Investigating the relationship between dialogic interaction and written argumentation in A Level History.

Submitted by Diana Marie Hilliard, to the University of Exeter as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education

March 2013.

This thesis is available for Library use on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

I certify that all material in this thesis which is not my own work has been identified and that no material has previously been submitted and approved for the award of a degree by this or any other University.

Signature........................................................................................................
Abstract

There has been considerable research into the teaching and learning of argumentation (e.g. Andrews, 2009; Sadler, 2004), focusing on strategies designed to help students to structure their written arguments. My study, however, focuses on the process of argumentation because I want to help sixth form students, aged 16-19 years old, improve the written argument in their A level History essays.

The methodological approach followed was an adapted form of Design-based research, which incorporated an exploratory study, teacher trials and three case studies as part of the iterative design process. A classroom intervention was devised underpinned by design principles based in persuasive argumentation (Kuhn, 2005) and dialogic talk (Wegerif, 2012), derived from an extensive literature review, and the findings of the exploratory study.

The exploratory study involved interviews with History education academics and examiners as well as classroom observations and semi-structured interviews conducted in collaboration with the teachers and students of four secondary History departments. Observations were taken of the teacher trials of the prototype intervention, whereas the data gathered from the case studies included pre and post intervention essays, audio and video recordings of the developed intervention in action, post intervention student interviews and questionnaires as well.

In Case study 1 and 2, AS and A2 students’ post-intervention causation essays, when measured for argumentation, showed improvement but those whose written arguments improved the most were those students who had engaged in interactions rich in dialogic talk (Wegerif, 2012). The findings from Case study 3, which involved the integration of documentary evidence into AS History essays, were unexpected. Students found the integration of source-based evidence difficult not only during the course of the spoken argumentation but also in their written responses. Further development of the intervention is necessary to help students handle source material effectively in both the spoken and written forms of argument.
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Chapter 1 – Introduction

Angela: … We were taught at GCSE to argue one side and then the other …

Researcher: Mmm.

Angela: … Whereas in A level you’ve got to carry a point all the way through and kind of like, shut … like, show that you know the other arguments, but shut them down …

Researcher: Uh-huh …

Angela: … And say, ‘well, some people say this, but …’ Like, that’s what I find the hardest, I think, going from GCSE to A Level, because at GCSE you’re told to give one side of the story, the other and the conclusion, whereas at A level you’ve got to give one side, not one side all the way through, but you’ve got to stick with one thing all the way through. That’s the thing I find really hard.

(Extract of an interview with Angela, a Year 13 student)

1.1 Background

Angela gained an A* at GCSE, but as a Year 13 student, in the final year of schooling before making her way to college or university, she was finding studying History at A2 level difficult. As an experienced classroom teacher of 16-19 year-old A level History and Politics students, I was aware how many of my sixth form students, like Angela, found writing argument in their A level History essays difficult.

I have taught a range of different History syllabuses at GCSE, AS and at A2 level, syllabuses offered by the WJEC, AQA, Edexcel, and OCR exam bodies. Whether the subject be Stalin’s Russia, Elizabeth I and her religious settlement, or William of Normandy’s invasion of England, however, the core objectives of each exam body’s specifications at AS and A2 are the same, as the following table indicates.
Table 1.1. Assessment objectives (AOs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AO1a</th>
<th>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of History in a clear and effective manner.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AO1b</td>
<td>Demonstrate their understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within a historical context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The relationship between key features and characteristics of the periods studied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2a</td>
<td>As part of a historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2b</td>
<td>Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Adapted from AQA, 2007, p. 65.*

The difference in assessment objectives between AS and A2 lies in the student demonstrating a deeper and more extensive understanding of the subject matter.

Underpinning these specific assessment objectives are several explicit aims to encourage students to have a greater enthusiasm for, and ‘an understanding of the nature of historical study – for example that history is concerned with judgements based on available evidence and that historical judgements may be provisional’ (Edexcel Specification History GCE, 2012, p. 11). Students are also encouraged to become ‘reflective thinkers and independent learners able to organise their work appropriately to argue a case and reach substantiated judgements’ (AQA Specification, History GCE, 2012, p. 65).
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A mark scheme that is designed to assess AO1a and b as well as AO2a and b at AS indicates that students must be able to compare, discriminate and evaluate sources whilst analysing their utility. Furthermore, students are also expected to integrate and contextualise the source material within the body of their argument (OCR GCE History AS Mark Scheme, June 2011, p. 6). A generic mark scheme for essays at A2 demonstrates quite clearly that students are expected to argue effectively. Even those students who would be placed within Level 2 by examiners (Levels 1-5 represent increasing levels of competence and historical learning) are expected to recognise historical debate, though they may only describe rather than illustrate an argument (AQA GCE History A2 Mark Scheme Specimen, 2010, p. 9).

The vehicle for the students' written argument, whether it is an argument that integrates source analysis or not, is the essay. Mitchell and Andrews (2001) highlight, among other things, that the essay in A level History, when it is reduced to formulaic responses such as ‘introduction, middle and conclusion’ or PEEL (Point Evidence Explanation then Link to question) is written in such a way as to prevent students clearly expressing their argument. Nevertheless, it is clear that History A level students must write convincing arguments in their essays if they are to achieve the highest marks.

As a classroom teacher, I had developed strategies to help my students reach the highest grades expected of them. These strategies were largely based around heuristics, which included examining and unpacking the essay questions, brainstorming, discussion and clear and explicit instruction for writing effective argument. I would frequently ‘model’ how to approach a History argument. Working as a private tutor, however, I had to adapt my teaching practice.

The students who came to me for extra help were all able to write essays that had introductions, clearly structured paragraphs and conclusions. Taken at face value, the essays looked as though they had the structure of an argument. Most of them demonstrated acute historical understanding and, in some cases, extensive historical knowledge, but they did not contain a coherent or explicitly stated argument. For many of my private students, the inability to write a clearly argued response was proving to be a problem.
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It was clear that they had already been taught how to structure their essays and the students were usually very familiar with the history they were expected to write about. My private students were highly motivated and determined to succeed. My experience as a classroom teacher suggested that there was little to be gained in focusing on the structuring of their essays; instead our lessons comprised extensive oral argument. I did not expect students to write or rewrite essays until we had engaged in considerable dialogue.

The dialogue in which my students and I engaged was extensive but always focused on the subject matter. Not only did we discuss how we might approach the structure of the response, we also discussed the possible differing interpretations of the subject matter. I rarely dominated the dialogue and although I was ‘scaffolding’ the students’ learning, I was conscious that the need to do so diminished as the lessons progressed. The students seemed to gain their ‘voice’ and were more confident in realising and discerning the different historical arguments. I was aware, too, that without focusing explicitly on the structural aspect of the argument, the students’ written responses were nevertheless also improving. I had observed that the students in a one-to-one situation were happy to argue when they felt comfortable with the material, but I was also aware that the actual process of arguing appeared to help them too.

This was something I wanted to explore further. I was conscious that the students were not ‘debating’ – they had not fully formed their opinion – so their ‘talk’ was not a complete and clearly evidenced representation of their views. It was something else instead. It was full of false starts and pauses but could, at times, become increasingly animated. The disjointed talk seemed to develop and gain in coherence the longer we discussed any History question. It appeared to me as if my students were thinking things through out loud. It was as if they were arguing to think and testing their opinions against me, as an interested and receptive audience, before they made a judgement. Sometimes this process was accomplished in an intensely animated way, the student unable to sit still in his or her seat; other times a student might simply stare quietly out of the window, the silence heavy with expectancy before she or he would turn to me, silently nod and smile.
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I became curious about the nature of our dialogue and how it was connected to an improvement in the students’ written work. There were two key aspects I wanted to explore: the intensely animated interaction that some students demonstrated and the correspondingly still yet equally intense reflective moments that other students engaged in. These seemed to be important stages in the development of the students’ oral arguments, and the evidence of such interactions would appear in the student’s written argument. Marking the essays after our dialogues full of arguing History, I could clearly see the students’ ‘voice’ and evidence of a coherent argument which had not been present before.

My initial research question, therefore, was ‘what is it about the dialogue that appeared to act as a bridge between the spoken and written arguments of my History students?’

I also wanted to know whether this process – the dialogue – could be replicated within a classroom environment. I wanted to see if it were possible to create an environment in which students could be encouraged to engage in focused oral argument and, if so, whether their essays improved correspondingly. As an experienced teacher of 16-19 year-old History students, I was aware, however, how difficult it might be to orchestrate this process. Most History syllabuses appear to require the delivery of an extensive and impressive range of historical knowledge in order for synoptic reasoning to take place. In the schools I have known, AS and A2 History is taught by two or more teachers, each taking responsibility for a History module. History modules are taught concurrently so that students are unlikely to have the opportunity to immerse themselves in just one period, which can prove problematic for some. My second research question, therefore, focuses on whether I could design and develop an intervention that could be easily integrated into A level classroom practice and would create the opportunity for the same type of dialogue - intense and animated and/or deeply reflective – that was present in my one-to-one tuition.

The third research question was simple. If I had managed to create opportunities for such dialogue to take place, I wanted to know what impact the
dialogue had on the written argument of the students who engaged in them – would their essays improve too and, if so, how?

1.2 The Investigation

I am conducting this investigation within the study of school History and not academic History for three reasons: firstly, as an experienced sixth form History teacher, I am familiar with the teaching and the expectations of AS and A2 exam classes, and I am also very familiar with the complexities and the nature of History argument. Secondly, this is not solely a study of History argument; it is instead a study intended to allow me to investigate the links between spoken and written argument, with the implication that the findings might offer insight into the teaching of argument in other disciplines – Science argument, for example, as well as History.

The third reason for conducting my study with 16-19 year-old participants is that this is a critical time in their development. Kuhn states that the adolescent ‘increasingly takes charge of his or her mental life, choosing what to think, when and where to do so, and how to allocate their mental effort’ (Kuhn, 2006, p. 64). She also suggests that learning which is not associative but conceptual – which leads to a change in thinking – requires cognitive engagement. Kuhn further asserts (2005, 2009), however, that for students to engage in higher order reasoning, that which involves reflecting on their own thinking processes – meta-strategic thinking – they need to be taught to reason. She also makes the case that arguing is a higher order cognitive skill that does not ‘come naturally’ and should therefore be an important component of any curriculum, particularly if adults are expected to participate fully in a democratic society (Kuhn, 2009). This is why I want to conduct my investigation with sixth form students: because I think that it is crucial for the cognitive development of every student that they are given the opportunity to learn and engage in arguing which could lead to conceptual change and subsequently to cognitive development.

I realise that the teaching and learning of argument has been studied extensively in other school disciplines, for example Science, (Erduran, Simon, & Osborne, 2004; Simon, Erduran, & Osborne, 2006; von Aufschnaiter, Erduran,
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Osborne, & Simon, 2008) and English (Andrews, 1995; Andrews, Torgerson, Low, McGuinn, & Robinson, 2006, 2009), but few studies other than Coffin (2004, 2006a & b, 2007), Coffin, North and Martin (2009), Mitchell (2001) and Andrews (2009a), have explicitly linked History and written argument; fewer still have linked History to written argument in the sixth form (Mitchell, 1994; Mitchell & Andrews, 2000).

History mark schemes demonstrate how highly written argument is prized. Examiners’ instructions for a top grade answer are as follows:

Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas and arguments and information included will be wide ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high degree of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate will be displayed. Answers will be well structured and fluently written (AQA GCE Mark Scheme 2011 June series, p. 5).

