ACADEMIC DISCOURSE SOCIALISATION: A DISCURSIVE ANALYSIS OF STUDENT IDENTITY

by

SEAN NOEL HAGEN

submitted in accordance with the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN PSYCHOLOGY WITH SPECIALISATION IN RESEARCH
CONSULTATION

at the

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

SUPERVISOR: PROF. S.H. VAN DEVENTER

CO-SUPERVISOR: DR C. OCHSE

JULY 2015

I declare that *Academic Discourse Socialisation: A Discursive Analysis of Student Identity* is my own work and that all the sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.

I further declare that I have not previously submitted this work, or part of it, for examination at UNISA for another qualification or at any other higher education institution.

_____   _____

Signature   Date

SEAN NOEL HAGEN

Abstract

This study set out to investigate how students construct their identities. Throughout their socialisation into academia, students are confronted with the paradox of learning as they negotiate the opposing discourses of enslavement and mastery that construct higher education. Utilising a critical discursive psychology approach this research aimed to examine the implications this paradox holds for the development of students' identities. In-depth interviews with five master's degree students allowed for an examination of the linguistic resources available for students to draw on in constructing their accounts of student-hood. Analysis of the interpretive repertoires and ideological dilemmas in the text revealed the uptake of contradictory subject positions in participants' navigation of academic discourse. In order to address the inconsistencies associated with these conflicting 'ways of being a student', participants 'worked' a face in their interactions with academic discourse. Their face-work served to address the paradox by integrating the contradictory positions evident in their accounts. It is in the agency displayed in the integration of these disparate positions that the emancipating student is revealed.

Keywords: academic discourse, interpretive repertoires, subject positions, student agency, tertiary education.

Dedication

For my mom, Bokkie Hagen and my late dad, Peter Hagen. Thank you both for teaching me the value of hard work and perseverance. Thank you for your support through thick and thin and for being the best possible parents any child could dream of. Mom, I admire your courage and I learn from you every day. Dad, we miss you dearly.

Acknowledgments

I would like to give my sincere thanks to the following people:

Professor Vasi van Deventer, my supervisor, without whose input, support and motivation this would not have been possible;

Dr Caryl Ochse, my co-supervisor, for your input, editing and for always being willing to listen over a cup of coffee and a cigarette;

My family, for putting up with me;

My friends and colleagues in the Department for your friendship, support and encouragement.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

The process of academic socialisation is not an easy one for students to navigate. At undergraduate level, students find themselves in the midst of an unknown community with new ways of 'seeing', 'doing' and 'being' in the world. They are expected to engage with their new communities and learn the languages and 'cultural practices' of the academy. As they move from the periphery, as newcomers, to a more central position within their academic communities at postgraduate level, their interactions with, and experiences of, academic culture continually shape their identities as students. Developing a coherent student identity is essential for academic growth and success. However, if one considers the paradoxical nature of learning, developing such a coherent sense of self may not be quite that easily achieved.

Throughout the course of their studies, students are expected to abide by the rules and regulations of their universities and diligently attend to the prescriptions of their lecturers. They are required to demonstrate mastery of their academic work by becoming knowledgeable by learning the competencies associated with their fields of study. The process of learning, in essence, results in the student's enslavement to and by their academic and disciplinary communities. At the same time, however, the academy expects its subjects to demonstrate autonomy and agency in navigating their studies and to emancipate themselves by breaking free from their dependence on the instruction and guidance of their lecturers and supervisors. Emancipation is thus a process of mastering through enslavement. This research set out to examine how students navigate the opposing discourses of enslavement and mastery.

This study documented the academic socialisation experiences of a group of master's degree students. The data were organised around three analytic concepts central to a critical discursive analysis, namely interpretive repertoires, subject positions and ideological

dilemmas. An analysis of these discursive resources facilitated an examination of the lived ideologies of present day student-hood, which, in turn, shed light on how students construct their identities.

The dissertation consists of six chapters. Chapter Two is divided in two sections. Section One details key concepts as well as the study's theoretical orientation. The literature review in Section Two problematises students' socialisation in light of the nature of the dominant discourses that construct academia. Chapter Three presents the methodological orientation and the research methods employed in this study. The results of the analysis are discussed in Chapter Four. To facilitate transparency regarding the interpretation of the data, longer extracts have been reproduced in an attempt to allow the reader to 'get a feel for' the empirical materials and to evaluate the claims made by this research. Chapter Five offers an interpretation of the analytic results and the findings from this research. The final chapter considers the implications of the researcher's identity for the execution of the various phases of this research. The chapter closes with a discussion of the validation of the findings from this study.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Section 1: Situating the Study: Context, Concepts and Theoretical Orientation

1. Context of the Research

Besides learning and mastering the subject material associated with their fields of study, in order to successfully navigate their learning journeys students also need to become proficient in the ways of 'doing' academia. Students need to learn the social practices (e.g. the language(s), behaviours, customs and culture) of academic discourse in their specific disciplinary fields. Academic socialisation (i.e. socialisation into academia and its related practices) has received increasing attention from researchers across several disciplines in recent years. In Psychology various developmental theories have been used to examine the changes students undergo in higher education and the concomitant increases in their developmental capabilities as a result (Evans, Forney & Guido-DiBrito, 1998). In the context of Graduate Student Education, organisational socialisation theories have been used to investigate how students are socialised into university through their experiences with the "processes, traditions, relationships and rules" of the culture of their university (Mendoza & Gardner, 2010, p. 20). Within the field of linguistics, researchers have examined how both native and non-native speakers (i.e. first and second language students) learn the academic language and practices associated with their specific discourse communities (Duff, 2010). Irrespective of whether the focus is on students' personal or social development, the institutional processes that shape their development or on their acquisition of academic language competencies, a central concern of higher education should be how best to accommodate students in their socialisation into academia and its practices (Duff, 2007).

For students, an integral part of navigating the socialisation process involves the development of their identities as students (Duff, 2010; Ho, 2007; Morita, 2004). As they advance from undergraduate study to master's and doctoral level, students' identities are

constantly developing as they grow from novice newcomers in their fields of study into seasoned subject specialists. Throughout the socialisation process, as students progress along their learning trajectories, their identities constantly evolve as they change how they participate in their academic communities (Lave & Wenger, 1991). They are also likely to develop multiple identities as they engage with the various discourse communities of which they are part (White & Lowenthal, 2011). As Lave (1996, p. 157) notes, "crafting identities in practice becomes the fundamental project subjects engage in". The development of their identities as students is an essential process through which newcomers to academia find their own voices as academics (Duff, 2010). Denying students their voices as they navigate their socialisation into academic culture impinges on their learning and sense-making, thus diminishing the opportunities students have to understand and identify with their academic communities (Zamel, 1998).

From the very first moment that students step in line (or go online) to enrol at university they are exposed to academia and its associated practices. The student's exposure to, and interaction with, academic discourse essentially shapes their development and experiences of what it means to be a university student. However, by nature, academic discourse is saturated with the operation of power and ideology, an inescapable reality with which students are confronted throughout the course of their studies. From the university's intimidating physical disposal of space with its large, imposing buildings and lecture halls, to the activities of academic apprenticeship that are monitored, regulated and evaluated, students are at the mercy of the more powerful institution (Grant, 1997). To a large extent, students are unable to challenge the dominant discourse of the university and thus have no choice but to conform to the traditions of academia. This status quo, indisputably, holds implications for the way in which students interface with academic discourse and the concomitant development of their identities as students.

2. Explication of Key Concepts

2.1. Discourse.

A discursive analysis, as is the case in this study, requires an explication of the term 'discourse'. Considering the variety of perspectives in discourse analysis and the theoretical and methodological variation that exists across these perspectives, producing a single, integrated definition of 'discourse' is tricky. Many researchers use the term discourse to refer to all forms of talking and writing (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). However, there is more to discourse than just spoken or written language. Wood and Kroger (2000, p. 19) use the term discourse to refer to "all spoken and written forms of language use (talk and text) *as social practice*" [emphasis added]. This definition emphasises that discourse (or language) is social action beyond the activity of speaking or writing. This means that language has a performative quality – discourse functions to perform some action. As framed by Wiggins and Potter (2008), discourse is action-orientated: In talking (or writing) we are not just saying things, we are also doing things. In other words, language is not only used as a medium for describing ourselves and the world around us, but these descriptions are oriented to different functions. People therefore use language "in the service of action" (Wiggins & Potter, 2008, p. 76), that is to accomplish something with their words: In talking, we blame, we criticise, we empathise, we support, we persuade and we request.

As Potter and Wetherell (1987) note, if language is used to accomplish different actions, an examination of language use will vary according to its function (or the purpose of the talk). Recognising this acknowledges that variation is a feature of discourse. People use language in a variety of ways to achieve a variety of outcomes or consequences. Variability is therefore expected "not only between persons, but within persons" (Wood & Kroger, 2000, p. 10).

Discourse is both constructed and constructive (Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Wiggins & Potter, 2008). Discourse is constructed in that language is made up of linguistic resources (i.e. made up of language building blocks – words, categories, metaphors, repertories etc.) that construct the world in particular ways (Wiggins & Potter, 2008). The constructive nature of discourse enables people to use language variably to construct different accounts of the social world. People can therefore construct different versions of themselves, other people, events and the world to achieve different outcomes, depending on the purpose for which it is used. There is an active selection as to how accounts are constructed and which language resources are included in accounts and which are excluded (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Talking about a person or event in one way is always alternative to another way of describing the person or event and is therefore one of potentially many ways of describing a person or event. Discourse is also constructive in that the versions of the world that people construct do not exist prior to their talk (Wiggins & Potter, 2008). Discourse constructs subjects, objects and even entire institutions such as medicine and science (Edley, 2001). Discourse thus constitutes who we are and the world around us, drawing us into particular positions or identities – we are therefore produced and positioned by discourse as certain subjects. As Edley (2001, p. 210) notes, who we are "always stands in relation to the available text or narratives" and "whatever we might say (and think) about ourselves and others as people will always be in terms of a language provided for us by history."

The assumption that language constructs the world illustrates the shift away from viewing language as a means to understanding cognitive representations of an objective reality (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). In other words, language does not reflect or reveal the social world 'out there' as we perceive it or as it is stored in our memories. This is in contrast to traditional cognitivist assumptions made in psychology, where language is seen as a resource to explain the inner workings of the mind or as a route to explain behaviour.

Rather, language *is* the behaviour to be explained (Wood & Kroger, 2000). Recognising this means recognising that language does not provide objective descriptions of the 'real' world; rather a description of an event or object is only one of a potential many ways of describing the event or object. Reality is created in and through talk (or discourse). This also means that "no single truth is possible" (Taylor, 2001b, p.12). Since reality is neither singular nor regular, the assumption, rather, is one of multiple realities and truths. The emphasis is therefore on the variability of language as it is used discursively to construct relativist (as opposed to realist) versions of the world.

Another central observation of discourse involves recognising the "situated" nature of discourse (Wiggins & Potter, 2008, p. 77). These authors note that not only is discourse situated within a specific sequential environment of words which is understood as part of a particular argumentative framework, but that discourse is also situated within a particular institutional setting such as a university lecture hall or a telephone helpline. As such, it is important to examine discourse "in situ, as it happens, bound up within its situational context" (p. 77). Accounts of the social world vary according to the functions they are designed to perform, which, in turn, vary according to the context of their production (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). It is therefore important to remember that particular accounts are "occasioned phenomena" (Wooffitt, 2005, p. 150), that arise from, and are designed for, the intricacies of interaction. At the same time, the descriptions produced in people's accounts echo the values and meanings espoused by the wider discourses that constrain and shape our social worlds (Wooffitt, 2005). Discourse therefore cannot be divorced from the local or immediate interactive context of its production nor from the broader social, ideological context within which it is produced.

From a Foucaultian perspective, the term discourse is also used to reflect "much broader, historically developing linguistic practices" (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 6).

Foucault's definition of discourse is summarised by Lessa (2006, p. 285) as "systems of thoughts composed of ideas, attitudes, courses of action, beliefs and practices that systematically construct the subjects and the worlds of which they speak." Here the term discourse refers to the ideological influences inherent in dominant discourses and an analysis of discourse examines the ways in which language is used to restrict how people think and speak and write and act in the world (Wooffitt, 2005). Inherent in the Foucaultian perspective on discourse is the notion of power which focuses attention on the kinds of "objects and subjects" which are constituted in and through discourse as well as the different "ways-of-being" these constitutions make available for people to draw on in conversation (Willig, 2001, p. 91). Discourse is structured by power and dominance and thus influences the minds of those dominated such that they accept this dominance, and ultimately act and comply with the interests of those in power (Mohamed & Banda, 2008). In this view power is a property of social arrangements since "discourses shape and constitute our identities and legitimate certain kinds of relationships between those identities, thus locking people into particular kinds of arrangements" (Wooffitt, 2005, p. 151).

In sum, discourse (or language) is a social practice. People actively use language to construct the world in particular ways. Moreover, these discursive constructions are oriented to particular functions in particular contexts. Discourse also constructs the social world and relations of power that have consequences for how we can behave, thus constituting our identities in certain ways.

2.2. Academic Discourse.

At its most basic level, academic discourse refers to written and spoken language and communication in an academic context (Duff, 2010). Zamel (1998, p. 187) maintains that academic discourse is "a specialized form of reading, writing and thinking done in the academy [...] a kind of language with its own vocabulary, norms, sets of conventions, and

modes of inquiry". White and Lowenthal (2011, p. 284) note that academic discourse represents a "specific yet tacit discursive style expected of participants in the academy". However, as with the term 'discourse', academic discourse also denotes more than just academic texts or language per se. As Duff (2010, p. 175) notes, academic discourse is "embodied both in texts and in other modes of interaction and representation". Zamel (1998) conceptualises academic discourse as a distinct culture made up of disciplines, each representing a separate cultural community into which students are initiated. Students new to an academic discourse community need to learn not only the discourse community's "ways with words" but also its "ways of knowing" (Zamel, 1998, p. 188). Academic discourse therefore does not merely entail learning the language of academic culture but also the 'doing' of the culture. As such, academic discourse is a "complex representation of knowledge and authority and identity" with strong "social, cultural, institutional and historical foundations and functions" (Duff, 2010, p. 175).

Academic discourse is continually evolving and does not exist as a static, established set of conventions (Duff, 2007). Rather, Duff (2007) notes, academic discourse may be considered a "social construction" (p. 3) based on the histories and social contexts of individuals, their learning communities and the power relations operating in these communities. As Zamel (1998) maintains, academic discourse is neither unitary nor are its disciplines fixed: As is the case with all cultures, academic discourse is continually subject to reshaping as new members enter and change the community. Academic discourse therefore evolves as its disciplines, genres and participants change and evolve.

Duff (2007) notes that the nature of academic discourse in today's information age, is such that students are being socialised into "multimodal, intertexutal, heteroglossic literacies" (p. 4) Academic discourse, whether spoken or written is not purely academic in nature. Academic discourse today is infused with references to popular culture texts such as

television programmes, movies and references to sports or current affairs issues, producing a "pop-culture-laden hybrid form of discourse in education" that builds on students' personal and academic interests and background knowledge (p .5). As such, academic discourse is a "social, cognitive and rhetorical process and an accomplishment, a form of enculturation, social practice, positioning, representation, and stance taking" (Duff, 2010, p. 170).

Given the definition of discourse adopted in this study, the term 'academic discourse' is used to refer to more than just the language of academia and the terminologies and methodologies of a subject or discipline. It also encompasses academic social practices that construct academia and its institutions as well as the identities and roles of its participants (students, lecturers, administrative staff, management etc.). Similarly, academic discourse is also constructed by the practices of academia and its participants. It therefore involves an active, constructive and constructed practice. Disciplines (for example Psychology) are powerful in determining the domain of discourse – what can be said and what cannot. But the discipline does not have absolute control: Experts of a discipline (academics and professionals) construct the discipline as much as they work within the confines of the discipline. In other words, the discipline is constructing and determining as much as it is constructed and determined.

Furthermore, academic discourse is produced and situated within particular historical, socio-cultural and political contexts. The practice of academia occurs in certain institutional settings (for example universities, lecture halls and libraries) and in the practice of academic activities (such as reading library books for a literature survey, attending workshops on research methodology, employing the appropriate register when consulting with a supervisor and even in the social banter amongst students during smoke breaks). The practices and traditions of academia follow and function according to certain social norms and ideologies embedded in these institutions. As such, relations of power are evident in how students

address their lecturers and professors, in the formalised traditions of producing scientifically-correct articles, and in what is considered appropriate behaviour in the classroom.

2.3. Student Socialisation.

Mendoza and Gardner (2010, p. 19) broadly define socialisation as "the process through which an individual learns to adopt the values, skills, attitudes, norms and knowledge needed for membership in a given society, group or organisation". Socialisation occurs by observing others in their roles and through formal and informal experiences, over time, with various processes, traditions, policies, customs, practices and values (Mendoza & Gardner, 2010). In the context of academia, student socialisation, then, involves learning the appropriate behaviours and competencies associated with an academic community. Students need to learn the skills associated with academic discourse such as reading academic texts, producing assignments, writing exams, listening to lectures and acquiring and employing appropriate academic speaking competence (Limberg, 2007). Students learn these skills through interaction with their teachers, peers and other role players in the academic community; by learning the theory and practices associated with their disciplinary field(s) of study and through exposure to the culture of their university or college, as well as the broader, discursively constructed academic discourse community. In so doing, students develop an understanding of what is expected of them in their role as 'student'.

Current conceptualisations of socialisation do not denote a "mindless, passive conditioning that leads invariably, with exposure or feedback or practice, to desired, homogenous responses, competencies, behaviours and stances on the part of novices engaged in them" (Duff, 2010, p. 171). Rather, the socialisation of newcomers is seen as a complex process of "two-way negotiation rather than a unidirectional enculturation" (Morita, 2004, p. 575) and involves displays of agency, resistance, innovation and self-determination, in which students are unlikely to simply internalise and reproduce the repository of "linguistic and

ideological resources" of academic discourse (Duff, 2010, p. 171). It is more likely to involve struggles concerning access to resources, tensions and negotiations between community members with different degrees of expertise and experience as well as transformation of the community's practices and the identities of its participants (Morita, 2004).

3. Theoretical Perspectives on Student Socialisation

Student socialisation has been examined from within various disciplinary fields. Research in Student Affairs in higher education has examined the intrapersonal and interpersonal changes students undergo in their socialisation at university (or college) from various developmental perspectives (Evans, Forney & Guido-DiBrito, 1998). Psychosocial theories (such as those of Erik Erikson and Arthur Chickering) have been used to explain the challenges students face at various developmental stages during their university (or college) years. Cognitive-structural theories explore how students interpret and perceive events in their lives by examining their intellectual, cognitive and moral development. Typological theories, such as the Myers-Briggs theory of personality types, draw attention to the individual differences in how students learn and develop throughout the course of their studies.

Student socialisation has also been examined using organisational socialisation perspectives (Mendoza & Gardner, 2010). Within the context of graduate education (i.e. master's and doctoral study), Golde (1998, p. 56) describes socialisation as a process by which "a newcomer is made a member of a community – in the case of graduate students, the community of an academic department in a particular discipline". Lovitts (2001) notes that, typically, graduate student socialisation occurs across three stages, namely the entry and adjustment stage, the development of competence and the research stage. The entry and adjustment stage pertains to their first year of enrolment at university in which students gradually transform from 'outsiders' to 'insiders' in their new academic communities

(Kuwahara, 2008). The second stage, corresponding to the student's second year of graduate study, involves the completion of coursework and examination requirements. After passing the examinations, in the research stage, the student decides on a research topic, prepares and defends the research proposal, completes the research. The process culminates in the writing of the dissertation.

Although the two models described above may be useful in understanding the developmental challenges students face and the institutional processes underlying their progress across various stages of socialisation, they reflect the modernist assumption that socialisation is a one-directional process that 'happens' to students (Li & Cassanave, 2008). Postmodernist perspectives, on the other hand, consider socialisation to be a two way process in which newcomers both mold and are molded by a professional or institutional culture (McDaniels, 2010) Thus, the student also affects and influences the organisation in the process of their socialisation (Mendoza & Gardner, 2010). Duff (2007, p. 3) notes that it is within this "sociocultural, interactional and increasingly poststructural" paradigm that researchers examine how newcomers are socialised into academic discourse.

Research in the field of applied linguistics has focussed on 'academic discourse socialisation'. This concept refers to the socialisation of newcomers into the discursive practices of an academic community (Duff, 2007). Such research seeks to examine how students develop the capacities and capabilities to participate in new discourse communities. In the literature, the term 'academic discourse socialisation' is also referred to as 'language socialisation' (Duff, 2007), 'the development of academic literacies', 'academic enculturation' (Duff, 2010) and 'participation in communities of practice' (Lave & Wenger, 1991). The idea central to all these terms is that of a social process through which novices (students) are apprenticed into an academic community through interaction and cognitive experience within those communities (Duff, 2007).

In linguistics, much of this research has focused on students' second language acquisition of ESL (English as a second language) and how they are socialised into the oral and written discursive practices of their academic communities (Duff, 2007). Morita (2004) notes two main orientations of such research. The first is a "product-orientated approach" that aims to identify *what* students need to know to participate competently in an academic community (p. 574). Common to this line of inquiry are methods such as needs analysis surveys that aim to find out what academic language and skills are required to successfully navigate the academic tasks required in various disciplines. Genre analysis, which is also classified as product orientated, aims to "identify the specific linguistic and rhetorical conventions" (p. 574) that newcomers to a discourse community need to master. Such research is characteristic of the unidirectional assumptions mentioned above that treats socialisation as an unproblematic assimilation into academic discourse (Morita, 2004).

The second approach in this area of research is classified as "process orientated" (Morita, 2004, p. 574). As its name suggests it is concerned with the processes of *how* students are socialised into academic discourse. This line of inquiry investigates "the situated or socially and temporally constructed processes" (p. 574) through which newcomers are socialised into academic discourse. Seen in this light, socialisation is conceptualised not as the one-way acquisition of pre-given knowledge or skills. Rather, it involves "a complex process of negotiating identities, cultures or power relations" (Morita, 2004, p. 575) in which learners often have to navigate multiple, changing and sometimes competing discourses inherent in their academic communities. The present study falls within this second line of inquiry as the focus is on the processual aspects of students' socialisation rather than the acquisition of isolated sets of skills.

In the context of the present study, academic discourse socialisation is conceptualised as reflecting more than the acquisition and development of academic literacies. In this study,

the notion of students' socialisation into academic discourse is better captured by the terms 'academic enculturation' and 'participation in communities of practice' as these denote a process beyond the development of written or oral academic language competencies. Notions of culture and community reflect a concern with student socialisation that includes, but is not limited to, the development of their academic language competencies. The focus is therefore on how students who enter a new academic community acquire not only its "ways with words" but also its "ways of knowing" (Zamel, 1998, p. 188). It suggests the idea of both absorbing and being absorbed by the culture of academia in order to understand the ways in which the academic culture works (Lave & Wenger, 1991). As Elbow (quoted in Zamel, 1998) notes, such a process requires not just acquiring and using the jargon of a culture but also involves *doing* the culture. Socialisation into academic culture therefore requires "immersion, engagement, contextualization [and] fullness of experience" for students to become proficient in the understanding and practice of academia (Zamel, 1998, p. 188).

