controversial one. This ethnographic knowledge is used to inform her analyses and leads her to characterise the process of argumentation, not in terms of the resolution of difference, pace argumentation theory, but as a form of sociability in the Jewish community, in which conflict, in the form of challenge and disagreement, is co-operatively enacted. Thus, when turn-taking conventions are broken and there is overlap, this is not always negative; it can indicate high levels of speaker involvement in a topic and serve to create solidarity, rather than discord (Schiffrin, 1984).

The value of the research discussed above lies in its description of the emergence of argumentation, both in prosodic terms and in terms of discourse markers. The prosodic

approach is highly suitable for identifying and analysing the emergence and unfolding of argumentative discourse. The analysis of discourse markers can help to address the question of the emergence, unfolding and authorisation of argumentation. The value of this research also lies in its call for a situated approach to the analysis of argumentation and the importance of ethnographic awareness.

It is to this that I now turn.

2.3.3 Linguistic Ethnography

In characterising linguistic ethnography, I draw upon position papers by Rampton et al., (2004), Creese (2008), and Maybin and Tusting (2011). Linguistic Ethnography, as the name suggests, works at the interface of linguistics and ethnography, bringing the insights from both to bear in the analysis. Generally speaking, it can be characterised epistemologically as social-constructivist and post-structuralist in nature, criticising all essentialist accounts of social life (Creese, 2008; Rampton, 2007). In their discussion paper on Linguistic Ethnography, Rampton et al capture its general orientation thus:

> Linguistic ethnography generally holds that language and social life are mutually shaping, and that close analysis of situated language use can provide both fundamental and distinctive insights into the mechanisms and dynamics of social and cultural production in everyday activity.

(Rampton et al., 2004, p. 2).

This "mutual shaping" is crucial, emphasizing the dynamic relationship between language and social life. Language is shaped by social life but is also constitutive of it. Linguistic Ethnography is characterised by a 'disciplinary eclecticism' Creese (2010, p.140) and Tusting and Maybin (2007) suggest that it is especially susceptible to an interdisciplinary approach as a result of the turn towards discourse within the social sciences. It is this eclecticism that allows the researcher 'to look closely and locally, while tying observations to broader relations of power and ideology' as Creese (2010, pp. 140-141) observes.

Insights from social theory are often drawn upon within linguistic ethnography and I draw upon Foucault's (1980) concept of a regime of truth and Bourdieu's (1991) concept of doxa. These concepts have been discussed earlier in the review and often relate to the authorisation of argumentation, one of my research questions. There is ethnographically-oriented research that explores this question. Thus, the concept of a regime of truth has been used to account for the ways in which argumentation has been authorised in different contexts. For example,

Lindstrom (1992) uses this concept to analyse a public dispute between a father and a son in Vanuatu, observing that discourses do constrain who can say what and when but that 'people can occasionally say the unsayable….evoking alternative or competing discourses' (1992, p.103). Similarly, Baynham (1995) draws upon the concept to explain how argumentation is authorised across a variety of discourse contexts, from the familial to the political.

On the face of it, there appears to be a tension between linguistics and ethnography (Rampton et al., 2004). In terms of analytical scope, the principal ethnographic focus on culture appears to be a broader one than the linguists' focus on language (Hymes, 1996, p. 6). Linguistics pulls towards abstraction and generalization and ethnography pulls towards particularity, Moreover, the ethnographic emphasis on the importance of situated processes might seem to sit uncomfortably with the more standardised set of empirical processes that characterise linguistics.

However, it is possible to view such tensions productively. In contrast to ethnography, Rampton et al., (2004, p.3) assert that linguistics brings a 'more formalist framework…with its powerfully precise procedures and terminology for describing patterns within communication.' They argue that ethnography serves to "open linguistics up" (Rampton.et al., 2004, p. 4) by situating the claims of linguistics within the richness of context and by stressing the importance of direct experience in the field in establishing interpretive validity. Conversely, linguistics can: "tie ethnography down," lending weight and authority to an ethnographic analysis based upon the gathering of field-notes and participant observation, thus helping to ground ethnographic analysis in the specifics of linguistic detail. This empirical detail is falsifiable in the way that ethnographic analysis is not. In terms of linguistic ethnography the linguistic analysis helps to provide the etic perspective.

Next I introduce the key constructs I will be using in the thesis.

2.3.4 Dialogic discourse

The concept of argumentative discourse as dialogic is central to the analysis presented in this thesis. This key concept derives from the work of Mikhail Bakhtin (1981) and is connected to the idea of voice, or, perhaps more accurately, voicing. Bakhtin asserted that all discourse is heteroglossic, or poly-vocal in nature; that is, any voice, even a single voice or utterance, contains within it the traces of other voices. Although Bakhtin is primarily concerned with written narrative, and more specifically with the novels of Dostoevsky, he also observes that this polyvocality is a pervasive feature of more ordinary speech. He draws a distinction

between authoritative discourses, which seek to set themselves beyond dialogue, and internally-persuasive discourses, which begin as the voices of another, then are appropriated through contact with other voices. They are double-voiced.

Double-voiced discourse, then, 'is directed both towards the referential object of speech, as in ordinary discourse, and towards another's discourse, towards someone else's speech' (Bakhtin, 1994, p. 105). The key point to make here is that appropriating the voices of others involves evaluation. For Bakhtin:

> Someone else's words introduced into our own speech inevitably assume a new interpretation and become subject to our evaluation of them; that is they become double-voiced

This evaluation is often negative. Interestingly, for a thesis on argumentation conceptualized in terms of different, often competing, voices, Bakhtin (1994, p. 108) describes double-voiced discourse as: 'the word with a sideways glance at someone else's hostile word.' It contains a 'hidden polemic' and is often antagonistic in nature in that 'a polemical blow is struck at the other's discourse on the same theme.' Bakhtin identifies a number of types of double-voiced discourse e.g. irony and parody and Chapter 5 of the thesis discusses how argumentation emerges in the form of such double-voiced discourse.

The dialogic nature of discourse means that all utterances are both responses to previous utterances and anticipate future utterances. That is, they have the quality of responsivity and addressivity. Bakhtin observes that:

> Our speech…is filled with others' words, varying degrees of otherness and varying degrees of 'our-own-ness, varying degrees of awareness and detachment. These words carry with them their own expression, their own evaluative tone, which we assimilate, rework, and reaccentuate.

<div align="right">Bakhtin (1986, p.89).</div>

This is what is known as intertextuality and Bakhtin defines it in terms of 'chains of speech communication' (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 94). I have already provided an account of how this concept has been influential in Critical Discourse Analysis.

Parody is characterized by a clash of voices, each with different intentions, in words which resonate for this study of argumentation, as they turn on metaphors of conflict:

> The second voice, having made its home in the other's discourse, clashes hostilely with its primordial host and forces him to serve directly opposing aims, as discourse becomes an arena of battle between two voices.
>
> (Bakhtin, 1994, p. 106).

Parody is often accompanied by what Rampton (2003) following Bauman (2001) refers to as a degree of stylization. This is defined as a form of exaggerated voicing (Blackledge & Creese, 2009). Bakhtin emphasized the ways in which double-voicing strategies like parody subverted the authoritative discourses of the medieval world of Rabelais. Both Rampton (1996) and Blackledge and Creese (2009) explore the ways in which stylised voicing in the form of parody is used to undermine authoritative discourses in the classroom.

Parody was one of the key characteristics of Bakhtin's concept of the carnivalesque (Bakhtin, 1968) and it is to this concept that we now turn. It is a concept that is used to analyse the ways in which argumentation can emerge playfully and creatively from a dialogic perspective. In his work on Rabelais (1968), Bakhtin suggested that carnival festivities served to subvert the authoritative discourses of medieval Europe, whether these were secular or sacred. In this way, they represented 'a counter-hegemonic tradition' (Caldas and Coulthard, 2003, p. 90) and provided: "temporary liberation from the prevailing truth and from the established order" and "the suspension of all hierarchical rank, privileges, norms and prohibitions" (Bakhtin, 1986, p 10). The parody that characterised the carnivals involved playfulness and creativity and researchers (Da Silva Iddings and McCafferty, 2007; Cook, 2000) have since identified these qualities as key ingredients of the carnivalesque.

The other dimension of the carnivalesque drawn upon in the thesis is known as grotesque realism (Bakhtin, 1986). This concept emphasises the material and the bodily and is democratic in that this is a dimension of experience that all humans share. It offered a counterpoint to the abstract, ideal and individualised world. Similarly, carnivalesque language, for Bakhtin, is full of the "laughter of all the people" (1994, p. 200) and is characterised by curses and by a pre-occupation with the body, its decay and degradation. This language is subversive, pitted against the official language of the powerful. It is subversive in that serves to degrade their power, if only temporarily.

The way we appropriate the voices of others can serve rhetorical as well as oppositional purposes in argumentation. The approach taken here draws upon the ideas of Volosinov (1978) who focusses upon the evaluative nature of speech reporting. In his words:

> Reported speech is speech within speech, message within message and at the same time also speech about speech, message about message.

> (Volosinov, 1978, p.149).

Speech reporting, for him, is a dynamic process turning on the relationship between the speech reported and the context in which it is reported. Volosinov (1978) emphasises the way that direct speech reporting foregrounds a commitment to both the content and the form of the utterance, whereas indirect speech foregrounds a commitment to the content, but not the exact form, of the utterance. In this way, the practice of speech reporting has implications for the kinds of rhetorical claims to truth that speakers can make. Building on this account, Baynham (1996, p.64) examines the ways in which direct speech reporting constitute particular claims to truth in non-narrative discourse, suggesting that: "the "claim to truth" in direct speech reporting is that the utterance reported was the very form of the words used by the speaker" and constitutes a stronger claim to truth than that embodied in indirect speech reporting, which does not purport to represent the actual words of another speaker, only the reporter's interpretation of the propositional content or meaning of the utterance.

2.3.5 Identity

Like, argumentation, identity is a complex and contested construct and it is to this construct that the review now turns. It will outline the approach taken to identity in this thesis. This is consistent with the broad approach to analysis outlined above. It begins by establishing the concept of the human self or identity as multiple and then demonstrates that human identities are socially constructed and that we can understand them by drawing upon the analytical concept of positioning.

2.3.5.1 The social construction of identities

Identity is 'who and what you are' (Blommaert, 2005, p. 203). To put flesh on the bones of the bald definition just offered we return to Blommaert, whose words below provide a useful point of entry to the complex issue of identity and how it is conceptualized in the thesis:

> Almost any significant author in the wide field of identity studies would argue that people don't *have* an identity, but that identities are constructed in practices that *produce, enact* or *perform* identity

> (Blommaert, 2005, p. 205).

There are a number of observations to make here, in the context of the present study. Firstly, human beings do not have a single essential self or identity. Rather, the human self or identity is multiple. Thus, for Fairclough: "we can see the external negotiation of difference with others as continuous with-and rooted-in-the internal negotiation of difference in the struggle to constitute the self" (Fairclough 1996, p. 8). The concept of a struggle to constitute the self is interesting here (and one which we return to below) but there is also a clear connection to argumentation, which often involves the negotiation of difference with others. Thus we need to speak in terms of different selves or identities. The participants in this thesis, for example, are not simply students, or teachers, but are employees, private citizens, family members and so on.

If identities are multiple, then there will be different types. Zimmerman (1998) identifies different levels of identity. Discourse identities relate to the moment-by-moment unfolding of roles, most relevantly for this study, speaker and listener. Situated identities are a matter of roles e.g. teacher-student or private citizen etc. Finally, transportable identities index the more general characteristics of individuals e.g. gender, ethnicity or class. The dimension of identity positioning connected with social class has (until relatively recently) neglected in the context of multilingual language learning (Block, 2007; Collins, 2006). However, this is now beginning to receive fuller attention (Block, 2013; Block et al., 2012; Rampton, 2006) within the field. In Chapter 6, I examine how class identities are indexed as argumentation and narrative unfold.

Secondly, identity is something that we enact or perform in social practices. The concept of the enactment or the performance of identity is an important one and derives from the work of Butler (1990) who asserted that identity is not something that one has but something that one does or performs in social interaction. This is put in terms of people doing or accomplishing identity work through discursive practices. This thesis focusses on the identity work done through the practice of argumentation.

The concept of identity as multiple and as performed are the twin bases of social constructionism (Hall, 1996; Berger and Luckmann, 1967), the belief that reality is socially constructed through different social and discursive practices in this case the practice of argumentation. Identity, then, is a matter of process, not product; it is ever-changing and dynamic. The ways in which identities are constructed and performed in interaction is the subject of increasing research (see De Fina et al., 2006).

2.3.5.2 Identities, the dialogic and positioning

If the construction of identity is a social process, then identity is also relational. It is here that the concept of positioning is important. Davies and Harre (1990, p. 47) define positioning as 'the discursive production of a diversity of selves' and propose it as a dynamic alternative to the more static concept of role. Their conceptualisation emphasises both the plural nature of identities and also their dynamic, relational nature. Blommaert calls the ways in which speakers change their positions in discourse: "the clearest empirical clue for identity" (Blommaert, 2005, p. 209).

People continually position themselves and others and this process can be seen in terms of "acts of identity" (Le-Page and Tabouret-Keller, 1985). Indeed, this is arguably the central process in identity work (Baynham, 2012, pers comm). However, it is important to acknowledge that this positioning process is not a matter of limitless speaker agency. Speakers are not only positioned by others in face-to-face encounters; they are also positioned by their personal histories, more precisely, their personal experience of social structures. In order to explain how this happens, the thesis draws upon Bourdieu's concept of habitus.

Bourdieu defined habitus as:

> a set of dispositions which incline agents to act and react in certain ways. The dispositions generate practices, perceptions and attitudes which are "regular" without being consciously co-ordinated or governed by any "rule."
>
> (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 12).

These dispositions arise out of an individual's experience of social structures and help to shape their current stances and practices. Blommaert (2005) asserts that habitus is what speakers bring along to interaction, in this case to identity work. In the thesis, I explore how the argumentative stances and practices of students and teachers as they do identity work can be shaped by their experience of social structures such as the Catholic Church or the workplace.

Much of the research into the ways in which identities are performed through discourse takes narrative as its point of entry (Baynham, 2006; Georgakopoulou, 2006). The performance of identities through argumentation *per se*, though, lacks a well-developed research base. However, as Georgakopoulou (2010, p. 272) points out 'positioning processes are evident in debates and in conflict talk.' It is this space the research inhabits.

These positioning processes are dialogic in nature. The concept of the dialogic has just been explicated and it is important in identity construction. This is not simply a matter of saying that identities are constructed in dialogue with others but it also that discourses themselves are poly-vocal, with different voices capable of representing different identities (De Fina, 2011). Bakhtin (1981) uses the concept of ventriloquation to describe the ways in which speakers position themselves when drawing upon the voices of others.

The concept of participation frameworks also provides a point of entry when examining the complex nature of speaker positioning. This derives from the work of Erving Goffman (1981), who deconstructed the notion of a speaker, distinguishing the person who produces the utterance (the animator), the person who designed the words (the author), the person who assumes responsibility for the sentiments expressed by the utterance (the principal) and the person who appears as a character in a narrative (a figure). The moment-by-moment positioning in the course of social interaction is what Goffman (1981, p.128) terms 'footing' and is concerned with 'the alignment we take up to ourselves and the others present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance.' The value of this approach lies in the ways in which speakers can construct different identities in discourse by taking up different degrees of authorship and responsibility in relation to their utterances.

There is a sense in which argumentation provides a very interesting focus for studying the performance of identity. The essence of argumentation as I have been defining it is difference (different voices) and this is also a key concept in identity theory. Baynham, citing Barker and Galasinski, sees the connection between identity theory and difference as a tight one, observing that: 'we define ourselves in terms of what we are not as much as in terms of what we are' (Barker & Galasinski, 2001, p 123, cited in Baynham, 2006, p. 384).

If identity is multiple, it is likely that that these different identities can come into conflict with each other. It is in this sense that Norton-Pierce conceptualizes identity as a site of struggle (Norton, 2000, p. 127). She views this concept as a logical extension of the position that identity is multiple and contradictory, stating that: "if identity were unitary, fixed and immutable, it would not be subject to contestation." She uses this term to capture the ways in which people may resist the ways in which they are positioned in society, terming this identity resistance (Norton, 2010). In her research, for example, she examines the ways in which female migrant workers resist negative positioning in the workplace.

In this thesis, I examine the ways in which this identity resistance emerges in classroom argumentation. There is other research which explores the ways in which the transportable identities referred to earlier, such as ethnicity and class, are performed through parody. This research comes from within a dialogic framework. So, Blackledge & Creese (2009) explore the way students use parody in the classroom to subvert authoritative classroom discourses and to resist the ways in which they are positioned by these. In doing this, Blackledge and Creese argue, drawing upon the concept of the carnivalesque, that students create their own carnival lives in the classroom. Similarly, Rampton (1996) explores the ways in which high school students resist class-related identities through parodying 'posh' and 'cockney' voices in the classroom. He suggests that in doing so they project a series of class-related dualisms, such as 'high-low,' 'reason-emotion' and 'mind-body.'

2.3.5.3 Identities and discourse

If identities are socially constructed, then language will clearly play an important role in this process because, as Hall (1996, p. 2) suggests: "identities are constructed within, not outside, discourse." It is in this sense that we can speak of the construction of identities as "discursive work" (Zimmerman and Wieder, 1970). This is the identity work that people do when they are speaking, or, in the case of this thesis, arguing. In this way, discourse analysis is tightly connected to identity performance and construction. De Fina et al., (2006) suggest that the concept of indexicality, discussed earlier in Section 2.3.2, helps us to understand how language connects to both local and global identities.

2.4 Conclusion

The review has taken a critical look at the literature in the field of argumentation studies and established that there is very little research into argumentation in the Adult ESOL classroom. This creates the space for my research into spoken argumentation conceptualized in terms of competing and consensual voices (Costello & Mitchell, 1995). These voices are better seen as situated speaking and identity positions and argumentation as a human practice. The review has established that reason is an important characteristic of argumentation and that it plays an important role in its authorisation. However, it has also suggested that the role of emotion is important and that narrative can also play a role in authorising argumentation. The ways in which identities are constructed through argumentation is also under-researched and this is another space the thesis aims to inhabit.

Moreover, throughout the review, and particularly in the final section outlining my approach, I have established a coherent theoretical framework for my research, one that supports the research questions, provides a robust approach to answering them and establishes a rationale for the methodological approach to be discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1 Introduction

The previous chapter presented the theoretical frameworks within which the research questions will be investigated. This chapter presents the methodological approach of the thesis. It will proceed as follows. To begin with, in Section 3.2, it offers an overview of the data set. Then it describes, discusses and evaluates the pilot study in Section 3.3 before doing the same with the main study in Section 3.4. Section 3.5 considers issues around validity and Section 3.6 deals with generalizability. Ethical issues are discussed in Section 3.7 and the chapter concludes in Section 3.8.

3.2 Overview of the data set

To begin with, it is necessary to offer an overview of the data set collected. A chart of the data set is provided[1] and specific details about this data set (e.g. dates, durations of interviews and lessons) are provided in the interview and observation schedules.[2] In addition, a detailed research timeline for both the pilot and the main study is provided.[3] Finally, I provide a code for the extracts included in the main body of the thesis in order to help the reader navigate and contextualise the analysis presented.[4] I summarise the content of the data set below:

3.2.1 The pilot study

The pilot study was conducted between October 2008 and July 2009. The data set comprised:

- ➢ Document Analysis.
- ➢ Audio-recordings of 2 Adult ESOL lessons, sections transcribed.
- ➢ Field notes on these lessons, made post-hoc.
- ➢ A focus group with teachers, sections transcribed.
- ➢ 2 semi-structured interviews with students recorded and transcribed.

In total, I conducted 5 hours of participant observation and a focus group which lasted just under 40 minutes.

3.2.2 The main study

The main study was conducted between October 2009 and July 2010. The data set comprised:

- ➢ Audio-recordings of 3 Adult ESOL lessons, sections transcribed.

---

[1] See Appendix 1.
[2] See Appendix 2.
[3] See Appendix 3.
[4] See Appendix 4.

- ➢ Audio-recordings of 2 teacher education lessons, sections transcribed.
- ➢ Audio-visual-recordings of 6 Adult ESOL lessons, sections transcribed.
- ➢ Field notes on these lessons, made post-hoc.
- ➢ 6 semi-structured student interviews, all transcribed.
- ➢ 3 semi-structured teacher interviews, all transcribed.

I conducted 12 hours of participant observation in my own teacher and teacher education classrooms. These observations were 2.5 hours each, yielding 15 hours of recordings. I also observed 2 sessions of each of the 3 teachers in training, yielding another 15 hours of recordings. In total, then, I recorded 30 hours of classroom interaction.

I conducted 9 interviews in total, 3 with the teachers in training whose classes I had observed and 6 with the students who had been in my class throughout the academic year. These interviews varied in duration but were all between 45 minutes and an hour in duration. All of the interviews were voice-recorded and all were conducted after the classroom observation phase of the research. In total, then, I recorded over 5 hours of student interviews and 3 hours of teacher interviews. An overview of the research process is given below:

Figure 1: The research process

Interview data

Content Analysis
Discourse Analysis

How do teachers and learners position themselves and each other in argumentation, and how are they positioned, in the Adult ESOL classroom?

Observational data

Field notes

Classroom recordings

Content Analysis

Content Analysis
Discourse Analysis

How does argumentation emerge and unfold in the Adult ESOL classroom?

How is argumentation authorized in the Adult ESOL classroom?

How do teachers and learners position themselves and each other in argumentation, and how are they positioned, in the Adult ESOL classroom?

How do teachers and learners perform identities through argumentation in the Adult ESOL classroom?

What is the role of narrative in argumentation in the Adult ESOL classroom?

3.3 The pilot study

3.3.1 Research questions

The pilot study addressed the following research questions**:**

1. What counts as argument in a multilingual classroom?

2. How do migrants to the UK construct arguments in a multilingual classroom?

3. How do they position themselves in such arguments?

4. How are they positioned in such arguments?

5. How do teachers position themselves in relation to the teaching and learning of argument?

6. Do teachers and migrants learn how to argue a case?

3.3.2 Access and recruitment of participants

In this section, I describe how I gained access to the research site and recruited the participants for the pilot study.[5]A brief biography of all the participants recruited for the pilot study is provided in Appendix 5.

The problem of gaining access to suitable research sites is a major one that confronts all ethnographers (see Feldman et al., 2003). Situating my research in the Further Education College where I worked part-time as a teacher and teacher educator in Adult ESOL provided an opportunity to recruit students and teachers as research participants. It meant that I had knowledge of, and direct access to, the main institutional gatekeepers within the college. Thus, I was able to approach college management, through my line manager, and obtain permission to conduct the research on the undertaking that it did not impact negatively upon student learning and that the students gave their informed consent.[6] I was a known quantity within the institution, a trusted and experienced teacher with a good record of achievement. Moreover, at that point, I had already conducted exploratory research within my own classroom (Cooke and Roberts, 2007) and could point to the fact that conducting research in

---

[5] The name of the research site and the names of all the research participants, here and henceforth, are pseudonymised in order to protect their anonymity. This is discussed in Section 3.7 on research ethics.

[6] The student consent form for the pilot study is included in Appendix 6.

the classroom had not had an adverse impact upon student progress. In this way, then, the sampling rationale emerged from the professional settings I was working in at the time of the research.

The research was conducted at the Bluebell Centre, an adult community site of a Further Education college, Park Town, in the city of Leeming. The students in the pilot study were recruited from my own Adult ESOL classroom. The 6 research participants were all non-expert speakers of English who attended my general English class once a week for 2.5 hours. The class took place in the evening because all the students worked during the day. Thus, the sample here was a convenience one. The class was working at Level 1 and Level 2 of the *Adult ESOL Curriculum* (2001). This is the equivalent of Upper-Intermediate and Advanced Level. They were all working towards national ESOL examinations at the same levels. The class was comprised of young adult European migrants, 3 males and 3 females.

The sample of teachers recruited for the focus group was, again, a convenience one in that they were all colleagues of mine.[7] However, I selected them because they were all working with students at the same level of the *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum* (2001) as my students. The sample for the focus group consisted of 4 experienced Adult ESOL teachers. The rationale behind the selection was that focussing on this level of the curriculum would allow me to get a picture of the state of play with regard to argumentation at a particular level, both in terms of teacher positioning and materials, curricula etc. In this way it allowed for a degree of triangulation, as I studied the documents at this level of the curriculum too.

3.3.3 Research design

The research was designed in order to address the research questions detailed in Section 3.3.1. In the sections that follow, the rationale behind the methods of data collection will be offered. For now, I make some general comments about the overall purpose and rationale for the research design. The desire to uncover how students are positioned by curriculum and assessment documentation motivated the document analysis. The desire to collect data on the explicit ways in which teachers positioned themselves and their students provided a rationale for the focus group. Finally, by conducting exploratory teaching in my own classroom, I could explore the ways in which students positioned themselves and each other in argument, and explore the understandings they had of what it was. Exploratory teaching (Allwright and Bailey, 1991, p.197) is teaching which endeavours not only to try out new ideas but also to

---

[7] The teacher consent form for the pilot study is included in Appendix 7.

evaluate existing ones. This formed an element of my practice in the pilot study but will be discussed later in the main study, where it played a more important role in the research design.

3.3.4 Data collection and methodology

3.3.4.1 Overview

In this section, I describe the data collection methodology that I used when conducting the pilot study and offer a rationale as to why these methods of data collection were used. Importantly, I discuss how each of the methodological instruments addressed each of the research questions posed in the pilot study. I also offer a critical evaluation of the methodology, its strengths and weaknesses. The main data collection methods used were: classroom observation, focus group and document analysis. I also made post-hoc field notes after the observations. In what follows, I discuss and critically evaluate each of these in turn.

3.3.4.2 Document analysis

The purpose of the document analysis was to uncover some of the ways in which the policy and assessment documents within Adult ESOL conceptualise argument. In this way, it addressed Research Question 1: What counts as argument? More precisely, it aimed to uncover some of the ways in which students are positioned by curricula, classroom materials and tasks, and assessment. Thus, it also addressed Research Question 4: How are learners positioned in argument in the Adult ESOL classroom?

The documents selected were: The Adult ESOL Core Curriculum (2001), the Skills for Life learning materials (2003) and the tasks and assessment criteria for the Trinity College ESOL examinations. These documents were selected because they address issues around curriculum content, classroom pedagogy, materials and assessment at the same National Curriculum level as the learners in the classroom observation. Within these documents, the analysis focussed upon what they revealed at Level 1 and 2. This approach was taken in order to establish a tight all-round focus on argument at a particular level of the curriculum and in order to allow for some triangulation of data.

3.3.4.3 Student discussion

I begin with classroom observation. Collecting data through classroom observation would allow me to address Research Question 2 i.e. the question of how migrants to the UK construct argument in the multilingual classroom, but it would also allow me to address

Research Questions 3 and 4 i.e. the question of how migrants to the UK position themselves and how they are positioned in argument. The data collected could be subject to a discourse analysis. It could also reveal something about the explicit positioning taken up by the students on the topic of argument, as the students were required to discuss a series of polemical statements on the topic of argument itself, what it is, and how it is authorised.[8] In this sense, the data collected would address Research Question 1: What counts as argument? In methodological terms, the emic perspective of the participants would be captured, as well as the etic perspective of the research analyst. I collected this data on two voice recorders. Finally, it is necessary to state that I collected the data from my own multilingual classroom; thus I was in the role of participant observer.

3.3.4.4 Teacher focus group

I conducted a short focus group with the teachers. I structured the focus group using a list of prompts and questions.[9] Thus the research approach here is replicable. The overall purpose was to investigate explicit teacher stances in relation to argumentation work in the Adult ESOL classroom. In this way, it would provide a vehicle for addressing Research Question 5: How do teachers position themselves in relation to the teaching and learning of argument? Once again, the goal was to obtain an emic perspective.

However, despite the structured nature of this approach, the focus group format was chosen to allow the teachers to discuss their stances and perspectives on argument. The strength of the focus group lies in its ability to move beyond the limitations of its structure and to allow for discussion. Newby (2010, p.350) observes that: 'discussion should flow to allow issues and perspectives to emerge and be discussed.' This discussion would allow for the exploration of these issues and perspectives. The prompts and questions were not to be applied rigidly and the over-riding concern was to allow the teachers freedom to develop and discuss their ideas as they saw fit. In this way the focus group would provide preliminary data about what teachers thought and felt about argumentation and also what kinds of practices they engaged in.

---

[8] These statements are to be found in Appendix 8 and serve to make the research replicable.
[9] These prompts and questions are to be found in Appendix 9 and serve to make the research replicable.

3.3.5 Data analysis

3.3.5.1 Document analysis

The *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum* (2001) does not use the term 'argumentation' at all. Whilst this, perhaps, is to be expected in that a technical term like this might not figure in syllabi or curricula, the preference for the term 'argument' is revealing in that it conceptualises argument in terms of static product. So, for example, the Level 2 competences identify the need to 'support opinions and arguments with evidence.' There is little on the elaboration and establishment of a point of view, in interaction with others or, indeed, about what constitutes evidence in support of an argument, although evidence is associated with the giving of reasons and examples. Argument is thus conceptualised as an abstract individual competence or set of discrete skills. There is no connection made with the imagination or with identities, either individual or collective. The conceptualization is monologic in nature and no connection is made with the narrative mode either, the two modes being conceptualized discretely. In this way, the findings here mirror the observations Andrews makes about the ways in which argument is conceptualised in the mainstream secondary *English National Curriculum* (2000).

Moreover, the emphasis is on effective discussion skills, emphasising the production of consensus. Thus, for example, at Level 1 students are expected to engage in discussion to 'produce a shared understanding about different topics.' The focus is on the management of disagreement when it arises.

This emphasis on consensus is also evident in terminal assessment. Thus, for example, in the Trinity College Speaking and Listening examinations at Level 2 in 2009, one of the three tasks required the students to resolve a problem by reaching a consensus. The topics are prescribed by the examiners and are generally of a personal, rather than a political, nature. In the second task, framed as a 'discussion', the topics for debate are also prescribed, and the students are given the opportunity to debate more general issues, such as the threat to the environment, or space exploration.

What, then, of these topics? The *Skills for Life learning materials* (2003) do introduce potentially controversial topics (e.g. male and female roles, Genetically-Modified food) as part of the Level 2 materials. However, generally speaking, the topics are both functional and largely uncontroversial, with an emphasis on the skills necessary to operate effectively in the

workplace. This avoidance of controversial topics is something attested to more generally in the global context of ELT (Gray, 2000).

There is also a unit on citizenship, where the students are invited to consider the rights and responsibilities of citizenship and where they learn about the operation of both local and national democracy. The guidance notes reveal a level of explicit policy positioning, exhorting teachers to: "Explain that the notion of rights linked to responsibilities is a key part of government policy, in large part due to the perception of the growth of a 'rights without responsibilities' culture" (Teacher Notes Unit 5, p. 60). Here, the teacher is expected to authorise the government's position in placing the emphasis on the 'responsibilities' that migrants have as citizens rather than their rights. The teacher, in other words, is expected to ventriloquize (Bakhtin, 1981) the policy position of the government.

In the Level 1 examination task, narrative is conceptualised in the traditional Labovian way (see Labov, 1972). The task to describe a memorable event in the past is canonically autobiographical, as is the conceptualization of narrative as something that occurs to one person in the past on one occasion. This Aristotelean unity of time and place leads to a focus on the accurate linking of rigidly-sequential statements in the past tense and reflects Labov's (1972) influential conceptualization of narrative. This is a monological view of narrative and sits uncomfortably with the complexity and variability of the real-life narratives heard in the course of debate in both the pilot and the main study. However, it has to be acknowledged that this is perhaps to be expected in the context of an assessment document, where some degree of simplification is inevitable.

3.3.5.2 Student discussion

In this section, I report on the student discussion, illustrating key points with two extracts from the discussion[10]. In the extracts presented below, the students are discussing the role of reason and emotion in the authorisation of argument. In what follows, I analyse the ways in which argument is constructed by the students.

Extract 1

1	Natasha	(reading from the definition sheet) argument should be based on reasons (.) yeah (.) agree with you (.) because if there is some reasons then argument happens

---

[10] The transcription conventions used are to be found in Appendix 10. The rationale behind transcription is discussed in Section 3.5.4.4.

2	Miroslav	well actually]
3	Artur	of course yeah (.) but sometimes you don't like]
4	Miroslav	well actually sometimes you don't need a reason sometimes]
5	Artur	yeah if you don't like someone you want to argue with him or her]
6	Natasha	it it it depends on the personality of people
7	Artur	yeah
8	Natasha	like with my personality (.) if you don't like me
9	Artur	I didn't say that
10	Natasha	nooo buuuutt (high-pitch) come on (.)
11	Artur	ok
12	Natasha	I'm not telling you that you don't like me but just just like for example
13	Artur	for example

(Pilot study: Martin's class, 13/5/09).

Extract 2

1	Natasha	argument involves emotions as well as reasons (.) I don't understand this
2	Miroslav	argument involves emotions as well as reasons]
3	Artur	I understand]
4	Natasha	how comes
5	Artur	it means involves emotion
6	Miroslav	yes
7	Artur	argument is kind of little talk but on a high level right (indecipherable sound mimicking people arguing) so (.) it means yeah when you put some emotion on your side when you argue right (.) that's what I am saying now (.) I'm moving my hands now
8	Miroslav	yes (.) calculating when you are doing an argument maybe you are angry about this point

(Pilot Study: Martin's class, 13/5/09).

Before conducting the analysis, it is important to note that the content of the extracts is interesting for what it reveals. Firstly, there is some insight into the role of emotion in argumentation. This includes the fruitful connection between gesture and the emotional intensity of argument made by Artur. Secondly, the extract also reveals both agreement and disagreement and a degree of clarification and development as the speakers begin to articulate and develop their positions.

The analysis begins by examining the role of the formal discourse markers here. Thus we have Natasha using 'because' to offer a reason for her initial response to the statement about argument, even though the logic behind her reason seems more to do with the cause of argument rather than how it is justified. This connects to the authorisation of argumentation. Then, there is the use of 'well, actually' to signal the introduction of an opposing viewpoint, a different voice. Finally, there is the use of 'yes' and 'no' as conventional markers of agreement and disagreement and the use of 'it depends' to signal both causation and the complexity of argument.

The insights of conversational analysis can also illuminate the ways in which the argument is being constructed here. Thus, Miroslav and Artur overlap as they respond to Natasha's assertion. In this way turn-taking conventions are broken and they both compete for the conversational floor. This is a competitive situation. However, this is not simply a matter of competing voices here; the voices are also consensual as it becomes clear that they are both in disagreement with Natasha's view that argument should always be based on reason.

The role of prosody is also important. This is because it carries the emotional dimension of the voice and points to elements of the speaker's positioning in argumentation. This positioning is visible, for example, in the playfulness revealed by these extracts. This is a theme that emerged in this pilot study and was one which I returned to in the main study. Here, Natasha provides introduces a personal example to illustrate her point that argument depends on personality. There is also a hypothetical element to the argumentation here, as she uses 'if' to posit a situation where the other students did not like her. However, Artur takes her utterance literally, rather than hypothetically and contradicts her, observing that this is something he has never said. There is an element of deliberate misunderstanding here, a way of appropriating the words of others that emphasises the listener's role in meaning-making (Bakhtin, 1981). Natasha responds by exaggerating the phrase 'no but' and using the phrase 'come on.' This suggests, perhaps, that she is partly aware of, and partly frustrated by, his playfulness.

Later Artur emphasises and illustrates the point about the emotional dimension of argumentation by parodying or mimicking the tone of people arguing. This is not a matter of lexical selection. The words are deliberately nonsensical. The meaning is carried by the prosodic features of voice e.g. the pace and rhythm (which is speeded up) and the pitch (which is higher). These features help him to make his point about the emotionally-charged nature of argument. The exaggeration visible in the extracts is akin to the kind of stylization of voice discussed by Rampton (2003)[11].

In summary, insights based on a more conventional examination of discourse markers and on insights from conversation analysis can be used to illuminate the ways in which argumentation is constructed. In addition, it is also possible to see the seeds of a more dialogic analysis, and the value of a sociolinguistically-informed approach to discourse analysis, especially in relation to prosody.

3.3.5.3 Teacher focus group

There was evidence of differing conceptualizations of argument amongst the teachers sampled. Thus, one teacher reported that: "It would actually be quite useful to look at the art of argument" and conceptualized it in terms of the classic Hegelian dialectic, explicitly invoking the philosophical terms "thesis," "antithesis" and synthesis" and linking these to the development of a point of view.

In contrast, another teacher observed that: "I have a lot of negative connotations" so "I avoid argument or, at least, I avoid conflict." This conceptualization seems to have more to do with the conceptualization of argument in the popular sense of a 'row'. This teacher reported that they avoided presenting their views in class and avoided controversy for fear of damaging group cohesion. For her the classroom was akin to a 'safe haven' from the harshness of the world outside (Baynham et al., 2007).

What is interesting here is the way that elements of the teachers' habitus (Bourdieu, 1991) position them in relation to their classroom practices. So, the teacher who invoked Hegel was an academically-oriented one (indeed he taught academic English) and was clearly drawing upon his socio-cultural knowledge and background. The other teacher invokes negative experiences of argument or conflict in the classroom to authorize her avoidance of it.

The dialogic format of the teacher focus group raised some interesting questions about what counted as argument. For example, the following two questions were raised, questions that

---

[11] Stylized utterances are emboldened in the data transcripts.

were not part of the initial list of focus group question but which facilitate the exploration of the issue:

- Does discussion come under the heading of argument?
- Does it argumentation include negotiation?

This first question problematizes the distinction between argument and discussion. Andrews (1995, p. 63) views discussion as more consensual in nature and suggests that it might be viewed as a speech genre (Bakhtin, 1986) of the broader speech mode of argumentation. The two are connected by the dialogical principle that the voices in argumentation are perhaps both competing and consensual (Costello and Mitchell, 1995). The second question suggests the functional work that argumentation does in order to arrive at a consensus when the differences that might be said to characterize it emerge.

The dialogic format of the focus group also went beyond explicit statements of positioning; it allowed for the exploration of them. This will be illustrated in the extract that follows, where the teachers are discussing what they see as their role when argumentation emerges in the classroom:

1	James	there's another thing (.) is that I've got a point of view as well (.)
2	Sally	mm
3	James	now do I express that or do I try to remain strictly neutral (.) I tend not to remain strictly neutral (.) when we've talked about (.) for example (.) tony blair's iraq war I said no (.) I was against it but that's my (.) I always label it that's my point of view this is my point of view (.) you may disagree with it (.) that's fine (.) and that sets to some extent the parameters for the discussion that we might have about it (.) I said I don't think it's right you might think it's right and we go from there rather than pretending I have not got a point of view
4	Sally	mm
5	Judith	mmm (uncertainty)
6	James	which I find difficult to do and we go from there (.) I think it's more honest and more uhm productive to say that's my point of view and you may disagree with it but you've got to add that that I'm perfectly happy for you to disagree
7	Judith	yeah(.) you have to be clear about that
8	Sally	and it's a good class when it's gone on and they

		actually turn round and say Sally what do you think
9	James	yeah yeah yeah
10	Sally	and then you think (.) great (.) this is good
11	Judith	I only ever give my opinion if asked.
12	Sally	ah (.) exactly
13	James	only
14	Sally	exactly
15	Judith	yeah
16	James	no I'd go a step further than that I don't throw it in right at the beginning but on the other hand I will throw it in if it's something I feel strongly about
17	Judith	yeah (2) yeah (.) (uncertainty) I don't

(Pilot Study: teacher focus group, 2/7/09)

In this extract, the teachers begin to articulate and, crucially, explore their own stances when argument is unfolding in the classroom. Thus, James introduces the topic of what Baynham (2007) refers to as teacher 'disclosure' in the classroom. This is the degree to which the teacher reveals their opinions on a particular topic or issue. Here, he expresses his conviction that he, as a teacher, has both an opinion and the right to disclose it in argument, as long as he is clear that it is his opinion, saying: 'I tend not to remain strictly neutral' and 'I always label it that's my point of view.' He frames the decision teachers face (to disclose or not) then offers his view. Judith agrees and emphasises the need to be clear about the possibility of disagreement. Then Sally's contribution develops and deepens the discussion on disclosure when she observes that students often want to know what teachers think, identifying that as one of the ingredients of a good class.

In terms of topic, the one referred to by James is certainly controversial, evidence that some teachers do deal with them in the classroom. There was a general consensus that "religion and politics" were the two controversial topics most likely to generate the difference that characterizes argumentation and that they needed to be circumvented on occasion.

There is disagreement here too. Sally agrees with James's views on disclosure but Judith's 'mmm' is a more uncertain one and suggests she has a different view. She confirms this later in the extract by saying she only discloses her opinions when she is asked. All this is achieved with the minimum of intervention by me, in my role as co-ordinator of the focus

group. Here, again, elements of the teachers' personal and professional experiences might inform their classroom practices and James was more politically-oriented than Judith, who expressed a desire to avoid difference or conflict.

3.3.6 Evaluation of the pilot study

In what follows I evaluate the pilot study, offering a critique of the methodologies used and describing how it led me to refine and develop the research questions to be addressed.

3.3.6.1 Evaluation of the research instruments

In this section, I evaluate the data collection instruments I used in the pilot study. I will identify the strengths and weaknesses of these in the course of the critique. I do this with a view to foreshadowing the main study and also because part of the purpose of any pilot study is to trial data collection instruments, and to test the methodology itself.

I begin with the strengths of the research tools. The document analysis proved useful in establishing how both curricula and assessment conceptualised argument. It also established something of how a conceptualisation of argument is embodied in government produced materials in Adult ESOL. In this way, some of the ways in which students and teachers are positioned in the teaching and learning of argument have been uncovered.

The focus group format allowed me to mine a rich seam of data. Its dialogic format allowed me to capture the ways in which teachers positioned themselves in the teaching and learning of argument. The dialogic format allowed the participants to explore their stances and practices, and not simply to state what they were. This worked quite effectively and required the minimum amount of intervention.

I made post-hoc field notes in my role as teacher researcher and these were useful in recording observations about how the argument unfolded in the classroom, allowing me to begin to capture, for example, its multimodal dimension. However, their post-hoc nature inevitably meant that immediate impressions and observations were often, sadly but inevitably, difficult to capture.

Using voice-recorders to capture classroom interaction brought advantages. For example, it facilitated an analysis in which the prosodic qualities of voice (such as tone and volume) were important. However, as alluded to above, this method of data collection meant that it was not possible to conduct a multimodal analysis. The lesson learned here motivated my decision to video-record classroom interaction in the main study.

3.3.6.2 Evaluation of the research questions

I have explained how the pilot study helped me to trial the data collection instruments used in the main study. I now turn to the question of how the pilot study led me to refine the research questions that this thesis addresses. These will be presented in the next section of the thesis. However, a glance at the research questions to be addressed in the main study will reveal the fact the term 'argument' has been replaced by that of 'argumentation.' This is because both my review of the literature and the findings of the pilot study pushed me towards a more dialogic conceptualisation of my topic, one which foregrounded process rather than product.

This line of thinking also motivated another change. I reframed the question of "How do multilingual students construct arguments?" as: "How does argumentation emerge and unfold?" This too would allow for the more dialogic co-constructed dynamic characterisation of argumentation emerging. The metaphor of "construct" is rather static and structuralist in nature and, as the theoretical framework established in the literature review suggests, fails to account for the more dynamic, fluid and unpredictable characteristics of argumentation.

I decided to abandon the Research Question: 'What counts as argument?' The principal rationale for this decision was that the question had a vagueness about it that meant that it was necessary to be more explicit about the conceptualisation of argument I was operationalising in the thesis. Otherwise, argument could simply mean anything I wanted it to mean. Some preliminary conceptualisation on the researcher's part was necessary and this could then be refined in the light of the data. Hence, what I understand and operationalize as 'argument' or, now, 'argumentation,' is part of the introduction to this thesis. The subject is then returned to in the discussion. Furthermore, the ways in which argumentation is conceptualised can be treated as part of the student or teacher's explicit positioning.

Similarly, the research question: "Do teachers and migrants learn how to argue a case?" was abandoned, considered too large in scope for practical investigation. However, this would be part of the historical positioning of students and teachers (their habitus) and would be addressed in the research question: "How do teachers and learners position themselves, and how are they positioned in argumentation in the Adult ESOL classroom?"

The pilot study also generated a new research question: "What is the role of narrative in argumentation?" This, of course, as the literature review has discussed, is an emerging research focus in argumentation.

3.4 The main study

3.4.1 Research questions

1. How does argumentation emerge and unfold in the Adult ESOL classroom?
2. How is argumentation authorized in the Adult ESOL classroom?
3. How do teachers and learners position themselves and each other, and how are they positioned, in argumentation in the Adult ESOL classroom?
4. How do teachers and learners perform identities through argumentation in the Adult ESOL classroom?
5. What is the role of narrative in argumentation in the Adult ESOL classroom?

It is necessary to observe that these research questions might be taken to suggest a universality which is not intended. No attempt is made to generalise beyond the specific instances presented here. Neither is there any attempt to 'cherry-pick' instances that demonstrate an a priori hypothesis. There is no a priori hypothesis. This point will be discussed in the sections on validity and generalizability later in the chapter.

3.4.2 Access and recruitment of participants

Procedures around access and recruitment in the main study were similar to those described in the pilot study in Section 3.3.2. This is because the research site was the same and the research participants were either students, or, in the case of the teacher trainees, colleagues as well as students. Thus the sample, again, was a convenience one and access was secured by approaching my line manager to seek permission, conditional upon student consent, for me to conduct exploratory teaching in my own Adult ESOL classroom.

Additionally, this time, I also sought permission from another line manager to conduct exploratory teaching in my Adult ESOL teacher education classroom. Permission to approach the teacher trainees having been granted, I then explained the nature of my research into argumentation to them and said that I would like to incorporate some of it into their sessions. Beyond this, I explained I was seeking to recruit teachers to conduct exploratory research in their own classrooms. Indeed, after the final group session, 3 teacher trainees approached me and volunteered to take part in the final phase of the research.

As in the pilot study, I obtained the informed consent of the all the participants using the forms included in the Appendices. I designed different forms for the different participants,

respectively, the teachers, and the students at both higher and lower levels.[12] They all completed a consent form. Information about class profiles and a discussion of the biographies of the participating students in the main study is provided in Appendix 14, in the same way as it is for the pilot study.

3.4.3 Research design

I have already established the ways in which the research questions were shaped by my reading of the literature. Now I turn to the ways in which the research design was informed by a critical reading of both the literature on argumentation and, more generally, the research methods literature. The research tools used to collect the data are observation and interview. These will be described later when I will also explain how the data collection methods were used to address the research questions.

There is an interventionist dimension to the research design. Thus, I engage in exploratory teaching in my own classroom and then a sample of teachers are invited to do the same, following some initial teacher education work on the theory and practice of argumentation.

There is a tradition of exploratory teaching in the domain of language education and an overview is to be found in Burns (2005). More specifically, in educational research there have been a number of projects which have aimed to identify existing pedagogical practices around argumentation and to devise approaches, strategies and materials to evaluate and improve these practices. Thus, Andrews et al., (1993) reported on exploratory teaching aimed at improving argument in primary and secondary schools. Similarly, Mitchell and Riddle (2000) reported on exploratory teaching in argument in higher education.

Moving closer to the research context of the present thesis, Roberts et al., (2007) reported on exploratory teaching conducted in the Adult ESOL classroom. This project focussed upon ways to develop extended turns of talk. It drew upon the principles of exploratory teaching practice described in Allwright and Bailey (1991, p. 197). These principles centred on teacher investigating elements of their existing practices and trying out new ones, the aim being to discover what works and why.

I now describe the different phases in the research, beginning with my exploratory teaching.

---

[12] These forms are included in the Appendices 11, 12 and 13 respectively. The ethical issues around the issue of recruitment are discussed in Section 3.7.

3.4.3.1 My exploratory teaching

The first phase of the research consisted of exploratory teaching in my teacher and teacher education classrooms. It should be noted that, although this phase came at the outset of the main study, it continued throughout the period of the main study, that is, from September 2009 until July 2010.

3.4.3.1.1 Phase 1: Exploratory teaching: My Adult ESOL classroom

The initial data collection phase began in October 2009, once my students had had the opportunity to gel as a group. This also gave me the time to establish a good working relationship with them. The aim of this phase was twofold: pedagogically, I wanted to help the students to develop their argumentation skills and prepare for their upcoming assessment. I also wanted to generate data which could be used to contribute to a research base in the field of argumentation. To do this, I consciously introduced activities around argumentation into my Adult ESOL classroom. This is the interventionist dimension of the research design. The nature of the teaching activities and topics, along with information about their dates and duration, together with a rationale for their inclusion, is set out in Table 1 below:

Topic/Activity	Date/ Duration	Rationale for inclusion	Number of Students
Students debate a series of polemical statements on controversial issues, each presenting on one of their choice[13].	14/10/09 2.5 hours.	This activity generated a lot of debate in my exploratory teaching in Roberts et al., (2007).	6
A discussion of "If you could do one thing to make the world a better place, what would it be and why?[14]	18/11/09 2.5 hours.	This allowed me to prepare students for terminal examination (Trinity College, Speaking and Listening task, Level 2).	5

---

[13] See Appendix 15 for list of statements.
[14] See Appendix 16 for details.

A problem-solving activity. Students bring their own dilemmas/ problems to discussion.	9/12/09 2.5 hours.	(Trinity College, Speaking & Listening task, Level 2, and a major strand of contemporary argumentation work in education e.g. Coffin and O'Halloran, 2008).	3

Table 1: Description of topics and activities in my Adult ESOL classroom

Data from this phase of exploratory teaching forms part of the analysis in Chapters 4 and 6 of the thesis.

3.4.3.1.2 Phase 2: Exploratory teaching: My teacher education classroom

Having introduced argumentation work into my own Adult ESOL classroom, I then wanted to introduce it into the teacher education classroom, making it part of teacher development work. Thus, the aim of this phase of the research was to engage teacher-trainees in critical reflection, about the nature of argumentation itself and its pedagogy. The teacher development phase was undertaken over 3 teacher education sessions. The research site was my own teacher education classroom and permission was obtained through the use of informed consent[15].

In designing these sessions, I was guided by the following general questions:

1. What do you understand by the concept of 'argument or 'argumentation'?
2. How do you feel about it?
3. What do you do with it in the classroom?

The first question was designed to elicit their conceptualisations of argument or argumentation. This I take to be an aspect of their positioning in argumentation, which, as the literature review has revealed, is a complex concept. The rationale behind this is two-fold: ethnography is, as we have observed, interested in the emic perspective of the participants and intervention work in classrooms is predicated to a degree upon some shared understanding of the concept of argument or argumentation (Mitchell, 2000).

Then I asked them to think about their existing pedagogical practices around argumentation i.e. how they worked with argumentation in the Adult ESOL classroom. Key questions here included: What activities do you do that aim to develop student argumentation skills? Would

---

[15] The form is to be found in Appendix 11.

you introduce controversial issues in your classroom? Would you disclose your opinions in argumentation? Would you become involved in argumentation when it emerged?

This was all done through small group discussion, which allowed them to explore their conceptualisations and practices. The developmental content of the session took the form of activities that were informed by current research into argumentation, including my own. These were not meant to be exhaustive but offered as a sample of the kinds of research-led teaching work current at the time. The aim here was to provide a stimulus for the next phase of the research in that it might provide ideas for their own exploratory teaching. The activities undertaken are listed in Table 2 overleaf, together with a rationale for their inclusion.[16]

Topic and Activity	Date/ Duration	Rationale for inclusion	Students
Teachers explored a transcript of student argumentation using a series of questions to help them reflect upon the ways in which the argumentation was emerging and being authorised (Hepworth, in Cooke and Roberts, 2007).	12/3/10 45min	To get teachers to 'notice' the ways in which argumentation was unfolding and being authorised. To model what they might do with students.	19
Teachers had to improvise and mime a complaint situation in which argumentation was unfolding. The other teachers used the multimodal cues to reconstruct the situation and the argumentation unfolding.	22/4/10 45min	To focus upon the multimodal dimensions of argumentation (Goodwin, 2000).	18
Teachers explored the ways in which short narratives functioned in and as argumentation in a job interview (see Roberts and Campbell, 2007).	7/6/10 45 min	To focus upon the role of narrative in argumentation.	19

Table 2: Description of topics and activities in my teacher education classroom

3.4.3.2 Phase 3: Teacher observation

In this phase, I conducted non-participant observation in the classes of the 3 of the teachers in my teacher education class. The expectation was that each teacher would conduct exploratory teaching in the area of argumentation. The ideas generated and discussed in the teacher

---

[16] Further details are provided in Appendix 17.

development sessions, or the pedagogical activities undertaken, might provide a starting point or they might simply try out their own ideas. Two visits were made to each class. All the classes observed were voice and video-recorded.

Table 3 below summarises the main pedagogical activities undertaken:

Teacher	Topic and Activity	Date/Duration	Number of students
Yelena	Students worked on the function of complaining. They listened to a recording of an authentic complaint, discussed their own history of making complaints, and role-played a complaint from a tenant to a housing officer.	10/6 and 17/6 2 x 2.5 hours	5
Sandra	Students watched a You-Tube video of a stylized domestic argument, reconstructing it using multimodal cues. They then went on to role-play complaints, based on their own experiences, in order to practice the art of effective complaining.	17/5 and 14/6 2 x 2.5 hours	8
Leila	Students worked on preparing persuasive narratives that might be used as evidence in a dialogical argumentation sequence.	9/6 and 16/6 2 x 2.5 hours	6

Table 3: Description of topics and activities in observed classrooms

Data from Yelena's class forms the focus of the analysis for much of Chapter 5.