For those students who can produce coherent and well-evidenced responses to the essay questions, the results are good, but the teaching of explicit History argument is not part of the syllabus. There is an underlying assumption that the critical thinking occasioned by analysing different forms of evidence should be sufficient to ensure that students are able to produce effective written argument. This is particularly so when the students are expected to recognise that the evidence is not neutral and needs also to be set within a historiographical context, which is the ‘norm’ for A2 History.

Recent publications by Fordham (2007) and Black (2012), action research studies based in classroom experience, discuss historical enquiry and follow a ‘critical thinking’ model for expressing history argument; this is not a model that I will be following in this study, however. My most recent school practice involved the teaching of Critical Thinking as a discrete subject within the sixth form. It was a subject generally regarded by the school at which I was teaching as a necessary adjunct to sixth form studies and was to be taught to all students, regardless of the A levels they were studying. The Critical Thinking course, as espoused by Van den Brink-Budgen (2002), was designed to teach students to
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analyse arguments. Within my classes, I had students who were studying Physics and Chemistry as well as those studying Politics, History and English. I discovered, however, that argument theory, construction and deconstruction of arguments seemed to become more accessible to the students only when they were asked to engage in the practice of argument. Even here, in classes dedicated to learning to recognise and argue on paper, the dialogue became very important.

I am not only motivated to explore the processes involved in the transition between oral and written argument, I am also driven to find a method by which I can help students improve their written arguments. The current study thus has both theoretical and practical implications. The approach is essentially pragmatic and focused specifically on finding a working solution to alleviate the problems that sixth form students have with writing arguments in History AS and A2 level essays. The fundamental precept is to explore the theories of argumentation and dialogue and interaction, to create a theoretical framework that will underpin the design and subsequent development of an effective classroom intervention.

The study is complex and involves several stages – exploration of theory and practice as well as designing, testing and developing an artefact within a classroom environment. It therefore requires a flexible methodological approach. An experimental, positivistic approach would suffice if the study was simply the testing of an artefact but it is more than that. As a teacher/practitioner I was familiar with and had used Action Research (AR) as an aspect of my MEd, (Hilliard, 2002). Although this approach is flexible, iterative and situated in classroom practice I felt that AR was not suitable because I was investigating a complex phenomenon that was not simply situated in my own practice. I felt that Design-based research (DBR), with its focus on design and the iterative development of both ‘close to practice’ theory and an intervention, specifically engineered to improve classroom practice, was the most appropriate methodological approach for me to take. The DBR approach will be discussed further in Chapter 3.
1.3 Chapters and Contents

Gorard and Taylor (2004) suggest that a design study goes through as series of phases, usually three distinct phases: a feasibility study (phase 1), prototyping and trialling (phase 2), and a field study (phase 3). Such a study would be iterative and end with a robust and a specific model. This investigation, however, does not follow this pattern. Following Plomp and Nieveen (in press), this study will be conducted through a series of iterations each one a ‘mini-cycle of research’ which explores and develops theory throughout the research process through a series of design frameworks.

Chapter 1 puts the research in context and explains its initial impetus. Chapter 2 comprises an extensive literature review, which is a fundamental aspect of the exploratory phase of the research process. The literature review offers an explanation of the study’s rationale and identifies the gaps in the literature, whilst also highlighting the literature that leads to the theoretical underpinning for this research. The literature review discusses the studies associated with the links between speaking and writing argument and arguing to learn, and sets History argument within that context. In this way the first theoretical framework – Design Framework 1 (DF1) – underpinning the initial phase of the study is framed.

Chapter 3 discusses the methodological approach underpinning the study and the methods used to gather and analyse the data of the exploratory fieldwork. Chapter 4 discusses the first iteration, where the first theoretical framework derived from the literature review is explored through two stages of fieldwork. The initial stage of the exploratory fieldwork consists of interviews with History education researchers and History A level examiners; the second is carried out in four secondary schools through classroom observations and semi-structured interviews with History teachers and sixth form A level History students. At the end of Chapter 4 the findings of the fieldwork research process, which tested the theory derived from the literature review, lead to the development of DF2.

As a result of the exploratory fieldwork, Chapter 5 begins with a return to the literature to examine possible educational interventions through which the principles that underpin DF2 can be explored. The intervention is meant to both
promote ‘argumentational’ dialogue as well as meta-strategic thinking in A level History students. In this way, it is hoped that the links between dialogue and written argumentation can be explored. Some of the findings of the exploratory fieldwork conducted in the schools will also be used to adapt the classroom intervention and thus meet the needs of A level teachers and their students so that it can be accommodated easily within the sixth form History curriculum. It is recognised that such a classroom intervention will also need developing, so at this point of the research process the intervention is a prototype – a working model to be tested. The chapter concludes, therefore, with a detailed discussion of the design of the prototype classroom intervention.

Following the DBR protocol (van den Akker, Gravemiejer, McKenney, & Nieveen, 2006), Chapter 6 includes a discussion and analysis of the practitioner implementation of the prototype intervention - the second iteration. Three trials were conducted: one in an A2 Law lesson, one in an AS Sociology lesson, and the third in an AS History lesson. Based on the findings of these trials, a further theoretical framework –DF3 – was developed.

Chapter 7 is a short methodology chapter that focuses on case study research. It discusses how and why case study research is an appropriate approach to take when conducting a DBR research study of this kind. The methods used to gather the data and the forms of data analysis used in the three case studies are also discussed. This includes a tool to measure argumentation in both verbal and written form, as well as a tool that attempts to indicate how ‘dialogic’ the verbal argument may be. Chapter 8 discusses Case Study 1, which represents the third iteration and the implementation and exploration of DF 3. The findings from Case Study 1 include results from student questionnaires and semi-structured interviews, which were designed to gain an insight into the impact of the classroom intervention on the students’ learning. These and the results of the main findings from Case Study 1 – that dialogic interaction does have an impact on the written argument of students – determined the further development of the theoretical framework, which became DF4.

Chapters 9 and 10 discuss two further case studies, each examining different aspects of historical learning. These two case studies make up
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Iteration 4. The classroom intervention, which had proved to be successful in creating opportunities for dialogic interaction, was tested in these two different circumstances to determine whether a generic model for argumentative interaction could satisfy the more specific needs of these other forms of historical learning. Chapter 9 discusses Case Study 2, which was conducted with A2 students, who require a more sophisticated level of verbal and written argument than the AS students who had participated in Case Study 1. Case Study 2 also included the opportunity to engage in blogging. It was hoped that blogging would create a ‘dialogic space’ in which the students could further develop their understanding of History argument. Case Study 3 was not an extension of Case Study 2, but a parallel study. In this case study, AS students were engaged in a document studies exercise. This skill is of particular importance to History students and needs to be demonstrated through argument, so it was a pertinent test for the intervention.

Chapter 11 involves a discussion of the key findings and the emerging themes of the study. The findings across the case studies are also discussed to see if there are any patterns that may be significant, though it must be remembered it is unwise to make sweeping generalisations from case study research. The final chapter, Chapter 12, includes a discussion on the strengths and weaknesses of the intervention as a vehicle for dialogic instantiation and any changes to the process are discussed in light of the findings. The study concludes with the creation of DF5 – a further set of principles developed from the research process – and suggests how the study could be developed further and how it may be implemented effectively within a History A level curriculum.

1.4 Summary of Chapter 1

The intention of this research study was to create, explore, and develop a theoretical framework that would underpin the design and development of an educational intervention. The intervention itself is the tool through which the theory is explored. As the theory is explored iteratively throughout the study and the intervention is adapted accordingly, the creation of the final framework, DF5, represents the completion of the present study whilst also indicating the next iterative stage. The intervention itself will then be at a stage where it could
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be easily integrated into current A level History teaching practice to give sixth form students the opportunity to engage in oral argument before they begin to write their History arguments.

This chapter also offered an explanation for the motivation of the study while demonstrating that the methodological approach used was an adapted form of DBR that combined case study research as part of its iterative process. The content of the chapters and the structure of the thesis were also explained.

The following diagram shows the research process, the four design frameworks with their corresponding iterations. Iteration 1 was the exploratory fieldwork, Iteration 2 the practitioner trials, Iteration 3 was Case Study 1 and Iteration 4 comprised the parallel case studies 2 and 3. This process culminated in the final framework – Design Framework 5.

The next chapter is the literature review – a fundamental aspect of the exploratory phase – whence the first theoretical framework is formed.
The diagram shows the iterative phases of the research process – ‘the mini-cycles of research’ – and demonstrates how each design framework is implemented and developed.
Chapter 2 – Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter is a review of the literature that concerns four areas pertinent to this study: the links between spoken and written argument; the links between arguing and thinking; dialogue and interaction, and the relationship between the discipline of History and argument itself. In this way it is hoped that greater insight into the ‘talk’ generated between the A level History students and myself will be gained.

Research into argument in education is important because the ability to argue well is synonymous with success at A level, and also has other social, academic and economic implications. This study is pertinent because it is conducted in an area in which little research has been conducted thus far: the teaching of argument to History A level students. Much of the research into the promotion of argumentation in secondary schools is Science orientated (e.g. Erduran et al. 2004; Sadler, 2004; Simon, 2008; Simon et al. 2006; von Aufschnaiter et al. 2008) or conducted within the discipline of English (e.g., Andrews, 1995, Andrews et al. 2006, 2009; Mitchell, 1994). There are only a handful of research projects that focus on the teaching of History to the 16-19 year-old age group in the UK (e.g., Black, 2011, 2012; Chapman, 2006a, 2011a; Fordham, 2007, Foster, 2011, Mitchell & Andrews, 2001). This study is an opportunity to add to the research field.

The chapter is in eight sections. Because of the limited research into the links between speaking and writing History argument at A level, this chapter,
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after defining argument and argumentation, starts with an examination of the literature associated with spoken and written argument in other educational disciplines. In this way successful studies researching the links between speaking and writing argument will be discussed to offer a potential model for investigating and promoting History argument. The following two sections then focus on other aspects of argumentation – arguing to learn, learning to argue; and classroom dialogue and interaction – in which ‘dialogic interaction’ is defined. Section 2.5 focuses on the nature of History followed by a section that discusses ‘argumentation’ as a concept within the History discipline. A discussion on the existing research that deals with the links between arguing and thinking and speaking and writing argument at History A level is an aspect of this section. The context for my own research will become apparent as it attempts to fill some of the gaps in this important research area. The seventh section briefly discusses History argumentation and dialogic interaction, which leads into the final section discussing the creation of the first theoretical framework, the principles of which underpin the initial phase of this research study.

It is, however, important to be clear at the outset about what is meant by the terms ‘argument’ and ‘argumentation’.

2.1.1 Defining argument and argumentation. These are complex terms that have been defined in various ways. Andrews (1997) makes the point that often the two terms have been used interchangeably, which does not help in establishing a difference – a differentiation which is vital in this study. For mathematicians and logicians, arguments can be reduced to formulae that stand for a ‘chain of rules or reasons, beginning with premises and leading to a conclusion’ (Caminada, 2008, p. 109). Philosophers too, such as Toulmin (2003), consider arguments to be claims and assertions to be proved or disproved. Comparing Toulmin’s (1958) and Walton’s (1998) models of argument, and the potential they have for improving the relationship between doctor and patient, Upshur and Colak (2003) suggest that argument following Walton’s dialectic stance is ‘a fundamentally social process conducted in diverse contexts between individuals with potentially differing interests’ (p. 289). Soap operas, however, demonstrate perhaps all too often a more extreme form of argument. Here, people engage in personal conflict, usually but not always
limiting themselves to hurting each other verbally. Billig (1996) makes the point that this form of argument sometimes goes beyond dialogue and resembles instead ‘moody silences and slammed doors’. Schommer-Aikins and Easter’s (2009) research into students’ perception of argument and how it impacts on their willingness to learn, highlight how many students understand this antagonistic form of argument as being the only form of argument.