So how do students go about learning to 'do' academic culture? Duff (2010) holds that, central to the socialisation process is the notion of apprenticeship: Learning to think and act in particular ways appropriate to the academic community. Traditional notions of apprenticeship assume that learning occurs either through the internalisation of transmitted knowledge or by the process of "learning by doing" where novices observe and imitate the activities performed by an expert (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 31). Such models of apprenticeship are characteristic of one-way conceptualisations of socialisation involving a passive transfer and appropriation of pre-existing knowledge (Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991). Lave and Wenger (1991) conceive the process of learning through apprenticeship in a different manner to such traditional models. As noted by Li and Casanave (2008, p. 5), Lave and Wenger's theory moves beyond such conceptions of socialisation, providing a "less unidirectional and more participatory" view of apprenticeship.

Lave and Wenger (1991) view learning through apprenticeship as a "situated activity" (p. 29). In contrast to the cognitivist conception, learning does not involve the accumulation of knowledge that is incrementally stored in the minds of learners. Rather, learning is located in the "evolving relationships" continually being forged between community members as they partake in the activities of the communities of which they are part (Haneda, 2006, p. 808). Learning is situated in the trajectories of co-participation and is thus understood as "an integral part of generative social practice in the lived-in world" (Lave and Wenger (1991, p. 31). From this perspective, interactive social engagement provides the context for learning (Hanks, 1991).

Central to this conception of learning through apprenticeship is the notion of "legitimate peripheral participation" (LPP) in communities of practice (CoP) (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 29). Learning occurs by participating in the sociocultural practices of a community. Mastery of the knowledge and skills of the community occurs as newcomers move from the periphery of a community's activities towards full participation. However, legitimate peripheral participation does not involve mere simple participation in a role at the edge of a larger process. Rather, the apprentice engages in several roles simultaneously: Subordinate, learning practitioner and aspiring expert, "each implying a different sort of responsibility, a different set of role relations and a different interactive involvement" (Hanks, 1991, p. 23). Participating on the periphery provides the opportunity for apprentices to make the practices their own as they develop a general idea or "skeletal understanding" of the community's practices (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 96). As newcomers move centripetally from the periphery towards becoming fully fledged members they become increasingly competent in the ways of 'knowing' and 'doing' in the community.

Considering that LPP involves increasing, and hence, changing forms of participation, being socialised into a CoP necessarily involves a continual (re)negotiation and

(re)construction of the identities of its participants (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Given that the organisation of any social structure involves relations of power (including the social structures in CoPs in which established members arguably wield more power than newcomers to a community) LPP is a conflictual process in which the identities of both newcomers and established members are continually transformed. Furthermore, the ways in which recognised members and newcomers establish and maintain their identities generate competing viewpoints on the community's practices and its subsequent development (Lave & Wenger, 1991). This means that the CoPs themselves (and their practices) change and evolve since the community's activities and the participation of individuals involved in these activities, together with their knowledge and perspectives, are "mutually constitutive" (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 117). LPP therefore refers to both "the development of skilled identities" as well as to the "reproduction and transformation of communities of practice" (p. 55).

In this study, learning the ways of 'being' and 'doing' in an academic community is regarded as a social practice. Socialisation into academia occurs relationally, between all role players involved, and does not simply involve the unproblematic transmission of knowledge from lecturer to student. It encompasses more than "practicing the discipline-specific language, norms and conventions" (Zamel, 1998, p.189). Students are socialised through a process of co-participation involving increasing engagement with an academic community and its practices. Furthermore, besides negotiating the "institutional and disciplinary technologies and epistemologies" of academia, newcomers also have to develop their own voice in the production and interpretation of academic discourse (Duff, 2010, p. 170). An integral part of this process involves negotiating their identities as students: Ways of being, knowing and doing 'student-hood'. As students move from the periphery at undergraduate level to a more central position within the community at master's and doctoral level, their identities constantly evolve as they advance from being newcomers towards becoming

established members of the academic community. As their socialisation progresses along their learning trajectories they constantly renegotiate their identities as they "move through different forms of participation" and become increasingly competent in their fields of study (Jawitz, 2009, p. 243).

Given the notion of learning through peripheral participation, the question is then: In an academic community of practice, how do students negotiate and construct their identities? Before embarking on an answer to this question, a closer examination of the nature of academic discourse is required.

Section 2: Problematising Academic Discourse

1. The Landscape of 21st Century Higher Education

Changes in the status quo of higher education over the past few decades have seen a shift away from traditional models of teaching and learning. With an ever diversifying student population, universities have had to bring about changes in the way curricula is designed for, and offered to, students. This shift has seen a move away from purely theory-driven courses to applied, experiential learning programs and curricula aimed at producing workplace-ready graduates who are equipped with the necessary skills to perform upon entering the job market. Today the emphasis is on interactive, dynamic and fluid curriculum designs, rather than the static and boring 'wrap-around' courses that have been offered in higher education in the past. In this ever changing landscape, universities have had to embrace these changes in order to meet the expectations that 21st century students have of higher education. In response to these changes, approaches to teaching and learning have shifted from traditional teacher-centred approaches towards favouring student-centred pedagogy (McCabe & O'Conner, 2014). No longer is the role of the lecturer that of the expert 'delivering' knowledge but rather one of collaborator in the facilitation of knowledge production. Student-centred approaches require a shift in responsibility such that the student, rather than the lecturer, is expected to assume and demonstrate a greater ownership of his/her learning than in teacher-centred approaches (McCabe & O'Conner, 2014). Students can no longer assume the position of the passive recipient of knowledge. Rather, today's learning requires students to be active participants who demonstrate an "autonomous, proactive and constructive engagement" in the learning process rather than a passive dependency on receiving instruction from their lecturers (McCabe & O'Conner, 2014 p. 354). The information age requires students as active agents who produce and are able to take responsibility for their own learning, rather than merely memorising the contents of a

prescribed book in order to master their field of study. Frand (2000, p.17) maintains that "The challenge for educators and higher education institutions is to incorporate the information mind set of today's learners into their programs so as to create communities of lifelong learners". This information-mind set assumes that it is more important to be able to manage complex information rather than simply accumulating knowledge. Today's students no longer need to learn facts by heart when they can simply connect to the internet from their mobile phones to find the information they need. Rather, there is a need for fast, efficient and immediate communication, and to be permanently connected to others (Frand, 2000). Van Deventer (2010) notes that the learning systems of the past, characterised by static and inflexible practices of conformation, are no longer adequate to meet the needs of information mind set learners: Today's students require learning that allows individuals to move at their own pace and manage their own learning activities that are authentic, personally relevant and embedded in real-world practice.

2. The Paradox of Learning: Enslavement or Emancipation?

Although there is a considerable amount of information in the literature about learner independence, not much can be found about learner emancipation or liberation (van Deventer, 2010). Learner emancipation may be conceptualised as "a process of academic professionalisation" in which learners are able to not only manage their own learning processes independently, but become "liberated from subject material – moving from being ruled by the material to being masters of the material" (van Deventer, 2010, p. 169). However, the nature of the learning process is paradoxical. It requires "mastering through enslavement" (p. 169) in that mastering a field of study occurs by a process of enslavement into that particular field. Take Psychology as an example: Psychology students generally need to complete an undergraduate degree and obtain an average above a certain (pre-decided and dictated) percentage – say 65% - for their third year psychology subjects in order to be

considered for postgraduate study. During undergraduate study, students undergo formal instruction and evaluation and are subjected to the terminologies, theories and methodologies of the discipline, thus becoming enslaved by the discipline in order to master it. Upon completion of an honours degree, if a student wants to register and practice as a Psychologist, s/he must, in South Africa, obtain a master's degree. Gaining entry into a master's program at most universities involves going through a selection process to establish their competency and suitability for master's study in Psychology. 'Experts' select only a handful of students for the degree and the duration of the master's program is spent further instructing, evaluating and supervising the student. Upon obtaining a master's degree and after passing a national board exam, the learner is finally declared competent in the ways and means of the discipline and can register as a psychologist in whichever subfield s/he intends to practice. Van Deventer (2010) states that emancipation is supposed to follow at doctoral level but notes that even doctoral candidates are subjected to the rules and regulations of the discipline: Even though a doctoral degree is supposed to advance the boundaries and contribute new knowledge to a discipline, a supervisor is still required to guide the student in the do's and don'ts towards the successful completion of the degree. Van Deventer (2010) questions this enslavement as an emancipating contribution to the discipline, maintaining that the truly emancipated learner is not one who is first enslaved into the ways of the discipline and through this enslavement then becomes a master in the discipline. Rather, learning that is emancipating requires that the student is able to independently manage his/her own learning actions and processes, moving beyond merely being knowledgeable about a certain subject area to a position of active agency in the learning process. Moreover, such an agent is able to master, command and work with the subject content and the wisdom and competencies of a discipline from a personal stance rather than simply being defined by the existing delineations of their field of study. The emancipated learner is thus "a learner showing a high

degree of agency in the form of a potential to disturb, interrupt and dislocate existing frames of reference" (van Deventer, 2010, p. 172).

Van Deventer (2010) states that although the notion of 'learner independence' is conceptualised in terms of learners' ability to take charge of, and manage, their own learning processes and activities, and is thus associated with self-development, learner emancipation should, in itself, be considered as a psychological element in personal development and not merely as the ability to show independent cognitive mastery of subject material. Van Deventer notes that the absence of terminology such as 'learner emancipation' in educational discourse can result in a restricted conceptualisation of learning and cognition.

Learning through enslavement does not fit the information mind set of the modern day student. Rather, learning through emancipation is a more suited approach for today's learners than disciplinary enslavement. However, despite changing student demographics and the concomitant changes in pedagogy, many of the discourses that construct teaching and learning in higher education are enslaving discourses thus disabling, rather than enabling, student emancipation. At undergraduate level, when students are still considered novices, disciplinary enslavement is arguably at its most acute. Students are expected to conform to the dictates of academic discourse without much room for manoeuvre or recourse. As they progress up the academic hierarchy, however, it is expected that they shake off the shackles of dependence and become increasingly autonomous in the execution of their academic work. This study explores the implications this paradox holds for students' socialisation into academia, specifically in terms of the development of their identities as students.

Before further investigating this issue, it is pertinent to examine the nature of academic discourse and its effects in the classroom, as well as its effects at an institutional and disciplinary level.

2.1. Academic Discourse in the Classroom.

Benwell and Stokoe (2002) note that institutional contexts serve to order patterns of talk in particular ways. Due to the regularised function and setting of institutional language (including language use in educational contexts) some degree of ritual and uniformity exists in the linguistic features of educational discourse. In specific, the functional constraints imposed by educational discourse, which are mostly oriented towards executing specific tasks, involve a "hierarchical participant framework" (p. 430). The consequence of this hierarchy is an "apportioning of responsibility for particular parts of discourse" (Drew & Sorjonen, quoted in Benwell & Stokoe, 2002, p. 430). In other words, classroom talk follows distinct patterns in the sequence and distribution of interactional moves in teacher-student discussions: The teacher generally asks the questions that requires a response from the student. The teacher then acknowledges and evaluates the student's response (Benwell & Stokoe, 2002). The authors note that such exchanges, which are further supported by the institutional roles attributed to 'teacher' and 'student', provide for asymmetrical interaction patterns in which teachers control classroom discourse. It is the teacher who asks the questions whereas the student merely responds. Teachers set agendas that students merely follow. Academic discourse therefore encourages and ultimately legitimises the asymmetrical nature of these dynamics. The nature of academic discourse, then, lends itself to positioning the teacher as powerful and the student as subservient.

Benwell and Stokoe (2002) investigated task-setting sequences in university tutorial sessions and found that, in tutor-led discussions, students orient towards a "transmission" (p. 449) model of teaching. Students were uncomfortable manipulating academic discourse. Rather they expected agency on the part of the tutor and thus resisted the opportunity for the collaborative and interactional production of knowledge. Furthermore, in both tutor-led discussions and group discussions, students showed resistance towards displays of

enthusiasm towards tasks or activities, preferring rather to display ambivalence towards academic work (Benwell & Stokoe, 2002). In addition, the students also displayed resistance to academic identity, demonstrating a reluctance to employ an 'expert' register and by distancing themselves from unmitigated knowledge displays (by other students) in group discussions.

Benwell and Stokoe (2002) hold that the students' resistance displayed towards tutor-led discussion tasks suggests a shift in the interactional dynamics of tutorials. The displayed resistance serves to "disrupt and challenge" (p. 441) agendas set by the tutors. However, such resistance is not shown in an effort to display a greater orientation towards academic identity in which students, for example, assume more control of the tutorial agenda. Instead, the displayed resistance functions to resist academic identity. The authors note that "in the current social climate [...] it appears that doing 'being a student' involves displaying ambivalence, a lack of enthusiasm and ironic distance from 'doing education'" (p. 446), a trend that seems to be endorsed by popular culture in 21st century student-hood. However, this "dumbing down culture" (p. 450) does not serve to detract from the scholarly enterprise but serves a social need students have to orient to other kinds of identity. As the authors note, "'doing education' and 'doing social identity' are inextricably linked" (p. 448).

Limberg (2007) notes the important role that academic talk(ing) plays in students' socialisation into the university community. Limberg investigated academic talk in interactions between teachers and students. He examined how such talk is conducted to accomplish academic matters such as matters pertaining to classes and coursework, or to address problems students might encounter at university. Limberg notes that academic talk follows aspects typical of institutional discourse that places particular constraints on participants' contributions. In other words, academic talk proceeds in accordance with the university's institutional framework and its "allowable contributions" (p. 179). Thus,

academic discourse constrains what can be said and by whom it may be said. Limberg notes that these constraints point to an asymmetrical distribution of resources where the teacher holds the power over the discourse parameters and the student merely has to accept whatever help or advice that is offered, whether the outcome of the interaction was fruitful or not. Clearly the teacher's/lecturer's position is favoured in academic interactions by virtue of his/her institutional position.

Mohamed and Banda (2008) examined lecturers' academic discursive practices and how these practices sustain unequal power relations with students at a higher education institution in Tanzania. The authors note the concerns expressed by educators about the unsuccessful academic literacy (writing) practices of their students. Lecturers located the problem as a function of students' failure to access dominant academic writing practices. The authors, however, maintain that lecturers' privileged knowledge of language and discursive practices and the power relations inherent in lecturers' discourse impacts students' (unsuccessful) writing practices. This results in a situation where students are pitted against lecturers who use their superior knowledge of academic literacy to undermine students. The authors argue that this works against "facilitating students' access to the privileged literacy practices" of academia (p. 95).

Mohamed and Banda (2008) further note how the relationship between students and lecturers is that of apprentice and mentor respectively and as such, is structured around authority and power imbalance. This imbalance, they maintain, results from lecturers' privileged access to institutional power resources, including lecturers' status and their knowledge of the discourse genres:

> Because of his privileged access to institutional power resources, the lecturer takes the
> rostrum and optimally uses his privilege of speaking including the implied privilege
> vested on him by the institution, that is, the university's orders of discourse of

controlling the speech of students who, in this case become silent participants. (p. 103).

Clearly, then, academic discourse favours lecturers' voices as dominant, resulting in a "monolingual" and "unidirectional" approach to teaching and learning where lecturers are positioned as the "authority and the sources of knowledge" (Mohamed & Banda, 2008, p. 103). 'Superior' knowledge places them in a "privileged position in the sociodiscursive relationship" (p. 101) between lecturer and student, a position which they use to construct and sustain their dominance in their interactions with students". The authors conclude that lecturers' powerful positioning and their discursive practices hinder the possibilities for meaning-making and serve to enact, sustain and maintain relations of power and dominance, a position clearly in opposition to student emancipation. By not inviting students into a community of discourse, real opportunities for dialogue between lecturers and students as co-participants in the construction of knowledge do not exist.

2.2. Institutional Academic Discourse.

Read, Archer and Leathwood (2003) note that academic culture is comprised of, and influenced by, socially prevalent and culturally distinct discourses of knowledge, communication and practice in higher education. These dominant discourses constrain students' perceptions of academia and what it means to be a university student. This further constrains how students think, speak and write in the academy. Furthermore, students' lack of familiarity with academic culture and its inherent power relations may lead them to feel alienated and isolated in higher education. Differences in status and knowledge between lecturers and students lead to a perception of "distance" between them, and place students in the position of "subordinate" in the academic hierarchy (Read, et al., 2003, p. 270). The differences between students and lecturers in terms of their ability to understand and employ the language of academia also emphasises this status differential, further contributing to the

perceived distance. Lecturers also have a "greater 'authority' to communicate in the 'field' of the academy relative to the student", such that students develop a diminished sense of importance of their own ideas and opinions (p. 270).

Read et al. (2003) note, however, that students do not simply passively 'receive' discourses of academic culture but attempt to challenge the academic culture that perpetuates "dominant constructions of the student" (p. 272). Although the dominant academic culture might not concur with students' own perceptions of what it means to be a student, they adopt "the pragmatic practice of 'adapting' to this culture in order to achieve" thus playing the game of academia to serve their own interests (p. 272). Other instances of resistance include students' utilisation of the discourse of the 'student-as-consumer' to challenge the dominance of academic culture. Since the construction of education as a consumer product, students employ their rights as consumers of educational discourse in order to reposition themselves higher in the academic hierarchy. Students thus show acts of resistance that challenge their "position of marginality" in academic culture (Read et al., 2003, p. 272).

Nevertheless, the authors note that although students may challenge discourses of academic culture, they remain, to a large extent, constrained by these discourses, insofar as universities still retain control over the types of students to which they give access and that these students still have to 'fit in' with the dominant discourses of academia. Even though it may seem to be the student's choice to challenge these dominant discourses, this challenge is actually "an action severely constrained by and ultimately complicit with" the ideologies they are attempting to challenge (Read et al., 2003, p. 269).

Employing a Foucaultian analysis to explore the university as a 'disciplinary block', Grant (1997) shows that higher education discourse constructs certain student subjectivities (student subject positions). Grant claims that the process of higher education disciplines students towards particular ends, one of these being the production of the "good or docile and

useful, student subject" (p. 101). The power relations inherent in the university all work to produce students as "successfully disciplined subjects" (p. 104). As such, the student is placed in the less powerful subject position, unable to challenge the dominant discourses that construct 'the student'. Students therefore become subjects who ultimately have to agree to and abide by the rules and regulations of the more powerful institution.

Grant (1997) notes that the student is subject to the discourses of control and regulation inherent in the university as institution. These discourses make certain ways of being a student more likely. This enables and constrains certain ways of thinking, speaking and acting and in so doing, brings about certain relations in the interaction between the university and the student subject. Take, for example, the relation between lecturer and student: In their interactions with their lecturers, students are not positioned as equal adults, but rather as that of "child, subordinate, supplicant, initiate, rebel or devotee" (p. 103). In this relation the lecturers hold the power to speak; power which is supported by their positioning as experts within their discipline as well as the power afforded them through their institutional authority (i.e. as examiners and regulators of their student subjects). The students, on the other hand, neither hold academic authority nor institutional authority and, thus, are positioned as silent.

Grant (1997) notes that not only are students subject to the power relations that originate in the university, but also to the controls and regulations of their own conscience (or self-knowledge) of what it means to be a good student. "This conscience or self knowledge is constituted by contemporary discourses of studenthood which are dynamically produced by, and in turn produce, the institution" (p. 104). By virtue of this conscience students work to produce themselves as good students "resulting in the shaping of 'appropriate' needs and desires, desires to know, to be wise, the desire to please, the desire to be successful" (p. 110).

And at graduation the institution rewards the student, publically parading the successfully disciplined subject for all to see, and in so doing, maintaining the hegemony of the university.

However, the possibility exists for students to resist the "dominant meanings and oppressive positions" that construct the student as docile subject (Grant, 1997, p. 111). Grant notes that since relations of power exist "between and among acting subjects", students can act in ways other than is propagated in the dominant discourse of academia (p. 111). Although classroom discourse requires that students sit quietly in class and make notes, students show resistance by talking amongst each other rather than listening attentively to what the lecturer is saying. However, by attending classes and taking notes, they are at the same time accommodating the discourse. Other forms of resistance are evident as students challenge the position of the 'independent learner' by forming study groups and exchanging notes, thus becoming interdependent learners who refuse the dominant model of studying in isolation. Grant (1997) also notes that playing the game of academia and indeed positioning themselves as the good student to achieve their own goals (rather than actually assuming the values of the institution) also works to resist the dominance of academic discourse. Grant concludes that although students are not completely determined by the dominant discourse of the university, "it is plain that they are not free" (p. 113).

2.3. Disciplinary Academic Discourse.

Parker (2001) examined how the discipline of psychology functions within, what Lacan termed, 'the discourse of the university'. He maintains that the driving force behind psychology concerns how psychological knowledge functions. Psychological knowledge functions "through the accumulation of a corpus of knowledge about human behaviour and thinking which is presented potentially, if not actually, as if it were universal" (Parker, 2001, p. 70). This assumed universality of psychological knowledge acts as a "battery of signifiers" which is defined by "regularities that ensure and enforce agreement and adherence" (p. 70).

This set of signifiers, evidenced in psychology journals and textbooks, in exam papers and degree certificates, defines the "nature and limits of a discursive field" (i.e. the discipline of psychology). Moreover, it "confronts" and "addresses" each student of psychology who is ultimately unable to master this field of signifiers (p. 70). Psychological knowledge is thus the agent and learners, who can only operate within its predetermined, strict parameters, are its subjects.

Parker (2001) furthermore holds that speaking to an audience as an expert from within the field of psychology, by virtue of the address, positions the addressee as 'other' to the agent, placing the audience in the "subject position upon which certain sets of attributes are endowed and assumed" (p. 71). Parker considers the paradoxical nature of this other, stating that the other may be considered an object who must be both perfect and lacking: Perfect in that the object must exemplify everything about psychology and at the same time be sufficiently other to the expert, lacking that which is to be discovered. The object is therefore "both necessary and lacking, and the task of the psychological researcher is, at the same time, to impress and dismiss this object" (p. 73)

Parker states that this relationship between agent and other results in the production of the "barred subject", the opposite of the "full-blown, self-present humanist subject" (p. 73). He holds that, in the discourse of the university, the end goal for students and subjects of psychology is for them to realise that, in fact, they do not know anything. All they can do is to adopt a position within psychological knowledge whereby they become 'agents' and treat 'others' as lost objects of psychological research.