3.4.4 Data collection

In this section, I describe the data collection methods used and explain how the data collected was used to address the research questions. I also discuss the role of the researcher in the data collection process. The principal data collection methods used in the main study, observation and interview, will be considered in turn.

3.4.4.1 Observation

This section opens with some general comments about observation within the context of ethnographic work. Observation is a major research tool in ethnography. It is used to record the lived stuff of social experience and enables the researcher to document the irreducibility, the complexity of experience (Blommaert, 2007). In this sense, observation is open and unfocussed. However, ethnographers also acknowledge a tension between this and the fact that the observer comes to the field with preconceptions, orienting ideas, and research questions. Put another way:

we never start from a completely clean slate and will always bring ourselves into what we observe while simultaneously retaining an open orientation to what we see.

Creese et al., (2015, p.38).

This partiality is to be acknowledged and worked into ethnographic accounts of experience. The ethnographer needs to be self-aware, and to be reflexive, in order to work with what Geertz (1988, p. 144) refers to as this 'un-get-roundable fact'.

3.4.4.1.1 Observation and the research questions

Classroom observation is a major research tool. I used voice recorders and a digital camera to capture the ways in which argumentation emerged and unfolded in the Adult ESOL classroom. I also took detailed field notes. The overall aim and rationale here was to generate the data to provide a "thick description" (Geertz, 1973) of classroom argumentation, one which would allow me to address all of the research questions in the main study. The discourse analysis would yield a detailed picture of the ways in which argumentation emerges and unfolds in the classroom (Research Question 1). This discourse analysis, though principally linguistically-informed in nature, would also be multimodal, thanks to the use of a digital camera as well as digital voice recorders. It would also allow me to capture the ways in which students authorized argumentation (Research Question 2). This would be revealed through an analysis of discourse markers and also through the ways in which the students appropriated the voices of others. Observational data would also allow me to address the question of how students and teachers position themselves and each other in the unfolding of argumentation (Research Question 3). It would also be possible to address the ways in which they performed identities through argumentative discourse (Research Question 4). Finally, the role that narratives play in argumentation would also be susceptible to analysis (Research Question 5).

3.4.4.1.2 Observation and the role of the researcher

One of the strengths of the research design is that it allows me to take up different roles in observation. Thus, there are times when I was in the role of participant observer and am actively involved in the argumentation emerging in my own classroom. On the other hand, there are times where I was a non-participant observer and was able to observe the argumentation emerging in the classrooms of others from a more detached standpoint. That is, I took up different observational roles. The underpinning notion here was that of a research continuum reflecting differing degrees of researcher participation.

Participant observation

Labov (1972), through his notion of the Observer's Paradox, suggests that the effects of the observer on the observed may diminish over time. When collecting data in role as a participant observer it is possible to suggest that such effects were in operation. I was the class teacher (or teacher trainer) and the observed classes, in one sense, would be classes too, in just the same way as all the others they had had with me up until that point. There would be no unfamiliar researcher in the classroom.

Like the rest of the data collection process, the taking of field-notes is a positioned activity, as Hammersley and Atkinson (2007, p. 141) put it:

> Whether field-notes can be written at all, how, and covering what issues, depends upon the nature of the research, the setting(s) in which the fieldwork occurs and the role (s) taken on by the ethnographer.

In my role as teacher-researcher in my own classroom, I was only able to take field-notes post-hoc, although there were opportunities to record a few observations during lesson breaks, or periods of classroom activity where the students were working independently. Otherwise, these notes were taken immediately after each class to maximise the potential for accurate recall. However, the post-hoc nature of the field notes clearly involves a loss, as the moment of interaction they are meant to record has gone. Similarly, I was not able to observe the classroom with anything other than a fixed camera position when I was a participant observer.

Non-participant observation

In my role as a non-participant observer, I was able to take field notes in a more measured way, at the time of the observed action and thus to maximise accuracy of recall. Most of the time, I opted for leaving the camera in the fixed position, thus allowing me time to make detailed notes, exploiting the potential of my role as a non-participant observer. Although I opted to fix the camera, there were times, especially if I felt there was a potential "rich point" (Agar, 1995, p. 587) in terms of an ethnographic moment, where I operated the camera manually, following the events as they emerged and unfolded. There is a trade-off here between the use of audio-visual recording and the making of field-notes.

3.4.4.1.3 Data collection instruments

Audio-visual recordings

The observational data was collected using voice-recorders and a digital video camera. I deal with each in turn. The voice recordings were made using a number of portable Olympus voice-recorders, which were unobtrusive and had built-in microphones. The size and portability of these recorders made them ideal for use in the classroom. I used 3 voice-recorders during the research process. In effect, I made sure that there was a voice recorder on each of the tables where group work was happening in the classroom. The classes I observed were all quite small in number, ranging from 5-15 students so the technology was perfect for capturing what was in effect small group interaction. Whole-class interaction was also captured (albeit less effectively) on each individual recording. I tested each of these immediately before the recording process began and checked playback immediately after it had ceased. In this way, I ensured their effectiveness.

A standard digital video-camera was used to collect audio-visual data. The rationale behind this was the opportunity it provided for collecting non-verbal data in addition to verbal data on argumentation. I video-recorded each of the 6 classes in the non-participant observation phase. Only 1 of my classes was video-recorded, as I wanted to minimise the intrusiveness of the camera. This was because one of my students was uncomfortable with the presence of the video camera. I discuss this in more detail in the section on ethics later in this chapter.

The ways in which the camera is to be used is also important. If it is used in a fixed position there are, as Blommaert and Jie note (2010), "blind spots", however wide-angled the lens, especially if, as was the case in my research, only one camera was used. Thus, not everything in the class was captured. Choosing where to position a fixed camera is important and, again, there are trade-offs. In most cases, I decided to position the camera so as to capture small group interaction. In addition to this, having the camera in a fixed position allowed me to make detailed field notes and it is to this that I now turn.

Field Notes

Field notes are a major source of primary data. They can be used to document the voices of the research participants and the voice of the researcher. Anyone reading should 'immediately get a sense of the people involved and the social context in which the activity takes place' (Creese, 2015, p. 69). They provide part of what coheres to become a 'thick description' (Geertz, 1973) of the research context. In short, they are an essential part of the

more holistic picture ethnographic study strives to achieve and they should 'conjure up for the reader the lived-stuff of the social environment' (Creese, 2015, p. 69).

I made field notes throughout the main study, recording my reflections on both the classroom observations and the interviews. These field notes were handwritten into research notebooks, which I kept by my side throughout the research. I also recorded my ongoing reflections on the research process in these notebooks. I wrote up these notes later, in order to maximise recall, ensure legibility and add detail. It should be acknowledged, though, that returning to field notes at a later date is to adopt a different stance in relation to one's research data. Emerson et al., (1995, p. 142) observe that:

> the notes, and the persons and events they recount, become textual objects (although linked to personal memories and intuitions) to be considered and examined with a series of analytic and presentational possibilities in mind.

Field notes, as Blommaert (2010, p.37) observes, tell you not just about what you saw but about *how* you saw it. Like transcription, as we will see, they involve a process of interpretation. They are an essential part of the ethnographer's repertoire. They can help you to fill-in any gaps or blind-spots that may become apparent during the fieldwork, contributing to a "thick description" (Geertz, 1973) of the classroom and emergent reflections upon it.

They are also a part of the research archive, as ideas about what is important will evolve as the research progresses. Blommaert and Jie (2010, p. 37) observe that they often become more focussed as research progresses. This did happen at certain points. For example, I began to focus increasingly on the role of language play in argumentation and on the role of gestures and facial expressions in its performative unfolding. This allowed me to capture research data that might otherwise have been lost by raising my awareness of it. This evolutionary process is valuable as it minimises the process of inference needed and makes it easier to begin to reconstruct the events witnessed (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007, p.145).

However, the limitations of field-notes, particularly those written after the event, should be recognised. They are inevitably partial in that they only provide a record of what gets written down. This, of course, reflects the researcher's preoccupation so they inevitably constitute an act of interpretation, not a factual record of classroom interaction, if ever such an aim were realisable.

3.4.4.2 Interviews

In this section, I discuss the interviews, another major data collection instrument used in the research. We have seen that there are different kinds of observations; in the same way there are different kinds of interviews. In this section, I discuss the interviews as a data collection tool, explaining how they were used to generate data that would allow me to address the research questions.

I have already observed that part of the distinctiveness of the ethnographic approach rests in a concern with the emic perspectives of those participating in the research. Hammersley and Atkinson (2007, p. 97) observe that participant accounts can be used by ethnographers to reveal things about the nature of the phenomena to which they refer, in this case argumentation, and also for what they tell us about the perspectives of the participants.

Interviews are often held to be either formal or informal in nature and formal interviews are held to be more or less structured (Richards, 2003). The interviews I conducted can best be characterised as formal and semi-structured in nature and approach. In a semi-structured interview, 'a set of questions is designed which acts as a guide for the researcher' (Creese et al., 2015, p. 30).

Research questions are often designed with the aim of orienting discussion in the direction of certain topics. For this reason, researchers prepare a list of topics for discussion because topics, as well as questions, can be useful when structuring interviews (see Blommaert, 2006; Labov, 1972). Not everything that can be found out can be found out through asking, as Hymes (1996) asserted. Therefore, a direct question may not always be the right strategic move.

Using a mixture of direct questions, topics and prompts as complementary data collection strategies[17], I aimed to give the respondents (whether student or teacher) the opportunity to explore general issues around argumentation and to develop a point of view.

The interviews were conceptualised as co-constructed and dialogic conversations, and were structured around certain questions and topics. Loosely-structured by certain questions or prompts, the interviewer or interviewee is free to move off-topic or question and explore emerging issues (Richards, 2003). There is, in other words, always an unpredictable

---

[17] The full list of interview questions and prompts for students and teachers is set out in Appendices 18 and 19 respectively.

dimension to interviewing in this tradition. As the interviewer, I was very much part of the interview process and, again, as with observation, it is important to be reflexive about this. However, it would be naïve to assume that the interviewer-interviewee relationship is an equal one. I was in all cases the teacher of the participants and therefore our relationship was asymmetrical.

Interview and the research questions

The interviews allowed me to generate the data in order to begin to address the research questions. For example, I asked both the students and the teachers "What counts as argumentation?" This was designed to capture the ways in which they reported their understanding of the term. I take the emic perspectives revealed here to be part of their explicit stance or positioning on the topic. However, this was not simply a matter of what they thought about it; it might also include an element of what they felt about argument or argumentation as a practice. In other words, it was emotional as well as cognitive.

I have already observed that argumentation is a difficult term to define and the rationale here was to explore the ways in which those who participate in it understand it. I deliberately used the term 'argument' as well as 'argumentation' in the interviews in order to keep the aperture of the analytical lens wide. This acknowledges the fact that it might not be helpful to ask a student what they understand by a relatively specialist or technical term such as argumentation. This decision was also motivated by the desire to get an emic perspective on what constitutes the more demotic term, in order to build connections between the two. This is one of Andrews's (1995) stated aims in his book-length treatment on the pedagogy of 'argument'.

This positioning in relation to argumentation is also historical in nature and I also wanted to use the interviews to explore some of the ways in which both the students and the teachers were positioned by elements of their life experience. What kinds of resources did they bring along to argumentation? I generated this data by focussing on key phases of their life experience, such as their family background or, crucially, their educational experience. This was partly motivated by a desire to connect with the emerging theme of identities in relation to argumentation. Part of identity is what the student or teacher brings along to argumentation, not just what they 'bring about' through it (Baynham, 2012).

Thus, in order to generate this data, part of the interview would be a life history one. This form of interviewing has its roots in anthropology and discussions of life histories (e.g. Du

Boulay and Williams, in Ellen, 1983) characterise them in terms of a/ the amount of data presented in the participant's own words and b/ by the focus on longer-term individual experience.

However, when presenting elements of their life history the participants are not simply drawing upon factual recall; rather they are presenting an argument. In this way, the life history element within the interview generated data that allowed me to address the role of narrative in argumentation (Research Question 5). This is something that Blommaert observes when he discusses the value of narratives, more specifically anecdotes, in illustrating and supporting an argumentative point in interviews. In the other part of the student interview I worked with a mix of questions and prompts.

In addition to these questions, I used the student interviews to begin to explore particular aspects of the way I had observed them arguing in my classroom. These were particular to each individual student and were based upon my knowledge of the student and the ways in which they had engaged in argumentation during the year. So, for example, I asked a particularly quiet student why she was often reluctant to engage in debate and discussion in the classroom. I asked a more demonstrative student about why she obviously relished debating issues and why she was often a very animated debater, in terms of her intonation patterns and her multimodal behaviour.

Finally, it is necessary to note that, because my research participants were my own students, I also had the opportunity to ask questions in the context of everyday classroom activities. In this case, as Hammersley (2007, p. 108) observes, the line between interviewing and participant observation blurs. This allowed me to mine a much richer seam of data, and also to ask questions at the time of occurrence, in order to maximise recall. I was also able to do this with one of the teachers, when accepting a lift back to my house after her class. The interview here was much more informal in nature.

It is easier to interview people with whom one has already established a rapport through participant observation, as Hammersley (2007, p. 109) suggests. This can serve to reduce anxiety and to build trust between interviewer and interviewee. This was the case for me as all of my research informants were also my students.

The data collection methods just described are to be seen as complementary. Thus, the interviews offer evidence of participant understandings, in contrast to the researcher's

perspective that comes through field notes. These kinds of evidence can be used to support interpretations of other data sets e.g. recordings of interactions.

In the next section, I describe the ways in which I handled and analysed the data collected.

3.4.5 Data analysis

3.4.5.1 Data preparation: Storage and retrieval

This section discusses the ways in which I handled the data collected in this research. First, there is storage. Blommaert and Jie (2010) identify the importance of effective cataloguing:

> You of course keep a detailed catalogue of your recordings. You can do this in your field-notes or in a separate document. In that catalogue, you give every recording an "identity tag": a number or code, along with the date, time, place of recording, the participants, and either a brief description of the contents or a number of key words that distinguish that particular recording.

(Blommaert and Jie, 2010, pp. 36-7).

I kept a catalogue in a separate file, for ease of access and this provided a summary and archive of the research process. It was invaluable throughout the research process in that it facilitated access to relevant data for the purposes of analysis. I also kept a record in my research notebooks.

Following the general guidelines outlined in the quotation above, each digitally-stored file was labelled with the date and site of the recording with the names of the key participants. Key words or phrases indicated the content of the file. Thus, for example, I had titles such as *Visual Argumentation* or *Debating Controversial Issues.* For ethical reasons, (to be discussed later) the names of the teachers of the observed classes or the interviewees were anonymised. Pseudonyms were used and a record kept.

Voice-recorded and audio-visual data was stored separately and clearly-labelled for ease of reference. Digital data was downloaded from the video and voice-recorders and saved in a number of places. Back-up copies were made. Transcriptions were stored in a different folder and so on. In this way, I established and developed a research archive (Blommaert and Jie, 2010) to which I would have easy and immediate access. This is designed to facilitate data analysis and it is to this that I now turn.

3.4.5.2 Data preparation: Telling cases

As a practical strategy for handling large amounts of data, and as a way of beginning the analysis, I adopt a strategy recommended in Blommaert and Jie (2010). They discuss the need to prepare data carefully before analysis to help decide which data to transcribe. With this in mind, So, I watched and/or listened to all the classroom recordings and interviews, and made notes on the contents. This gave me a feel for the whole data set and also provided a context for the identification of key episodes that might repay further, more detailed investigation. Moreover, as I explain in the next section, what gets included can be informed by a sense of what gets left out of the final analysis.

This was not a linear process but, rather, was complex and iterative. Thus, I reread my field notes, made further notes and after a second as a result of a viewing and/or listening, and kept the research questions in mind. So, for example, I focussed on identifying the ways in which argumentation was emerging and unfolding and the ways in which the participants positioned themselves and others in this. When I identified a particular episode, I noted the time-point on the recording to facilitate retrieval later.

How, then, were interesting episodes identified? The focus was on the identification of 'telling' and not 'typical' cases. A 'telling case' is described as one 'in which the particular circumstances surrounding a case, serve to make previously obscure theoretical relationships suddenly apparent' (Mitchell, in Ellen, 1984, p. 239). A good case study allows the analyst to 'establish theoretically valid connections between events and phenomena which previously were ineluctable' (ibid). The emphasis is upon analytical, not statistical inference. This is consonant with ethnography's focus on theory development. Another way of explaining this is to refer to what Agar (1995) call 'rich points.' These are moments of interaction which are distinctive in some way. These rich points can become a focal point for analysis.

I now explain, through example, how the concept of a telling case applies to my analytical framework. One such telling case occurred as I was setting up my equipment at the beginning of one of my observations. The students were drifting in and it was a typical soft start to an ESOL class. The teacher was present but the class itself had not yet begun. The students began to discuss the new fee regime imposed by the college. The teacher became involved in the discussion. The argumentation that subsequently unfolded was 'naturally-occurring' and not something artificially set up by the class teacher or me as a researcher. To begin with, this argument, for argument it was, emerged contingently and unpredictably and

unfolded both verbally and multimodally, in terms of gesture and facial expression. Moreover, it was authorized by emotion as well as reason. The teacher was clearly uncomfortably positioned, caught between her professional identities as class teacher and college employee and her identities as a friend of the students and a migrant herself.

Drawing upon theoretical frameworks can also be helpful in the initial stages of analysis, as Copland et al., (2015) observe. Bakhtin's (1981) concept of heteroglossia and Goffman's (1981) concept of participation frameworks could help me explain the complexity of the speaking and identity positions she took up. Furthermore, there was clearly a struggle going on, a struggle to be heard, a struggle for audibility (Bourdieu, 1977). This connected to issues of power. Finally, there were clear issues around politeness as she knew the students well and clearly enjoyed their respect. Here, I drew upon Goffman's (1967) concept of face, later developed by Brown and Levinson (1987).

In short, I realised that this particular stretch of talk helped me to answer many of my research questions i.e. How does argumentation unfold? How is it authorised? How do students and teachers position themselves and how are they positioned in its unfolding? In view of all this, I decided to transcribe the episode in detail and this revealed further insights, which are discussed at length in Chapter 4.2.1. In this way, it became the rich point that framed the rest of the analysis.

3.4.5.3 Rationale behind the selection of data in the main study

In this section, I would like to continue the discussion by making a few observations about the underpinning rationale for the inclusion of the data selected here and to explain how what got left out informed what was included. The telling case or rich point I have just discussed formed the first part of the analysis presented in Chapter 4. In the second part of the chapter, I included argumentation that unfolded as part of more planned pedagogical work. This too centred on the debating of controversial issues but unfolded in a different classroom. It was chosen because it shows the teacher taking up a different stance in argumentation, deliberately opening up the space for it to emerge and using it as a pedagogical tool.

In the second chapter, I wanted to take up and explore the theme of language play and argumentation, a theme that had emerged very clearly from the analysis. This was one that allowed me to explore my interest in the spontaneous, emergent and emotional dimension of argumentation because, as Cook (2000) observes, play is strongly connected to the emotions, to the imagination and to spontaneity. Furthermore, the dialogic approach taken to

argumentation in this thesis provided a powerful framework within which play and creativity in the form of parody, irony, for example, could be analysed (Maybin and Swann, 2007).

Finally, the role of narrative in (and indeed as) argumentation emerged as a strong one, and I devoted a chapter to it as narratives were all-pervasive in the data I collected. Furthermore, the role of narratives within argumentation has been identified as an area in need of research (Baynham, 2011a).

So, what of what got left out? How did this inform what was included? Rampton et al., (2004) following Hymes (1996) state that one of the characteristics of ethnography is that it should always be aware of what gets left out of the final analysis. Well, there was evidence of small stories being used as exempla in the service of argumentative points in the research interviews, further illustrating and supporting one of the main threads of my analysis in Chapter 6 of the thesis, where the focus is on narratives emerging in debate. Moreover, such narratives were also a feature of the debate that emerged in the teacher education classroom. Similarly, there were many more examples of language play and creativity in argumentation than I could ever hope to include.

These observations will be returned to in the final chapter, where the limitations of the study and the possible directions for future research will be discussed. In the final analysis, it is reasonable that not everything can be included and my interest in the ways in which argumentation unfolded in the multilingual classroom meant that there was little scope to include data collected in the more monologic context of the research interview. However, the data collected here did inform my analytic judgements in ways that I have discussed elsewhere, in upcoming section on validity for example.

3.4.5.4 Data transcription[18]

Transcription is the beginning of analysis and it is important to acknowledge that it is an interested process. The making of a transcript involves interpreting the event it seeks to record. It is as Ochs (1979) observes: "transcription is a selective process reflecting theoretical goals and definitions." The decisions I made about how much to transcribe, and how to transcribe it, were guided by a range of factors: the research questions to be addressed, my working conceptualisation of argumentation, the themes and concerns

---

[18] The transcription conventions used are set out in Appendix 10.

emerging from the data. These, of course, had in turn been informed by my reading of the literature and the pilot study.

Therefore, I begin by making some general remarks about the ways I approached it. This is because transcription is a time-consuming business. As Blommaert and Jie (2010, p. 68) observe: "Ten hours of recording would easily consume one hundred hours of transcribing; we don't always consider that a wise investment." In total, I collected over 40 hours of recordings. This clearly raises questions such as: How much do I need to transcribe and in how much detail do I transcribe it?

I decided to transcribe all the interview data and to select key episodes from the observational data. Overall, this meant that, according to Blommaert and Jie's rule of thumb, I spent about 200 hours transcribing interviews and observational data.

It is important that the transcription should be fit for purpose. The study is a discourse analysis of argumentation so for me this meant that I needed to transcribe speech in some detail in order to capture the nuanced ways in which interaction develops between speakers. This was particularly true for the recordings of classroom interaction.

My conceptualisation of argumentation in terms of voices meant that the transcription would have to be sufficiently detailed in order to allow me to present a prosodic analysis, including representing features such as stress, rhythm, intonation and volume. This would allow me to capture what Volosinov (1978) termed the "evaluative charge" of the human voice, so crucial to argumentatively-oriented interaction. In this way, the emotional dimension of argumentation could be represented. A focus on intonation would also allow me to identify the ways in which argumentation emerges playfully e.g. in the understatement of irony or the hyperbolic tone often characteristic of parody. A phonetic transcription was not generally attempted, unless I was attempting to represent what Rampton terms stylization of voice (Rampton, 2003).

My approach to transcription also allowed me to represent turn-taking and, most importantly, the ways in which speakers interrupt or overlap other speakers. This had emerged as an important feature of argumentative discourse since my early exploratory teaching in the field of argumentation, described in the introduction to this thesis. This presented challenges. Argumentation is an emotionally-charged speech activity and interruptions or overlaps, whether supportive or otherwise, sometimes led to indistinct utterances. However, the use of

Olympus Transcription software helped to meet these challenges, allowing for the use of slower playback, noise reduction etc.

I also wanted to begin to capture the multimodal dimension of argumentation as it emerged and unfolded, although this is a tricky business, as Ochs (1979) points out. Multimodal transcription is even more time-consuming than verbal transcription. However, my study is not principally a multimodal one and argumentation is treated here as a verbal practice. Nevertheless, I did record multimodal features in a separate column.[19]

What, then, of the challenges presented by transcription in relation to non-expert speakers? The first point to make is that I wanted to remain faithful to their exact utterances and so the transcript reflects their words verbatim, so far as I can record them. My principal interest was not in questions of accurate form, especially at sentence level. Thus, I did not attempt to tidy-up the transcriptions in any way. Transcribing non-expert language speakers presents challenges, especially when identifying and representing more subtle forms of language use, such as irony and parody, but my ear is well-attuned to their voices.

3.4.5.5 Data coding

The coding process was informed by the research questions, the literature review and by my working conceptualization of argumentation but was also able to reflect emergent data patterns.

I began by coding manually, using the review and comment feature in Microsoft Word. I did not use corpus analysis to handle the data because I had reservations about the decontextualized nature of this form of data analysis. I did, however, make use of the qualitative software tool NVivo8 once I had transcribed the data. This helped me identify emergent patterns in the data in applying insights from a grounded theory approach (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) as well as coding for patterns arising out of the research foci. These extracts were saved under one Free Node in NVivo8, which I labelled "Emerging Themes." The aim was to remain accountable to the data.

In the next phase of coding, I began to refine the analysis by grouping these emergent themes. To do this, I saved them separately under the Tree Nodes. Thus, for example, I coded for argumentation which emerged in the form of double-voicing, such as parody and irony. I also

---

[19] The sample of data analysis provided in the Appendix 20 illustrates how I did this.

coded for argumentation which emerged as a co-construction as well as that which emerged as a clash of different voices. Beyond this, I coded discourse markers and their function in argumentative work e.g. to reveal a process of reasoning or to challenge a claim.

This analytical process involved a constant revision of this coding process, collapsing categories if and where necessary. Thus, I grouped the double-voicing strategies referred to above under the more general category of language play. To take another example, I grouped the different dimensions of face, positive and negative, under face-based politeness and collected the non-canonical types of narratives that began to emerge under the heading of 'small stories.' I began to code for the different ways in which students and teachers positioned themselves in relation to argumentation, their conceptualisations of it, how they positioned themselves in relation to it when it emerged.

Like the process of transcription just described, the coding process involves interpretive work and presents challenges. It is not always possible to ascribe a particular argumentative function to a particular utterance, which may, for example, function as both a challenge and a claim. O'Halloran (2011, p.180) following Coffin (2007) coded moves according to the broader category of "discussion" in acknowledgement of these difficulties. He observed that pragmatic concerns around face management, for example, common in face-to-face talk, may render many argumentation moves ambiguous or, to put it another way, multi-functional.

A similar point is made by Schiffrin in relation to discourse markers. She observed that coding discourse markers in terms of argumentative function is useful but problematic as they are sometimes multi-functional (Schiffrin, 1987, p227). Moreover, spoken argumentation does not always contain explicit discourse markers and, therefore, more interpretative work has to be done.

To meet these challenges a robust method of identifying and coding linguistic features is needed, together with a reflexive awareness of the limitations. I now provide an example of how I approached this. Part of the analysis presented in Chapter 5 is predicated upon identifying stylized utterances. This is perhaps especially challenging in the context of researching non-expert speakers of English, however advanced they might be.

In the first instance, I used my intuition and judgement and drew upon my experience of teaching non-expert speakers of English. I started to notice that speech reporting provided a locus for stylization and to pay attention to this. Then, following Rampton (2003, p. 55) and Bauman (2001, p. 171) I established a procedure. This led me to begin to classify stylized

performance in terms of an ensemble of linguistic and semiotic features. These included: abrupt prosodic shifts in loudness or pitch, or rhythm, quotative verbs introducing reported speech, formulaic lexis, stereotypical in terms of the characteristics portrayed, speaker or audience laughter, and multimodal dimensions of performance e.g. gestures, and facial expressions.

In this final section I describe the ways in which I coded the field notes I collected in the research. I began by reading them through in their entirety in order to get a holistic picture of what they were revealing. I then began coding, in order to see what this particular data set was revealing, looking for themes and emergent patterns. It is necessary to acknowledge that this was not simply a matter of 'unmotivated looking' (Psathas, 1995). Some of these codes were generated by the research questions, as well as by the reading I had done on argumentation. Thus, for example, I coded for the ways in which argumentation emerged, especially multimodally, its embodiment, or the ways in which students and teachers, including me, positioned themselves and each other in terms of power relationships and politeness.

However, other codes emerged as the analysis developed. For example, I became increasingly interested in the ways in which argumentation emerged in the form of language play, particularly, through voicing strategies such as parody and irony. This, however, did not necessitate the formulation of a new research question, as it could be dealt with as an aspect of the emergence and unfolding of argumentation.

I also used the field notes to foreground aspects of my role in the research. The purpose of this, as I have observed earlier, was to remain reflexive about my positioning. This is something that Copland (2015) also does and is necessary because, as Emerson et al., (1995, pp.105-6) state, field notes: 'are selective, purposed, angled, voiced, because they are authored.'

3.4.5.6 Analytical frameworks: A worked sample of classroom data

In this section I present a worked example of the approach I have taken in the analytical chapters of the thesis. The aim is to exemplify the approach I set out in the final section of the literature review. The rationale behind the selection of this data is that it allows me to operationalise a range of key constructs in my analysis. These are sometimes described in ethnography as sensitising concepts (Blumer, 1969) and they help us to approach the data by

offering potential explanatory purchase. It is also important to observe that other data would have been more than adequate for this purpose, so the extract has not been cherry-picked.

I begin by providing a context for the analysis. The data extract I have chosen to analyse comes from argumentation in my teacher-education classroom. Thus, it is part of the exploratory teaching I did. The teachers in training are discussing issues around argumentation, more precisely about how they position students pedagogically by what they do with it in the classroom. This data is from a small group discussion and I am not involved in the argumentation, apart from at the end to bring the class together for a plenary. The principal antagonists here are Yelena, the teacher who features at the beginning of Chapter 4, in the argumentation on tuition fees for ESOL classes, and Geoff, another teacher in training.

The argumentation emerges as follows:

1	Yelena	we were having a discussion about international women's day
2	Geoff	I know (.) it's women's week apparently (sarcastically)
3	Yelena	no no (.) it's day (.) day (.) it's the 8 march
4	Geoff	is there such a thing as men's day
5	Yelena	no (.) you don't need a men's day because it's women who generally don't have equal rights]
6	Geoff	I asked my I asked my]
7	Yelena	with men]
8	Geoff	oh come ON [:ɔ] (exclamation)

(Main Study: Martin's teacher education classroom, 12/3/10)

The first point to make is that the topic, as well as the argumentation itself, emerges contingently, in that it is taken up by Geoff as controversial, becoming the focal point of the following debate. It is situated in the sense that International Women's Day fell in the week prior to the debate reported here. This topic is clearly, moreover, one which implicates issues of social justice i.e. the rights of men and women as citizens. This is visible in Yelena's direct invocation of women's rights and is a thread that runs through the debate, as we shall see. Thus, to use Zimmerman's (1998) terms, as well as two antagonists in debate (their discourse

identities) and two student teachers (their *situated* identities), more *transportable* identities, connected with gender and citizenship, are indexed (Silverstein, 2003) in this debate.

The key point to make is that the local identities in debate here index more global identities and ideologies around gender and citizenship. Yelena is a female who reveals in interview that the topic of women's rights is close to her heart. Geoff is a male in his 50s, who, as we will see, takes a different position on this topic.

These identities are performed or enacted through the discourse and it is here that speaker positioning is crucial. In terms of dialogic discourse, the Bakhtinian concept of discourse as an 'arena of struggle between different voices' (1981) can be invoked here, in order to account for argumentation emerging in the form of double-voiced irony. This is supported by a prosodic analysis, in that the intonation here is a contextualisation cue (Gumperz, 1982) that indexes Geoff's sarcastic positioning in relation to the utterance. The irony here can also be explained by drawing upon Goffman's concept of participation frameworks (Goffman, 1981). Here, Geoff is the animator, though not the author of the utterance, since his use of the word 'apparently' represents it as the unacknowledged voice of another. Most importantly, though, he is not committed to the principal, or the sentiments underlying the utterance.

Yelena responds to this by contradicting Geoff. Her impatience is revealed prosodically in the short, staccato rhythms and the repetition. Geoff's sarcasm is also present in his question, which is a rhetorical one, as he clearly knows that there isn't a 'men's day.' His utterance in response to Yelena's assertion that 'it's women who generally don't have equal rights with men' is no more than an exclamation of disbelief, indexed prosodically, again, by the stress at the end of the phrase and the elongated nature of the final vowel in the word 'on.'

This kind of prosodic analysis offers insights into the ways in which argumentation emerges and unfolds and how it is authorised. There are also insights from Conversation Analysis that one can apply to this, and other, data. Here, there is the breakdown in turn-taking when Geoff interrupts Yelena, in a competition to claim the conversational floor.

Moving beyond this concern with sequence and structure, the analysis now illustrates how a linguistically-informed approach to discourse analysis can illuminate the study of argumentation. It begins by observing that a formal analysis of discourse markers, especially those most closely associated with the operation of reason, such as 'because,' can offer insights into the unfolding of argumentation. Here, the subordinating conjunction 'because' is used to authorise the point about not needing a men's day. Such an analysis, as we have seen,

is pursued by interactional sociolinguists such as Deborah Schiffrin (1987) and will form part of my approach in this thesis, especially when tracing the ways in which argumentation emerges and is authorised by reason.

The argumentation continues:

1	David	I said that with my class and they said it was a man day every other day of the year
2	Yelena	yes which I would agree with (laughs)
3	Geoff	and the person speaking about it is a female a senior female police superintendent (.) come on (.) I ask you (David laughs)
4	Yelena	well they are lucky that in this country a woman can become a senior police superintendent (laughs)
5	Geoff	well I tell you what they're mostly in flaming managerial jobs nowadays I think so I-in this country you can't say things like that (.) women's day (.) it's rubbish (Yelena and David laugh)

(Main Study: Martin's teacher education classroom, 12/3/10).

To begin with, there are insights which a traditional pragmatic approach to the data can bring. There is playfulness here, even though the topic is a serious one. The point about 'man day' being 'every other day of the year' is amusingly reported and taken up in the same spirit. Similarly, when Yelena turns the tables on Geoff and uses his point to authorise her wider argumentative claim, she laughs in a rather satisfied manner.

However, the laughter elsewhere is rather uncomfortable in nature, and this reflects pragmatic concerns around a loss of face. The fact that David and Yelena are co-constructing argumentation against Geoff is a potential threat to Geoff, with particular regard to his positive face (Brown and Levinson, 1987) or his wish to belong to the student teacher group and to be liked. This may explain his intemperate and rather dismissive tone, which may in

turn account for the rather embarrassed nature of the laughter of David and Yelena at the end. Their positive face has (arguably) been threatened by the contentious nature of Geoff's views, which emerge in the context of what seems to be a shared group concern for women's rights. In this way, all the participants in this debate are threatened with a loss of face.

At this point in the debate, another teacher trainee enters the debate, observing he has discussed women's day with his class. What is striking here is that the argumentation is authorised by invoking the voices of others; here the members of his Adult ESOL class ('they said'). Their voices here serve to authorise the argumentation in favour of equal rights for women. Indeed, Yelena takes this as a point in favour of her argument, by stating she is in agreement with this. Argumentation emerges here as consensual as well as competing voices. The idea of introducing other voices in the debate in order to authorise one's own voice is a key one and has been discussed in the literature review in terms of the concept of intertextuality (Kristeva, 1986).

There is a further point to be made here, one which has important implications for the concept of argumentation structure. This is that the voices drawn upon in argumentation can be more distant in nature. That is, they are not simply the voices of the immediate participants. We see this in David's invocation of the voices of his students and we see it again in Geoff's response to their point. He cites the case of a senior police superintendent who was in the news arguing in favour of more rights for women within the police force in order to challenge the view that women do not have equal rights. This is a classic *ad hominem* argumentation strategy, in which an attack on the speaker themselves is used to refute a wider argumentation claim. The point here turns on the perceived hypocrisy of the call for greater equality by someone who has attained high office.

The invocation of these voices in the emergence, unfolding and authorisation of argumentation raises issues around the positioned nature of argumentative voices, already discussed as part of my approach in the literature review. Here, we can illustrate further how this approach can be implemented. In the first instance, the concept of positioning connects to the concept of wider transportable identities here, specifically identities around gender (she is a woman) and occupation (she is a senior police officer).

The connection between positioning and power is also observable here. The issue of speaking rights, of what can and can't be said, is picked up directly in Geoff's comment to Yelena that: 'you can't say that.' This denial of the right to speak here is accompanied by a rather

dismissive tone, visible, for example, when he belittles women's day as 'just an element of feminism really.' Yelena exclaims, the rising intonation betraying her anger: 'oh (.) is that a swear word.' The denial of the right to speak brings a threat to her negative face, to her independence (Brown and Levinson, 1978), specifically her right to express an opinion. Again, the prosody indexes the anger she feels.

The connection with citizenship is visible here once again. The challenge he meets forces him to clarify what exactly it is that he is saying. The value of arguing to achieve clarification is well attested to in the literature (Andrews et al., 1994). Beyond clarification, the challenging of positions can lead to the changing or modification of positions. In this regard, the following exchange is illuminating:

1	Yelena	actually when we talk about western societies where men and women are supposedly equal and still not
2	Geoff	supposedly (.) we are we you know
3	Yelena	it's not exactly
4	Geoff	well
5	Sandra	equal pay (rising intonation)
6	Geoff	I tell you what S that's more in the banking sector and all of that they might do the same job but they might not get the same bonuses and stuff
7	Sandra	statistically across the board women are paid less for across the board
8	Geoff	theoretically they should be but on the upper echelons I agree with you

(Main Study: Martin's teacher education classroom, 12/3/10)

Geoff challenges Yelena's claim that there is a lack of equality between men and women. At this point in the argument, Sandra is drawn in, challenging Geoff by asking him, in the form of a rhetorical question, to account for unequal pay. Geoff is forced to clarify, arguing that unequal pay applies more to a particular sector and to bonuses not basic salaries. Sandra's riposte is to authorise her claim by invoking official statistics and Geoff is forced to concede some ground and acknowledge that there is indeed a gap between theory and practice, especially with regard to those in the top jobs. This concession, maybe even contradiction, is visible linguistically in the use of the discourse marker 'but.' This even involves some

measure of alignment of voices, reminding us that the voices of argumentation are both 'competing and consensual' (Costello and Mitchell, 1995).

There is a final point to be made in relation to the constructs deployed in this thesis. This is that the debate focussed on in this example contains small shifts into narrativity, what Hymes (1996) famously referred to as 'fleeting moments of narrativity.' These seem to be connected to the ways in which argumentation is authorised and can be seen in the ways in which the participants invoke other voices in support of their claims. As we have also observed, the argumentative point of the same narrative can be evaluated in different ways by different protagonists.

There is emic evidence to support the interpretive validity of what has been argued here. In interview, Yelena observes that the topic of women's rights is close to her heart. She is also from the Ukraine and has an international perspective on the issue that her antagonist, a monolingual middle-aged male lacks. Though care needs to be taken when generalising, such background information can inform the etic analysis.

In the foregoing analysis, I have illustrated how the data has led me towards a number of sensitising concepts that I go on to use in the data analysis.

3.5 Validity

Ethnography rejects positivist characterisations of research validity, reliability and generalizability. It works from empirical data towards theoretical claims. It is, like history and law, inductive in its argumentation, seeking to generalize but not to statistical frequency (Blommaert and Jie, 2010, p. 12).The aim is thus to generate theory and not to verify a priori hypotheses. I had no a priori hypotheses in mind at the outset of the study. There is no contradiction here with the acknowledgement that the researcher is positioned within the research process. This is, as we have seen, true for those working in more quantitative paradigms.

However, it is true that the researcher's role in making truth claims in ethnographic work does merit serious reflection (Maybin, 2011). There is a tension between the truth claims based on the analysis of data collected (transcripts, documents, field notes) and the acknowledgement of the ways in which the researcher is positioned within the research. The emic perspectives of the participants are re-presented through the theoretical frameworks and analytic interpretations that inform the etic perspective of the researcher.

However, there are ways in which the tension here can be viewed productively. Deploying a variety of data collection methods, as ethnography does, can help to establish the validity or credibility of the analytic inferences made (Hammersley, 2007). This is a form of method triangulation, where data collected by different methods are compared. Therefore, data collected from interviewing my research participants can inform inferences made based on the transcript analysis. This sometimes takes the form of respondent validation where inferences from different data sources are checked and the emic perspective of the participant can be used to check the validity of the inferences drawn. This emic perspective can emerge through interview or it can emerge in classroom discussion.

Similarly, multimodal evidence collected through digital camera or field notes can help assess the credibility of the inferences made in the course of the overall discourse analysis. These linguistic and multimodal analyses are falsifiable and lend robustness to the research claims made. To recall Rampton's phrase, used earlier in the chapter, they help to 'tie ethnography down.' It is the combination of ethnographic and linguistic methodologies that brings validity (Creese, 2011).

The view that the emotional involvement of the teacher-researcher invalidates the study can be countered with the view that the supposed detachment of an outside observer is equally problematic, if not more so, providing an unrepresentative snapshot of a longer view (Pike, 2002). My inferences from the research evidence are informed by my ethnographic knowledge of the students in a way that is simply not possible for an outside researcher.

In fact, it could be argued that it is my very involvement in classroom argumentation that encourages the students to participate fully. As I suggest in the thesis discussion, there is a sense in which I am modelling and enacting a kind of citizenship. This kind of approach is discussed by Baynham et al (2007) in relation to teacher disclosure and it involves teachers disclosing beliefs and opinions, as well as salient aspects of their identities, in order to establish the classroom as a space in which open and meaningful discussion can take place. This involves establishing a trust on the basis of example, something which a silent non-participating observer cannot do.

3.6 Generalizability

I will now consider the issue of the generalizability of ethnography. This is a key dimension of validity. Ethnography, it has already been observed, does not attempt typicality, preferring instead to identify telling cases for study.

However, this does not mean that there is no way of generalizing from the data. To begin with, the class of students I taught are, arguably at least, typical of those to be found in general English classes in Adult ESOL. That is, they are economic migrants to the UK, who run part-time study alongside part-time work. They come largely from the EEA accession countries, such as Poland and Latvia. They are also young, or under 35. In these general senses, at least, they are a representative sample, or, at least, 'not atypical' (Rist, 1970) of the population.

Ethnography is inductive in its approach. The movement is from empirical data to theory and not the other way round. The data show you where to go and you apply theoretical concepts. That is to say: 'Generalisation does not inhere in the case but in the conceptual apparatus of the explicator' (Shulman, 1986, p.12). The emphasis upon the situated nature of phenomena in ethnography means that ethnographers are generally cautious about making generalized claims based on the details of particular cases. Where these are made, they are made at an analytical or theoretical level and are not a matter of statistical inference (Blommaert & Jie, 2010; Yin, 2003).

3.7 Research ethics

In this section, I discuss the issue of research ethics. The headings in this section of the discussion are taken from Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) who discuss ethics in relation to ethnographic research. I use their headings to structure my ethical discussion here, beginning with informed consent and going on to discuss confidentiality, anonymity and exploitation. This discussion will encompass both the Adult ESOL students and the teacher trainees.

However, before beginning, it is necessary to say something about ethical regulation. Ethical issues are not just a personal matter and the thesis has abided by the code of conduct of the British Association for Applied Linguistics. Ethical clearance for the thesis was granted by the Research Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Education, Social Science and Law (09-005 AREA). I modified the consent forms to include some of their suggestions, specifically, the undertaking not to use the video-recordings for anything other than research purposes unless I obtained the written permission of the participants, and the right of interviewees to refuse to answer questions which they felt uncomfortable with.

3.7.1 Informed consent

The principle of informed consent is clearly central to any discussion of research ethics. This consent was obtained in writing, through the use of appropriately designed forms. Different

forms were designed for the different research participants and these are included in the Appendices to the thesis. These forms explained the nature of the research and the roles of the participants within it.

The discussion begins by considering the adult migrants in the research. Despite the fact that they are adults, migrants to the UK do constitute a potentially vulnerable community and can face both disadvantage and prejudice in the course of their daily lives (Cooke and Simpson, 2008). Most obviously, perhaps, there are the challenges they face as non-expert speakers of English. The adult migrants who participated in the study were, in the main, upper-intermediate or advanced level learners of English, so the language problems were not a major barrier to comprehension. However, one group of students were beginners and this clearly makes language more of an issue.

In order to counter this, a number of measures were taken. Firstly, the informed consent of the research participants was obtained in good time and well before the research process commenced. The form designed for them had been trialled and improved as part of the pilot study, largely in terms of the simplification of language for lower level multilingual students. This written explanation on the terms of their involvement was supplemented with verbal explanation and clarification. This was provided by me or the class teacher, who best knew the students and their language capabilities. In this way, any matters arising could be dealt with verbally, before the start of the research process.

There were other challenges to obtaining informed consent. Absenteeism, together with inconsistent patterns of attendance, is sometimes a feature of Adult ESOL. This problem was resolved by providing early information, and regular reminders, about the research and its timeline. In addition to this, there was the issue of socio-cultural knowledge. The lack of this sometimes means that institutional encounters of adult migrants can often be asymmetrical (e.g. Roberts et al., 2007 on job interviews) and I wanted to ensure that I was explicit about the nature of the research and the expectations it brought with it.

The right of research participants to withdraw from the research process at any time is a dimension of informed consent. This, in fact, did happen during the research when one of the potential teacher-trainee participants was uncomfortable about a video observation and withdrew consent. Informed consent also needs to be continually negotiated and should not be assumed. Again, this happened during the research. One of the research participants, a shy Polish woman, didn't want her participation in a debate video-recorded but consented to it

being voice-recorded. The right of the research participants to refuse to answer any questions they felt uncomfortable with during the research process has already been commented upon.

The two examples cited above speak to the issues of harm and exploitation and confidentiality and anonymity in the course of the research process. Harm can result from the stress caused to respondents who feel that their participation in the research process is being evaluated in some way by the researcher. This ethical issue is thrown into particularly sharp relief when that researcher is also their teacher. The use of video-recording as a data collection instrument has ethical implications and is particularly intrusive. Thus, ethical questions in the research process connect to more practical research issues like design and data collection.

The notion of informed consent is never fully attainable. Hammersley and Atkinson (2007, p. 210) point out that researchers "rarely tell *all* the people they are studying *everything* about the research." In their discussion of informed consent, Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) raise a key issue for the current research. They discuss researcher disclosure in the context of what they term active deception or the level of toleration that is probably essential to the ethnographic research process. They characterise this toleration as follows:

> This will often be a matter of researchers not mentioning their own views: but sometimes it may even involve them indicating agreement or acceptance despite their real beliefs.

<div align="right">(Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007, p. 211)</div>

For the current study, this question of the level of disclosure is a key one, as argumentation is so tightly connected to the expression of personal beliefs and convictions. The issue of if, or how much, to disclose, in argumentation, is a decision I faced in my role as teacher researcher in the debate reported in Chapter 4 of the thesis. There are other implications for the research too, especially in the light of the role of teacher researcher that I took up at many points in the research. I consider some of these in the sections below.

3.7.2 Confidentiality and anonymity

Clearly, another key issue for any discussion of ethics is the need for confidentiality. Therefore, as a pre-requisite for involvement in the research, all the participants were guaranteed total anonymity at every stage of the research process, through to the write-up and dissemination of findings. This is crucial because at any stage of the research process, the

participants may disclose information, during observation, or in interview, which if shared might be potentially sensitive or personally detrimental.

There were ethical issues which emerged during the research process. Perhaps this was to be expected given the research focus on argumentation. To give a concrete example of this, when the students raise the issue of the increase in tuition fees in Chapter 4, both they and the teacher are potentially vulnerable in terms of the positions they took up on what was, and remains, an extremely sensitive topic. So, for example, the fact that students criticise both college and governmental policy on tuition fees for adult migrants could have damaging consequences if shared with others.

Similarly, the teacher is placed in a very awkward position, forced to explain, and, to an extent, defend a college policy with which she may well disagree. Any attempt to share the details of that encounter, which was played out in front of a video camera, might have had negative consequences for the teacher's position as an employee of the college. Clearly, it is more difficult to anonymise participation if it has been video-recorded, not simply voice-recorded. Disseminating the results of my research in, for example, local teacher education sessions, might involve violating the participant's right to anonymity.

However, I made the decision to include data from the transcripts in the final thesis but not to use the video in any future dissemination events unless I consulted the participant beforehand and obtained their consent. This was what Guillemin and Gillam (2004, cited in Kubanyiova, 2008) call an 'ethically important moment' and demonstrates the ethical dilemmas that researchers can face.

The emergence of controversial subject material in the Adult ESOL classroom also raised ethical dilemmas for me too, during participant observation as a teacher researcher. For example, during a discussion about religion, one of the students introduced the issue of suicide bombing in a way which connected it directly to Islam. Again, this was, and remains, a sensitive topic and I recorded my unease at this in my field notes. Should I have brought such a controversial topic into the classroom? Should I have challenged the association made between Islam and terrorism in my role as class teacher? Did the fact that I didn't mean I was giving tacit credence to such views? Hammersley and Atkinson (2007, p. 213) term these 'sins of omission' as opposed to sins of commission. I did, in fact, use data from this discussion at a conference and was uneasy about the inclusion of the extract which contained this.

3.7.3 Exploitation

There is no doubt that entering the classroom as a teacher researcher is different from doing so simply as the classroom teacher. As Winter (1989, p. 23) points out, collecting data from one's own classroom inevitably involves entering into new relationships with both the students in those classes and colleagues in the institutions where those classes take place. The business of demarcating educational research and practice is a difficult one and there are issues around the gaining of consent in a situation where the researcher is also a teacher and teacher trainer and is hence in a position of power and influence over the learners and the teacher trainees. Thus, my participants may have felt more obligated to consent to involvement if the person asking them is their teacher as well as a researcher. This made them potentially susceptible to exploitation.

Exploitation is a matter of the gains and losses that accrue to research participants as a result of the research process. I was careful at all stages of the research process to ensure that the participants did not feel that they were simply research fodder. In role as the teacher researcher, I designed pedagogical activities which were research-led and in this way hoped to help the students develop the argumentation skills necessary not just for successful examination performance but also for future employment and potential citizenship. I was not involved in their formal assessment so there was no immediate conflict of interest. However, I was involved in preparing them for assessment so there was a tension. The way I resolved this was to treat the sessions around argumentation as part of their language learning experience.

In relation to my teacher-trainees, I had not been involved in conducting their assessed teaching observations. This meant that the classroom observations I conducted could be treated as developmental in nature. As with my Adult ESOL students, I offered them the opportunity to develop their knowledge and skills base in what is an important but neglected area. This, then, would form a small but meaningful part of their professional education, with research-led teaching in argumentation a key and continual focus. The discussion in the post-observation interviews provided them with an opportunity to develop professionally without being formally observed and assessed, as it involved a degree of pedagogical discussion around teaching strategies and approaches.

There is also a question about the extent to which the research participants have ownership over the research data and the uses to which it is put. My stance on this was that the participants were allowed to access the data if they so wished.

3.8 Conclusion

This chapter has presented the methodological approach of the thesis. This is, as we have seen, ethnographic in nature and orientation. It has offered an account of the research design and methodology, encompassing the full sweep of the research from its early stages through to its conclusion. It has also discussed issues around research ethics and validity. Together with the literature review, it establishes the theoretical and methodological framework within which the analysis to follow is conducted. Thus, in the next chapter, I present the first of three analytical chapters exploring the nature of argumentation in the Adult ESOL classroom.

Chapter 4: Argumentation as competing and consensual voices

4.1 Introduction

This chapter frames the analytical chapters that follow and addresses all the research questions posed in the methodology chapter. It proceeds as follows: it begins by revisiting some of the sensitising concepts discussed in the literature review. Then, using the approach established in Chapter 2.3, and exemplified in Chapter 3.4, it applies these concepts in a linguistic ethnographic analysis of argumentation.

I begin, in Section 4.2.1, with an analysis of argumentation that emerged contingently at the beginning of one of the classes I observed as a non-participant. This was Yelena's class and the basic content of this class is outlined in Table 3 in Chapter 3.4.3.2. After this, in Section 4.2.2, I analyse argumentation that emerged in a more pedagogically motivated debate in my own Adult ESOL classroom. Again, basic details of the topics, tasks and activities are provided in Table 1 in Chapter 3.4.3.1.

In the section setting out my approach in the literature review, I established the importance of the dialogic in argumentative discourse, of a conceptualisation in which its competing and consensual voices are best described as situated speaking and identity positions. I also discussed the concept of participation frameworks (Goffman, 1981), which has been used to capture the complexity of the positions the students and teachers take up in relation to the utterances they make and in relation to each other. It will also be remembered that concepts from social theory, more precisely, Foucault's (1980) concept of a regime of truth and Bourdieu's (1991) concept of doxa, will be drawn upon in order to demonstrate how students and teachers position themselves, and are positioned, in relation to wider issues of power.

4.2 Argumentation in the Adult ESOL classroom

4.2.1 Debating fees

The analysis begins with data from the beginning of Yelena's class. It starts here for a number of reasons. Firstly, by getting into the grain of everyday argumentation, I continue to illustrate and establish the analytical lens I use to examine argumentation. Secondly, in the spirit of ethnography, I want to ground my analysis of argumentation in the small details of everyday interaction, to establish connections between more popular and academic notions of

argument or argumentation. This is a move Andrews (1995, p.2) makes in his study of argumentation, although he concedes that his data (an extract from a novel) is literary, and thus rather artificial, in nature. I make the same move but, in contrast, my example will be a real pedagogic one.

In what follows, I conduct a detailed analysis of a section of classroom talk. Having established a context for the talk, I analyse the ways in which argumentation emerges and unfolds, and the ways in which it is authorised, paying particular attention to the role of reason and logic but also exploring the ways in which the students and teachers position themselves and each other, and the ways in which they are positioned, in argumentation.

4.2.1.1 Context, emergence and unfolding

To begin, I establish the context. Yelena's class is working at Level 1 and 2 of *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum,* or Advanced Level. The students are drifting in and beginning to settle. There is a murmur of chatter as they greet each other. Yelena is waiting for the students to settle for the class proper to begin. So far, this has all the hallmarks of a typical "soft start" to an ESOL class. I am present as the visiting researcher with voice recorders and video camera.

Then, suddenly, Anna, one of the students in the class, arrives, visibly upset and the following dialogue emerges:

1	Anna	I have to pay FIVE HUNDRED POUNDS
2	Jarek	HOW much (shocked)
3	Anna	I have to pay full (.) always was
		half (.) now I have to pay full
4	Helen	WHY (rising intonation)

(Main Study: Yelena's class, 10/6/10).