In discussing ‘argumentation’, Glassner and Schwarz (2007) suggest that it is a link between creative and critical thinking, whereas others consider argumentation to be a key process in concept change and cognitive development (Limón, 2001; Mason, 2001; Mason & Scirica, 2006; Means & Voss, 1996, Voss & Means, 1991). Coffin and O’Halloran’s article (2008) reflects this mixed attitude to argument and to argumentation. They also demonstrate that there are discrepancies in the ways that teachers and learners perceive the meaning of ‘argument’ and ‘argumentation’. Their work highlights the point that, while there are many modifiers for argument, there are fewer for argumentation. This suggests, among other things, that, educationally, argumentation – the process of arguing – is not clearly understood.

Coffin and O’Halloran (2008) suggest that ‘argumentation is the process and argument the product of putting forward and negotiating ideas and perspectives’ (p. 219). These are useful distinctions, particularly if it is accepted that ‘negotiating ideas and perspectives’ allows for concept change and cognitive development. But too often, as Andrews (1995) asserts, argument is perceived to be a battle or a war and within this ‘metaphor’ argument is limited to ‘winning and losing’ and is not a negotiation. Andrews suggests (1995) that a more useful metaphor for argument is that which likens argument to a ‘rhetorical dance’. The ‘positions’ and ‘moves’ taken in a dance are conciliatory and necessary to allow an exploration of the other’s points of view. Andrews develops this stance in his theoretical and research study into argumentation in higher education (2010). ‘Argumentational’ is a neutral term used by Andrews (2010) to describe the processes of argument. He uses it because he claims that using the term ‘argumentative’ suggests that the processes involved are associated with argument in a violent, or ‘tetchy’ sense, returning to the argument as war metaphor. As a violent form of argumentation is not the purpose of the present research study, ‘argumentational’ is the term that will be
used to describe the processes involved in argumentation. The term ‘argumentation’ in this present study will cover all the arguing processes that lead up to the end product. The end product is the completed argument, which will be found in the students’ essays.

2.1.2 Aspects of argumentation not covered in the thesis. There is an extensive body of literature on argument and argumentation, and it is important to state at the outset that this review will not include reference to formal argumentation – this is an investigation into informal argumentation. Nor will the review discuss argumentation that is associated with artificial intelligence (AI). This latter approach lies within the cognitive perspective, and likens the human mind to a computer. Reasoning thus becomes a kind of computer program so that argument is strictly confined and defined through rules and the application of logic. In the field of AI, researchers such as Dung (1995) and Bench-Capon (2003) have demonstrated how computer programs can be made to replicate not only formal but also, increasingly, informal argumentation. Interesting as this research is, it will not be part of the review.

The review will not include literature that focuses on the links between narrative and argument (Andrews, 1989; Coffin, 2006a & b). Nor will it discuss the multimodality of argument (Andrews, 1997, 2009b; Bourne & Jewitt, 2003; Coffin, 2009), although it is recognised that the object of the study is to explore the links between the speaking and writing of argumentation, which suggests that the argumentation will not be confined to just one ‘mode’. Nor will the review cover literature that focuses solely on the structuring of written argument, because my A level students were already aware how to structure and write their essays.

The following table shows the key texts associated with the forms of argumentation covered within the first part of the literature review.
### Table 2.1. Key texts on argumentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of literature review</th>
<th>Nature of article or book</th>
<th>Name of author(s)</th>
<th>Year of publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The links between speaking and writing argument.</strong></td>
<td>Research/ theory</td>
<td>Bereiter &amp; Scardamelia</td>
<td>1982, 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Freedman &amp; Pringle</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Crowhurst</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Johns</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Andrews</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/ theory</td>
<td>Anderson, Nguyen-Jahiel, McNurlen, Archodidou, Kim, Reznitskaya, Tilmans, &amp; Gilbert</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/ theory</td>
<td>Reznitskaya, Anderson, McNurlen, Nguyen-Jahiel, Archodidou, &amp; Kim</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Hidi, Berndorff, &amp; Ainley</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Felton &amp; Herko</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Crasnich &amp; Lumbell</td>
<td>2004, 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Riley &amp; Reedy</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Fisher, Jones, Larkin, &amp; Myhill</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arguing to learn, learning to argue</strong></td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Billig</td>
<td>1987/1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Voss &amp; Means</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Means &amp; Voss</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Kuhn, Shaw, &amp; Felton</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Limón</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Fawcett &amp; Garton</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Andriessen</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Schwarz &amp; Linchecski</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Rigotto &amp; Greco Morasso</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dialogue and interaction in classroom discourse</strong></td>
<td>Theory/ research</td>
<td>Wertsch</td>
<td>2008/1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Linell &amp; Marková</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>O’Connor &amp; Michaels</td>
<td>1993, 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Mercer Wegerif, &amp;</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialogue and interaction cont.</th>
<th>Dawes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td>Wegerif, Mercer, &amp; Dawes 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td>Nystrand, Wu, Gamoran, Zeiser, &amp; Long 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research/ Theory</strong></td>
<td>Hobson 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theory</strong></td>
<td>Linell 2003, 2004,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theory</strong></td>
<td>Alexander 2008 (a &amp; b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td>Burns &amp; Myhill 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td>Rojas-Drummond &amp; Mercer 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td>Myhill &amp; Dunkin 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td>Myhill &amp; Warren 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td>Myhill, Jones, &amp; Hopper 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td>De Laat &amp; Wegerif 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td>Wells &amp; Arauz 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td>Mercer &amp; Littleton 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td>Glassner &amp; Schwarz 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research/Theory</strong></td>
<td>Mercer &amp; Hodgkinson (Eds.) 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research/Theory</strong></td>
<td>Rojas-Drummond, Littleton, Hernández, and Zúñiga 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2 The Links Between Speaking and Writing Argument.

Andrews (1995) suggests that argument, whether it be spoken or written, is a mode of discourse that assumes there is an audience. The purpose of the discourse is to actively engage in changing the mind of the other person. Freedman and Pringle (1984) suggest that children are used to engaging in oral argument from an early age, but they assert that writing argument is a skill that needs to be taught because written argument does not resemble spoken argument. They infer that ‘children need to develop a new set of cognitive and rhetorical strategies’.
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Writing from a cognitive psychological viewpoint, Bereiter and Scardamalia (1982) highlight clear transitions that ‘elementary aged' children have to make from spoken to written language when they learn to write. They cite Vygotsky’s (1978) observation that children make a major step in symbolic thought when they move from oral to graphic expression. They also mention that in this process children go from face-to-face communication to communication with an unknown, unseen and remote audience, which is the transition that children may find the hardest. When they learn to write argument, children move away from conversations that are full of other people’s inputs to a situation where they are presenting language in a silent and autonomous manner. Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987) offer an extensive explanation of the processes children may find difficult and suggest eleven principles which would aid the transition from conversation to composition. In short, what they attempt to do is substitute the conversational turns and inputs of the richly cue-dependent spoken discourse. They try such things as slow dictation, prompts, and sentence primers, but they concentrate specifically on the structure of written language, suggesting that the transition is made difficult because spoken language is ‘open and unstructured whereas written language is closed and very structured'.

The later research of Fisher et al. (2010) also highlights the importance of ‘talk’ in the process of writing. Using Hayes and Flowers (1980) model, they demonstrate that writing is not a simple translation of talk to text. It is far more complex and not least because of the physical skills necessary to engage in making legible signs that constitute what the pupil means to say. Primary school children find the process of composing writing challenging because, psychologists argue, their working memory is limited and it is easy for the children of primary age to become cognitively overloaded. Fisher et al. (2010) identify three areas in which talk can support writing in primary classrooms: through oral rehearsal – ‘talking aloud’ – of what they have written; talk to generate ideas; and talk for meta-cognitive purposes which allows pupils to reflect on their own writing. Although these strategies have been designed to help primary school children develop their writing skills – and are not specifically linked to promote argumentation – they could be used in different subject areas and adapted to engage different age groups, including A level History students, learning to write argument.
The EPPI-Centre report (2006) reviews successful research into argumentative non-fiction writing across the 7-14 year-old age range. Andrews, Torgerson, Low, McGuinn, and Robinson, the authors of the report, focus on research that fits within the privileged scientific framework. Using randomised test procedures, the report also searched for non-experimental research, though none was found. The report highlights conditions for successful practice in promoting argumentational writing that also includes basic writing skills. These conditions also reflect the work suggested by Hayes and Flower’s (1980) writing model, and consist of planning, writing, and revising work. The report suggests two more stages should also be included: drafting and editing. There is no definitive way in which these processes should be carried out, though it is recognised that some training in cognitive reasoning should supplement what is perceived to be the natural maturation process of children’s development. Hayes and Flower also suggest peer collaboration as a means of ‘scaffolding’ both forms of oral and written argumentation, and propose that peer and teacher modelling of effective practice should be implicit within the practice, as well as explicit procedural facilitation.

Crowhurst and Knudson are two researchers highlighted in the report. Crowhurst (1990) advocates the teaching of argumentation to elementary-level children and does not support the thesis that children are too young at this stage to be able to write argument. Crowhurst acknowledges that because children do not have the same exposure to argumentative writing as they do to narrative, they would initially find writing argument difficult. However, she makes a strong case for placing argumentational writing within children’s concrete experience. This assertion was tested by Riley and Reedy (2005), who clearly demonstrated how young children between five and seven could be taught how to write argument and argue equally convincingly on subject matter that meant something to them. This also echoed the findings of Hidi et al. (2002), who were investigating the links between ‘liking, self-efficacy in writing and interest’ in the subject matter. Discussing research carried out within the TESOL context and with older students, Johns’ work (1993) also emphasises how writing for a specific purpose, rather than for an abstract hypothetical exercise, helps students develop their argumentation. Her research clearly
demonstrates the advantages of instructing students to write for real audiences and how much the argumentation of her students improved correspondingly.

Knudson’s research (1991, 1992, 1994), which deals with children aged 9-18 years old, focused extensively on argumentational writing and is conducted in a quasi-experimental way, using statistical evidence to support her findings. One aspect of Knudson’s research (1992) conducted with students from Year 10 and Year 12, tested four instructional strategies, each closely linked, using model pieces of writing. Knudson found that there was little difference in performance. She did, however, discover that, although most students could use claims, warrants, and data effectively, very few used counterarguments – and this was a stable finding over the two age ranges. Furthermore, it became apparent that although students’ argumentational strategies may not have improved, their arguments improved holistically depending on their prior knowledge of the topic. This supports, to a certain extent, Crowhurst’s assertion (1990) and Black’s claim (2011, 2012) that argumentation improves when children know what they are talking about.

Basing their work on the nouvelle rhétorique of Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1958), Crasnich and Lumbelli (2004) focused their experimental research on promoting the form of written argument that takes counterarguments into account. The emphasis was on the strength of the arguments and how well their students could conceive possible objections to the arguments they were forming. Students took part in oral arguments which were then transcribed and further evaluated by the students themselves. The 30 high school students involved were then given a problem-solving task and had to work out the most effective way to persuade an addressee of their particular resolution. The final part of the experiment involved a ‘talk aloud’ protocol in which the researcher talked through examples of argumentation and counterargument to offer instruction in what may have been implicit and therefore unseen to the students. Tests indicated that the students who had been part of the experiment were able to recognise and compose arguments attuned to the addressee’s stance more effectively than students who had not been part of the experiment. It is not clear, however, just how important the ‘talk’ was to the process and, although the students had to write a composition, it was not clear whether this composition was based on what they had
previously ‘argued’ or was on a new topic – so that the test was on the skills of arguing rather than on understanding of the topic area.