> Students of psychology are treated in such a way that they become disqualified from knowing about themselves, become embarrassed about the knowledge they may already have about their own psychology, and if they are to stay within the orbit of psychological knowledge they can only do so as barred subjects. (p.74).

In sum, the nature of academic discourse is inescapable. Its constructive effects are far reaching and have tangible implications for the participants in academia. It constructs the identities of its participants, thus legitimising certain ways of being and nullifying others. It constrains the possible contributions its participants can make. In the classroom, its hierarchical character endorses asymmetry in the interactions between participants, favouring lecturers' voices while stifling those of the students. Likewise, at both an institutional and disciplinary level, the socially dominant discourses of academia function to produce students as impotent subjects unable to challenge the status quo of what it means to be a student. Considering this, it is no surprise that students resist academic identity, for it is this very identity that works against facilitating their emancipation and keeps them enslaved. Nor is it surprising that they orient to a transmission model of teaching and learning and are reluctant to participate in the co-construction of knowledge. We may consider the roles of teachers and students to have changed in recent years but the enslaving nature of academic discourse tells a different story. As Duff (2010, p. 176) notes "the way newcomers and their histories and aspirations are viewed and by how they are positioned – by themselves, by others and by their institutions – as capable (or incapable), as worthy, legitimate, showing potential for fuller participation or membership (or not) as insiders (or outsiders)" has important implications for how students navigate their socialisation into academic discourse.

3. The Research Problem

The impetus for this research is clear: Academia is changing at a rate not seen before. The information age and its technological advances have produced a new-generation student with needs different from those of students in the past. If higher education is to meet its students' needs, it is pertinent to ask how learners undertaking higher education today negotiate their identities and position themselves in relation to academia, its role players and its practices. Considering the hierarchical, and hence, constraining nature of academic

discourse, is facilitating students' emancipation truly of concern for higher education institutions? Are students afforded the space and opportunities needed to navigate their studies in a meaningful way? Given that student have to navigate the paradox that positions them as enslaved masters, how do students interface with academic discourse? How does the paradox affect the development of their identities as students? What are the manifestations of the paradox as evidenced by the way student's talk about their socialisation? Do they comply with the expected norms and traditions of academia and take up the subject positions or 'ways of being' that academia makes available to them? Or do they somehow resist the confines of the academy and inhabit other positions that in some way challenge its dominance? How does their agency play out in their navigation of academic discourse? Despite the centrality of such issues for students undertaking higher education, research concerning the development of students' identities has not garnered the attention it deserves (Duff, 2010). The focus of this study was therefore aimed at exploring how, in light of the paradoxical nature of the socialisation process, students construct their identities as students.

4. Rationale for the Research

Kiguwa and Canham (2010) note that emancipatory social change within the context of education requires a critical reflective engagement in the learning process and necessitates from both teacher and student a "personal investment in particular identities and subject positioning that are continually challenged and interrogated" (p. 64). To facilitate such change, subject positions traditionally held by teachers and students, as well as static models of knowledge and power in higher education, need to be "challenged, revisited and reconstituted to accommodate more egalitarian positions and meanings that are, in turn conducive to education transformation" (Kiguwa & Canham, 2010, p. 67). These authors note that "emancipation through learning" becomes possible by reconstructing the role of the learner from passive to active. In so doing, the opportunity to re-examine the "dialectical

relationship between knowledge and agency" is possible (Kiguwa and Canham, 2010, p. 67). However, although such sentiments are noble in theory, it is obvious that questions remain as to their implementation in real-life academia.

Chapter 3: Method

1. Discourse Analysis: Conceptual and Methodological Foundations

Discourse analysis is not simply a methodological alternative to traditional methodologies in social psychological research. As Wood and Kroger (2000) note, it is an alternative perspective on social life that is informed by particular assumptions about language or discourse (conceptual elements) and includes ways of working with discourse as data (methodological elements). The conceptual and methodological elements of discourse analysis stem from the onto-epistemological assumptions of its governing paradigm, social constructionism. The ontology of such research recognises the world not as an entity 'out there' but as socially or discursively constructed through language. Discourse analysis therefore assumes a relativist epistemology in contrast to the assumptions of realism that underpin positivist research. The emphasis is therefore on "the multiple and relative rather than the singular reality-reflecting status" of the world (Wood & Kroger, 2000, p. 13).

Since, from a discursive perspective, people are seen to actively employ particular constructions of the world in order to accomplish social actions, this conceptual shift in focus from what people are talking about to what they are doing with their talk requires parallel shifts in the methodological features associated with discourse research (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). The organising principle guiding the analysis of data in discourse analytic research advocates a definitive focus on "discourse - and, in particular, the ways in which discourse is oriented to actions within settings, the way representations are constructed and oriented to action" (Wiggins & Potter, 2008, p. 74). In other words, it is important to consider not only the content of people's talk but also what their talk is designed to achieve. This presupposes the importance of considering both the immediate interactive context as well as the broader, ideological context in which accounts are produced in an analysis of discourse.

Given the conceptual and methodological underpinnings of discourse analysis highlighted above, in this study, participants' narratives and identity constructions were interpreted and analysed as socially organised action, systematically and deliberately employed to address their interactional and inferential concerns in both the local context of their production (the interview) as well as in the broader, social or discursive context (Edley, 2001).

1.1. A Discursive Psychology Approach to Investigating Identity.

This research drew upon the theoretical assumptions and methodological features of a field of research within the broader tradition of discourse analysis, known as discursive psychology. Discursive psychology, also referred to as Discourse Analysis in Social Psychology or DASP, (cf. Wood & Kroger, 2000) reflects a critique of the assumptions of traditional psychology and its consequent methods used for investigation. In short, Wooffitt (2005, p. 113) notes that discursive psychology is "nothing less than a thorough reworking of the subject matter of psychology" and involves the application of the discursive perspective to the subject matter of social psychology. It is premised by the understanding that people are social and relational and that psychology is "a domain of practice rather than abstract contemplation" (Wiggins & Potter, 2008, p. 73).

In the discipline of psychology, identity has been examined from numerous perspectives. Traditional social psychological models view the self as an entity which can be definitively described, a self that "has one true nature or set of characteristics waiting to be discovered" (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 95). Trait theory, for example posits the self as consisting of various traits, attributes and abilities that culminate in the self as 'a personality' (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). From this perspective, identity equates to the sum of peoples' personality traits and dispositions. Variations may exist across these traits and dispositions and they may change over time as people develop (Baron & Byrne, 1997), but, in essence,

our identities and sense of self derive from, and are determined by, our personality traits. In a similar vein, Role Theory maintains that people acquire a sense of identity by the roles they have to play within society (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Being a mother, a husband, a student – these are all seen as social roles people play. People need to learn how to inhabit these roles and how to act appropriately in them and it is in occupying these social positions that people acquire a sense of self. From this perspective, identity is not derived from certain personality characteristics but rather is learned from the roles people assume. Even though a person may assume a variety of roles, nonetheless, each role exists as a definitive entity (Potter & Wetherell, 1987).

Discourse analysts approach the concept of identity differently from traditional social psychological conceptions. A discursive psychology approach, as with most other forms of discourse analytic research, requires a shift in focus to how psychological 'things' – such as identity –are brought into existence through people's talk. From this perspective, identities do not exist independently to their construction: It is through language or discourse that people are able to construct certain identities or selves (White & Lowenthal, 2011). Establishing an identity is thus a discursive accomplishment (Edley, 2001; Wood & Kroger, 2000). It is a complicated, ongoing process that is dynamic in nature and is interactionally achieved between social actors (Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991).

From this language approach to the self, the focus is not on discovering the true nature of the self, but rather on how the self is talked about or theorised in peoples' discourse (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). As Taylor (2007, p. 5) notes, "talk is understood as the site in which identity is instantiated and negotiated so the 'identity work' of speakers is investigated through the analysis of their talk". Identity is constructed in discourse "as individuals lay claim to various recognisable social or shared identities" (Ainsworth & Hardy, 2004, p. 237). It follows, then, that there is not one self to be discovered but rather "a multitude of selves"

found in different kinds of linguistic practices available to speakers (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 102). By implication, identity is therefore also not stable or consistent but rather "fleeting, incoherent and fragmented" and continually subject to renegotiation (Edley, 2001, p. 195). (A full exposition of the analytic techniques employed to examine the identity constructions of participants in this study follows in Section 3.7).

2. Design

This study employed a multiple case study design in order to explore the identity constructions of a sample of master's degree students at a South African university. In keeping with the principles of qualitative research, this design was employed to develop an in-depth understanding of how – and why – students construct their identities. This design was utilised so as to elicit 'thick' descriptions from participants regarding their experiences of their academic socialisation, from undergraduate through to postgraduate study. To this end, the study documented participants' narratives of their learning journeys and of how they negotiated their participation in academic discourse. The analysis and interpretation of the data was guided by the theoretical orientation discussed in Chapter 2.

3. Ten Stages in the Analysis of Discourse

Potter and Wetherell's (1987) key text on discourse analysis, 'Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour' was used as an organising framework to guide the execution of the various phases of this research. The authors provide an exposition of ten stages in the discourse analytic research process. They note that these stages "are not clear sequential steps but phases which merge together in an order which may vary considerably" (p. 160). As with other qualitative work, discourse analysis is inherently iterative in nature. This therefore required a continual movement back and forth between the theory, the data and the analysis as the research progressed.

3.1. Stage 1: Research Questions.

This study set out to examine the following research question: How do master's degree students construct their identities as students? Uncovering these self-constructions in the context of their academic discourse socialisation necessitated examining how students interface with academic discourse (i.e. their lecturers, fellow students, coursework material etc.). Considering the discourse perspective adopted, this study aimed not only to describe "the sheer range of self-images" available in students' talk but also to examine how these images were used and to what end(s) (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 110).

3.2. Stage 2: Sample selection.

Purposive sampling was employed to recruit participants for this study. The sample consisted of five master's degree students. The sample was drawn from a group of first year master's degree students, all of whom had completed the coursework component of their degree and were in the process of writing their dissertations. The rationale for the selection of senior students for the sample was that senior students have had more exposure to the process of academic socialisation than, for example, first year undergraduate students. Having spent between five and six years at university in pursuit of tertiary education, these students had been exposed to a variety of learning environments, pedagogical strategies and coursework activities, and thus, could likely speak with more authority than junior students could about their experiences of being students. The sample consisted of three male and two female participants, all in their mid-twenties. They had all completed their undergraduate and honour's degrees (at different universities) and were enrolled for a full time coursework master's degree in psychology.

Although a sample of five participants could be considered relatively small, Wood and Kroger (2000, p. 80) note that the intensive nature of discourse analysis usually means that the sample size "in the traditional sense of number of participants, be relatively limited".

Sample sizes in discourse analytic work are generally smaller than those employed in quantitative or other qualitative approaches. As these authors note, "the critical issue concerns the size of the sample of discourse (rather than the number of people) to be analysed" (p. 80). Similarly, Potter and Wetherell (1987) maintain that, since the focus of discourse analytic research is on language use rather than on the people producing the language and, considering that a large range of linguistic patterns is likely to emanate from relatively few people, smaller sample sizes are generally adequate as they provide as much information as hundreds of responses as is characteristic of sample sizes in positivist research. Wood and Kroger (2000) maintain that variability in the discourse of interest influences the sample size: If considerable variability exists across participants' discourse it might be necessary to supplement the data, whereas if the text shows that variability in the discourse overlaps sufficiently among participants, the sample size can be relatively small. Given these considerations, in this study the sample size was provisionally limited to five participants. As the analysis progressed, a sufficient degree of data saturation was evidenced by an adequate overlap in participants' discourse, thus indicating no need to further supplement the sample.

This study could consider several biographical variables (including gender, ethnicity, religion etc.) as part of the sample characteristics, all of which could be seen to influence the conversation in one way or another. However, as Wood and Kroger (2000) note, the issue to consider is whether or not these variables are of concern for the participants themselves. They maintain that "context is only to be used in formal analysis if it is relevant to participants" (p. 128). In other words, if participants orient to a particular extrinsic contextual feature - including information pertaining to their specific circumstances, the roles they inhabit or their particular biographies - it becomes "procedurally consequential" and is then included as part of the analysis (p. 128). In this study, the focus was not on participants' biographical details

and how these relate to the construction of their identities as students. What was important, however, was that participants in this study could be "ethnographically categorised" as students at the same institutional hierarchical level (Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991, p. 154). In other words, all participants were senior students nearing the completion of their postgraduate degrees and thus, were at similar points in their academic discourse socialisation.

After obtaining ethical approval for the study, potential participants were approached and informed about the research and the aims of the study. Participation was voluntary and consent to participate was obtained prior to the interviews. To ensure anonymity pseudonyms have been assigned to participants.

3.3. Stage 3: Data Collection.

Debates exist in the literature on discourse analysis with respect to the use of data that occurs naturally (i.e. as part of the everyday activities of the research participants) as opposed to using researcher-instigated data (such as data obtained from interviews with participants). Potter and Wetherell (1987) maintain that the data used in discourse analysis often comprises records or documents of participant interaction, rather than materials generated from the researcher's own interactions with participants. The advantage of this, they hold, is the absence of the researcher's influence on the data. Wood and Kroger (2000) similarly note the concern for using data that is generated by the researcher, also citing the influence that the researcher might have on the discourse. Wooffitt (2005), on the other hand, notes that perhaps the most commonly used data sources in discourse analysis research are accounts of recordings from informal interviews between researchers and respondents. Phillips and Hardy (2002, p. 71) address this dilemma by noting that "which texts occur naturally in any particular situation depends on the research question" and that "texts that best constitute data depend on what the researcher is studying". They maintain that if the research focuses on how individuals construct themselves "then interviews may be less problematic because the

way in which individuals construct themselves in an interview with a researcher may be similar to how they construct themselves in other arenas of talk" (p. 72).

The data used for analysis in this study was generated from individual interviews with the participants. Access to the data was restricted to the researcher and the researcher's supervisors. Data will be stored electronically for five years from completion of the study.

3.4. Stage 4: The Interviews.

In order to examine how students construct their identities, the interview questions were designed to explore a range of issues central to being a student. Pilot interviews were conducted to ensure that the focus of the interview questions was sufficient to address the research question at hand. The open-ended interview questions aimed to elicit information about students' experiences of their learning journeys, from undergraduate study through to postgraduate level, as well as about their ideas and beliefs concerning what it means to 'be a student'. This included asking participants to reflect on their role(s) as students and the role(s) of their lecturers in the learning process. They were also requested to reflect on lecturers' pedagogical strategies and how these strategies facilitated or inhibited their learning. Other questions required students to detail how they approached and experienced formal study activities such as producing assignments and studying for exams, as well as attending classes, workshops and practical work-experience placements. Participants were also asked about their interactions with their lecturers. This included interactions that were formal in nature (such as classroom interactions and interactions with their supervisors) as well as informal interactions (such as casual chats with lecturers during coffee breaks).

Semi-structured, in-depth interviews allowed respondents the opportunity to provide detailed responses to questions about their learning journeys. An informal tone was adopted in the interviews such that a colloquial and easy way of conversing about participants'

learning journeys was established between the researcher and participants. The interviews lasted between 40 minutes and one hour.

3.5. Stage 5: Transcription.

The interviews were digitally recorded for transcription purposes. The Jeffersonian transcription system is often associated with discourse analytic research, specifically conversation analytic work, where the investigation is often microanalytic in nature and focuses on particular interactional practices (Wood & Kroger, 2000). This system is necessarily detailed and is designed to capture properties of talk such as the design of specific utterances or turn taking sequences. This system is further tailored to account for the features of talk/text itself such as volume, emphasis and sound stretching (Wooffitt, 2005). The transcription of verbal data for other forms of discourse analysis is not always as detailed as those found in conversation analytic work, since, as Wood and Kroger (2000) note, it may not always be suitable for other forms of analyses.

The focus of this research was to examine the discursive accounting practices of students at a macro level, rather than at the fine-grained, micro level as is the case in conversation analysis. The macroanalytic nature of this research did not necessitate a focus on aspects of talk such as turn-taking, overlaps in utterances, pause-length or rise or fall in intonation. A standard "orthographic approach" (Wood & Kroger, 2000, p. 83) was therefore employed in the transcription of the data. This approach uses conventional spelling and verbal descriptions for other signs (e.g., "laughs"). The transcripts included the contributions to the conversation made by both researcher and participants, including the interview questions which were included as the context for participants' responses during analysis.

3.6. Stage 6: Coding.

In order to break the discourse down into manageable chunks, the first step in the coding of the data involved selecting all references to the criteria of interest from the

transcriptions and grouping these together into categories (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Potter and Wetherell further note that the categories used in the coding of the data are "crucially related to the research questions of interest" (p. 167). Considering that the central purpose of this study was to explore the identity constructions of students, and that the interview questions were designed to elicit information about participants' socialisation experiences at undergraduate and postgraduate level, the most logical way of organising the data in preparation for analysis was to code relevant text into two main categories, namely 'The undergraduate student' and 'The postgraduate student'. Four additional categories were generated from the text and were used to code other data relevant to participants' socialisation experiences. These categories were labelled 'The undergraduate lecturer', 'The postgraduate lecturer', 'Undergraduate study' and 'Postgraduate study'. Using the cut-and-paste function in a word processor, data were coded by grouping together relevant words, phrases and sentences into their respective categories. Coding was done as inclusively as possible. Borderline instances were included (rather than excluded) in the categories. When an utterance/utterances reflected more than one category, it was included as part of all the categories it represented. Once populated, these categories served as the starting point for the analyses proper.

Data segments concerning participants' experiences of being university students at both undergraduate and postgraduate level, as well as their ideas and beliefs about what it means to be a student, were selected for coding. Data were further sorted according to topic. Topics included: The roles participants assumed in their studies as well as the roles of their lecturers; formal and informal interactions with other role players in academia (including classmates, lecturers and academic and practical work-experience placement supervisors); academic activities in which participants engaged throughout the learning process (including

attending classes, producing assignments, studying for exams and attending work-experience placements) and difficulties participants experienced in the learning process.

After coding was complete, the data were reorganised around the analytic concepts discussed in Section 3.3.7 below.

3.7. Stage 7: Data Analysis.

Wood and Kroger (2000) note the distinction between top-down and bottom-up analytical procedures when doing discourse analysis. Top-down approaches to studying language consider language use in relation to broader social forces, as is the case in this research. Wooffitt (2005) notes that top-down approaches are concerned with notions of power, ideology, discourses, texts and subject positions. Whereas bottom-up approaches study the structural and functional features of discourse and the organisation of specific interactional activities (Wooffitt, 2005), top-down approaches employ analytical concepts that are quite broad in comparison to the micoranalytic concepts used in bottom-up approaches (Wood and Kroger, 2000).

This study employed a bottom-up analytic approach to examining identity which Edley (2001) describes as *critical* discursive psychology. This approach, which combines poststructuralism and interactionism, treats identity both as "products of specific discourses" and as a resource for accomplishing social actions in talk-in-interaction (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002, p. 110). It recognises that people construct events of the world using repertoires provided for us by history. Edley (2001, p. 190) notes that any "language culture" likely offers a number of different ways of talking about (or constructing) an object or event. As such, people actively select from available repertories to construct different accounts of the world. However, not all ways of speaking about an event or the world are equal. Since discourse constrains what we can say and what we cannot, some ways of speaking about an object or event may then become more dominant than other ways of speaking about the

object or event. Some ways of understanding and interpreting the world therefore become culturally dominant to other ways of understanding and interpreting the world. Edley (2001, p. 190) notes that these dominant understandings then "assume the status of facts, taken for granted as true or accurate descriptions of the world". The way in which people experience themselves and their worlds is therefore "a by-product of particular ideological or discursive regimes" (p. 210). People are both produced by, and subjected to, hegemonic understandings of the world and thus, are positioned as particular kinds of subjects. In other words, who we are always stands in relation to these cultural narratives or discourses (Wood & Kroger, 2000). One of the central aims of critical discursive psychology is to examine these hegemonic understandings and "to enquire about whose interests are best served by different discursive formulations" (Edley, 2001, p. 190). In so doing, it offers analysts the opportunity to examine "not only how identities are produced on and for particular occasions, but also how history or culture both impinge upon and are transformed by those performances" (p. 190).

Edley (2001) notes three analytic concepts central to a critical discursive psychology approach. The first concept in this analytical framework is the 'interpretive repertoire'. Interpretive repertoires are "recurrently used systems of terms" (Wooffitt, 2005, p. 35) and provide speakers with particular and coherent ways of interpreting or talking about objects and events in the world. Wetherell and Potter (1992, p. 90) define this concept as "broadly discernible clusters of terms, descriptions and figures of speech often assembled around metaphors or vivid images". Interpretive repertoires are identified through people's use of "a lexicon or register of terms and metaphors, drawn upon to characterise and evaluate actions and events" (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 138). They are resources that are flexibly drawn on in conversations that "are usually made up of a patchwork of 'quotations' from various

interpretive repertories" (Edley, 2001, p. 199). As such, this concept can be thought of as the "discursive terrain that makes up a particular topic or issue" (Edley, 2001, p. 198).

Interpretive repertoires are recognisable when different people make the same kinds of arguments or talk about an object or event in a similar manner (Edley, 2001). Similarities in the way people talk about an object or event therefore indicate that they are drawing on a particular interpretive repertoire to construct the object or event. (The concept 'interpretive repertoire', although closely related to the concept 'discourse', differs from the latter with regards to its emphasis on agency of speakers in their deployment of language (Edley, 2001): Edley notes the term 'discourse' is often used to reflect a more Foucaultian orientation in which discourses are seen to construct entire institutions and subjectify people. In contrast, Jørgensen and Phillips, (2002, p. 107) note that interpretive repertoires signify that people are not only subject to the constructive effects of discourses but that they can also use discourses "as flexible resources" for accomplishing social actions. Drawing on this concept allowed for an examination of the "interpretive procedures" participants used in the construction of their accounts as well as the ends to which these procedures are employed (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 146).

The second concept employed in the analysis of the data, namely 'subject positions', refers to "identities made relevant by specific ways of talking" (Edley, 2001, p. 210). Originally formulated by Rom Harré (see Harré & van Langenhove, 1991), subject positions refers to "the constitution of speakers and hearers in particular ways through discursive practices" (Wood & Kroger, 2000, p. 100). In other words, when people talk about a person, object or event, they are positioning themselves and their identities in relation to that person, object or event. In so doing they also position that person, object or event in particular ways. Identities are thus negotiated into existence by actively taking up particular subject positions within different discourses. Positioning plays an integral part in how people construct

accounts of their identities (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). This analytical concept therefore provides a means of exploring how people position themselves in conversation. As such this concept offers the opportunity to discern particular identities or selves which are presented in particular ways – and, presumably for different reasons - in conversation.