Here, we have the emergence of argumentation. Anna is clearly upset and angry that she will have to pay £500 for her ESOL classes from next year. This is signalled prosodically by the increase in stress, volume and pitch on the new amount (£500). Similarly, Jarek's shocked response is revealed through increased stress, volume and pitch on the word "how." The camera doesn't record who the final question in this extract is directed at. This illustrates the problematic nature of simplistic characterizations of the categories of "speaker" and also, less commented upon but crucial to the dialogic perspective, "listener." Goffman (1981)

problematizes these notions in terms of participation frameworks. Here, we don't know if Helen's question is aimed at Anna or Yelena.

Questions are important in argumentation, especially from a dialogical perspective. They orient towards the listener in different ways and also implicate issues of power and control. They demand a response. Through them, speakers position both themselves and others. As Mitchell observes, Bakhtin's theory of dialogic discourse (1981) implicitly characterizes the speaker of an utterance as a questioner (Mitchell, 2001b, p. 131).

Here, the questions are interesting. Jarek's question is as much an exclamation of disbelief as it is a question. Part of its function is therefore rhetorical. Helen's question is a demand for explanation and justification. Once again, the increase in volume and rise in pitch volume signal the level of emotion involved. It is as Mitchell says: "Questions can play a major role in structuring exchanges in which difference is dialectically produced and fostered as dialogue" (Mitchell, 2001b, p. 110). Through these questions the students take control of the dialogue here, albeit temporarily. This is a reversal of the usual power relations that pertain in classroom discourse, where the teachers ask most of the questions (*pace* Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975).

The students bring the topic of the fees increase into the classroom and through questioning open up the space for the difference that characterizes argumentation to emerge and unfold. Argumentation emerges here as a co-construction, as multi-party as well as dyadic. The voices of argumentation in this instance are consensual as well as competing, rooted in collaboration.

These questions also suggest a level of interest and involvement with this topic. They demand clarification and elaboration; they demand a response. In Norton's terms (2000) the students here clearly have a level of emotional "investment" in the topic, which concerns their language learning entitlements. The topic of the new fees to be introduced by the college has been brought along in a student-initiated move. Yelena has not introduced the topic, and is forced to respond contingently and rather reluctantly. This investment is financial as well. In this way, they are speaking from a particular position here and this position is an identity position. They are speaking as economic migrants and potential United Kingdom citizens.

This argumentation also emerges multi-modally and this is recorded in the field notes taken during the lesson and captured on the video-recording: "Anna's body language is defensive throughout, sitting back in her chair, with arms folded, impervious to persuasion. She is grim-

faced, tight-lipped and looks unhappy" (Field Notes, 10/6/10). Here, the anger is also indexed by her posture. She is leaning back in her chair, away from the teacher, again, the physical distancing indexing the different viewpoints. The folded arms suggest defensiveness, a readiness for explanation perhaps. Her facial expression also indexes her discontent. There is a kind of "instinctive positioning" emerging, more commonly expressed in terms of a "gut reaction" (Andrews, 1995, p. 116). Argumentation, then, emerges as emotion as well as reason and this emotion is indexed both linguistically and multi-modally. Its voices are not disembodied; rather, they are materially embodied in human beings. This is a point made by Goodwin (2000) and the example above illustrates his concept of embodiment, discussed in the Section 2. 2.5. 4 of the literature review.

At this point, then, a contentious issue has emerged. Yelena is present but has not yet intervened. Thus, the argumentation emerges without pedagogical prompting. That is, it emerges spontaneously, contingently. Then Yelena enters the debate, addressing the difference that has opened up:

1	Yelena	I know it's going to be a problem next year
		(.) we're going to talk about it] (uncomfortably)
2	Anna	NOBODY talk about it]

(Main Study: Yelena's class, 10/6/10).

This appears to be the beginnings of an argument in the popular sense of a "quarrel" or a "row" (Oxford English Dictionary, 2013). At the very least it is a difference of opinion. Yelena concedes the issue is problematic and that they will be discussing it. It is clear from her uncomfortable tone that this is awkward and that she is forced to respond contingently here. This was not part of the planned content of the lesson.

Anna then interrupts the teacher ("NOBODY talk about it"), the raised volume and pitch signalling her anger. The raised stress, pitch and volume on "NOBODY" foreground the emotion as she directly contradicts her teacher here. This is an interruption and breaks turn-taking conventions. The concept of turn-taking clearly has purchase in relation to unfolding argumentation, although it is important to observe that (as here) it indexes student engagement and involvement and is not simply something negative that points to communication breakdown.

Her response functions as a challenge and points to the situated nature of argumentation, the way it implicates questions of power. It highlights the negation of voice that is silence. Foucault observed that: "not everything can be said at any time" (Foucault, 1972, p. 64). The teacher is the voice of authority in the classroom and she is being interrupted, challenged and contradicted. Conversely, the student is in the subordinate position. The implication of Anna's utterance is that the silence on this issue is deliberate, that this subject is not open to debate. This speaks to Bourdieu's concept of *doxa*, which, as Eagleton observes, implicates the silencing voice of power:

> What Bourdieu calls *doxa* belongs to the kind of stable, tradition-bound social order in which power is fully naturalized and unquestionable, so that no social arrangement from the present could ever be imagined.

> (Eagleton, 1991, p. 157).

In the Adult ESOL classroom, it is the teacher who is in the position of authority and their role is crucial when argumentation emerges. However, as the next extract illustrates, the teacher is often positioned awkwardly between their students and those in authority over them.

4.2.1.2 Teacher role in argumentation

Yelena, then, under challenge, is forced to engage with the topic:

1	Yelena	if you are on a low income you pay half price(.)but from next year it's not going to be available]
2	Jarek	(laughs) good news (ironic)]
3	Yelena	good news yeah (hesitant) (2) park town college (.) so if you come next year]
4	Jarek	from the government]

(Main Study: Yelena's class, 10/6/10).

For now, I focus on the role of the teacher in argumentation. In Chapter 5, I will consider the role of the student's irony here. Yelena begins to explain and clarify the new policy. Explanation is a close cousin of argument (Antaki, 1994) and clarification, or at least the demand for it, as we have already seen, is one of the functions of argumentation (Andrews et al., 1993, p. 22). In doing so, she becomes involved in the argumentation. The ways in which

she positions herself and the students in the argumentation that has emerged will form the focus of what follows.

I want to suggest that Yelena is ventriloquizing the voice of college policy. Bakhtin uses the term "ventriloquation" to describe how a speaker positions themselves by speaking through the voices of others. He observes that every utterance is: "filled with others' words" and that: "the words of others carry with them their own expression, their own evaluative tone, which we assimilate, rework and re-accentuate" (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 89).

This is what I think we are seeing here and in one sense this is not surprising. This implicates identity, roles and relationships and here I draw upon the concept of participation frameworks (Goffman, 1981). Yelena is not speaking as a private citizen; she is speaking as the class teacher and, consequently, as an employee of the college. This is part of her professional role and identity. She is clearly positioned uncomfortably by the argumentation that has emerged. This is revealed by her tone. She is uncomfortable as she has been a teacher of these students for a year and she is, furthermore, a migrant to the UK herself.

Nevertheless, her position as the animator (Goffman, 1981) of college policy here forces her to ventriloquize what Bakhtin (1981) referred to as the "authoritative discourses" of the college. Authoritative discourses are the most powerful discourses and, moreover, are those that attempt to set themselves *beyond* dialogue.

Yelena makes this explicit when she invokes the name of the college, in a move, perhaps, to distance herself from personal responsibility for the fee increase. She does this by making it clear who is actually responsible. It is interesting that, before she does this, she repeats (or ventriloquizes) the phrase used by the student (the ironic "good news.") but what is telling is that it is delivered without conviction, in a hesitant manner suggesting that she too is not committed to its propositional content, although she is reluctantly forced to ventriloquize the voice of the college, the dominant voice in the argumentation. In Goffman's terms (1981) this is the principal, the aspect of the speaker who is committed to the sentiments of a particular utterance. She is clearly not committed to the fact that this is good news. The longer pause before she utters the college's name reinforces the sense that she is uncomfortable in laying the blame at the college's door.

Issues of responsibility and blame are often the very stuff of argumentation. Jarek's comment demonstrates that he is aware that responsibility for the new fees extends beyond the walls of the college and that the voice of the government is also being ventriloquized through the

college and the teacher. The college had just introduced a new fee-paying regime for the following academic year (i.e. 2010-11). Under this new regime, migrants who worked part-time were no longer entitled to fee reductions. Beyond this, nationally, the government had introduced new fees for English language classes in the context of an increasingly hostile political climate for multilingual migrants. Thus, issues of scale arise in this micro-interaction. In this way, argumentation is a highly situated practice. The argumentative difference here opens up around questions of blame and responsibility.

The question of who will authorize the decision-making about attendance at classes in the next academic year is also a controversial one, as the following exchange suggests:

1	Anna	teachers decide this year who can come back next year
2	Helen	yeah (.) teacher and manager decide
3	Yelena	the manager decides and also we'll have a little exam
		(laughs nervously)(.) next year at the beginning of
		the year (.)(clears throat) in September (3) excuse me
		but it's really bad to tell people no you can't come
		next year (.) because you're not going to pass
		your exam

(Main Study: Yelena's class, 10/6/10).

Anna attributes responsibility to the teachers. Helen agrees but adds that the managers are also responsible. Yelena responds by stating that the managers are the ones who decide and also that the decision will be authorized more academically, by means of assessment. She ventriloquizes the management voice in the form of direct not reported speech. Coming after the negative evaluation of "it's really bad" the use of direct speech here foregrounds the stark implications of the new policy. The ways in which different kinds of speech reporting authorize argumentation in different ways will be the focus of the analysis in Chapter 6.

Yelena ventriloquizes the management position here but the negative evaluation demonstrates that she is not simply ventriloquizing the dominant voices in the argumentation. The positioning here is complex and, for the teacher at least, and again, uncomfortable. So, the moves that she makes serve to distance her from culpability for the new fee-regime. There is even, then, apology here, a concession that a degree of unfairness is involved. The long pause before apologising perhaps signals this discomfort. The laughter suggests she is nervous and uncomfortable, as does the clearing of the throat. This is the laughter of social embarrassment (Goffman, 1981; 1967). These argumentation moves are clearly face-threatening, to use

Brown and Levinson's (1978; 1987) terms. Yelena has a good working relationship with these students and wishes to be liked. The threat is thus to her positive face and that of the students. Giving sympathy, what she is doing here, is a strategy for saving positive face (Brown and Levinson, 1978; 1987). Argumentative discourse clearly connects tightly with pragmatic issues of face and politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1987) and, as a visiting researcher, I can personally testify to the discomfort and embarrassment this dissent raised in the classroom.

The difference that characterizes argumentation sometimes emerges in the form of what Cook (2000) refers to as "verbal duelling." He glosses this in terms of a "ritualized combativeness" of the kind that one might expect in the British House of Commons, with its tradition of adversarial argumentation. We see this at work below when Yelena continues the debate by trying to explain the function of the examination in deciding who returns:

1	Yelena	if you pass it
2	Anna	you can come again yeah
3	Jarek	if you don't pass
4	Anna	you still need to pay (laughing)
5	Yelena	
	no no you don't need to pay(frustration)	

(Main Study: Yelena's class, 10/6/10).

Yelena's position here is subverted by the students who again seem in control. Anna's response (especially the use of "yeah.") suggests she already understands how the new system works. Then, Jarek poses his own hypothetical question, putting a different scenario, a more negative one, as opposed to Yelena's. Anna's response completes the argumentation that this is a kind of "zero-sum game," one that the students cannot win, a kind of undefeatable Catch-22 logic. They are turning the intractability of the argumentation on its head here; it is their only way of triumphing over it. This is argumentation as a kind of battle (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). Yelena's tone and the repetition of "no" index her frustration.

The argumentation emerges as co-construction, with Anna and Jarek on the same wavelength. The utterances in Turns 3 and 4 are latched utterances with no perceptible inter-turn pause as Anna completes Jarek's turn. These indicate that argumentation can also be collaborative, a co-construction.

The analysis thus far has focussed principally upon the emotional dimension of argumentation and upon the ways in which its situated nature implicates questions of power and authority. However, as the literature review has suggested, reason is often taken to be the hallmark, the *sine qua non* of argument and any serious study of argumentation must take full account of its role. It is to this that I now turn.

4.2.1.3 The role of reason

The contingent nature of argumentation is revealed linguistically in the previous dialogue by the use of the "if-then" structure. Argumentation is often hypothetical or conditional in this way and involves causation. Note too, though, that hypothetical argumentation like this involves the imagination as well as rationality. However, the following dialogue illustrates that argumentation is also authorized by reason, or logos, to use Aristotle's (1926[4BCE]) term:

1	Anna	(irritated) I don't want pay full price (.)because for me it's not fair if somebody have for free and I have to pay (.)
2	Yelena	well (.) you only get it for free if you're on job seeker allowance or housing benefit]
3	Anna	yes] I know but look how many people who not coming they have for free(.) if they pay they come (.) its true (.)why they don't come and because they don't pay for this class (.) I pay and I come
4	Yelena	I'm not sure A because I don't even know who pays and who doesn't (.)so I can't make this judgement
5	Anna	it's my opinions
6	Yelena	but you
7	Helen	because it's the different situations (.) depend where you're coming from
8	Anna	if I'm working I have to pay
9	Helen	yeah

| 10 | Dorota | but we are on the lowest wage |
| 11 | Anna | but I sit at home and don't do nothing I go to college (laughs) |

(Main Study: Yelena's class, 10/6/10).

Anna's first utterance is marked by a higher pitched irritation at having to pay more. The main argumentative contrast is identified by her in the opening utterance of this exchange, the use of the telling phrase "it's not fair" here reminds us that argumentation is often about the difference between how the world is, or how it is perceived to be, and how it is felt that it *ought* to be (see Georgakopoulou, 2000, p. 71). Note that this implies the awareness of another voice, another position. This again involves the imagination; the imagination of a better future.

In the exchange above, the students are using reason to authorize and co-construct powerful argumentation against the new fee regime. The co-construction is visible in, for example, turns 8, 10 and 11 where Dorota and Anna develop each other's contributions, highlighting the unfairness and illogicality of the new proposals. They are challenging the "authoritative discourses," (Bakhtin, 1981) the dominant voices and positions, looking for the contradictions, the paradoxes, in them.

This is argumentation emerging in the classical dialectical tradition of the *reductio ad absurdum* (Van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 2004, p. 43). Thus, Anna observes that, for them, paradoxically, it is those who currently get free classes who do not attend whilst those (like her) who pay do attend. She deploys the same dialectical strategy later when she observes that patterns of shift work means attending all fixed-timetable classes can be difficult. Dorota's observation that they are now expected to pay full-price whilst working the lowest-waged jobs is also an appeal based on reason, and implicates logic in the form of paradox.

If part of what one defines argumentation as is a "process of reasoning" (Andrews, 1989) then how do we empirically identify the ways in which this reasoning emerges and unfolds? In the *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum* (2001) and other policy and assessment documents the use of formal discourse markers is seen as important. This is clearly one way in which the analyst can trace the emergence of argumentation in the form of reason.

The formal discourse markers here offer empirical clues to the reasoning going on. Consider, for example, the role of the discourse marker "because" in the dialogue above. According to Schiffrin (1987, p. 91) one of the main functions of this in argumentation is to introduce the

support for a position or claim being established in argument. It is therefore functioning as a subordinating conjunction of reason (Schiffrin, 1987, p. 191). The exchange provides evidence of the usefulness of using discourse markers to trace the process of reasoning. Thus, in Turn 1, Anna authorizes her claim or position that the new regime is not fair by using the subordinating conjunction of reason "because." Similarly, in Turn 4, Yelena authorizes the claim or position that she is not sure with the reason that she doesn't know who pays or not.

The use of "so" provides an interesting counterpoint here. Schiffrin (1987, pp. 191-227) deals with "so" and "because" together as they are comparable structurally (*so* signals a main clause, *because* a subordinate one) and semantically (as markers of cause and result). Again, in the extract above, there is some evidence for the usefulness of this approach. In Turn 4, Yelena uses "so" as a marker of inferential reasoning and states her position that "I can't make this judgement." Schiffrin (1987) sees "so" as prefacing a position in argumentation and "because" as prefacing the "support" for that position.

The extract also reveals something interesting about another key discourse marker of difference, that is, of course, *but.* This is an adversative conjunction or connective (Schiffrin, 1987, p. 176). In Turn 3, Anna uses it to move from making a concession ("yes I know but") to returning to her position and, more specifically, establishing the support for it. In Turns 10 and 11, the discourse marker "but" prefaces both utterances. In Turn 10, Dorota uses it to preface what for her is the contradiction that it is those who are on the lowest wages who have to pay. In Turn 11 Anna builds upon this counter-argumentation. So, the counter-argumentation, the different argumentation positions, are indexed by the adversative conjunction "but."

The focus on discourse markers is useful but should not be treated as unproblematic. Discourse markers are not always present, especially in spoken argumentation, and they also do work other argumentative work, as both Antaki (1994) and Schiffrin (1987) observe.

The emergence of reasoning here demonstrates again that that argumentation emerges as a co-construction. This reasoning is jointly achieved through dialogue; it is not monologic. The argumentation here is premised (even where difference opens up) upon collaboration as well as competition. That is, its voices are consensual as well as competing (Costello & Mitchell, 1995), even in short stretches of discourse (Andrews, 1995). Helen's comment also reveals the potential complexity of argumentation, its dependence on context, with the observation that who pays what "depends" on their different situations.

This exchange also allows us to extend our analysis of the role of questions in argumentation. Anna's question in Turn 3 is rhetorical: "Why they don't come..?" The question is closed, anti-dialogic in nature (Mitchell, 2001b, pp. 130-131) and functions more as a challenge to the teacher's position than a real question. It is a question that is charged with its own answer.

This appeal to reason, and indirectly, to logic, through the notion of paradox, suggests that the unfolding and authorization of argumentation is concerned, at least to an extent, with the rational paradigm. However, it is also concerned with the evidence of particular cases (i.e. her own experience here). The ways in which particular cases authorize argumentation will form part of the focus in Chapter 6 of this thesis.

The speaking position the students are talking up here is also an identity position. They are economic migrants and they are all working part-time, unlike some of their class colleagues who are seeking full time employment. Here they define themselves, and who they are, in relation to what they are *not*, (they are not on Job Seeker's Allowance or in receipt of Housing Benefit) a crucial element of identity performance as we will see again later (see Baynham, 2006; Barker and Galasinski, 2001). It is this very position that means they will suffer disproportionately as a result of the fees increase. The plural form of the personal pronoun used by Dorota in Turn 10 i.e. "we" indexes their collective position here.

Meanwhile, Yelena continues to ventriloquize the official college policy on fees. Her role is one of expositor not arguer. Indeed, she moves to head off confrontation by saying she is not in a position to make a judgement as she does not know who pays and who doesn't. However, most of the time, she seems intent on closing-down the argumentation that is emerging, as in the following:

1	Anna	but I thinking about next year (.) I have
		to go on rotation shift (.) and I think
		maybe one week I can do morning one week
		I can do evening and they change]
2	Yelena	you'll have to speak to S]

(Main Study: Yelena's class, 10/6/10).

Here, Anna, perfectly reasonably, is pointing out the difficulty that shift work brings when attending classes at fixed times. Yelena interrupts, invoking the authority of the manager, S, and also refers to a copy of a college-produced handout explaining the choices the students have under the new fee regime. These are again what Bakhtin (1981) refers to as the

"authoritative" discourses. What we see operating here is a kind of political economy of voice (Gal, 1989), a regime of truth (Foucault, 1980, p. 131).

Anna's utterance "it's my opinion" is worthy of comment here. She is appealing to the sincerity of her belief here, rather than to its status as a truth claim. Schiffrin (1985, p. 256) suggests that the purpose of opinions in argument is to "sacrifice the truth-claim of a position for the sincerity of its speaker." This is a way of negotiating conversational difficulties. As Schiffrin (1985, p. 250) puts it, framing something as an opinion:

> makes it possible for individuals to agree to disagree-to agree with the sincerity with which the principal is committed to a substantive proposition, but to disagree with the truth of that substantive proposition as put forward by the author.

The business of "agreeing to disagree" comes down to a fundamental characteristic of democracy and connects tightly to tolerating and accepting difference and respecting those who hold different views.

4.2.1.4 Closing debate

The way in which the argumentation ends is telling and this is because it is Yelena who closes it down:

> well definitely when you know more about what you're doing next year speak to Sarah and I'm sure she'll be flexible (.) well (2) shall we do some work

> (Main Study: Yelena's class, 10/6/10).

There is no movement towards consensus or resolution here. The argumentation is only ended when Yelena invokes her authority as teacher and says: "well (2) shall we do some work now?" It is she who has, in common parlance, the "last word" here, the most important one in any argumentation. It is as Schiffrin (1985, p. 35) notes: "Arguments often end without winners and losers and without resolution." The question is again rhetorical in nature, as work is what they are there to do; the inference to be drawn is that what they have been doing is a distraction, unconnected to language learning. The slightly longer pause perhaps indicates she feels it is time to move on.

In actual fact, they have been working, co-constructing powerful argumentation in support of their right to affordable language provision. They have also been complaining effectively, which ironically is the main pedagogical focus of the formal lesson that follows. My field notes pick this comment up, simultaneously articulating my position in this debate: "Well

shall we do some work? They are working, discussing the college charges" (Field Notes, 10/6/10).

Yelena refers the students to Sarah, her manager, to end the argumentation, indicating through the pause and use of the adverb "well" that the matter is closed. As Schiffrin (1987, p. 102) points out "well" as a discourse-marker is often used to head-off an unpalatable situation of some kind. In this way, she closes down the argumentation before the official discourse of the lesson begins. In Foucault's terms, the general politics of truth here do not derive from reason but are authorized by what the powerful (the teacher, the college, the government) deem to count as truth. However convincing the rational argumentation advanced by the students is, it will not be sufficient. In this way, spoken argumentation can be "closed" in nature when power relationships are unequal.

However, the students return to the topic when the official lesson begins, as it is a lesson based around complaining. When Yelena shows the students a cartoon picture of an unhappy woman and asks the students why she might be unhappy, Anna says cheekily that: "maybe somebody told her to pay £500." She then takes up this role saying, again with high –pitched irritation: "I don't have £500." She re-contextualizes her voice, through the cartoon character, subverting the pedagogic purpose of the teacher. Ironically, in the context of a lesson on complaining, the student is making a perfectly understandable connection. This is what they have been doing in the context of the student fees argumentation. In Norton's (2000) terms, there is a level of identity resistance here. Identity becomes a site of struggle because the student is resisting Yelena's attempt to position her as a student and thus move her on to the work planned and a different topic. Anna wishes to return to the topic of the fees and to the identity position of a low-waged migrant worker arguing for her right to affordable language provision.

4.2.2 Debating capital punishment

4.2.2.1 The pedagogical context

As stated in the introduction to this chapter, the next phase of the analysis draws upon data gathered from the exploratory teaching I conducted in my own Adult ESOL classroom. I was therefore in the role of teacher researcher. Like the students focussed upon in the previous section, my students were at Level 1 and 2 of the *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum* (2001) and were advanced level speakers of English. Similarly, too, the debate is on a controversial issue, in this case capital punishment. This time, however, the introduction of debate around

controversial topics was the result of a deliberate pedagogical choice. The students were all Polish, Eastern European migrants, working day jobs and attending my evening class once a week.

Getting students to debate controversial issues is a traditional pedagogical activity in all forms of English classroom, including the multilingual one. The choice of this type of pedagogical activity is itself an act of identity (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller, 1985) and indexes aspects of my identity as a teacher-researcher. That is to say, in my role as teacher, this choice of activity is a characteristic feature of my educational practice and forms part of my professional "habitus" (Bourdieu, 1991). The value of such an activity is that it opens up a space for divergent voices, one of the defining characteristics of argumentation (Costello and Mitchell, 1995).

The topics were mainly imposed by me, in my role as teacher and the students had little topic control. This was one of the constraints of the task. The selection of argumentation topic, though, is not simply a matter of teacher choice. As Antaki (1994, p. 159) observes: "the choice of topics to argue over is partly individual but must be limited by the stock of things that society at any one moment determines to be controversial."

At the time, a controversial war was being waged in Iraq, a war which involved Poland, the country of origin of all of the students present in class that day. The topic of immigration is clearly of relevance to a class of multilingual migrants and at the time there was also a lively current debate about smoking in public-places. The students were also given the option of introducing their own topic and one did this, speaking about the environment.

I framed the task as follows:

> you're going to say if you agree or disagree with one of of those statements (.) and then say why (.) and then you'll have the opportunity to ask questions or to disagree with each other as you think

(Main Study: Martin's class, 14/10/09)

This verbal framing established strong floor-holding rights; the students had the right to establish their case before being challenged on it. This anticipated potential disagreement and such an adversarial framing clearly implicated pragmatic issues of face and politeness. In this way, then, the debate is framed in terms of "for and against" debate, a zero-sum framing reminiscent of Parliamentary or legal debate (Tannen, 1989).

4.2.2.2 Emergence and unfolding

The debate begins in an interesting way. The silence that greets the teacher's request for an opening contribution is filled when one of the students, Leslaw, utters the words: "I think everybody agree" of the controversial statements. This is ambiguous: it could be ironic or it could be that he is "putting words into other people's mouths," making claims on their behalf even though none of them has spoken yet. However we interpret this, it anticipates the response of an audience and is thus dialogic in nature. It demonstrates the "addressivity" (Bakhtin, 1981) of all utterances; that, is, they are always oriented towards a listener. The primacy of this response is what Bakhtin (1981, p. 282) referred to as the "activating principle." We cannot be sure how our words are going to be appropriated by others and this is what makes argumentation emergent and contingent.

Leslaw then states his claim:

1	Leslaw	capital punishment should be legalised
2	Agnieska	OHHH [ə ʊ] (2)(exclamation of surprise)
		why do you think

(Main Study: Martin's class, 14/10/09).

Agnieska's response is more a verbal exclamation of surprise or shock, emphasised by the longer pause, the vowel lengthening in "oh," and the rising intonation. The prosody indexes the spontaneous emotional dimension of the response. This is what Goffman (1981, p. 108) referred to as a "natural emotional expression." For *her,* the claim is a controversial one. Here, again, we have argumentation emerging in the form of a gut reaction, or a kind of "instinctive positioning" (Andrews, 1995, p. 116). This is followed by a direct challenge in the form of a question, a demand for justification. The post-hoc field notes reveal that this instinctive positioning is also evidenced multi-modally: "Agnieska looked surprised, even shocked, at the claim. She looked slightly open-mouthed and it was immediately clear that she had a different viewpoint" (Field Notes 14/10/2009). The connection between the verbal and multimodal emergence of argumentation is one we observed earlier in the chapter and again suggests the importance of emotion in argumentation.

Examining the broad sweep of Leslaw's argumentation for capital punishment we can see that it emerges deductively. That is, he reasons from premises to conclusion. The twin premises he sets out to establish are those of pre-meditation and certainty of guilt. Thus, he uses logic, in Aristotle's (1926[4BCE]) terms, *logos*, to authorize his claims. In the extract

below, Leslaw develops his case for capital punishment by anticipating and responding to counter-argumentation:

> and on the other side if like now they going to prison(.)they going to prison for 50 years (.) and all people pay tax and like (.) they paying for him for I don't know for food (.) so why I need to pay because if I pay in tax I pay as well for prison(.)I don't know but this is government money (.) so why I need to pay for somebody to kill two people (.) so we can save money and just looking where it's not humanism (.) some people talking about humanism (.) but why why this this person he forget about humanism at this moment when killing (.) so governments should forget as well

(Main Study: Martin's class, 14/10/09)

This emerges as part of a larger extended turn and is monologic. In it, we can trace the process of reasoning as we did earlier, examining how, for example, the discourse marker "so" indexes the drawing of inferences and prefaces the statement of positions and the ways "because" indexes the evidential support for these positions. His line of reasoning emerges thus: he is a taxpayer and pays through tax for the prisoner's upkeep. If the death penalty was introduced that expenditure would be avoided and the result would be a financial saving. His reasoning also emerges through the use of an analogy. The killer forgets humanity at the moment of killing and so, therefore, should the government.

In this way, we could examine argumentation in terms of its internal coherence and structure. This is what Schiffrin (1985) terms rhetorical argumentation and is a matter of the ways in which a disputable claim is supported. In her work on argumentation, Schiffrin (1985) problematizes the concept of monologic and dialogic argumentation, observing that if one talks of the way in which argumentation is authorized it suggests a monologic view, yet acknowledging that all argumentation is, at least, implicitly, dialogic.

We can see this problematic in evidence here. Even in the middle of an apparently monologic turn, the rhetorical construction and authorization of argumentation, there are traces of other voices, other positions. To begin with, there is the pedagogical voice, coming through the injunction to anticipate counter-argumentation. Then there is the suggestion of reported speech here, however vague it might be "some people talking about humanism." His analogy between the state and the individual is a disputable one; indeed, as we shall see shortly, I dispute it later in the debate in my role as teacher. Finally, although this is not explicitly invoked, there is the suggestion of a kind of Biblical "eye-for-an-eye" voice of revenge here,

partly authorising the claim. This is taken up and made explicit by the next contributor to the debate.

Questions, we have already observed, are dialogic in the sense that they orient to other voices and other positions (Mitchell, 2001a, p. 13). The questions asked here (e.g. "Why this person he forget?") are, if only implicitly, acknowledging this other position. However, they are rhetorical in effect as the answer is assumed. This strategy closes down argumentative space and forms part of an aggressive argumentation strategy, assuming the assent of the listeners; this is argumentation as a battle, argumentation to win. As Berrill (1992) pointed out, the conceptualisation of argumentation as battle is a monological conceptualisation, based on the concept of destroying other voices and positions.

I want to suggest that all argumentation, even the most monologic, is, at least implicitly, dialogic in nature. This is in fact exactly the observation that Kuhn makes:

> An assertion with accompanying justification-a course of reasoning aimed at demonstrating the truth-is an empty, indeed, superfluous, argument unless one can conceive of the possibility of the assertion being wrong-in other words, conceive of an opposing assertion...Any reasoned argument in support of an assertion thus contains a full dialogic argument

> (Kuhn, 1991, p. 12).

There is perhaps something irresistible about bringing the voices of others into argumentation. The ways in which the voices of others are re-contextualized in argumentation is a major analytical focus in the thesis. It is a matter of inter-textuality (Kristeva [1980] following Bakhtin [1981]), or, in the context of spoken language, inter-discursivity. We are beginning to see that the re-contextualization of voices involves not just the voices of the immediate dialogue but also more distant, historical ones.

As teacher, I then open up the floor for debate, inviting response with the open question: "does everybody agree?" Agnieska, the student who challenged Leslaw's pro-capital punishment case, responds to the teacher's as follows, setting out her own case, as follows:

> no (.) I don't (.) I respect your opinion (.) but I agree with one point-of-view (.)but it's obvious should be punished (.) I'm not judge (.) it it's not my point of view to judge somebody like this (.) I saw one movie long time ago and I am convinced that capital punishment can be very hard for a person who is innocent (.) but some but some factors showing that this person just did something wrong killed somebody(.)but we

are not god (.)we have no right to deprive somebody anybody life (.) this is my point-of-view (.) we are human beings we can make mistakes (.) and from this point-of-view I think it shouldn't be legalised institution (.)but every time we are not 100% sure we shouldn't deprive anyone of a life

(Main Study: Martin's class, 14/10/09)

Her contribution emerges as a response to this opening up of the floor. It is also, more importantly, contingent upon Leslaw's argumentation and she uses his argumentation to scaffold (Bruner, 1985) hers, responding point by point. She is a skilful debater. She begins with a face-saving (Brown and Levinson, 1978; 1987) move ("I respect your opinion.") just after stating directly that she disagrees with his position. Pragmatic considerations of face and politeness are clearly of particular relevance to argumentative discourse (Schiffrin, 1985). This moment by moment positioning is a matter of what Goffman (1981) calls footing. He describes footing as "the alignment we take up to ourselves and the others present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance" (Goffman, 1981, p. 128). This concept can help us to account here for the dialogic nature of the monologic turn as she adjusts her footing within the turn.

Having carefully framed her disagreement, she then directly addresses the points he makes. She counters his injunction to revenge, with its Biblical echoes, by explicitly invoking religion to authorise and establish the credibility of her claim: "we are not god we have no right to deprive somebody anybody life." Man is human and makes mistakes. The authorization here comes through an appeal to ethos, to the credibility or otherwise of human authority.

This is not just a matter of authorizing her argumentation though. It is also a matter of identity performance, more precisely, the performance of identity through the emphasis upon what she says she is *not*. The key here is the argumentative difference that opens up. This, I will suggest, is central to the expression of her identity here. Thus she is a human being, probably a religious believer, but she is *not* a judge, she is *not* god etc. As Baynham (2006, p. 384) puts it: "a crucial insight of identity theory is that we define ourselves in terms of what we are not as much as in terms of what we are." She is defining her identity in terms of her antagonism to his position. He is, by implication, taking on these roles and so she is positioning him. Indeed, we have seen Leslaw do exactly the same, establishing his

argumentation and his identity position by counterpointing it to those of others ("some people talking about humanism").

Indeed, she makes the Biblical echo more than just an analytical inference on the part of the researcher by explicitly invoking god and religion. This Biblical explicitness is also made visible later in the debate by another student who, arguing for the death penalty, says of convicted killers: "we supposed to forget for his humanity and er treat like he did for others." This is what Bakhtin (1981) refers to as the "ventriloqual" nature of language; the words we utter have already been spoken elsewhere. These words were uttered by Tomasz and, more distantly, ventriloquize the moral teachings of Jesus as they have come down to us through the words of the Bible.

However, the evaluation is contested here. The students draw upon the Bible to authorize different positions on the moral dilemmas presented by the debate on capital punishment. Indeed, Agnieska responds to Leslaw's invocation of humanism by saying: "ah but from my humanity point-of-view we should forgive don't create revenge." Here she counter-points his argumentation for revenge with hers for forgiveness. It is hard not to hear Biblical voices here, Old Testament revenge versus New Testament forgiveness. These are all Polish students from a Catholic country and they are likely to be familiar with Biblical text. Indeed, this familiarity is explicitly revealed elsewhere, when the motion that religion should be deleted is debated. They all have stories to tell about their Catholic backgrounds. Moreover, during this debate, their explicit positions on religion are revealed. This, then, is an aspect of their identity that they bring along to classroom debate. In this way, the word "humanity" becomes contested, its meaning argued over in relation to the issue at hand.

Agnieska is disputing the meanings attached to the term by Leslaw. She appropriates it in a different way. The utterances are not neutral. This speaks to the dialogical nature of language itself, which brings with it a contested history of use, reception and response in different contexts. These different contexts, as Agnieska's contribution makes explicit here, include Biblical ones. In words which resonate for a study of argumentation, Bakhtin (1981, p. 21) puts it thus: "Actual meaning is understood against the backdrop of other concrete utterances on the same theme, a background made up of contradictory opinions, points-of-view and value judgements." In this way, the argumentation draws upon historical voices.

However, Agnieska's argumentation is not simply authorized by a general appeal to tenets of religion and morality. It is also authorized by an appeal to personal experience. Indeed, this is one of the first moves that she makes:

> I'm not judge (.) it it's not my point-of-view to judge somebody like this (.) I saw one movie long time ago and I am convinced that capital punishment can be very hard for a person who is innocent

(Main Study: Martin's class, 14/10/09)

What we see here is a shift from more argumentative propositions of belief into something that looks very much like personal narrative. This, again, is what Goffman (1981) refers to a change in footing, with footing the moment-by-moment unfolding of positioning. The role of narrative in argumentation will be explored in Chapter 6 of the thesis.

So far, I have focussed upon the point, as it were, of most resistance; taking what Schiffrin (1985) would term "rhetorical" argument in support of a position and suggesting the ways, explicit, or implicit, that a more dialogical approach might offer insights. However, data elsewhere from this debate suggests that argumentation emerges as a highly competitive practice. The data suggests there were times when the difference that characterizes argumentation emerges as a kind of war. In the following exchange, the students are debating whether it is possible to establish guilt beyond reasonable doubt:

1	Danuta	and]
2	Leslaw	because sometimes it's like 100% sure]
3	Danuta	it's always possible to punish without justification]
4	Tomasz	we cannot really make mistake several times] (Danuta sighs)

(Main Study: Martin's class, 14/10/09)

Here, Danuta is going to elaborate her argumentation but is interrupted first by Leslaw and then Tomasz, leading her to sigh with frustration with the consequences that her voice is silenced, at least temporarily. The overlap here is indicative of a level of emotional investment in the topic but it emerges here as a struggle to be heard, each of them trying to articulate their own position. Here is argumentation emerging as a battle between voices, a matter of competition not consensus. This use of military metaphors to describe the process

of argumentation is common, at least in the west. According to a well-known formulation of this view:

> We see the person we are arguing with as an opponent. We attack his positions and we defend our own. We gain and lose ground. We plan and use strategies. If we find a position indefensible, we can abandon it and take a new line of attack.

> (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 4)

When there is considerable difference in argumentation, in the language of Conversational Analysis, turn-taking starts to break-down under the pressure of the disagreement. The opening of this debate reveals something important about the structure of argumentative discourse. Because of the disputatious nature of the topic, and the claims being made, argumentation is more likely than, say, narrative, to be interrupted during the process of its construction. As Schiffrin (1987, p. 167) observes:

> The disputability of the position means that arguments are challenged and interrupted during the process of their construction, such that they do not always emerge as an intact sequence of position and support.

Argumentation here could be characterized in terms of a breakdown of dialogue. However, the difference that challenge opens up may have more productive consequences. For example, Leslaw concedes that establishing guilt beyond reasonable doubt is an assumption and is forced to make it explicit under challenge, to clarify:

1	Leslaw	so of course they need to (.) government they need
		to check each case (.)if it's they sure 100% that
		person can be]
2	Danuta	they will sending an innocent man to prison]

(Main Study: Martin's class, 14/10/09).

His use of the hypothetical "if" reveals the contingent nature of his reasoning. However, he doesn't get to draw his own inferences before he is interrupted by Danuta who draws her own (different) inferences, which constitute a direct challenge to the premises he is trying to establish his argumentation upon. Innocent people will be imprisoned (and executed) if there is no certainty on this matter.

Premises are foundational assumptions in philosophical notions of argumentation and if these are challenged then the challenge is a serious and radical one. This is a kind of *reductio-ad-*

absurdum we identified earlier with the antagonist drawing out the contradictions and paradoxes of the opponent's case. Observe again, the partial absence of the formal markers often connected to argumentation. Danuta (unlike Leslaw) uses no explicit discourse markers like "but" or "so" to signal opposition or draw inference. Again, the inexplicitness of spoken as opposed to written argumentation leaves audience and analyst with inferential work to do.

The function of argumentation in terms of clarification is attested to elsewhere in the data when, for example, under heavy challenge, a teacher trainee is forced to clarify his position in a debate on women's rights, using the very explicit trope: "I'm not saying…I'm just saying." It is here, I think, that argumentation comes closest to a kind of critical thinking identified by those like Vygotsky (1978). The old adage "How do I know what I think until I hear what I say?" seems apposite.

Thus far the analysis has presented the different speaking positions in the manner of a kind of "zero-sum" game, in terms of thesis and antithesis. This is the way in which I framed the debate too, with the emphasis on agreement or disagreement. However, argumentation can also develop in more complex ways. For example, in the analysis presented in the last section, Agnieska begins by making a concession, by acknowledging that punishment of some kind is necessary (*"but I agree with one point-of-view but it's obvious should be punished"*). This shift in footing is momentary but shows her orienting towards the speaking position taken up by Leslaw, however fleetingly.

In Bakhtin's (1981) terms, she is acknowledging another voice, another position. However, we should note that acknowledging a position in some way before going on to attack it is a common strategy, as Andrews (1995) observes. Conversational Analysts (Antaki and Wetherell, 1999) also comment on the rhetorical power of what they call making a "show" of concessions. Later in the debate, as we see below, another student, Danuta responds to the argumentation authorized by revenge in a more nuanced manner:

1	Tomasz	I think that that kind of person supposed
		to be sentenced just the same as the
		person (.) as the person which was his
		victim actually]
2	Danuta	to punish in the same way]
3	Tomasz	exactly
4	Martin	you agree with that yeah
5	Danuta	if somebody kills other human should be

		punished in the same way (.)but the other
		hand only god has right to
6	Tomasz	judge
7	Danuta	to take life to (.)I don't know
8	Martin	do you agree with these
9	Danuta	I am for and against yeah

(Main Study: Martin's class, 14/10/09).

The nuanced nature of this is marked by the phrase "but on the other hand" which anticipates the introduction of the different speaking position. Her uncertainty is also revealed explicitly ("I don't know") and she characterizes her position as "for and against." Their voices are consensual to the extent that they even anticipate and complete each other's utterances and the speaking positions. Indeed, Turn 5 and 6 are latched, with a barely perceptible pause. Here, the interruptions, when they emerge, are not a sign of breakdown but indicate a degree of common ground or at least a common awareness of the different positions, as Tomasz takes a different view on the issue. The voices of argumentation are consensual as well as competing (Costello and Mitchell, 1995). As Andrews (1995) notes, the concept of dialogue is premised upon mutual understanding.

The possibility of change is always present in argumentation. Views may evolve or develop, without necessarily changing completely. This is part of its dynamic nature. One of the students, Agnieska, even acknowledges this possibility as she evaluates the point of a narrative about a miscarriage of justice which saw a man with mental health difficulties executed for drug-smuggling. She says: "maybe when they gonna be more careful I agree with your point." The conditional voice here indexes not just the contingent nature of argumentation but also the role of imagination as well as rationality. This imagination of an alternative world is part of the focus in Chapter 5 and the role of narrative is examined in Chapter 6.

Thus, in the context of debates over moral issues like capital punishment there may be intermediate positions along a continuum, with the possibility of shifts of position, as opposed to simple polarised and entrenched views. This is why, as section 2.2.3.2 of the literature review suggested, it is problematic to see argumentation in terms of a process of removing doubt, as some in informal logic do (Walton, 1989).

4.2.2.3 Teacher role in argumentation

In Section 4.2.1 I considered the ways in which Yelena, as the teacher, became directly, if reluctantly, involved in argumentation. The analysis will now consider some of the ways in which I became involved in the emergence and unfolding of argumentation in the debate on capital punishment. The analysis will consider involvement in terms of both the management and the substance of the debate. My first involvement in the capital debate was to clarify a point of information. Leslaw was calling for the death penalty to be re-introduced and to return to the situation as it was in Poland and the UK at one time. I state when I think capital punishment was abolished in the UK:

1	Martin	1969 I think it was abolished in the UK
2	Leslaw	I think 80 (.) 80s still
3	Agnieska	not capital punishment in England
		(rising intonation)
4	Martin	no (.) 1969 it was abolished

(Main Study: Martin's class, 14/10/09).

Leslaw disagrees, suggesting capital punishment was still legal in the 1980s and Agnieska's rising tone indicates she is not aware it has been abolished at all, or is at least unsure. Here, I am speaking as a private citizen as well as a language teacher and my contribution here helps to contextualize the debate in the UK context, providing relevant socio-cultural background information. The development of such socio-cultural knowledge does not have to be adversarial but can be more collaborative in nature, involving consensual as well as competing voices. Thus, later in the debate, Leslaw introduces the case of a Polish man (certified as suffering from mental illness) who was executed by the Chinese government for drug smuggling. This involves another shift of footing into narrative and the student and I jointly reconstruct the details of the case in order to explore the implications of it for the general issues being debated.

A fully participatory democracy is predicated upon the notion of an informed citizenry. Facts or evidence are part of argumentation and debate. In the context of a referendum on capital punishment in the UK, it is at least as useful as some of the facts and figures that students are required to memorize for the *Life in the UK* test, established in 2002. The example here is relatively minor but, in the next chapter, we see how the more substantial differences can open up between teacher and students when discussing the socio-cultural knowledge needed to participate in out of class interactions.

The management of argumentative difference in the classroom is ultimately the responsibility of the teacher and ensuring that turn-taking rights and issues of face (Goffman, 1967) are respected is also part of this. The teacher's role, in this sense, might be seen as analogous to the role of chairperson in a political debate, or even the Speaker in the House of Commons. They are there to see that difference is expressed within a context of respect and to ensure that everyone has the right to be heard.

I commented earlier on the way in which the dialogue below demonstrated a challenge to the basic premise of Leslaw's argumentation. Now I focus on my role as teacher:

1	Leslaw	so of course they need to (.)government
		they need to check each case (.)if it's
		they sure 100% that person can be]
2	Danuta	they will sending an innocent man to
		prison]
3	Martin	go on D (.) what were you saying
4	Danuta	but we wrongly sending an innocent man
		to prison

(Main Study: Martin's class, 14/10/09).

My question is an open, Wh- one and part of its function is to open up a space for Danuta to elaborate her response. Here I use my authority as the teacher to nominate speakers, opening up the conversational floor. She reformulates slightly but doesn't really elaborate upon her views. However, the question opened up the possibility for her to do so. This can be connected to the government policy agenda on citizenship as every citizen has a right to speak and a right to be heard in a fully participatory democracy. Bourdieu (1977) speaks of things in exactly these terms. In this way, the classroom is the agora or public forum where public debate on issues takes place, a place where citizenship can be enacted or modelled.

There is a degree of ethnographic knowledge involved here too in the sense that, as the class teacher, I know something about the lives and identities of my students. In relation to argumentation, I know who the more vocal students are. In this case, Danuta is a quiet student who often listens silently without contributing to classroom discussion. In my role as researcher later, I asked her why she was reluctant to contribute to debate in class and she replied simply: "because I am shy." However, here, she interrupts another student, suggesting a degree of involvement, of engagement. My intervention as the teacher serves as an attempt to capitalise on this, as I know she is a reluctant contributor. In pedagogical terms, the

argumentative difference here opened up the possibility for a more extended spoken contribution.

The aspects of the teacher's role focussed on thus far are perhaps uncontroversial. The way in which I became involved in debate over the next few extracts, is more controversial. In this section, the ways in which questions were used in challenging views and opinions will be the focus. This, as we will see, involves the students being challenged by (and challenging) me as the class teacher. The analysis will begin here by focussing upon the role of teacher questioning and is based on the exchange below:

1	Leslaw	that's why can be (.) you know mistakes
		some mistakes as well (.) some people
		you know giving prison (.) 20-30 years
		and they finding that they are innocent
2	Martin	so(rising intonation)
3	Leslaw	they find out proves that the others
		kill
4	Martin	ok (.) so doesn't that mean that
		capital punishment is a bad idea (.)
		if we're killing innocent people (.)how
		would you answer that
5	Leslaw	yeah yeah(.) but always can be mistake

(Main Study: Martin's class, 14/10/09).

Here, as the class teacher, I am becoming involved in the unfolding argumentation in a number of ways. My first question is simply the use of the discourse marker *so*, with rising questioning intonation. The effect is rhetorical, pushing the student to draw inferences from the example he has just been using in the debate, a kind of argumentation by *reductio-ad-absurdum*, in the terms of classical argumentation (Aristotle, 1926[4BCE]). Such inferences might lead to the weakening or undermining of his case, or thesis, exposing its contradictions or paradoxes. Indeed, the question forces Leslaw into a concession i.e. that absolute proof is not possible.

I follow this up with an inference of my own and with another rhetorical question where this time I state the conclusion that I would draw from this. In Turn 4, the rhetorical question is uttered with rising intonation. This, and the Wh-question that follows, asks him to respond with counter-argumentation. The Wh-question is uttered on a falling tone. As a result, Leslaw

is forced into a concession that mistakes can always be made. This very old rhetorical argumentation strategy is a Socratic one. As the teacher, I am in the Socratic role and engaging in dialogue and debate with the student. However, as Andrews (1995, p.61) observes, the roles and relationships in Socratic dialogue are unequal and I am still in the role of authority here, despite the fact that the students are adults with adult sensibilities.

In the normal order of things, it is the teacher who asks the questions in the classroom and the language classroom is no different here. However, as we shall now see, students can also question the teacher on their beliefs and opinions. If everybody is a private citizen, with the right to free speech, whatever their profession, so is the language teacher. This raises other issues about teacher stance in argumentation. These issues centre upon what Baynham (2007, p. 37) refers to as teacher disclosure. This is a matter of the extent to which teachers disclose their own opinions and beliefs in the language classroom. Evidence reported in the pilot study, Section 3.3.5.2 revealed different slightly different teacher stances towards disclosing their opinions in classroom debate.

The exchange to be focussed upon in what follows emerged near the end of what had been quite a thorough exploration of the issues around capital punishment:

1	Agnieska	what do you think M
2	Martin	my opinion's not important
3	Agnieska	why(rising intonation)
4	Martin	if you want to know I'm against the death penalty because we make mistakes (.) I don't think it stops people
5	Danuta	because human life is priceless
6	Martin	in the heat of the moment I don't think it's right to kill somebody in cold blood (.) which is what]
7	Tomasz	yeah] but what if the killer actually killed with cold blood
8	Leslaw	so I think maybe you change your mind if you go to prison talking with prisoners who (.) like serial killers or something like this (.) you change mind]
9	Martin	but] to kill somebody (.) for the state to kill

		somebody in order to stop them killing seems]
10	Tomasz	ok but]
11	Martin	a bad example to me]

(Main Study: Martin's class, 14/10/09).

There are consensual as well as competing voices here. Danuta's utterance in Turn 5 adds further reason to the case that I am beginning to make. My view is actively and explicitly sought by the student, perhaps reversing expectations around questioning in the language classroom. Agnieska is seeking my view as a private citizen and is clearly surprised that I am reluctant to disclose my opinion, the surprise revealed by the question with rising intonation in Turn 3. The request emerges here perhaps because the debate has run its course the issue has been comprehensively explored. Everyone present has expressed their view apart from me.

When asked to give my opinion on the issue, my first move is to appeal to my role and identity position as a teacher, not as a private citizen. However, following Agnieska's request for a reason, which implies that she sees my opinion as important, I relent and offer my view, framing it clearly with the conditional "If you want to know." The fact that she uses my first name indexes my identity as human being and private citizen as well as a teacher, although it should be acknowledged that the use of the teacher's first name is usual in an Adult ESOL class.   Throughout, I am clear that it is my view ("I don't think"/ "it seems…to me.") Here, again, there is a meta-pragmatic explicitness. It is clear that, as Schiffrin (1990) notes, the giving of opinions is often connected with hedging, deployed here by both students and teacher. For example, the expression "maybe," used by Leslaw to blunt the edge of the fact that he is disagreeing with my opinions.

I begin to counter the deterrent argumentation elaborated earlier in the debate. I authorize my argumentation by appealing to reason and morality.   The appeal to reason draws upon the analogy between the state killing and individual killing. If the state wants to show that it is wrong to kill, it needs to set an example. To say killing is wrong and to then engage in it is a paradox. The state, I suggest, should set a moral example. This is a form of argumentation based upon *ethos*.

There is an interesting role reversal here, with the students soliciting my views as a private citizen. The level of student investment (Norton, 2000) is indexed by the overlap or interruption in a way that more docile classroom turn-taking would not be. This includes the

students challenging me by means of questioning. Here, I am forced to consider the issue from a different angle, to respond to a different voice. In this case, Tomasz's question in Turn 7 is a hypothetical one ("*What if….?*"), introducing an imaginative dimension to the debate. We return to hypothetical argumentation in the Chapter 6 of the thesis. There is a degree of risk in becoming involved in argumentation. The students are also interrupting me, a move that threatens both my positive and negative face (Brown and Levinson, 1987; 1978).

My field notes for the lesson in which this argumentation took place reveal my explicit stance on teacher disclosure:

> I think students should see that the teacher is a human being with opinions of their own, not a neutral cipher. I also think that the teacher should push the students to elaborate and defend their own arguments in the classroom. Their role is not simply confined to linguistic correction. If they have established good working relationships with their students, there should be no problem here.

> (Field Notes, 14/10/09)

The moment-by-moment unfolding of argumentation, like its deliberate introduction, depends on teacher, as well as student, identities. Teachers, as well as students, have beliefs about the way the world is and how it should be. Beyond this, I would also suggest that there is a pedagogic rationale for teacher involvement in unfolding argumentation.

This is what Swain (2000) refers to as "pushed output," a way of the teacher eliciting more extended turns of talk from the students, the aim being to promote fluency. Thus it is a form of verbal scaffolding (Bruner, 1985) in the development of argumentation in the classroom. Language development is facilitated by language use and the "collaborative dialogue" (Swain, 2000) that students and teachers engage in can promote language development. Thus, it is not simply about language learning; it is about the quality of the argumentation that the students are producing. These two are not mutually-exclusive and I would suggest that it is possible for language teachers to work to develop both.

The connection to citizenship I have begun to make in this chapter is one that the students make explicitly themselves. Leslaw, as we have seen, authorizes his argumentation for capital punishment by appealing to his identity position as a tax-paying citizen:

> if like now they going to prison (.) they going to prison for 50 years (.) and all people pay tax and like they paying for him for (.) I don't know (.) for food(.) so why I need

to pay because if I pay in tax I pay as well for prison (.) I don't know but this is is government money (.) so we can save money

<div align="right">(Main Study: Martin's class, 14/10/09).</div>

When he uses the plural pronoun "we" he is partly identifying as a private citizen, who contributes to the government coffers. This explicit reference to his status as a tax-paying citizen is taken up by Agnieska, his antagonist, at the end of the debate, when it is clear that there will be no consensus on the issue. She invokes their identity positions as citizens, saying: "this is my opinion I respect yours and I realise that we pay taxes we don't agree." Thus, the tolerance of argumentative difference is part of what it is to be a citizen. They are enacting this tolerance of difference here and in the process, I would suggest, enacting citizenship.