An additional aspect of their study (Crasnich & Lumbelli, 2005) concentrated on the nature of the ‘talk’ between teacher and student – they insisted that students and teachers should only interact in a way based on Carl Rogers’s (1951) client-centred approach. The intention was to help students reflect on their own work and to be more attuned to their addressee’s point of view. Crasnich and Lumbelli argued that this was a fundamental aspect of their study and was meant to be a precursor for all of the other activities that they conducted on argumentation. This is an interesting approach but, again, although the focus is on ‘talk’, and in this case also ‘reflection’ and ‘attunement’ to the addressee, it does not offer the opportunity to investigate the links between talk and argument. The students in Crasnich and Lumbelli’s study are attempting to ‘problem solve’ and to argue in order to reach a consensus, whereas History students are not arguing to solve a problem, but to explore and understand interpretations from a variety of perspectives.

Research carried out by Anderson, et al. (2001) and Reznitskaya et al. (2001) with children in the US aged 9-11, shows clearly how oral discussion (ostensibly oral argumentation) enhances and improves written argument. Anderson et al. (2001) consider reasoning ‘as a process of argumentation’ based on the research of Kuhn (1991, 1992) and Billig (1987/1996), but also ‘trace their thinking to Bakhtin (1981, 1986) and Wertsch (1991)’ because they make the assumption that reasoning is ‘fundamentally dialogical’ (Anderson et al., 2001, p. 2). The quasi-experimental research of Anderson et al. (2001) demonstrates how argument ‘strategems’, where children seem to appropriate the language and the behaviour of others within their group, at times unconsciously, becomes the foundations of argumentation schema. Reznitskaya et al. (2001) further developed this work – the snowball hypothesis – by investigating the links between the oral argumentation and what was written. There appears to be a crossover between the two ‘modes’ of communication where traces of what was spoken and acquired in collaboration with others is taken into the written work. Felton (2004) and Felton and Herko (2004) further developed this work using older students of high school Humanities and showed how careful scaffolding could enhance persuasive
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writing. Felton and Herko (2004) demonstrate that when students are given explicit instruction in argument writing and are then expected to engage in interactive verbal argumentation, their written responses improve. Until the ‘workshop intervention’, the students had only been capable of writing one-sided arguments in their essays; as a consequence of the intervention, the students wrote two-sided arguments. It is clear that the interaction impacted upon the students’ thinking, but the nature of that interaction is not clear. This was not reported in the research.

2.3 Arguing to Learn and Learning to Argue

In his review of argumentation and learning, Schwarz (2009) notes that the relationship between argumentation and learning is complex. He suggests that arguing to learn can be construed as the means by which a specific goal is achieved either in understanding or constructing knowledge. Learning to argue, on the other hand, is, he suggests, the means by which the skills of argumentation are acquired – for example, the ability to justify or counterchallenge (Schwarz, 2009, p. 93). Voss and Means (1991) partially agree with this viewpoint but do not separate learning to argue and arguing to learn, suggesting instead that ‘argumentation, defined as the generation and evaluation of arguments, is assumed to be a fundamental tool of reasoning and skill in argumentation is therefore regarded as basic to a person’s reasoning ability’ (1991, p. 337). Voss and Means focus on informal rather than formal argument. This viewpoint is supported by Billig (1987/1996) who cites Protagoras, rather than Aristotle, another Greek master of rhetoric, as the basis of his understanding of informal argumentation. Billig claims that there are always two sides to an argument, even an informal argument, and goes further to suggest that the ‘formal’ logic of Aristotle’s argument does not help us to appreciate reasoning as fully as perhaps we could, even though the recourse to ‘rational thought’ is tantamount to Aristotle’s logic.

Billig (1987/1996) emphasises the two-sidedness of human thinking – a form of internal argument – whereas Voss and Means (1991) claim that reasoning can be viewed as an inferential process which is structured in the same way as an informal argument. Both stances recognise that an individual’s
reasoning will be influenced by their individual attitudes, knowledge, beliefs and/or values.

Voss and Means go on to say that an informal argument is assessed on its ‘soundness’. This means that the reason(s) that support the claim should be acceptable (i.e., easily perceived as being plausible), the reason should be relevant to the claim and, finally, the extent to which a reason, as a counterargument, can be perceived to support the initial claim, thus determines both the strength and the soundness of the argument. Voss and Means (1991) found that counterargument is the one element of informal argument that tends to be forgotten unless prompted. This supports the findings of Knudson (1992) who was also aware that counterarguments were frequently missing in student essays.

Means and Voss (1996) discuss several research studies dealing with young children and students right through school age to college which looked at the role of ability, knowledge and age, and the impact they have on reasoning skills. Although inconclusive, they submit that neither age nor experience has a bearing on the ability to reason. This suggests two things: that the ability to reason is not developmental and/or that students have not been taught how to reason well. Means and Voss also suggest that the ability to reason in a particular subject depends on how much knowledge is necessary in order to answer any specific question. In short, lack of relevant knowledge could be a limiting factor. What Means and Voss do discover and state ‘tentatively’ is that ‘general ability is a major characteristic of good reasoners’. They go further, to say that ‘better reasoners tend to be analytical, flexible and they are more inclined to use meta-cognitive mechanisms’ (p. 343).

In her review of competence in higher-order reasoning in the fields of causal and scientific reasoning, Kuhn (2009) found conflicting and divergent evidence that does not wholly support Means and Voss’ (1996) claims. Though she qualifies her findings by explaining that a lot of the evidence came from a variety of sources and should therefore be interpreted with care, Kuhn suggests that children, pre-schoolers in particular, are very capable of reasoning effectively. She also finds evidence to show that college students are competent reasoners. However, she found something of a gap in the middle,
suggestion that children in their adolescence seem somehow to lose the ability to reason, which supports Voss and Means’ findings. Similarly, Kuhn found that adults without college-level education did not reason as effectively as college students. It seems, then, that reasoning should be taught. As argumentation appears to be a discourse through which reasoning occurs, we must examine how argumentation, which has been designed explicitly to promote reasoning is conducted.

Andriessen (2006) makes the point that in Science, new discoveries and understandings are reached when people of opposing views sit together and discuss their different viewpoints to achieve consensus. He suggests that the fostering of a similar process of arguing and reaching a consensus within the classroom could lead to greater understanding between the ‘protagonists’. This echoes the argument theory of van Eemeren and Grootendorst (1988, 2004) – pragma-dialectics. Ostensibly, this argument theory recognises a difference of opinion and confronts that difference through the process of argument whereby different points are advanced and countered until finally the dissenter concedes. The emphasis may be on persuasion and arguing against counterpoints, but the actual underlying premise is that one person’s point of view becomes dominant while the ideas of those who concede are dismissed. Rigotti and Greco Morasso (2009) emphasise, however, that the whole process is based in ‘reasonableness’ – nothing can be argued unless it is reasonable, and the argument should advance logically. The conflict is resolved through argumentation and it is suggested that the conflict itself and its potential for resolution is what will lead to cognitive development. This is a fundamental aspect of the following research studies, each examining ‘conflict’ in one guise or another.

Cognitive conflict has been investigated in several ways, as the next three studies show. Taking the constructivist approach, Limón (2001) tested out the idea that presenting anomalous data or contradictory information to her students to make them question that information and think again, would lead to cognitive development. She discovered that there were a lot of other factors that needed to be taken into consideration before she could be certain that there were links between contradictory information and conceptual change. She discovered that a student’s prior knowledge, motivation, values and
epistemological beliefs all impacted upon whether he or she could even begin to learn using such an argumentative strategy. It became evident that creating an environment in which challenging material was the focus of the work was not enough to promote change, and in some cases not even enough to promote engagement. Limón argues that ‘students must be assisted in their learning how to resolve cognitive conflict through both modelling and scaffolding’ (p. 367).

Following a cognitive approach, Fawcett and Garton (2005) conducted research to examine both Piagetian and Vygotskyian premises suggesting that conflict is a means by which cognitive development can be fostered. Piaget (1959) suggested that it was the disequilibrium generated by being faced with alternative and opposing ideas and the need to re-establish equilibrium that brought about cognitive development. Vygotsky (1978), on the other hand, wanted to scaffold individuals’ learning by putting them with a significant other who could help them take the next ‘cognitive step’ through working with them in their ‘zone of proximal development’. It was the disparity between the individual and the significant other that enabled the scaffolding to occur.

Fawcett and Garton’s (2005) study tested collaborative learning and the difference between talk and no talk. What they discovered was that Piagetian and Vygotskyian theories were not so ‘mutually exclusive’ and that talk was very important in the learning process. Schwarz and Linchevski (2007), however, conducted a similar collaborative experiment investigating peer interaction in relation to cognition, but this time they also analysed some of the talk. What they were able to prove was that simple discussion between students did not lead to conceptual change even if they set up the dyad as a conflictual relationship following Piaget’s thesis (1959). What appeared to lead to conceptual change was the opportunity to test abstract hypotheses with a concrete representation (i.e., scales). When faced with a visible contradiction and guided by a researcher to explain why there might be discrepancies, then and only then was the quality of the dyad discussion much improved. It also became clear that the less able student in a mixed-ability dyad benefited whether in talk mode or not, whereas the most able student only benefited when he or she was given the opportunity to discuss his or her reasoning fully.
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Rojas-Drummond and Mercer (2004) and Rojas-Drummond et al. (2010), among others, have tried to establish more clearly what type of talk is most effective in promoting reasoning. Socio constructionists, and those writing from a socio-cultural viewpoint, have suggested that there are links between collaborative ‘talk’ and individual reasoning (Mercer, 1995, 1996, 2004; Mercer et al. 1999; Wegerif et al. 1999). If we assume that language and thought are inextricably linked, then it is logical to assume that argumentational talk will also influence written language. The next section thus looks at the literature on dialogue and interaction in the classroom to determine what influence argumentational talk may have.

2.4 Dialogue and Interaction in the Classroom

Alexander (2008a & b) talks of an emerging dialogic pedagogy which is associated with a change from teaching and learning classroom processes based in transmission to processes that are more collaborative and focus on engaging the student as an active partner in their own learning. Wells and Arauz (2006) describe the way in which ‘questioning’ is conducted within the classroom as an example of this process. They demonstrate how the IRF format – Initiation, Response Feedback cycle – can be modified in order to focus on student questioning. The reasoning behind ‘freeing up’ the questioning is that it encourages spontaneity whereby students should begin to take responsibility for their own learning. O’Conner and Michaels (1993) demonstrate how re-voicing pupils’ questions sensitively can lead into effective whole classroom discussion. Myhill, Jones, and Hopper (2006), working with primary teachers and in primary classrooms, suggest ways in which critical moments can be exploited to make connections and develop pupils’ learning. Their research highlights the importance of listening carefully to pupils, and asking questions that draw out and develop their thinking. The questioning was not based in testing recall as in the IRF cycle. Nystand, Wu, Gamoran, Zeiser, and Long (2003) talk of these critical moments as ‘dialogic spells’. They point out, however, as do Burns and Myhill (2004), Myhill and Dunkin (2005), and Myhill and Warren (2005) that dialogic spells are very rarely found in the classroom because changing the way teachers ask questions does not
automatically change the nature of the classroom discourse or the relationship the teacher has with his or her class. But O’Connor and Michaels (2007) point out that trying to objectively analyse teacher questioning in terms of dialogic response is difficult because meaning is generated between teacher and pupil through the building of a relationship where classroom rituals are brokered, negotiated, and created in a way an outsider will not appreciate or be able to measure.