Edley (2001) notes that in order to identify the subject positions that speakers take up in their talk, the analyst needs to remain aware of "*who* is implied by a particular discourse or interpretive repertoire" and what a given statement (or set of statements) says about the speaker (p. 210). To examine the subject positions participants inhabited in the text, the categories generated from the data were scrutinised for what Potter and Wetherell (1987, p. 111) refer to as "narrative characters" produced in participants' discourse. In other words, participants' constructions were inspected for the production of different (student) narrative characters. For example, a description of how a participant would only start working on an important assignment the day before it was due produces a certain kind of narrative character. This narrative character takes up a particular subject position by virtue of this description, that is, as a student who is not too concerned with rigorous preparation when it comes to producing important assignments. On the other hand, a description of how a participant would spend several months painstakingly working to perfect an assignment indicates a different positioning, one that is indicative of a student who arguably values thorough preparation when producing assignments more than the student in the first example. By examining these narrative characters it was possible to explore the range of subject positions produced in participants' text.

The third analytic concept in this critical discursive framework is what Billig et al. (1988) refers to as 'ideological dilemmas'. Similar to interpretive repertoires, ideological dilemmas are language resources that people can draw on in their interactions and everyday sense making. The concept refers to the often dilemmatic nature inherent in the beliefs,

values and practices – or the "lived ideologies" – of a given culture or society (Edley, 2001, p. 203). Lived ideologies can be said to represent the "common sense" or way of life of a culture or society (p. 203). However, the common sense of a given culture or society consists of many conflicting and competing arguments and ideas. As such, society's common sense is often characterised by "inconsistency, fragmentation and contradiction" (p. 203). These dilemmas are often revealed by the oscillations between contradictory subject positions evident in a speaker's account or by the contrary or competing themes or arguments evident in contemporary common sense understandings of a social object (Edley, 2001).

The contradictions associated with competing understandings of an object often pose a dilemma for speakers: Taking up two different subject positions, which espouse two different, competing understandings of an object, results in incoherence or inconsistency in people's narratives. To examine how people deal with these inconsistencies, the notion of 'face-work' was employed as part of the analysis. Face-work refers to the actions people undertake to make what they are saying and doing consistent with their 'face' (Goffman, 1967). By attending to issues of 'face', people 'work' these contradictory positions so as to take up and 'perform' a coherent identity. In this study, face-work is used to refer to how participants managed or performed the identity/identities constructed in their texts in order to address or resolve the disparate aspects of 'being a student'. In other words, in order to resolve the dilemmas associated with inhabiting potentially contradictory subject positions, participants engaged in 'face-work' so as to enable them to present a coherent identity in their accounts of being a student.

Utilising a critical discursive psychology framework was well suited for investigating how participants constructed their identities. Scrutinising the interpretive procedures employed by participants offered the opportunity to reveal the "range of linguistic resources" available for students to draw on in constructing an identity as a student (Edley, 2001, p.

198). Uncovering the subject positions participants took up in their discourse allowed for an examination of how students negotiate their participation in academic discourse and thus, how their identity and agency 'plays out' in their academic socialisation. Unpacking the ideological influences present in participants' constructions allowed for an exploration of the cultural resources that society in general, and the academic community in particular, makes available to students, and by implication, allowed for an examination of how the operation of power innate to academic discourse affects students' socialisation. Furthermore, employing the notion of face-work provided an opportunity to examine how speakers managed the discrepancies associated with the competing subject positions in their texts.

Data were scrutinised for patterns in the data either in terms of similarity in their structure or content or differences (or variability) in what they were saying (Marshall & Raabe, 1993). These constructions were then subjected to further analyses in order to explore their functional orientation and whether or not they served the same purpose or function for all participants.

3.8. Stage 8: Validation.

Validation in discourse research involves warranting the research by providing justifications and grounds for analytic claims and the findings of the study (Wood & Kroger, 2000). In positivist research the criteria reliability and validity are used as measures to assess the scientific robustness of a study. However, in discourse analysis a different set of criteria is used for evaluation. These criteria are discussed in Chapter 6 after the presentation of the analytic results.

3.9. Stage 9: The Report.

The report of the findings of this study is presented in the form of a master's degree dissertation.

3.10. Stage 10: Application.

The final stage in the discourse analytic process involves the practical application of the research's findings. This research contributes to a body of critical knowledge concerning the transformation of teaching and learning practices in higher education. As such, the theoretical contribution made by this study can be used to inform educational practice as to how we should accommodate students in the process of their academic discourse socialisation.

Before presenting the results of the analysis, the ethical considerations pertaining to this study are considered.

4. Ethical Considerations

Although the topic of this research was not of such a nature that participation in this study could cause psychological harm, respect for the participants and their stories of their learning journeys was an important consideration, both at the time of data collection as well as during analysis and presentation of the results. Participants were asked to provide an account of their experiences of being students and all were in their final year of formal tuition. Some participants had already registered with a professional board which would, upon completion of their dissertations, allow them to practice as professional psychologists in whichever area of the discipline they were specialising. Asking them to provide an account of their study journeys meant that they had to articulate a meaningful story of the many years they had spent studying which, presumably, laid the foundation for what they would be doing for the rest of their lives. Whilst relating a particular incident one participant became tearful, so although the enquiry was not focussed on exploring potentially psychologically harmful issues, relating an account of what it means to be a student indeed was an emotional experience for this participant. Furthermore, the different identities that participants presented in their narratives are precisely that: Their identities – ways in which they speak about

themselves and their worlds. As analysts we have to uphold the ethical imperative of respect for participant autonomy. Care was therefore taken to treat participants and their texts with the respect they deserve, throughout the different phases of this research.

Chapter 4: Analytic Results

The presentation of the analytic results details the interpretive repertoires evident in participants' texts. The uptake of the subject positions associated with each repertoire is explored together with the ideological dilemmas emanating from participants' accounts of being a student. Consideration is given to the face-work participants engaged in in response to the ideological dilemmas evident in their accounts.

Three interpretive repertoires were identified in participants' texts. A behavioural repertoire was used to construct the behaviours in which participants engaged in as students. A competence repertoire showed how participants positioned their identities and the identities of other role players in academia in relation to academic knowledge or expertise. A power repertoire evidenced the subject positions made available by the political structures within the academy as well as by the import of the economic discourse of consumerism.

1. The Behavioural Repertoire

The behavioural repertoire was used to construct the roles and characteristics of students and lecturers. By talking about the activities and behaviours they engaged in as students, such as attending classes, preparing assignments and socialising, participants could construct the roles they, as students, assumed, as well as the roles their lecturers played in the learning process. This repertoire therefore enabled participants to demonstrate the typical behaviours they engaged in as students. The subject positions evident in their texts shed light on the lived ideologies of student-hood. In other words, the ways in which they positioned themselves and their identities (through their talk of their behaviour as students) revealed the different ways of being a student that are available for inhabitation. Consider the following extracts (where 'I' is the interviewer; 'S' is the student respondent; […] denotes deliberately omitted material; and [text] represents clarificatory information):

Extract 1: (Vincent)

1	I:	What was expected of you, do you feel, at undergraduate level, versus your studies in
2		honours and masters, what do you feel was your role as a student in your undergraduate
3		studies?
4	S:	Erm, I think for the undergraduate, um, it's a lot easier, erm, well obviously compared to
5		now, erm, I think what, basically what I expected of myself was just to attend the classes,
6		'cause, erm, just, just being there, shaved off half my studying time, basically, so just
7		being there and having someone tell me or explain what's going on and you know, sitting
8		there, listening, going through stuff made studying a lot easier, erm compared to the
9		other students, or a lot of them, who didn't go to class often, erm, spent double the
10		amount of hours studying for a test, whereas I just literally had to go through the notes
11		the night before, erm, so in that respect I think what was expected was just to be there, to
12		show up, erm, I mean, your parents are paying for it, why not go, I think that was the
13		main, and the learning would also be a lot quicker and a lot easier if you were there,
14		that's erm, it's not really, it gets complicated when you don't know what's going on, you
15		have to figure it out for yourself, basically, erm, when compared to [university name],
16		you have to figure it out for yourself almost, you don't have classmates, you don't
17		have erm, you know, people to help you figure out the problem or the assignment
18		information or whatever […]
19		What did you expect the role of the lecturer to be [at honour's level]?
20		Erm, I didn't really have much expectations, I never really had a lot of contact with my
21		lecturers, in a sense that it was never really necessary to approach them , and try and
22		figure out, erm, or try and solve my problem that I have with the topic or subject or
23		whatever, it was never that necessary, I either figured it out myself, or asked a friend if I
24		could, erm, you know, that was the MO [modus operandi] almost […] I knew they were
25		there as a resource if I had any problems, erm but the notes we got, I got, the
26		information, the, you know, the instructions we got were so clearly set out that you
27		couldn't really go wrong, you just had to follow the instructions, basically […]

With regards to the behaviours he engaged in as a student, Vincent's text indicated the

presence of two subject positions. As is evident in this extract, on the one hand he constructs

the identity of a confident agent, capable of managing and directing his own academic

socialisation: He notes how he conscientiously attended classes because doing so "made the

learning a lot quicker and a lot easier" (Line 13) when it came to studying for tests or exams.

He demonstrated an agency in the manner in which he organised his learning environment

(i.e. by conscientiously attending class in order to develop a deeper understanding of the

subject content). He thus constructs himself as a resourceful student, noting that it was not really necessary to approach his lecturers to help him solve coursework-related problems because he either solved the problem himself or with a friend or classmate (Lines 21 – 23). This subject position is therefore representative of an independent student who took responsibility for his own learning. The second subject position evident in his text, however, suggests that being a student is not quite as simple and straightforward as he initially maintained: He remarks that learning becomes difficult when "you have to figure it out for yourself" (Lines 14 – 15). This subject position is suggestive of a different kind of student who is less independent than the one highlighted above. This student relies more on his lecturers for instruction and guidance than on his own agency to navigate his studies. This student sees learning as "complicated" (Line 14), and is dependent on lecturers to "explain what's going on" (Line 7). Such a position is therefore demonstrative of a student who is less confident in his ability to manage his own learning. This constructs the lecturers as the primary agents in the learning process whereas students are positioned more passively and as dependent on the lecturers to help manage and direct their learning.

These two subject positions are contradictory in nature: Taking up the position of independent, self-directed student who can manage his own studies conflicts with the position of a student who is sees learning as complicated and who is dependent on his lecturers to explain the work. The conflicting nature of these subject positions suggests that Vincent is drawing on two conflicting common-sense understandings of what it means to be a student. Moreover, he oscillates between these opposing positions in his text: In his first turn, he initially constructs the position of the confident, self-directed student who conscientiously attended classes in order to manage his own learning. In Line 7 he positions himself as the dependent student who needed "someone [to] tell [him] or explain what's going on". In Lines 10 to 11 he reorients to the independent student position, indicating that he "literally had to

go through the notes the night before" whereas the other students who did not attend class had to "spend double the amount of hours studying for a test". He reverts back to the dependent student position in Lines 14 to 18 by constructing learning as difficult when "you don't know what's going on [and] you have to figure it out for yourself" (Lines 14 – 15). His account of how it was never really that necessary to contact his lecturers in his final turn suggests the reuptake of the independent student subject position. Oscillating between these contradictory subject positions suggests the presence of an ideological dilemma (Edley, 2001). This is sustained by the participant's discourse which suggests that a dilemma exists between taking up a position as a confident, self-directed student and a position as an uncertain, dependent student: In this extract, the dilemma is illustrated by the manner in which Vincent switches from active voice to passive voice: Initially he notes that "what I expected of myself" (Line 5) was just to attend the classes. Using the active voice attributes the responsibility and agency demonstrated by his class attendance to the speaker. However, in Line 11 he reformulates this expectation to the passive voice, noting that "what was expected was just to be there". This utterance constructs the responsibility for his class attendance as a function of an undefined other's expectations and not his own. He thus shifts responsibility for his dependent, uncertain positioning to the undefined 'other' who expected him just to be there.

Vincent integrated or assimilated the contradictory positions of the self-directed, independent student and the dependent student by working the 'face' of the strategic student. It is true that going to class and having a lecturer explain the work can help to reduce the time needed to prepare for a test. It is also true, however, that independent and self-directed learning is complicated since this requires that students manage their own learning without depending on lecturers to explain the work to them. In order to deal with these conflicting positions and to reconcile being a dependent student with being an independent student, he

worked the 'face' of the strategist. As a strategic student, his dependence on instruction is not rooted in, for example, a lack of knowledge or incompetence. Instead, it is based on the notion that going to class saves time when preparing for tests and exams, a perfectly logical thing to do. Working the 'face' of the strategic student thus enabled him to assimilate these contradictory lived ideologies of student-hood.

Michael's employ of the behavioural repertoire also evidenced the presence of two subject positions. Consider the following extract:

Extract 2: (Michael)

1	I:	If I had to ask you what does it mean to you to be a good or a successful student how
2		would you, what in your mind is a good or successful student?

3	S:	Ok, erm, for me there's a difference between a good student and a successful student,
4		erm, I was never the good student, erm, especially at undergrad level, made a lot of
5		mistakes, erm, student life and so on, so I wouldn't say that the lecturers at undergrad
6		level would call me a good student, I was never a good student.

7	I:	Are you saying you were a bad student, or-

8	S:	Erm, yes, no I, I wasn't the worst student.

9	I:	Why do you say you weren't good?

10	S:	Ok, good student, no, I didn't put the time and effort into my studies erm, that I should
11		have, erm, I failed a couple of subjects, erm, if I, I wouldn't say it's a matter of
12		dedication, it's more a matter of being in a comfort zone and ya, enjoying life, seeing
13		where it takes you, that kind of idea, philosophy, ya it's definitely got to do with, uh, the,
14		your youthfulness and yes, so and there were other students that was the same age as I
15		was or even younger, that were good students so I wouldn't necessarily say that a young
16		student equals a bad student, and once again I don't see, it's more on a continuum, the
17		bad and good students, it's not two different categories, yep, good and bad, but I lean
18		towards the bad student.

19	I:	And what is the successful student?

20	S:	Ya, that's, that's where I, that's where I wanted to explain the whole idea of being at a
21		master's level, it's not necessarily successful out of a career perspective but it's
22		successfully, I think not a lot of people do have master's degree when you look at the
23		stats, erm successful student is, I have to be, that's where I differentiate between a good

24   student and a successful student, I was never a good student but I made it to my, to a
25   master's level and I believe I'll finish my dissertation, not too long from now [laughs]
26   so that's what makes me a successful student […]

As demonstrated in his first turn, Michael constructs a less studious subject position than was the case with Vincent in the first extract. Michael notes that he was "never the good student" (Line 4) and that he "made a lot of mistakes" (Lines 4 -5) and "failed a couple of subjects" (Line 11). His account makes salient another lived ideology which dictates that being a student is not purely about the academic endeavour. As he remarks in Line 5, being a student also means partaking in the "student life" (which, as is clear in Lines 18 to 20, refers to the social aspects of student-hood). He therefore positions his identity as somewhat of a socialite who overindulged in the social aspects of student life at the expense of his academic development. In Lines 17 to 18 he constructs this position as one that "lean[s] towards the bad student". (This also implies that a student who does not overindulge in the student life 'leans towards' being a good student.) As becomes evident in his second turn, Michael's discourse also demonstrated the uptake of another subject position: He notes that failing the subjects was not due to a lack of "dedication" (Line 12) on his part, but rather "a matter of being in a comfort zone […] seeing where life takes you, that kind of idea, philosophy" (Lines 11 – 12). As such, he constructs his "bad" behaviour as a function of a life-philosophy related to being in a comfort zone and not as a function of being undedicated. He is thus able to position himself as a student who, despite having failed a few subjects and living perhaps a little too much of the 'student life', was nonetheless dedicated to his studies.

Michael also oscillated between the contradictory subject positions evident in his text: In this extract for example, in his first turn, by noting that he made many mistakes, he takes up the position of *not* a good student. In Lines 12 to 14 he orients to a less-bad position by denying that a lack of motivation resulted in him failing a few subjects. In Line 18 he explicitly reorients to the position of the "bad" student. In his final turn he again orients to a

less-bad position, noting that he believed himself to be a successful student who made it to master's level. Oscillating between these contradictory positions is suggestive of a dilemma: Euphemising his bad behaviour (by remarking that it was not a "matter of dedication" but more of "being in a comfort zone") suggests that he does not want to position himself as an undedicated student. However, the euphemism also serves to argue *for* (versus against) his unscholarly behaviour by 'downgrading' the depravity of this behaviour from 'undedicated' to 'being in a comfort zone'. These conflicting arguments suggest a dilemma between taking up the position of the dedicated student who diligently attends to his studies and the position of the student in a comfort zone who indulges in the student life.

The 'face' that Michael 'worked' as a resolution to these contradictory ways of being a student is that of the successful student: In his first turn he distinguishes between a good student and a successful student. In doing so, he replaces the notion of the good student (a position he notes he never occupied) with that of the successful student. In other words, he is able to distance himself from his formulation of his identity as *not* a good student. Moreover, distinguishing between a good student and a successful student also serves to rescind the notion of the "bad" student: If he were not the good student who attended to his studies, the inference can be made that he was a "bad" student. However, a "bad" student is arguably not a successful student. By constructing himself as successful he therefore nullifies a self-positioning as a "bad" student. In this way he is able to perform the 'face' of the successful student and assimilate the contrary positions of the undedicated socialite and the dedicated student.

Denise's employ of the behavioural repertoire is illustrated in the following extract:

Extract 3: (Denise)

| 1 | I: | Now if I asked you to erm, reflect on how you learnt, undergrad versus postgrad, what |
| 2 | | did you feel that your role was, what was expected of you as a student at undergrad level, |

3		what did you have to do in order to successfully navigate your studies, versus, was there
4		any difference in your postgraduate studies?
5	S:	Well to be honest, [university name] undergrad is not that difficult, so at undergrad level,
6		I didn't feel that pressured, the assignments you just did them on the last day, sent them
7		in, and for exams, when it came to exams I always studied a lot, I've always gone the
8		extra mile, so I found for me, just having a good grasp of the material to the point where
9		I could almost recite it, was what I expected of myself, not necessarily what they
10		expected of me, but what I expected of myself, erm, but to be honest, I would study, but I
11		wouldn't study to the point where you know, I wouldn't give up my life for my studying,
12		the last month before exams I would study, erm, when it comes to honours, to be honest,
13		it was pretty much the same except, about three months before the exams I started
14		working, 'cause I realised this is a higher field, exams are an extra hour, you have to
15		know a lot more, and not only that but you have to take the knowledge and reinterpret
16		it in your own words, criticise the knowledge and recons-, reconstruct the work in
17		your own words, you can't just, black and white, there, there done [inaudible] you can't
18		just take the black and white from the text book and transfer it to the exam […]
19	I:	What does it mean to be a good or successful student?
20	S:	In my own view, its good marks in your exams, that for me has always been my
21		benchmark, but to be honest, I don't think that's actually the best idea, that's just my
22		narrow view of the world, at the end of the day I think so many people don't work as
23		hard as they should and they always think ,oh I'll just pass, 50 [percent] is fine, but at the
24		end of the day I do believe that you should get as much as you can, you should get the
25		highest mark you are capable of, it shouldn't just be, oh, well I'm lazy, let's just get
26		50, it should be, I'm gonna show you how much of this knowledge I can absorb and I can
27		apply, I'm gonna show you my abilities, that for me has always worked, it's a good, I test
28		well, but overall, I do think my views are a bit limited, I do think that it actually boils
29		down to how much you can take from the course and apply in the real world, because
30		we're not gonna be students for ever, what are we gonna do with this information, we
31		need to apply it in the workplace, so I think at the end of the day, that is what counts,
32		when you can go into the workplace, you have an idea of what you're doing, and you
33		haven't just buried yourself in a book, 'cause you actually need practical experience, you
34		need something to sell, you can't say, well, I've read this book, the company's gonna go,
35		well, so? […]

Denise constructs the identity of a hardworking scholar in her account, noting that she

"always studied a lot" and had "always gone the extra mile" (Lines 7 - 8). She remarks that

she "didn't feel that pressured" (Line 6), thus positioning her identity as a student who

worked hard and was able to deal with the pressures of higher education. She relates that she

also earned good grades and spent months preparing for exams. The way in which she

organised and took control of her learning was to study "to the point where [she] could almost recite" (Lines 8 – 9) the work. In this way she was able to perform well in the exams and could use "good marks" (Line 20) as a "benchmark" (Line 21) against which to measure her performance and success. She therefore constructs the position of a student in control of her learning environment and who managed her learning through discipline and structure. Denise's text also suggested the presence of another subject position: She notes how, at honours level, it was no longer sufficient to "take the black and white from the text book and transfer it to the exam" (Line 18). In other words, her method of taking control of her learning environment was no longer sufficient to navigate the pressures of postgraduate study (where it is expected that students show a deeper understanding of the work than to merely regurgitate the contents of the prescribed book in the examination). The way in which she navigated her learning environment therefore became increasingly difficult to maintain the further she progressed. She notes how, at honour's level, she would have to spend three months preparing for exams in comparison to one month at undergraduate level (Line 13). This, together with the dependence she displayed on her lecturers for instruction, guidance and support (see Extract 8 in this regard) reflects the position of a student much less in control of her studies than she initially maintained in the extract above.

The dilemma Denise faced therefore centred around being in control versus not being in control. The dilemma reveals itself in the contradictions evident in her text: First, she notes that when it came to her honour's studies, "it was pretty much the same [as undergraduate study] except, about three months before the exams I started working". This contradicts her description of her undergraduate studies in which she maintained that she "didn't give up [her] life for [her] studying" (Line 11) and that she would (only) study one month prior to exam commencement. Starting preparations three months prior to the exams, therefore, suggests that honour's study was not all that similar to undergraduate study. Furthermore, as

noted, at undergraduate level she took control of her learning by memorising and reciting the work in the test or exam. This is arguably a passive contribution. Being in control of her studies therefore depended on a structured and non-demanding environment. However, when the environment became less structured and more demanding (at honour's and master's level) and required an active contribution on her part she could no longer take control of her learning simply by regurgitating the contents of the prescribed book in the exam and thus, was no longer in control.

The dilemma is also evident in her final turn: In Line 20 she notes that being a successful student means earning high marks in the exams. In Line 22, however, she negates this position, remarking that this might not be the best idea and that perhaps it just reflects her "narrow view of the world". However, as she indicated, this is the standard by which she measured her own success. Then, in Line 24, she oscillates back to the position which argues for (versus against) the value of earning high marks. She then contradicts herself again in Line 28, noting that this view is "a bit limited" and that what really counts is "how much you can take from the course and apply in the real world" (Line 29). The inconsistencies in the ways she positions herself and the conflicting arguments made with regards to these opposing subject positions suggests that these two opposing ideologies are dilemmatic for Denise.