This general debating of issues can thus be linked to the citizenship agenda. This is a major strand of the current ESOL policy agenda, linking language development and competence to the wider social and political knowledge needed for effective democratic participation in society. To take the topic at hand, there have been continual calls for a referendum on the re-introduction of the death penalty in the UK and it is perfectly possible that the students, as potential or actual UK citizens, would need to have an informed opinion on this issue. Here, issue-based argumentation can be connected to full, democratic participation in UK life. It is both their right and their responsibility as democratic citizens. This thread of analysis runs through the thesis.

4.2.2.4 Closing debate

Part of the ethnography of argumentation (Andrews, 1995; Prior, 1995) is about the how argumentation ends as well as how it emerges. The role of the teacher is clearly important here. This is not just a matter of teacher judgement as to when a case has been made or when a debate has run its course. It is also a practical matter of the time available for the argumentation in the classroom. Here, they are the invested with the authority of the college to bring the lesson to a close after a certain amount of time. They are, in Goffman's (1981) terms, the "animator" of the policy of the institution. Thus, the debate on capital punishment ends with my intervention:

1	Martin	right (.) so we've got slightly different opinions haven't we (.) 2 in favour]

2	Agnieska	I don't know I am against]
3	Martin	one against and one in the middle (.)
		well (.) that's interesting (.)now shall
		we just take one more (.) what was
		yours

(Main Study: Martin's class, 14/10/09).

The discourse marker "right" signals the end of the debate. The question tag "haven't we" emerges with falling intonation, and so is more statement than question. I have the "last word" here, always a crucial one in any debate. There was no formal vote on the proposal to end the debate, which might have connected the debate more closely to the democratic process. Instead, in role as teacher and chairperson, I summarize what I take to have been the speaking positions talked up by the students, positioning them rather passively, speaking on their behalf. This is partly a linguistic process too, appropriating their voices. For example, Danuta characterizes her position, saying "I am for and against." I reformulate this in terms of a kind of middle-way.

The discourse marker "so" suggests the inferential work this involves. The contested nature of what I do here is perhaps suggested by the interruption from Agnieska, to emphasize, or clarify, she is against the motion proposed. This also involves her, again, defining herself in opposition to the proposal, and restating her speaking position. My use of the discourse marker "well" prefaces evaluation. There is an interesting parallel with the teacher's use of "well" in the fees debate, which I suggested might be designed to close down further debate. The discourse marker "now" heralds the topic shift as another student is given the floor to present a different case. My role in the debate has returned to the more conventional one of chairperson.

The intractability of argumentation when dealing with opinion and belief is attested to here. The subject has been explored in some depth there is no significant re-alignment or change of position even though concessions and have been made on both sides. Argumentation, then, is often brought to an end with an agree-to-disagree stance. However, we have also seen that the "for and against" stance suggests the complexity of the issue at hand and the speaking positions taken up in relation to it. Unlike narrative, where there is often internal textual closure as the narrative comes to an end, argumentation is often more open-ended in this respect, closed-down externally (Andrews, 1989).

4.3 Conclusion

This chapter has begun to illustrate what a dialogic approach can bring to the study of argumentation. It suggests that argumentation is a situated practice, emerging as the interaction of voices both in the moment of dialogue but interaction but it also involves the re-contextualization of more distant voices. The ways in which argumentation emerges are highly contingent upon the roles, relationships and identities that operate both in the classroom and beyond and this connects it tightly to questions of power and authority.

Argumentation can be authorized by reason and emotion or it can simply be authorized by power. Cognitively, it can function as a kind of critical thinking, involving processes like clarification under challenge. The differences it opens up mean that it also connects to pragmatic issues of politeness and to wider questions of democracy and citizenship.

What, then, can be said about ESOL students specifically? The students in the fees debate show they are capable of resisting the way they are positioned, by the teacher in terms of topic, and by the college in terms of policy, by bringing the topic of fees for language education into the classroom. In putting this topic on the agenda, and in debating it, despite, seemingly, the best efforts of the college, and, to a certain extent, the teacher, to close debate down, they enact and perform democratic citizenship.

What, then, about the role of the ESOL teacher? The teacher in the fees debate is positioned awkwardly when argumentation emerges contingently. Similarly, though less reluctantly, the teacher in the capital punishment debate is drawn into the debate by the students. Here, they are able to speak as a private citizen as well as a teacher and their intervention helps to promote a real exploration of the issue at hand and extended turns of talk from the students.

In the next chapter, I explore the ways in which dialogic argumentation emerges and unfolds creatively in the form of language play.

Chapter 5: Argumentation, Voicing and Language Play

5.1 Introduction

We have seen, in the previous chapter, how argumentation involves taking up different speaking and identity positions. We have also seen how it can threaten face and lead to the laughter of discomfort and embarrassment. Argumentation is a serious business. However, this chapter takes up and explores the theme of language playfulness in argumentation. It will do this because my data suggest that argumentation often emerges and unfolds playfully and, I will suggest, creatively.

I will draw principally upon data from the debates already introduced and contextualised in Chapter 4, in Yelena's class and my own. However, it will be remembered that the debate in Yelena's lesson emerged contingently at the outset of the class. In this chapter, I also draw on data collected from the complaint role-playing activity which formed the main pedagogical focus of this lesson. The basic content of this lesson is outlined in Table 3 in Chapter 3.4.3.2.

The chapter will proceed as follows: In Section 5.2, I draw upon Bakhtin's (1986) concept of a speech genre to explore how students creatively subvert expectations in the multilingual classroom and beyond. Then, in 5.3, I use the concept of grotesque realism to examine the ways in which students subvert generic and linguistic expectations in the classroom. In Section 5.4 I examine double-voiced language creativity in the form of parody, irony and punning. In Section 5.5, I conclude.

5.2 Playing with speech genres

Bakhtin (1986) developed the concept of a speech genre to account for the situated nature of utterances. For him:

> Each separate utterance is individual, of course, but each sphere in which language is used develops its own relatively stable types of these utterances. These we may call speech genres. … All three of these aspects – thematic content, style, and compositional structure – are inseparably linked to the whole of the utterance and are equally determined by the specific nature of the particular sphere of communication
>
> (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 60).

Therefore, within a given context, there will be expectations around content, structure and language use. The wider context of the spoken interaction shapes the individual utterances

that emerge and "we learn to cast our speech in generic forms and when hearing others' speech, we guess its genre from the very first words" (Bakhtin, 1986).

In this section, I examine the ways in which students play with speech genres to subversive effect, drawing also upon the concepts of identity play and identity resistance (Norton, 2011). The analysis will also draw upon the ideas of Rampton who emphasized the potentially subversive nature of playing with the expectations of particular speech genres. He observes that: "generic expectations and actual activity seldom form a perfect match, and the relationship between them is an important focus in the political struggle" (Rampton, 2006, p. 31). The difference, to put it in terms of argumentation, between what is expected and what emerges is the focus. I begin to illustrate this now by reference to the official discourses of a classroom role-play.

In the analysis that follows, I will focus upon the ways in which students resist the generic expectations of argumentative speech forms such as the formal debate or complaint role-play. In so doing, I will suggest that they are playfully resisting the speaking and identity positions being made available to them by the more official discourses of the classroom role-play.

The analysis will now focus on the speech genre of telephone complaining. It will do so by returning to Yelena's classroom, focussed upon in Chapter 4 where the debate over fees emerged. The students, it will be remembered, are working at Level 1 and Level 2 of the *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum* (2001). The pedagogic focus is effective complaining, clearly an argumentative practice. The main pedagogic strategy used is role-play, although there is a lot of classroom discussion (another speech genre) around the socio-cultural knowledge needed to complain effectively.

I begin by observing that there is a complex positioning at work here. Firstly, the speech genre being simulated is that of a telephone complaint. The scenario is as follows: a council tenant is to make a telephone call to a housing officer at a local city council in order to resolve a plumbing problem. However, this institutional speech genre is being simulated in another institution i.e. the classroom, with its own speech genres (role-plays, debates, discussions etc.) each with their own set of roles, relationships, expectations etc. Within this institution, role-play is clearly a pedagogic strategy, one which is explicitly premised upon the taking up different speaking positions and identities, in this case council house tenants and council employees.

At the outset of the lesson, Yelena is very clear in establishing the set of expectations the speech genre brings with it, focussing on the role of the tenant. She emphasizes the need for politeness and self-control and the need to give reasons in support of their complaint. Moreover, she is clear that the burden of proof and of achieving understanding lies with the tenant. Her explicitly stated pedagogical purpose is to enable students to complain more effectively. She is trying to help them to develop what Bourdieu referred to a practical sense or "a feel for the game" (Bourdieu, 1988, p. 782) and to take up more powerful speaking positions in the out of class institutional encounters they will need to negotiate. However, the difference between the generic expectations established at the outset and the actual activity is visible the moment the role-play proper begins:

1	Dorota	how can I help you (.) what is your problem (.)
		we need to send someone to fix the tap for you
		(.) but we just need to have a look at our queue
		list (.) so give me a minute please
2	Jarek	what about today
3	Dorota	oh I don't think it's possible because we have
		a lot of people waiting(.) next Monday might be]
4	Jarek	yes] but X has to go to hospital you know (.)
		can you IMAGINE (rising intonation)

(Main Study: Yelena's classroom, 10/6/10).

Dorota, in role as the council housing officer, conforms to generic expectations. She opens with appropriate politeness and formality ("How can I help you?") and comes straight to the point ("What is your problem?") The phrase "queue list" suggests officialese and serves to establish her in the role, talking up the appropriate speaking and identity position. Her tone is calm with a hint of regret when she says it might not be possible to grant his request. Later, she says "I used to work in call centre in Poland." Her occupational habitus (Bourdieu, 1991) positions her favourably here, her past experience providing her with the socio-cultural knowledge needed to deal effectively with complaints.

In contrast, when he realises an early call out may not be possible, Jarek immediately subverts generic expectations and begins to talk up a different speaking and identity position. He authorizes his argumentation using emotion, not reason. His question is a rhetorical one, charged with its own answer, uttered with rising intonation, the stress firmly upon the word "imagine." The phrase "yes but" with its adversative conjunction, suggests this is unfolding

argumentation, conceding ground then introducing counter-argumentation designed to elicit the sympathy of the council housing officer.

Soon after, Dorota exposes a logical inconsistency in his reasoning and he is forced to concede that he can use the sink to wash in. The following dialogue unfolds:

1	Jarek	I know (.) you're pulling my leg (.) PLEASE (2) HELP ME (.) I'm talking to you in the name of my kids (.)have YOU got kids (.) just you put your legs in my shoes](rising intonation)
2	Dorota	I'm not gonna talk about if I have kids or not]
3	Jarek	please (.) I'm very upset (.) my kids very upset
4	Dorota	so let me get it straight (.)let me get it straight (.) you can't use the water in your flat
5	Jarek	yeah please X has exam in hospital and she must be (.) you know this is priority
6	Dorota	I'm not gonna talk about exam (.) let's talk about sink in bathroom

(Main Study: Yelena's class, 10/6/10).

Again, Dorota is good in-role. She makes it clear what she will and won't discuss ("I'm not gonna talk about…Let's talk about"). This is what Latour (1987) referred to as "black-boxing" argumentation and, again, what Bourdieu (1991) termed *doxa*. We saw this earlier in relation to the fees debate in Chapter 4 and in both cases those in the more powerful speaking positions (the college, the teacher, the council etc.) dictate what can and cannot be debated. Dorota also seeks clarification where necessary.

Jarek is again subverting generic expectations, authorizing his argumentation by emotion, and not reason. He asks the representative to empathise with him, using the metaphor "just you put your legs in my shoes." This appeal to empathy, to an imaginative placing of oneself in another's position, is a strategy to resolve his problem, arguably an effective strategy because: "most arguments are resolved with the help of the imagination and with co-operation between feeling and reason" (Andrews, 1995, p. 157). It is, indeed, the advice the students have been given by Yelena, prior to the role-play, when she urged the students, in-role as tenants, to imagine themselves into the shoes of the housing officer in order to resolve the problem.

However, Jarek subverts that advice by turning it on its head; the housing officer is invited to imagine themselves in the position of the tenant. This is consistent with his view that the burden of responsibility for resolving the problem lies with the city council, rather than with the tenant, as Yelena suggests. There is identity work going on here because he invokes his identity position as a father in support of his argumentation. He is not simply a tenant. He does this by asking her the question: "Have YOU got kids?" positioning himself and her as parents, rather than more officially as tenant and employee: The rise in both pitch and volume signal the challenge here. The implication is clear. If she does have children, she should understand and therefore help him.

That this was a deliberate rhetorical strategy is revealed just after the role-play, in the evaluation, where Jarek says that "even kids don't persuade her oh no." The use of the intensifying adverb "even" sets up an argumentative contrast and is a matter of what Baynham (1995, p. 44) has termed "the semantics of counter-expectation." In this case, the unspoken inference is that although the appeal to the plight of the children didn't persuade her, it ought to have done.

His language is informal and idiomatic, full of emotion. The "please" in Turns 3 and 5 is plaintive in tone, as is the exhortation "help me," both accompanied by a rise in volume. The emotion is also reflected in the short staccato rhythm. The longer pause after the "please" in Turn 1 suggests his upset. The prosody indexes the level of emotional investment here. I would also submit that his language is rhetorical in effect and that this too can be seen as an act of resistance. For example, there is a rhetorical power in the repetition and grammatical parallelism of *I'm very upset (.) My kids very upset."* Here, the language is poetic in Jakobson's (1960) terms in that it draws attention to itself and where there is a "focus on the message for its own sake" (Jakobson, 1960, p. 356).

This is not the formal, rational language of politeness and self-control that Yelena has been urging upon them. Again, this subverts the expectations of both the speech genre practised for and those of Yelena, which represent the official discourses of the classroom. Yelena has been urging the students to use polite, rational, transactional language. In short, Jarek is talking up a different speaking position from the one made available in the official discourse of the role-play. This speaking position is also a different identity position and so this is identity play and also an act of identity resistance (Norton, 2011).

The ways in which the role-play ends also subverts the official expectations of the genre. Jarek terminates the telephone call abruptly, without a resolution to his problem. This generates laughter amongst the other students. Indeed, this laughter may originate in the recognition that things don't normally happen in this way. The expectations they have are subverted. This is what Goffman (1974) referred to as playing with the frame.

This move is of course evaluated negatively by Yelena in terms of effective strategy. However, this is a simulation and I want to suggest that, in doing this, Jarek deliberately usurps, however fleetingly, the power of the institution to have the final word, and in doing so registers a small act of identity resistance (Norton, 2011). In a sense, here, he is playing with the speech genre, taking some control.

The ending of the other official role-play provides an interesting counterpoint to the ending of this one. The student role-playing the housing officer puts the telephone down abruptly on the tenant, in effect cutting them off, having insisted that they cannot send anyone out immediately. There is simply no right of redress and the laughter this generates underlines the intractability of argumentation in situations where asymmetrical power relationships exist. The complainant is ultimately powerless. The laughter here is perhaps rooted in recognition of such powerlessness. They, like the tenant in the role-play, are not in control.

5.3 Grotesque realism

In the section above, I began to identify how the language used in one of the official role-plays subverted expectations in its emotional rather than its rational nature. In this section, I develop this insight by drawing upon Bakhtin's concept of "grotesque realism." He defines this concept in the following terms:

> The essential principle of grotesque realism is degradation, that is, the lowering of all that is high, spiritual, ideal, abstract; it is a transfer to the material level, to the sphere of the earth and body in their indissoluble unity.

(Bakhtin, 1986, p. 19)

Bakhtin (1968, p. 317) stated that "abuses curses profanities and improprieties are the unofficial elements of speech." Laughter "degrades and materializes." It is a subversive force, it undercuts (Bakhtin, 1968, p. 20). In the classroom, it can be an act of resistance to more official discourses, both within and beyond the classroom, and form an element of what Blackledge and Creese (2009) refer to as the "second" or "unofficial" lives of the students.

In the role-play, we have already observed that the language Yelena is encouraging the students to use is formal, polite, rational and transactional. They are to avoid bad language of any sort. This has indeed been the subject of an explicit teaching point. The aims of the role-play, I will suggest, seem rather high, ideal and abstract, to cite Bakhtin's terms above. The function of grotesque realism is degradation, the degradation of power. I will now suggest and illustrate that this is how it is used here. Consider the following dialogue, which emerges as part of the evaluation phase after one of the official role-plays:

1	Helen	but they still said they still can't come to solve the problem because they are busy (.)so what can I do (.) I just try to push them (exasperation)
2	Dorota	she could say I smell and I've got a date (laughter)
3	Jarek	I'm a doctor my council is stinky (laughter)

(Main Study: Yelena's class, 10/6/10).

Helen has just role-played the tenant and her attempt to resolve her problem was unsuccessful. In one sense she subverted the expectations of the speech genre, bringing her own complaint to the role-play, subverting the teacher's imposed scenario. This subverts the official teacher-directed discourse at the level of topic. However, in all other ways, she stays within the expectations of the speech genre as established by Yelena but this has not been successful. As we observed at the end of the last section, the telephone call was terminated without her problem being resolved.

Her exasperated tone and her rhetorical question ("what can I do?") both suggest frustration with the lack of success of the official speaking positions made available to the students here (that of rational, self-controlled tenant etc.) by Yelena. However, what emerges out of this is a kind of unofficial spontaneous role-play, which subverts the expectations of the speech genre in its grotesque realism.

In this role-play, Dorota improvises in role, taking on the speaking and identity position of a private citizen preparing for a date. Leaving the problem unresolved will mean bodily dirtiness and by implication an unsuccessful outcome to the date. She shifts the focus from the high and institutional to the low and the bodily. The language is informal, the language of the bodily senses. The use of "could" signals that the use of the imagination here as she playfully invent reasons to support the case for a call out. This is hypothetical argumentation emerging in the form of reported speech.

Jarek responds, again spontaneously, picking up the bodily metaphor, talking up the speaking and identity position of a doctor, with the city council as the sick patient, in need of treatment. The language is earthy, the adjective "stinky" informal, almost childlike. It is important to observe here that this unofficial role-play is also identity play, as different identity positions are talked up. Furthermore, as well as language resistance, it is also identity resistance as the students subvert the identity positions made available to them in the teacher-directed role-plays.

It is metaphorical language and metaphor is another form of language play (Cook, 2000). Metaphorical thinking often originates in bodily experience (Gibbs, 2006; Carter, 2004). Here, Jarek draws an analogy between bodily health and the health of the wider body politic. Physical bodily sickness may reflect the more abstract corruption of the body politic, in this case the moral corruption of the city council as Jarek sees it.

This is a way of attributing blame and responsibility to the institution and a way of wresting back control, however temporarily. In his invented scenario, he now has the power, in contrast to the powerlessness of the complainants in the official role-play. Language play emerges in the form of metaphor and functions argumentatively here; indeed, the process of analogy was regarded as one dimension of *logos* by Aristotle (1926, [4BCE]).

These are unofficial role-plays and serve to subvert the official role-play genre in the classroom. They resist at the level of topic and at the level of language. They also resist the pedagogical purposes of the teacher in another way. This is because one of Yelena's main aims has been to help the students to develop a "feel for the game" (Bourdieu, 1991), a strategic competence in complaint making.

Part of this, they have agreed, is the provision of legitimate reasons to support their case. Dorota is perfectly aware that the reason she offers here is not a legitimate authorization for a callout and that, therefore, she is not displaying a feel for the game. The students are deliberately constructing "mock" argumentation, engaging in the official genre of the role play but simultaneously subverting it.

In this way, the students choose to deliberately subvert Yelena's authority as teacher and the official discourses of the classroom. This brings to mind what Blackledge and Creese observed in their research: "there appeared to be more than one set of expectations for the students: the "official" genre of teacher-directed discourse, and the "unofficial," carnivalesque genre of the marketplace" (Blackledge and Creese, 2009, p. 249).

Rampton (2003) makes an interesting connection between the practice of grotesque realism and a rejection of traditional hegemonic power relations. He identifies a set of well-established dualisms that play out in relations of class inequality. These are: high versus low; mind versus body; reason versus emotion. These are interesting when applied to argumentation. The official discourses emphasise, as we have observed, reason, not emotion, mind versus body and, by extension, high versus low. On the other hand, the grotesque realism emerging in the unofficial role-plays emphasizes the low, the bodily, and emotion as opposed to abstract reasoning. I want to suggest that the switch into grotesque is counter-hegemonic in this sense, that what we are witnessing here is at the very least the playing out a different set of associations.

5.4 Playing with language

The analysis thus far has focussed upon the argumentative differences that open up when generic expectations are subverted. We have seen how playing with expectations around language can have implications for speech genres. Clearly, playing with language is intimately bound up with playing with speech genres as even the slightest change in language footing can lead to a change in speech genre, or at least to generic hybridity.

It is now time to shift the focus a little and to examine how argumentation emerges and unfolds in the form of double-voiced discourse like parody and irony. Double voiced discourse involves complex positioning. In his work on literary art, Bakhtin observes the common characteristic of double-voiced discourses: "discourse in them has a two-fold direction-it is directed toward the referential object of speech, as in ordinary discourse, and toward another's discourse, toward someone else's speech" (Bakhtin, 1994, p.105).

Therefore, the utterance has a referential focus, positioning itself in relation to the world. It also positions itself in relation to a second voice, a second speaking position. The first voice brings in a second, one which has a different semantic intention. So, it involves a lot of inferential or interpretative work on the part of the listener. It also involves a lot of inferential work on the part of the researcher.

5.4.1 Parody

In order to illustrate this, we begin with parody. Parody is one of the main features of carnivalesque language (Bakhtin, 1968). He defines the relationship between the voices in parody in the following terms:

> The second voice, once having made its own in the other's discourse, clashes hostilely with its primordial host and forces him to serve directly opposing aims, as discourse becomes an arena of battle between two voices.

(Bakhtin. 1994, p. 106)

This is clearly salient for argumentation defined in terms of different voices. Argumentation is often described metaphorically in terms of war (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). This analysis of parody will also draw upon the concept of verbal performance. This is a concept which Bauman takes up (1986, p.3), drawing upon the ideas of Jakobson (1960). He describes performance in terms of language that draws attention to itself as well as its referential content, language which demands evaluation and has the potential for critique.

5.4.1.1 Secular parody

The examples of parody which form the focus for this section of the analysis are drawn from the same role-playing activities. They emerge as the official role-plays are being rehearsed. As we have seen, Yelena has taken great care to establish the need for rationality and self-control on the part of the tenant. Jarek has been placed in the group of students who are to rehearse the role of the housing officer. The group settles and he makes the first contribution:

If your bath leaking press one (monotone) (other students laugh)

(Main Study: Yelena's class, 10/6/10).

This is argumentation emerging as double-voiced parody. There is a clash between two voices here. There is the voice of the institutional answer-phone and there is the voice of Jarek. The answerphone is an institutional voice drained of emotion and identity, serving purely instrumental purposes. In contrast, Jarek, as we have seen, is emotional and very human and his intentions clash with those of the voice he is appropriating. He forces this voice to serve his purposes. These purposes are critical and evaluative. He is parodying the inhuman voice of the institution and the lack of a human touch when dealing with customer enquiries. He has already made this point earlier in the lesson, observing that complaining to large institutions is a "soulless" process and that complainants are positioned powerlessly by the institutions they deal with. In Althusser's (1971) terms, they are "interpellated" by them.

Prosodically, intonation is crucial here. As Volosinov (1978) observes, intonation indexes the evaluative stance of an utterance, connects it to its context. The complexity of the stance is also suggested by the fact that, rather paradoxically, the exaggerated tone indexes emotion

just as much as its lack. This is a good example of argumentation emerging through a stylization of voice. Stylization is what Rampton (2006, p. 27) terms "a particular kind of performance." Blackledge and Creese (2009, p. 249) observe that parodic utterances often emerge in the form of stylized discourse. Such discourse is characterised by: "slight exaggerations of the usual, in terms of either intonation or frequency of reiteration." We can see such intonational exaggeration emerging in the example above, as well as in the recognizable and formulaic language of the answerphone "If you need…press" There is even the implicit meaning (to be retrieved pragmatically by the listener) that the message will continue by re-iteration in the form of a list of further options.

Parody often emerges to the accompaniment of laughter and this utterance is indeed greeted with laughter. This laughter is potentially subversive in nature and effect. It might be an instance of Bakhtin's "laughter of all the people," (1994, p. 200) and the language of the "people's unofficial truth" (Bakhtin, 1994, p. 209) subverting, however fleetingly, the official discourses of the powerful. These official discourses include those of the classroom and the parodic utterance has subverted Yelena's explicit instruction to rehearse (not undermine) the role and argumentation of the housing officer. However, Bakhtin was aware of the ambiguity of such laughter, the fact that those who are doing the mocking "also belong to it" in that they are implicated in some way. Thus, again, there is a complexity of positioning emerging here.

Soon after this, Justyna, tasked too with preparing to role-play the housing officer, produces the following utterance:

> **but we have big QUEUE [kyu:] (.)we are too BUSY (.) we DON'T have enough people to send to you to repair it**

<div align="right">(Main Study: Yelena's class, 10/6/10)</div>

Here, argumentation emerges once again in the form of double-voiced parody and we have language play in the service of rehearsal (see Lantolf, 1997). Justyna takes on the speaking and identity position of the housing officer, rehearsing the reasons (long waiting lists, staff shortages etc.) why they might be unable to send someone out to deal with the problem straightaway. However, her voice is present too, negatively evaluating, subverting the more powerful one (i.e. the council one) from within, as it were. The proof of her positioning here is to be found in the narrative she relates about a neighbour who unsuccessfully tried to call out the council to fix a leaky bath. In this way, an emic perspective can support the etic perspective of the analyst.

Once again, the prosody is indexical of emotion, of the stylized nature of this performance (see Rampton, 2006 above). The phonetic transcription highlights the performed nature of the word "queue," suggesting mock indignation that anyone would want swift service. Like the exaggerated monotone of the parody of the answer-phone voice earlier, this is also an impressive rhetorical performance. The rhetorical dimension here is also marked formally, most notably the classical rhetorical triplet ("we are…we have…we don't…") with the reasons for the council's inability to help tumbling forth, given power and point by the repetition and its cumulative rhythmical tempo. There is also grammatical parallelism here, in the contrast between the affirmative and the negative dimensions of the voice, we have…we are…we don't, and this serves to justify the potential decision not to send someone out to the problem straightaway. These rhetorical features are again similar to those identified by Jakobson (1960). The collective pronoun "we" is revealing here, suggestive of the collective voice and identity of the institution.

The performance contributes to an overall effect of mock indignation, as the housing officer's indignation that anyone would have the temerity to bother them with a request for help. This is consonant with her explicit views as articulated elsewhere in the discussion, where she is sceptical of the responsiveness of organisations like local city councils to tenant problems.

It might be objected that the prosodic analysis offered, together with the observation about grammatical parallelism, is over-worked, given that it is produced spontaneously by a non-expert speaker. However, the point here runs counter to any view of such an utterance as the product of limited language resources. Rather, the point is that a spontaneous utterance like this reveals a complex and skilful positioning on the part of the student, and this is achieved through skilful language use. They are a non-expert language user, to be sure, but are nonetheless capable of sophisticated language use, here in the form of parody. There is evidence of this throughout the chapter, and elsewhere in the data collected.

The students also use parody to evaluate each other's performances in role. So, later, when evaluating the role-play presented by two other students in the class, Jarek uses a stylized voice when evaluating the performance of the student (Amdi below) role-playing the housing officer:

1	Jarek	he was like a computer
2	Yelena	he was the computer (laughs)
3	Amdi	what's that mean
4	Jarek	**YES** (2) **NO** (2) **NO** (2) **YES** (mimics monotonal voice)

(Main Study: Yelena's class, 10/6/10).

Here, again, Jarek mocks the performance with his use of the computer analogy, suggestive as it is of the identity-less inhuman machine. This is also a kind of extreme stylization of the neutral transactional needs-oriented language Yelena has been trying to encourage. He makes use of reiteration ("yes no no yes") and intonation (a monotonal voice) to parody Amdi's performance in the role-play. The volume of his voice rises to stylize, the longer pauses further emphasizing the unnatural machine-like quality.

This performance lacked emotional investment, something to which I, as the non-participant observer in the classroom, can testify. For example, in his customer service role, Amdi had said:

> I am very sorry you are in the queue (.) we are very busy (.)I will send a technician in the following week because your problem is not an emergency (.) you can use a flannel

(Main Study: Yelena's class, 10/6/10).

His tone is rather flat and deadpan, and this is underscored lexically with the rather formulaic phraseology smacking of "officialese" or "authoritative discourse" (Bakhtin, 1981). This suggests a lack of real commitment to the principal of the utterance (Goffman, 1981), that is, the sentiments underlying it. Here he is perhaps simply the animator of the utterance. This is a difficult judgement to make though, as this utterance is not as obviously stylised as the others reported here. Amdi has rather a monotonal delivery anyway.

The point of the parody in all of these cases is to satirise the more powerful speaking position, the voice of the impersonal system, devoid of emotion and identity and to resist, however temporarily, the asymmetrical power relations involved when speaking to those with more powerful speaking positions. It also serves to undermine Yelena by contesting the speaking and identity positions she is making available to them.

The analysis presented in the thesis thus far has suggested that the voices of argumentation include voices that are re-contextualized from beyond the immediate context of the moment of dialogue. Perhaps the most fascinating re-contextualisation of voice in emerged when the students were discussing the meaning of the term "assertive." This was part of a discussion on how to complain effectively and formed a prelude to the role-play activity. This kind of definitional activity is clearly salient in the multilingual classroom.

The student responsible for the first parodic utterances analysed in this section, Jarek, defines the word by saying:

> I sound like billboard advert (2) YEAH (2) BUT (2) YEAH (2) BUT (2) NO (.) it's a comic (.) english comic (.) yeah but no but yeah but no but (.) is not assertive

> (Main Study: Yelena's class, 10/6/10).

Here he defines the word "assertive" playfully, by re-contextualising the voice of Vicki Pollard, a character in the popular TV series *Little Britain* (2007). The re-contextualised voice is differentiated verbally by a preceding pause, by increased volume and a slower rhythm (with longer pauses) that serves to highlight the difference between the affirmative and negative dimensions of the voice. The same formal features we have already identified in parody are present (repetition, rhyme and grammatical parallelism). The second time he utters the phrase the rhythm is quicker. This is a closer approximation to the comic voice he is ventriloquizing, that of Vicki Pollard, and thus a clearer parody.

The re-contextualising of this voice here is interesting on a number of levels. In order to define what assertiveness is he proceeds by saying what it is *not.* This is interesting for a thesis based on the notion of argumentation as difference but is also perhaps in keeping with his overall argumentative (often, as we have seen, parodic) stance in relation to the authority of the teacher and the classroom activity in which they are engaged. He introduces an informal comic voice to pit against the more formal official discourses of the classroom. These words, very interestingly, also partly echo the parody Jarek offers earlier of the student, Amdi, ventriloquizing the impersonal voice of officialdom. So there is a complex layering, a complex verbal lamination at work here.

However, it needs to be emphasised that parody is never simply a question of a disembodied voice. It is connected with roles, relationships and identities. By re-contextualising the voice of Vicki Pollard, he takes on the stylized identity of an argumentative character, her stylised catch-phrase revealing a stance that is the very stuff of argumentative difference and conflict. This voice and its related identities is itself parodic, designed to mock a certain type of young shell-suited single mother. Moreover, the voice and identities re-contextualised are taken from a programme whose entire raison-d'etre is the business of parody.

In *Little Britain*, a whole gamut of traditionally British characters are presented and parodied. The recontextualisation of this voice here, then, is also telling as there has been some discussion about the socio-cultural knowledge required to make successful complaints,

particularly in relation to the strategy of assertiveness in a cultural context with some dispute about whether or not being aggressive is an effective strategy in UK-based complaints. The concept of "Britishness" or "British culture" that is central to the programme is clearly salient in the context of a multilingual classroom where students are being socialised into new communities of practice (Wenger, 1998) and where the concept of being British is also central to the government's citizenship agenda.

5.4.1.2 Sacred parody

The analysis has focussed so far on secular parody. Now it turns to more sacred parody. The examples of sacred parody analysed here are drawn from the debate on capital punishment, which was discussed in Chapter 4.2.2, and from a debate on the role of religion in relation to how to make the world a happier place.

Parodies of the debates and rituals of the Catholic Church were a common element of the medieval carnival and served to subvert religious authority (Bakhtin, 1968). The following extract is taken from the end of the capital punishment debate, when the issue of the religious authorisation of argumentation emerges:

1	Danuta	if somebody kills other human should be punished in the same way(.) but the other hand only god has right to
2	Tomasz	judge
3	Danuta	to take life to I don't know
4	Martin	do you agree with these
5	Danuta	I am for and against yeah
6	Leslaw	but I am the tool in god's hands (laughs, eyes wide)
7	Martin	you're the tool ok god's instrument (.) yeah ok

(Main Study: Martin's class, 14/10/09).

Danuta is talking up the speaking position that only God has the right to take a human life and is authorizing this position by drawing upon the authority of religion. Indeed, as we saw in Chapter 4, this means of authorizing argumentation has been important in the debate. It is at this point that the parody emerges, as Leslaw asserts that "I am the tool in god's hands." The point to emphasise here is that this argumentative move involves him talking up the speaking position of a religious believer acting on behalf of god. He is appropriating the

voice of the believer but his own voice and intention is working in a different direction, subverting from within. The utterance is therefore a site of struggle between the appropriated voice and the voice of appropriating speaker.

Indeed, he is not just appropriating voice or speaking position, he is appropriating an identity position, engaging in both language *and i*dentity play. The argument move serves to satirise the position of the other student here and, beyond this, anyone who would offer such authorization. The use of the adversative conjunction "but" perhaps functions as a kind of *reductio ad absurdum* strategy, to draw out the possible consequences and contradictions of those who would use religion to authorize argumentation. Like Hamlet, he takes up (but parodies) the role of the avenger, ventriloquizing the voice of god. There is an ethnographic back-story here as Leslaw is antipathetic towards religion and argues elsewhere for the deletion of religion as a way of making the world a better, happier place.

My field notes suggest that this parodic utterance also emerges multi-modally: "Leslaw's eyes are wide with madness when he utters these words" (Field Notes, 14/10/2009). There is no obvious stylization of voice here so these other clues to the parodic nature of the utterance are important (Rampton, 2003). The parodic nature of the utterance is also indexed by the accompanying laughter. The laughter here serves a number of purposes. It is, again, a kind of "laughter of the people" (Bakhtin, 1994, p. 200) in that it is a celebration of the subversive unofficial discourses that subvert the official discourses of religion. It might also have more inter-personal effects here, as it lightens the mood of serious debate.

The next example of sacred parody is taken from the same class, but a different discussion, and emerged as the students were debating how to make the world a better, happier place. This is the activity outlined in Table 1 in Chapter 3.4.3.1. In the extract below, the students begin to discuss the Catholic Church:

1	Tomasz	my friend he is from (.) he was for really long
		time with his girlfriend and they were engaged(.)
		the priest just asked whether they slept with
		each other and they said (.) ok yes we have]
2	Leslaw	too late]
3	Tomasz	so it's not allowed to be married like countries
		like England and Poland (.) they asked why and he
		said because you not clean
4	Leslaw	and give him a sum (laughter)

5	Tomasz	and after a while the parents arrived give it like 500 (.) let's say in the name of god I'll do that once (crosses himself)
6 (performs action of blessing)	Leslaw	I cleaned you (.) you are clean now my son
7	Tomasz	they went for some lessons after they paid and the priest said now you ready (.) which was silly and insane

(Main Study: Martin's class, 18/11/09).

Here, Leslaw, the same student who parodied the religious authorisation of argumentation in the previous debate, is making his claim that religion should be deleted in order to make the world a better place. To begin with, we can observe that narrative plays a key role in argumentation. Tomasz's narrative, which is evaluated jointly by the students (see Leslaw's "too late" in Turn 2) emerges as evidence of the corruption of the priesthood. It authorizes the claim by drawing upon example. The role of narrative in argumentation will be the focus of the next chapter.

However, the principal focus of the analysis here is on the way in which one, and then both, of the students take up the identity position of the priest in the narrative. In Turn 5, Tomasz offers the parody of the benediction, appropriating the voice of the priest agreeing to offer blessing: "Let's say in the name of god I'll do that once." In Turn 6, Leslaw responds and parodies the ritualistic role of the priest, uttering the words of blessing: "I cleaned you (.) You are clean now my son." Again, the parody emerges multimodally. My field notes record that: "Leslaw made the sign of the cross, the priest's blessing, as he uttered these words" (Field Notes, 18/11/09). The laughter indexes the mockery of priestly corruption and is radical and anti-authoritarian, the peoples' laughter of the carnivalesque.

The emphasis on performance here is telling because in this particular context, the language here is what Austin (1962) referred to as a "performative" in that it is intended quite literally to perform a very specific function. The ritualistic words of a priest are a very good example of this. Here, the target of the parody is clearly the corruption of the priest and the sacred ritualistic words are imitated but subverted from within. However, here, the rituals of the Catholic religion are subverted. There is a kind of classical *ad hominem* argument operating

in such parody, as the general position is attacked through attacking the person who holds it. This is an attack on *ethos,* on the credibility of the speaker.

This debate about religion provided many such moments of playfulness and creativity. For example:

1 Tomasz   can I say something about the vatican
2 Artur   yes you can (laughs)

(Main Study: Martin's class, 18/11/09).

Here, Tomasz's request for the right to speak on a particular topic is met with permission from Artur, not from me, as the teacher, at whom the comment was directed. However, the important point to make here is that Artur's stance suggests that he is aware this is a controversial subject but it is plausible that there is the suggestion of a Papal dispensation to speak in the student's response. In this way he usurps the role and identity position of both me as the teacher (in granting classroom speaking rights) and Pope (the man who ventriloquizes the voice of god on earth) in a single utterance. Artur is speaking as an atheist and appropriating and subverting the official discourses of the church.

What is also telling here is that the speech genre of the formal classroom debate is mixed with another speech genre i.e. that of Catholic religious ritual. This suggests that speech genres are hybrid, a point that Bakhtin (1986) makes. The hybridity here serves the purposes of parody, as the authority and rituals of the Catholic Church (and those of the teacher and classroom) are subverted and undermined.

The ethnographic background to this religious satire is partly a matter of what the students bring along to the classroom interaction, as well as what they bring about. This is Bourdieu's habitus (1991) and, as Section 2.3 of the literature review explains, habitus is a matter of the ways in which the sediment or structures of past experience positions us in relation to the present. The students here are all Eastern European and mostly Polish. It becomes clear that they are very familiar with the rituals of the Catholic Church. Artur, who ventriloquizes the voice of the Pope above, explicitly refers to himself as an atheist, defining his identity position in opposition to the religious majority. As suggested earlier, this defining of identity in terms of what we are not as well as what we are is an important part of identity theory (Baynham, 2006; Barker and Galasinski, 2001).

The sacred parody extended, perhaps, more controversially to Islam. The data below is taken from later in the debate when the students were discussing the religious authorization of acts

of violence, particularly, and controversially, in relation to Islamic terrorism. This was controversial but current at the time of its emergence because there was a much wider public debate about the role of Islamic fundamentalism in relation to acts of terrorism and the so-called "war on terror" that followed 9/11 and 7/7. Consider the dialogue:

1	Tomasz	let's say the attackers and the terrorists
		the exactly muslim ones they so happy
		because they think they will get 90]
2	Leslaw	or 100]
3	Tomasz	67 or something virgins like that]
4	Leslaw	100]

(Main Study: Martin's class, 18/11/09).

Here, the hypothetical or imagined voice ("let's say") introduces the idea of "for the sake of argument." It involves the playful creation of alternative future worlds. This involves the creation of "imagined communities of practice," which are in turn premised upon the notion of an "imagined identity" (Norton, 2011). Within the speech genre of the formal classroom debate, there is a kind of mock theological debate, as one of the students interrupts and corrects the other on a point of information concerning the number of virgins who might be available to the male martyr on arrival in the after-life. It emerges in the form of what Cook (2000) termed "verbal duelling." This is a kind of parody of such a formal debate though, a parody, perhaps, of the literalism of the fundamentalist beliefs expressed, with the taking up of the identity position of a fundamentalist. Behind it, of course, is the authority of a literal reading of the Koran. The expectations of the speech genre of formal debate are further confounded when a female student in the room responds in the following way:

1	Leslaw	but they can't prove that it's true (.) tell story
		fairy story (.) they dying just for this because
		nobody prove that the virgins they waiting
2	Agata	sorry guys (laughter)

(Main Study: Martin's class, 18/11/09).

Here, the laughter is the laughter of bathos. The "high" rather abstract and idealised nature of the debate about religion emerges with its talk of proof and truth, the language of rationality and argumentation. However, this is subverted with the casual informality of "sorry guys" as she offers a mock-apology to the male students in the room. This is inappropriate for a formal

debate on a topic of some gravitas. Once again, the focus is on the low, the body, the emotion, not the abstract mind. This supports the analysis of grotesque realism earlier.

What, then, of my role as the class teacher in the debates around religion? Unlike the capital punishment debate in Chapter 4, my opinions were not solicited and the debate unfolded without much teacher intervention. This may have been different if there had been some Muslim students in the classroom and here, and elsewhere, the field notes (18/11/2009) record that I did feel uncomfortable about the ways in which the debate was unfolding.

There is a question here which speaks to the issue of the freedom to cause offence. Does freedom of speech entail the freedom to speak critically or (in the case above) mockingly about the religion of others? The spontaneous nature of contingently emerging spoken argumentation means decisions need to be made quickly by teachers in classrooms. Once again, the spontaneous emergence of argumentation presents challenges for the teacher. My intervention in the unfolding of the religious debate consisted in the re-contextualization of a famous philosophical voice into the debate:

1	Martin	do you know there's a very famous quotation from a
		french philosopher called voltaire and he said (.)
		tell me what you think of this(.) he said if god did
		not exist it would be necessary to invent him
2	Artur	I'm agree
3	Tomasz	me too

(Main Study: Martin's class, 18/11/09).

I re-contextualize Voltaire's voice here near the end of the debate. It is a distal historical voice but a telling re-contextualization here. The quote I ventriloquize here speaks of the need for (and the persistence of) religious belief. Voltaire was notorious for attacking what he regarded as the absurdities of supernatural religion, authorizing his own deist claims in the name of Enlightenment rationality. He also did so playfully using both parody and irony as satirical weapons. For example, in *Candide* (2006 [1759]), through the character of Dr Pangloss, with his fatuously optimistic catch-phrase, "all is for the best in the best of all possible worlds," he parodies the optimism of the philosopher Leibniz. Thus, the recontextualisation of his voice is highly apposite here, as this kind of parody is what is happening in the debate.

It is also apposite in ways which only the post-hoc analysis can uncover. In these terms, his voice is also perhaps important here as he was a famous advocate of freedom of speech. He famously said that: "I do not agree with what you have to say but I'll defend to the death your right to say it." This concern with freedom of speech goes to the heart of the issue of argumentation and democracy. In this way, I am perhaps subconsciously, aligning with what appeared to be the emerging consensus on the danger of religious fundamentalism, using Voltaire's voice to authorize the argumentation and giving it credibility and appealing to his reputation as an authoritative thinker. This is the Aristotelean (1926[4BCE]) appeal to ethos. Voltaire famously said: "Those who believe in absurdities can commit atrocities."

However, the point to make in terms of my position in relation to the emerging argumentation is that it is collaborative. I share many of the views emerging. I am aligning with an emerging consensus. The voices are collaborating to co-construct argumentation. That this is the case becomes evident as Artur and Tomasz align explicitly with these sentiments. Indeed, I capitalise upon this emergent consensus and call for a break in the lesson. The re-contextualisation of Voltaire's voice here is also an element of my personal habitus, my personal identity, as I am an admirer of his.

To conclude the section on parody, we refocus on the complexity of it. The complex, often paradoxical nature of parodic strategies is pointed up by Pennycook, (2007, p. 587), who observes that:

> Parodic strategies are …acts of sameness that create difference: they differ from the original and simultaneously change the original through re-contextualisation.

There is a clear link with argumentation here in that, as we have already established, difference in terms of voice or different voices is one of its essential characteristics. For Pennycook, above, mimicry of powerful unsettles them if only temporarily. So the contributions of the students here function subversively as examples of what Pennycook terms: "repetition as an act of difference, recontextualisation, and renewal" (Pennycook, 2007, p. 580).

5.4.2 Irony

Double-voicing also encompasses irony and this was also visible in the data gathered for the thesis. In popular terms, irony is defined in terms of the difference between speaker intention and the surface meaning of the words used (Attardo, 2000). It is, to recall Bakhtin's words,

discourse focussed referentially on the world and also on a second (and different) speech act. Bakhtin (1994) refers to irony as a form of "not talking straight."

In terms of participation frameworks, Goffman's (1981) deconstruction of the speaker into author, animator, principal, and figure may help us to explore the stances speakers take up in argumentation. The concept of the principal (i.e. the person who takes responsibility for the sentiments expressed by an utterance) is particularly interesting when examining the level of commitment a speaker has to their utterance.

Ironic meaning is often carried by the speaker's tone and this can be problematic in a monolingual, let alone a multilingual context, as, of course, can parody. It is a subtle strategy, involving a lot of inferential work on the part of the listener. It indexes complex evaluative stances. It is, like parody, potentially subversive in its effect, although its function is not always subversive. Like punning, in popular parlance, when an ironic voice issues in the form of sarcasm it is denigrated as the lowest form of wit but what is often ignored is the latter part of the saying, which labels it the highest form of intelligence.

To begin to illustrate this a little, I return to the same phase of the debate on the new fees discussed in Chapter 4. The analysis will not be recapitulated here. Instead, the focus here will be on the use of irony as a form of double-voicing in this argumentation. In the extract below, Yelena has begun to outline the consequences of the new fees:

1	Yelena	if you are on a low income and you pay
		half price (.) but from next year it's
		not going to be available]
2	Jarek	(laughs) good news (ironic)]
3	Yelena	good news yeah (hesitant)

(Main Study: Yelena's class, 10/6/10).

The tone of Jarek's reply tells us this is double-voiced language play in the form of irony. It emerges as understatement, in contrast to the hyperbole that often characterizes stylization, as the previous section on parody revealed. Such understatement is often characteristic of irony (see Carter, 2004, p. 23). The irony originates in the dialogical relationship between the two utterances; in the context of the teacher's explanation, the news is clearly not good. The irony is grounded in the fact that the audience, students and Yelena alike, know that this is not good news.

Thus, within this single utterance, there are two voices. The explicit propositional content of the utterance (i.e. the voice that says that it *is* good news) is subverted from within by another voice, another intention, a voice which is saying that this is clearly *not* good news. In Goffman's (1981, p. 12) terms, they are the "animator" of the utterance but are not committed to its "principal." Yelena's response is telling. Her hesitant re-contextualisation of Jarek's ironic voice here indexes a similar lack of commitment, as does the fact that she then goes on to identify where responsibility for the fee increases rests.

The irony serves to mock the news Yelena brings but it also mocks her as the figure of authority in the classroom. Beyond this, of course, it mocks the college and the government, the source of the fee-hike, as the analysis in 4.2.1 reveals. In this sense it is subversive. It is a sharp-edged weapon deployed to devastating effect here. The irony problematizes the truth claim of language to represent or refer to the world. Thus, a simplistic relationship between utterance and extra-linguistic reality is unsettled, subverted. Language play, here in the form of irony, problematizes truth-conditional semantics.

Thus, a complex positioning is emerging, in which, the relationships between speaker and utterance and between the propositional content of utterances and truth-claims about the world are problematized. However, this positioning is also a matter of how the teacher and the students relate to each other in argumentation. It raises questions around politeness. In these terms, Jarek's irony here could be seen to have a distancing effect, blunting the edge of the sharp disagreement emerging, by virtue of its non-literal nature, in Bakhtin's terms of it "not talking straight." This may be a strategy to manage the difference and disagreement that is emerging in the classroom. To use Brown and Levinson's (1978; 1987) terms, this disagreement is a threat to the positive face of both Yelena and the student i.e. their wish to be liked by each other. Therefore, the irony serves to save the positive face of both student and teacher and maintain classroom harmony.

As well as an argument move in a controversial debate, irony, like parody, as we saw above, can be used to evaluate the work being done in the multilingual classroom. To illustrate this, I will take two examples from the evaluative discussions that emerged after the role-plays. I begin with a comment made by Amdi, one of the students in the role-play focussed on earlier, where one of the students, Jarek, abruptly terminated his telephone complaint to Leeming City Council. Yelena's question, which invites evaluation, is also perhaps rhetorical in effect:

1   Yelena   did he solve his problem

2   Amdi   he didn't solve his problem (.) he put phone down

(2). leeming city council (surprised tone and laughter)

(Main Study: Yelena's class, 10/6/10).

The ironic stance is indexed by the voice, both through the emergent tone of surprise that Leeming City Council is delivered in and by the laughter, gently mocking as it is in tone. The full meaning and its irony is implicit, to be retrieved pragmatically by the other students and Yelena as the teacher. The ironic stance is also a matter of the semantic relationship *between* these utterances. The students are left to make the inferential connections between them (the problem was not solved, he terminated the call, Leeming City Council hold all the power, *thus* the move was not successful). The role of the listener is crucial and they are trusted to do the inferential argumentative work. The slightly longer pause gives them time to do this.

In his own performance as housing officer, Amdi, as we have observed, terminated the telephone call abruptly, suggesting his view of the role and underlining the point of his criticism here. The subtlety of an ironic tone can be difficult to pick up in a monolingual context, let alone a multilingual one, even in the tone of an advanced level student, as here. The emphasis on the way meaning is taken up by the listener is characteristic both of irony and of a dialogic approach.

The ecological balance of the classroom will be affected by the use of language play like irony. The laughter here, for example, may unite the other students behind the student's viewpoint but may also be a threat to the positive face (Brown and Levinson, 1978; 1987) of the student who is being negatively evaluated. There has been some face-threatening behaviour here, with each of the students negatively evaluating the other. Perhaps irony here is, again, a form of subtle face-work, a way of reducing the threat to face by keeping meaning more implicit. Indeed, Brown and Levinson (1978; 1987) identify irony as one of the strategies used to save negative face in their work on politeness.

The complexity of a double-voiced stance and a complex overlapping of irony and parody are further revealed when the other official role-play is evaluated, at Yelena's behest:

1   Yelena   so what did you think of H's complaining

2   Justyna   it's nothing (.) you will be DIRTY ALL week

(Main Study: Yelena's class, 10/6/10).

This remark emerges at the end of the role-play when the means of persuasion Yelena has been advocating have been exhausted. As Helen says "they still said they can't come" and asks, exasperatedly: "what can I do?" This testifies to the intractability of argumentation. The voice is ironic because it patently is not simply nothing. The problem has not been resolved. There is ironic understatement here, a very different kind of voice than that the stylized hyperbolic one which, as we have seen, often characterises parody. This is made clear by the utterance that follows, which makes explicit the consequence of the complaint not being dealt with. The use of the adjective "dirty" and the intensifying adverb "all" introduce a hyperbolic tone. The juxtaposition of these two utterances is the source of the irony.

However, this is more than simply an ironic voice. It is also parodic. Justyna, like the other students, has listened to a report of how Leeming City Council trivialised the plumbing-based complaint, where the complainant was told they could use a flannel so their case was not an emergency. In the light of this voice, Justyna can be seen to be parodic, ventriloquizing the voice of the powerful, taking on its speaking position and simultaneously undermining it. This trivialisation of the complaint is echoed here in Justyna's phrase. A complex inter-play of ironic and parodic voices is present here.

We can see, then, that irony is a subtle evaluative strategy.

We now consider a final example, one that emerged at the beginning of a debate we will focus upon in the next chapter, and the debate where we drew examples of sacred parody from. At the beginning of the debate (centring, as will be remembered, on proposals to make the world a better, happier place), I have asked my students to: "imagine you are a politician" imposing a particular if imagined identity position upon them. One of the students, Artur, when asked by me to begin the debate, begins his response by saying: "you can imagine me as a politician." This is accompanied by a smile (Field Notes, 18/11/09) as well as a laugh. There is no trace of bitterness in the tone, merely a gentle irony. There is even a suggestion of self-mockery or self-deprecation in his voice.

Why, then, the use of irony here? These words are addressed to me as the teacher as well as to the rest of the class. The student is an anarchist, and knows that I and the other students know this. He knows, therefore, that the identity position imposed upon him i.e. that of an elected politician is an inappropriate one. Rather, then, than a direct refusal to take on the role and identity imposed as part of the activity (argumentation is imaginative), he chooses to

resist by adopting an ironic stance. Inter-personally, there are, again, connections to pragmatic issues of politeness here. He is beginning his contribution by adopting a less confrontational stance towards the task, the teacher and the other students. He is aligning himself more closely with them. This, however, doesn't last long, as he begins the debate by adopting a very polemical stance, saying: "I wanna cancel all schools and jobs."

Finally, I focus on another form of language play, punning, in relation to argumentation.

5.4.3 Punning

> While other forms of word play that force incongruous juxtapositions of semantically separate concepts (rhyme, alliteration, metaphor, irony) receive serious and respectful attention in literary criticism, punning is largely ignored or scathingly dismissed

> (Cook, 2000, p. 81).

Punning has a bad reputation, hence the common expression "No pun intended." Despite the fact that it is a feature of language play we often feel the need to apologise for, its use is widespread across a range of genres, everything from high literary art through advertising to ordinary conversation (Carter, 2004; Cook, 2000, pp. 80-84). Cook (2000, p. 79) states that it is both "the extreme case of a use of language in which the exact wording is essential" and that it "seems to create an inversion, in which language itself dictates meaning, rather than the other way round." He argues that both of these characteristics cut against the rationalist attitudes to language and perhaps account for its downgrading, it's supposed unsuitability for serious topics.