Mercer (1995, 2004, 2010), Mercer and Littleton (2007), and Wegerif (2004, 2005, 2010b, 2011b) have conducted research that looks more closely at the interaction and the dialogue of pupils in primary schools. Their work is not confined to determining whether questioning leads to dialogic spells, in whole classroom discourse but instead focuses on children’s talk as they work collaboratively, in small groups, either with computers or simply problem solving. Mercer et al. (1999) and Wegerif et al. (1999) were able to demonstrate three different forms of dialogue, one of which – exploratory talk – seemed to be an effective way for children to work together to problem solve. Pre- and post-testing showed that there had been cognitive development on both the individual and the group level. Wegerif (2005) was also interested in the children’s ‘off-task’ talk and found their play talk richly creative. This was also replicated in observations he made of ‘philosophy for the young’ classes. Glassner and Schwarz’s (2007) research also focuses on ‘creativity’ and its links to argumentation. They suggest that students’ inability to see other points of view and integrate them into their analysis to present two-sided arguments is due to the fact that a high level of imagination is required to free themselves from holding onto one meaning. They suggest that ‘the imagination aspect of creative thinking does not develop during adolescence’ (p. 17). This seems to add to Kuhn’s argument (2009) that students lose the ability to argue during their adolescence.

Walton (1999) also focuses on ‘types of dialogue’ and describes arguments as a form of ‘goal-directed’ dialogue or a ‘conversational exchange in which two parties attempt to reason together’ (p. 71).

The following table shows the types of dialogue that Walton thinks are typical examples of goal-orientated ‘discussions’.
Table 2.2. Types of dialogue (taken from Walton, 1999, p. 72)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of dialogue</th>
<th>Initial situation</th>
<th>Participant's goal</th>
<th>Goal of dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>Conflict of opinions</td>
<td>Persuade other party</td>
<td>Resolve or clarify issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry</td>
<td>Need to have proof</td>
<td>Find and verify evidence</td>
<td>Prove (disprove) hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>Conflict of interests</td>
<td>Get what you most want</td>
<td>Reasonable settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information-seeking</td>
<td>One party lacks information</td>
<td>Acquire or give information</td>
<td>Exchange information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberation</td>
<td>Dilemma or practical choice</td>
<td>Coordinate goals and actions</td>
<td>Decide best course of action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eristic</td>
<td>Personal conflict</td>
<td>Verbally hits out at opponent</td>
<td>Reveal deeper conflict</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Eristic = antagonistic – a form of argument which seeks to ‘win at all costs’ – resolution is not the goal of the dialogue; instead it is to hurt, inflame and beat the other side until the other is coerced into ‘agreeing’.

Walton makes the point that these are practices that are bound by social rules so that implicit to engaging in any of these forms of dialogue are understood patterns of ritual and behaviour ostensibly intended to bring about resolution. He considers this approach to be dialectical because two parties are supposed to be collaboratively (although partly contestively) taking part in a rule governed exchange of viewpoints in a dialogue where there is a difference of opinions of viewpoints so that one party argues for one side of the issue and the other party argues on the opposed side (p. 71).

Walton recognises the two-sidedness of argument, but does not appear to make a link between arguing and thinking. Walton’s work has been more closely linked with computer-generated forms of argumentation and it seems that the idea of argumentation as an object in its own right (Walton, 2006) rather than as a process has taken precedence in his interpretation.

Billig (1996) is critical of confining dialogue to goal-orientated rules. Billig links dialogue directly to thought. For him, thought is an internal dialogue. He claims this inner dialogue is ‘infinite’, which is why he argues that logic with its
rules does not hold the key to thought, while rhetoric does, because it has an ‘openness’ which allows for the infinite. Billig, as a social psychologist, is also critical of the cognitive perspective that likens the mind to a computer – he suggests instead that the human mind is infinitely more than just a problem-solving machine. He asserts that ‘witcraft’ – the act of responding to an opposing point of view during an argument – requires the individual to engage in sophisticated thought and cognitive processing. Billig (1996) goes on to argue that this is more than problem solving; that it is, in fact, very creative, and it is this creativity inspired by the argument that brings about cognitive development, which seems to contradict the assertions of Glassner and Schwarz’s yet supports the findings of Wegerif (2005).

De Laat and Wegerif (2006) also criticise Walton’s model for argumentation as being an ‘imposition of rules devoid of any relation to naturally occurring discourse’. They argue instead for a framework that emerges from the dialogue found in the classroom. Wegerif’s stance is dialogic and based in the work of Bakhtin (1981). Wegerif (2008, 2011a) clarifies the distinction between the dialectic and dialogic interpretation of educational dialogue on an ontological level, arguing for Bakhtin’s interpretation of the appropriation of signs and meanings rather than Vygotsky’s culturally, tool-mediated perspective. What seems to be fundamental to Wegerif’s (2013a) argument is not the dialogue itself, but the space created by the dialogue in which reflection and thinking occurs. He argues (2013a) that dialogic space, which he describes as being closer to Hilbert Space than physical space, is a space where meanings are open to radical re-interpretation by an infinite number of voices. Dialogic space becomes multi-dimensional and dynamic.

Wegerif (1999) also notes the very active silences of the children in his earlier study as they try to work out problems: frequently they communicate the answer with a gesture rather than utter it. Wegerif talks about the ‘calling forth of talk’, which echoes Hobson’s (2002) work on how young children learn to talk. Young children communicate long before they talk and Hobson suggests their language is brought into being through the relationships they have with other people, notably the primary carer. Hobson suggests that this is a pattern which is repeated throughout early childhood. Each stage in learning is
brokered through a mediated, almost organic ‘space’ through which communication is formed.

Walton’s model does not allow for an interpretation of the interaction involved in the argumentation either. The work of Linell and Marková (1993) demonstrated, writing from the linguistic perspective, how Searle’s theory of speech acts, which also underpins the argumentation theory of pragma-dialectics, does not take into account the interaction, or the space, associated with the dialogue. In discussing what dialogism is and how to interpret it within the classroom, Linell (2003, 2004) shows how important it is that the dialogue is not isolated from the interaction. The silences become just as important as what is said and the manner in which words are conveyed with the associated ‘body language’ – from facial ‘twitches’ to hand gestures and whole-body movements as well. In short, this is dialogue in interaction.

Wegerif’s (2010a & b, 2011b) more recent research suggests that there is a fourth type of dialogue within the classroom environment in which pupils and students can engage. This type of dialogue is derived from exploratory talk, but is more open and is not designed to seek consensus but rather to explore differences. Fundamental to the on-going process is the relationship of the individuals engaged in the argument – they are considered as equals so that the argument is not about the promotion of values, self-interest, and self-identification but is instead an exploration of difference. The boundaries of self-promotion and identification are blurred and the two people interacting in the argument are orientating themselves to the dialogue – ‘the inside and outside nature of dialogue’ – where meanings are being continually brokered, not just in the present interaction but through echoes of previous and potential future exchanges rather than anything else. It is also important to realise that exploratory talk has vestiges of ‘disputational’ and ‘cumulative talk’, but that all three are types of talk that are designed to problem solve and to reach a consensus. Dialogic talk is not designed to ensure that both parties agree at the end of the exchange, but to ensure that a greater and deeper understanding of the other’s perspective has been reached. Wegerif (2013a) suggests that in our struggle for understanding we are always seeking the other’s perspective in a dialogue that is situated not only in a physical time and space but in any time and space. That is why Wegerif (2013a) argues that dialogues in education
should be considered ontological rather than epistemological: it is more than co-
constructing knowledge, more a way of being (2013b, p. 8)

Following the research of Wegerif (2013a) **dialogic interaction** is more closely defined within the present research study as the form of interaction between two or more individuals where the ‘matter of dialogue’ is all encompassing. It is within this infinite if not perpetual space for ‘dialogue’ where meaning is continuously drawn forth from the dialogue that something new can emerge – and it can be more than the sum of the two parts. Dialogic interaction within this thesis also recognises the ‘inside-out and the outside-in’ nature of dialogue, the internalisation of words, which allows a multiplicity of voices whilst an inner voice emerges. This emergence of voice is more than an acquisition of voice, which seems to suggest that the voice is acquired from someone or somewhere else. What is important is that in this thesis ‘acquisition’ of voice stands for ‘emergent’ voice. It is the emergent voice, which will be investigated in the links between spoken and written argumentation. It is therefore suggested that dialogic interaction, which brings forth an ‘emergent voice’, can lead to conceptual change and cognitive development.

The nature of History and the role argumentation has within the discipline is the focus of the next three sections. In exploring History in this way it will also become clear whether a theoretical framework for the exploration of the links between speaking and writing argument based in the dialogical principles of Wegerif’s dialogic talk is compatible with the nature of History as it is taught in schools.

### 2.5 The Nature of History

It is of course beyond the scope of this section of the literature review to represent all that has been written on the subject of History and how it should be studied. This means that there will not be a discussion on different schools of thought in History on a continuum with traditionalism at one end and postmodernism at the other. Nor yet will it be a discussion of the history of History and whether History should be perceived as a science or not. Interesting as these topics are, this section focuses solely on the aspects of
History that might have relevance for the present study. After all, ‘[i]f history is pre-eminently interpretation, the practice of history is argument’ (McGill, 1973, p. 115).

The following table demonstrates the range of literature involved in this part of the literature review.

**Table 2.3. The range of literature associated with History and argumentation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of literature review</th>
<th>Nature of article or book</th>
<th>Name of author(s)</th>
<th>Date of publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The nature of History</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Carr</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Carretero &amp; Voss</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy/theory</td>
<td>Southgate</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Marwick</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>VanSledright</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theory/Research</td>
<td>Coffin</td>
<td>2006 (a &amp; b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Megill</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Torney-Purta</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Carretero &amp; Voss,</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Leinhardt, Stainton, Virji, and Odoroff</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Linaza</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Wiley &amp; Voss</td>
<td>1996, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Voss &amp; Carretero,</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research/theory</td>
<td>van Drie &amp; van Boxtel</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Schwarz</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research/theory</td>
<td>Kitson &amp; Husbands, with Steward (2011)</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>O’Reilly</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Pontecorvo &amp; Girardet</td>
<td>1993,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Stahl, Hynd, Britton, McNish &amp; Bosquet</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Chapman</td>
<td>2003a, 2006a, 2011a &amp;b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>De la Paz &amp; Felton</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2011, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links between</td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Karras</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southgate writes that ‘[e]veryone knows, of course, what history was and is: quite simply, the study of the past’ (2001, p. 13). He further explains that this seeming truism has at its heart the underlying belief that somehow the past is just waiting to be gathered, collated and catalogued as a mass of facts that represent the ‘truth’. The role of the historian is to seek out this truth using fragmentary, vague traces from a past that is too long closed to us. Seeking a complete truth from partial and imperfect source material is not a recent view, and Southgate cites Lucian of Samosata, a Greek writing in the second century AD, who states that History is all about ‘laying out the matter as it is’ or was (2001, p. 13). All historians agree that any historical investigation should be scrupulously carried out using the available evidence in a way that prevents personal bias as much as possible.