The 'face' Denise worked in order to reconcile being in control versus not being in control was the 'face' of the developing student: Obtaining the highest marks possible was used as a benchmark by which Denise could measure or evaluate her academic success (Lines 24 – 25). She notes that she "tests well" (Lines 27 – 28), that is, she earned high marks as a student. She defends this benchmark, stating that "so many people [students] don't work as hard as they should" (Lines 22 – 23) and are happy just to earn 50%. She remarks that the attitude students should hold towards their studies is one of: "I'm gonna show you how much of this knowledge I can absorb and I can apply, I'm gonna show you my abilities, that for me

has always worked" (Lines 26 – 27). This positions her benchmark (i.e. obtaining the highest

marks possible) not as merely reciting from the text book as she initially maintained. This

benchmark is not just about absorbing knowledge but is constructed as a reflection of how

much knowledge she can "apply in the real world" (Line 29) as well as a demonstration of

her "abilities" (Line 27). In other words, she reformulates her initial position (which equated

high marks with reciting black and white from the textbook) to include the practical

application of knowledge and a demonstration of her abilities. She continues, however,

noting that this (revised) position may still be "a bit limited" (Line 28). In other words, she

does not rescind her initial position (even the revised one) but she acknowledges its

limitations. As such she demonstrates the 'face' of a student who can acknowledge her

limited views and thus positions herself as a student who is in the process of developing (i.e.

from the limited position of "burying yourself in a book" to applying knowledge and gaining

"practical experience" [Line 33]).

Harry and Julie's accounts of being a student differ from the other participants. Unlike

the other participants, the subject positions demonstrated in their texts do not concern being

in control (of their studies) versus not being in control. Rather, Harry's narrative revolved

around his search for passion and meaning in his studies whereas Julie's text centred on

navigating the power relations in academia.

Extract 4: (Harry)

| 1 | I: | And what would you have liked your lecturers to have done differently at undergraduate |
| 2 | | level? |

3	S:	Well, I think everyone knows [university's name] reputation of lecturers being too busy
4		with other stuff to actually make enough time for people […] that's what it was like, its'
5		like fifteen minutes and people just want to get you out the office so that they can do
6		other things, but, no, ok, the, some lecturers were, were, they were very good because
7		they made the time for you, it's like they want to, they wanted other people to know
8		about this subject, you know, they wanted to share maybe their passion or something like
9		that, it's like, I absolutely love Karl Marx, so I'm gonna make time for you, 'cause I

10	think you'll love this too, the other people, I think they just like, this is the money that
11	I'm making and I'll just get my wages at the end of the month, I think maybe their
12	motivation, you know, I think time was obviously the difficult thing there, I'm sure there
13	are a lot of lectures who maybe did have that passion but because of the time constraints,
14	like they couldn't just take it a bit slower and tell us a bit more, you know, most of the
15	time you're going through the chapters, chapters, chapters and I mean, I, if you miss one
16	week, the week before you're on like page one hundred of the text book and uh, the next
17	week you'll already be on page two fifty, 'cause they would just breeze through the stuff,
18	you know, erm, so I think it's the university also at the higher level that makes them
19	push through the stuff so quickly, they can't make the time to actually just have a general
20	discussion about it, you know, and I think that's important, you see where people are,
21	and say ok, maybe let me go back explain it, ok cool everyone is on the same level, let's
22	move forward, some lectures like, I don't care where you are, that's your problem, I just
23	wanna finish this stuff […] honours was very nice because you know, it was more
24	reading, it wasn't just reading one book, you're actually reading articles, most of the
25	courses was just based on reading different articles and then that's also applied to the real
26	world, it's not just theory, its actual, this study took place this is what they found and
27	they link it to theory, so now I really got involved in reading that and I'd read an article
28	and I'd check a reference and like, oh, I'm gonna read that as well, so it became more of
29	a passion for me, it wasn't just a degree anymore, I wasn't worried about the degree or
30	anything, it's just I was really interested in the stuff I was reading about. So I think that
31	was the main difference, after honours, the degree still didn't really mean anything to me,
32	like oh now I know about people, I still think it was my own experience, interacting with
33	people like on a daily basis, speaking to people like on a daily basis and speaking to
34	people about issues in their lives, that's, that I actually like started thinking of myself as a
35	counsellor or a psychologist, but the degrees, I won't say that they made me confident in,
36	oh now I'm a psychologist, now I'm qualified.

In his account of being a student, Harry demonstrated the need to be acknowledged as a legitimate or 'franchised' student of psychology. However, as is evident in Extract 4, he was instead relegated to a position in which he was denied a legitimate agency as a student in his studies. This is apparent in Lines 3 to 6 in his remark about how lecturers did not make time for their students and how they "just wanted to get you out of the office so that they can do other things". He notes how lecturers would "just breeze through" (Line 17) subject content without taking the time to engage students in discussions to assess their understanding of the work. Later in the interview (see Extract 19, Lines 8 - 9) he comments that studying was about "just going to class into the lecture, sit there, make sure you understand what the book says, then use that book to write the exam". As such, he notes that

studying felt as though it was a "package" (Extract 19, Line 1) on offer to students who had little choice but to accept the package on offer. In contrast, as is evident in the extract above in his description of his honour's degree studies from Line 23 onwards, he also demonstrated the desire for legitimate engagement with his studies: He states that, at honours level "it wasn't just reading one book, you're actually reading articles" that are applicable to "the real world, it's not just theory" (Lines 24 – 26). He notes how he "really got involved" in what he was reading and that studying "became more of a passion" and was not just about "a degree anymore" (Lines 27 – 29). This position is demonstrative of a student who is allowed legitimate access to his studies rather than being positioned as a student who had to engage with an inauthentic process.

The dilemma between being positioned as a disenfranchised student and a franchised student is visible in this extract in the manner in which he talks about his lecturers: He oscillates between blaming the lecturers and offering excuses on their behalf for being negated to the position in which he simply had to accept his disenfranchisement: Initially, in Lines 3 to 5, he criticises the lecturers for not making time for their students. He then moderates this initial positioning, noting that there were some lecturers who did want to share their passion for their subjects. He reverts back to a more critical positioning in Line 10, maintaining that some lecturers were only interested in their salaries and not in their students' development. He again reorients to a less critical positioning of the lecturers in Line 12, stating that the time constraints imposed by the university prevented lecturers from engaging sufficiently with their students. Besides oscillating between these positions, the dilemma is also expressed in his explicit formulation of the situation he found himself in, that is, as a disenfranchised student whose lecturers were disinterested in his understanding of the work, as problematic in Line 22.

The 'face' Harry performed in order to integrate these discrepant positions is that of the passionate student: His account of student-hood concerned how he broke free from the confines of an inauthentic learning process, going beyond the boundaries of the university and his coursework to find passion in his studies. He remarks that he was no longer "worried about the degree" (Line 29) or simply concerned with passing the exams. As he indicates in Lines 32 to 34, he was able to find passion in his studies through his interactions and experiences with people, no longer relying on obtaining a degree to fulfil his need for being a franchised student. Later in the interview he notes that "I'll be making a career out of this… it's not just something to get the piece of paper [the degree certificate]…it is discovering the passion and then, you know, you can see that, oh, this degree is gonna help me to, to take my passion and just make it a career". The manner in which he found and maintained his passion and, thus, became a fully-fledged, legitimate student was to transgress the academic borders of psychology.

Extract 5: (Julie)

1	S:	[…] Research psychology is something that I was actually quite against in honours year,
2		because my supervisor who was supervising my mini dissertation told me that I couldn't
3		write, he told me that some people can do it and some people can't and he said, its ok,
4		you can't do it, it's fine, so I was really put off research [laughing] […] and I explored
5		master's again for this year and one of the things that came up was this course […] it's
6		just then I decided to go for it because I really didn't wanna be bogged down by that,
7		that one statement that my lecturer made that year and I just thought agg, I'm just
8		gonna defy everything you said, and then I, I liked the, I liked the, the selection process
9		and I, I thought that will be nice and yip that's where I am now, so it's never really been
10		something, research, something that I knew I'd go into, ya.

11	I:	I like that, defy what the lecturer did, can we, can we just talk a little bit about that,
12		this guy says to you, or woman, whatever it was, that you that you can't write, how did
13		you understand that?

14	S:	I took it as my style of writing, I, that's how I understood it, that it's not research, [I'm]
15		strong in research.

| 16 | I: | And now, if you think back what do you think about it? |

17	S:	I feel like I actually, I could write back then, but I suppose, I was in honours, I didn't
18		wanna question anybody, so I just took it as is, now I think my writing is still good but
19		I'm in a different context completely, so you know, when I compared myself to students
20		there, when I compared myself to students here, it's completely different, than, I grew
21		last year even though I didn't write so much, and I think I've I stopped caring a lot what
22		people would say about things like that because everybody says I write well even though,
23		ya […]
24	I:	So now, if somebody says that to you again, what are you gonna say? Let's say I'm your
25		supervisor and I say this to you, what are you gonna say?
26	S:	Oh my word, erm, if you told me that I can't write, ok then I would say, I'm in this
27		course for a reason, and somebody must have liked something that I did, so why don't
28		you tell me what I can work on then, if that's your opinion, but that's not mine at this
29		point in time, it's not my opinion that I can't write, that's your opinion, so what do you
30		think I should do and then I'll decide if I can, if I'll take your advice or not, yeah.

Julie constructs the position of a defiant student in her account of student-hood. She notes that, during her honour's studies, her supervisor had told her that she could not write and that, as a result, she was "really put off research" (Line 4). However, despite this, she decided to "defy" (Line 8) what her supervisor had said and apply for a research master's degree. Her defiance is also evident in the negation of her supervisor's sentiments in her remark in Line 17 when she notes, "I feel like I actually, I could write back then". The defiant student subject position is also clear in Lines 26 to 30: She notes that, if, during her master's studies, she had been told that she could not write she would have dismissed it as the other person's opinion. Her defiance is further evident in her statement that she would decide whether she would take this person's advice or not. In other words, she would not simply accept the (hypothetical) lecturer's advice but decide for herself whether to take the advice or not. Besides demonstrating a defiant position, Julie's text also suggested the presence of another subject position: In Lines 17 to 18 she remarks that "I was in honour's, I didn't wanna question anybody, so I just took it as is". This position is representative of a student who, rather than question (or defy) her lecturers, accepted the status quo by not questioning

anybody. Such a position thus reflects an accepting student, and stands in contrast to her self-positioning as a defiant student.

Julie's text evidenced oscillations between these contrary subject positions. In this extract, for example, in Line 4, she demonstrates the uptake of the accepting student in her utterance, "so I was really put off research": This utterance suggests an acceptance of her supervisor's sentiments that she could not write. In the latter part of her first turn she demonstrates the defiant student position by noting that she applied for a research master's degree despite what her supervisor had said. In Lines 17 to 18 she also initially demonstrates the defiant student subject position ("I feel like I actually, I could write back then"). In her statement, "I was in honours, I didn't wanna question anybody, so I just took it as it is", she demonstrates the uptake of the accepting student position. She then reorients to the defiant position, noting that "now I think my writing is still good" (Line 18) and that she has "stopped caring a lot what people would say about things like that" (Lines 21 – 22).

Julie's discourse suggests that the contrary positions of the defiant student and the accepting student evident in her text presented her with a dilemma: On the one hand, constructing the identity of a student who defied her lecturer implies a disinclination to accept the lecturer's sentiments. This is illustrated in her utterance that she "didn't want to be bogged down" (Line 6) by what her supervisor had said. Being bogged down implies that accepting her supervisor's sentiments, that is, that she could not write, was problematic for her. However, in Lines 21 to 22 she notes that she stopped caring what people say because everybody says she writes well enough. In other words, even though she maintains that she did not care what people thought (which reflects the defiant student position), her discourse suggests that she based her opinion about here writing competency on the fact that "everybody says [she] write[s] well enough" (which reflects the accepting student position).

In order to resolve the dilemma associated with these conflicting subject positions, the 'face' that Julie worked was that of the capable student. In her final turn she notes that it is not her opinion that she could not write. By noting that she would decide whether or not to accept the advice of the hypothetical lecturer, she constructs the identity of a student who is capable of assessing both her own work as well as the advice offered by a lecturer. By 'performing' the face of the capable student she is justified both in her defiance as well as her acceptance, and thus, is able to integrate these opposing subject positions.

2. The Competence Repertoire

Whereas the behavioural repertoire illuminated the different behaviours participants engaged in as students, a competence repertoire was used to refer to matters pertaining to their proficiency in executing academic tasks. The competence repertoire revealed how participants positioned their identities with respect to academic/disciplinary competence. In specific, participants used this repertoire to construct their identities in terms of the expert-novice dichotomy. Vincent, Michael and Denise's texts evidenced the uptake of both the expert and novice subject positions. Harry's discourse showed only the uptake of the novice position whereas Julie's text indicated a self-positioning as an expert.

Extract 6: (Vincent)

1	I:	And would you say you learnt more or less that way [through practical experience] than
2		you did grafting [studying] from the book?
3	S:	I think more, you learn more that way, in the sense that when you actually have to do the
4		thematic analysis, or apply it, it's almost, that's the thing you focus on, that takes all your
5		cognitive resources and the, the facts almost come secondary.
6	I:	Secondary?
7	S:	Or almost automatic in that way, you know, that's not what you're trying to remember,
8		you're not trying to remember the facts, you're trying to apply this so the facts almost
9		come automatically, 'cause you have learnt it, you have read it, erm so sort of focussing
10		on the more abstract part of it makes the other part seem more automatic, or more easier

| 11 | | to remember, and then obviously doing something yourself makes it a lot easier to |
| 12 | | remember than just reading about it. |

| 13 | I: | What was the role that your lecturers at postgraduate assumed? Sum up for me what were |
| 14 | | the different roles that different lecturers assumed. |

15	S:	For my supervisor for example, erm, she I'm not sure, I think the first time I submitted
16		my first draft she probably thought I had absolutely no idea of what I was talking about,
17		no clue what so ever, I think that's the impression I gave her, and I think from there on-

| 18 | I: | Ok, why do you say that? |

| 19 | S: | I'm not sure, erm, the, let's say, the feedback that I got, it wasn't, wasn't, I don't wanna- |

| 20 | I: | I don't know who your supervisor is so you can talk. |

21	S:	Erm, it wasn't helping, it was almost, challenging is the best word I can think of , erm,
22		she, she was very easy to, to point out where I was wrong, or what she didn't understand,
23		which forced me to, to go and read more on the topic to better explain myself so that she
24		could understand me, erm I think that was the biggest problem, most of the time I didn't
25		have the knowledge to properly convey my message, I think, so what I did right on there,
26		I think a, a lot of time, was either misinterpret it or she just thought 'no', just completely
27		wrong, erm, and then the feedback I got sort of forced me to go back, you know, read
28		what she suggested, you know, re-read this chapter to better understand it for myself so
29		that I can better give her that message.

In the first half of the extract Vincent demonstrates the uptake of an expert position. In his first two turns he notes that the application of theoretical knowledge in a practical context is more conducive to learning than simply studying the theory from a textbook. The application of knowledge requires a more advanced set of skills than trying to memorise theory and facts from a book (Line 12). This is representative of a competent student who is able to focus on the "abstract" (Line 10) whilst "the facts almost come secondary" (Line 5). In other words, the focus is not on "trying to remember the facts" (Line 8). Rather, he notes, when engaging in the application of theoretical knowledge, the facts almost come "automatically" (Line 7). He therefore constructs the identity of an expert student who is able to apply knowledge rather than simply learn theory by heart. As is evident from this extract, Vincent also demonstrates a subject position that is not quite as proficient as the one

suggested by his first two turns: He notes that, upon submitting the first draft of his research proposal to his supervisor, she "probably thought [he] had absolutely no idea of what [he] was talking about" (Line 16). He adds that "most of the time I didn't have the knowledge to properly convey my message" (Lines 24 – 25). As such, the lecturer is constructed as the expert. In contrast, his own subject position is demonstrative of a novice position and contrasts with the formulation of his identity as an expert in his first two turns.

Vincent's discourse suggests the presence of a dilemma with regards to the conflicting positions of expert and novice: In this extract, for example, in describing the difficulties he experienced with his proposal he oscillates between locating the problem as a function of himself and as a function of his supervisor. In Line 16 he locates the problem with his supervisor in his statement that "she probably thought I had no idea what I was talking about". In Line 22, he notes that his supervisor was quick to "point out where [he] was wrong or what she didn't understand". The first part of this utterance locates the problem with him (where he was wrong) whereas the second part locates the problem as a function of the supervisor (who didn't understand the message he was trying to convey). A similar pattern is evident in Line 23 when he notes that his supervisor forced him to "read more on the topic to better explain [himself] so that she could understand [him]". In this utterance, he initially locates the problem with himself, that is, the problem is constructed as a function of him not being able to clearly communicate his ideas. In the latter half of the utterance the problem is constructed as a function of his supervisor not being able to understand the message he was trying to convey. He owns the problem again in Lines 24 to 25, noting that "most of the time I didn't have the knowledge to properly convey my message, I think" (although 'most of the time' and 'I think' serve to hedge his construction of his lack of knowledge and, thus, demonstrates a reluctance to constructing his identity as novice). His to and fro oscillations

between owning the problem himself and locating it with his supervisor suggest the presence of an ideological dilemma with regards to the uptake of the positions of expert and novice.

In order to resolve the conflicts associated with the disparate positions of expert and novice, the face-work that is demonstrated in Vincent's discourse is targeted at framing the problems he encountered in the learning process not as a function of his own novice-ness but rather as arising from some other factor unrelated to academic competence or expertise (or lack thereof). In this extract, Vincent frames the problem as a function of poor communication: In Lines 24 – 25 he notes that he didn't have the knowledge "to properly convey [his] message". In Line 29, he also notes how he needed to better convey his message. This frames the problem as a function of poor communication and not as a lack of competence with regards to subject knowledge. In locating the problem as a function of poor communication he might be perceived as a poor communicator but not necessarily a novice student. [(Similarly, in Extract 1, the reason he offers for his class attendance is not incompetence or lack of expertise. Instead, he cites the reason for his class attendance as minimising the time needed to spend preparing for tests or exams and because "it gets complicated…[when] you have to figure it out for yourself" (Lines 14 – 15).]

The competence repertoire also enabled Michael to construct his identity in terms of the expert-novice frame:

Extract 7: (Michael)

1	S:	Getting to masters level, that was totally different from both the undergrad and honours,
2		ya […] at this master's level, they did not necessarily stipulate exactly what they
3		expected, erm they gave us a few pointers, for instance, ya your proposal has to be
4		finished by the end of the year, but the role was very, we could shape our own roles
5		throughout the whole year, or that's how I experienced it, I could, I could actually create
6		my own role within the MA program, whereas the other, undergrad and honours level,
7		they created, they told you what role you were going to play […] [At master's level] I
8		was given the opportunity to go into whatever direction I wanted to go in and the great
9		thing about this is that the guidance was always there, I was given the freedom but
10		whenever I doubted my own beliefs, or whereto from here, then my supervisor would be

11	there for me, I could go into my own direction, as soon as I'm stuck like I just put up my
12	hand and my supervisor would be there to take my hand and actually guide me from
13	there, and in that guiding process they didn't guide it into their own direction necessarily
14	but they gave me the freedom to actually take it, or give me the, they would rather show
15	me the different possibilities and let me decide which possible, or which one I would
16	choose rather than, erm, giving me one answer and me following that, yes.

Michael notes that at undergraduate and honour's level students had to follow the prescriptions of their lecturers, whereas, as master's students, they could "create" (Line 5) and manage their own roles as students. While the lecturers prescribed what and how students had to learn at undergraduate level, at postgraduate level they only provided students with "a few pointers" (Line 3) regarding how to approach their studies. In other words, he constructs the expert master's student as one who takes charge of his/her own studies. He positions himself as an expert student who could shape his own role as a student. However, his text also evidences the presence of a novice subject position: He notes that, whenever he had a problem all he needed to do was put up his hand and his supervisor would "take [his] hand and actually guide [him] from there" (Line 12). This serves to construct his identity as a novice whilst his supervisor is positioned as the expert who can guide him whenever he doubted his own beliefs. This contrasts with his self-positioning as the expert master's student who was able to navigate his studies without being told what to do.

In Lines 13 to 16 Michael differentiates between being prescribed what to do (as he indicates was the case at undergraduate level) and being guided by his supervisor when he needed help at postgraduate level. In doing so, he deconstructs the position of 'expert' and 'novice': He notes that at postgraduate level being guided did not involve having to do precisely as he was told. This would position him as a novice. Rather, he relates that his supervisor would "show [him] the different possibilities" and let him decide which course of action to follow (Lines 15 – 16). Making the distinction between having to unquestioningly follow prescriptions and being able to choose amongst different possibilities positions him in

(more of) an expert than a novice position. Making this distinction suggests a disinclination to constructing his identity as a master's student who needed the prescriptions of his lecturers to navigate his studies. At the same time, his dependence on his supervisor to take his hand and guide him suggests a reluctance to inhabiting the positon of expert: His discourse thus suggests that whether to inhabit the position of the expert, who is able to direct and manage his own learning or the position of novice, who relies on the lecturer to guide students is dilemmatic for the speaker.

He addresses the dilemma through his deconstruction of the position of expert and novice. In other words, his deconstruction serves as the face-work in order to integrate the disparate positions of expert and novice: He positions himself as more expert than novice by virtue of the fact that he did not follow the prescriptions of his supervisor but rather actively chose between possibilities and, thus, "created" his own role as a student. This serves to construct him as an agent who could choose between possibilities rather than as a novice student without agency who simply followed the prescriptions of his lecturers. In doing so, he could assimilate the novice position (as a student who was guided by his supervisor) with the expert position (the ability to direct and manage his own learning).

The competence repertoire also allowed Denise to construct her identity in terms of the subject positions of expert and novice. Consider the following extract:

Extract 8: (Denise)

1	I:	So are you saying [the master's degree lecturers] played a facilitative role?
2	S:	Yes, they did, also a very active role in the sense that they were mostly the ones who
3		guided the workshops, or whether them or external people who came in, that was more of
4		an active role for me because they actually showed us step by step, ok this is what you
5		need to do, it wasn't just facilitating your process, it was sort of taking you by the hand
6		and leading you, for the workshops but for the rest of the time, it was a facilitative role,
7		yes, and I also found, erm sort of like, [lecturer's name]'s proposal development project,
8		that sort of helped us even though we hated it [laughs] cause it sort of forced us to figure

9		things out, while he didn't play a very supportive role in the sense that you couldn't just
10		say [lecturer's name], we're stuck, help us, the fact that in that sense we also had to
11		figure it out for ourselves, ok, this is what he expects of us, we need to do this, we need
12		to sit down and figure it out for ourselves, that also activated the other side of learning,
13		which is self-learning, not just being guided but also having to think for yourself, so in a
14		sense, this year was very dynamic, there was a lot of different types of leaning going on.
15	I:	And if there is an answer to this, what would you say was more effective in terms of your
16		learning, sort of being guided saying, step A B or C or in terms of the way [the proposal
17		development lecturer] approached something, where you had to, how did you say, self-
18		solve the problem?
19	S:	To be honest, I've enjoyed the workshops, the practical side and all which does involve
20		being guided, the first, the first implementation of it, but in the long term I do think self-
21		learning is a more helpful tool to have because when it came to the placements , when it
22		comes to my job next year, I'm not gonna have someone saying let's do a workshop, I
23		don't know how to write a report for the client, they're not gonna do that, you're going to
24		be expected to self-learn, and so I think you need both, but if I had to choose one I would
25		actually say, even though I enjoy it less, self-learning, for me, is very crucial.