He also points out that, in some traditions e.g. in Zen Buddhism, the pun is considered important, and regarded as the "navigator of thought" (Redfern, 1984). There is a connection here with punning, positioning and identities. He asserts that the pun subverts the idea of a one-to-one mapping of language and reality. For a pun is a play on words, the same linguistic form containing within itself semantic ambiguity. To put this in Bakhtin's (1981) terms, even a single word is multi-accentual in that it contains within it the traces of different voices.

How, then, does this connect to the language learning classroom and what, more specifically, does it have to do with argumentation? This will form the focus of the analysis that follows. Consider the following example, which emerged in the final phase of the role-play evaluation, which has formed the focus for much of the analysis in this chapter:

1   Yelena   so this part wasn't very clear(.) and so did we

solve the problem (.) no (.) so leeming city

council couldn't understand

2   Jarek   typical for leeming city council (laughter)

(Main Study: Yelena's class, 10/6/10).

Yelena's evaluation is clear: the student (Jarek himself) was not sufficiently clear in making his complaint and thus the problem went unsolved because Leeming City Council "couldn't understand." The line of inference is clear, revealed by the use of the discourse marker "so." The question she asks is rhetorical in effect. In this way, blame or responsibility lies firmly with the student. Yelena uses the word "couldn't" with the sense of "wasn't able to."

However, Jarek takes up the utterance in a different way, creating an alternative reality, one in which Leeming Council didn't want to understand; perhaps, moreover, going on to make a broader-based argument claim i.e. to suggest this lack of empathetic understanding is typical of the institution. That this is his view is suggested by the fact that he appealed for such empathetic understanding in-role earlier. He plays with the ambiguous semantics of the modal verb "could" here, turning the tables, resisting Yelena's evaluation by shifting responsibility from the individual to the institution. It is as Cook (2000, p. 84) suggests: "There is, in the pun, the power to invert the established order…by means of the exploitation of the arbitrary features of the language code."

So, the semantics of the word itself become contested, an arena of struggle. This is a key feature of post-structuralist approaches to language. Norton (2011, p. 319) summarizes it below:

> Post-structuralists take the position that the signifying practices of society are sites of struggle, and that linguistic communities are heterogeneous arenas characterized by competing claims to truth and power. Thus language…is understood with reference to its social meaning in a frequently inequitable world.

The pragmatic effect is akin to what Cook (2000) refers to as "verbal duelling." He glosses this in terms of ritualized combativeness "in which the words are used like a ball in a contest between two opponents who are being cheered on by their respective supporters" (Cook, 2000, p. 64). He also points out that, as well as competitiveness, verbal duelling also depends on a degree of co-operation between participants, upon an acceptance of the fact that there are shared conventions and the fact that the combativeness is symbolic.

The outcome is a point in favour of his claim, not Yelena's. Here, the laughter has a clear subversive function, creating a kind of solidarity with his fellow students and potential conflict with the teacher. There is a threat to Yelena's positive face (Brown and Levinson, 1978; 1987) and to her authority. But it is also an act of linguistic and identity resistance (Norton, 2011) as the student's pun resists the identity position offered by Yelena's evaluation, opposing it with his own and achieving identity work in the process, defining himself through the difference that opens up.

The pragmatic (clearly argumentative) effects of an apparently slight instance of word play should not be lost. This is a subtle way of resisting the authority of the powerful, not just the teacher but the city council. Thus, punning can be used with serious topics and for serious purposes. Cook (2000, p. 81) observes that puns are used in all seriousness in the Bible. In the context of language learning, it is also a sophisticated linguistic strategy on the part of a non-expert language speaker of English, evidence of considerable ability. Cook (2000) observes that language play is both a means and an end in the language classroom.

5.5 Conclusion

In this chapter I have focussed on what Andrews (1995, p. 74) termed "the subversive energy that parodic, ironic and other forms of positioning can bring to an argument." He comments on the subversive nature of these forms and the connection with argumentation, observing:

> They are subversive, and argument covers a great many of these forms because it demands an audience, it responds to injustices, contradictions, platitudes-above all it questions authority, assuming that there is always more than one voice, one viewpoint.

Andrews (1995, p. 61)

I also hope to have presented a case for seeing argumentation in terms of emotion, imagination and creativity. In doing so, I hope to deepen and develop discourse analytic approaches which foreground rationality. I also hope to provide a counter-weight to the ways argumentation is viewed in policy documentation and pedagogy. The analysis here has suggested that argumentation can emerge and unfold in the form of language play and creativity. The forms in which argumentation emerges and unfolds include double-voiced ones (like parody and irony) and playfulness in the form of metaphor and punning. I have suggested that they index a complex positioning, both in the immediate context of dialogue, and beyond, encompassing more distant voices. I have also suggested that their performed

nature means that they are particularly suited to the business of evaluation in the multilingual classroom (see Maybin & Swann, 2007). Finally, I have suggested that this language play and creativity is potentially subversive in nature and function and indexes identity play and, more specifically, identity resistance (Norton, 2011). Once again, the connection with citizenship and questions of social justice is visible and the rights of the consumer should be at the forefront of concerns in the complaint role-play.

The next chapter will consider the role of narrative in argumentation.

Chapter 6: Argumentation and the narrative voice

6.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter we considered the ways in which argumentation emerged and unfolded in the form of double-voiced strategies like parody and irony. In this chapter, I will approach argumentation through its relation to narrative. In doing so, I will address the following research question: What is the role of narrative in argumentation in the Adult ESOL classroom? Exploring this question brings insights into the other research questions, such as the role of narrative in the emergence, unfolding and authorisation of argumentation and the identity work that narrative does in argumentation.

I will explore the role of narrative in argumentation for two reasons: firstly, as the literature established, there is a space for research into the role of narrative in argumentation per se, (see Baynham, 2011a) and perhaps this space is even more evident in Adult ESOL. Secondly, narrative was an all-pervasive feature of the data collected in this thesis, thus further warranting investigation. The focus throughout will be on the ways in which different types of narratives function in, and as, argumentation, helping to authorize rhetorical claims to truth. The focus will also be upon the ways in which identity work is achieved through by bringing of narratives into the classroom.

The chapter proceeds as follows: In 6.2, I situate the analysis by describing the pedagogical context. In 6.3, I explore the role of canonical narrative in argumentation before going on, in 6.4, to explore the role of different kinds of "small stories" in argumentation. In 6.5, I explore how the point of the narrative provides a focus for the study of argumentation. In 6.6 I consider the role of narrative in authorizing argumentation, focussing principally on the role of different kinds of speech reporting and the different rhetorical claims to truth that they make. In 6.7, I focus on the concept of permeability of narrative and argumentation, and comment on the ways in which narrative emerges in argumentation before going on to suggest that the bringing in of narratives indexes social class identity performance in Section 6.8.

6.2 The pedagogical context

In order to establish something of the ways in which the students are positioned in relation to argumentation here, I outline the pedagogical context. The analysis that follows draws principally on data from a debate in my own Adult ESOL classroom where the students were

responding to the question: "If you could do one thing, what would you do to make the world a happier place?"[20] In terms of the affordances (Van Lier, 2000) of the task, it was designed to open up interactional space, positioning students as citizens of the world, as it were, free to make proposals as they wished. There was no pedagogical injunction to produce narratives and no topic prescription. There is a hypothetical dimension to the argumentation and a deliberate affordance the space it opened up for the students to bring the outside into the Adult ESOL classroom. The analysis also returns briefly to data from the capital punishment debate which formed a major focus for the analysis presented in Chapter 4.

6.3 Canonical narratives

In one sense the narrative with which the analysis begins has all the hallmarks of the canonical narrative, as defined by Labov (1972), and discussed in the literature review. It emerged out of argumentation against the injustice (and paradox) of the wasting of food in a world where some starve:

> 1 Agata   I agree with this all I was in holidays now and in
>   a hotel you can eat whatever you want if you don't
>   like you don't eat it and I just took some food
>   and I cut it a bit and I tried it and I didn't
>   like it I left it and on the next day I went to
>   desert with excursion and we had a breakfast pack
>   with us and I sit down and I didn't feel so hungry
>   and there was 3 kids small looking at me they were
>   standing and looking into my eyes and when I took
>   that bag all food I just give to them they started
>   fight they was just fighting who will take that
>   pack and it made me feel so horrible I was just
>   thinking like about I was just sitting in a hotel
>   yesterday I was just thinking **I like that I don't
>   like that** (glib tone, picking gesture) and then
>   for the small pack and there is nothing 1 banana 1
>   water 1 juice and 1 bread with the cheese and they
>   were fighting over that I was just in the car and

---

[20] See Appendix 16.

> I was just I crying and just felt so horrible
>
> *that's true*
>
> 2　Tomasz　　it just show how unfair world is

(Main Study: Martin's class, 18/11/09).

Here we can see the hallmark stages of the Labovian (1972) narrative. We begin with the scene setting "orientation," move through the "complication" of the appearance of the hungry children, the unsatisfactory "resolution" of the fight over the breakfast bag and the "coda" where she draws the conclusions about the point of the narrative for her. The narrative is gripping in its own right and demonstrates that unfolding argumentation can involve the emergence of monologic narrative. This analysis might be taken to run counter to the dialogical view of narrative and argumentation established in Chapter 2.2.5.5 of the literature review.

However, I want to suggest that the narrative here emerges as a move in a dialogical argumentation sequence. It is not detachable from its context. Agata's opening utterance "I agree with this all" demonstrates that this narrative emerges from, and is a response to, the argumentative claims made before. In her evaluation, she signals her explicit agreement with these claims, illustrated by a narrative about the waste of food the previous student witnessed while working at the Hilton Hotel in London. Having evaluated the point of the previous narrative, she then tells her own. In this way, her narrative emerges contingently out of the unfolding argumentation.

The structure of the narrative turns on the argumentative contrast between her spoilt attitude to the all-you-can-eat hotel food, which she cuts up, and leaves, and the desperation of the small hungry children fighting over the meagre contents of the breakfast bag. Part of this involves a shift of footing (Goffman, 1981) into direct speech performance ("*I like that (.) I don't like that*") when highlighting her picky, spoilt attitude to plentiful food available. These performance features include verbal ones, such as intonation, her glib tone emphasising the spoilt nature of someone who has too much. The rhetorical role of speech performance in the authorisation of argumentation will be returned to later in this chapter.

Thus, she evaluates herself as a figure (Goffman, 1981) in the narrative. Research (Baynham, 2011b; Hill and Zepeda, 1993) suggests such verbal performance features, although traditionally associated with narrative, are also characteristic of argumentation structures. These performance features are also multimodal, as she dramatizes the pickiness through

gesture, more specifically pointing, to accompany the deictic pointing of the demonstrative pronouns "that" (Field Notes: 18/11/2009).

Like a Biblical parable, classical fable, or Buddhist koan, the narrative illustrates or embodies a moral lesson or truth and it is for the listener to make appropriate inferences and connections. As with the hidden premises of Aristotle's enthymeme, the evaluation is to be inferred by the listener. Indeed, the comment of one of the other students, Tomasz, demonstrates that just such a process has taken place. He says "it just show how unfair world is." Here, evaluation is provided by another, and is a dialogical act, jointly-achieved. In Bakhtin's words (1981), as we have seen, listening is the "activating principle" and the argumentative point of the narrative is retrieved pragmatically.

Although there are the specific details one might expect with personal narrative (e.g. the 3 small boys), it is interesting that there are no proper nouns to indicate specific locations or people. Indeed, the nouns are stubbornly abstract. She is on "holiday," at a "hotel," the "excursion" is in the "desert" and "the 3 kids small" are unnamed and of indeterminate gender. This is typical of narrative functioning as an exemplum, to which the analysis turns shortly.

What, though, about the evidential claim to truth of this personal narrative? Why is it rhetorically powerful as a move in argumentation? She finishes the narrative by saying: "that's true". There is a claim to truth here. This claim is connected to the authenticity of this narrative and amounts to claiming: "I was there. I witnessed this." This is what Baynham (1995, p. 41) refers to as the evidential claim of personal narrative. It is invested with authority and legitimacy precisely because it was something that actually happened to her.

Why, then, should this be such a powerful move in argumentation? The claim is that narrative adds evidence and authority to argumentation because it is more difficult to counter than an explicitly stated proposition, grounded as it is in notions of consent (see Kress, 1989). The evidential claim of this personal narrative is that it is factual, rooted in the speaker's own experiences. Thus, challenging it amounts to challenging the experience (Baynham, 1995, p. 42). Narrative thus becomes a strategy for closing down argumentation, for presenting argument claims or propositions, in effect, as fact (see Kress, 1989). Schiffrin (1990, p. 255) asserts that: "In contrast to opinions, which may either begin or end an argument, stories are likely to be used as efforts to end an argument."

This is particularly interesting because the narrator of this story had already indicated her need to leave the lesson a little early, suggesting perhaps that the telling of this story might indeed have been motivated by a desire to close down the argumentation. This is perhaps confirmed by the fact that Agata did indeed leave early. In fact, Tomasz's summing up of the point of the narrative, commented upon earlier, is also, arguably, a typical closing move.

6.4 Small stories

The literature review discussed the concept of 'small stories.' These, it will be remembered, are defined as follows:

> A gamut of under-represented narrative activities, such as tellings of ongoing events, future or hypothetical events, shared (or known) events, but also allusions to tellings, deferrals of tellings and refusals to tell. These tellings are typically small when compared to the pages and pages of transcript of interview narratives.

> (Georgakopoulou, 2006, p. 123)

In what follows, I will explore the ways in which small stories play a role in the unfolding and authorisation of argumentation.

6.4.1 Fleeting moments of narrative orientation

In order to begin to explore and illustrate this idea of "small stories," I return to data from the capital punishment debate, discussed in Chapter 4. In this debate, Agnieska, it will be remembered, begins to develop her argumentation against the death penalty:

> no I don't (.) I respect your opinion but I agree with one point-of-view but it's obvious should be punished (.)I'm not judge (.) it it's not my point-of-view to judge somebody like this (.) I saw one movie long time ago and I am convinced that capital punishment can be very hard for a person who is innocent

> (Main Study: Martin's class, 14/10/09)

What is interesting for our present focus here is the shift of footing (Goffman, 1981) from utterances which seem to convey opinion into narrative with "I saw one movie." This, I suggest, is a very small story. It is a narrative of personal experience but certainly not the canonical Labovian narrative discussed in the previous section. It is more akin to what Hymes (1996) called: "fleeting moments of narrative orientation to the world." What, then, is

this narrative doing in the wider argumentative discourse in which it is embedded? I suggest that it has something to do with the way that the argumentative claims made here are authorized, something to do with providing evidence for such claims.

There is no argumentative discourse marker to indicate a cause-effect relationship, only the rather neutral co-ordinating conjunction "and." The film (which is not named) she saw many years ago seems to be connected to the strength of her commitment to the subsequent claims that capital punishment can be hard for the innocent and she goes on to claim that it should not be applied in cases where there is no certainty or clear proof. The fact that this is spontaneously emergent spoken argumentation might account for the absence of such a marker. The audience is left to infer the causal connection in the absence of explicitness.

6.4.2 Refusals to tell

In Chapter 4, we observed, in the debate about the new fees, that argument is about what can and cannot be said and connected this to power relations (Foucault, 1972). Similarly, in narrative, a refusal to tell can be illuminating, implicating questions of power. In the following example, Artur is authorizing his polemical claim that "all jobs should be cancelled." He says:

> I hope that I could find people who really like their job (.) for example my mates from work when when boss calling them (.)I don't wanna say how he calling them (.)they say yeah we are alright with it (.) we like that (.) they agree yeah and then that's fine (.) he has to do it because he he has to push them (.) even in the wrong way

> (Main Study: Martin's class, 18/11/09).

Here, he refuses to report how the boss is referring to his friends. Hill and Zepeda (1993) observe that reporting speech (or *not* reporting it, as here) often indexes pragmatic issues of face and politeness. Reporting the abusive words might constitute a threat to the positive face (Brown and Levinson, 1987; 1978) of both Artur and the other students. However, I want to suggest that there is more to this than simply the desire to avoid causing offence by reporting bad language. The clear inference is that this language was abusive in nature and indexes a lack of respect on behalf of the boss.

There is a sense in which this is more powerful as evidence because it is unspoken, the audience left to make the inference, clear though the implication might be. There might also be a sense in which the audience is treated with more respect and trusted to make explicit what is implicit, rather than the argumentation being made wholly explicit. The power of this

as evidence also originates in the implication that the student was there at the time and is a direct witness to the language used. In Goffman's (1981) terms, his friends are the "figures" in the story but Artur casts himself in the role of the overhearer, rather than the direct addressee. This allows him to position himself in opposition to them, as less compliant in the face of verbal abuse.

The figure of the boss, the authority figure, is clearly negatively positioned through this refusal and this is clearly part of the evidence being presented in his case for better working conditions. There is a sense here in which he is more than just an individual boss; he comes perhaps to represent all bosses. The exemplary function of this narrative is explicitly marked by "for example" and it is to the narrative as exemplum that we now turn.

6.4.3 The exemplum

An exemplum is a narrative told in the service of an argumentative point (Eggins and Slade 1997, pp. 257-59), a narrative where the evaluation or point is most explicit (Andrews, 1995, p.40). These may, or may not, (as in the case below), be marked by a formal discourse marker such as "for example." By way of illustrating this, consider the way in which the following narrative emerged in argumentation. Artur is making his case for cancelling all jobs by advancing the generalized argument claim that "accidents happen at work." The extract below begins with evidence in the form of a further claim that work is so dangerous that people sometimes die there:

> sometimes people dying at work as well (2) my father died at work (.) because he'd been a driver of the ambulance (.) and he'd been very tired after 48 hour shift (.) so it was too much for him (.) too much for everyone I think

> (Main Study: Martin's class, 18/11/09).

In terms of its duration, it is again something more akin to the "fleeting moments of narrative orientation to the world" alluded to by Hymes (1996) and discussed in 6.4.1. Artur's father was an ambulance driver who worked a 48-hour shift and died at work. This small narrative is tightly embedded within more propositional claims often characteristic of argumentative discourse. This shift into narrativity is not explicitly signalled lexically, as it is elsewhere in the data, by a discourse marker like *for example*. However, it is prosodically signalled, through a very effective pause. This is effective rhetorically, presaging the shock of the revelation to come. Pauses also precede the general conclusion he draws from the narrative, giving it power and point.

Within the narrative, the discourse markers ("because" and "so") point to the cause-effect relationship of the nature of his father's work (specifically the long shifts) and his subsequent death. This shift into evaluation is marked lexically, with the discourse marker "so." Then there is another pause and, once the narrative has been evaluated, the claim is broadened in a return to the argumentative present. There is no formal discourse marker to signal this. There is simply the pause.

Here the argumentative point of the narrative for the present moment is made in relation to his own argumentation. This shift in moment-by-moment positioning, or footing (Goffman, 1981) from the specific pronoun "him" to the more general "everyone" is highlighted by the repetition and structural parallelism they are embedded in ("too much for him…too much for everyone"). The same is true earlier, with the shift into anecdote, from "some people dying" to "my father died"). There is a strong rhythmical structure, in which the structural parallelisms both highlight the difference and make the connection between the specific example and the general claim.

The gravity of the example makes its appeal emotional, if not visceral. This is a powerful instance of what Aristotle (1926 [4BCE]) calls the pathetic argument. In Goffman's (1981) terms, the *figure* presented in the story is the father of someone the audience knows. Thus, his identity position as a son is invoked as part of the authorization of argumentation. This has the effect of eliciting their sympathy and, consequently, strengthening the base for the claim (that work is dangerous) in the ways that narratives often do. Schiffrin asserts that stories are "used during argument to strengthen speaker's claims" and explains that this is because they:

> help transform the listener of the story into a vicarious participant in an experience and …allow the narrator to present him/herself as animator, figure and author. Because they create a widened base of support for the speaker's position, they free the author from sole responsibility for the truth of a position, and allow the principal to share responsibility for commitment to a position with the audience

> (Schiffrin, 1990, p. 255)

Here, she adopts Goffman's (1981) categorisation of the speaker, suggesting that the listener is drawn into the narrative world, experiencing what the speaker has experienced. This widens support for the claim i.e. now they have vicariously experienced it. In the same move, it distributes the responsibility for the truth claim, mitigating the speaker's commitment to it by drawing the audience in. This is why it constitutes a powerful rhetorical move. Hill and

Zepeda (1993) pointed to a similar function for narrative in oral argumentation in their research.

Although this is a particularly vivid example, it indexes the importance of the emotional dimension that narrative brings to argumentation. In the context of the emerging argumentation, this small story functions as an exemplum. The point of the narrative here is to illustrate his claim, to provide evidence, to authorise it. Hill and Zepeda (1993) see the attribution of responsibility and blame as one of the functions of embedded oral narrative in argumentative discourse and this is also one of its functions here.

6.4.4 Generic narrative

Generic, or iterative, narrative is a matter of what occurs typically or repeatedly (Baynham, 2011b). It is non-canonical in that the iterativity means that the uniqueness condition of canonical narrative is suspended (Baynham, 2006, p. 382). The narrative is not something that only happened to one person once. Artur, the first student to speak, shifts straight into narrative mode. His chief argumentative claim is that "I wanna cancel all schools and jobs." This is how he begins to justify his polemical claim:

> I am still sick about the job (.) that's why I think the people should do what they want to do (.) I can see at 8 o'clock in the morning people going to (.) to work and they are really sad and tired without any sleeping (.) because of stress (.) because they have to wake up in the morning (.) without a job you can be independent

> Main Study: Martin's class, 18/11/09).

It is interesting that Artur clearly sees personal experience as a resource for authorising his argumentation that people should do what they want. He authorizes his argumentation by appealing to personal experience: "I am still sick about the job that's why I think…." The phrase "that's why" clearly indexes cause and effect, reason. Again, although this is personal experience, it is not the canonical past event. The present simple suggests a more generic narrative ("I can see…") and a different, broader-based argumentative truth claim, as well as the specificity of anecdote. This, he might be taken to imply, is what happens every day on the underground. It has the quality of typicality or iterativity.

Argumentatively, this generic narrative functions as a "situated generalization" (Baynham, 2000, p. 114), anecdotal narratives which also carry a more generalizing truth claim. This, as we saw earlier, was a move that Artur made when speaking of the death of his father.

This is a small story, in terms of duration and in terms of it being "non-canonical." It is tightly embedded in more argumentative discourse and within the conversational turn. Artur switches from narrative to argumentation mode. It is the evaluative point of the story that is significant. Here, we see the consequences of work on peoples' lives, bringing to mind the opening scene of Woody Allen's film, *Stardust Memories* (1980) with its tired defeated tube-train commuters on the morning journey to work. The evaluation is prefaced by the subordinating conjunction "because." Work is an exhausting and depressing experience and is here specifically connected to argumentation around a loss of independence and control.

There is an ethnographic backstory to excavate here too, an identity position as a migrant worker, as Artur works long hours in the fast-food chain *Subway* for very low wages. Interestingly, he is from a radical anarchist background in Poland, a fact not unconnected, on one level, to his main argumentative claim around the oppressive nature of work. Thus, elements of his political habitus are invoked here (Bourdieu, 1991). In a generic narrative, there is a way in which the speaker is making a claim on behalf of the commuters, claiming the entitlement to speak for them (see Baynham, 2006, p.382).

The analysis now considers another kind of "small story."

6.4.5 Hypothetical narratives

Hypothetical narrative involves the relating of a future or imagined event. They fall under the umbrella term 'small stories' (Georgakopoulou, 2006) and an example of this kind of narrative can be seen in the utterances below, where Agata is urging the other students in the debate to 'show who they are' in their workplace interactions:

> (.)it's like you have to show who you are too (.) he was like telling me (.) oh you can't do that you can't do that(.) if I would start cry and run away and say I can't do it he would say (.) cry go away I don't need it (.) I don't need you go away

> (Main Study: Martin's class, 18/11/09).

Agata's opening utterance is, I suggest, more an argumentation claim than a narrative. It is an assertion of belief or opinion. For the purposes of the analysis in this chapter, it is the way in which this is authorised that is interesting. There is a hypothetical or imagined narrative element in the utterances that follow. This is indexed by the use of the conditional markers 'if' and 'would.' Agata begins with a fleeting past narrative by reporting the way her boss has tried to control her at work. Then she imagines a future scenario in which she responds by

giving up and saying she can't do the things he wants her to do. This conditionality extends to the boss's response, which she asserts would be to get rid of her.

It should be noted that there is also an element of reasoning here, authorising the unfolding argumentation, a relationship of cause and effect embodied in the use of the conditional structure. This represents a form of hypothetical argumentation, a 'for the sake of argument' approach, which is common in everyday argumentation. There is also, though, identity work going on here. She is positioning herself as someone who would *not* do such a thing, as someone who would show strength in the face of such bullying. We know that a key characteristic of identity theory is defining ourselves in terms of what we are not (Barker and Galasinski, 2006) and this is what she is doing here.

The analysis now focusses on a final kind of small story.

6.4.6 Shared stories

In this section the analytical focus will be on what Georgakopoulou (2007) terms shared stories. These represent another non-canonical narrative type that fall within the purview of the "small stories" characterization offered earlier. The purpose of the analysis in this section will be to illuminate the ways in which such stories might function within emerging and unfolding argumentation.

What, then, is a shared story? Georgakopoulou (2007, p. 50) defines them thus: "Stories that are oriented to in interaction as familiar either because they have been told in the past or because the events reported in them are known to all or some of the participants."

In the data that I focus upon here, the shared stories orientated to are stories of workplace experience, in particular the experience of discrimination in the workplace. I will suggest, in doing so, that the students share knowledge of the kinds of events reported in these stories, even if they haven't personally experienced the same events. In 6.4.2 the student refuses to tell exactly how the boss was abusing his co-workers. In the next phase of the analysis I will focus on stories that emerge inter-textually on the theme of workplace discrimination. The narrative below, told by Gosia, emerges immediately after the narrative told in 6.4.2 and centres on the same theme of discrimination in the workplace:

> and other thing is racism (.) I think it's more in common here (.) if you are for
> example foreigner (.) and evidence (.)about my thinking (.) is that my colleague was
> had to left after pushing her too far (.) it was too much pressure on her and somebody

who was like her boss (.) it was like some problem and she didn't didn't try to fix it (.) she was just pushing her too by like doing her to fixing it

<div align="right">(Main Study: Martin's class, 18/11/09).</div>

This short narrative is interesting in its own right. It has an interesting vagueness: "somebody.....some problem." The figure in the story is Gosia's colleague, although it may be that it is a refusal to tell her own story, as a way of saving a threat to her positive face (Brown and Levinson, 1987; 1978).

However, moving beyond politeness, the word "evidence" shows that she makes a connection between narrative and evidentiality. Like Artur in 6.4.2 she brings a similar identity position into the classroom, that of low-paid migrant worker. The narrative emerges in a turn prefaced by her stated aim, which is: "to create a more enjoyable work environment."

There is what Georgakopoulou called a dialogical relationship between the narrative worlds here: "In the context of future narrative worlds, participants draw upon shared past narrative worlds, in order to support and legitimise their own projected version of events" (Georgakopoulou, 2006, p. 89). In the terms of argumentation, the students are beginning to authorise their argumentation on the need for a better future by providing evidence of the unsatisfactory past in narrative mode. Like the meaning embodied in the Hopi Indian word *Koyaanisqatsi* (1982), these narratives illustrate a way of living that calls for another way of living. The narratives help to establish the argumentative contrast between the way the world is and the way the students feel it should be and are therefore a potential catalyst for change. We have to see the future in our imagination. The research context has already indicated that no real connection is made between argumentation and imagination in the *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum* (2001). The connection is usually confined to rationality in the traditionally Aristotelian way.

However, for research into argumentation, it is the point or evaluation of such narratives that provides a crucial focus. Georgakopoulou observes this in relation to the way such shared stories can unfold:

> Shared stories are typically mini-tellings, comprising a narrative skeleton, that is, a quick reference or reminder of its events and their resolution. What is normally spent time on is the point or evaluation of those events.

<div align="right">(Georgakopoulou, 2007, p. 50)</div>

To illustrate this, consider the following dialogue, which emerges immediately after the narrative above has been told:

1	Leslaw	I think that racism is too big word I think for this (.) it's more like discrimination I think (.) it's [almost the same
2	Gosia	yeah]
3	Leslaw	it's almost the same(.)I don't know discrimination because of something not from this country
4	Gosia	yeah (.) or asian or
5	Leslaw	racism to me is like]
6	Artur	it's happening from the other race]
7	Leslaw	between groups
8	Gosia	like ethnic groups but (.) for me if somebody is just from (.) I don't know a different country it's not (.) I don't know if we can call racism (.) just discrimination because if you are not belong from here so you are worse than me]
9	Leslaw	maybe it's more like discrimination than racism]
10	Tomasz	it's more like discrimination in both actually]
11	Gosia	I think it's too strong word to use

(Main Study: Martin's class, 18/11/09).

Here, the students are debating the point of the narrative in relation to the emerging issue of discrimination in the workplace. They are evaluating the point of the narrative. What is particularly interesting is that this evaluation is emerging as a co-construction. Furthermore, it is also a contested process. Leslaw is characterizing the point in terms of workplace discrimination whereas Artur is insisting that it is better characterized as racism. Gosia's stance seems to be evolving in the direction of discrimination. The degree of overlapping, the interruption, here suggests that establishing the point in relation to the issues is energizing the students. They are focussed on the point. Georgakopoulou (2006, p. 92) observes that, in more argumentatively-oriented discourse: "Participants dwell as much upon a story's point as they do upon its events." Here, they are disagreeing about what the point of narrative is.

This co-evaluation is striking here and has implications for a view of narrative in argumentation. As Ochs and Capps (2001, p. 36) put it, narrative in argumentation is perhaps about: "piecing together an evaluative perspective on an incident."

The point of the narrative provides a kind of pivot for the shift from narrative into argumentation I am characterizing and it is to this that the analysis now turns.

6.5 So what? Arguing the point

In the context of research on argumentation, the point of a narrative is crucial. This is Labov's famous "so what?" question. The canonical narrative in 6.3 suggested that evaluation can be jointly achieved, with no disagreement about the point of the narrative. However, this agreement over the point is not always characteristic when considering the role of narratives in the unfolding of argumentation. In this section, I will focus upon the ways in which the evaluation of the point of a story is contested or argued over.

The following narrative emerges again in the context of a continuing debate about the ways in which migrants can suffer discriminatory treatment at work. There is also talk of how migrants are discriminated against by the boss due to their lack of language or their country of origin. It is this that is Agata is referring back to and dismissing:

1	Agata	and about your english and your whatever from
		where you are (.)I don't believe in that(.)if you
		wanna get something you have to go for it(.)and
		in my experience at work the same situation
		(.) english girl came to my shop and she started
		shop she said like (.) oh you're foreign you can
		get a job here faster than I can (.) we give a
		chance for another english girl to come to work
		and work (.) she stayed with me 3 hours (.) I
		left her for break she didn't came back]
2	Artur	what about the job]
3	Agata	we can talk about it all (.) I mean like
		(.)everything depends of us (.) if you will take
		it in [your head you will be stupid you will be
4	Leslaw	I think it depends on the management as well (.)
		if proper manager]

5   Tomasz   I agree and I disagree]

(Main Study: Martin's class, 18/11/09)

Agata makes an argumentative counter-claim and then states her own position, which is that "if you wanna get something you have to go for it." She is arguing that migrants have to demonstrate determination and a degree of agency in the workplace. In performing this act of identity (Le Page and Tabouret Keller, 1985) she is simultaneously dismissing the more passive position attributed to the figure of the migrant in the story told by Gosia, whose friend was forced to leave the workplace because of bullying. To illustrate this she shifts into narrative mode and says she has experienced the "same situation." The shared experience is the experience of bullying; thus it is a shared story in Georgakopoulou's (2007) terms.

She relates a small story in which the "English girl," who has the linguistic capital (Bourdieu, 1977) *and* is born in the UK, leaves the job. The implication is that she doesn't demonstrate the determination needed to "go for it." It is offered as evidence, in other words, to counter the argumentational proposition that migrants are somehow powerless in the workplace. She, as the migrant worker, without the same linguistic capital, stayed in the job, despite suffering the "same situation" of being bullied. She defines herself in opposition to this figure in the narrative and in so doing performs identity work, by suggesting she would have had the determination to stay.

What is interesting, though, is that, before she can explicitly draw this argumentative inference, before she can evaluate the point of the story, she is interrupted by Artur, whose question ("What about the job?") suggests a different evaluation. He is perhaps suggesting that the nature of the job itself was a factor in the English girl deciding to leave. This reading of his position is supported later when he raises the issue of the unskilled nature of the work migrants often do. In any event, the question is delivered sharply and represents a challenge.

In response, Agata concedes that this might be a topic for discussion but restates her claim. This is then contested by Leslaw, who claims that it depends on the manager as well as on the migrant. In this way, he too contests her evaluation. Then Tomasz claims that he both agrees and disagrees. The overlapping here indexes student involvement as they contest the evaluation of the story offered.

Tomasz then relates the following narrative, whose central point seems to centre on the lack of agency and control some migrants have in the workplace. This emerges contingently and is a response to Agata's narrative:

1	Tomasz	I help for example to find job for one girl (.)
		and after few days she start crying (.)she said that
		it's so hard to work and co-operate with the boss
		(.)I said why (.) where's the problem (.)and then he
		said and then she said (.) cos he's calling me that
		I am cute and well maybe they should make a date (.)
		but after when she said no then he start to abuse
		her(.) so I went to the guy and I explained look
		she's here for work not pleasure (.)and then
		everything was fine but that's what]
2	Agata	no my dear (.) everything is in our hands]
3	Tomasz	that's what they could say even from people from
		foreign and sometimes they like machines (.)they
		just machines and they controlled by iraqis]
4	Agata	no my dear (.) everything is only in our hands]

(Main Study: Martin's class, 18/11/09).

This is an interesting echo of the identity position parodied in the role-play work in the previous chapter. Here, the adult females in the warehouse are passively positioned, in Althusser's terms, "interpellated" (Althusser, 1971). The metaphor indexes a notion of a machine-like human identity. They have no agency or control, rather, they are controlled. Again, there is interruption as the point of the narrative is disputed and Agata restates her claim. She goes on to relate her own narrative. This concerns her experience of discrimination in the workplace. This provides an argumentative counterpoint to Tomasz's narrative about the adult female who was bullied:

1	Agata	I was coming to work one year and every day he was
		trying to show me that he is more higher than I am
		(.)it's like you have to show who you are too (.)
		he was like telling me (.) oh you can't do that you
		can't do that(.) if I would start cry and run away

and say I can't do it he would say (.) cry go away

I don't need it (.) I don't need you go away]

2	Artur	exactly (.) then you would just lose the job]
3	Agata	he was shouting on me every day and he knows if he
		will do anything to me I will tell him (.)what he's
		doing wrong what's bad in this job (.) and he knows
		if I will go away he will be losing me]
4	Artur	as well I'm]
5	Agata	everything it's in our hands (.)the same that girl
		maybe if she would show herself much better it
		would be different (.) you never know.

(Main Study: Martin's class, 18/11/09).

The injunction that "you have to show who you are" is a strong one and represents, I will suggest, both an argumentational claim *and* an identity claim. Blommaert (2005, p. 203) defines identity in terms of who and what human beings are. Agata evaluates the adult female in the narrative above as what Goffman (1981) called a "figure" in a narrative, saying that things might have been different had she been stronger, more determined. She herself provides an exemplum here. If her boss did anything, she would speak out and leave; it would be his loss. This hypothetical narrative posits an alternative world and is an act of the imagination.

At this point Artur interrupts to try and turn the tables. This is evidence for his claim too; it is the boss who has control and she is disposable. A debate subsequently emerges about the nature of the low-waged unskilled employment the migrants typically do. Artur provides an example from personal experience:

yeah for example in the very nice place where I am work (.) you becoming manager you you (.) I mean (.) they the boss or even all the company not giving you training how to (.) how to (.)deal with people with your stuff (.) you just doing your way and that way might be wrong of course yeah (.) so (.)if someone is just like this little little guy

(Main Study: Martin's class, 18/11/09).

Dialogically-speaking, this is a counter-example, a challenge in the argumentation sequence, not simply about the monologic support for a claim. We can see here, then, that narratives are

emerging contingently as part of a dialogic argumentation sequence, in response to one another, and as evidence for competing claims about the nature and extent of migrant agency in the workplace. We can also see that the point of these narratives is contested. The narratives provide the incidents, the examples, and these are the subject of the evaluation.

As Georgakopoulou (2007, p. 53) observes:

> A typical uptake of shared stories as argumentative devices is not the authenticity or persuasive power of the reported events themselves but the point or interpretation of them; in particular it is the validity of the analogy between the stories events and the issues debated that tends to be cast doubt on.

In the context of my data, the individual stories function analogically. The degree to which these are relevant to the matter at hand is often the focus for argumentation. Schiffrin (1990, p. 255) puts it in a similar way when she observes that stories in and of themselves are "insulated from attack" but what is often attacked is "the ability of a story to stand as an appropriate example for the general position being argued." In other words, it is the status of the narrative as example or exemplum (in relation to the unfolding argumentation) that is being disputed.

Thus, Artur offers the following evaluation on the general position adopted by Agata in the light of his narrative above, which he sees as undermining her position:

> and that's what she said (.) that everything is in our hands (.) not really (.) not in that situation (.) everybody knows we struggling to find another jobs as well

> (Main Study: Martin's class, 18/11/09).

Here, Artur evaluates the significance of the other student's main argumentative claim, testing it against the evidence of his own particular case, his own personal experience. Thus, he offers the following evaluation on the argumentation put forward by Agata, which he restates and then attacks on the basis that it is not an appropriate example to support the position she is taking (in Schiffrin's terms) or a valid analogy (in Georgakopoulou's terms). Here, Artur evaluates the narrative differently, using it to authorize a different argumentative point. Agata's story is for him evidence for a lack of agency and power. He draws a different conclusion.

6.6 Narrative and the authorization of argumentation

6.6.1 The rhetorical power of personal and generic narrative

We have seen that personal and generic narratives have rhetorical power in argumentation. We can now begin to answer the questions posed in the literature review: "Why do argumentative moves often include embedded narrative?" (Hill and Zepeda, 1993, p. 12) "What are the purposes to which narrative can be put in the rhetorical staging of argument?" (Baynham, 1995, p. 35) Baynham (1995, p. 42) comments explicitly upon the evidential claim of personal and generic narratives:

> The evidential claim of personal and generic narrative is precisely that it is factual and based on the speaker's own experience, thus authorised and vouched-for by the speaker. To challenge the speaker's position is to challenge the speaker's factual knowledge and experience.

The claim is that narrative adds authority to argumentation because it is more difficult to counter than an explicitly stated argumentative proposition. The evidential claim of personal narrative is that it is factual, grounded in the speaker's experience; thus, challenging the speaker's argumentational position is tantamount to denying their experience. Narrative thus becomes a strategy for closing down argumentation, for presenting a particular argumentative proposition, in effect, as fact (see Kress, 1989).

Ochs and Capps (2001, cited in Georgakopoulou, 2006, p. 90) summarise some of the argumentative functions of embedded narrative:

> Embedded narratives serve the illustration of a point, support an argument, make a comparison, elaborate, provide an example etc. In other words they act as argumentative devices.

The analysis now focusses on the ways in which the voices of others are used to authorize claims in argumentation.

6.6.2 Speech reporting and the authorization of argumentation

In Chapter 5, part of the analysis focussed on double-voiced speech strategies such as parody and irony and the evaluative effects they achieved. In this section, I develop and extend the analysis of the ways in which the speech of others is appropriated by considering the ways in which speech reporting constitutes different rhetorical claims to truth, the ways in which it authorizes argumentation. In this, I develop the insights of the chapter so far on the ways in

which different types of narratives (e.g. personal, generic etc.) make different rhetorical claims to truth.

To do this, I draw again on the ideas of Volosinov (1978). The literature review discussed his critique of the understanding of speech reporting that views it as an abstract syntactic operation. He highlights the active and, crucially, the rhetorical work that speech reporting embodies and also its reflexive metalinguistic nature. He observes that: "reported speech is speech within speech, message within message, and at the same time also speech about speech, message about message" (Volosinov, 1978, p. 149).

The value of this insight for the dialogic understanding of argumentation underpinning this thesis lies in the fact that reported speech forms: " reflect basic and constant tendencies in the active reception of other speaker's speech, and it is this reception, after all, that is fundamental for dialogue" (Volosinov, 1986, p. 117). In this way, there is a dynamic relationship between the reported speech and the context in which it is reported.

The analysis will consider direct and indirect speech reporting in terms of the different rhetorical claims to truth they carry with them. It will also consider the ways in which speech reporting authorizes argumentation in different ways. In doing this, it will draw upon the literature on evidentiality (e.g. Besnier, 1993; Hill and Irvine, 1993). Evidentiality in this regard is defined in terms of the linguistic expression of what Anderson, (1986, p. 273, cited in Besnier, 1993) terms "the kinds of evidence a person has for making factual claims." It also draws upon Baynham's (1996) treatment of direct speech reporting in non-narrative contexts.

6.6.2.1 Direct speech

We begin by considering direct speech. Volosinov (1978) emphasises the way that direct speech foregrounds the commitment of the reporter to the content and the form of the utterance. Thus a particular claim to truth is being made. As Baynham (1996, p. 64) puts it: "The "claim to truth" in direct speech reporting is that the utterance reported was the very form of the words used by the speaker." This is grounded in what has come to be known as the "verbatim hypothesis" (see for example, Clark and Gerrig, 1990) and premised upon the concept of an original utterance.

This concept of an evidential or a truth claim can be connected to the concept of authority or authorization. In these terms, the practice of direct speech reporting involves the authorization of argumentation by those whose speech is reported as well as the reporting

speaker. To cite Baynham again (1996, p. 64): "Embedding an utterance as spoken by another signals that the utterance is authorized by someone other than the current speaker."

The ways in which one reports the speech of others speaks to the question of the ways in which argumentation is authorized. In order to illustrate this, we return Artur's words below. They emerge as he is elaborating his claim that all jobs should be cancelled. The direct speech, the shift into performance, is highlighted in bold:

> I hope that I could find people who really like their job (.) for example my mates from work when when boss calling them (.) I don't wanna say how he calling them (.) they say **yeah we are alright with it (.) we like that** (.) they agree yeah and then (.) **that's fine he has to do it because he he has to push them (.)** even in the wrong way

> (Main Study: Martin's class, 18/11/09).

The direct speech is performed. He clearly demarcates their voices, performing them using distinct intonation patterns. There is no anger in how he performs the voices of his friends; the tone is one of surprise that anyone could object to the boss's behaviour. Their compliant acceptance is reinforced multi-modally (argumentation is permeable) by a shrug of the shoulders and a facial expression that, again, suggests surprise (Field Notes: 08/5/2009). There is an element of mockery, indeed of parody here, and this, as the previous chapter has revealed, involves taking up a particular identity position while simultaneously subverting and resisting others. Here, he is positioning himself as in opposition to both his friends and the boss as he has already said he hates his job. Through this opposition, he is doing identity work.

So what, then, can be said about the role of direct speech reporting here in terms of a claim to truth and authorization? He reports the words of his friends as if verbatim and in so doing signals that the utterance is authorized by someone other than him. It is also part of his emergent argumentation and lends evidential support to the claims he is making.

However, it is necessary to qualify this line of argumentation a little. As both Volosinov (1978) and Tannen (1989) observe, the distinction between direct and indirect speech reporting is not always a clear-cut one. Rather like the modes of narrative and argumentation, they continually find their ways into each other and might be better characterized as existing along a continuum.

By way of illustration, I analyse the following instance of speech reporting, which emerges when one of the students, Tomasz, is commenting upon the ways in which bullying or abusive behaviour can negatively impact upon migrant identities in the workplace:

> but sometimes they just try to persuade you that you're stupid and after while some people just (.) actually start believe it and even like D said (.) they try to make the perfect job they are as well (.) inside the mind feeling disappointed of themselves because they struggle to just (.) really say straight away **that (.) look (.) I am not kind of thick (.) I'm the human**

<div align="right">(Main Study: Martin's class, 18/11/09).</div>

Here, the central identity claim to be made emerges in a blend of direct and indirect speech. This is a powerful rhetorical performance, with the use of the imperative voice in "look" and the syntactic parallelism and contrast ("I am not …I am") operating to foreground the claim to human identity in the workplace. In the terms outlined above, he invokes the voices of oppressed migrants to authorize and evidence his identity and truth claim here. It is an act of identity resistance (Norton, 2011) too. However, his use of the demonstrative pronoun "that" is often characteristic of indirect speech reporting and reveals that this is not simply direct speech but also a rhetorical reformulation.

6.6.2.2 Indirect speech

Indirectly reporting speech is something that involves more interpretative work; it authorises claims in a different way. Indeed, it represents a different type of rhetorical claim to truth. It is a weaker evidential claim to truth than direct speech reporting. That is, it does not purport to represent the actual words of another speaker, only the reporter's interpretation of the propositional content or meaning of the utterance. Thus, it is a matter of the inferential work done by the speech reporter to render explicit that which is implicit or indirect in the reported utterance.

In the following extract, Tomasz, is describing the sexual harassment he has witnessed in the workplace:

> I help for example to find a job for one girl (.)and after few days she start crying (.) she said that it's hard to work and co-operate for the boss (.) I said why (.) where's the problem (.) and then he said and then she said (.) cos he's calling me that I am cute and maybe they should make a date (.)but after when she said no then he start to abuse her (.)

(Main Study: Martin's class, 18/11/09).

This narrative emerges in the form of an exemplum (see 6.4.3) but the focus here is on the speech reporting. There is clearly an element of indirect speech here, revealed by the use of "she said." He reports that she said she found it difficult to work with her boss. However, there are clearly elements of more direct speech reporting here, in the form, for example, of the adult female's voice, its performed nature, the switching into the present tense of "he's calling me that I am cute." Once again, there seems to be a blending of direct and indirect speech reporting.

6.6.2.3 Lexicalisation

I have suggested that speech reporting strategies exist on a continuum. This might move from direct speech, through indirect speech. This will include what Baynham (1980) refers to as to lexicalisation strategies, which involve just mentioning acts of speaking. They are a matter of dialogically referring back to previous speech.

Consider Artur below:

> sometimes like she said they show you that you are somebody somebody (.) no (.) well like nobody not somebody (.) like small person nothing important

(Main Study: Martin's class, 18/11/09).

Here, Artur is referring back to what the previous speaker has said. There is no claim to represent the exact words of the student. He is not rehearsing what the student said in any way. However, this strategy indexes the inter-textual nature of argumentation. Here, Artur acknowledges the points that Gosia, the other student, has made (about bullying bosses) before strengthening the claim with his own narrative of a bullying boss. The quotative phrase "like he said" indexes this process linguistically.

6.7 Permeability

In the literature review, Section 2.2.5.5, I observed that argumentation and narrative were distinct modes of analysis. However, in what follows, I suggest that the ways in which these modes inter-penetrate is more complex than allowed for in traditional conceptualizations such as those in the *Skills for Life* policy documents. This is a matter of how argumentation and narrative emerge.

In the data presented thus far, even the more canonical narrative in 6.3 is not de-contextualizable or detached but is embedded and within the wider argumentative discourse context. The small stories focussed upon in 6.4 provide further evidence of the tight embedding of narrative within argumentation. Thus, the fleeting moment of narrative orientation in 6.4.1 and the exemplum in 6.4.3 are very tightly embedded within the conversational turn. The analysis has also revealed that the argumentative function of the narrative is not always explicitly signalled by formal discourse markers but is often to be retrieved pragmatically by the listeners. So it is that, 6.4.1, the other students are left to infer the evidential function of the film the student saw on the issue of capital punishment.

In this way, the data suggest that narrative can be tightly embedded within more argumentative discourse, and that the boundaries between the two modes are not watertight. This supports Parret's observation that: "argumentation and narrativity overlap in many sequences of discourse" (1987, p. 165). I will use the term permeability to suggest the complex ways in which the modes of narrative and argumentation find their way into each other. Baynham (2012, pers comm.) expresses this using the metaphor of a dye, where the colours bleed into each other. In this way, there is no clear line of demarcation but a graduated shifting from one to the other. However this is described, there are subtle shifts in footing (Goffman, 1981) occurring in emerging argumentation and narrative.

6.8 Argumentation, narrative and the performance of class identities

> Narratives, in our approach, are aspects of situated language use, employed by speakers/narrators to position a display of situated, contextualized identities.

> (Bamberg and Georgakopoulou, 2008, p. 379).

In the view expressed above, narrative (like language) is a resource. One of its functions is the negotiation and performance of identities and it is my contention that this is visible in the ongoing argumentative talk that has formed the subject of the last few pages of the analysis. These identities are both individual and collective. I have commented upon the individual identity positions the students bring in through narrative in the analysis thus far.

In this section, I want to concentrate on one particular form of collective identity, that of social class. This traditionally neglected area of sociolinguistic research into identity (see Block, 2007) is now receiving increasing attention (see Block, 2013; Block et al., 2012). The central point I want to develop here is that the argumentation unfolding, in addition to

indexing personal identities, also indexes the social class position of the multilingual migrants. Social class is, of course, notoriously difficult to define.

Rampton does so as follows:

> The term 'class' points to a very broad principle of organization in capitalist societies, a principle of inequality ('stratification') structuring the distribution of resources, both material and symbolic, a source of domination, conflict, and suffering.
>
> (Rampton et al, 2005, p. 2).

He suggests that we need to examine the ways in which class is lived moment to moment, the way it works itself into the "fibres of the self" (Williams, 1977). The debate at hand has been over the issue of the degree of agency and control that multilingual migrants to the UK have in the workplace. The web of workplace narratives emerged contingently, one in response to the other, each an evidential resource for the differing evaluative claims being made about the degree of agency enjoyed by migrant workers. Indeed, it is striking, if unsurprising, just how many workplace narratives emerged. All the students present were part-time migrant workers and had their own workplace narratives to tell.

Dissatisfaction with workplace conditions also came through the narratives, acting as a spur to change and a better future. It is hardly surprising that it should be thus. Official Home Office statistics demonstrate that migrants to the UK are more likely to suffer unemployment or low-pay than their non-migrant counterparts (Vertovec, 2006). Is there any way in which we can trace larger identities in the grain of the interaction?

Georgakopoulou (2006, pp. 84-5) suggests that:

> Large (i.e. extra-situational, exogenous, "portable") identities can be best traced in discourse through an emphasis on the "small," that is, the details and sequential management of the talk.

How do their local roles in the narrativity here index wider roles? Georgakopoulou's work focuses mainly on gender but I would suggest that what the migrants have in common in the data I have analysed is their class position in the workplace, and the discrimination and disempowerment this can lead to. The shared workplace narratives, the competing evaluations, the use of the collective pronouns "we" and "us," the intertextuality of workplace narrative evident here, what Bakhtin refers to as "answerability," and the explicit

introduction and pervasiveness of the topic of the workplace, indexes class position as much as it does gender or ethnicity.

This speaks, perhaps, of their position as economic migrants to the UK. They do similar jobs: low-paid service sector work like shop and hotel-based work etc. We know that adult migrants to the UK are over-represented in this sector of the workforce. They share an interactional history of this discrimination and this is visible in the grain of the discourse. Their jobs position them disadvantageously, as migrant workers, and, not surprisingly, feature as an aspect of their life experience that would benefit from improvement.

6.9 Conclusion

What, then, can be concluded about the role of narrative in argumentation? The analysis has revealed that narrative and argumentation find their way into each in complex ways, ways which might be better characterized in terms of permeability rather than rigid modal demarcation. The evaluation or point of argumentation provides a useful pivot for the shift I have characterized in some of the data presented here.

If narrative does indeed provide a way of closing down difference, grounded as it is in notions of consent (Kress, 1989, p. 12), then this makes it a very powerful rhetorical move in a dialogical argumentation sequence. Baynham observes that:

> If argument is fundamentally predicated on dissent, narrative is predicated on agreement between co-participants in discourse....it discursively enforces agreement between co-participants (in Foucault's terms, its regime of truth). It is therefore more difficult, though not of course impossible, to struggle out of a narrative, with all its density of implicit epistemological claims, than it is to disagree with an explicitly-stated proposition.

> (Baynham, 1995, pp. 44-5).

The analysis has revealed, moreover, that different types of narrative bring with them slightly different rhetorical claims to truth. The truth claim of narrative is a strong one; seen at its strongest in the claims of personal narrative. Thus it is not surprising that it is powerful rhetorically. In relation to speech reporting, different types of speech reporting also bring with them different rhetorical claims to truth, authorizing positions in argumentation in different ways. Finally, narrative also serves to play a role in the performance of student identities, both individual and collective.

Chapter 7: Discussion

7.1 Introduction

In the discussion that follows, I will answer the crucial "So what?" question in relation to this thesis, discussing the contribution that the analysis presented here makes to the knowledge base on argumentation. The implications of these claims for research, policy and practice will be discussed. In doing this, I will also refer back to the literature review in order to help evaluate the contribution to knowledge the thesis makes.

The discussion will be framed by the research questions posed at the outset. These are restated below:

> ➤ How does argumentation emerge and unfold in the ESOL classroom?
> ➤ How is argumentation authorized in the ESOL classroom?
> ➤ What is the role of narrative in argumentation in the ESOL classroom?
> ➤ How do ESOL teachers and learners position each other and how are they positioned in argumentation in the ESOL classroom?
> ➤ How do ESOL teachers and students perform identities through argumentation in the ESOL classroom?