Carr (1987) highlights the privileged position of the writer of History. He cites Collingwood’s (1946) idea that ‘the past is not a dead past but a past that is in some sense living in the present’ (p. 22) and develops the idea by suggesting that History is a ‘reconstitution” created by the perpetual “interaction of an unending dialogue between the present and the past’ (p. 30). The historian tries to understand the thoughts of those in the past, thereby making ‘all history a history of thought’. Empirical evidence is selected and interpreted as the past is reconstructed.

paradox that historians have to deal with thus ‘History functions through an
inextricable connection between reality and interpretation which is nonetheless
denied’ (p. 1090).

The tension between ‘reality’ and ‘interpretation’ is denied because, in
arguing an interpretation, the historian is presenting a case that may not or
cannot be real and yet becomes ‘real’ in the re-telling of it. What is uncertain
appears to become certain because of the nature in which the discipline of
History operates; because of the methodologies historians are required to
adopt, ‘to write History is the only way of making it’ (Carr, 1987, citing
Oakeshott, 1933, p. 22). And yet, it is recognised that what has been presented
can never be the final word; that what has been written is in fact only
provisional. Source material can be interpreted differently – or new source
material is found which forces a reconsideration of previous interpretations.
Defined in this way, the study of History seems to be very dialogical – because
of the ineffability of its source material, historians are always seeking and
brokering new meaning.

As Carr (1987) states, adapting Clark’s (1952) dictum, history is ‘a hard
core of interpretation surrounded by a pulp of disputable facts’ (p. 23). Marwick
(2001) develops this point by reminding his reader that there are many facts
and details that are known to the historian but which are not a significant part of
the building of historical knowledge – what is significant is the inference the
historian draws from these facts, but only, it must be remembered, after
extensive ‘corroboration’ and ‘qualification,’ working with both primary and
secondary sources of evidence (p. 153). Evans (2000) goes on to say that even
though ‘facts’ can be considered contentious - even by postmodernists who
consider them as ‘events’ - an historian’s argument has to be based in the
evidence.

Nonetheless, the writing of History and the creation of a ‘text’ cannot be
devoid of the values and opinions of the writer, no matter how objective the
writer tries to be. The writing of History is also confined within the context of its
time and cannot really be understood unless it is viewed and appreciated within
its own historical context. Megill (2007) however suggests that the writer of
History also writes for the audience of the future as well as the present. This
interplay between the written word and the ‘future’ seems to give History an almost three dimensional aspect and again echoes the multi-dimensional aspects of dialogicism which reinforces the dialogic nature of History.

Coffin (2006a) argues that historical discourse is further complicated by the fact that there appear to be polarised views on what History is meant to be. She highlights the differing positions of whether History should offer ‘stories about or present analysis of past events’ (p. 7). Carretero and Voss (1994) suggest that both approaches have a place in its study: ‘one goal would be to provide precise information about how our ancestors lived and the other would be to offer multi-causal explanations of change and development’ (p. 3).

It is recognised that both narrative and argumentation have key roles in the study of History, but the focus here is on argumentation.

2.6 History Concepts and Argumentation

Given the prevailing dominance of the cognitive approach in psychology and education research, it is not surprising that there is a considerable amount of literature dedicated to History arguing, reasoning, cognitive processing and skills acquisition (Ashby, Gordon, & Lee, 2005; Carretero & Voss, 1994; Dickinson, Gordon, & Lee, 2002; Voss & Carretero, 1998, to name but a few) but this section is limited to argumentation and its relationship with history concepts.

History education researchers focus on the problems that students have with the acquisition of History skills and historical concepts. Kitson et al. (2011) suggest that part of the problem lies in the fact that ‘concept’ is a very loose term and can be defined in various ways. They suggest, for example, that learning a History concept at school is closely linked to the acquisition of an historical skill and often the line between the two – skill and concept – can be blurred. Although argumentation may be considered implicit within the study of History, if it is taught at all it is taught as one of a range of skills that History students need.
Schwarz (2009) suggests that the ‘designing of argumentative activities to promote productive discussion’ should be easier in History than in Mathematics or Science because ‘discussions on historical issues will be closer to discussions in natural settings’ (p. 119). In this, Schwarz suggests that because History uses everyday language to explain its concepts, arguing in History should be easier.

Halldén’s (1997) research, on the other hand, confirms the opposite point of view and suggests that students have problems learning historical concepts because they have to unlearn meanings. ‘Significance’ for example, is a particularly charged term. Within History it has the usual English meaning, but it also has a pivotal function. Historians study the past in different ways and seek evidence to support their explanations of what may have happened. The choices they make impact on how the explanation is formed and as a consequence are very significant. Students studying History through a historian’s eyes have to consider this ‘significance’ as part of the historian’s interpretation of an historical event.

Halldén (1998) discusses the concepts of ‘evidence’, ‘causation’ and ‘explanation’ as representing a meta-level that gives an epistemological shape to the discipline. Van Drie and van Boxtel (2008) cite Limón’s (2002) work which develops Halldén’s research further, including other historical processes like ‘empathy’ and ‘narration’, and call them meta-concepts instead of describing them as part of a ‘meta-level’; she suggests these meta-concepts are implicit within the methods historians use to investigate historical situations.

Halldén (1997) also suggests that History does not have a central core of concepts like Science, and van Drie and van Boxtel (2008) demonstrate his assertion in their discussion on substantive concepts. These latter, they tell us, are the concepts that ‘refer to historical phenomena, structures, persons and periods’. Kitson et al. (2011) also discuss substantive concepts and support the findings of van Drie and van Boxtel, who state that students have problems with these concepts because they are abstract and have no fixed meaning. Wegerif (2013a) points out that even if we agree on how we describe a concept we may not mean the same thing. It is also true that the meaning is often implicit and only makes sense within an historical narrative. Like Halldén (1998), Limón
In their review article, van Drie and van Boxtel (2008) offer a framework for thinking about History reasoning which encompasses what they consider to be the three fundamental aspects of describing, comparing and explaining change. They further develop these aspects by considering the following six features as major components of historical reasoning: use of substantive and meta-concepts, asking historical questions, use of sources, contextualisation and finally argumentation.

Though conducted some time ago using college freshmen, McGill’s study (1973) demonstrates a dilemma that is still inherent to some of the few studies conducted in History argumentation. He notes that students tend to think of differing interpretations in a way that suggests that one interpretation is right and the other is wrong, failing to see that interpretations of History are based on selections of evidence which offer a way of understanding the past, not of proving how the past actually was. The way in which History is sometimes presented in the classroom tends to prevent the student from seeing the practice of an historian. The key process of working through the layers of source material, tertiary through to primary, and questioning each source – what, where, how, why, by whom and for what purpose – and then making a judgement, whilst also being aware of the different historiographical interpretations, is not easily accessed by students, who see History as simply a process of learning ‘facts’.

Wineburg (1991) demonstrates this gap between teachers’ and students’ perception of History by exploring different teachers’ conceptions of History. In this way it becomes clear that if teachers have different ideas about what constitutes History knowledge and how it should be interpreted, then it should not be surprising that students also have differences in perception. The research of Kuhn (2009) into the development and acquisition of higher-order thinking also has a bearing on this seeming dichotomy between teacher and student. Those students who acquire the evaluatist ‘level’ of higher-order
reasoning are more likely to view History and its emphasis on interpretation and argumentation differently to those students who have a more absolutist approach to reasoning.

These metacognitive standpoints are reflected in the research on conceptual change by Torney-Purta (1994), Leinhardt, et al. (1994) and Linaza (1994), and also echo Halldén’s findings (1986, 1997, 1998) that students tend to personalise change, for instance giving countries agency, such as conceiving of Nazi Germany being collectively responsible for the Holocaust. Students do not tend to think ‘structurally’ as historians do and see change as solely the responsibility of one person – Gavrilo Princip’s assassination of Franz Ferdinand caused the First World War, or as the result of one event – the Storming of the Bastille caused the French Revolution (Mathis, 2006) and the throwing of the tea chests into Boston harbour caused the American War of Independence.

It is obvious that promoting higher-order thinking is an important consideration for the manner in which History argument should be taught in the classroom. The next two subsections address how History argument is taught for 16-19 year age group and highlights the gaps that my research is designed to exploit.

2.6.1 Links between arguing and thinking in History at A level.

Although there is an increasing number of sources geared to promoting effective History classroom practice for the secondary teacher, there is little that focuses specifically on the links between arguing and thinking in History at A level.

Following the cognitive approach, five studies were conducted which exploited the idea of thinking like an historian – in this case in relation to interpreting source material. Wineburg (1991) used a ‘talking aloud’ protocol to help students work out how they should approach History documents and the strategies they should use to interpret the evidence. Stahl et al. (1996), however, suggested that secondary school students did not benefit from reading more than two different texts, particularly if they were contradictory, unless they had had specific instruction in integrating information from different texts beforehand. Wineburg (1998) returned to the talking aloud protocol to see
how historians tackle source material when they are not an expert in the period, and discovered that the skills of the historian allowed the non-expert to access the source material and eventually interpret the material in the same way as the expert. Thinking as an historian therefore has its benefits. Simply teaching the knowledge of History rather than the relevant skills is counterproductive. Wiley and Voss (1996, 1999) support the claims of Wineburg, and demonstrate that the writing of argument is enhanced when secondary school students are expected to act and think as historians and construct an argument from multiple examples taken from the source material. The findings of Wiley and Voss (1999) suggest that when students are encouraged to make their own judgements based on the material and then present their own arguments, they are able to achieve and retain a deeper understanding of the subject matter, rather than simply replicate existing arguments. De la Paz and Felton (2010), using an experimental approach, explore the notion of ‘thinking and arguing like an historian’ by testing an instructional argumentative strategy that was designed to help students access the sources in the way that historians would. Their research demonstrates that those students who were involved in the group using the argumentative strategy did better than the students who were not, and that these students were able to demonstrate more effective writing of argument too.

O'Reilly (1991) demonstrated how he incorporated informal reasoning in the form of critical thinking into his teaching practice to develop his students’ appreciation of History argument. Although his work is explicitly designed to improve the arguing skills of his students – his students learnt to structure an argument – he found that this alone did not enhance their understanding of the History they were learning. During research which was based on a similar critical thinking model, Karras (1993) became aware that he was simply teaching his secondary school students to structure an argument in History, not to think in it. Pontecorvo and Girardet (1993), on the other hand, demonstrated clearly how the process of arguing is enhanced when the study concentrates on discourse and shared reasoning. More importantly, perhaps, they were also able to demonstrate that a deeper learning could be achieved when students are not teacher-led but teacher-guided.
Chapman (2003a, 2006a, 2011a & b) uses a critical thinking model which is based on Toulmin’s model (See Appendix 2) with its focus on informal logic (2003). Toulmin asserts that the “primary function of a justificatory” argument is to support the assertions made. To do this, he would argue, one uses warrants backed by the data to support the assertion, if not qualifying it with a rebuttal, to ensure that the claim is as justified as it can be. Toulmin offered his argumentation framework as an alternative to one based in pure logic. In this way he hoped to be able to support informal reasoning. Chapman’s research is conducted using the same language of argument – getting students to make claims supported by data in an effort to ensure that their written argument improves. The research Black (2011, 2012) conducted with her sixth formers, however, was not based on a specific argumentation model. Whilst acknowledging the influence of Chapman (2010) and Fordham (2007), she created a model which combines both historical knowledge and critical thinking within the context of social interaction. Black suggested that students can only really argue if they have sufficient knowledge of what it is they are arguing, but the arguing itself is necessary as a facet of the knowledge construction. She acknowledged that the social interaction of her students played an important part in the preparation of their written assignments.