In Line 2 Denise explicitly positions her lecturers as having played an "active role" in her studies. She notes that the role they assumed was not "just facilitating your process" (Line 5); rather, it involved "taking you by the hand and leading you". In other words, lecturers would show students "step by step what you needed to do" (Lines 4 – 5). Attributing this role to the lecturers positions them as the experts and her own identity as a novice student in need of "guidance" (Line 13) and "support" (Line 9). Denise's account also demonstrated an expert self-positioning: In her account of the proposal development class she relates that, as master's students, they had to "self-learn" (Line 13) and "figure things out" (Lines 8 – 9) on their own without guidance from the lecturer. This constructs the position of the expert student. In her final turn, she notes that self-learning is a "more helpful tool to have" (Line 21) than being guided. She draws on the notion that, in the workplace, one is expected to self-learn. By indicating that "self- learning, for [her], is very crucial" (Line 25) she takes up the expert position as a self-learning student.

As with Vincent and Michael, Denise's text suggests the presence of a dilemma with regards to the uptake of the positions of expert and novice. In Line 8 she notes that the students "hated" the proposal development class because "it forced [students] to figure things out" without the help of the lecturer. Her use of the words 'hated' and 'forced' indicate a resistance to taking up the role of expert self-learner. Similarly, inhabiting the role of novice also seems to be problematic: She initially notes that the role her lecturers played at master's level was a "facilitative" one (Line 1). In Line 5 she maintains that this role was not only facilitative in nature but that it involved guiding students step by step. She hedges this notion in Line 6, stating that it was only in the presentation of workshops that lecturers would guide students step by step and that "for the rest of the time it was a facilitative role" that they had played (Line 6). In the latter half of the extract her account focuses on relating that master's study was not about "just being guided but also having to think for yourself" (Line 13). In other words, after initially positioning the lecturers as the experts in the learning process her account works to limit the frequency with which lecturers guided students step by step and to amplify the expertise she displayed at postgraduate level. This suggests that inhabiting the position of a novice student, who is dependent upon the guidance of her lecturers, is also dilemmatic for her.

Denise did not demonstrate a move towards resolving the disparate positions of expert and novice. Rather, she maintained both positions, thus providing a clear display of the complex dynamic between them. Even when urged (by the interviewer's question in Lines 15 - 18) to resolve the positions (by indicating which method of learning is more effective) she insists on maintaining them both (Lines 19 – 25). Although she indicated that self-learning is a "more helpful tool" and is "very crucial" for her, she did not annul her novice positioning. Rather, she ordered the positions of novice and expert along a temporal path leading from her

training context to a work context, which allowed her to manage the emotional impact of the

expert position (from a position that is "hated" to a role that is "enjoyed less").

As shown above, the competence repertoire enabled Vincent, Michael and Denise to

construct their identities in terms of both novice and expert subject positions. Harry's

discourse, however, did not demonstrate a punctuation of his identity as an expert. The

following conversation concerns the development of the proposal for the research study

Harry planned to conduct for his master's degree.

Extract 9: (Harry)

1	S:	[…] I was just lucky enough to read that one article, just to take it from a qualitative to a
2		quantitative study [laughs] and then I see ok, now this is a lot more possible, these guys
3		have already done this study, there's no problem in, in focussing on something that they
4		kind of brushed over, let me focus on that and then it all came together, and to do the
5		proposal was actually quite easy because I was really just adding on to a study that's
6		already been done, erm, but you know, then obviously I didn't have much knowledge
7		about quantitative stuff and stats and all that so you know, that's when you, I started
8		doubting this, I'm like this dyadic data analysis stuff man, I don't know [laughs] and
9		you're reading these articles and some professor has been writing about this for the past
10		30 years, you know, you check the references, you read the stuff you know, like agg, I
11		don't know who am I gonna speak to, to help me […] but then like, I'd approached one
12		of the authors and told them you know how did you do this and they, they just kind of
13		just referred me to a book […] and I got hold of the book and it was explained very, not
14		easily, but after reading the book three times, [laughs] I kind of started understanding a
15		bit of it, and you know then you then I felt really confident that this is something that I
16		can do.

As is evident from this extract, Harry discourse did not indicate the explicit uptake of

an expert subject position. Rather, his discourse evidences the presence of a novice self-

positioning. In Line 1, for example, he notes that he was "just lucky enough" to have read an

article about a study similar to his own research. It is by virtue of having read the article that

"it [the proposal] all came together… [and] was actually quite easy" (Lines 4 - 5). He does

not construct himself as an expert who, by virtue of his skills and expertise, was able to

develop his own proposal. His novice position is demonstrated in Line 6, for example, when

he notes that he "didn't have much knowledge about quantitative stuff and stats". In making the comparison between himself and "some professor [who] has been writing about this stuff for the past 30 years" (Lines 9 – 10) he implicitly positions his identity as novice, and that of the professor's as expert (by virtue of the fact that the professor has 30 years of experience and he does not).

Even though his text does not evidence the uptake of an expert subject position, Harry's discourse does indicate moments of awareness of the expert discourse: Rather than demonstrating a self-positioning as an expert, his text provides a description of the process of developing from novice to expert, a process which he constructs as resulting from hard work. For example, in Lines 13 to 16, he notes that he had to read the book he was referred to three times before understanding it and that after reading the book he began to feel "really confident that this is something that [he] can do". This utterance suggests an awareness on his part of what constitutes expert behaviour (i.e. being confident in his ability to execute his study) without indicating the uptake of the expert subject position.

Considering that Harry's discourse only evidenced the uptake of a novice position (and no expert position) no dilemma was present with regards to these disparate positions. However, as becomes clear in the following extract, he did engage in face-work with respect to his novice position. The conversation in the following extract centres on his experience of his honour's studies:

Extract 10: (Harry)

1	S:	Like the only complaints that I really have about honours, is, ok, first of all, like you
2		work on these assignments and then you know it's like a 30 page assignment that you put
3		together and then it only really counts ten percent of the year and then you go write the
4		exam and because on that day you were just a little bit tired or because at that point in
5		your life you were so stressed out that you couldn't learn that you get 50 percent for the
6		exam, then you get 52 percent for the year, so that's the disheartening thing is, is you
7		know you should have done better but just at that point in your life erm, a pass was
8		actually a good mark you know, so you know that you know the work but the mark

9	doesn't reflect that and especially when you like apply for masters and stuff when people
10	see oh there's a 50 something, there's a 60, they'll think oh, you know, they'll make
11	assumptions about that but you know for yourself that you know a lot more than that, if I
12	can just sit with someone and talk about it and I'd always say well if I just sat down with
13	the lecturers they would see that I actually know about this stuff instead of having to
14	actually to write about it

As is demonstrated in this extract, Harry engages in face-work to counter being positioned as a novice by the university: He notes that obtaining a mark of 50 or 60 percent for a subject could disadvantage a student, especially when it comes to applying for entry to a master's program (Line 9). He maintains that such a mark might not be a true reflection of what a student knows or is capable of but could be the result of the student being "a little bit tired" when writing the exam (Line 4) or being "so stressed out that you couldn't learn" (Line 5). In other words, when relating that he was confronted by the fact that he was a novice student, that is, a student who does not meet the academic requirements for entry to a master's program, he engaged in face-work to address being positioned as such. Rather than ascribing obtaining sub-standard marks to being a novice, he attributes his poor performance to being tired or stressed. He notes that, under such circumstances "a pass was actually a good mark" (Lines 7 – 8). The face-work is evident in his attempt at constructing a pass as a good mark. (In Lines 12 to 14 he actually makes explicit the notion of face-work in his description of wanting to "[sit] down with the lecturers [so that] they would see I actually know about this stuff".) In other words, when confronted with the possibility of being positioned as novice by the university he engaged in face-work to mitigate his novice-ness. Unlike the other participants, however, his face-work in the competence repertoire was not designed to integrate the oppositional positions of expert and novice.

As was the case with Harry, Julie's discourse did not evidence a self-positioning as both expert and novice student. In contrast to Harry's discourse, however, Julie's employ of the competence repertoire was aimed at constructing her identity as an expert (rather than as

novice). From her last two turns in Extract 5 it is evident that Julie takes up the position as an expert in relation to the academic competency of writing: She makes explicit the notion that she "could write back then [during her honour's year in which her supervisor had criticised her writing competency]" (Line 17). She further noted that, at the time of the interview, she was still of the opinion that her writing was good (Line 18), a sentiment she repeats again in Lines 28 to 29. Her account thus demonstrates the uptake of the expert (student) subject position.

Even though her text did not indicate the presence of a novice self- positioning, there was face-work evident with regards to her uptake of the expert position: Throughout her interview Julie's discourse demonstrated a disinclination to positioning herself as novice. In Extract 5, for example, she explicitly positions herself as expert, noting that she is not of the opinion that she cannot write and that "everybody says [she] writes well enough" (Line 22). She notes that even if her master's supervisor (hypothetically) told her that she could not write, she would consider this as mere opinion. In other words, she negates the lecturer's sentiments to opinion rather than fact. Her face-work therefore aimed to invalidate the expertise of the lecturer and, by implication, endorse her self-positioning as an expert.

3. The Power Repertoire

The third repertoire evident in participants' accounts was used to frame their learning journeys in terms of the power dynamics that operate in academic discourse. The dynamics of this repertoire are complex as it entailed two discourses, one which was brought to bear upon the other. It involved the employ of a political discourse and an economic discourse. Drawing on a political discourse enabled participants to construct two positions, a subordinate position and a dominant position. (The discourse is defined as political in that it refers to the politics that construct the institution of academia as dominant and the student as subordinate.) Traditionally, the student occupies the subordinate position and the institution

the dominant position. This makes it difficult for the student to vie for the dominant position. In reality, students cannot control the institution because this would require an entire redefinition of the notions of student, institution and education. They can, at best, gain power by undermining the dominant discourse. The analysis indicated that participants undermined the dominant discourse by bringing an economic discourse to bear upon the political discourse. Drawing on an economic discourse allowed participants to position themselves as consumers of education. Doing so afforded them the opportunity to challenge and undermine the power of the academic institution and lecturers by positioning universities as service providers and themselves as clients. This manoeuvring is not surprising given the global context of universities in an information age in which information has become a commodity. Note that in the case of the power repertoire (unlike in the other repertoires) participants did not oscillate between opposing subject positions. This is because, as students, they cannot actually occupy a position of being in control (versus their subordinate position). However, the students' 'manoeuvring' (by employing a consumerist discourse) nevertheless constituted a form of face work. By positioning themselves as consumers they resolved the underlying conflict between being in a subordinate position versus being in control. Consider the following extracts:

Extract 11: (Michael)

1	I:	If you reflect back on this journey that you've been on, what would you say was your
2		role as a student, both at undergrad and postgrad?
3	S:	It's quite different with the undergrad, the honours and the masters, so far, my roles that
4		differ from each course, I'd say starting off at my undergrad, it was expected from you to
5		be at class, to deliver whatever they demanded, and erm, it was something totally
6		different, initially we were asked to, I think it was in my first year, we asked the
7		professor, so what do, in exams, do we put down on paper? and they said, listen, later on
8		in your life you will be expected or you will be able to express or give your own
9		expressions of whatever you were taught, but at this stage, at undergrad level up until my
10		fourth year with [name of degree], right through, textbooks, that's it.

11   I: And this was actually communicated to you?

12   S: Ya no no that was clearly communicated to us, and they said, you know, getting to a
13   master's level then you will be able to give your own opinion on certain stuff but at first
14   stick to the basics, the theory, we're gonna test you on the theory, that's what, ya, that's
15   your role as a student at undergrad level.

In this extract, Michael sketches a rather bleak picture of his undergraduate studies. He notes that, as undergraduate students, they were explicitly told that they were not allowed to give their own "expressions" (Line 9) or "opinion[s]" (Line 13) concerning subject content. He relates that a professor had indicated that, until they reached master's level, students were expected to stick to the basics by learning theory from textbooks. He also maintains that students had to deliver whatever the lecturers "demanded" (Line 5), thus positioning the lecturers as inappropriately oppressive. His account therefore vilifies the lecturers and the university who are constructed as authoritarian, coercive and prescriptive. This positions him as a subordinate with little or no voice in his studies. As such, he constructs a position devoid of agency and, thus, one that is powerless in the face academic discourse.

The uptake of the consumer subject position is evident in the way Michael talks about his training in statistics in the following extract:

Extract 12: Michael

1   S: I was under the impression that we would get here and they would train us to be
2   professionals or not professionals but at least would be able to do stats after leaving,
3   so we were given a couple, we attended a couple of workshops with stats, and it was
4   practical workshops, theoretical workshops, great experience, but I soon realised
5   that you, this stats can't be taught within one or two days or a couple of workshops,
6   it's something that I would have to take into my own hands, where I would for instance
7   erm, ok, erm I got this one textbook from the internet, it's basically like a SPSS's guide
8   for dummies, and I'm in the process of working though the book myself, taking it step
9   for step, they, they've supplied us, the, university supplied us with the workshops
10   giving us the basics but now I actually have to take that and do with it whatever I would
11   like to do, do I want to gain knowledge in stats, but I'll have to do that on my own or by

12	asking people, they are freely available in the halls, or by doing stuff like taking SPSS's
13	Guide for Dummies and working through it, ya, and it's not always easy, I haven't gone
14	through the whole textbook for instance, but I am in the process, ya so it's a, but they, the
15	lecturers communicated it to us throughout the year and they communicated it to us quite
16	clearly that they will not be able within a year's time to train us or, in everything, they
17	will only be able to supply us with the basics, so erm I think if they did not communicate
18	that to us at the beginning of the year I might, this might have been a bigger shock, ya,
19	but they communicated it clearly […]

The first thing to note in this extract is the way Michael speaks about learning. Learning is constructed as if it is something that the lecturer or the university can 'give to' the student; as if it is a linear, unidirectional exchange that occurs between a provider (of knowledge) and a consumer (of knowledge). This is clear in his formulation of how the lecturers "supplied" students with the basics (Lines 9 & 17) and how "the university supplied us with the workshops giving us the basics" (Lines 9 -10). Learning is therefore constructed as if it were a commodity or something that can be given and, hence, received or "gained" (Line 11). Furthermore, expressing "shock" (Line 18) at the fact that students would only be "given" the basics (Line 10) and would not be "trained to be professionals" (Line 2), constructs the training offered by the university as not having met his expectations. This shock is directed at the 'service' offered by the university and thus, suggests the employ of a consumerist discourse. (Although Michael does not make explicit mention of a value-for-money theme, being dissatisfied with his training at university – which is paid for – implies dissatisfaction with what he received in return for what he paid.)

Taking up the consumer subject position enabled Michael to position himself as sufficiently entitled to evaluate and question the students' training in statistics. The speaker's uses the word "shock" to describe his reaction upon realising that the students would only be trained in the basics of statistics. Being shocked, especially by something like the training offered at a university, is unlikely to imply a positive surprise. Expressing shock therefore acts as quite a strong criticism of the lecturers, the university and their training as students.

Criticising the university's inadequate training implies he has the right to be critical about this. Enjoying and exercising such a right reflects a consumerist discourse of 'value-for-money' which advocates the right to criticise a product or service that does not meet your expectations - especially if the product or service is paid for. The implication is that the lecturers (and the university) are positioned as service providers, obliged to supply a specified and particular education to the rightful, paying recipient, the student-consumer.

As shown in the two extracts above, Michael's discourse is demonstrative of both the subordinate and consumer subject positions respectively. As subordinate, he positions himself with no power to influence what or how he studied. As a consumer, however, he could exercise agency and autonomy in the learning process (in that he could direct his own learning with regards to statistics). As a consumer he undermined academic discourse: He did not have to be satisfied with being trained only in the basics of statistics; he shopped around on the internet and purchased a statistics guide so that he could direct his own training in statistics. He therefore brings the economic discourse to bear upon the political discourse by exercising an agency which is enabled by his status as consumer. This served to undermine the dominance of the lecturers and the university and challenge his position as subordinate in the student-institution interaction.

Julie's text also evidenced the presence of the subordinate and consumer subject positions. The conversation in the following extract concerns how she would interact with her students if she had been a lecturer:

Extract 13: (Julie)

1	S:	No, I think every university has their pros and their cons, their goods and their bad,
2		[…] thinking about students and really getting to know students you work with is very
3		important so, is this student very structured, is this student spontaneous, you know, I can
4		let her be free a little bit, getting to know your, getting to know my students would be
5		very important, and because I am in a way giving them a service, I think that would be
6		important to me as a superior, yeah, in any, in any degree, to my undergraduates, to

7   postgraduates, I really don't like the fact that they treat undergraduates so badly [laughs],
8   yeah.

9   I: Ok how do they treat them badly?

10   S: Well, when I was sitting in a third year class I think, erm, our lecturer literally told us,
11   don't come to me, don't talk to me, don't ask me questions until you get to postgraduate,
12   then I will take you seriously, so it was, erm, needless to say half the class failed, erm
13   because of that, but, yeah, I think, students need guidance in a way, and you, you also
14   can't always say when you let the reigns go and when you let them fly, but that's
15   something that you have to work out, as a, as a individual who has taken on an academic
16   position, you're working with students and you were a student once, so, ya.

In this extract, Julie describes how "badly" (Line 7) they were treated as

undergraduate students. She relates an incident in which a lecturer had told the students not to

ask questions and that he would only take them seriously once they reach postgraduate level

(Lines 9 – 11). Her sentiments about allowing students to be "free a little bit" (Line 4) and

knowing when to "let the reins go and when you let them fly" (Line 14) constructs her

lecturers as having limited and restricted her freedom as a student. As was the case with

Michael's account in Extract 11, Julie's account serves to position her as a subordinate

subject to a restricting learning process. (Drawing on this dominant political educational

discourse, Julie also constructs the subordinate subject position in Extract 5 in her account of

how her supervisor had told her that she could not write.)

The consumer subject position is demonstrated in Julie's first turn when she makes

explicit the consumerist discourse in her utterance, "I am in a way, giving them a service"

(Line 4). Even though there is no explicit mention of a financial transaction, her utterance

implies dissatisfaction with the "service" she received from her lecturers. Her sentiments

about getting to know one's students in order to provide them with appropriate instruction

also construct education as if it should be tailored to each student's individual needs and

personalities. The consumer discourse is also evident in her utterance, "I think every

university has their pros and cons" (Line 1). First, it indicates that universities are constructed

similarly to corporate organisations which are compared with each other and evaluated in terms of what (products and services) they can and cannot offer. Second, it also highlights that students today have the luxury of picking and choosing between tertiary education institutions like consumers shopping at a supermarket. This, by implication, means universities have to compete with each other for patrons just as merchants have to compete for customers, a fact Julie demonstrates in the following extract:

Extract 14: (Julie)

```
1   S:   […] I like working, I never really was against working hard or anything like that […]
2        if anything I'm a little frustrated where I am, dissertation-wise, so if I had, I think if I
3        had, I got a second chance, I would have probably considered going to a different
4        university that completed things in a year, because that's how I am, I like finishing
5        things, on time, good time periods, using time well, basically, and there were times in
6        this year where, I wasn't busy, and you know I don't think that's where I should've been,
7        I sh-, think I should have been working hard all the time, yeah, so.
```

Julie's uptake of the consumer subject position is evident in the way she notes that, had she known that she would not finish her dissertation in one year, she "would have probably considered going to a different university that completed things in a year" (Lines 3 – 4). With the commercialisation of education, the scenario in which Julie could have chosen a different institution at which to study is a very real possibility and one that all universities today have to contend with. By positioning herself as a consumer she is able to evaluate and criticise her university training (and her dissertation supervisor), thus undermining and challenging the dominance of academic discourse.

Denise's uptake of the subordinate position is demonstrated in the following extract:

Extract 15: (Denise)

```
1   I:   If you think of your working relationships that you had with you lecturers this past year,
2        erm, what would you say, if anything, in that process facilitated you learning?
```

3   S: Well, for me, an informal atmosphere and an informal relationship works a lot better than
4   a formal relationship, obviously you always need boundaries, you can't treat them like
5   your buddy, but the atmosphere here is very relaxed, and you can go and call them by
6   their first names, you can chat with them and joke with them, and that, for me, was a
7   great way to relax and to not feel like I'm a student imposing on their time but more like,
8   not an equal, but sort of like a mentor-mentee relationship more than a strict relationship,
9   just having, sort of, someone come in and say, you have to be here and if you're five
10   minutes late, you're in trouble, and sort of treating you like children, that for me is very
11   much, like, ok, whatever, I'm not a child […] that doesn't work for me in terms of
12   opening up […] so yes, I think it's crucial to have that openness and to not have some
13   closed-off, strict relationship.

Denise relates that, for her, "an informal relationship…works a lot better than a formal relationship" (Lines 3 – 4). She notes that a "mentor-mentee relationship" (Line 8) [rather than a formal lecturer-student relationship (Lines 8 -9)] is "a great way to relax and to not feel like I'm a student imposing on their time" (Line 7). These sentiments construct the formal lecturer-student relationship as undesirable in comparison to the mentor-mentee relationship. In specific, she maintains that a formal lecturer-student relationship is "closed off" and "strict" (Line 13). Moreover, students are treated "like children" (Line 10) and as such are not "equal" (Line 8) to the lecturers. These sentiments construct the subordinate subject position.

Although Denise does not make explicit mention of 'service delivery' as was the case with Michael and Julie, as is shown in the following extract, her text also evidenced the presence of the consumer subject position:

Extract 16: (Denise)

1   I: How did you come to study psychology?

2   S: […] I had never been exposed to it before, at a first year level, even then I found it quite
3   fascinating, 'cause it's a little bit technical, it's a little bit creative, sort of encompasses a
4   lot of different types of learning, so, yeah, I really enjoyed psychology so I decided to
5   major in that, also in communications, so I kept the media, journalism side open, but I
6   also followed what I enjoyed which was psychology, and then second, third year, just
7   carried on studying, enjoyed it even more, found communications when it came to

8   studying and the exams I found them terrible, essays yuk, boring, and obviously I didn't

9   love studying psychology, cause no one loves studying [laughs] […]

10 I: What expectations did you have of being a student, when you first started studying and

11   how have those expectations changed or evolved, if they have, through the course of

12   your study journey?