These research questions interconnect in different ways. So, the ways in which argumentation emerges and unfolds connects to the ways in which it is authorized. For example, if argumentation is being authorized by a rhetorical appeal to reason, this will be empirically traceable in the discourse analysis. Similarly, if the rhetorical appeal is to emotion, then this will be visible in the prosody of the discourse e.g. its tone. Positioning oneself in argumentation can index questions of power but it is also a central feature of identity work.

7.2 The emergence and unfolding of argumentation

> ➤ **How does argumentation emerge and unfold in the ESOL classroom?**

My thinking on this research question has evolved during the course of the thesis. This research question went through a number of incarnations. It was initially formulated as: "What counts as argumentation in the ESOL classroom?" This was subsequently rejected on the grounds that what counted as argumentation would be whatever I took to be argumentation. It was subsequently reformulated as: "How do ESOL students construct arguments in the ESOL classroom?" The construction metaphor is more helpful but still

perhaps suggests a view of argumentation as a static speaker product, put together according to a pre-existing plan.

The literature review has already observed that the policy documents (e.g. *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum*, 2001) and the assessment criteria of examination boards (e.g. Trinity College) often treat "argument" as the construction of an individual speaker, and also, of course, as assessable in such terms. Assessing the argumentation of a single speaker against a tick-box of competences might be bureaucratically more processable but it falsifies the complexity of multi-party argumentation, the inter-dependence of one contribution with another. The criteria also separate speaking and listening in unhelpful ways.

The metaphor of emergence, on the other hand, is an ecological one suggested by Clifford (1986, p. 19) who described culture as "contested, temporal and emergent," an appropriate description of the nature of some of the argumentation documented in this thesis. This metaphor reflects the post-structuralist emphasis on the process of argumentation as discourse, which unfolds online as a result of the complex, fluid and dynamic interaction or as Bakhtin (1981) would have it "inter-animation" of the different voices that characterise it. Language itself is, of course, emergent and contested, as Bakhtin also recognized.

The concept of emergence places the emphasis upon the listener and the ways in which the voices of speakers are taken up or appropriated. The response is, as we have seen, what Bakhtin (1981) referred to as the "activating principle." For him, linguistic meaning is itself emergent (see Ellis, 2011) and incomplete until a speaker populates the voices of others with their own semantic intentions. We see, for example, in the debate in Chapter 4.2.2, how two students appropriate the word "humanism" in ways that differ sharply in meaning and how the debate they have is situated within a wider debate about questions of justice and humanity that go back to Biblical times and beyond.

Argumentation emerges contingently. The analysis presented in Chapter 4.2.1 illustrates this. Here, the topic of student fees is introduced by one of the students and the debate that follows was not part of the official lesson plan, although, ironically, the pedagogic focus was upon the function of complaining. Students have a degree of agency and this means that the teacher will face decisions about how to respond to topics that emerge in this way. This might involve closing them down, as the teacher tries to do in Chapter 4.2.1 or "going with the teachable moment" (Baynham, 2007, p.60) and responding contingently, exploiting the pedagogic affordances of the emergent argumentation. The evidence presented in Chapter

4.2.1 suggests the pedagogic affordances (extended turns of talk, high levels of student involvement) of going with these moments when they do emerge.

Unexpectedness is, therefore, part of the terrain of argumentation, just as it is in real life communication. This is perhaps especially the case in spoken argumentation with its more spontaneous interactive nature. Teachers and students can be positioned awkwardly and the difference that characterizes argumentation can emerge very quickly. Argumentation is clearly a discourse activity that brings with it a certain amount of risk and it is never possible to predict when argumentative difference will emerge. Chapter 4.2.1 suggests that it may do so around the edges of the lesson before the official lesson is under way. This is where Sutter (2010, pers comm.) has suggested that students often speak from within on matters of personal urgency to them so this is unsurprising.

Similarly, it is not possible to predict how argumentation, once it emerges, will unfold. Thus we see in Chapter 4.2.2 how one of the students (ironically as it turns out) anticipates agreement on the list of controversial topics presented only to run into immediate controversy when he begins to express his views. What is seen as controversial depends upon not just the individual speaker and listener but also upon what society more generally, as Antaki (1994) observes, sees as being controversial. That is, it is positioned. The implication here is that it difficult to control (as a teacher or course book writer) what topics are debated in the classroom.

If argumentation is contingent and emergent, it also emerges and unfolds as a co-construction. In Chapter 4.2.1, the students co-construct powerful argumentation against the official college policy of student fee increases that the teacher is reluctantly forced to ventriloquize. Thus the voices of argumentation involve collaboration as well as competition. They are both competing and consensual (Costello and Mitchell, 1995) even within short stretches of discourse. This is something that Andrews (1995, pp. 83-84) illustrates and observes.

In fact, even within a single apparently monologic speaker turn, the voices of others are appropriated. This reveals the dialogic nature of all discourse, its poly-vocal nature (Bakhtin, 1981). The thesis suggests that argumentation often emerges and unfolds in the form of what Bakhtin (1981) terms "double-voicing." Chapter 5 illustrates the ways in which the double-voiced strategies of irony and parody involve the appropriation of the voices of others for argumentative purposes. This illustrates the ways in which argumentation emerges and

unfolds both creatively and playfully. Linguistically, the key feature here is often tone and its playful manipulation.

The importance of tone is revealed through the use of stylization (Rampton, 2003) and involves exaggeration for effect. Thus, in Chapter 5.4.1, an answer-phone message is stylized to attack the impersonality of the way in which the city council deals with complaints from tenants. The speaker simultaneously repeats and subverts the answer-phone voice in a move that reveals the complexity of the positioning involved in double-voiced argumentation. There is a complex lamination at work here as the student is not simply undermining the more powerful voice of the city council, they are undermining the voice of the classroom teacher and the speaking positions they are urging them to take up.

Thus, the argumentation emerges and unfolds both in the context of the immediate classroom dialogue but also in terms of more distant intertextual voices. This distance is a matter of time as well as space. So, discourse analysts need to account for the ways in which coherence and structure in argumentation is more than simply its immediate unfolding in the moment of interaction. It is here the concept of intertextuality offers analytical purchase (Kristeva, 1980).

Such creative double-voicing emerges in the form of irony and the analysis in Chapter 5.4.2 suggests that this is often characterized (unlike parody) by tonal understatement. So, when the student greets the teacher's news about the hike in tuition fees with the ironic phrase "good news" the irony has a radical function. It suspends all claims to truth, including the claims to truth embodied in language and the ways in which it refers to the world. Once again, the positioning is complex. The speaker and their audience know that this is not good news and the utterance is double-voiced in that the speaker's intention undermines a straightforward mapping of linguistic meaning onto reality here.

An alternative world is created and it is a world that is turned upside down, where bad news becomes good. It is ideological in the sense that Marx and Engels (1974, p. 47) used the term: "If in all ideology men and their circumstances appear upside-down as in a *camera obscura."*

Argumentation can also emerge within a single word, a word which can be appropriated in different ways by different speakers. Thus, the meaning of the abstract but important noun "humanity" or "humanism" is disputed in Chapter 4.2.2, with the two antagonists in the capital punishment debate investing it with different meanings.

Language play in the form of punning also indexes this and, as we see in Chapter 5.4.3, is used for the purposes of argumentation. Here, it will be remembered, one of the students contests the meaning of the modal verb "couldn't" in a verbal duel with the teacher. The teacher has evaluated the student's performance in the role-play, saying the City Council "couldn't understand" them, the implication being they weren't clear enough and were to blame for the misunderstanding. However, as we saw, the student contests this by exploiting the potential for alternative meanings, saying that the inability or unwillingness of the city council to understand (or empathize?) was "typical." Thus, they, and not the student, were to blame.

This exploits the dialogic nature of all discourse (Bakhtin, 1981) to argumentative effect. The teacher's discourse strives to be *authoritative*, to withdraw beyond dialogue. However, by exploiting the linguistic ambiguity here, or, as Cook (2000) puts it, the arbitrariness of the linguistic code, the student appropriates the discourse, investing it with their own meaning. The discourse is dynamic, contested, in a process of semantic emergence and becoming. Bakhtin (1981) terms such discourse "internally-persuasive." In this way, language is a site of struggle where different meanings are contested. This post-structuralist view of language has implications for identity (defined as a site of struggle, Norton, 2000) and the theme of identity will be taken up later in the discussion.

Argumentation also emerges, as Chapter 5 suggests, in the form of grotesque realism (Bakhtin, 1968). This, like parody, is an element of the carnivalesque. This carnivalesque resistance subverts the official discourses of the classroom. Through this, the students resist and subvert the official discourses of the classroom, creating their own unofficial discourses, in the case of Chapter 5, role-plays. This can be connected to the anti-hegemonic nature of the carnivalesque, if hegemony is defined as "relations of subordination and domination…[that saturate] the whole process of living…our shaping perceptions of ourselves and our world" (Williams, 1977, pp. 209-10).

In his study of the function of parody and the grotesque Rampton (2003) points to the ways it can resist and undermine a set of dualisms that are said to characterize class inequality (see, for example, Bourdieu, 1991). These dualisms are high versus low, mind versus body, reason versus emotion and have interesting resonances in relation to argumentation. The students, through parody and grotesque realism, are undermining the hegemonic discourses of argumentation as reason, as mind and as high, presenting it in moments of performance as emotion, as body and as low. This is reflected linguistically in the "language of the market

place" (Bakhtin, 1968), the bodily nature of the parody, and the ways in which this transgresses the more official speech genres (Bakhtin, 1986) of the classroom and the institutional world it is simulating. In this way, the speaking position urged upon the students by the teacher (i.e. that of a rational and strategic actor) is undermined and resisted.

This contributes to the discourse analysis of argumentation in that a single word or utterance can form the focus for analysis. It builds upon the insights of Conversational Analysis, which focussed upon the conversational turn and the moment of interaction, by capturing the ways in which more distant historical voices are re-contextualized and the ways in which the word and the utterance, not just the turn, can form the analytical focus. This informs the ways in which argumentation structure and coherence are understood.

The discourse analysis presented here also suggests that argumentation emerges and unfolds multimodally as well as linguistically. This emerges, in spoken interaction, in the form of gestures and facial expressions. Thus, in Chapter 4.2.1, the student's dissatisfaction with the official line on government fees is revealed both gesturally (arms defensively folded) and facially (through her pursed lips and frown). Similarly, in Chapter 5.4.1, the emergence and performance of stylized parodic voices is often accompanied by gestures. We see this in the way the priest is parodied in terms of gesture (making the sign of the cross). In this way, argumentation emerges and unfolds in a holistic way, rather than separating out the linguistic from the multimodal and stylization can be multimodal as well as simply linguistic. It is here that I have suggested that Goodwin's (2000) concept of embodiment has some analytical purchase.

The discussion thus far has focussed upon the emergence and unfolding of argumentation. I now consider the connected question of the ways in which argumentation is authorized in the ESOL classroom. This is, of course, part of its emergence and unfolding and thus the research questions are inter-related.

7.3 The authorization of argumentation

> **How is argumentation authorized in the ESOL classroom?**

Persuasion is a major function of argumentation. In this section of the discussion, I explore what the analysis presented in this thesis has revealed about the ways in which the argumentation emerging and unfolding in the ESOL classroom is authorized. In doing so, I will draw upon Aristotle's (1926, [4BCE]) concepts of ethos, pathos and logos.

7.3.1 Ethos

What does the data reveal about the ways in which students and teachers in the multilingual classroom authorize claims in argumentation? The analysis in the last section suggested that argumentation can be authorized by an appeal to the authority of the speaker. This is what Aristotle referred to as an appeal to ethos. This classical form of proof is a matter of the ways in which the speaker establishes their credibility in relation their audience.

Thus, the teacher in Chapter 4.2.1 invokes the power invested in her by her role as teacher to close down the debate. She also invokes the institutional hierachies of the college when she refers the students to the college manager if they have any further questions. Beyond this, of course, as the students in Chapter 4.2.1 observe, lies the authority of the government. The new fees legislation has the power of legal statute. Beyond that, potentially, are other authorities, the European Union, for example, or the European Court of Human Rights.

Truth is connected to power and ideology. The concept of a "regime of truth" is a useful one and derives from Foucault. Here, it is what counts as truth that matters:

> Each society has its regime of truth, its "general politics" of truth: that is, the types of discourses which it accepts and functions as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish between true and false statements; the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedure accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true.

> (Foucault, 1980, p. 131).

In 4.2.1 the general politics of truth within the college authorizes the new fee regime and this has the status of what Bakhtin (1981) called authoritative discourse. This is discourse that sets itself beyond dialogue. It is as one of the students observed in Chapter 4.2.1, on the subject of the new fees: "nobody talks about it." Similarly, the teacher's view of what constitutes the right way to approach the telephone complaint in Chapter 5 is what counts as the truth for her and, beyond that, for the institutional encounter they are rehearsing for.

The analysis suggests that speaker credibility can be established by an appeal to religious as well as secular authority. Thus, in the capital punishment debate in Chapter 4.2.2, one of the students invokes a religious authorisation for her stance against the death penalty, justifying her claim on the grounds that it is wrong as only God has the right to give and take away life. The language ventriloquizes (Bakhtin, 1981) the Biblical passage "the Lord gave and the

Lord hath taken away" (Job 1:21). This is a strong rhetorical move, ventriloquizing Biblical text.

7.3.2 Logos

The emphasis on rationality as the hallmark of argumentation is, as we have already observed in the literature review (e.g. Van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 2004; Habermas, 1984), a strong one. The evidence presented in this thesis clearly speaks to the existence of an important connection between argumentation and rationality and it is clearly one of the major ways in which argumentation is authorized.

Thus, in Chapter 4.2.1, the students engage in dialectical reasoning, a kind of *reductio-ad-absurdum* argumentation in co-constructing a powerful rational argument against the new fee regime. They expose the contradictions and weaknesses of the new policy by appealing to reason. Thus, as we see, they observe the difficulty for economic migrants working variable shifts to access fixed provision. Similarly, in Chapter 4.2.2 we see how I, in the role of teacher, use rationality to draw out what I perceive as the logical inconsistencies and contradictions in the position of the student who is taking a different position to me in the capital punishment debate.

There are implications for research. In terms of discourse analysis, the data suggest that the process of reasoning (Andrews, 1989) can be traced through a fine-grained analysis of salient discourse markers. The thesis has provided evidence of the ways in which discourse markers can begin to trace such a process of reasoning. Thus, the evidence here lends support to some of the detailed work on discourse markers characteristic of argumentation (e.g. "but" "so" "because") conducted by Schiffrin (1987).

There are other ways of analysing coherence and cohesiveness in discourse though. For example, topic brings coherence and the ways in which different topics emerge is interesting in relation to the contingent nature of argumentation, where topics can shift quickly and topic imposition can also be a resisted. This needs to be part of any comprehensive discourse analysis. The role of emotion is also important in any discourse analysis of argumentation and this will be discussed in the next section.

There are implications for policy and pedagogy too. The emphasis in the *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum* (2001) and in the assessment criteria is often on the use of formal linguistic markers to index such reasoning. Using such formal markers effectively to indicate a process of reasoning (as well as recognizing its emergence in the speech of others) is undoubtedly a

valuable skill for multilingual students to develop. However, the evidence presented here suggests that we should be cautious too.

To begin with, the thesis has suggested that the explicit use of discourse markers is not always characteristic of spoken argumentation. This may be because spoken argumentation is generally more spontaneous and less explicit in nature than its written counterpart. Therefore, the inferential work students must do in the absence of explicit discourse marking. Then, there is the fact that such discourse markers also do other functional work and the thesis here confirms the observations of Antaki (1994) and Schiffrin (1987) in this regard. Finally, the use of appropriate linguistic markers of reason does not necessarily make for good argumentation. Other factors (staying on topic, making appropriate concessions, arguing effectively in context) are also involved.

7.3.3 Pathos

> I'm not sure about a process of reasoning because some arguments (.) perhaps their basis is you know an emotional or religious one and it's very hard to prove that (.) you either believe this or you don't believe it.

<div align="right">(ESOL Teacher, Martin's teacher education classroom, 12/3/10)</div>

The teacher's words above, from a teacher education session on argumentation, suggest that emotion has a part to play in the authorization of argumentation. The thesis suggests that argumentation is not simply reducible to the operation of rationality. Rather, it is a process which also engages human emotions. Thus the argumentation on the fees in Chapter 4.2.1 is authorized by an appeal to the emotions as well as to reason. The students present themselves, both to the teacher and to me as visiting researcher, as hard-working, low-waged students who are being discriminated against because they are working.

The strengths of the beliefs and opinions of the students who people these pages are often indexed by prosodic variations in pitch and volume. It is these which discourse analysts can use as empirical clues to the ways in which argumentation is emerging, unfolding and being authorised. For example, in the debate on capital punishment in Chapter 4.2.2, the student's shock at discovering that one of her colleagues was arguing in its favour emerges in the form of the exclamatory "Oh!" Here, we see a kind of gut reaction, an instinctive positioning on an issue. Andrews suggests that this kind of instinctive positioning can be viewed not as antithetical to argumentation but, rather, as a kind of "high-speed rationality" (Andrews,

2009, p. 5). This strength of emotion, as we saw in Chapter 4.2.1, can also be indexed by multimodal features of argumentation such as gesture.

The interplay of the emotional and rational voices in argumentation provides an interesting focus. In the role-play in Chapter 5, for instance, one of the teacher's main pedagogical injunctions to one of the students in Chapter 5 ("don't get angry") speaks exactly to the need to strike a balance in the service of effective argumentation, here the most effective ways to make a complaint. It is interesting that the same teacher (in the earlier tuition fees debate) counsels the student who is complaining not to get angry. The pedagogical point made in Chapter 5 is the need for self-control. This need for control and the emphasis placed upon the management of emotions, through politeness strategies, is also a feature of the policy literature on argumentation, as the literature review revealed.

Looked at another way, though, urging this self-control upon migrants is yet another way of controlling them more generally, emphasising the responsibilities angle of the citizenship agenda, not the rights one.

The voices of reason and emotion are not mutually exclusive and can work together. In the fees debate in Chapter 4.2.1, the students deploy both rational argumentation (fixed timetables don't serve shift-workers, the fees will hit the low-waged hardest as those on benefits get full remission) but it is also authorized by emotion, and is connected to their personal experience as low-waged migrant workers struggling to make ends meet. The student in Chapter 5.2 attempts to persuade through an appeal to empathy based upon the fact that his problem will leave his children in a vulnerable position. Argumentation is authorised, then, in both rational and emotional ways.

The voices of emotion and reason can also work against each other, pulling in different directions. The emotion displayed by one of the students in the role-play leaves him vulnerable to rational counter-argumentation i.e. if he can't use the shower he can use the sink. However, this might be as much the result of an imposed complaint scenario as of the ineffectiveness of his argumentation. This tension between the emotional and rational dimensions of argumentation is commented on by the educational researcher Deanna Kuhn:

> In their everyday lives…the issues about which they might have occasion to reason argumentatively are likely to be ones about which they feel a great deal of emotion and perhaps even have some stake in the resolution of. In these cases, the cognitive

competencies and control that have been discussed here encounter the further challenge of affect, which can energize, but also compromise, reason.

(Kuhn, 1991, p. 297)

The examples cited above reveal something of how emotion can both energise and compromise reason. The question of control, principally emotional self-control, is raised here. Argumentation is thus authorized by rationality and emotion. It is also authorized by another mode of discourse, that of narrative, and it is to this that I now turn.

7.4 The role of narrative in argumentation

> **What is the role of narrative in argumentation?**

There is no understanding that narratives can contribute to arguments, or, indeed, be arguments.

Andrews (2001, p. 99)

Andrews' observation above, made in relation to the *English National Curriculum* (1990), applies equally well to the *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum* (2001). The official discourses do not sufficiently acknowledge the potential of narrative in and as argumentation. One of the central claims made in Chapter 6 of the thesis is that narratives can play a major role in authorizing truth claims in argumentation. They do so by making an appeal to experience.

Chapter 6.4.3 illustrates the way in which narrative can function as an exemplum in the service of an argumentative point. Here, it provides evidence in the form of a specific case (i.e. the death of the student's father after a long shift) to support the more generalizable argumentative claim that work can be dangerous. This supports other research findings on the role of narrative in argumentation (e.g. Baynham, 2011b; Eggins and Slade, 1997).

Chapter 6 also suggests that narrative is a powerful way of authorizing argumentation because it is more difficult to dispute the truth claims of a narrative than it is to dispute those of an explicitly stated argument proposition. This is because disputing the truth claim of a personal narrative involves questioning the speaker's factual knowledge and experience. Thus, in Chapter 6.4.3, it would be easier to dispute the argumentative claim; in this instance, that people die as a result of poor working conditions than to dispute the authenticity of the narrative that is offered as evidence in support of this claim i.e. the fact that the speaker's father died after a long shift at work. In this way, my research findings lend support to

Baynham's claim that this is a source of the rhetorical power of narrative in argumentation (1995, pp. 44-45).

This narrative also invokes pathos in order to broaden the base of support for the argumentative truth claim. The student's father, the figure (Goffman, 1981) in the narrative, is the father of someone they know and this draws them into the world of the narrative. This emotional appeal is visible in other narratives e.g. in Chapter 6.3, the student's narrative of the 3 small starving boys elicits sympathy for their plight and also for the truth claim that the world should be a more just place, with resources distributed more equally. This broadening of the base of support for argumentation (via the elicitation of sympathy) is something attested to elsewhere in the literature on the role of narrative in argumentation (e.g. Schiffrin, 1990).

Chapter 6 suggests, too, that different kinds of narratives embody different kinds of truth claims. So the generic narrative presented in Chapter 6.4.4 embodies a more general truth claim than the more canonical personal narrative presented in Chapter 6.3. The generic narrative embodies the truth claim that this is what typically happens. Thus, the tired commuters are tired *every* day on the journey to work. This supports the findings of Baynham (2000; 2011b) on the different evidential claims to truth embodied in different types of narrative. Here, although the focus is not on narrative *per se*, there are also implications for narrative study.

In Chapter 6 the analysis suggests that what can be challenged in argumentation is the appropriateness of the narrative in authorizing the claims being made. In Chapter 6.5, the disagreement is based on just such grounds i.e. the narrative told illustrates the lack of agency of economic migrants in the workplace. It serves to undermine rather than support the other student's claim that everything lies in the hands of the migrant workers. Thus the point of the narrative in relation to the argumentative claim being made is disputed, rather than the factual truth of the narrative. This is also a point made by Georgakopoulou (2007) and Schiffrin (1990) in relation to the role of narratives in argumentation.

In Chapter 6.6.2 the role of speech reporting as an evidential claim to truth is also considered. The analysis suggests that direct speech reporting constitutes a stronger evidential claim to truth because we are claiming to represent the words of the other person as if they were the words they actually spoke. Thus, the truth claim is authorized by someone other than the appropriating speaker. On the other hand, indirect speech reporting brings with it a weaker

truth claim in that the words are not reported as if verbatim but paraphrased by the speaker in some way. The analysis also suggests that direct and indirect speech are not to be treated as polarities but as a continuum along which there can be blends of different types of speech reporting. The findings here provide a degree of empirical support for Baynham (1996) who examines the rhetorical function of direct speech in non-narrative discourse.

As has already been established in the literature review (see Baynham, 1996), traditional accounts of speech reporting treated it in purely syntactic terms; that is, as a series of abstract syntactic operations transforming direct into indirect speech.   In the policy documents (*Adult ESOL Core Curriculum*, 2001), and often in pedagogical grammars (e.g. Murphy, 2004), this can be reflected in the presentation of rules for achieving the transformation of direct into indirect speech e.g. pronoun shift, tense shift, the embedding of reported clause etc (see, again, Baynham, 1996). This approach to speech reporting is rooted, like so much of ESOL policy, in a view of language as an autonomous system.

However, instead of focussing on speech reporting as an abstract grammatical operation, students could be encouraged to think carefully about the ways in which appropriating the voices of others can serve rhetorical purposes, embodying the different kinds of evidential claim made and the different ways of authorizing argumentation, as suggested by Baynham (1996).

The official policy discourses (*Adult ESOL Core Curriculum*, 2001) clearly demarcate narrative and argumentation. There is no sense in which these modes of discourse are understood as having more permeable boundaries and thus that they might inter-penetrate in complex ways, as has been suggested by the analysis presented in Chapter 6.4.1 and 6.4.3. This was described metaphorically, in Chapter 6.7, using the concept of permeability. This has implications for the discourse analysis of argumentation and narrative.

It is in the evaluative dimension of the narrative that the point of the narrative is made clear. Here, the emerging argumentation is like an expansion and development of the evaluative aspect of the narrative and is fundamentally concerned with highlighting the point of the narrative. Thus, the student's narrative in Chapter 6.4.3 shifts from the specific "it was too much for him" to the more generalizing "too much for everyone I think."

There are implications for the ways in which mode and genre are treated in both research and teaching domains. If different modes bleed into each other, inter-penetrating in complex ways, then a rigid approach to genre teaching may have initial purchase but needs also to be

informed by a sense of this inter-penetration. For example, in the context of unfolding argumentation in the job interview, the role of narrative as a resource to be deployed in the making of a case has been highlighted (Roberts and Campbell, 2006). The right kind of narrative must be deployed at the right time in order to serve the argumentative claim being made.

In researching the role of narrative in argumentation, Chapter 6 suggests that there is a need for more research on what Bamberg and Georgakopoulou (2006) refer to as "small stories." These are non-canonical stories encompassing everything from the refusals to tell illustrated in Chapter 6.4.2 to the "fleeting moments of narrative orientation to the world" (Hymes, 1996) discussed in Chapter 6.4.1. Even canonical narratives in Labovian (1972) terms are often subject to evaluation by others and can emerge as a move in a dialogic argumentation sequence, as revealed in Chapter 6.3. In this case the evaluation was a shared one but in other cases the evaluation can be sharply disputed, as in Chapter 6.5.

7.5 Argumentation, positioning and identities

> **How do ESOL teachers and learners position themselves and each other and how are they positioned in argumentation in the ESOL classroom?**

7.5.1 Policy and pedagogy

How are teachers and students positioned in argumentation in the Adult ESOL classroom? The discussion here will begin by considering the ways in which they are positioned by policy and then consider the ways in which students are positioned pedagogically by teachers, in terms of task and topic. It then focusses on the ways students and teachers position each other in terms of roles and relationships in the classroom. Then, the theme of argumentation and citizenship will be discussed.

We have already established that policy discourses (*Skills for Life learning materials,* 2003; *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum*, 2001) emphasise "argument" not "argumentation" and that they privilege the role of rationality. Indeed, "arguments" often seem to be used to mean "reasons." This reveals a view of argumentation as a set of individualized competences. Furthermore, students and the learning process are seen "in terms of product, performance, grade levels and output" and assessable as such, as Andrews (1997, p. 64) observes more generally of the *English National Curriculum* (1990). This is the language of commerce not education and rooted in a simplistic transmission model of teaching and learning.

In privileging rationality, no strong connections are established with identity, with emotional and imaginative expression and with personal convictions and beliefs. Moreover, as well as being educationally unsound, it is undemocratic and students and teachers are positioned passively in this process, interpellated (Althusser, 1971) by the authoritative discourses. It is not participatory.

In terms of topic, the *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum* (2001) is not prescriptive but does emphasise the "familiar topics" and the achievement of "shared understanding." The topics presented in the *Skills for Life learning materials* (2003) are largely uncontroversial, as are those prescribed for debate in terminal assessment. Global ELT coursebooks generally avoid taboo topics (Gray, 2002). Tasks emphasize problem resolution and the achievement of consensus. Generally speaking, this means that discussion, not argumentation, is the focus.

This focus is not problematic in itself. The reaching of consensus, the resolution of problems and the management of disagreement are key features of the democratic process and clearly a major function of argumentation (Andrews, 1994). Indeed the debates in Chapter 4 suggest that students are often skilful in their management of explicit disagreement. The avoidance of controversial issues might not be paternalistic but simply a laudable attempt to promote cohesion through the avoidance of controversy.

However, the range of tasks and topics is narrowed and it is this that is potentially problematic. Discussion is clearly a valuable classroom activity but it might be seen as merely one speech genre within the wider mode of argumentation (Andrews, 1995, p. 63). Restricting student work to discussion whose aim is reaching a consensus might actually serve to limit the opportunities for genuine argumentation. This point has already been made by Coffin and O'Halloran (2009) in the literature review.

Inevitably, there is a wash back from such official discourses into the classroom and the ways in which teachers of Adult ESOL position students through topic and task. This forms the focus for the next section of the discussion.

The analysis presented in this study reveals evidence of topic prescription by teachers. I decide which topics are to be debated in Chapter 4.2.2 and the topic of the role-play in Chapter 5 is also prescribed by the class teacher. However, the data here also attest to the power of student agency revealed in the ways they appropriate the topics. Thus, in Chapter 5.3, the students improvise their own unofficial role-plays, in a process which also sees resistance in the form of topic shift. They resist the speaking and identity positions being

made available to them in the imposed role-play scenario. In debate, even when topics are imposed student voices and identities come in robustly as they draw upon their personal beliefs, opinions and experiences in order to authorize their positions and evaluate the positions held by others.

Other tasks are less prescriptive and invite the students to bring their own topics into the classroom. The task that generated a lot of the data in Chapter 6 provided certain affordances. It opened up imaginative space in the form of hypothetical argumentation, asking: "If you could do one thing to make the world a better, happier place, what would it be? Such suppositional questions are important in the development of argumentation, as Andrews notes (Andrews, 1995, p. 157). In framing the question, I invited the students to imagine themselves in role as politicians. The topics they bring to the classroom in response to this e.g. the workplace, religion etc. suggest what is possible in terms of topic range. The task provoked vigorous debate. Many of these topics are controversial and it is to this I now turn.

We have seen in the debates in Chapters 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 how argumentation can lead to conversational difficulty and threats to face. This, as perceived by teachers, can lead to a restriction of the topic areas covered in the ESOL classroom, as the following quote from a teacher suggests: "For me there are two classic areas that need to be circumvented at times and that's religion and politics" (ESOL Teacher, Pilot Study). However, I also want to suggest that the evidence presented in this thesis suggests that dealing with controversial topics can also provide valuable pedagogical affordances, as well as wider democratic affordances in terms of citizenship and participation.

The debates that form the focus of the analysis in Chapters 4 and 6 were lively and characterized by a high degree of student engagement and involvement. So, interruption and overlap are not always negative features of conversational interaction. Indeed, they might be characteristic of a more positive and vibrant classroom ecology, in a way that a more docile turn-taking is not.

The potential value of argumentation in the language learning classroom is suggested by the following remark, made in a teacher education lesson, by the teacher of the class focussed upon in Chapter 4.2.1:

> if you're using argument as a teaching tool as a teaching (.) in your sessions it's good because you argue about something that you feel strongly about and that motivates a lot of language to come out… because you want to get your meaning across and stop

worrying about mistakes and grammar because you just want to persuade that person in front of you

(Yelena, teacher education classroom, 12/3/10)

The teacher observes that a high level of emotional investment (Norton, 2000) in a topic provides a linguistic affordance, because the desire to persuade leads to a focus on fluency rather than a potentially inhibiting focus on accuracy. This fluency is attested to in the debates analysed in this thesis and provides further evidence that argumentation over controversial issues can lead to the generation of more extended turns of talk in the ESOL classroom (Cooke and Roberts, 2007). Such extended turns were identified as being rare in the survey of classes conducted as part of the *ESOL Effective Practice Project* (Baynham et al., 2007).

We have also seen that the difference that characterizes argumentation can function productively in that it can be connected to the clarification and development of a position as a result of that position being challenged. Thus, the teacher in Chapter 4.2.1 is forced to clarify the college policy on student fees and in Chapter 4.2.2 the student is forced to clarify and extend his thinking by the teacher's questions. This clarification is not just a matter of clarification for others; it is also a matter of clarification for oneself. The dictum: how do I know what I think until I hear what I say seems apposite here. In this way, the moves made in argumentation leave empirical traces of cognitive development and attest to the potential argumentation has for the development of critical thinking (Andrews, 1995; Billig, 1991; Vygotsky, 1991).

The analysis presented in this thesis provides evidence that dealing with controversial issues brings other pedagogical affordances. In Chapter 5, the topics of religion and politics do provide affordances for sophisticated language play such as parody, irony, punning and metaphor. This lends support to those such as Cook (2000) who observes that it is often the very topics which are avoided as taboo in course books (see Gray, 2002) which provide valuable affordances for language play. The analysis in Chapter 5 suggests that Cook (2000) is right when he says that the avoidance of such topics will mean losing opportunities for play-related language development, say, through the attention to language form.

The evidence presented in this thesis suggests that the students (and teachers) are capable of handling sensitive topics within a context of mutual tolerance and respect for each other's opinions, even though there are clearly threats to face at times. They are, after all, adults with

adult sensibilities. In this way it is possible to suggest that avoiding such topics in the ESOL classroom is rather patronizing and attributable to paternalism as much as to a wish to avoid controversy. Indeed, in the context of reading in English language classrooms, Wallace (1992) suggests that students are more likely to take offence by being patronized than by the actual topics themselves. That is, they are capable of tolerating difference, even when that difference is not something that can be resolved. This is perhaps characteristic of argumentation over personal religious or political beliefs around controversial topics. We see this in Chapter 4.2.2, where both students make concessions but remain convinced of their own opinions to the end. There is no change of mind, even though the possibility for this exists. Similarly, the sharp differences in the way in which the role-playing activity (and ultimately the institutional encounter it is meant to simulate) is evaluated in Chapter 5 remain unresolved at the end of the lesson. Thus, as Coffin and O'Halloran (2007) observe, not all argumentation is resolvable. The idea of reaching a consensus, of problem resolution, can be over-emphasised in argumentation, which can be an intractable practice.

7.5.2 Argumentation and citizenship

7.5.2.1 Argumentation, citizenship and participation

Many migrants to the UK, though by no means all, aspire to UK citizenship. This brings with it rights as well as responsibilities, although it tends to be the responsibilities of UK Citizenship that are emphasized by the UK government. The right to learn the language of the country you are seeking citizenship in is arguably one of the most important of these rights for multilingual migrants to the UK. This was the topic they brought into the classroom in the argumentation that emerged and unfolded in Chapter 4.2.1

The topic, it will be remembered, was taboo, one of the students observing that; "nobody talk about it." The policy was being introduced by the college in response to new government legislation and was being presented to the students (then, 2009, as now) as a fait accompli. This connects to Bourdieu's (1991) notion of doxa i.e. that which is beyond dialogue, beyond argumentation. The teacher, as we see, is positioned awkwardly in this debate, forced to ventriloquize government policy, ironic in the light of the fact that she herself is a migrant to the UK. She invokes the authority of her role to bring the debate to a close.

However, the debate demonstrates that argumentation sometimes emerges as a result of student-initiated moves and that powerful argumentation can be co-constructed against the more powerful voices in society, here the voices of the government. This is, to continue with

Bourdieu's terms, argumentation as a struggle for audibility (Bourdieu, 1991) in the classroom and, beyond it, in wider UK society. Audibility can be defined as: "a combination of the right accent as well as the right social and cultural capital to be an accepted member of a community of practice" (Block, 2007, p. 41).

In this way, argumentation emerges here as part of a wider debate which connects tightly with their rights as potential or actual UK citizens: should they be entitled to free or affordable English classes as part of their entitlement as UK citizens?

The students have a level of emotional (as well as financial) investment (Norton, 2000) in the topic that also indexes their identity positions as migrants to the UK. They know that English is a source of the linguistic and cultural capital to access education and employment and to take their place as fully participating UK Citizens. This classroom-based argumentation is situated within a wider debate, both within and outside the ESOL Sector. Within the sector, organizations such as *Action for ESOL* (2012) believe that all migrants to the UK should have a statutory entitlement to English language provision. This is the case in countries like Australia. A more meaningful take on citizenship and participation might involve the kind of critical debate on the government's policy agenda that the students conduct in Chapter 4.2.1.

By bringing along their own topics for argumentation, they are not just striving for audibility. They are generating their own argumentative curricula in a more democratic and participatory way, in the tradition of Paolo Freire (1970). This is already happening within the ESOL sector in organizations like *Reflect ESOL*, a re-framing of the *Reflect* approach to literacy teaching developed by the organisation *Action Aid*.

The role-play work on complaining in Chapter 5 also connects tightly to issues of argumentation, citizenship and participation. Complaining is clearly an argumentative practice and Adult ESOL students are also, in neo-liberal capitalist society, consumers of goods and services and have the right to complain and seek redress when these services are unsatisfactory. Indeed, the teacher's explicitly stated pedagogical aim is to enable them to complain more effectively to maximise this right to redress. This involves social and cultural knowledge as well as linguistic knowledge and it is in this sense that, as Sutter (2009, p. 76) has pointed out, ESOL teachers have been teaching citizenship for a long time. This, as the data presented in Chapter 5 suggests, can be contested and, of course, adult students have their own experiences of making complaints in the UK.

Most adult migrants to the UK are not UK citizens. However, this is an aspiration for some and, as UK citizens, they would, of course, have the right to vote. This may involve the right to vote in direct single issue referenda, as it did in the EU referendum in 1972. These referenda are a matter of the present and the future as well as the past. Thus, David Cameron has promised a referendum on EU membership in 2016 and there was a referendum on Scottish Independence in 2014. Such voting is direct democracy in action, possibly more democratic in nature than representative democracy. This is where argumentation in the form of a classroom debate over issues connects to citizenship and participation.

However, such participation is premised upon the concept of an informed citizenry, who can justify their own positions and evaluate the positions of others. In a more private capacity, they are citizens with a right to freedom of expression. The right to freedom of expression encompasses the right to disagree. In Chapter 5.4.1, I re-contextualize the voice of Voltaire in the debate on religion and this is his identity position. It was also the identity position of one of the students who authorized her right to a difference of opinion in terms of her identity position as a citizen, saying: "I know we disagree (.) We both pay taxes." A citizen has the responsibility to contribute to UK democracy through the tax system and with this comes the right to express a different view.

Her appeal comes, tellingly, towards the end of the capital punishment debate in Chapter 4.2.2, a debate where there are, as we have seen, polarized, ultimately, unresolved, differences of opinion. She is responding in part to the way her antagonist in the debate authorizes his opinion by appealing to his status as a taxpayer, saying "I pay tax."

This suggests that argumentation is part of the practice of citizenship, conceptualized as something that is done, not just something that is conferred upon multilingual migrants. Fairclough et al., (2006, p. 99) express it thus, linking citizenship in with positioning by examining: "the range of ways in which people position themselves and each other as citizens in participatory events." In the foregoing paragraphs the positioning in terms of citizenship is explicit but it need not always be so. Participating in the debates in Chapter 4.2.1 and 4.2.2, in the role-play in Chapter 5 and in deciding how to make the world a happier place in Chapter 6 have demonstrated, I argue, such citizenship in action.

This brings us to a discussion of argumentation and social cohesion.

7.5.2.2 Argumentation, citizenship and social cohesion

I have already signalled the relationship of argumentation to citizenship and democratic participation in society. There is another angle to be explored here, that of citizenship and social cohesion. It is important to begin by noting that cohesion is a poorly defined and contested concept. In a lot of government discourse, it seems to be little more than: "a byword for good behaviour" as Cooke and Simpson (2009, p. 26) observe. In much public discourse the clear implication is that multilingualism is responsible for the social fragmentation of communities (Blackledge, 2006). Argumentation is clearly salient here too.

The data presented in Chapter 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 of this thesis suggests that argumentation can emerge in the form of adversarial combat, or war, to borrow Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) famous metaphor. This involves the breakdown of dialogue as the students interrupt each other. Such interruption can damage the classroom ecology. In Brown and Levinson's terms (1978; 1987) it is face-threatening. The restriction of their freedom to speak is a threat to negative face and also carries a threat to positive face, that is, their wish to be liked and respected by their fellow students.

This threat also exists to the relationships between students and their teachers. Thus, in Chapter 4.2.2, as we shall see below, I am interrupted by students when expressing my opinions on capital punishment. Similarly, in Chapter 4.2.1, the teacher is clearly embarrassed when forced to ventriloquize a controversial the fees policy she knows will be unpopular with students.

In this sense, then, the differences opened up in argumentation are potentially damaging to social cohesion. The ways in which these differences are managed are the focus of research into argumentation in Conversation Analysis (e.g. Muntigl and Turnbull, 1998) and in pragmatics more generally (Brown and Levinson, 1987). The evidence in Chapters 4 and 5 suggests students are very resourceful in managing such disagreement. Strategies deployed include the use of formal markers of politeness (e.g. "I respect your opinion but…") so beloved of the *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum* (2001). However, they move beyond this and demonstrate that attention to formal discourse markers of politeness is not sufficient, as Andrews (1995) observes.

Chapter 5 suggest that language play in the form of irony can help to reduce the threat to face through the indirectness of the relationship between the content of the utterance and the intention of the speaker. This indirectness serves to blunt the edge of the disagreement

emerging and is indicative of a complex positioning. In Chapter 4.2.1 the status of truth claims as sincerely held opinions (rather than absolute truths) is foregrounded. So the student challenging the teacher on the policy of fee increases states that: "It's my opinion." This is a strategy identified by Schiffrin (1990) in her research.

The wider democratic implications of the face-threatening nature of argumentation speak to the risk of offence, something that has always pre-occupied liberal democracies. It boils down to the question of whether a citizen's right to freedom of expression trumps their right not to be offended by the free speech of others. This is not an easy question for teachers in the classroom or for wider society. For example, my field notes made after the debate on how to make the world a happier place record my uneasiness at the negative positioning of elements of fundamentalist Islam that emerged in the debate on religion referred to in Chapter 5. Had there been Muslim students in the class at the time I might have intervened.

In such cases, perhaps the best one can hope for is an understanding and a respectful tolerance of the differences opened up. Here, again, the classroom can become a democratic institution in microcosm. Indeed, Andrews identifies democracies as the "natural home" for argument: "because they are in tune with change: creating, understanding, tolerating and resolving difference where possible" (Andrews, 2009, p. 3).

Thus, argumentation is the way that a healthy society deals with difference, one of the hallmarks of argumentation as this thesis has conceptualized it. The students tolerate difference, in much the same way as the two parties who constituted the last British coalition government tolerated difference, setting it aside and focussing on compromise where possible.

7.5.2.3 The teacher as citizen

> I've got a point-of-view as well. I tend not to remain strictly neutral…If it's something I feel strongly about I give my opinion but label it as my opinion.
>
> (James, Pilot Study, teacher focus group, 2/7/09).

It will be clear from the discussion so far that the teacher is also a private citizen, with beliefs and opinions of their own, as the quote above suggests. They have political and religious convictions about the way the world is or should be, just as the students do. This is part of their habitus (Bourdieu, 1991), what they bring along to argumentation. It is part of what positions them in relation to the unfolding and emergence of argumentation.

What, then, has the analysis revealed about the positions teachers take up in argumentation as it emerges and unfolds in the multilingual classroom? This is connected to the other research questions, especially the one about how positioning in argumentation is involved in the performance of teacher identities. In the section that follows, I discuss what the data reveals about how I and the other teachers positioned ourselves and the students in classroom argumentation.

The other research question that connects to teacher positioning in argumentation is the question of how argumentation emerges and unfolds in the multilingual classroom. As we have seen, one of the characteristics revealed here is the contingent nature of spoken argumentation. In Chapter 4.2.1 we saw that argumentation (on student fees) emerges quickly. The students bring the topic into the classroom and the teacher has to respond contingently.

This, it will be recalled, positions her very awkwardly between government and college policy and her students. She knows her students both professionally and personally as individuals. Furthermore she is also positioned by the fact that she is a migrant to the UK herself so she has a degree of empathy for their situation. However, she is forced to ventriloquize the more powerful voices. The fact that she makes no direct disclosure of her view on the new fee policy indexes the situated and contingent nature of argumentation. Her position as a private citizen with a right to freedom of expression has to be set against her position as an employee of the college. This means that she is forced to ventriloquize and implement college (and, beyond that) government policy, even if she disagrees with it.

There is an ethnographic dimension to this positioning that connects to what she brings along to the classroom. This is historical positioning and affects the ways in which argumentation is brought about in interaction. This professional positioning also includes factors like the extent and level of her experience, how confident she feels with regard to disclosing her opinions on college policies, especially those with which she may be in disagreement. This brings us to the question of teacher disclosure.

Teacher disclosure is discussed here as a dimension of teacher stance. Baynham et al., (2007, p. 37) define it as: "the level of self-disclosure and personal narrative that they bring into their teaching." I will suggest that the issue of teacher disclosure is thrown into particularly sharp relief in relation to argumentation in the multilingual classroom because all

controversial issues, such as politics, religion, and sexuality, have the potential to position the teacher in ways that can be uncomfortable.

In Chapter 4.2.2 of the thesis, I disclose my opinions in the capital punishment debate. This provides an interesting contrast to the lack of disclosure already discussed in relation to the fees debate. In many ways it is easier for me to disclose and to become involved in the unfolding argumentation. Firstly, and perhaps most importantly, the topic does not position me awkwardly between policy and students, in the way that the topic of student fees definitely does. Secondly, I do this only after my opinion is solicited by one of the students. Finally, I have positioned the students pedagogically by introducing these topics for debate as part of the lesson.

All these things (and they speak again to the situated, contingent nature of argumentation) make it easier for me to speak out as a private citizen. Indeed, it is possible to insist that this is essential for active citizenship. The teacher, like the students, is an adult and a private citizen, with the right to freedom of expression. Moreover, they should be prepared to argue their case and to engage in debate with others who might hold different views. This is what happened in Chapter 4.2.2, where one of the students actively solicits my opinion on capital punishment. This suggests that adult students are indeed often interested in the beliefs and opinions of their teachers.

Thus, I respond contingently, to a student-initiated request, in the way that one experienced teacher, when asked about disclosure, in the pilot study observed: "I only ever give my opinion if asked" (Judith, Pilot Study). I also make the status of my contribution clear i.e. it is just my opinion. The data in Chapter 4.2.2 show that the students respond to the disclosure in a mature and respectful manner, given the difference it opens up. The data here supports the view that teacher involvement in debate might be one of the defining characteristics of a good class. As one of experienced teachers on the pilot study observed: "It's a good class when they actually turn around when it's gone on for a while and say, what do you think?" (Sally, Pilot Study).

There is also the issue of freedom to speak. If the teacher is open about their views on controversial issues, then this encourages the students to be open too. Moreover, in talking up a particular speaking and identity position, the teacher is introducing the students to another voice, another position, one which they may not have encountered before.

Indeed, Baynham et al., (2007, p. 38) in a general survey of ESOL teaching found there were teachers happy to talk about openly about their lives and beliefs in the classroom, offering a particularly interesting example of teacher disclosure around the controversial issue of sexual orientation:

> Michael makes a point each year of telling his class he is gay, partly because he expects them to be open with him, and partly because he believes that they may not often get the chance to meet gay people

(Baynham et al., 2007, p. 38).

In these ways, therefore, it is possible to see teacher involvement as a kind of modelling and enactment of citizenship, with the classroom as the classical agora.

The analysis presented in Chapter 4.2 suggests that there might also be pedagogical benefits to teacher involvement in argumentation. If involvement in argumentation is seen as akin to a kind of critical thinking (Andrews, 1995; Billig, 1991; Vygotsky, 1991) then teacher involvement in unfolding argumentation can be seen to provide as an affordance for the development of a student's skills in argumentation. These argumentation skills are important for citizenship and democracy, as Kuhn (1991) suggests. She also observes that there is a need for such a development.

Teacher involvement can also, perhaps crucially in the multilingual classroom, act as an affordance for language learning and development. Teacher involvement in the debates about student fees in Chapter 4.2.1 and capital punishment in Chapter 4.2.2 provided affordances for language learning. Such affordances included but were not limited to: the opportunity to ask questions of the teacher, to interrogate them on a point of view, thus reversing the traditional classroom dynamic where it is usually the teachers who ask questions of the students; the opportunity to raise and debate an issue in which they had a major investment as language learners and potential UK Citizens.

The data also suggests that citizenship is not something to be abstractly conferred upon students by governments but is something that is enacted and performed by students through participation in classroom argumentation. Thus it is possible to conceive of citizenship as a practice, something that is now being discussed in research (e.g. Block, 2011). This connects citizenship in to identity and it is to this that I now turn.

7.5.3 Argumentation and identity work

> **How do ESOL teachers and students, through positioning, perform identities through argumentation in the ESOL classroom?**

I think this is arguing it's like part of our life (Agata, interview, 23/6/10)

The conceptualization of argumentation offered in the introduction to this thesis and the critical review of the literature has emphasised the importance of the connection between argumentation and identities. The connection between positioning and identity is central here. Put simply, by taking up a speaking position one simultaneously positions others. This is arguably the central process in identity work. Thus, a speaking position is also an identity position. In what follows, the thesis aims to contribute to a research base in the area of argumentation, positioning and identity.

The student quoted at the beginning of this section, a quote elicited in a research interview, suggests the importance of argumentation in the everyday lives of human beings. It is part of who and what we are, to draw again upon Blommaert's (2005, p. 203) definition of identity. This is also an intuition that provided one of the starting points for the thesis.

The ways in which people position each other and perform identities through narrative has been the focus of increasing research (e.g. Georgakopoulou, 2007; Baynham, 2006). In contrast, the ways in which identities are performed through argumentation is under-researched and it is this space that the following discussion inhabits. The evidence presented in this thesis suggests that argumentation is an important site for identity work, in just the same way in which narrative is.

These identities are individual; the people who argue within the pages of this thesis are speaking as employees, customers, family members, religious believers or non-believers etc. However, they are also collective, or transportable (Zimmerman, 1998). Hence as individuals they are also articulating group positions. They are these things as well as students and teachers. This is what they bring along to identity work. They are also positioned historically by their previous life experiences. This is Bourdieu's (1991) concept of habitus.

The discussion will draw upon the concepts of identity play and identity resistance (Norton, 2011). Earlier, we focussed upon the use of double-voiced strategies like parody in argumentation. However, it is not just voices that are playfully appropriated and subverted. It is speaking positions and their associated identity positions. The focus in this section, then, is

not just on language play but on identity play, not just on language resistance but identity resistance, to use Norton's term (2011).

So, in the complaint role-play in Chapter 5, the teacher encourages the students to take up a particular identity position i.e. that of a rational, strategic self-controlled complainant who should try to understand the position of the representative they are speaking to. However, one of the students immediately resists this, talking up a different speaking and identity position, authorizing his argumentation by appealing to the emotions (as well as rationality) and appealing for empathy on the part of the council official. Thus, he resists the speaking and identity positions made available to him by the teacher.

This is identity play and resistance even sees the students improvising their own unofficial role-plays, creating new speaking and identity positions. For example, in Chapter 5.3, one of the students takes up the identity position of a doctor, who is needed to cure the city council of the smell of corruption. This identity play allows him to shift the burden of responsibility from the complainant to the city council. Another takes up the identity position of a private citizen anticipating a date to offer a mock justification for a call out: "She could say I smell and I've got a date." In Norton's (2011) terms she takes up an imagined identity.

Norton observes that the concept of an imagined identity is implicit in the concept of imagined communities of practice (2011). The concept of an imagined community of practice has purchase in relation to argumentation as it could be said that students imagine a community of practice in the form of an alternative, and better, future and that it is this that motivates their identity resistance to the unsatisfactory positions offered in the authoritative discourses of the role play.

Identity play and resistance is also visible in the debates. In Chapter 4.2.2, in the debate on capital punishment, one of the students appropriates the identity position of a religious believer, saying: "I am the tool in god's hands." In doing so, he subverts the identity position of the speakers in the debate, his antagonists, who have been authorizing their views on the death penalty by invoking religion. In this way, the data in Chapter 5 provide further empirical evidence of the identity work that parody does in the multilingual classroom (Blackledge and Creese, 2009; Hirst, 2003).

In this way the verbal resources of parody, involving the appropriation of the voices of others, serve to illuminate the speaking position and identity of the appropriating speaker. This returns us to the idea, established in the literature review, that we define ourselves as

much in relation to what we are *not* as much as we do in relation to what we are (Baynham, 2006; Barker and Galasinski, 2001). This suggests a strong connection between argumentation, which we have been defining in terms of different voices and speaking positions, and the performance of identity work.

I would submit that the evidence presented in the study suggest that larger identities are performed through argumentative discourse. I would like to focus here for a moment on the issue of social class. What all the students had in common was their identities as migrant workers. In Chapter 6 the students debate the degree of agency they have in the workplace in argumentation, bringing in their workplace identities through narratives of different kinds. They are figures (Goffman, 1981) in their own stories and they co-construct argumentation, as well as differing sharply over how to evaluate such stories.

This is suggestive of the performance of social class identities. Social class is a difficult concept to operationalize but I think that Rampton's definition below provides a starting point. Here, he defines class as:

> a process in which people negotiate and struggle for position, affiliation and advantage within unevenly receptive institutions that have a significant impact upon their destinies"

(Rampton, 2006, pp. 274-5).

In rehearsing a telephone complaint, in arguing for affordable language tuition, in arguing for fairer treatment at work, the students are indeed, I would suggest, struggling for position in the face of unevenly receptive institutions, respectively the city council, the college and their various workplaces. The literature review identified the recent attention given to class identities in applied linguistics (e.g. Block, 2013; Block et al., 2012) at the same time as acknowledging it is still a neglected area. The evidence presented in this thesis suggests that social class is a potentially salient dimension of migrant identities.