The main focus of each of these research studies was not argument itself, however, but the acquisition of an essential History ‘skill’ or ‘concept’, for example ‘significance’ or ‘continuity and change’ that requires the writing of argument as an implicit factor of the process. Chapman’s research with sixth formers was focused on argument in association with causal reasoning (2003a, 2006a) and interpretation (2011a & b), whereas Black’s research was aimed at helping her students argue about diversity (2011, 2012). Toulmin’s critical thinking model may help students structure their work. Certainly it is a model which forms the basis of a lot of research into Science argumentation (e.g., Erduran et al. 2004). But it is a model that concentrates on the form and structure of argument and the focus of my study is the process of argumentation – in particular the links between speaking and writing argument.

2.6.2 Links between speaking and writing History argument at A level. Little research has been conducted into the explicit links between the speaking and writing of History argument at A level. Only Coffin’s research
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(2004, 2006a & b, 2007, 2009) concentrates specifically on the links between speaking and writing argument, but not with A level students. She takes a multimodal approach (2009) to argument but conducts her research from a systemic functionalist perspective, describing spoken and written argument as ‘genres’ on a continuum. She contends that students’ writing of argument (2004, 2006a & b) within the subject area of school History is part of a developmental process whereby children move from the ‘narrative’ to the ‘argumentative’ form of History writing. Her later research, however, was conducted either on the construction of undergraduate History argument (Coffin, 2007; Coffin et al. 2005; Coffin et al. 2006) or with pre-GCSE children aged 9-14 (Coffin et al. 2009). Her focus, then, was on creating online written ‘debate’ as a bridge between spoken and written argument.

Working within the American educational system, Karras (1993) focused on teaching History through encouraging his high school students to engage in historical argument. This was done by charting the various stages of an argument on the classroom blackboard. He felt that this method, which emphasised the visualisation of the argument as it developed, helped his students appreciate the ‘other side’ of an argument. Karras found, however, that though it helped them understand the structure of an argument, the charting process did not markedly improve the written argument in his students’ essays. Counsell’s work (1997) on discursive and analytical writing at Key Stage 3, has been taken as a basis for the teaching of argument strategies to UK secondary school History pupils. Although the ideas were developed to be used for teaching at GCSE level (Laffin, 2000), Counsell’s research has not been explicitly adapted for A level students. Laffin (2009), relying on extensive classroom teaching experience, has created activities to promote History learning at A level, but although the activities are designed to extend thinking skills, they are not explicitly focused on the speaking and writing of History argument.

Harris’s research (1997, 2001) concerned the writing and structuring of essays. His study concentrated on ways in which more focused reading and discussion in class could help his A level students improve their essays. His action research project, with its emphasis on the deeper learning approach espoused by Marton, Hounsell, and Entwhistle (1984), did bring about an
improvement in essay writing in History. However, though the research acknowledged that a student’s argument was important, it did not focus on developing argument in an essay, but rather on structuring the essay itself. On the other hand, the research that Mitchell (1994), and Mitchell and Andrews (2001), conducted at sixth form and in higher education, focuses not only on argument in essays, but also on its role within schools and subject disciplines. Mitchell and Andrews suggest that the essay form has become synonymous with the transmission of an argument, yet advocate that students engage in ‘arguing’ activities prior to the writing of their essay (Mitchell & Andrews, 2001). They are concerned that the conventions of linear essay writing – writing an introduction, middle, and conclusion – actually prevents the delineation of a genuine written argument. They suggest instead that teachers should focus on different ways of generating argument.

Andrews (2000) highlights the importance of argumentation to the cognitive approach, particularly as it has links with thinking. He suggests moreover ‘that thinking will not only be grounded in its social and political situations but also in the specific disciplinary contexts in which it is asked to operate’ (p. 5). He suggests therefore that the arguing associated with each discipline is unique and specific. Andrews’s later research (2009a, 2010) nevertheless explores the tensions between generic and discipline-specific argumentation. Within his study into argumentation in higher education (2010), he investigated the role of argumentation in History compared with the role of argumentation in Biology and Electronics/Electrical Engineering. During interviews with History lecturers, Andrews demonstrated how important the process of argument is to the discipline of History – for example, ‘the drilling down through the layers of evidence, from tertiary to primary’ source material. Given the significance of argument to the study of History, Andrews (2010) reports a telling observation made by one of the lecturers, who suggested that undergraduates who were able to successfully engage in oral argument were not always able to translate their success into their written argument, and vice versa. It is, however, unclear whether the observation was made about students who engaged in classroom discussion, or in formal debate. Andrews (2010) suggests that the lecturer’s observation might also have something to do with the way in which these undergraduates had been taught to argue in History during their sixth form
years. This makes the teaching and learning of argumentation at sixth form even more important.

How this can be compatible with the dialogic theory espoused by Wegerif (2012, 2013a) is the subject of the next section.

2.7 History Argumentation and Dialogic Interaction

De Laat and Wegerif’s (2006) dialogical model of higher-order thinking is based in the naturally occurring dialogue of the classroom. Wegerif discusses Bakhtin’s dialogic approach and demonstrates how dialogue could be considered three dimensional. In any dialogue, the interaction is not just a ‘toing and froing’ of turn taking on one level, but is instead progressive and three-dimensional too. The dialogue is not fixed because it progresses as it moves back and forth and as each ‘addressee’ responds to what is said, what might have been, and what may be said next. Bakhtin’s dialogic approach, as cited by Wegerif (2013a), focuses on the orientations taken by the addressees but includes another dimension – an orientation to the superaddressee – unlike Perelman and Olbrects-Tyteca as cited by Crasnich and Lumbelli (2004), where the addressee orientates to the other addressee and the potential counterargument. Dialogic interaction is based in an orientation to the dialogue itself where the addressees are not just listening to the other, they also become aware of what they are saying too – the drawing forth of talk.

Wegerif (2005) discusses the importance of intersubjective orientations and shared ground rules within dialogic exchanges, citing the importance of the work of Habermas (1991) and Buber (1923/70). Fundamental to the dialogical model is the understanding that the two addresses orient themselves to the dialogue within an environment created by the shared ground rules, which emphasises equality and respect for the dialogue and for each other. The exchanges are meant to be explorations of difference in which no one is coerced into accepting or rejecting an idea by an authoritative voice, but instead accept a persuasive voice that ‘enters into us and stimulates one’s own words’ (De Laat & Wegerif, 2006, p. 11).
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Because the knowledge of History can be considered provisional, there can be nothing certain about History argument, which is a fundamental reason why inductive reasoning based in probabilities rather than deductive reasoning is a more appropriate way to look at History argumentation. History argumentation, moreover, is essentially persuasive, which is why it seems compatible with dialogicism.

Persuasive argument, however, is a twin-edged sword and should be considered most carefully. Billig (1996) suggests that in arguing a case persuasively one chooses and adapts words to match and ultimately manipulate the mood of the audience. Billig notes that Aristotle was well aware of the significance of good rhetoric and how persuasive and powerful it can be. Mason (2001) also makes this point, though she does so differently, simultaneously questioning the legitimacy of using ‘persuasion’ within education as a means of effecting conceptual change. She offers clever advertising as an example of attitudinal change effected through persuasion; Billig does likewise, discussing psychologists’ work priming populations for bad news during war time.

So persuasion can effect change through peripheral and core effects. Mason further makes the point that the amount and extent of conceptual change depends on the message the learner is given. She does, however, also make the point that the term ‘conceptual change’ needs further research because it is too vague and seems to mean different things to different researchers – echoing Kitson et al. (2011). For example, one of the research studies Mason reviewed showed that persuasion linked to emotions caused conceptual change. The post-test, however, was conducted immediately after the lesson, so it is uncertain at what level the change had occurred or how long lasting it was. Mason also argues that students associate persuasion with changes in beliefs, while experts associate it with changes in knowledge. It is not surprising, therefore, that there is some confusion about what concept change constitutes exactly.

Walton (1999) suggests that if a persuasion argument is to be successful then both sides of the case must be fully explained. Furlong (1993) conducted research into informal reasoning of economic issues, expecting the students
involved to create arguments that reflected multiple approaches. He was testing to see whether students produced two-sided arguments as they formulated their ‘persuasive’ arguments, and made the point that ‘to reason from multiple and conflicting perspectives invites cognitive conflict and possible emotional discomfort... However the willingness to consider counterexamples and previously unembraced social solutions is the beginning of societal change and peaceful resolutions’ (p. 171).

What Furlong discovered, though, is that students presented strong arguments but did not include a counterargument unless they were prompted or directed to do so. He suggests that this might not necessarily reflect the reasoning involved in the arguments presented, but instead the students’ resistance to appearing ignorant and confused. He goes on to make a strong argument for teaching students to consider two-sided reasoning as the most appropriate way to conduct argumentation rather than placing emphasis on one-sided arguments and the appeal to look expert in the subject and so cause all opposition to wither away. This has implications for classroom instruction. It is apparent that, although students are interacting in the argumentative process, they are unequal partners. They may well find themselves engaged emotionally, but there is still an element of the argument that is somehow outside of the student. They are passive, being controlled by the teacher or researcher constructing arguments that may or may not promote cognitive development. So although Furlong talks about engaging students in two-sided argumentation, the interaction does not meet the criteria for Wegerif’s dialogic talk, which would have the students as equal partners in the dialogue and thus ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ of the interaction it at the same time.

Therefore, although there are elements of History argumentation compatible with a dialogical framework, the manner in which the interaction occurs is very important. The ‘persuasive voice’ should not manipulate or coerce; the environment must promote equality so that persuasion is based in an openness and an orientation not only to the dialogue but also to gaining a deeper understanding of the subject matter.
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2.8 Towards a Theoretical Framework – Design Framework 1

The literature review so far has covered a range of different research studies that have a bearing on the links between spoken and written argumentation. It has also incorporated studies that demonstrated a link between thinking and arguing, as well as those studies that concentrated on argument as a form of dialogue that also had links to reasoning. Finally, the literature that incorporated learning in History, as well as argumentation, was also considered. What becomes clear from the research so far reviewed is that there are several argument theories underpinning the current research into argumentation which will need to be considered when I come to establish the framework for this research study.

Toulmin’s theory (1958) has been used as a basis for much of the research into Science argumentation, particularly the measuring of the quality of argumentation, as in Toulmin’s Argument Pattern, TAP (Erduran et al., 2004, Simon, 2008). Andrews (2000), however, suggests that, despite the popularity of his argument theory, Toulmin has been misrepresented. Andrews argues that Toulmin is not just concerned with the structure of an argument’s claims, data, and warrants. Instead Andrews suggests that the strength of Toulmin’s model rests in the processes involved in determining the claims, data, warrants, and rebuttals. I will not, however, be using Toulmin (1958) even if he has been misrepresented, as the underpinning theory for my research. I acknowledge that the model has a strong connection with informal reasoning, but it does not allow me to investigate argumentational interaction, which is an important aspect of my study. Nor will I use Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca’s model of argumentation (1958), as cited by Crasnich and Lumbelli (2004), which appears to be based in the strengthening of one’s argument against a potential counterargument. This has little to do with exploring different perspectives from a position of equality. Though there is a strong emphasis on attuning to the addressee’s stance, this is only in order to respond to a potential counterargument. Exploration rather than confrontation is the form of argumentation I would prefer to follow. Equality is also an aspect I want to strive to engender within the argumentational exchanges – the arguing is not meant to be an exercise in coercion, though I realise that persuasive dialogue is not without its shortcomings.
Walton's types of dialogue (1998), taken at face value, look as though they could be useful as a way of determining the types of dialogue that occur within society. Goal-driven dialogue, however, designed to bring about agreement one way or another, is not the focus of this study. The focus is to explore difference not consensus, and for this reason the model of van Eemeren and Grootendorst (2004) is also inappropriate for this study. It is recognised that taking positions and preparing cases against possible ‘attacks’ by a protagonist will engender a degree of thinking and, if nothing else, a consolidating of knowledge, but van Eemeren and Grootendorst argue not just for consensus but to demonstrate how weak the other argument is. Lumer (2010) suggests that a successful outcome of an argument in their terms is when the other side concedes or capitulates. This means that ultimately their aim is a complete rejection of alternative points of view. This model does not sit well with History argumentation, which acknowledges alternative points of view. Although these views will be argued against intensely and sometimes vehemently, the discipline of History within western society does not expect to totally eradicate other forms of explanation. Wegerif’s dialogic talk (2011b), however, acknowledges difference and accepts there will be tensions within the interaction, and advocates not eradication, but exploration so that those engaged in the interaction gain a greater understanding of each other’s point of view.