13 S: […] At postgrad you also start thinking about how you're gonna apply this to the

14   working world, it's not just like, well, I've got three more years, its fine, you know, it's

15   sort of like, well next year I've gotta get a job, what am I doing, so it became a lot more

16   focussed and directional for me when it came to postgrad, because you'd have to start

17   thinking, ok, I'm not just doing a general BA now, what am I going to do with my life,

18   and it becomes a lot more, when you start studying you start thinking about how this is

19   going to work for the, like, for the rest of your life, am I interested in this topic, am I

20   gonna be able to do this for the rest of my life, so that, for me, became a much more key

21   thought in my mind […]

In her first turn, Denise relates that she "really enjoyed" (Line 4) studying psychology because it was "fascinating" (Line 3). Her description constructs psychology as stimulating and interesting. Moreover, she notes that because she enjoyed psychology she decided to major in it. In other words, it was the enjoyment of the subject which motivated her to major in psychology. Learning is thus constructed with the instrumental aim of enjoyment as its driving factor. Such instrumentality suggests the presence of a consumerist discourse (Williams, 2013). This instrumental character is also evident in her second turn when she notes that, at postgraduate level, studying "became a lot more focussed and directional" (Line 7). In specific, higher education became a vehicle for Denise to explore and find a vocation that she would "be able to do for the rest of [her] life" (Line 11). Studying is therefore not constructed with the primary aim of intellectual development but is rather geared towards an extra-curricular outcome (vocational satisfaction). This suggests that, for her, higher education was directed more at non-educational objectives and less at the scholarly endeavour. Such a consumerist orientation stands to challenge the status quo of higher education and undermine the traditional outcomes of teaching and learning.

The subordinate and consumer subject positions were also evident in Vincent's text. However, unlike Michael and Julie and Denise, Vincent did not construct the subordinate subject position as one which restricted his freedom as a student:

Extract 17: (Vincent)

1 2	I:	Would you say there was more of, a deeper level of engagement with content, with resources, or whatever, at master's level than undergrad?
3 4 5	S:	It was, at undergrad it was very superficial, they, well compared to now, superficial in the sense that they asked a question, you gave an answer, erm, you know, that's it, you're either right of you're wrong.
6	I:	Did you feel any control in that process?
7 8 9 10	S:	None at all, no, none at all, I was prescribed what I was supposed to study, erm, I knew that there were certain things the lecturers like to focus on, or that was more important, the more accurate I can give back the information the better marks I got, so that was my goal, erm, to basically convey it back, exactly what's in the textbook.

In this extract Vincent maintains that, at undergraduate level, there was not much room for manoeuvring when it came to subject content: He describes the process as "superficial" (Line 3) in that the lecturers asked the questions and students gave the answers. Moreover, he notes, "that's it, you're either right or wrong" (Lines 4 – 5). In other words, students had little choice but to accept the status quo. He relates that he did not feel any control in this process and that the goal became one of re-conveying "exactly what's in the textbook" (Line 10) in the test or exam. This suggests an awareness on his part that his status quo as a student did not afford him much power in the learning process. However, as is shown in the following extract, he did not construct this condition as having impinged on his freedom.

Extract 18: (Vincent)

1	I:	And what makes a good lecturer?

2   S: […] The ideal lecturer, erm, I would say it's someone that had to be, erm, someone that
3   was able to give clear instructions of what they want, erm give background information
4   of, erm what they want, how they want it, basically, erm, just to add another level and
5   then erm, to give it some context, some instructions on why they want it that way and not
6   any other way, basically, erm I think having those sort of level of instructions would
7   probably facilitate the best learning, factual and contextual, so a lecturer who would be
8   able to give instructions in that way, I think, would benefit my learning […]

9   I: Can I ask why, why do you want those instructions?

10   S: It's, it's for me personally, it's my method of learning, erm that's how I learn, erm you
11   tell me what to do, I do it on my own, figure it out on my own, that's how I learn, you
12   tell me how to, you tell me what you want to do, and how you want it done, you give a
13   little more context, then, I know a little more of what exactly you're expecting, erm so
14   then, but then I'll do it on my own, figure it out on my own, if I have a problem, then I
15   can come back to you, if I don't understand something then I can come back to you,
16   that's why the instructions are so important, the clearer the instructions are the less
17   reason there is for me to come back to you if I do get stuck […]

Vincent's discourse suggests that he was content to operate within the confines and prescriptions provided by the lecturers and university. He notes that his learning is best facilitated when lecturers "give clear instructions of what they want" (Line 3). This suggests that not only was he comfortable with the structure imposed upon the learning process but also that he preferred or desired this structure. He maintains that, if he knows exactly what the lecturers expect he is able to "figure it out on [his] own" (Lines 13 - 14). He therefore does not construct the prescriptions of academic discourse as having restricted or limited his freedom.

This extract illustrates the notion that learning is constructed as an exchange between lecturer and student. Vincent explicitly constructs a conditional 'if-then' position, noting several times that if the lecturers provide him with instructions he will figure it (the work) out on his own. He further notes that if the instructions are clear, there will be less reason for him to come back to the lecturers. As such, learning is constructed similarly to a product or service that can be bartered between supplier and consumer. The extract also demonstrates

the expectations that students have regarding their tuition: Not only does Vincent expect that lecturers provide him with instructions but he also expects these instructions to be "specific" and "very clear" (Lines 4 – 5). This facilitates the positioning of lecturers as responsible for 'imparting' a 'specified' education to students.

Buying into a consumer position allowed Vincent to manipulate the learning situation: In Extract 1, for example, he notes that, "your parents are paying for it [tertiary education], why not go" (Line 12). This positions him as entitled to attending class by virtue of the fact that his education is being paid for by his parents. Extract 1 also demonstrates that his class attendance was not primarily aimed at the pursuit of knowledge per se. Rather, attending class had an instrumental focus, targeted at making the learning "a lot quicker and a lot easier" (Line 13). He also notes how "it gets complicated when you don't know what's going on" (Line 14) and how, without going to class, "you have to figure it out for yourself" (Line 16). Class attendance is therefore constructed not with the aim of intellectual development but, rather, with the instrumental aim of minimising the time required to prepare for exams and to keep studying uncomplicated. As such, he positions himself as a student who consumes education and engages with academic discourse on his own terms, as and when he sees fit. Rather than engaging with the classes and subject content in the way prescribed by the lecturers and university, he followed a 'work-smarter-not-harder' approach in his studies. In doing so he was able to undermine the prescriptions and expectations of the lecturers and university.

Harry's text also evidenced the subordinate and consumer subject positions. Consider the following extracts:

Extract 19: (Harry)

1   S: […] You started to feel as though it was this package that they're offering you, like do
2   this, it was all about just passing, really, just going to the exams and getting the credits

3	and getting your 120 points to get your degree, you know, 'cause everything was so
4	quick, everything was so fast paced, I think that's the sort of like full time way, you gotta
5	go from lecture to lecture to lecture, and, when you're studying you're just studying so
6	that, you know, you can understand that material there and go into the exam and pass,
7	you're studying for the exams, you know, so that's what undergrad was like for me, it's
8	just, just going to class into the lecture, sit there, make sure you understand what the
9	books says, then use that book to write the exam.

In his description of his undergraduate studies, he notes how it felt as if studying "was this package they're offering you" (Line 1). He also maintains that studying became focused on understanding "what the book says, then use that book to write the exam" (Lines 8 -9). He notes that full time study was "so quick…so fast paced" (Lines 3 – 4) that there was not much time for anything except going to class and obtaining sufficient credit in order to sit for the exam. Although he does not make explicit the notion of power, the implication is that students simply had to contend with the status quo of undergraduate study if they wanted to complete their degrees. As such, Harry text also demonstrates the subordinate subject position.

As was the case with Denise, Harry's uptake of the consumer subject position was also associated with the attainment of instrumental goals beyond the academic endeavour:

Extract 20: (Harry)

1	I:	And then you seem to have enjoyed your honour's and master's more, why is that?
2	S:	I think it was because I had more time to actually think about what I was doing, you
3		know, where is this degree gonna take me in life, and when you, when, where I was
4		working I was doing pastoral counselling, working in a church environment, and you
5		know counselling and doing play therapy with little children and then you know doing
6		community work, that, it makes you realise that listen this is something I really enjoy and
7		the psychology will allow me to do this for a career, you know, I'll, let's say, become a
8		counselling psychologist or research psychologist and then I'll be able to do counselling
9		for the rest of my life and get paid to do it or I'll be able to go and do community work
10		and do research about it, so that's when I think when you can see how it comes together
11		with your vision, like maybe your longer term goals, that's when you really start
12		enjoying it because it's more of a long term, long term thing, you're not just committing
13		to the subject to pass the exam, you're seeing the further benefits further down the line,

14	so I mean now with my dissertation it's, it's not something I'm doing just, just for the
15	dissertation, it's something I'm doing maybe for the next ten years at least, I'm hoping,
16	that this will be something I'll be passionate about and I'll be doing work within this
17	field and you know, I'll be making a career out of this and enjoy that career so it's not
18	just something to get the piece of paper, 'cause, then after that, you know I must then
19	discover my passion, so I think, that's it is discovering the, the passion and then you
20	know you can see that oh this degree is gonna help me to, to take my passion and just
21	make it a career.

In his description of his postgraduate studies, Harry makes explicit the notion that postgraduate study was not "just committing to the subject to pass the exam" (Lines 12 -13) as was the case at undergraduate study. Rather studying became focussed on what he really enjoyed (Line 6) and on the "benefits further down the line" (Line 13). He also notes that he was not doing his dissertation "just for the dissertation" (Lines 14 - 15) but that it would be something he will be passionate about and that he will be able to make a career out of it (Lines 14 – 17). This indicates that learning was not focussed on the intellectual pursuit. Rather, psychology became a vehicle for him to explore and find enjoyment and "passion" (Line 20) in what he was studying as well as serving as a potential career prospect. As such, his uptake of the consumer subject position serves to undermine the educational outcomes espoused by higher education, and thus challenges the dominance of academic discourse.

Chapter 5: Discussion

The paradox that students face in higher education concerns the way in which they are constituted by the dominant discourses of academia. Throughout their socialisation into the academy students undergo formal instruction in order to learn the culture and practices associated with their fields of study. Mastery of their fields of study therefore occurs through a process of being enslaved into their disciplines. The discourses of enslavement work to discipline students in the ways of the academy and students have little choice but to concede to being enslaved. At the same time, however, students are expected to demonstrate mastery in managing their studies and to break free from the shackles of dependence on guidance and instruction. The paradox therefore lies in the disparate constitution of students as enslaved masters. Academia's popular view of undergraduate study as a period of enslavement and that of postgraduate study as the period in which emancipation should take place, punctuates the paradox as a temporal sequence. Punctuating the paradox as a temporal sequence, however, does not resolve the dilemma. The discourses of enslavement and mastery work simultaneously throughout the student's socialisation. The paradox therefore permeates the entire learning process.

Developing a coherent identity as a student is fundamental in the student's socialisation. The student's position as both master and slave, however, presents the student with a dilemma. In order to arrive at a coherent sense of self, the student has to 'work up' an identity that resolves the discrepancies in the paradox of mastering through enslavement. This is a process of emancipation. It is in the resolution of these discrepancies that student agency manifests. The greater the student agency the more emancipated s/he becomes. The empirical results support this dynamic.

Three interpretive repertoires were present in in participants' account of being students. These repertoires permitted participants to draw on different understandings or lived

ideologies of what it means to be a student. In doing so they constructed their identities in various ways. In other words they engaged these repertoires in particular ways and, in so doing, demonstrated the uptake of particular subject positions. However, the use of these repertoires did not yield a smooth or seamless account of their socialisation into academia. The repertoires revealed discrepancies with regards to the subject positions participants inhabited in their texts. The three repertoires identified were a behavioural repertoire, a competence repertoire and a power repertoire. The behavioural repertoire enabled participants to construct the behaviours they engaged in as students. A competence repertoire was used to refer to matters regarding their academic or disciplinary competence. A power repertoire, which entailed both a political discourse and an economic discourse of consumerism framed the power dynamics at work in the student-institution interaction.

1. The Behavioural Repertoire

The behavioural repertoire illuminated the typical behaviours participants engaged in as students. Each participant's discourse revealed the presence of contradictory subject positions with regards to their behaviours. In other words, participants described behaviours that were conflictual in nature. Vincent's employ of this repertoire constructed his behaviour in terms of an independent student and a dependent student subject position. Michael's text evidenced behaviours that reflected the identity of both a dedicated student and that of an undedicated student. The behaviours constructed in Denise's account concern the subject positions associated with a student who took control of her studies as well as a student who was not in control of her learning. The two subject positions constructed in Harry's text demonstrated the presence of a disenfranchised subject position as a student and a franchised position. Julie's account revealed the uptake of the subject positions of the defiant student and the accepting student.

The presence of such conflicting behaviours reflects the contradictory nature of the lived ideologies or common sense understandings of what it means to be a student. Considering that these conflicting ideologies hold implications for how students can and/or should behave, it is no surprise that the behaviours constructed in participants' texts conflict with each other. Moreover, the disparate nature of these 'ways of being' suggests that students experience this paradox in their undertaking of higher education: The independent, in-control, dedicated, franchised and defiant subject positions reflect the discourses of mastery which dictate that students take responsibility for their own learning and autonomously navigate their academic socialisation. The subject positions of the dependent, not in-control, undedicated, disenfranchised and accepting student, in contrast, reflect the discourses of enslavement that construct the lecturers and university as responsible for directing students' socialisation into academia.

The data suggest the way in which students resolve the predicaments associated with these conflicting lived ideologies is by working a particular face in their interactions with academic discourse. In other words, in order to inhabit and project a coherent identity each participant had to integrate these disparate ways of behaving. Vincent resolved the conflicts associated with inhabiting an independent and a dependent subject position by performing the face of a strategic student. A strategist can demonstrate both independence as well as dependence. As such he was able to assimilate the independence he showed in terms of managing and directing his own socialisation with his dependence on his lecturers for instruction and guidance. By working the face of the developing student, Denise projected the identity of a student in the process of developing. This served to marry her being in control of her studies (which she achieved by organising and structuring her learning environment and earning good marks in the exams) and not being in control (when the learning environment became less structured and more demanding). Learning the contents of a prescribed book by

heart is an acceptable activity for a developing student, even though taking control of her learning in such a way is, as she noted, not the ideal. Not being in control of her studies is also accounted for by performing the face of a student who is still developing (whereas such behaviour would be incongruent with a developed student). By working the face of a successful student, Michael was able to assimilate being an undedicated socialite, who overindulged in the social aspects of student life, with the behaviour of a dedicated student: As a successful master's student he could define himself as a dedicated student despite having failed a few subjects. Harry's position as a disenfranchised student, who was denied a legitimate and meaningful engagement with his studies, could be integrated with his desire for a franchised position by working the face of a passionate student. Working this face, he could transcend his disenfranchisement by looking for - and finding - passion outside the academic boundaries dictated by his lecturers, university and even the discipline of psychology. In a similar way, working the face of the capable student enabled Julie to integrate her defiance with the position of the accepting student. It is in the assimilation of these disparate behaviours – in the working of their face – that students address and resolve the paradox with which they are confronted. Performing a particular face served to integrate different 'ways of being' a student. It is in the integration of the opposing identities evident in participants' texts that student agency reveals itself. And it is in the operation of this agency that the emancipating student appears. The emancipating student is thus a strategist, who demonstrates an awareness of the demands of the context as well as the ability to act upon these demands. Emancipation is found in the developing student, whose agency lies a striving for self-actualisation. The emancipating student displays an inner passion that has a motivating effect on his/her personal drive. The emancipating student displays an agency in striving for and attaining success by taking the demands of the environment into account whilst realising his/her personal ability. And it is in the agency of the capable student, who

can recognise and respond to the demands of the environment as well as his/her own strengths and shortcomings, where an emancipating contribution is realised.

2. The Competence Repertoire

The competence repertoire revealed how participants positioned their identities in relation to academic competence. In specific, it showed how participants constructed their identities in terms of the expert-novice dichotomy. The analysis suggests the paradox manifests in the disparate constitution of the student as both expert and novice. By taking up the position of novice, participants bought into an enslaving discourse. Taking up the expert position, in contrast, is demonstrative of a discourse of mastery. The resolution of this paradox is complicated because the expert-novice dichotomy, which constructs the lecturer as expert and the student as novice, is constituted by the dominant discourses of the university.

Vincent, Michael and Denise's texts indicates the presence of both expert and novice positions. Adopting both positions suggests they buy into the paradox of mastery through enslavement. Taking up the novice position (as a student with limited knowledge) as well as the expert position (as a student who could apply knowledge and to whom the facts come automatically) is paradoxical and presents Vincent with a dilemma. The same is true of Michael and Denise: Michael's uptake of the expert position is evidenced in his account of how he could create his own role as a master's student. In contrast, requiring his supervisor to take him by the hand when he was confronted with a problem is demonstrative of the novice position. Denise demonstrated the position of expert by becoming the self-learner and the position of novice who preferred to be shown, step by step, what to do in the workshops.

Harry and Julie's employ of the competence repertoire is interesting because their accounts do not relate both positions as was the case with Vincent, Michael and Denise. Harry's text evidenced the uptake of the position of novice but not the position of expert whereas Julie's account showed the uptake of only the expert position and not the position of

novice. Harry's text suggests he downplayed his expertise, locating expertise with his lecturers and supervisor rather than with himself. He does not show awareness of the mastering discourse in terms of academic expertise. His discourse therefore does not show an awareness of the paradoxical nature of the mastering-enslavement discourse. Julie's discourse shows an active negation of the expertise of the lecturers. The criteria for her expertise are therefore not based on the mastery of the discipline but on the negation of the criteria of expertise (rejecting expert opinion).

The dynamics of this repertoire's functioning is not simple: The resolution of the paradox in this repertoire did not lie in an integration of the conflicting subject positions as was the case in the behavioural repertoire. In order to address and resolve the conflicts associated with taking up both the positions of expert and novice, the face-work demonstrated by Vincent and Michael was directed towards addressing the position of novice. By locating the problems he encountered in the learning process as a function of some factor unrelated to competency or expertise, Vincent resisted the novice position. In other words, his face-work sought to undermine the position of novice rather than to explicitly position him as expert. In contrast, the face-work evident in Michael's account was actively directed at positioning his identity as an expert (which he achieved through his deconstruction of the positions of expert and novice). Although Denise's account evidences both positions of expert and novice, and even though her discourse suggests that the incongruity associated with these conflicting positions is dilemmatic for her, she did not work towards a resolution of these conflicts. Rather than rescinding the position of novice, as was the case with Vincent and Michael, she ordered these positions along a complicated spatio-temporal path projecting from the learning context into the work context, and she relates the expert position to negative emotional impact. Julie's text did not indicate the uptake of the novice position. In other words, there

was no need for her to resist the novice position. Instead, her face-work involved 'accomplishing' her expertise by downplaying the expertise of her lecturers.

Vincent and Michael's text indicate awareness of the novice position. However, their face-work was directed at resisting/defending against the novice position. In other words, they were aware that, as students, they had to move from a novice position to an expert position. Their agency is demonstrated in this awareness, a condition fundamental for emancipation. Vincent's agency lay in his resistance of the novice position. Michael's deconstruction of the positions of expert and novice constructs his expertise not in terms of academic expertise but in his ability to make active choices and to create his own role as a student. In other word, even though he was aware of the demands of the environment, he redefined these demands, locating agency in the choices he made. Denise's account demonstrated an intense awareness of the demands of the environment as well as the expertise needed in order to address the demands. Although she displayed awareness of the conflicts associated with the disparate positions of expert and novice, she remained caught up in this awareness. Rather than demonstrating agency in resolving these conflicts, she failed to do so. (From a psychological point of view, this must have created anxiety for her. She dealt with this anxiety by postponing the resolution through a future projection.) Although Harry's text only evidenced the position of novice, his discourse indicated awareness that being a novice is not preferable. He did not, however, actively resist the position of novice as was the case with Vincent. As was the case with Denise, the demonstration of agency on Harry's part was absent. Julie showed awareness of the demands of the environment but she negated these demands and ignored the fact that she needed ability and expertise to meet the demands. From a psychological point of view this is problematic because the behaviour seems obstructive. (Recall that she rejects expert criticism of her writing skills on the grounds of her own perception of her ability.)

In the light of this, the process of becoming an emancipated student in terms of disciplinary expertise is a difficult journey. The possibility for emancipation was undermined by ignorance of demands and denial of requirements, and anxiety accompanied the awareness of the need for emancipation. Those who managed to embark on emancipatory behaviour struggled. They had to actively resist novice-ness without clearly seeing their way forward, and when becoming aware of the way forward demands were dodged by personal choices.

3. The Power Repertoire

The power repertoire reflected the power differentials present in academic discourse which constitute students as subordinate to lecturers, universities and knowledge. Academic discourse is organised such that students are not and can never really hold the power. It is the institution that holds the power and the student, mostly, has to abide by it. In other words, the dominant position is not available for students to inhabit. They can only really ever be subordinate. However, drawing on an economic discourse, participants positioned themselves as consumers of education. This subject position allowed them to undermine their lecturers and universities. The consumerist position stands to challenge the dominance of academic discourse and as such, the economic discourse is brought to bear on the political discourse.

The dynamics of the power repertoire entailed the operation of two discourses, a political discourse (where 'political' refers to the 'politics of academia', which constitute students as lower ranking in the academic hierarchy than lecturers, the university and disciplinary knowledge) and an economic discourse of consumerism. Drawing on a political discourse, participants constructed themselves as subordinates with little power in the learning process. Drawing on an economic discourse facilitated a positioning of participants' identities as consumers of education. Their consumer status afforded them a certain degree of power as paying customers of their universities. The economic discourse was thus brought to

bear on the political discourse and, as such, served to challenge the discourses of enslavement.

The empirical data revealed the presence of both the subordinate and consumer subject positions across all participants' texts. All participants but Vincent constructed the subordinate position as one which impinged on their freedom as students (insofar as they had no say in their studies; they simply had to do as they were told). Even though Vincent's text did not construct the subordinate position as restricting, he was aware of his subordinate position as a student. The presence of the consumer subject position across participants' texts demonstrates their resistance to not being in a position of power.

The consumer position was used to undermine academic discourse as it afforded participants the agency to criticise their lecturers, training and universities. Michael, Julie and Denise's criticisms of their training reflects an agency that allowed them to voice their dissatisfaction with their training. Denise and Harry's texts indicate that learning was not undertaken with the primary objective of scholarly development but rather served instrumental aims beyond the learning encounter. It is in these actions – in criticising and questioning their lecturers and their coursework and in using their status as consumers - that the agency of the student reveals itself. The emancipating student is therefore a consumer who uses his/her status as rightful and paying customer to seek value for money in his/her education.