7.6 Conclusion

This discussion has highlighted the contribution this thesis makes to the field of knowledge on argumentation. It has discussed the emergent, emotional, imaginative and playful dimensions of argumentation, as well as the more commonly focussed upon dimension of rationality. It has highlighted the contribution that a post-structuralist focus upon both the immediate voices in the dialogue and the more distant inter-textual voices can bring to

concepts of argumentational structure and coherence. It has examined the ways in which argumentation is authorized by a mixture of rationality, emotion and an appeal to authority. It has also highlighted the tight connection between argumentation and human identities and underlined the importance of argumentation to full democratic citizenship. Drawing out the importance of these dimensions enables us to see argumentation as a fully-situated human practice. It suggests that greater account must be taken of the ethnographic texture of argumentation if progress is to be made in its teaching and learning.

8: Conclusion

8.1 Introduction

This final chapter will proceed as follows. In Section 8.2, I will conclude by summarising the study and its main findings and arguments. In Section 8.3, I will emphasise what I see as being its major contributions to the discourse analysis of argumentation. Finally, in Section 8.4, I will evaluate the study, commenting on its limitations, and use this as a platform to suggest future avenues for research work in the field.

8.2 Summary of the study

This study has conducted a fine-grained analysis of the ways in which argumentation emerges and unfolds in the Adult ESOL classroom. In so doing so, I hope to have uncovered not just some of the forms in which argumentation emerges but also some of its major functions.

The study began by delimiting the scope of argumentation, in order to provide a focal point for the discourse analysis to follow. In the literature review (Chapter 2), this scoping out was extended and the space the research was to inhabit was further established and the theoretical frame for investigating the research questions was established. The methodology (Chapter 3) for conducting an analysis of argumentation was then established, together with a sense of its theoretical underpinnings.

The findings chapters were organized as follows; in Chapter 4, the analysis began by focussing on one telling argumentative episode in the research. This was selected because it demonstrated many of the key characteristics of argumentation, providing an entry point into the analysis that followed, helping to frame it. Then, in the second part of Chapter 4, I focussed on the ways in which more pedagogically planned debate emerged, refining and further developing a discourse analysis. This included a further examination of the role of the teacher in the unfolding of argumentation.

In Chapters 5 and 6, the focus was (respectively) on the role of language (and identity) play and on the role of narrative in argumentation. In Chapter 5, I drew upon Bakhtin's (1968) concept of the carnivalesque as the starting point for an analysis of double-voiced language play, connecting language play, identity play and, more specifically, identity resistance. In Chapter 6, I used Bamberg and Georgakopoulou's (2006) notion of a "small stories" as an analytical lens to examine the role of different kinds of narrative in argumentation, focussing

on the different rhetorical claims to truth they constituted. In the discussion chapter, I drew these threads together in the light of the research questions posed in Chapter 3.

The main findings and arguments of each chapter are summarised below:

Chapter 4 addressed the following research questions:

> ➤ How does argumentation emerge and unfold in the Adult ESOL classroom?
> ➤ How is argumentation authorized in the Adult ESOL classroom?

In Chapter 4 argumentation emerges and develops as a situated dialogic process. It emerges as the "inter-animation" (Bakhtin, 1981) of human voices. These voices can be competing or consensual. In multi-party argumentation, voices can be both competing and consensual, involving co-construction and competition. These voices are situated and emerge in the form of speaking positions. These speaking positions are also identity positions. They emerge linguistically and multi-modally, through gestures, facial expressions etc. Argumentation is contingent, both upon the immediate discourse context and, beyond this, upon the wider socio-economic and political context. In this way, argumentation implicates power relations. Argumentation is an expressive as well as a rational mode, indexing human emotions and identities.

Chapter 5 addressed the following research questions:

> ➤ How is argumentation authorized in the Adult ESOL classroom?
> ➤ How are student and teacher identities performed through argumentation in the Adult ESOL classroom?

Argumentation can emerge and unfold playfully in the Adult ESOL classroom. This language play can emerge in the form of double-voiced form e.g. parody or irony. Such language play is also indexical of complex evaluative stances and positioning. The argumentative function of language play can simultaneously be ideational and inter-personal (Halliday, 1977) in nature. Thus, it can resist and subvert official discourses, or it can be a manifestation of politeness, a way of negotiating conversational difficulty. Language play also indexes identity play as imagined identity positions (Norton, 2011; Lave and Wenger, 1991) are performed and offered as alternatives to the official identity positions offered. Speaking positions and their associated identity positions can be subverted too and constitute acts of identity resistance (Norton, 2011). This identity work, it is concluded, is both individual and collective.

Finally, Chapter 6 addressed the following research questions:

➢ What is the role of narrative in argumentation in the Adult ESOL classroom?

➢ How is argumentation authorized in the Adult ESOL classroom?

Argumentation and narrative are more permeable modes than official educational discourses as represented in the curriculum documents allow for. It is the point of the narrative (its evaluation) that often provides the pivot for the shift from narrative to argumentation. Narrative can be a powerful rhetorical means of authorizing argumentation. The role of speech reporting is important in this authorization. Examining the role of narrative in unfolding argumentative discourse necessitates a movement beyond canonical Labovian (1972) conceptualizations of narrative to examine the role of small stories (Bamberg and Georgakopoulou, 2006) in argumentation. Different kinds of narrative (e.g. generic, personal etc.) constitute different rhetorical claims to truth (Baynham, 2006; 2000).

8.3 Contribution of the study

I will now outline the contribution of my thesis in two areas:

  i)   the discourse analysis of argumentation in Adult ESOL

  ii)   pedagogy and practice in Adult ESOL.

8.3.1 Contribution to the discourse analysis of argumentation

I now focus on the contribution that the study makes to the discourse analysis of argumentation. This study is, to the best of my knowledge, the first of its kind to conduct a discourse analysis of argumentation in the Adult ESOL classroom. It is offered in the hope that where I have ventured, others will now follow, building on my research and perhaps developing some of the suggestions I outline later in the section on possible future work.

The main contribution this study makes to the discourse analysis of argumentation lies in its treatment of argumentation as a dialogic process.

The dialogic analysis here has implications for discourse theories around argumentation structure, coherence and cohesion. Conversation Analysis, we saw in Chapter 4, can help to illuminate the analysis of argumentation in terms of turn-taking and its breakdown. This focus on sequential exchange structures is valuable but does not tell the whole story, as it focusses exclusively on the synchronic dimension of argumentation structure, that is, on the moment of interaction.

A dialogic approach, on the other hand, brings a diachronic dimension to the discourse analysis of argumentation, examining the ways in which the voices of others are

recontextualised in argumentation. These voices are, of course, from the past and we have seen in Chapter 5, for example, how they are drawn upon in order to authorize positions in the moment of interaction. In this way, a single speaker turn in argumentation is potentially dialogic in nature, bringing in and appropriating the voices of others in complex ways. Indeed, even a single utterance (emerging as parody) or a single word (in the case of the pun) by a single speaker can be argumentative in the sense of double-voiced or contested, as Chapter 5 reveals.

When analysing argumentative discourse, then, it is not enough simply to focus, as the *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum* (2001) does, on formal discourse markers of surface cohesion, such as "therefore" and "so." This is definitely useful, perhaps especially when we are tracing the empirical emergence of argumentative reasoning for example, as we saw in Chapter 4. In Chapter 6 of the study, I suggest that discourse analysts need to attend to the linguistic markers associated with the process of speech reporting in order to trace the ways in which this is used to authorize argumentation claims and achieve overall meaning and coherence.

Indeed, to foreground the expressive dimension of argumentation, it is necessary for a discourse analysis to move beyond the analysis of formal discourse markers. Conceptualizing argumentation in terms of voice and connecting it to passion, feeling and human identities as well as rationality means that we need to take proper account of the importance of tone in the analysis of argumentative discourse. The voice, quite simply, is indexical of human emotion and is crucial in revealing what Volosinov (1978) terms an evaluative stance. Thus, the analysis presented in Chapter 5, foregrounds the crucial role that tone plays in double-voiced language play such as parody or irony.

In its study of the role of narrative in argumentation, the study suggests that narrative and argumentation are not as easily delimitable as official ESOL policy, curriculum and assessment discourses suggest. Rather, they are modes that find their way into each other, blending in subtle and nuanced ways, rather like the colours of a dye bleeding into each other. The concept of permeability has been used to suggest the ways in which this happens, with the evaluative point of the narrative a key focal point for the emergence of such permeability.

The study also makes a contribution to discourse analysis of the role of narrative in argumentation identified by Baynham (2011a) as an area in need of further research. In its focus on the rhetorical role of different kinds of non-canonical narratives in argumentation it has also contributed to a research base suggesting the need for a re-theorization of narrative

(Bamberg and Georgakopoulou, 2006). In Chapter 6, the findings on the role of "small stories" within argumentation begin to offer empirical support for Labov's (1997) observation that narratives that subserve argumentation might demand a different analytical lens.

The concept of permeability has implications for the beginnings of a contribution in another area, that of multi-modality. Spoken argumentation is permeable in that it emerges in terms of the paralinguistic as well as the linguistic. Thus, the study suggests that a discourse analysis of spoken argumentation needs to take account of its multimodal dimension. In Chapter 5, the expressive, creative dimension of argumentation is inscribed not just in the voice but in the body. A strand of the analysis throughout has suggested that argumentation emerges multi-modally, in the form of gestures, facial expressions etc. The multimodal analysis of spoken argumentation is in its infancy in the Adult ESOL classroom and this study makes a modest contribution to the knowledge base here. I have suggested that Goodwin's (2000) concept of embodiment can be of value here.

If argumentation is also an expressive social practice, as the section above has suggested, then it will index human identities. The analysis presented throughout the study suggests some of the ways in which identity work is performed through argumentation. This identity work is a matter of speakers positioning themselves and, simultaneously, others in unfolding argumentation and also being positioned by others, including the teacher and the wider socio-cultural context. These identity positions the adult students and teachers take up are both individual and representative in nature.

This identity work is partly a matter of what students bring about through argumentation i.e. the ways in which it is interactionally inscribed in the grain of the argumentative discourse itself. It is also a matter of what they bring along, their habitus (Bourdieu, 1991). The research literature on positioning and identity work is reasonably well-developed in relation to narrative but the identity work performed through argumentation still lacks a well-developed research base. The analysis presented throughout this thesis contributes to an empirical research base in just this very area.

8.3.2 Contribution to pedagogy and practice in Adult ESOL

The second contribution the thesis makes is in the area of Adult ESOL pedagogy and practice. The central connection to make here is with the citizenship agenda. What is revealed

in the pages of this thesis is, I argue, citizenship in action, with participation in argumentation enacting and modelling citizenship in the agora or public square that is the classroom.

Thus, when the students are discussing the issue of capital punishment in Chapter 4 they are taking up speaking and identity positions as private citizens, who have a right to freedom of belief and freedom of speech within a context of mutual tolerance and respect. In Chapter 4, we see students explicitly acknowledging their right to express different positions by appealing to their roles and identities as tax-paying citizens. In the context of discussing controversial issues, they might be required, for example, to vote in a referendum on capital punishment.

I also suggest that, in Chapter 4, the teacher is also able to take up the speaking position of a private citizen with the right to freedom of expression in the Adult ESOL classroom. In this way, the Adult ESOL classroom becomes a microcosm of wider democratic society, as Andrews (2009; 1994) observes. Teachers can play a key role in helping multilingual migrants operate effectively in their new communities of practice (Wenger, 1998). This involves developing socio-cultural as well as linguistic knowledge. This is why Sutter (2009) suggests that ESOL teachers have been teaching citizenship for a long time. Any meaningful conceptualization of citizenship is surely predicated upon the concept of an informed citizenry (Kuhn, 1991).

It is here that argumentation plays a role, providing a forum for debate which helps Adult ESOL students to develop the socio-cultural knowledge necessary to take up their roles (actual or potential) as UK citizens. Adult ESOL students need to learn how to argue effectively in out-of-class institutional encounters. In Chapter 5, the pedagogical purpose is to enable the students to take up more powerful speaking positions in complaint situations. This, as we saw, was a contested process, the role-play evaluated differently in terms of blame and responsibility.

Argumentation also involves the use of language and identity play to perform acts of linguistic and identity resistance to the official discourses made available in the classroom (Norton, 2011). The focus is on their roles and identities as consumers of services in neo-liberal Britain.

This identity work is also collective in nature. Thus, in Chapter 4, we see the students arguing collaboratively for the right to affordable English language provision. This identity position is inscribed in the co-constructed nature of the argumentative discourse. It is also a dimension

of their identities that they bring along to the Adult ESOL classroom, a dimension that speaks to their socio-cultural positions as low-waged, shift-working adult migrant workers struggling to access inflexible, increasingly expensive, language provision.

Moving away from more general issue-based argumentation, in Chapter 6, the analytical focus shifts to the performance of workplace identities, indexing their socio-economic position as migrant workers in the UK. It is the contention of this thesis that the collective or transportable identities brought about and brought along here are not simply to do with citizenship but are indexical of social class. In this way, the research contributes to the slow but steady rehabilitation (see Block, 2013; Block et al., 2012; Collins, 2006; Rampton, 2000) of a hitherto largely neglected area of discourse and identity work in sociolinguistics.

8. 4 Limitations and areas for future research

8.4.1 Limitations

Inevitably, any study will have its limitations. I will identify some of these and then, in the next section, suggest they are viewed more productively as avenues for future research. For reasons of scope, then, I have focussed primarily on the linguistic and not the multimodal dimensions of argumentation. Thus, my remarks upon the multimodal nature of argumentative discourse are tentative and exploratory and the subject would repay further research. Similarly, I have not been able to report on the role of narrative in argumentation as it unfolds in the sociolinguistic interview or to focus upon argumentation in the teacher education classroom.

In a sense, these limitations provide a counterpoint to the areas identified in Chapter 1 of the thesis when delimiting the scope of the study. The small-scale nature of this study means that it is inevitably exploratory in nature, opening up all sorts of interesting avenues that it must ultimately and of necessity be left to others to pursue. There were many such avenues opening up and it was impossible to do justice to them in the analysis reported in the pages of this thesis. The Methodology chapter has already discussed the rationale for the inclusion of the data and the need to be aware of what gets left out.

8.4.2 Areas for future research

8.4.2.1 Argumentation in institutional domains outside the classroom

The analysis presented in this thesis current has restricted its focus to argumentation in the domain of the classroom. This included pedagogical practices in the classroom designed to

prepare multilingual migrants for institutional encounters in domains outside the classroom. However, it would be interesting to study the ways in which argumentation emerges and unfolds in institutional encounters outside the classroom. This would build on research into the role of narratives in argumentation in job interviews (Roberts and Campbell, 2006) and the role of narratives in argumentation in asylum seeker interview (Blommaert, 2010). The findings of such research could then be brought-back inside the classroom to add a dimension of authenticity to existing classroom materials and pedagogies.

8.4.2.2 Argumentation and multimodality

In the first instance, establishing a manageable research focus meant that it was only possible to begin to suggest some of the ways in which argumentation has a multimodal dimension. The study began to uncover the tight connection that exists between the verbal and the multimodal dimensions of argumentation and this in itself would provide a fruitful avenue for additional research. For example, a more thoroughgoing and explicitly multimodal analysis of the ways in which these semiotic dimensions (gestures, facial expressions) emerge and unfold in the classroom would provide an additional contribution to the knowledge base here.

If argumentation is indeed a permeable practice, then its multimodal dimension will need investigating in more depth. As Kress (2013) observes, teaching and learning is a multimodal business and this is true even in the language classroom, where the focus is often, understandably, on the linguistic. This is a study for another day when a more sustained multi-modal transcription based solely on audio-visual data gathering, as opposed to audio-visual and audio, can be deployed. A study of the ways in which visual argumentation operates would be a further area for future research. This would build upon work by those such as Andrews (2005) who highlights the need for new models of argumentation in this area.

8.5 Conclusion

"There is never a final grand statement" (Charles Bukowski)

There is always another voice, another position and the book on argumentation can never be closed. Double-voicing relativizes the concept of truth, and Morris observes that this was something Volosinov acknowledged though regretted (Morris, 1994, p. 6). Argumentation, I began by observing, is both a difficult and a contested concept. This is highly apposite for an analysis which has drawn upon the ideas of Bakhtin. This is also entirely in keeping with the spirit in which this linguistic ethnography of argumentation has been conducted.

I would like to finish by re-focussing on my own identities as a teacher, researcher and human being. I began with an intuition that the ways in which "argumentation" or "argument" were conceptualized in policy terms was inadequate. I began with a sense that a different voice was needed, a different speaking and identity position. By getting in the grain of argumentation as it emerged in the classroom, I wanted to work against the grain of the policy conceptualization.

Thus, the *Skills for Life* policy documents separate out speaking and listening but I see them as intimately connected, impossible to separate. The documents conceptualize argumentation in terms of abstract, individual competences but I see it as a socially situated practice. The documents bleach out the tight connection with human identities but for me the connection is central. The documents privilege reason, whereas I see reason as part of a wider story that reconnects argumentation with feeling and passion, and with the human imagination.

References

Action for ESOL (2013). Action for ESOL website. [Online]. [Accessed 4 February 2012]. Available from: http://www. actionforesol.org.uk

Adger, C.T. (1984). Communicative Competence in the culturally diverse classroom: negotiating norms for linguistic interaction. PhD Thesis, Georgetown University.

Agar, M. (1995). Ethnography. In Verscheuren, J. et al. (eds.) *Handbook of Pragmatics. Manual.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 573- 580.

Allwright, D., and Bailey, K. (1991). *Focus on the Language Classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses. In *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays.* London: Verso, pp. 121-73.

Anderson, L. (1986). Evidentials, paths of change and mental maps; typologically regular asymmetries. In Chafe W and Nicholls, J (eds.) *Evidentiality: the linguistic coding of epistemology.* Ablex, pp. 273-312.

Andrews, R. (2009). The importance of argument in education. Inaugural lecture. Institute of Education. University of London.

Andrews, R. (2007). Argumentation, critical thinking and the postgraduate dissertation. *Educational Review* **59** (1), pp. 1-18.

Andrews, R. (2005). Models of argumentation in educational discourse. *Text* **25** (1), pp. 107-127.

Andrews, R. (1997). Reconceiving Argument. *Educational Review* **49** (3), pp. 259-269.

Andrews, R. (1995). *Teaching and Learning Argument.* London: Cassell.

Andrews, R. (1994). Democracy and the Teaching of Argument. *English Journal* **83** (6), pp. 62-69.

Andrews, R. (1993). Argument in schools: the value of a generic approach. *Cambridge Journal of Education* **23** (3), pp. 277-285.

Andrews, R. (1992). Narrative, Argument and Rhetoric. In R. Andrews (ed.) *Rebirth of Rhetoric: Essays in language, culture and education.* London and New York: Routledge, pp.116-128.

Andrews, R., and Mitchell, S. (eds.) (2001). *Essays in Argument*. London: Middlesex University Press.

Andrews, R., Costello, P. & Clarke, S. (1993). *Improving the Quality of Argument: 5-16*: Final Report. Hull: University of Hull, Centre for Studies in Rhetoric.

Andrews, R. (ed.) (1992). *Rebirth of Rhetoric: Essays in language, culture and education.* London and New York: Routledge.

Andrews, R. (ed.) (1989). *Narrative and Argument*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Andriesson, J. Baker, M., & Suthers, D. (2003). Argumentation, computer support and the educational context of confronting cognitions. In Andriesson, J, Baker, M. & Suthers, D. (eds.) *Arguing to Learn: Confronting Cognitions in Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning Environments.* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 1-25.

Antaki, C. (1994). *Explaining and Arguing: The Social Organization of Accounts.* London: Sage.

Antaki, C. and Wetherell, M. (1999). Show concessions. *Discourse Studies* **1** (1) pp. 7-27.

Antaki, C. and Widdicombe, S. (eds.) (1998). *Identities in Talk.* London: Sage.

Argaman, E. (2009). Arguing within an institutional hierarchy: how argumentative talk and interlocutor's' embodied practices preserve a superior-subordinate relationship. *Discourse Studies* **11** (5), pp.515-541.

Arksey, H. and Knight, P. (1999). *Interviewing for social scientists: an* introductory *resource with examples.* London: Sage.

Aristotle. (1928) *On Sophistical Refutations.* Ross, W.D. (ed.) Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Aristotle. (1926). *The Art of Rhetoric*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Attardo, S. (2000). Irony as relevant inappropriateness. *Journal of Pragmatics*. **32** (6), pp. 793-826.

Austin, J. (1979). Performative Utterances. Philosophical Papers. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Austin, J. (1962). *How to do things with words.* London: Oxford University Press.

Badger, R. (2006). Investigating agonism in linguistics. *Journal of Pragmatics,* **38** (9), pp. 1442-1456.

Baker, M. J. M. Quignard, K. Lund and M. van Amelsvoort (2002). Designing a Computer-supported collaborative learning situation for broadening and deepening understanding of the space of debate. Paper presented at Fifth International. Conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation, Amsterdam.

Bakhtin, M. (1994) Problems in Dostoyevsky's poetics. In Morris, P. (ed.) *The Bakhtin Reader: Selected writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, and Volosinov.* London: Arnold, pp. 110-113.

Bakhtin, M (1986). *Speech Genres and other Late Essays.* Emerson, C and Holquist, M. (eds.) Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination*: *Four Essays.* Holquist, M. (ed.) Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1968). *Rabelais and his world.* Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.

Bamberg, M., and Georgakopoulou, A. (2008). Small stories as a new perspective in narrative and identity analysis. *Text & Talk*, **28** (3), pp. 377-96.

Barker, C., and Galasinski, D. (2001). *Cultural Studies and Discourse Analysis: a dialogue on language and identity.* London: Sage.

Bauman, R. [1975] (2001) Verbal art as performance. In A. Duranti (ed.), *Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 165-188.

Bauman, R. (1992). Performance. In Bauman. R. (ed.) Folklore, cultural performances and popular entertainments. New York: Oxford University Press, pp.41-50

Bauman, R. (1986). *Story, performance and event: Contextual studies of oral narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baynham, M. (2012). *Conversation with Michael Hepworth.* 23 May.

Baynham, M. (2011a). Narrative Analysis. In Hyland, K and Paltridge, B (eds.) *The Continuum Companion to Discourse Analysis.* London: Continuum, pp. 69-85.

Baynham, M. (2011b*).* Stance, positioning and alignment in narratives of professional experience. *Language in Society* **40** (1), pp. 63-74.

Baynham, M. (2006). Performing self, family and community in Moroccan narratives of migration and settlement. In De Fina, A., Schiffrin, D., and Bamberg, M. (eds.) *Discourse and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 376-398.

Baynham, M. (2003). Narrative in time and space: beyond backdrop accounts of narrative orientation. Narrative Inquiry **13** (2), pp. 347-66.

Baynham, M. (2000). Narrative as evidence in Literacy Research. *Linguistics in Education,* **11** (2), pp. 99-117.

Baynham, M. (1996). Direct Speech: What's it doing in non-narrative discourse? *Journal of Pragmatics,* **25** (1), pp. 61-81.

Baynham, M. (1995). Narrative in Argument, Argument in Narrative. In Costello, P., and Mitchell. S (eds.) *Competing and Consensual Voices: The Theory and Practice of Argument*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp.35-49.

Baynham, M. (1988). Narrative and narrativity in a first generation migrant community. PhD thesis, University of Reading.

Baynham, M., C. Roberts, C., Cooke, M., Simpson, J., Ananiadou, K., Callaghan, J., McGoldrick, J. and Wallace, C. (2007). *Effective Teaching and Learning; ESOL London*: NRDC.

Berger, P., and Luckman, T. (1967). *The Social Construction of Reality*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Berrill, D. (1992). Issues of audience: egocentrism revisited. In Andrews, R. (ed.), *Rebirth of rhetoric*. London: Routledge, pp. 81-101.

Besnier, N. (1993). Reported Speech and effect on Nukulaelae Atoll. In Hill, J.H., and Irvine, J.T. *Responsibility and evidence in oral discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 161-181.

Billig, M. (2005). *Laughter and Ridicule: Towards a social critique of Humour*. London: Sage.

Billig, M. (1991). *Ideology and Opinions.* London: Sage Publications.

Billig, M. (1989). The argumentative nature of holding strong views: A Case Study. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, **19** (3), pp. 202-223.

Billig, M. (1987). *Arguing and thinking: a rhetorical approach to social psychology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blackledge, A. (2006). The Racialization of language in British political discourse. *Critical Discourse Studies,* **3**(1), pp. 61-79.

Blackledge, A., and Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: A Critical perspective*. London: Continuum.

Blackledge, A. and Creese, A. (2009). Meaning-Making as Dialogic Process: Official and Carnival Lives in the Language Classroom. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, **8** (4), pp. 236-253.

Blair, J.A and Johnson, M. (1983). Informal Logic: The Past Five Years, 1978-1983. *American Philosophical Quarterly*. **22** (3), pp. 181-196.

Block, D. (2013). *Social Class in Applied Linguistics* London: Routledge.

Block, D., Gray, J., and Holborrow, M. (2012). *Neo-liberalism and Applied Linguistics*. London: Routledge.

Block, D. (2011). Citizenship, education and global spaces. *Journal of Language and Intercultural communication.* **11** (2), pp. 161-169.

Block, D. (2007). *Second Language Identities*. London: Continuum.

Blommaert, J. (2006). Ethnography as counter-hegemonic: remarks on epistemology and method. [Online]. London: Kings College. [Accessed 10 May 2009]. Available from: http://www.kcl.ac.uk/innovation/groups/ldc/publications/workingpapers/34

Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: a critical introduction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blommaert, J. (2000). Data formulation as text and context: The aesthetics of asylum seekers' narratives. [Online]. London: Kings College. [Accessed 15 February 2012]. Available from: http://www. kcl.ac.uk/innovation/groups/ldc/publications/workingpapers

Blommaert, J. (2001). Investigating Narrative Inequality: African Asylum Seekers' Stories in Belgium. *Discourse and Society*. **12** (4), pp. 413-449.

Blommaert, J. and Dong, J. (2010). *Ethnographic Fieldwork: A beginner's guide*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Blumer, H. (1969). The methodological position of symbolic interactionism. In Blumer, H. (ed.) *Symbolic interactionism: perspective and method*. Englewood cliffs: NJ: Prentice Hall, pp.1-60.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). The peculiar history of scientific reason. *Sociological Forum*. **6** (1), pp. 3-26.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). Outlines of a theory of practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bowerman, M. and Brown, P. (eds.) (2008). *Cross-linguistic Perspectives on Argument Structure: Implications for Learnability*: Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Briggs, C. (1997). Notes on a confession: On the construction of gender, sexuality and violence in an infanticide case. *Pragmatics* **7** (4), pp. 519-546.

Briggs, C. (1986). *Learning how to ask*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bruner, J. (1985). Child's talk: learning to use language. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*. **1** (1), pp. 111-114.

Burke, K. (1969). Rhetoric *of Motives.* Berkley: University of California Press.

Burleson, B.R. (1981). The Senses of Argument Revisited: Prolegomena to Future Characterizations of Argument. In Ziegelmueller, G., and Rhodes, J. (eds). *Dimensions of Argument: Proceedings of the Second Summer Conference on Argumentation*, Speech Communication Association, Annandale, VA, pp. 955-979.

Burleson, B.R. (1979). On the Analysis and Criticism of Arguments: some theoretical and methodological considerations. Journal of the American Forensic Association **15,** pp. 137-147.

Burns, A. (2005). Action Research: an evolving paradigm? *Language Teaching* **38** (2), pp. 57-74.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.

Caldas-Coulthard, C. (2003). Cross-cultural representation of "otherness" in media discourse. In Weiss, G and Wodak, R. (eds.) *Critical Discourse Analysis. Theory and Interdisciplinarity.* Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 272-296.

Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with Spoken Discourse.* London: Sage.

Carter, R. (2004). *Language and Creativity: The Art of Common Talk*. London and New York: Routledge.

Chomsky, N. (1972). *Language and Mind.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

Clark, H. and Gerrig. R. (1990). Quotations as Demonstrations. *Language,* **66** (4), pp. 764-805.

Clarke, S. (1995). Ushering in the Tigers of Wrath: Playfulness and Rationality in Learning to Argue. In Costello, P. & Mitchell, S. (eds.) *Competing and Consensual Voices: The Theory and Practice of Argument*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp.23-34.

Clifford, J. (1986). Introduction: Partial Truths. In *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Poetics of Ethnography*. Clifford, J & Marcus, G (eds.). California: University of California Press, pp. 1-27.

Coffin, C. (2007). *The Language and Discourse of Argumentation in Computer Conferencing and essays*. Research Report. Economic and Social Research Council.

Coffin, C. (2004). Arguing about how the world is or how it should be: the role of argument in IELTS *tests. Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 3 (3), pp. 229-246.

Coffin, C. and O'Halloran, K. (2009). Argument Reconceived? *Educational Review,* **61** (3), pp.301-13.

Coffin, C., and O'Halloran, K. (eds.) (2008). Argumentation in educational contexts: new methods, new directions. *International Journal of Research and Method in Education* **31** (3), pp. 219-227.

Coffin, C., Painter, C. and Hewings, A. (2005). Engaging Electronically: Using CMC to develop students' argumentation skills in Higher Education. *Language and Education*, **19** (1), pp. 32–49.

Collins, J. (2006). *Where's class in second language learning?* [Online]. London: Kings College. [Accessed 24 July 2009]. Available from: http://www.kcl.ac.uk/innovation/groups/ldc/publications/workingpapers/index.aspx.

Condelli, L., Wrigley, H., Yoon, K., Seburn, M. and Cronen, S. (2003). *What works* study for Adult ESL Literacy Students, Washington DC: US Department of Education.

Cook, G. (2000). *Language play, language learning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cook, G. (1997). Language play, language learning. *English Language Teaching Journal* **51** (3), pp. 224-31.

Cooke, M., Roberts. C., Bushell, P., Hepworth, M., McGoldrick, J., and O'Neill, J. (2007) *Developing Adult Teaching and Learning: Practitioner Guides-ESOL.* Leicester/London: NIACE/NRDC.

Cooke, M., and Simpson, J. (2009). Challenging agendas in ESOL: Skills, employability and social cohesion. *Language Issues*. **20** (1), pp. 19-30.

Cooke, M., and Simpson, J. (2008). *ESOL: A Critical Guide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cooke, M. and C. Roberts (2007). *Developing adult teaching and learning: practitioner guides. ESOL.* Leicester/London: NIACE/NRDC.

Copland, F. and Creese, A. (2015). *Linguistic Ethnography: collecting, analysing and presenting data*. London: SAGE.

Corsaro, W., and Rizzo, T. (1990). Disputes in the peer culture of American and Italian nursery-school children. In Grimshaw, A.D. (ed.) *Conflict Talk: Sociolinguistic investigations of everyday conversations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 21-66.

Costello, P., and Mitchell, S. (eds.) (1995). *Competing and Consensual Voices: The Theory and Practice of Argument*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Coulter, J. (1990). Elementary properties of argument sequences. In Psathas, G. (ed.) Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis, number 1: Interactional competence, Washington DC: University of America Press, pp. 181-203.

Creese, A. (2008). Linguistic Ethnography. In: King, K.A. and Hornberger, N.H. (eds.) Encyclopedia of Language and Education (2nd Edition). New York: Springer, pp. 229–241.

Creese, A., and Martin, P. (2003). Multilingual classroom ecologies: inter-relationships, interactions, ideologies. *International Journal of Bilingualism and Education.* **6** (3-4), pp.161-167.

Crick, B. et al (2003). *The New and* the *Old*: the report of the '*Life in the United Kingdom"* Advisory Group. Home Office Communications Directorate.

Crystal, D. (1998). Language *Play*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Davies, B., and Harre, R. (1990). Positioning: the discursive construction of selves. *Journal for the theory of Social Behaviour.* **20** (1), pp. 43-63.

De Fina, A., (2011). Discourse and Identity. In Djik, T.A. (ed.) *Discourse Studies: A multi-disciplinary introduction.* London: Sage, pp. 263-282.

De Fina, A., Schiffrin, D., and Bamberg, M. (2006). Introduction. In De Fina, A., Schiffrin, D., & Bamberg, M. (eds.) *Discourse and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-23.

Deignan, A. (1995). *Collins Cobuild guides to English* 7: Metaphor. London: Harper Collins.

Dentith, S. (2000). *Parody*. Oxford: Routledge.

Dentith, S. (1995). *Bakhtinian thought: An introductory reader*. London: Routledge.

Department for Education and Skills. (2001). *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum*. London: Basic Skills Agency/DfES. [Online]. [Accessed 13 February 2011]. Available from: http://www.dfes.gov.uk/curriculum_esol

Department for Education and Skills. (2003). *Learning Materials ESOL*. London: Basic Skills Agency/DfES. [Online]. [Accessed 23 January 2011]. Available from: http://www.dfes.gov.uk/readwriteplus/LearningMaterialsESOL.

Dillenbourg, P. (ed.) (1999). *Collaborative learning: Cognitive and Computational Processes*. Pergamon.

Driver, R., Newton, P., and Osborne, J. (2000). Establishing the norms of scientific argumentation in classrooms. *Science Education* **84** (3), pp. 287-312.

Du Boulay, J., and Williams, R. (1983). Collecting Life Histories. In Ellen, R. (ed.). *Ethnographic Research: a guide to general conduct,* London, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, pp. 247-257.

Eagleton, T. (1991) *Ideology*. (2nd edition). London: Verso.

Eggins, S., and Slade, E. (1997). *Analysing Casual Conversation*. London: Cassell.

Ellis, N. (2011). The emergence of language as a complex adaptive system. In Simpson, J. (ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. London: Routledge, pp. 654-688.

Emerson, R.M., Fretz, R., and Shaw, L (1995). *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Engelbretsen, R. (2007). *Stance-taking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Erduran, S., Simon, S. and Osborne, J. (2004). Tapping into Argumentation: Developments in the application of Toulmin's argument pattern for studying science discourse. *Science Education* 88 (6), pp. 915-33.

Fairclough, N. (1995*). Critical Discourse Analysis.* London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1992*).* Discourse and Text: Linguistic and inter-textual analysis within discourse analysis. *Discourse and Society* **13** (2), pp. 193-217.

Fairclough, N., Pardoe, S., and Szerszynski, B. (2006). Critical discourse analysis and citizenship. In Hausendorf, H., and Bora, A. (eds.) *Analysing citizenship talk.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 98-123.

Feldman, M. S., Bell, J., and Berger, M.T. (2003). *Gaining Access: A practical and theoretical guide for qualitative researchers.* Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira.

Foucault, M. (1987). *The Archaeology of Knowledge.* London: Tavistock.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge*. Brighton: Harvester.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge.* London: Tavistock.

Freire, P. (1996). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. London: Penguin.

Gabrielatos, C., and Baker, P. (2008). Fleeing, sneaking, flooding: A corpus analysis of the discursive construction of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK Press 1996-2005. *Journal of English Linguistics* **36** (1), pp. 5-38.

Gal, S. (1989). Language and Political Economy. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. **18** (1), pp. 345-367.

Gee, J. (1996). *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses: Critical Perspectives on Literacy & Education.* London: Routledge.

Geertz, C. (1988). *Works and Lives: the anthropologist as author*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Geertz, C. (1973). Thick Description: Towards an interpretive theory of culture. In Geertz, C. (ed.) The Interpretation of Cultures New York: Basic Books, pp.231-267.

Georgakopoulou, A. (2007). *Small stories, interaction and identities*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Georgakopoulou, A. (2006). Thinking big with small stories in narrative and identity analysis. *Narrative Inquiry*. **16** (1), pp. 122-139.

Georgakopoulou, A. (2001). On indirect disagreements in conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics*. **20** (12), pp. 1881-1900.

Georgakopoulou, A., and Goutsos, D. (2000). Revisiting discourse boundaries: the narrative and non-narrative modes. *Text* **20** (1), 63-82.

Gilbert, M. (1994). Multimodal Argumentation. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* **24** (2), pp. 159-177.

Glaser, B., and Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies of qualitative research.* London: Wiedenfield and Nicholson.

Goffman, E. (1983). The interaction order. *American Sociological Review*. **48** (1), pp. 1-17.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience.* New York: Harper and Row.

Goodwin, C. (2000). Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* **32** (10) pp. 1489-1522.

Goodwin, M.H. (1990). *He-Said-She-Said: Talk as Social Organisation among Black Children.* Bloomington: Indiana Press.

Goodwin, M. H. (1978). Conversational practices in a peer group of urban black children. Unpublished PhD, Department of Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania.

Goodwin, C., and Goodwin, M. H. (2000). Emotion within situated activity. In A. Duranti (ed.) *Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp.239-57.

Goodwin, C., and Goodwin, M. H. (1990). Interstitial Argument. In Grimshaw, A.D. (ed.) *Conflict Talk: Sociolinguistic investigations of arguments in conversations.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 85-118.

Goodwin, C., and Goodwin, M. H. (1987). Children's arguing. In Philips, S., Steel, S & Tanz, C. (eds.) Language gender and sex in comparative perspective Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.200-248.

Goodwin, M. H., Goodwin, C., and Jaeger-Drore, M. (2002). Multi-modality in girls' game disputes. *Journal of Pragmatics* **34** (10-11), pp. 1621–1649.

Govier, T. (1987). *Problems in argument analysis and evaluation*. Dordrecht: Foris publications.

Gray, J. (2002). The global coursebook in ELT. In Block, D., and Cameron, D. (eds.) *Globalisation and Language Teaching*. London: Routledge, pp. 151-168.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In Cole, P. and Morgan, J (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics.* Vol. 3 *Speech Acts,* New York: Academic Press.

Grimshaw, J. (1992). *Argument Structure.* Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Guillemin, M., and Gillam, L. (2004). Ethics, Reflexivity, and 'Ethically-Important Moments' in Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*. **10** (2), pp. 261-280.

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. (1977). Sociocultural knowledge in conversational inference. In Saville-Troike, M. (ed.) Georgetown Roundtable. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.

Gumperz, J., and Hymes, D. (eds.) (1972). *Directions in Sociolinguistics.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Habermas, J. (1984). *The Theory of Communicative Action,* Volume *1, Reason and the Rationalization of Society.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Hall, S. (1996). Introduction: Who needs identity? In Hall, S., and du Gay, P. (eds.) *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage.

Halliday, M. A. K (1977). *Language as Social Semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.

Halsey, A.H. (1972). Political ends and Educational Means. In Halsey, A.H. (ed.) *Educational Priority 1* London: HMSO, pp. 3-12.

Hammersley, M. (2006). Ethnography: problems and prospects. *Ethnography* and Education, **1** (1), pp. 3-14.

Hammersley, M. (2003). Recent Radical Criticism of Interview Studies: any implications for the sociology of education? *British Journal of Sociology of Education* **24** (1), pp. 119 – 126.

Hammersley, M (1992). *What's wrong with ethnography?* London: Routledge.

Hammersley, M., and Atkinson, P. (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in Practice.* London: Routledge.

Hesse, D. (1992). Aristotle's Poetics and Rhetoric: Narrative as Rhetoric's fourth mode. In Andrews. R. (ed.) *Rebirth of Rhetoric: Essays in language, culture and education.* London and New York: Routledge, pp. 19-38.

Hill, J.H., and Irvine, J.T. (1993). Introduction. In In Hill, J.H. and Irvine, J.T. *Responsibility and evidence in oral discourse.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.1-24.

Hill, J., & Zepeda, O. (1993). Mrs Patricio's trouble: The distribution responsibility in an account of personal experience. In Hill, J.H., and Irvine, J.T. *Responsibility and evidence in oral discourse.* Cambridge University Press, pp. 197-226.

Hirst, E. (2002). Diverse Voices in a Second Language Classroom: Burlesque, Parody and Mimicry. *Language and Education* **17** (3), pp. 174-191.

HMSO *Life in the UK: A Journey to Citizenship.*

Holborrow, M. (1999). *The politics of English: A Marxist view of language.* London: Sage.

Honderich, T. (1995). *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hutchby, I. (1996). *Confrontation Talk: Arguments, asymmetries and Power on Talk Radio.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hutchby, I. (1991). The organisation of talk on talk radio. In Scannell, P (ed). *Broadcast Talk.* SAGE: London, pp. 119-137.

Hutcheon, L. (1994). *Irony's Edge: The Theory and Politics of Irony.* London: Routledge.

Hymes, D. (1996). *Ethnography, Linguistics, Narrative Inequality: Toward an Understanding of Voice.* Taylor and Francis: London.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. University of Pennsylvania Press: Philadelphia.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In Pride, J.B and Holmes, J. (eds.) *Sociolinguistics.* Harmondsworth: Penguin, pp. 269–293.

Hymes, D. (1968). The ethnography of speaking. In Fishman, J. (ed.) *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. The Hague: Moulton, pp. 99–138.

Da Silva Iddings, A.C. and McCafferty, S. (2007). Carnival in a mainstream kindergarten classroom: A Bakhtinian analysis of second language learners' off-task behaviours. *Modern Language Journal*. **91** (1), pp. 31-44.

Ietcu-Fairclough, I. (2008). Legitimation and Strategic Maneuvering in the Political Field. *Argumentation* **22** (3) pp. 399-417.

Ivanic, R. (1998). *Writing and Identity: the discoursal construction of identity in academic writing.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Jackson, S., and Jacobs, S. (1982). Conversational Argumentation: A discourse analytic approach. In Cox, J. R., and Willard, C. (eds.) *Advances in argumentation theory and research* Illinois: Southern University Illinois University Press, pp. 35-47.

Jackson, S., and Jacobs, S. (1980). Structure of conversational argument: Pragmatic bases for the enthymeme. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* **66,** pp.251-265.

Jacobs, S. (1989). Speech Acts and Arguments. *Argumentation* **3** (4), pp. 345-365.

Jacobs, S. (1987). The Management of Disagreement in Conversation. In Van Eemeren, F.H., Grootendorst, R., Blair, J.A., and Willard, C.A (eds.), *Argumentation: Across the Lines of Discipline. Proceedings of the Conference on Argumentation*, Foris: Dordrecht, pp. 229-239.

Jacobs, S. (1983). When Worlds Collide: An application of Field Theory to Rhetorical Conflict. In Zarefsky, D., Sillars, M.O., and Rhodes, J (eds). Argument in Transition: Proceedings of the Third Summer Conference on Argumentation, Speech Communication Association. Annandale, VA, pp. 749-755.

Jacobs, S. (1982). The Rhetoric of Witnessing and Heckling: A Case Study in Ethnorhetoric, dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Jaffe, A. (2009). The sociolinguistics of stance. In Jaffe, A (ed.), *Stance: Sociolinguistics perspectives.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 3-28.

Jakobson, R. (1960). Closing statement: Linguistics and Poetics. In Sebeok, T. (ed.) *Style in Language*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press, pp.350-377.

Book of Job. (2013). *The Official King James Bible website.* [Online]. [Accessed 17 June 2010]. Available from: http://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Job-Chapter-1.

Johnson, R. and Blair, J. (1985). Informal Logic: The past five years 1978-1983. *American Philosophical Quarterly* **22** (3), pp. 181-96.

Kahane, H. (1992). *Logic and Contemporary Rhetoric: The Use of reason in Everyday Life.* Belmont, California: Wadsworth.

Kendon, A. (2001). Gesture as communication strategy. *Semiotica*. **135**, pp. 191-209.

Kendon, A. (1995). Gestures as illocutionary and discourse structure markers in Southern Italian conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* **23**, pp. 247-279.

Koyaanisqatsi. (1982). [Film]. Godfrey Reggio. Dir. USA: IRE Productions.

Kress, G. (2013). *Multimodality: a social semiotic approach to contemporary communication.* London: Routledge.

Kress, G. (2011). Partnerships in research: multimodality and ethnography. *Qualitative Research* 11 (3), pp. 239-260.

Kress, G. (2001). *Multimodal teaching and learning: the rhetorics of the science classroom*. London: Continuum.

Kress, G. (1989). Texture and Meaning. In Andrews, R. (ed.). *Narrative and Argument*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press, pp. 9-22.

Kress, G., and Van Leeuwen, T. (1996). *Reading Images: The grammar of visual design.* New York: Routledge.

Kristeva, J. (1986). *The Kristeva Reader*. Moi, Toril (ed.). New York: Columbia University Press.

Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in language: a semiotic approach to literature and art.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Kuhn, D. (1991). *The Skills of Argument.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Labov, W. (1997). Some further steps in Narrative Analysis. *Journal of Narrative and Life History.*

Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city: studies in the Black English vernacular.* Oxford. Blackwell.

Labov, W., and Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic discourse*. New York: Academic Press.

Labov, W., and Waletsky, J. (1967). Narrative analysis: oral versions of personal experience. In Helm, J. (ed.) *Essays on the Verbal and the Visual Arts*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, pp. 12-44.

Lakoff, G., and Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Lantolf, J.P., and Pavlenko, A. (1995). Sociocultural theory and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* **15** (1), pp. 108-124.

Latour, B. (1987). *Science in Action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard university Press.

Lave J., and Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning. Legitimate peripheral participation*, Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.

Le Page, R.B., and Tabouret-Keller, A. (1985). *Acts of Identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Liddicoat, A., Dopke, S, Love, K., and Brown, A. (1994). Presenting a point of view: caller's contributions to talkback radio in Australia. *Journal of Pragmatics.* **22** (2), pp. 139-156.

Lillis, T (2001) *Student writing: access, regulation and desire.* London: Routledge.

Lindstrom, L. (1993). Context contest: debatable truth statements on Tanna Vanuatu. In *Rethinking context: language as an interactive phenomena.* Duranti, A., and Goodwin, C (eds). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.101-124.

Little Britain. (2007). BBC1 First broadcast 21 January 2007.

Littleton, K., Bale, S., Joiner, R., and Messer, D. (2000). *Learning and Instruction*. **10** (6), pp. 483-496.

Lyons, J. (1982). *Speech, Place and Action: Studies in Deixis and Subjectivity*. Oxford: John Wiley.

Lyotard, J. F. (1984). *The Post-modern Turn: New perspectives on Social Theory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1974). *The German Ideology*. Arthur, C.J. (ed). London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Marx, K. (1845). *Marxist Internet Archive. Thesis on Feuerbach XI*. [Online]. [Accessed 14 May 2009].Available from: http://www.marxists.org.uk/archive/marx/works/1845/theses/theses.htm.

Maxwell, J. A. (2004). *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Maybin, J., and Tusting, K. (2011). Linguistic Ethnography. In Simpson, J. (ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Routledge: London, pp. 515-529.

Maybin, J., and Swann, J. (2007). Everyday Creativity in Language: Textuality, Contextuality, and Critique. *Applied Linguistics* **28** (4), pp. 497-517.

Maybin, J. (1991). Children's informal talk and the construction of meaning. English in Education **25** (2).

Maynard, D.W. (1985). How children start arguments. *Language in Society*. **14** (1), pp. 1-29.

McAlister, S., Ravenscroft, A., and Scanlon, E. (2004). Combining interaction and context design to support collaborative argumentation using a tool for synchronous CMC. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*. **20** (3), pp. 194-204.

Mercer, N. (1996). The quality of talk in children's collaborative activity in the classroom. *Learning and Instruction*. **6** (4) pp. 359-377.

Mercer, N., Wegerif, R. and Dawes, L. (1999). Children's talk and the development of reasoning in the classroom. *British Educational Research Journal*. **25** (1) pp. 95-111.

Mishler, E.G. (2006). Narrative and Identity: the double arrow of time. In De Fina, A., Schiffrin, D., and Bamberg, M. (eds.) *Discourse and Identity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 30-47.

Mishler, E.G. (1986). *Research Interviewing:* context *and narrative*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mitchell, J.C. (1984). Case Studies. In. Ellen, R.F. (ed.) (1984). *Ethnographic Research: A guide to general conduct*, London: Harcourt Brace-Jovanovich, pp. 237-241.

Mitchell, S. (1994). *The Teaching and Learning of Argument in Sixth Forms and Higher Education*. Hull: University of Hull Centre for Studies in Rhetoric.

Mitchell, S. (2001a). Some key concepts in Argument. In. Andrews, R., and Mitchell, S. (eds.) *Essays in Argument.* London: Middlesex University Press, pp. 1-12.

Mitchell, S. (2001b). Questions and Schooling: Classroom discourse across the curriculum. In Andrews, R. and Mitchell, S. (eds.) *Essays in Argument.* London: Middlesex University Press, pp. 109-136.

Mitchell, S., and Riddle, M. (2000). *Improving the quality of argument in higher education: Final report*. London: School of Lifelong Learning and Education: Middlesex University.

Montgomery, M. (1999). Speaking Sincerely: Public reactions to the death of Diana. *Language and Literature.* **8** (1), pp.5-33.

Muller, E., and Di Luzio, A. (1995). Stories as examples in everyday argument. Versus. 70-75 pp. 114-145.

Muntigl, P. and Turnbull, W. (1998). Conversational structure and facework in arguing. *Journal of Pragmatics, **29** (3), pp. 225-56.*

Murphy, R. (2004). *English Grammar in Use*. (3rd Edition) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Newby, P. (2010). *Research Methods in Education*. Harlow: Pearson.

Norrick, N. R. (2000). *Conversation Narratives: Storytelling in Everyday Talk*: Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

North, S., Coffin, C., and Hewings, A. (2008). Using Exchange-structure analysis to explore argument in text-based computer conferences. *International Journal of Research and Method in Education.* **31** (3), pp. 257-276.

Norton, B. (2011). Identity In. Simpson, J. (ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Routledge: London, pp. 318-331.

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and Language Learning: Gender, Ethnicity and Educational Change.* Harlow: Longman.

Ochs, E. (1979). Transcription as Theory. Transcription as theory. In Ochs, E., and. Schieffelin, B. (eds.). *Developmental pragmatics.* New York: Academic Press, pp.43-71.

Ochs, E. and Capps, L. (2001). *Living Narrative.* Cambridge MA; Harvard University Press.

O'Halloran, K. (2011). Investigating Argumentation in Reading Groups: Combining Manual Qualitative Coding and Automated Corpus Tools. *Applied Linguistics.* **32** (2), pp. 172-196.

O'Keefe, D.J. (1982). Two concepts of argument. In Cox, J. and Willard, C (eds). *Advances on Argumentation Theory and Research*. Carbonsville and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, pp. 3-23.

Orwell, G. (2013[1948]). *Nineteen Eighty Four*. London: Penguin.

Oxford English Dictionary. (2013). [Online]. [Accessed 12 February 2013]. Available from: http:// www.oed.com

Parret, H. (1987). Argumentation in narrativity. In Van Eemeren, F. (ed.) *Argumentation: Across the Lines of Discipline.* Dordrecht: Foris, pp. 165-176.

Pennycook, A. (2007). The rotation gets thick. The constraints get thin: Creativity, re-contextualisation and difference. *Applied Linguistics* **28** (4), pp. 579-96.

Perelman, C., and Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1958). *The New Rhetoric: A treatise on Argumentation.* University of Notre-Dame Press.

Pierce, C.S. (1955). *Philosophical Writings of Pierce*. Buchler, J. (ed.) New York: Dover.

Pike, M (2002). Action research for English teaching: ideology, pedagogy and personal growth. *Educational Action Research* **10** (1), pp. 27-44.

Pinker, S. (1989). *Learnability and cognition: the acquisition of argument structure*. Cambridge, MA. MIT Press.

Plato. (2002). *Five Dialogues*: *Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Meno, Phaedo*. Cooper, J. M. (ed). Hackett: Indianapolis.

Prior, P. (2005). Towards the ethnography of argumentation: A response to Richard Andrews: Models of argumentation in educational discourse. *Text* **25** (1), pp. 129-144.

Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation Analysis: the study of talk-in-interaction*. London: Sage.

Rampton, B. (2006). *Language in Late Modernity: Interaction in an Urban School*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rampton, B. (2005). *Late modernity and social class: the view from sociolinguistics.* [Online.] London: Kings College. [Accessed 11 July 2010]. Available from: http;//www.kcl.ac.uk/innovation/groups/ldc/publicatiuons/workingpapers/31.

Rampton, B. (2003). Hegemony, Social Class and Stylization. *Pragmatics* **13** (1), pp. 49-83.

Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity among adolescents.* London: Longman.

Rampton, B., Harris, R., Collins, J., and Blommaert, J. (2005). *Language, Class and Education*. [Online.] London: Kings College, London. [Accessed 13 December 2009]. Available from: http://www.kcl.ac.uk/innovation/groups/ldc/publications/workingpapers/27.

Rampton, B., Tusting, K., Maybin, J., Barwell, R., Creese, A., and Lytra, V. (2004). UK Linguistic Ethnography: A Discussion Paper. [Online.] [Accessed 15 July 2010]. Available from: http:// www. ling-ethnog.org.uk.

Ravenscroft, A., and McAlister, S. (2008). Investigating and promoting argumentation: towards new digital practices. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*. **31** (3), pp. 317-335.

Redfern, W. (1984). *Puns.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Richardson, J. E. (2004). *(Mis) Representing Islam: The Racism and Rhetoric of British Broadsheet newspapers.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Reflect *ESOL* (2013). *Reflect ESOL.* [Online]. [Accessed 15 September 2012]. Available from: http://www.reflect-action.org.uk

Retzinger, S. (1991). *Violent Emotions: Shame and Rage in Marital Quarrels*. London: Sage.

Roberts, C. and Campbell, S. (2006). *Talk on Trial: Job interviews, language and ethnicity*. London: Department for Work and Pensions.

Roberts, C., Cooke, M., and Stenhouse, J. (2007). *FAQs. Frequently asked questions and quickly found answers.* London: Department for Work and Pensions.

Roberts, C., Davies, E., and Jupp, T.C. (1992). *Language and discrimination: a study of communication in multi-ethnic workplaces*. London: Longman.

Sacks, H. (1992). Lectures on Conversation, In. Jefferson, G. (ed). Oxford: Blackwell

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., and Jefferson, G. (1974) A Simplest Systematics for the Organisation of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language* **50** (4), pp. 696-735.

Sampson, H. (2004). Navigating the waves: the usefulness of a pilot in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research* **4** (3), pp. 383-402.