4. Conclusion

As was evident from the literature review presented in Chapter 2, current conceptualisations regarding students' socialisation into the academy does not highlight the paradox of learning that students have to navigate throughout their academic careers. Such research reflects that the discourses of enslavement work to discipline students into the ways and means of their universities and their fields of study. However, even though such research

serves to criticise and problematise the nature and dynamics of academic discourse it does not address the paradoxical situation with which students are confronted, nor the manner in which they attempt to resolve these discrepancies. The results of this study clearly demonstrate the presence and awareness of the mastering through enslavement paradox. As shown in the analytic results, students buy into both discourses of enslavement and mastery. Given the paradox it is not surprising that participants' text revealed the uptake of conflicting subject positions. Their resolution of these disparate 'ways of being' revealed an agency which, as van Deventer (2010) notes, has the potential to disrupt and dislocate existing frames of reference, and thus, facilitates the emancipation of the student.

Chapter 6: Reflection and Validation

1. Reflection

The constructive effects of discourse highlight the inescapable truth that the researcher and the researched cannot be "meaningfully separated" (Taylor, 2001b, p. 17). The epistemological departure point in discourse research necessitates acknowledging the influence the researcher has on the research process. The researcher's personal and social attributes can potentially influence the research and its outcomes in various ways. Taylor (2001b) notes two specific areas where the researcher's identity becomes relevant to the research, namely during data collection and during analysis and interpretation.

With respect to data collection, the aspects of my identity which need to be taken into consideration pertain to the duality in my institutional status: At the time of data collection I was a student completing my master's degree in psychology, which was the same degree the participants were studying towards. I was also a junior lecturer at the same institution and department where the participants were completing their degrees. Being a student studying towards the same degree as the participants (although not in the same year as they were) helped establish a certain camaraderie between the participants and myself. Both the participants and I were apprentices undergoing the same socialisation into the same academic discourse community. I could thus identify with them and share in their trials and tribulations as they could identify with me and share in mine. This allowed me to approach the participants as an insider who shared their situation and interests (Taylor, 2001b). Having somewhat of an insider status, as well as already having being acquainted with the participants through my interactions with them in class, aided in establishing an 'easy' rapport with the participants, and, as such, the interviews were relaxed and of an informal tone.

The interview context itself would undoubtedly have had some influence on participants accounts. Any interview is likely to elicit (at least some) feelings of anxiety in respondents, especially if the interviewer is an authority figure (if only by virtue of his institutional status). My association with the university at which they were studying, together with my status as lecturer on the course they were studying, could therefore have influenced participants to offer socially desirable responses that might differ in other, less intimidating situations. However, my status as student and the fact that I was undertaking the same degree as the participants could also have mitigated my status as lecturer, allowing respondents to feel more free to express what 'being a student' meant to them.

The interview questions may also have affected the responses offered by participants (Taylor, 2001b). Interview questions set the context for the conversation and, as such, frame the topic under discussion in a particular way. In other words, the topic - participants' academic socialisation experiences – was framed in terms of the themes contained in the interview questions. The interview questions may have raised issues that the participants may not otherwise have considered relevant to the topic or they could have excluded topics that participants deemed relevant to the discussion but were not covered in the interview (Taylor, 2001b). In this regard, the pilot interviews were used as a measure to ensure that the interview questions captured the research topic as comprehensively as possible and excluded topics that were not relevant to the investigation. In addition, the semi-structured character of the interviews and the open-ended nature of the questions allowed participants, if they so wished, the opportunity to broach topics additional to those contained in the interview questions. However, this was no guarantee that they took advantage of this opportunity.

Furthermore, the nature of interviews in general, that is, how they proceed according to a protocol where the interviewer asks a question and the interviewee is expected to respond, may have affected what participants said and what they did not. Usually, the

interviewer also directs the interview and thus, to a large extent, also controls the discourse parameters of the conversation. The subject position enabled by my status as interviewer was inevitably also more 'expert' when considered in relation to the only position participants could adopt (i.e. as interviewees and subjects of research). Participants could therefore only speak of their socialisation experiences from the position of 'less-expert' research participant and only in terms made possible by the interview questions, which I, as the more-expert researcher (and lecturer) asked. (This is quite reminiscent of classroom situations where the lecturer's voice is favoured since participants could only speak from the position of respondent in an interview and, thus, as Potter's necessary but lacking objects).

During data analysis, the knowledge and worldview of the researcher also potentially influences the processes of analysis and interpretation (Taylor, 2001b). The act of identifying, labelling and defining a section of discourse necessarily involves the analyst's interpretive schemata (Burman & Parker, 1993). In order to guard against (further) imposing my own categories on the data, the categories used in the coding process were largely defined by the interview questions and used under the assumption that the meanings of these categories (for example, 'undergraduate lecturer' or 'postgraduate student') were mutually agreed upon and understood by both participants and interviewer through their negotiations of these meanings in the interviews. However, the claims made by this study can by no means be said to be uninfluenced by the researcher's own worldview. My interpretation of a sequence of data as representative of, for example, a consumerist discourse cannot be said to be free from my own experiences of and interactions with academic discourse: My tertiary education started in 1995 which was arguably after the advent of the marketisation of education. Considering this, I am not familiar with education that is non-consumerist in nature. My own academic socialisation also inevitably involved negotiating the expert-novice discourse. I therefore also know how to go about constructing a position of expertise. As with the participants in this

study, I too know about the 'dos and don'ts' of 'being a student' and have also played 'the game of academia'. However, as much as these experiences can be seen to bias the analysis and interpretation of the data, being familiar with what it means to be a student can also be argued as a strength of this research, as I could approach the topic as someone not completely unfamiliar to the student experience.

Researchers also need to understand the language and social and cultural references used by the interviewees. The interviews were conducted in English. All participants were fluent in English, even though, for some, it was not their home language. Although between five and ten years older than the participants, 'being a student' myself meant I was familiar with 'student jargon' such as 'spotting' and 'grafting'. I could therefore draw on my own local knowledge of what it means to be a student in the analysis and interpretation of the data. Furthermore, assuming the role of both interviewer and analyst also meant that I could "bring the experience of the original interaction to the interpretation" (Taylor, 2001b, p. 18).

The often oppositional nature of the different ways of talking about 'being a student' that were uncovered in the text highlights the very real lived ideologies that students have to navigate in academia. The findings from this study are in no way said to represent *all* the possible ways of talking about 'being a student' that are available for speakers to draw on. At best the findings from this study could be "generalizable as shared knowledge" (Taylor, 2001a, p. 314) that other speakers *can* employ in constructing accounts of student-hood. However, this does not serve as a prediction that these different linguistic resources *will* be used by other students in accounts of their learning journeys. Since accounts are constructed for certain purposes in different contexts, it is plausible that there are many more ways of speaking about 'being a student' which may be employed in other students' accounts.

2. Validation of Findings

Considering the differences between the theoretical and methodological assumptions of discourse analytic research and the assumptions made when assuming a realist position in positivist research, the principles of reliability (stability of findings) and validity (truth or accuracy of findings) need to be reconsidered in light of this study's onto-epistemology. Conventionally, in positivist research the assumption is made that "reliability can be assessed independently of context" (Wood & Kroger, 2000, p. 164). However, social action does not occur in a vacuum. As Potter and Wetherell (1987, p. 28) note, "When language is conceptualised as a form of action performed in discourse between individuals with different goals we are forced to take the social context into account". Knowledge generated by discourse research is therefore situated and contingent on "the specific circumstances of place, time, and participants in which the research was conducted" (Taylor, 2001a, p. 319). The focus in discourse research is on language and considering that different words can have the same meaning in different contexts and the same words can have different meanings in different contexts, it is imperative to consider the context in which phenomena occur in order to properly understand their meaning. However, this is problematic for traditional scientific conceptions since assessing repetition or reliability on a conceptual level is much more difficult (Wood & Kroger, 2000).

Validity, in conventional research, is assessed in terms of how accurately the findings from a study mirror aspects of the 'real' world. In contrast, since a discursive approach assumes a position of "epistemological relativism", the emphasis is on the discursively constructed nature of the social world (Wood & Kroger, 2000, p. 166). Discourse has shifting and multiple meanings: It is therefore impossible to determine whether one version of the world is better or more accurate or truthful than another. The analyst's account can therefore be seen only as one interpretation of a possible many versions of reality and as such, cannot

claim truth or falsity (Wood & Kroger, 2000). However, this is not to say that discourse analysis is subjective or simply the analyst's opinion: As Gee (1999) notes, validity is something that different analyses can have more or less of, that is, some analyses may be more or less valid than others. Furthermore, validity is also never 'once and for all', as all analyses are open to discussion and/or dispute as work progresses in a particular field (Gee, 1999).

Given these considerations, the status of discourse analysis as "an alternative metatheoretical perspective" warrants a different set of criteria to validate the findings of research in this tradition (Wood & Kroger, 2000, p. 163). Three criteria are considered here, namely fruitfulness, robustness and transparency.

2.1. Fruitfulness

This criterion of validity can be considered "an extra-analytic criterion" (Wood & Kroger, 2000, p. 175) and refers to the degree to which an analytic scheme is able to give (coherent) meaning to new kinds of discourse and its ability to produce novel hypotheses and explanations of the social world (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Tracy (1995, p. 210) holds that a study is considered fruitful when it is "intellectually implicative for the scholarly community" in that it should "suggest productive ways to reframe old issues, create links between previously unrelated issues and raise new questions that are interesting and merit attention". The findings from this study can by no means be interpreted as new or novel: Psychological knowledge is littered with literature referencing 'consumer education' and the 'expert-novice' dichotomy and the effects these have on education in today's society. The notion of academic enslavement is also not a new phenomenon as evidenced by the work of authors such as Michael Foucault. However, this study does shed light on how these repertoires, as instantiations of the broader discourses that produce them, enable actors in academia to 'accomplish' identity. This research addresses the call to interrogate the subject positions

available for students to inhabit in the learning process. In so doing, this research seeks to challenge the dominant discourse of the university in an attempt to reconstitute the subject positions available for students in academia.

2.2. Robustness and Transparency

Gilles (2009) notes two further criteria for consideration in the validation of claims made by discourse analytic research, namely 'robustness' and 'transparency'. Robustness refers to whether or not the claims made by a body of research are able to withstand intellectual challenge. Robustness may be achieved by not overstating a study's claims in light of the methods employed. In other words, claims made by discourse research are not the types of claims that are made by positivist research, where findings can be generalised to larger populations. The point of discourse research is also not to try and 'capture' something in the 'real' world, such as 'students' or their experiences of 'academic socialisation' and then to generalise it to a larger population of students. Nor is the enterprise aimed at an attempt to assess the facticity of accounts or descriptions. Instead, as Potter (1996, p. 123) notes, the goal is to examine how "people *themselves* manage and understand descriptions and their facticity" [original emphasis]. Thus there is no attempt at categorising or characterising the participants or students in general as 'having' any particular identity or identities.

Transparency refers to the extent to which the interpretations and claims made by discourse research are logically and empirically supported through textual evidence (Gilles, 2009). In order to facilitate transparency in this research, responses to interview questions were included in full in the extracts so as to allow the reader the opportunity to decide whether the interpretations and/or claims being made are logical and coherent. Transparency may also be achieved by acknowledging that the claims made in discourse research are produced by analysts who bring their own knowledge, understandings and worldviews to the

reading and analysis of the data as well as the writing of the report. This is not to say that such research is therefore a subjective exercise. However, it does mean having to acknowledge the findings of the research in light of its aims. The emancipatory aim of critical discourse research informed the reading of the data and the interpretation of the results in this study. As such, the findings from this study are interpreted against the backdrop of the paradox of learning.

3. Limitations

Limitations of this study include that data were obtained solely from interviews conducted with participants. Future research could consider data triangulation by obtaining information about what 'being a student' entails from sources other than interviews, thus possibly illuminating other aspects relevant to student-hood not made salient in the interviews. Furthermore, even though the aims and analyses in this study were focussed on examining discourse at a broader level than is usually the case in conversation analytic work, employing the Jeffersonian transcription system (rather than the orthographic approach followed in this research) could yield more insight into the organisation or structure of talk in academic contexts and how this enables role players to 'accomplish' identity.

References

Ainsworth, S., & Hardy, C. (2004). Critical discourse analysis and identity: Why bother? *Critical Discourse Studies, 1*(2), 225-259. doi: 10.1080/1740590042000302085

Baron, R. A., & Byrne, D. (1997). *Social Psychology* (8th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Benwell, B., & Stokoe, E. H. (2002). Constructing discussion tasks in university tutorials: Shifting dynamics and identities. *Discourse Studies, 4*(4), 429-453. doi: 10.1177/14614456020040040201

Billig, M., Condor, S., Edwards, D., Gane, M., Middleton, D., & Radley, A. (1988). *Ideological Dilemmas: A social psychology of everyday thinking*. London: Sage Publications.

Parker, I., & Burman, E. (1993). Against discursive imperialism, empiricism and constructionism: Thirty-two problems with discourse analysis. In E. Burman & I. Parker (Eds.), *Discourse analytic research: Repertoires and readings of texts in action* (pp. 155-172). London: Routledge.

Duff, P. A. (2010). Language socialisation into academic discourse communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 30*, 169–192. doi: 10.1017/S0267190510000048

Duff, P. A. (2007). Problematising academic discourse socialisation. In H. Marriot, T. Moore, & R. Spence-Brown (Eds.), *Learning discourses and discourses of learning* (pp. 1-18). Melbourne: Monash University ePress. doi: 10.2104/ld070001

Edley, N. (2001). Analysing masculinity: Interpretive repertoires, ideological dilemmas and subject positions. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates., *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis* (pp. 189-228). London: Sage Publications.

Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., & Guido-DiBrito, F. (1998). *Student development in college: Theory, research and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Frand, J. L. (2000). The information age mindset: Changes in students and implications for higher education. *Educause review, 35*(5), 15-24.

Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method.* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Gillies, D. (2009). *Critical discourse analysis and current education policy.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, Scotland.

Goffman, E. (1967). On face-work. An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. In *Interaction Ritual: Essays in face to face behaviour (*pp. 5-45). New York: Doubleday.

Golde, C. M. (1998). Beginning graduate school: Explaining first-year doctoral attrition. In M. S. Anderson (Ed.), *The experience of being in graduate school* (pp. 55-64). San Francisco: Jossey- Bass Publishers.

Grant, B. (1997). Disciplining students: The construction of student subjectivities. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 18*(1), 101–104. doi: 10.1080/0142569970180106

Haneda, M. (2006). Classrooms as communities of practice: A reevaluation. *TESOL Quarterly 40*(4), 807-817. doi: 10.2307/40264309

Hanks, W. F. (1991). Foreword. In J. Lave & E. Wenger, *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation* (pp. 13-26). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harré, R., & van Langenhove, L. (1991). Varieties of positioning. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour 21*(4), 393-407. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-5914.1991.tb00203.x

Ho, Mei-ching. (2007). *Academic discourse socialization of American and Taiwanese graduate students in TESOL: A case study of small-group activities* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (AAT 3270586).

Jacoby, S., & Gonzales, P. (1991). The constitution of expert-novice in scientific discourse. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 2*, 149-181.

Jawitz, J. (2009). Academic identities and communities of practice in a professional discipline. *Teaching in Higher Education 14*(3), 241-251. doi: 10.1080/13562510902898817

Jørgensen, M. W., & Phillips, L. J. (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method.* London: Sage Publications.

Kigua, P., & Canham, H. (2010). Creating a culture of thinking? Reflections on teaching an undergraduate critical social psychology course. *Acta Academica Supplementum 2,* 62-90.

Kuwahara, N. (2008). It's not in the orientation manual: How a first year doctoral student learned to survive in graduate school. In C. P. Casanave & X. Li (Eds.), *Learning the literacy practices of graduate school: Insiders' reflections on academic enculturation* (pp. 186-200). Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

Lave, J. (1996). Teaching, as learning, in practice. *Mind, Culture and Activity 3*(3), 149 – 164. doi: 10.1207/s15327884mca0303_2

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lessa, L. (2006). Discursive struggles within social welfare: Restaging teen motherhood. *British Journal of Social Work 36*(2), 283–298. doi: 10.1093/bjsw/bch256

Li, X., & Casanave, C. P. (2008). Introduction. In C. P. Casanave & X. Li (Eds.), *Learning the literacy practices of graduate school: Insiders' reflections on academic enculturation* (pp. 1-11). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Limberg, H. (2007). Discourse structure of academic talk in university office hour interactions. *Discourse Studies 9*(2), 176-193. doi: 10.1177/1461445607075343

Lovitts, B. (2001). *Leaving the ivory tower: The causes and consequences of departure from doctoral study*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Marshall, H., & Raabe, B. (1993). Political discourse: Talking about nationalization and privitization. In E. Burman & I. Parker (Eds.), *Discourse analytic research: Repertoires and readings of texts in action* (pp. 35–51). London: Routledge.

McCabe, A., & O'Connor, U. (2014). Student-centred learning: The role and responsibility of the lecturer. *Teaching in Higher Education, 19*(4) 350-359. doi: 10.1080/13562517.2013.860111

McDaniels, M. (2010). Doctoral student socialisation for teaching roles. In S. K. Gardner & P. Mendoza (Eds.), *On becoming a scholar: Socialization and development in doctoral education* (pp. 29-44). Sterling, Virginia: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Mendoza, P., & Gardner, S. K. (2010). The Ph.D in the United States. In S. K. Gardner & P. Mendoza (Eds.), *On becoming a scholar: Socialization and development in doctoral education* (pp. 11-26). Sterling, Virginia: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Mohamed, H. I., & Banda, F. (2008). Classroom discourse and discursive practices in higher education in Tanzania. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development 29*(2), 95-109. doi:10.2167/jmmd548.0

Morita, N. (2004). Negotiating participation and identity in second language academic communities. *TESOL Quarterly 38*(4), 573-603. doi: 10.2307/3588281

Parker, I. (2001). Lacan, psychology and the discourse of the university. *Psychoanalytic Studies 3*(1), 67-77. doi:10.1080/14608950020026854

Phillips, N., & Hardy, C. (2002). *Discourse analysis: Investigating processes of social construction*. London: Sage Publications.

Potter, J. (1996). *Representing reality: Discourse, rhetoric and social construction*. London: Sage Publications.

Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour.* London: Sage Publications.

Read, B., Archer, L., & Leathwood, C. (2003). Challenging Cultures? Student conceptions of 'Belonging' and 'Isolation' at a post-1992 university. *Studies in Higher Education 28*(3), 261-277. doi:10.1080/03075070309290

Taylor, S. (2001a). Evaluating and applying discourse analytic research. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates, *Discourse as Data: A guide for analysis* (pp. 311-330). London: Sage Publications.

Taylor, S. (2001b). Locating and conducting discourse analytic research. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates, *Discourse as Data: A guide for analysis* (pp. 5-48). London: Sage Publications.

Taylor, S (2007). Narrative as construction and discursive resource. In M. Bamberg (Ed.), *Narrative – State of the Art. Benjamins Current Topics 6* (pp. 113–122). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Tracy, K. (1995). Action-implicative discourse analysis. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology 14*, 195-215.

Van Deventer, S.H. (2010). Facilitating the emancipation of the learner. *Acta Academica Supplementum 2,* 168-181.

Wetherell, M., & Potter, J. (1992). *Mapping the language of racism: Discourse and the legitimation of exploitation.* New York: Columbia University Press.

White, J. W., & Lowenthal, P. R. (2011). Minority college students and tacit "Codes of Power": Developing academic discourses and identities. *The Review of Higher Education 34*(2), 283-318. doi: 10.1353/rhe.2010.0028

Wiggins, S., & Potter, J. (2008). Discursive psychology. In C. Willig & W. Stainton-Rogers (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research in psychology* (pp. 73-90). London: Sage Publications.

Williams, J. (2013). *Consuming higher education: Why learning can't be bought.* London: Bloomsbury Publishing PLC.

Willig, C. (2001). Discursive psychology. In *Introducing qualitative research in psychology: Adventures in theory and method* (pp. 87–105). Buckingham: Open University Press.

Wood, L. A., & Kroger, R. O. (2000). *Doing discourse analysis: Methods for studying action in talk and text*. London: Sage Publications.

Wooffitt, R. (2005). *Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: A comparative and critical introduction*. London: Sage Publications.

Zamel, V. (1998). Questioning academic discourse. In V. Zamel & R. Spack (Eds.), *Negotiating academic literacies: Teaching and learning across languages and cultures* (pp. 187-197). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Appendix A: Ethical clearance certificate

UNISA | university of south africa

Department of Psychology

20-06-2013

ETHICAL CLEARANCE OF A RESEARCH PROJECT INVOLVING HUMAN PARTICIPANTS

Project: Academic discourse socialisation: The discursive construction of students

Researcher: Sean N Hagen

Student number: 36433349

Supervisor: Prof S H van Deventer (Department of Psychology, Unisa)

Co-supervisor: Dr C Ochse (Department of Psychology, Unisa)

The proposal was evaluated for adherence to appropriate standards in respect of ethics as required by the Psychology Department of Unisa. The application was approved by the departmental Ethics Committee without any conditions.

Prof P Kruger

Department of Psychology
College of Human Sciences
University of South Africa

Appendix B: Consent form

Informed consent form to participate in a research study.

Title of the proposed study:

Academic discourse socialisation: The discursive construction of students

Traditionally, the discourses of teaching and learning surrounding students entering the field of Psychology have been discourses of 'enslavement'. In other words, students prescribed to and had to learn how to become disciplined and professional thinkers within the field of Psychology. The post-modern information age is breeding a different kind of student with very different needs to those in the past. This means that the traditional discourses of enslavement are no longer appropriate when it comes to the teaching and learning of Psychology. Several researchers have identified this crisis and the need for radical changes in our approach towards teaching and learning in Psychology is evident and necessary. The project aims to investigate the enabling and disabling discourses that manifest in the interface between students of Psychology and the custodians of the discipline. Both students and custodians of Psychology tap into enabling as well as disabling discourses that maintains the status quo of teaching and learning in Psychology. The explication of these discourses allows one to move towards the development of new student and custodian epistemologies in the re-imagining of Psychology.

We would appreciate your participation in the study. Please sign this consent form to indicate that you are willing to participate. If you have any questions, please contact me via e-mail or telephonically.

I have received information concerning the study and I understand the purpose of this research. I consent to participate in the study subject to the following conditions:
1. I understand that all information regarding myself will be treated confidentially and will be stored securely.
2. I understand that I am under no obligation to participate and may withdraw from the research at any time without prejudice.
3. I understand that I receive no payment or compensation for participating in this study.
4. I am aware that the results of the study will be published in the form of a dissertation for a master's degree
5. I am hereby informed of the right to access the findings of this study.

....
Initial(s) & surname of participant

....   …………………………………………..
Signature of participant   Date

Thank you for your participation. Please save a copy of this signed document.

Mr SN Hagen