Sandlund, E. (2004). *Feeling by Doing: The Social Organisation of Emotions in Academic Talk-in-interaction.* Karlstad University Studies.

Sassure, F. de (1983). *Course in General Linguistics* (trans. R. Harris). London: Duckworth.

Schegloff, E.A. (1988). Pre-sequences and indirection. Journal of Pragmatics **12,** pp.55-62.

Schegloff, E.A. (1984). On some gestures' relation to talk. In: Atkinson, J. M., and Heritage, J.C (eds.): Structures of Social Action. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 266-296.

Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schiffrin, D (1990). The Management of a co-operative self during argument: the role of opinions and stories. In Grimshaw, A.D. (ed.) *Conflict Talk: Sociolinguistic investigations of everyday conversations.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 241-259.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, D. (1985). Everyday argument: the organization of diversity in talk. In Van Djik, T.A. (ed.) *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Vol. 3, pp. 35-46.

Schiffrin, D. (1984). Jewish Argument as Sociability. *Language in Society* **13** (3), pp. 311-335.

Searle, J.R. (2010). *Making the Social World: The Structure of Human Civilization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Searle, J.R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An essay in the* philosophy *of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Secor, M. (1987). Recent Research in Argumentation Theory. *The Technical Writing Teacher* **14** (3), pp. 337-54.

Shulman, L. (1986). Those Who Understand: Knowledge Growth in Teaching. *Educational Researcher* **15** (2), pp.4-14.

Silverstein, M. (2003). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language and Communication.* **23,** pp. 193-229.

Silverstein, M. (1976). Shifters, linguistic categories, and cultural description. In Basso, K., and Selby, H. (eds.) *Meaning in Anthropology* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, pp. 11-55.

Simon, S., Erduran, S., and Osborne, J. (2006). Learning to Teach Argumentation: Research and Development in the Science classroom. *International Journal of Science Education.* **28** (2-3), pp. 235-260.

Sinclair, J., and Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils.* London: Oxford University Press.

Stardust Memories. (1980*).* [Film]. Woody Allen. Dir. USA: United Artists.

Stubbs, M (1986) *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of* Natural *Language.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Sutter, J. (2009). A Review of *ESOL: A Critical Guide*. *Language Issues* 20 (1), pp. 75-77.

Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In Lantolf, J.P. (ed.) *Socio-cultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 97-115.

Swann, J. (2012). *Everyday creativity in English* in *Communicating in English: talk, text, technology.* D. Allington, D., and Mayor, B. (eds.) Routledge: Milton Keynes, pp. 179-223.

Tannen, D. (2002). Agonism in academic discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* **34** (10-11), pp. 1651-1669.

Tannen, D. (1998). *The Argument Culture: changing the way we argue and debate*. London: Virago.

Tannen, D. (1989). *Talking Voices: Repetition, dialogue and imagery in conversational discourse.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Toulmin, S. (2003). *The uses of argument: updated edition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Toulmin, S. (1958). *The uses of argument.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Toulmin, S., and Rieke, R., and Janik, A. (1984). *An introduction to reasoning.* (2nd edition). London: Collier Macmillan

Trinity College London. Speaking and Listening Examination Specifications. [Online]. [Accessed 18 January 2011]. Available from: http://www.trinitycollege.ac.uk

Van Djik, T.A. (1996). Discourse, Power and Access. In, Caldas-Coulthard, C., and Coulthard, M (eds). Texts and Practices: readings in Critical Discourse Analysis. London: Routledge, pp. 84-104.

Van Eemeren, F., and Grootendorst, R. (2004). *A Systematic Theory of* Argumentation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Eemeren, Jackson, S., and Jacobs, S. (2011). Argumentation. In Djik, T.A. (ed.) *Discourse Studies: A multi-disciplinary introduction.* London: Sage, pp. 85-107.

Van Leeuwen, T. (1995). Representing Social Action. *Discourse and Society*. **6** (1), pp. 81-106.

Van Leeuwen, T., and Wodak, R. (1999). Legitimizing immigration control: A discourse-historical analysis. *Discourse Studies*. **1** (1), pp. 83- 118.

Van, Lier, L. (2000). From input to affordance: Social interactive learning from an ecological perspective. In Sociocultural theory and second language learning. In Lantolf, J.P. (ed.) *Socio-cultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.245-261.

Vertovec, S. (2006). *The Emergence of Super-diversity in Britain*. Oxford: University of Oxford.

Volosinov, V. (1978). Reported Speech. In Matejska, L., and Pornorska, K. (eds.) *Readings in Russian Poetics.* Ann Arbor MI: Michigan Slavic contributions, p.149-175.

Volosinov, V. (1973). Marxism *and the Philosophy* of *Language,* New York: Seminar Press.

Voltaire. (2013). *Wikiquote website* [Online.] [Accessed 12 January 2011]. Available from: http://simple.wikiquote.org/wiki/Voltaire.

Voltaire. (2006[1759]). *Candide.* London: Penguin Classics.

Vuchinich, S. (1991). The Sequential organisation of closing in verbal family conflict. In Grimshaw, A.D. (ed.) *Conflict Talk: Sociolinguistic investigations of arguments in conversations.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p.118-139.

Vygotsky, L. (1991). Genesis of the higher mental functions. In Light. P., and Sheldon, S., and Woodhead, M. (eds.) *Learning to Think*. London: Routledge.

Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Language* and *Thought.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in Society*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Walker, A. (2004). Socratic strategies and devil's advocacy in synchronous CMC debate. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning* **20** (3), pp. 172-182.

Wallace, C. (2003). *Critical Reading in Language Education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Walton, D. (2010). *The Place of Emotion in Argument*. Pennsylvania: Penn State Press.

Walton, D. (2006). *Fundamentals of Critical Argumentation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walton, D. (1992). *Slippery slope arguments*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Walton, D. (1989). *Informal Logic: A Handbook for Critical Argumentation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weinberger, A., and Fisher, F. (2006). A framework to analyse argumentative knowledge construction in computer-supported collaborative learning. *Computers and Education*. **46** (1), pp. 71-95.

Weiss. F. (ed.) (1974). *Hegel: The Essential Writings***.** New York: Harper & Row

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wenzel, J. W. (1980) Perspectives on Argument. In Rhodes, J and Newell, S. *Proceedings of the Summer Conference on Argumentation,* Speech Communication Association, Annandale, VA, pp.112-133.

Willard, C.A. (1981). The status of the non-discursiveness thesis. Argumentation and Advocacy. 17, pp. 190-214.

Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Winter, R. (1989). *Learning from experience. Principles and Practice in Action Research.* London: Falmer Press.

Wittgenstein, L. (1958). *Philosophical Investigations.* New York: Macmillan.

Wodak, R. (2008). "Us" and "Them" inclusion/exclusion -discrimination via discourse. In *Migration, Identity and Belonging*. Liverpool: University of Liverpool Press, pp. 54-78.

Wood, Nancy.V. (2007). *Perspectives on Argument*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Yin, R.K. (2003). *Case Study research: design and methods*. 2ND edition. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Yu, C. (2013). Two interactional functions of self-mockery in everyday English conversations: A multimodal analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics* **50** (1), pp.1-22.

Yu, C. (2011). The display of frustration in arguments: A multimodal analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics.* **43** (12), pp. 2964-2981.

Zimmerman, D.H. (1998). Identity, context and interaction. In Antaki, C. and Widdicombe, S. (eds.) *Identities in Talk*. London: Sage, pp.87-106.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Chart of the Data set

Type of Data	Quantity and nature of data	Quantity and nature of data
	Pilot Study 2008-2009	Main Study 2009-2010
Audio-visual data Non-participant observation		Digital Video data of 6 Adult ESOL classes, 2 classes for each of the 3 teachers in the study. Total: 15 h
Audio-visual data Participant observation	Audio-visual data of 2 of my Adult ESOL classes. Total: 5h	
Audio data Interview/Focus Group	Audio recording of a teacher focus group Total: 38m	9 audio-recordings, 3 teachers and 6 students in my Adult ESOL class. Total: 8 h.
Field notes		Field notes on all classes visited as a non-participant observer Field notes made post-hoc drawing on all classes where I am a participant observer.
Document Analysis	*Adult ESOL Core Curriculum Skills for Life Learning Materials* (Level 1/Level 2)	

Appendix 2: Observation and Interview Schedules

Observation Schedule 2009-2010: Main Study

Date	Observational activity	Duration
18 November	Participant Observation 1: ESOL classroom.	2.5 hours
25 November	Participant Observation 2: ESOL classroom.	2.5 hours
2 December	Participant Observation 3: ESOL classroom.	2.5 hours
23 April	Participant Observation 4: ESOL Teacher education classroom.	2.5 hours
7 May	Participant Observation 5: ESOL Teacher education classroom.	2.5 hours
17 May	Observation 1: ESOL classroom (Sandra)	2.5 hours
9 June	Observation 2: ESOL classroom (Leila)	2.5 hours
10 June	Observation 3: ESOL classroom (Yelena)	2.5 hours
14 June	Observation 4: ESOL classroom (Sandra)	2.5 hours
16 June	Observation 5: ESOL classroom (Leila)	2.5 hours
17 June	Observation 6: ESOL classroom (Yelena)	2.5 hours

Interview Schedule 2009-2010: Main Study

Date	Interviewee	Duration
17 May	Sandra	41m.23s
18 May	Artur	46m. 08s
22 June	Leila	42m.20s
23 June	Leslaw Agata	56m29s/50m14s
24 June	Yelena	1h08m
30 June	Tomasz	1h02m
1 July	Danuta	45m.12s
2 July	Miriam	1h29m

Observation Schedule 2008-2009: Pilot Study

Date	Observational activity	Duration
13 May	Participant Observation 1: ESOL classroom	2.5 hours
20 May	Participant Observation 2: ESOL classroom.	2.5 hours
2 July	Teacher Focus Group	38m46s

Appendix 3 Research Timelines

2009-10: Main Study

November	December	April	May	June	July
Participant Observation	Participant Observation	Participant Observation	Participant Observation	Non-Participant Observations	Student interviews
ESOL class	ESOL class	Teacher Education	Teacher education class	ESOL class	1/7 2/7
18/11	2/12		7/5	9/6 10/6 14/6	
25/11		23/4		16/6 17/6	
				Teacher/Student interviews	
			Non-Participant Observation	22/6 23/6	
			ESOL class	24/6	
			17/5	30/6	
			Teacher/Student interviews		
			17/5 18/5		

2008-9: Pilot Study

May	July
Participant Observation	Teacher Focus Group
ESOL classroom	2/7/09
13/5 20/5	

Appendix 4: Table contextualising the data extracts included in the thesis

Phase of Study	Class/Activity	Teacher	Number of Students	Date
Pilot	Student discussion: What is argument?	Martin	6	13/5/09
Pilot	Teacher Focus Group: discussion on teacher disclosure.	Martin	4	2/7/09
Main Study	Teacher Education class: discussion of debates in the Adult ESOL classroom.	Martin	20	12/3/10
Main Study	Observed class: Complaint role-plays.	Yelena	5	10/6/10
Main Study	Debating capital punishment.	Martin	6	14/10/09
Main Study	Discussion on how to make the world a happier place.	Martin	6	18/11/09

Profiles of these classes and the research participants are to be found in Appendices 5 and 14.

Appendix 5: Brief biographies of participants in the pilot study

a/ My Adult ESOL class

Artur is 32 years old. He is Polish and he attended high school and dropped out of college. He works part-time as a sandwich artist for Subway. He is also a participant in the main study and a fuller biography is to be found there.

Maria is a 42 year old Spanish woman who has a high school and university background. She teaches Spanish at a local institute in Leeming.

Tomasz is 23 years old. He is Polish and has a high school background. He currently works in the construction industry. He is also a participant in the main study and a fuller biography is to be found there.

Natasha is 34 years old. She is Indian and her expert language is Punjabi. She has a university education and trained to be a pharmacy assistant. She currently works part-time on the checkout at a supermarket.

Miroslav is 32 years old and from Italy. He has a university education and currently works in sales accountant at a firm in Leeming.

Catherine is 24 and comes from Poland. She has a high school education and currently works in the catering industry.

b/ Teacher Focus Group: brief biographies

Martin is 42 years old and works part-time teaching Academic English at Bluebell College and part-time teaching EAP at Leeds University. He has 7 years ESOL teaching experience.

James is 55 years old and works part-time teaching general ESOL at Bluebell College. He also teaches modern foreign languages for the Open University. He has 8 years ESOL teaching experience.

Sally is 52 years old and works part-time teaching general ESOL and some specialist ESP at Bluebell College. Before that she worked as a primary school teacher. She has 12 years ESOL teaching experience.

Judith is 39 years old and works part-time teaching general ESOL at Bluebell College. Before that she worked as a primary school teacher. She has 8 years ESOL teaching experience.

Appendix 6: **Student Information and Consent Form for the pilot study**

This project is being conducted by Michael Hepworth with class L1/2 evening.

Description of Project

I would like to find out more about:

1. How students argue in and out of class.

2. What students think and feel about the process of arguing in and out of class.

3. What type of situations students need to argue in.

4. How students' schooling and social background might affect the way they argue.

What will I ask you to do in this project?

In this project I will ask you to:

- Allow me to video-record one or two of our classes. These lessons will help you prepare for the speaking and listening examination.

- Keep a diary where you write down your thoughts and feelings about some of the situations you argue in. This doesn't have to be very long!

- Consider volunteering for an interview where I ask you about your life e.g. family background, schooling etc.

What will happen to the information I get?

I will use the information to help students develop their skills of argument in the most effective ways possible. I will share these ideas with other teachers, so other students can benefit from the work your class has done. I will write about the project in my research and may talk about it to other teachers and researchers.

Your agreement to take part in the project

If you agree to be part of the project:

- You can ask me questions about it at any time.

- You are free to say you do not want to be involved in any activity at any time.

- You will be asked if the information you give can be part of the final project.

- You real name will not be used in the project.

If you would like to discuss anything further with me, please feel free to contact me at:

Michael Hepworth

School of Education

Room 9.91 EC Stoner Building

University of Leeds. Telephone: (0113) 343 4585. edmdh@leeds.ac.uk

Appendix 7: Information and consent form for the teacher focus group: Pilot Study

Information and Consent Form

Description of Project

As part of my research, I would like to investigate how ESOL teachers engage, or might engage, with the process of argumentation in their classrooms.

In particular, I would like to find out more about:

    1. How teachers define argumentation in relation to their work in the multilingual classroom and what stances they adopt in relation to argumentation in the Adult ESOL classroom.

    2. How teachers support the learning of argument in the multilingual classroom.

What will I ask you to do in this project?

In this project I will ask you to:

- Participate in a short focus group where issues around argumentation and its role in the Adult ESOL classroom will be discussed.

- Allow me to voice-record this focus group.

What will happen to the information I get?

I will use the information to help me to investigate the stances teachers take up in relation to argumentation in the Adult ESOL classroom, and the ways in which they might support the development of argumentation skills. I will write about this in my research and may discuss it other teachers and researchers.

Your agreement to take part in the project

If you agree to be part of the research:

- You can discuss any issues or concerns you may have about it with me at any time.

- You are free to say you do not want to be involved in any activity at any time.

- <u>You can refuse to answer any of the questions asked as part of the research if you wish.</u>

- You will be asked if the information you give can be part of the final project.

- Your real name will not be used in the research.

I give my consent to be involved in the research.   Signature_____

If you would like to discuss anything further with me, please feel free to contact me at:

Michael Hepworth

School of Education

Room 9.91 EC Stoner Building

University of Leeds.

Telephone: (0113) 343 4585. edmdh@leeds.ac.uk

Appendix 8: Sample statements for student discussion in pilot study.

In your groups, say why you agree or disagree with the following statements:

1. Argument is about conflict between people.

2. Argument is about solving problems and reaching agreement or compromise.

3. Argument is about giving your own ideas, justifying them and trying to persuade others that they are right.

4. Argument is people shouting at each other.

5. Argument should be avoided.

6. Argument should be based on reason.

7. Argument involves emotion as well as reason.

Appendix 9: Questions/Issues to structure teacher focus group in pilot study

Conceptualizations

1. What do you understand by the term argument?

The Adult ESOL context

2. What role do you think the teaching and learning of argument has in ESOL? What about:

- Citizenship.

- ESOL for work.

- Social cohesion.

    3. Do you incorporate the teaching and learning of argument into your work as an ESOL teacher? If so, how do you do this? What strategies and resources do you use?

    4. What does the ESOL National Curriculum have to say about the teaching and learning of argument?

    5. Do the *Skills for Life* resources promote the teaching and learning of argument?

ESOL teacher training/CPD

    6. Were you taught how to develop argument skills as part of your initial teacher training? If so, how was this done? If not, do you think it would have been useful? Why?

    7. Have you ever had any CPD on the teaching and learning of argument? If so, what...if not, do you think it would be useful/what would you need etc.

Appendix 10: Transcription conventions

(.) = Pause of less than a second.

(2) = Pause of more than one second. Number indicates length.

] = interruption or overlapping speech.

⌐ = Latched utterance

( ) = Parentheses indicate key information about tonal and multimodal features.

(Laughter) = laughter.

CAPS = Emphatic Stress.

Bold = Stylized utterance or reported speech.

[ ] = IPA transcription.

Appendix 11: Information and consent form for teachers: Main Study

Description of Project

As part of my research, I would like to investigate how trainee-ESOL teachers engage, or might engage, with the process of argumentation in their classrooms.

In particular, I would like to find out more about:
1. How teachers define argumentation in relation to their work in the multilingual classroom.

2. How teachers can support the learning of argument in the multilingual classroom.

What would I ask you to do in this project?

In this project I would ask you to consider:
1. Allowing me to video-record one of our teacher education classes where I would introduce activities designed to stimulate reflection on the teaching and learning of argument.

2. Volunteering for an individual out-of-class interview where you will be asked to explore the possible influence of aspects of your life history on the ways you approach the teaching and learning of argument.

3. Volunteering to be observed teaching a class where you consciously introduce argument tasks. This would be followed by an individual interview where you reflect upon pedagogical issues arising from this class.

What would happen to the information I get?

I would use the information in research designed to help teachers to best support the learning of argument in the ESOL classroom. I would share ideas with other teachers, so that they, and their students, can benefit from the work you have done. I will write about the project in my research and would talk about it to other researchers. I will not use the video recordings for anything except for my research without your written permission.

Your agreement to take part in the project

If you agree to be part of the research:
- You can discuss any issues or concerns you may have about it with me at any time.

- You are free to say you do not want to be involved in any activity at any time.

- You can refuse to answer any of the questions asked as part of the research if you wish.

- You will be asked if the information you give can be part of the final project.

- Your real name will not be used in the research.

I give my consent to be involved in the research.   Signature_____

If you would like to discuss anything further with me, please feel free to contact me at:

Michael Hepworth

School of Education

Room 9.91 EC Stoner Building

University of Leeds.

Telephone: (0113) 343 4585. edmdh@leeds.ac.uk

Appendix 12: Information and consent form: my class: Main Study

---

Research Project on multilingual argument

Information and Consent Form

This project is being conducted by.................. with class...................

Description of Project

I would like to find out more about:
1. How students argue in class.

2. What students think and feel about the process of arguing in class.

3. How students' schooling and social background might affect the way they argue.

What will I ask you to do in this project?

In this project I will ask you to:
- Allow me to video-record one or two of our classes. These lessons will help you prepare for the speaking and listening examination.

- Consider volunteering for an interview where I ask you about your life e.g. family background, schooling etc.

What will happen to the information I get?

I will use the information to help students develop their skills of argumentation in the most effective ways possible. I will share these ideas with other teachers, so other students can benefit from the work your class has done. I will write about the project in my research and may talk about it to other teachers and researchers.

Your agreement to take part in the project

If you agree to be part of the project:
- You can ask me questions about it at any time.

- You are free to say you do not want to be involved in any activity at any time.

- You will be asked if the information you give can be part of the final project.

- You real name will not be used in the project.

- You will be able to see the final research report if you want to.

Appendix 13: Student consent form for lower level ESOL students: Main Study

Student Information and Consent Form

Please read this form.

It will tell you about my research.

It will ask you if I can record your class.

My research

I would like to find out more about how students discuss things in class. So I am visiting student classrooms like yours. I am recording the classes.

What do I have to do?

I would like to ask you the question:

Is it ok if I record your class?

What will happen to the information I get?
- I will use the information to help students get better at discussing things.

- I will share information with other teachers and students.

- I will use the information in my research and talk about it to other researchers.

If you agree:
- You can ask me questions about my research.

- You can say you do not want to be involved in my research.

- Your name will not be used in the research.

I agree to be part of this research. Signature: _____-

If you would like to ask me anything else you can contact me at:

Michael Hepworth

School of Education

Room 9.91 EC Stoner Building

University of Leeds.

Telephone: (0113) 343 4585. edmdh@leeds.ac.uk

Appendix 14: Discussion of the biographies of the participants in Main Study

I use the interviews I conducted to work up a series of descriptive and analytic vignettes, drawing upon their own words where appropriate. The aim is to further situate my analysis of argumentation by capturing something of how they position themselves and how they are positioned (in terms of their personal habitus) in relation to argumentation.

My class

Students

Artur is a 33-year old Polish man who has been living and working in the UK since 2003. He is soon to return to Poland to be with his wife. He dropped-out of university in Poland after studying sociology for a year and came to the UK. He describes how he was in the first wave of EEA Polish migrants: "I've been one of the first." He moved to the UK because he wanted 'to get independent and I always been a fan of British music and I just wanted to see how people living here.' His ambition is to be a bass guitarist.

Since then he has been working as a sandwich artist for the fast-food chain *Subway*. He has also been attending part-time ESOL classes. His age is significant because he is part of the generation that witnessed the fall of the "iron curtain" post-1991. He puts it thus: 'I'm a kind of that generation that is living between communism and capitalism.' He comes from a strong communist background and he now self-identifies as an anarchist. He used to have the *Solidarity* logo on his jacket. He defines his identities in opposition to the family he grew up in; 'I have always a been a kind a you know a different one even with my family we've always been getting not riots just arguments stuff like that.' His mother, an archivist, wanted him to go into higher education, he wanted, in his own words: 'work in a factory and get some gigs.' So: 'it was arguments about my meaning of the life and their meaning of the life it was a kind of disagreement.' His father, who died in a work-related accident, was an ambulance driver. His grandfather was a traditional communist and B recalls discussions with him. So, differences of opinion characterised family life and B describes himself as the "little black sheep.'

Tomasz is from Poland. He is 24 years old. He has been in England since 2004. He is single and is living in Leeds to be with his girlfriend. His older sister lived in London. He learned some English in primary school and more in secondary school. He came for a new experience and to 'build up his future.' His father died when he was young. He first came to England when he was 13 years old and visited his sister in London regularly. He is currently working

in the construction industry and has been working here for 3 years. He has done various other jobs, including working as a pizza chef for two years.

He talked about argument in terms of 'evidence.' He is used to debating issues and talked of politics lessons in Poland where 'we had someone…who was speaking and we had to make argument if we actually against or if we actually agree with' and says he connects this with the possibility of social change 'it just shows each person could you know change something.' He also observes that they liked to go beyond the subject and discuss their own topics but that this was combined with a sense that they could not change 'the system.' He emphasised the demands placed upon him in these debates to show politeness and respect and this is visible in the way he argues in class.

Agata is from Latvia. She is 21 years old. She is single. She has been in England for 3 years. She started to learn English from primary school and also at university, where she did Business Studies. She left university, came to England and never went back, partly because she enjoyed the independence. She came to work and to get some new experience. She is an only child but comes from a large extended family. Her father is in the UK but she doesn't see him very often. Her mum is a housewife in Latvia. She is currently working in a shoe shop. She has been working there since she arrived in the UK.

It is interesting that Agata sees argument or argumentation as an important function in everyday life. She says: 'I think this is arguing it's like part of our life.' She says she argues with the manger every day at work. She says that she had the opportunity to argue as part of her English classes but that she didn't like having the topics for argumentation prescribed, whether by the teacher or by the examiner. She says: 'if it's like you come into class and teacher's giving you some title and it's like you must argue then I don't like I don't enjoy.' She says that it's better if the teacher gives the students a choice of topics and says that this is better: because maybe there's something that you've really got on your heart and there's a chance to talk about it.' Her argumentation often unfolds in terms of gestures and is dramatic. This is something she discusses in terms of her background, where she did a lot of dramatic dialogue work in the school language classroom: 'it could be maybe back from the school as well because we used to do a lot of theatres.'

Leslaw is from Poland. He met his wife in the UK. He is in his 30s. He has lived in Leeds since 2006 and before that he lived in London. He studied as an apprentice to be a car mechanic. Then he went to a series of technical and vocational schools, centring mainly on

food production. He also studied Accountancy for 2 years. He also studied part-time Social Work and got a Bachelor's degree and has experience of social work. He moved from London to Leeds to be with his current partner, also a migrant to the UK. He worked for a time in the service sector, at the Hilton Hotel in London and is currently working in food production.

He views argument in terms of 'proof' and evidence and it is interesting, if unsurprising, that he relates it to this personal experience: 'and I know from my life that so this is argument this is like explanation why you thinking doing this.' He observes that the practice he has had in argumentation was largely written and centred upon essay writing, where he says that: 'you can choose some topic and you need to like persuade or something to your point.'

Danuta is from Poland, from Wroclaw, a city near the border with the Czech Republic. She is 28. She is married but has no children as yet. She has done some secretarial work in Poland and is doing part-time secretarial work in the UK. Her husband is also Polish and is working in the UK. She and her husband will probably be moving back to Poland in the near future, having no plans to stay more permanently.

When asked how she feels about discussion and debate she observes that this is something she doesn't like doing, even in Polish, although she says she finds it easier to discuss things in her native language. She explains this reluctance by saying: 'I'm shy' and 'not confident with myself.' She attributes this to something in her own psychological make-up: 'I have a block inside.' She says that it is easier for her to discuss topics she brings to discussion, as opposed to ones imposed by someone else. She also says that she gets stressed when trying to recall the right language to use in discussion.

Teacher participants

Yelena is a migrant to the UK. She comes from the Ukraine and is now an experienced ESOL practitioner. She is in her 30s. She is highly educated, to doctorate level, and has a CELTA, an initial language teaching certificate.

Leila is a British citizen. She is in her 30s. She is highly educated and has a doctorate. She is an experienced ESOL practitioner with a background in modern foreign language teaching and English teaching abroad.

Sandra is a British citizen who is relatively new to the ESOL profession. She comes from a background in community education.

Class Profiles

In what follows, I provide some basic details about the classes observed:

Teacher Education class

There were 20 students in this class. The majority were already working as ESOL teachers and undertaking on-the-job initial ESOL Teacher Training qualification at Level 5. The majority were British-born and the class contained a significant cohort of trainees who were part of the native-born Black and Minority Ethnic community.

Class 1: Y's class

Y's class met three times per week during the day. They were working at Level 1 and Level 2 of the *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum* (2001) and were thus advanced level students. There were 6 students in the classes I observed. There were 4 males and 2 females. 4 of the students were from Poland and the other 2 were from Africa and Korea.

Class 2: S's class

S's class met twice a week in the evenings. They were working at Entry Level 1 and Entry Level 2 of the *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum*, that is, at elementary level. There were 8 students in the classes I observed. They were from countries as diverse as Pakistan, Korea, China and from Eastern Europe, the Czech Republic. Poland etc.

Class 3: L's class

L's class met 3 times a week during the day. They were working at Entry Level 1 and 2 of the *Adult ESOL Core Curriculum*, that is, at elementary level. There 5 students in the classes I observed. There were 2 males and 4 females. They were from Africa and Asia.

Anna is a Polish citizen and is working part-time jobs, including variable shift work.

Dorota is a Polish citizen. She is in her mid-20s. She is single. She works part-time as an assistant in a care home.

Jarek is in his late 20s. He is a Polish Citizen. He is working part-time as a school caretaker.

Amdy is from Africa. He is in his mid-30s and has refugee status in the UK. He is looking for work.

Helen is from South Korea. She is working part-time and is married to a British citizen.

Appendix 15: List of polemical statements for student debate

Consider the following statements. Prepare to say whether you agree or disagree and why:

1. The war in Iraq is wrong.

2. Smoking should be banned in public places.

3. People should be entitled to free healthcare.

4. Capital Punishment should be legalised in the UK.

5. Immigration should be stopped.

Appendix 16: Task-sheet: Debating making the world a better place

If you could do one thing to make the world a better or a happier place, what would it be and why?

Think about the following questions:

1. What <u>reasons </u>would you give to support your proposal?

2. What <u>evidence</u> would you use to support your proposal?

3. Can you think of any arguments <u>against</u> your proposal? What might they be & how would you respond?

Appendix 17: Questions for teacher education discussion

The pedagogical rationale behind the activities below was to get the teacher trainees to explore the place of argumentation in the Adult ESOL classroom. I was guided by the following questions: What is it? What do you think and feel about it? What do you do with it?

The research rationale was that it allowed me to investigate the ways in which teachers of Adult ESOL position themselves and their students in argumentation.

1. **What do you understand by the term argument or argumentation?**

Discuss the usefulness of the following metaphors for argumentation:

      1. A battle or war
      2. A construction
      3. A dance

      Can you think of any other ways we might conceptualise argument? How do you think the way we conceptualise it affects the way we teach?

      "It is a conflict between people. Like a war." ESOL Learner

2. **Do you have taboo topics for debate? Why? Why not? Is the classroom is a "safe haven" or a space for "bringing the outside in"?**

"For me there are two classic areas that need to be circumvented at times and that's religion and politics."

3. **Do you get involved when your learners are discussing something or do you make a conscious decision to remain neutral? How do you respond if students ask for your opinions?**

"I only ever give my opinion if asked."

"I've got a point-of-view as well. Do I express or do I remain strictly neutral? I tend not to remain strictly neutral…If it's something I feel strongly about I give my opinion but label it as my opinion."

"…and it's a good class when they actually turn around when it's gone on for a while and say what do you think."

4. **What do you do to support the development of argumentation skills in your ESOL classroom? Brainstorm a list of strategies.**
5. **Do we learn how to argue or how to teach argumentation?**

Activity 1: Using transcripts

The pedagogical rationale here is to raise awareness of how people argue. This activity is replicable and usable with any debate. The data and the questions that accompany it are drawn from the exploratory teaching I did as part of the *Turning Talk into Learning* project (Cooke and Roberts, 2007).

Listen to the extract from the debate and read the transcript. Use the following questions to help you discuss how the learners argue their points of view:

1. Do they use emotion or reason or to authorize their argumentation?
2. Do they use examples and evidence to authorize their argumentation?
3. Do they use hypothetical situations to authorize their argumentation?
4. Do they make general points out of particular examples?
5. Do they listen to and acknowledge the points that other people are making? Do they use what other people say to develop their argumentation?

Extract from Transcript

A: It's not good (.) and for health (.) for money (.) everything is not good (.) why (.) what have he drink for (.) spend money (.) and just drink and go to the toilet and finish

B: no it's the same as people that drinks orange juice or]

A: no]

B: apple juice but why they don't drinks only water

A: no no no because only water]

B: yes they] choose (.) I get this choice (.) I can say ok instead of drink water maybe I could take one beer

C: I can spend on cigarettes]

D: but water] and orange juice healthy for your body

A: yeah (.) and health for body

B; no not]

A; and mind maybe]

B: I understand what you think maybe but when you see some juice some juice in our supermarket just when I taste them I'm sure that's not good for my health because there are a lot of chemical inside or thing like that so

Activity 2: Multimodality

The pedagogic rationale for this activity is that it will provide an opportunity to focus on the multimodal dimension of argumentation, perhaps particularly neglected in a language learning context. This is a research-led activity in that it speaks directly to the research suggesting argumentation is 'embodied' in nature (Goodwin, 2000)

In research terms, the audience will be using multimodal contextualisation cues (Gumperz, 1972) in order to work out what kind of argument is taking place. Again, this is a replicable activity which could be used with Adult ESOL learners at any AECC level.

Task:

Think of a situation in which there is some argument or argumentation emerging and unfolding. This can be a situation you have actually been in or it can be an imagined or hypothetical one. Prepare to mime this activity as a group. You are not allowed to talk during it. You will, however, need to discuss it as you prepare but you do not need to script the activity. You can just improvise. The rest of the group will watch and try to provide a commentary on what is happening. What is the situation? How do you know?

Activity 3: Persuasive stories

The pedagogic rational for this activity is that it is research-led in that it focusses on the role that narrative plays in argumentation. The material is drawn from the research of Roberts et al., (2007) on the use of small stories as evidence in support of argumentation in British job interviews. The teachers watch a video of a non-expert speaker of English responding to a question using a narrative to illustrate and support a claim they make. Then they are invited to choose a question from a list of Frequently-Asked-Questions. They then improvise a dialogue where they use a short anecdote to illustrate and support the claims they make in their answers.

List of questions

Do you like working in a team?

How do you deal with repetitive work?

How do you cope with change?

Do you like working in a team?

Activity 4: Debating non-Standard language

Task: Teacher trainees evaluate a series of non-Standard utterances, as follows:

1. I ain't never done nothing.
2. This is something I won't put up with.
3. I don't know about youse lot.
4. I'm loving that T-shirt.

They are required to discuss the criteria they would use in order to evaluate the utterances. Prompts are given e.g. Is it written or spoken? What is the context for the utterance?

Appendix 18: Student Interview questions/prompts/topics

Background

- Talk a little about yourself
- Where were you born? Where did you grow up?
- Tell me a little bit about your family
- Parents (jobs), siblings, children etc.
- Did you discuss things?
- Migration to the UK. Why did you migrate to the UK?

Education

- Talk about your schooling, college and university experiences.
- Did you learn to argue?
- Do you enjoy arguing?

Employment

- Talk about your employment experience in the UK and in your home country.

Language education

- Talk about your Adult ESOL experience, especially in relation to spoken debate and discussion.
- Did you learn to argue in English?

Conceptualisation

- What do you understand by the terms 'argument' or argumentation?
- What do you think about it?
- What do you feel about it?

The interviews were conducted by working from a series of questions and prompts. These were generated from the research questions and from the themes that were emerging from the analysis.

Appendix 19: Teacher Interview questions/prompts/topics

In the <u>teacher interviews</u> I asked each teacher the following questions:

1. What counts as 'argument' or 'argumentation'?
2. What do you think and feel about it?
3. How do you work with it in the Adult ESOL classroom?

Following this, I prompted them to discuss the way they had worked with argumentation in the observed session. This involved a mix of prompts and questions designed to stimulate reflection upon the nature of the pedagogical approaches taken. These included: Why did you work with argumentation in this particular way? Why did you work with the topic of complaining? Why did you work with the multimodal dimension of argumentation?

I also invited them to discuss their training and experience in relation to argumentation, prompting them with questions such as:

Were you trained in how to teach argumentation skills?

How have you worked with argumentation before?

Part of the interview was also of a life history nature, in the same way, and for the same purpose, as it was for the students.

Background

> ➢ Talk a little about yourself
> ➢ Where were you born? Where did you grow up?
> ➢ Tell me a little bit about your family
> ➢ Parents (jobs), siblings, children etc.
> ➢ Did you discuss things?

Education

> ➢ Talk about your schooling, college and university experiences.
> ➢ Did you learn to argue?
> ➢ Do you enjoy arguing?

Language education

> ➢ Talk about your Adult ESOL teaching experience, especially in relation to spoken debate and discussion.
> ➢ Did you learn to argue in English?

Appendix 20: Sample of Data Analysis: Multimodal argumentation

The main purpose of this analytical vignette is to illustrate how a multimodal analysis can inform and develop a linguistic analysis. It draws upon the concept of embodiment (Goodwin, 2001) in order to develop and extend the linguistic discourse analysis rooted in the concept of voice, or, more specifically, voicing (Bakhtin, 1981).

In terms of argumentation, the task invites the students to infer and then verbalise meaning based on the multimodal clues offered in the online video clip. They are thus looking for what Gumperz (1977) refers to as 'contextualisation cues' in the body language of the participants, rather than in their verbal language, which the students have to reconstruct.

Argument in the family: a domestic row

Context

The students are watching a *You-Tube* clip of a domestic argument from a 1950s black-and-white film. There is no dialogue, only music, Beethoven's 5th Symphony, functioning as a kind of aural metaphor for the unfolding argument, with discordant clashes of cymbals representing disharmony, and more harmonious music signalling reconciliation. The teacher has stopped the video and is showing a still picture on the screen. The interaction that follows is captured in the transcript below:

Speaker	Dialogue	Embodied features
S1	ok ok ok i listen to you ok don't do like that again shut up	Points at S2
S2	no no I no listen	Puts fingers in ears
S1	no shut up shut up	
S3	it's your fault no your fault	Points to each in turn
S1	no shut up shut up if you not shut up I not talk to you any more GO AWAY	Sweeping movement of hand

Analysis

The argument emerges and unfolds both linguistically and multimodally. Linguistically, to use Bakhtin's (1981) terms, the students ventriloquize the voices in the argument using the

contextualisation cues (Gumperz, 1992) offered by the body language of the participants. Thus, S1 takes up the role of the woman in the argument. The prosodic features of her voice (the rise in volume, the short, staccato rhythm) and lexical features (the repetition, the informal, though, mild, swearing) foreground both the anger, or mock anger, and the performed nature of the utterance.

However, this vocal performance is also embodied, to draw upon Goodwin's (2000) term. To be precise, the anger is reinforced multi-modally by the pointing of an accusatory finger. S2 responds in kind, taking up her cue from S1. Her refusal to listen is performed prosodically (again, the short, staccato rhythm, the repetition of 'no') but is embodied (Goodwin, 2000) in the sense that she also puts her fingers in her ears. S3 also gestures pointing to the man and the woman in turn, attributing blame, almost in role of adjudicator.

S1 repeats her emotional outburst and uses the imperative "go away" emphasising it prosodically through and increase in volume but also gesturally with a sweep of her hands. There is (as with the task) an element of hyperbole here, of what Rampton (2006) refers to as "stylization" i.e. hyperbolic performance. Her gesture mirrors and parodies the woman's gesture on the still picture in front of the class. It may also reflect, as the following dialogue suggests, a kind of habitus (Bourdieu, 1991), or historical positioning. This is a situation with which they are familiar. All of us have experience of argument in the form of a domestic row between husband and wife. The following dialogue emerges when the reconciliation is effected:

Speaker	Dialogue	Embodied features
S1	like my husband just do it ok you right i am wrong i go pub	Sweeps hands
S2	my husband say ok (.) i am sorry (.) ok	Hands together in praying gesture. Head bowed

S1 makes it clear with the use of the preposition 'like' that this is an analogous experience to her own. She ventriloquizes (Bakhtin, 1981) the voice of her husband as he accepts defeat in argument. Again, this is performed prosodically (short, staccato utterances, rising volume)

and multimodally (the sweeping of the hands signify his surrender and imminent departure). In stark contrast and in response to this, S2 ventriloquizes the voice of her husband, performing his apology in a hushed voice, bowing her head and extending her hands in prayer in a gesture of supplication. In fact they are not simply ventriloquizing abstract voices; rather, they are taking on new speaking and identity positions i.e. those of their respective spouses. There is identity play here.

Appendix 21: Interview extracts

Student Interview 1: Agata (23/6/2010)

Context

In the extract below, Madara is discussing the ways in which she has learned to argue.

I: but if you have the chance to express your opinion do you enjoy doing that

A: no i didn't no that's why i wasn't trying to say something a lot if we were just a few people then yes if it's between it's different if you are with your friends because maybe you are talking about something what you like and you can argue but if it's like you come into class and teacher's giving you some title and it's like you must argue then i don't like i don't enjoy

I: because

A: it's like you have to say something give your opinion cos the teacher will give you mark of it like you was good or bad or you didn't say anything like you don't have a mark

I: mm

A: it's different

I: is that because the teacher is choosing what you are arguing about

A: yeah yeah they giving you title and you have to argue about that and nothing else that's quite hard i don't like it

I: and that happens in the exam sometimes

A: yeah especially in exam when you are already stressed you don't know what you will have to talk about and they giving you some title and you have to talk about it it's so hard

I: yeah

A: it's better if the teacher will give you the chance like I've got 3 titles like choose about which one it's different then yes and if everyone agree about the same one it's much easier but if she comes and say you must argue about this then and you really don't like that

I: yeah yeah so if the teacher gives you a choice or it's something that you want to talk about

A: yeah yeah then if she's telling me choose what you would like to then ok

I: you enjoy that

A: then yes then it's alright because maybe there's something that you've really got on your heart and there's a chance to talk about it and there are people around you to argue about it but if you must talk about it

Student Interview 2: Tomasz (30/6/2010)

Context

In the extract below, Mariusz is describing aspects of educational experience in relation to debate.

I: and so it should be yeah yeah so and when you were doing the politics thing were there any things that you weren't allowed to say or was it all very free

T: er no we had to be very very you know culture and we couldn't just like we should not swear because if you swear once then it means that your variety of words is just very very pure and you will simply not entitled to do any kind of speech while you are abusing someone else so we knew exactly how far we can go but trying to involve others but also we knew that a word can harm someone seriously

I: ok so they're weapons sometimes

T: yeah

I: and you could discuss anything there were no topics that were forbidden or could you say could you give an opinion any opinion

T: erm according to the well we were just like erm study politics problems governments

I: and could you say anything there or were there limits to

T: no you could say everything and that was brilliant because once you not allowed to talk about to make your own opinion then it just comes confusing inside well actually we were brave to talk and we like to ask questions that are actually out of the subject and our teacher explained to us that that yes he knows that but we can't change system we can't change the reality so because he was helpful we felt comfortable on the subject

I: ok so you could discuss anything you wanted to

T: yeah

I: and uhm that's because I think that when you're giving your opinions in English when you are explaining things in English I think that you are very very strong and I wonder whether this is part of the reason

T: it's part of the nature also and the just a bit of experience

Student Interview 3: Danuta (1/7/2010)

Context

In the extract below, Danuta is discussing the shyness she feels when asked to debate issues in class.

I: so when you were at school in poland i suppose it might be in polish classes or in other classes where you had like discussions or something you were discussing whatever it might be a topic or something did you enjoy doing that

D: (hesitates) not really

I: no why not

D: because I am shy person

I: yeah

D: and I don't like to talk uhm I can't explain oh my god

I: no it's ok I understand try and say a little bit more

D: I'm not confident with myself like you know I told you before

I: ok even when you're using your first language and

D; even even in polish language

I: ok so it's not when you're cos 1 thing I've noticed in your English classes is that your English is very good but and we've talked about this haven't we but you kind of sometimes you don't seem to want to say much

D: yeah because I have block inside I don't know I'm blocking (laughs)

I: yeah yeah and is that just for confidence

D: and I can't remember any English words sometimes

I: oh ok

D: I don't know why because stress I don't know maybe

I: ok is it because it's in front of other people or uhm

D: yeah I think so

I: ok even people that you know is it the same with that or

K: yeah yeah the same even if I know people

Student Interview 4: Leslaw (23/6/2010)

Context

In the extract below, Leslaw is discussing is experience of debating…

I: when I say the word argument what do you think of

L: it's like if we're talking about something it's like your proof if we're talking about something and you want to explain more you're using some arguments for example example because I did this and this and I know from my life that so this is argument this is like explanation why you thinking doing this

I: ok yeah in your education when you went to school and when you went to college and things were you ever taught how to argue

L: taught

I: at school did you ever learn how to argue how to make an argument

L: ah yeah yeah in this university we did something like everybody write some work

I: essays

L: you can choose some topic and you need to like persuade or something to your point

I: yeah

L: you can't choose by yourself because was maybe too easy so there was some topics and you can choose maybe this this this and after prepare to say and all the students listen you and it was first time so I was very worried how be that but wasn't bad

I: so you had some teaching they taught you how to argue yeah

L: yeah

I: when you were writing but not when you were speaking only for essays

L: yeah this one was like both first you giving your work as well what you did and as well you're you know talking you need to like say like you say some arguments or to show your points what

I: ok when you were speaking

L: yeah

I: at university

Student Interview 5: Artur (18/5/2010)

Context

In this extract, Artur is discussing his schooling:

A: so yeah that's what I said before I used to be kind of radical (.) a radical anarchist so for me being a controversial (.) being a (…) being a different one (.) it was essential thing you know (.) to do (.) it was my thing to be like that you know

I: yeah part of your identity

A: whatever it was (.) especially at that kind of school because schools (.) in my opinion school represented system and stuff like that soooo (.) I was against that (.) I was against the law I was against the system (.) I really wanted to be that guy who is telling the true (.) sometimes bitter true (.)

I: yeah

A: about the living no

I: yeah (.) because you couldn't discuss some things

A: I couldn't discuss and all the member of the classes been against me (.) all the teachers been against me as well so (.) but anyway I felt really good in my way (.) so

I: yeah yeah (.) because you were true to yourself

A: yeah exactly yeah yeah I could prove it

I: yeah no that's really interesting so if I was to say If I say well what so you understand by argument or argumentation then what would you say or

A: argument

I: or argumentation

A: different (.) different kind of meaning (.) different kind of views (.) is argument (.) for me argument is nothing about fighting (.) it's nothing about (.) it's just a kind of discussion (.) for example I'm arguing with my wife yeah we just having different opinions (.) that's it (.) so it's nothing about aggression (.) and I really love that because (.) if you (.) if you argue with someone if you making discussion you can you can (.) you can realise different point of view than yours (.) a lot of people are like that that my point is right and that's it (.) I'm not like that (.) never been like that (.) I always wanted to listen to what people feeling (.) that's why sometimes I just put the difficult subject through the discussion (.) to just see what people feeling about that yeah (.) sometimes of course I'm doing that in the sarcastic way or the joking way stuff like that (.) that's what I said to you before (.) no police no law stuff like that yeah

Student Interview 6: Miriam (2/7/2010)

Context

In this extract, Malgorzata is discussing what she understands by the concept of argument.

I: what do you understand by argument then in the classroom for example

M: oh in the classroom I understand it more like discuss like uhm talk just so

I: yeah and did you ever were you ever taught how to argue when you were a student not a teacher did you ever learn how to discuss or to argue a point of view

M: not really it wasn't it wasn't it wasn't so it wasn't called like let's have an argument no it was like more like I said you need to defence your point of view so more or less yeah

I; ok exactly yeah so did you when you were a student were you taught how to do that

M: not really I can't remember I can't remember so I think it was more like probably we are not aware we are doing it and e did it it is like you write you need to write down your points what do you what have you got for and against

I: yeah

M: you know what I mean so not really such thing maybe I can't remember to be honest

I: did you write essays for and against essays

M: oh yeah yeah of course yeah so if you like essays will be this what you think will be argument or learning how to do it

I: yeah so as a student maybe you did a little bit of that

M: probably probably but I think but for example now when I think being a teacher if we would have a subject to discuss or to write about so probably I will tell my students you need to write down and we can discuss or the opposite group can say now we are disagree or something like that I don't know

I: ok yeah cos I was going that's really interesting because I was going to say when you were training to be a teacher uhm that was teaching Russian to polish speaking students

M: yeah

I: did you learn techniques to help them argue or discuss

M: oh yeah definitely because yeah like you know because in the class you have different kind of children so some are shy some 1 of them some of them are more active so yeah you need to help the others I think yeah

Teacher interview 1: Yelena

I: no that's interesting (.) just following on from that cos I have it's an interesting question how people get involved or not

Y: mm

I: in discussion and what the role of the teacher so you have a clear idea about what you think the teacher should do in terms of expressing their opinions

Y: yeah

I: would you do it if it helped them to develop their views

Y: well yes because if we have a discussion like this inevitably you you will get asked you know and what do you think about it

I: yeah (.) that was my next question (.) do they ask you

Y: and they do and you know in (.) terms of what my opinion is I try not to offer it in terms of this is what I did sort of if it's not we had (.) with a level 2 class we had a discussion on capital punishment and it's a big controversial topic

I: yeah

Y: we had a very agitated discussion in class with people who have very strong views especially if you have strong religious views

I: yeah

Y: and they asked my opinion and I think it is justifiable to give your opinion and say I'm not an authority (.) I don't have uhm I don't think that I know what's right and what's wrong (.) that's what I think

I: mm (.) but when they asked you about that capital punishment you gave them your opinion

Y: I gave them my opinion

I: did you just state it or did you end up going on to explain it

Y: I explained it yeah I explained it (.) yeah but I try to stand back as much as possible

I: yeah and when you'd explained it just out of interest when you explained it did they kind of to have a teacher explaining their opinion on something controversial (.) how did they react to that

Y: yeah (.) it's difficult because in a way still even at that level it still felt final and some people said well yeah teacher thinks the same as I do yeah

 I: yeah they took it as an endorsement

Y: as an endorsement of somebody's view on it so yeah I think it's a difficult point
I: again the rationale for that was

Teacher interview 2: Sandra

I: the activity was it about what you were saying about the about reconstructing it was that your strategy

S: I guess it was part- cos like I say I'd looked I'd briefly looked at a couple of others cos I'd kind of decided I wanted to see some sort of argument

I: yeah

S: er I liked that one because it was all quite over-the-top and you that was an intentional decision to go for that one and then I'd looked at something on east enders and then I looked at the python one

I; right yeah

S: something like that but then they wouldn't have worked because it was very much based on the language what was being said and you know they just wouldn't have got that they wouldn't have been able to see it really

I: yeah that's interesting it depends on the language rather than the other stuff

S: yeah because when you kind of watched it for the sort of the non-verbal stuff you kind of realised that there wasn't that much to it

I: but they did manage to reconstruct it at the end didn't they sort of reconstructed I noticed that as it was playing they were sort of chipping-in and

S; yeah they were copying it weren't they while it was actually happening

I: yeah

S: I was kind of pleasantly surprised at what it brought out it it brought more out than i was expecting you know there was a lot of assumptions made based on all those different actions that were going on

I: yeah

S: I mean I'm not sure what I 'm not sure about like is why in the reconstructions that they did at the end those role-plays whether those gestures would have come anyway you know because you can't you know ask them to create those things happening created them or whether they would have just come out naturally I suppose that's the thing isn't it it's a kind of an automatic response

Teacher interview 3: Leila

I: I just wondered before we did something in class what your understanding of it   was

L: well it wasn't something I'd necessarily thought of including or a topic that I'd thought of dealing with

I: mm

L: but no I can certainly see the application of building persuasive arguments and stories and so on

I: yeah so if I'd said argument would it just been the row definition

L: well I think that's the one that comes into your mind initially isn't it but yes I mean

I: a popular definition

L: but that's when you say it without any kind of context isn't it (.) clearly there are lots of different kinds of argument (.) academic argument

……..

L: with level 2 they have to watch a documentary programme and to discuss (.) it's not really using your own arguments it's kind of arguments around an issue it was kind of arguments around an issue it was BBC programme called is britain full quite

I: oh ok (.) quite controversial then

L: yeah (.) it was about population but really it was all about immigration you know

I: yes

L: so I though well they'll have something to say it'll generate a bit of debate you know and (.) they didn't really come out with themselves but I was trying to get them to see that it was quite a biased programme it was on just before ethe election as well

I: yeah

L: it was a bit of a right wing agenda you know

I: yes I'm sure yeah undoubtedly

L: I mean once I'd kind of pointed that out to them they started coming out with all kinds of examples from the documentary what they could see it was quite biased

I: yeah

Appendix 22: Extracts from classroom data

Extract 1: Teacher Education class

The class are evaluating the use of the double negative in english

T: but i want to know why (.) tell me why the negative thing is not acceptable or not correct (.) why (.) on what grounds

M: there's an element of repetition there isn't there

T: there's repetition

L: it's a bit redundant to have 3 negatives when you only need 1

T: if I am emphasising something (.) you aint seen nothing yet

M: but then some in east european languages double negatives is quite common

T: do you know why double negatives were frowned upon in english (.) where does that come from

Y: from latin (.) because english grammar was described as derived from latin (.) i think (.) because classical

G: I was gonna say does it come from french because you get a double negative in French ne and pas

Y: no i think (.) disregard of double negatives in french is because it doesn't exist in latin

G: no (.) you asked where does it come from

Y: but that's not a double negative (.) that's 2 particles that form a double

G: yeah but (.) i agree with you but you're talking ain't isn't really a negative either

Y: it is

G: well i know it is but I know it's not a double negative but it's 2 parts to a negative

H: is not no no no i was saying that aint is not

G: oh we've got complicated

T: so (.) just stepping back from your

S: so where did it come from

T: it's from latin that was supposed to be as Y said almost like the model for english

S: well isn't that the same in french

Extract 2: Sandra's classroom

The class are discussing the importance of body language:

T: so that's the language with my body isn't it (.) it's what we can say without words (.) so in this we have lots of body language (.) yeah

S: can i say something, to (.) when i been Italy first time in my language if i say no no no no (shaking head) this mean yes no no no this mean yes no no no no (.) ok and Italy say si yes (nods) and no no (shakes)

T: so hang on

 S: si is no my language say no no no no no this mean yes yes (2) first time I go venezia and i forget my money (.) and I forget on bus and this bus driver gone and I have only marks and I go and I too much hungry and I say please can you change for me maybe 20 marks and he say no (shakes head) I say ok he say ok I take I give you

T: so because of his body (.) that's good (.) that's good example that S so no means yes

The class are reconstructing a domestic argument considering multimodal features.

S1: ok ok ok i listen to you ok don't do like that again shut up (points at S2)

S2: no I no listen (plugs fingers in ears)

S1: no shut up shut up

S3: it's your fault no your fault (points to each in turn)

S1: no shut up shut up if you not shut up i not talk to you any more go away (sweeping movement of hand).

S1: like my husband just do it ok you right i am wrong i go pub (sweeps hands)

S2: my husband say ok (.) i am sorry (.) ok (voice low, hands together, head bowed)