My study is not just about finding ways in which to improve my students’ written argument. I am also motivated to help them to reason more effectively. I intend to help my students become ‘evaluatist’ (Kuhn, 2009) in their reasoning, so the model of argumentation that will underpin my study needs to be a model that encourages higher-order thinking.

Kuhn (1991) suggests that argument is dialogic, but her definition seems to be a based purely in the word ‘dialogue’ – argument is dialogue therefore it is dialogic. Although it allows for an argument to be two-sided – which following Billig, was akin to the internal dialogue associated with thinking – Kuhn’s definition does not allow me to determine and access the form of interaction I want to focus on. I want to investigate the intensely active and animated and/or the intensely still and reflective interaction that I had witnessed with my students. I have suggested that it was the intensity of the interaction where the
student was so caught up in the dialogue that was the important element of the transition between spoken and written argument.

Dialogue and the interaction in which it is framed are at the heart of my study. Kuhn’s definition of ‘dialogic argumentation’, with its links to thinking, is limited because it does not allow for the interactive nature of the dialogue. Wells and Arauz (2006) on the other hand, base their understanding of dialogue in the classroom on cultural historical activity theory (CHAT). They argue, following Vygotsky (1986), that it was the joint activity of humans, and the language that formed part of this activity, that brought about human development. Wells and Arauz (2006) discuss language in a different way to Kuhn. They acknowledge the intersubjectivity of a dialogue and, following Bakhtin (1986), emphasise that it is the orientation to the ‘other’ as he or she responds to an utterance that can generate new meanings and in this way for them the interaction becomes ‘dialogic’.

Critiquing the work of Wells and Arauz (2006) on monologic and dialogic activities in the classroom, O’Connor and Michaels (2007) suggest that there are other dimensions at work. They suggest that the idea of monologic and dialogic forms should not be confined to describing simply the discourse in a classroom; they suggest that the ‘stance’ that the teacher takes is equally important. They submit that the interpretation of Wells and Arauz (2006) is based on an ideological stance which depicts monologic discourse as being ‘associated with fixed transmission of unchanging ideas and of status inequalities’, whereas ‘dialogic discourse connotes social relationships of equal status, intellectual openness and possibilities for critique and creative thought’ (O’Connor & Michaels, 2007, p. 277). They go on to offer examples of monologic discourse as the delivery of a lecture with no questions from the floor, and dialogic discourse as discussion-led classes. However, they suggest that these two examples could equally be considered as either dialogic or monologic depending on the ideological stance of lecturer or teacher. If the lecture ended with a series of questions which opened up to a wide-ranging discussion which explored the themes of the lecture, it could not be considered monologic; conversely, if the discussion was dominated by the teacher asking closed questions based in recall only, and not exploration of student thinking, it would be not be a dialogically inspired discussion.
Mercer et al. (1999) and Wegerif et al. (1999) follow a socio-cultural perspective to suggest that it is ‘exploratory talk’, not cumulative talk that brings about cognitive development on a group and individual basis. But Wegerif (2008) suggests that the sociocultural model is often associated with the neo-Vygotskian perspective on dialogue, which has been considered ‘dialogic’. However, Wegerif draws a distinction between Vygotsky and Bakhtin’s perspective on dialogue on an ontological level. He argues that Vygotsky’s perspective is dialectic and Bakhtin’s dialogic. Although Thompson (2012) argues against Wegerif’s position, considering Wegerif to have a ‘one-sided view of the dialectic which is subsumed into identity’, an important distinction still rests in the fact that ‘Vygotsky’s perspective is based in the use of dialogue as a tool, whereas Bakhtin’s interpretation is that dialogue is used through the mediation of human relationships’ (Wegerif, 2008, p. 348). Wegerif (2010a&b) further develops these points basing his explanations of dialogic talk in Heidegger (1978) and in Bakhtin’s dialogic perspective. In discussing the teaching of thinking, Wegerif uses ‘dialogue’ as a metaphor for thinking. He discusses the tension that exists in a dialogue where one interlocutor can hold several perspectives which cannot be combined into one – and it is this tension, he suggests, which allows for the development of creativity and critical thinking. This distinction is important because other theories suggest that the differences are eventually subsumed. In this theory they are not. Wegerif further submitted that metaphors for thinking, which include thinking as a derivation of tool use – such as in the neo-Vygotskian perspective – did not really allow an appreciation of the ‘bigness’ and ‘unbounded’ nature of thought. Wegerif suggested, furthermore, that the essays and the oral transcripts in which thinking can be conveyed are actually ‘traces’ of thinking, not actual thinking.

The dialogical perspective of Wegerif (2011b, 2013a), based in the works of Bakhtin (1981, 1986), is the theory of argument that underpins the first theoretical framework. This leads me to the formation of the first theoretical framework.
Design Framework 1

My initial and fundamental conjecture is that if students are encouraged to engage in oral argumentation before they write their argument in their History A level essays then their written responses will be improved.

This is based in the following theories derived from the literature review.

The links between spoken and written argument

• The idea that spoken argument can and does influence written argument is based in the research of Anderson et al. (2001), Reznitskaya et al. (2001, 2007, 2009), and Reznitskaya and Anderson (2006).

The links between arguing and thinking

• Argument is considered as persuasive within this body of research after Kuhn’s (2005) appropriation of Billig’s (1996) thesis that arguing is likened to thinking through ‘witcraft’, which in turn leads to cognitive development.

History argument and thinking

• Expecting History students to engage in persuasive argument is to initiate them into an Historian’s apprenticeship. Research has demonstrated that students encouraged to engage in History argument have a deeper and better understanding of the subject material, (de la Paz & Felton, 2010; Wineburg, 1998) particularly when they are expected to make judgements about the evidence (Wiley & Voss, 1996, 1999)

Dialogic interaction

• I am suggesting that ‘dialogic interaction’, based in the research of Wegerif (2005, 2011b, 2012, 2013a), has an important role in the links between spoken and written persuasive argumentation because it too can lead to cognitive development. It comprises of both talk and reflection.

Dialogic talk
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- Following Wegerif’s theory of dialogic talk (2011, 2012, 2013a) the interaction needs to be:
  - based in ground rules that promote equality
  - exploratory in nature and not disputational
  - orientated to the dialogue itself and not caught up in orientations to the group or self-identification
  - characterised by an openness and willingness to change.

Dialogic reflection.

- I am also suggesting that reflection plays a critical role in the interaction. This is seen in Billig’s (1996) ‘reflection is an internal dialogue’ thesis and Wegerif’s research (2010, 2012, 2013a) into dialogic talk and the creation of a dialogic space in which reflection can take place. It is important therefore to focus not only on the dialogue, but also on the interaction and the silences as well – the ‘calling forth’ of talk into a dialogic space.

In this way it is conjectured that an emergent voice – a product of the dialogic interaction – will be a link between spoken and written argumentation.

From these theories I derive the following pedagogical principles which are presented in the following table.

Table 2.4. Design Framework 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Framework 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students* should engage in oral argumentation before they write arguments in their essays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should engage in persuasive argumentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should be encouraged to make judgments about History which will become the basis of their arguments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should follow ground rules to encourage them to engage in dialogic talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should be encouraged to reflect on their oral and written arguments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note – students* refers to History students although it is possible that students from other disciplines might be able these principles to improve their argumentation.
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2.9 Summary of Chapter 2

My research lies within History education. Its motivation is the improvement of History argument in A level essays. I am considering argument and the creation of argument for its own sake and not just as an integral part of History conceptual learning (van Drie & van Boxtel, 2008). Although subject specific I intend that the argument skills to be learnt will also be generic and, if used successfully in History classrooms, may be of use to those who are teaching argument within Science classrooms.

In the first four sections of this chapter, I looked at the different research studies associated with the links between speaking and writing argument at sixth form level. I also discussed the links between arguing and thinking and then looked at the research into the links between thinking, dialogue and interaction. In the following three sections I discussed the nature of History and the role of History argumentation within the discipline. This section of the literature review also summarised the existing literature associated with the links between arguing and thinking, and speaking and writing argument at A level History, highlighting the gaps in the literature and contextualising my own research study. The review also integrated an appreciation of the different argument theories underpinning the research studies discussed. Following a brief discussion of these theories, I proposed my initial theoretical framework – Design Framework 1 – which forms the basis for the first iteration - the exploratory study.

The next chapter is the methodology chapter and discusses how I will be conducting my research, design-based research (DBR), and the methods used to conduct and analyse the research data within the first two iterations.
Chapter 3 – Methodology

3.1 Introduction

My investigation is a complex study. Not only am I researching in the field of argumentation, I am also researching interaction with a view to improving written argument. I am not, however, attempting to devise another way for students to structure their responses; I am instead trying to create opportunities for students to argue to think and in that way argue to learn. I am suggesting that their written argument will improve because they will have been given opportunities to think through – by co-constructing knowledge collaboratively, if argumentationally – what it is they are attempting to write. To add to the complex nature of the research, I am also conducting the investigation with sixth-form A Level History students. A level History argument is multi-faceted. The students need to consider the nature of the evidence and how it is represented as well as the underlying perspectives and motives of the historians through whose interpretation they access the events of History and upon which they are asked to make judgements.

Andrews (2010) points out that argumentation research is ‘interdisciplinary’, which means that it has no fixed underlying ideological assumption, nor is it tied to any one paradigm. It can equally be argued that interaction research has been informed by a range of different disciplines too – Psychology and Semiotics to name just two. Research into dialogism is also not limited to one discipline – Linell takes a linguistic stance while Wegerif’s stance is educational and philosophical. Whereas research into History education can be quasi-experimental (e.g. van Drie and Van Boxtel, 2003) or conducted through case studies (e.g. Black, 2012, Chapman, 2011a). So the manner in which I conduct my study cannot be confined to any one ideological or research-specific approach. Essentially I am researching ‘pragmatically’ (Creswell, 2007) in seeking to understand and resolve a perceived problem. Creswell suggests that ‘pragmatism is not committed to any one system of philosophy or reality’ (2007, p. 23), and that researchers are therefore ‘free’ to choose whatever
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methods seem appropriate. What takes precedence is the resolution of the problem; what matters to pragmatists, according to Creswell, is ‘what works’.

In this study I am suggesting that if students engaged in argumentation that leads to dialogic interaction, their written argument would improve. This, however, involves the assumption that students do not already engage in dialogic interaction. An essential aspect of my study, therefore, is to explore what happens in sixth form A level History classrooms. If I discover that my original premise is correct, I need to find a method by which to instantiate dialogic interaction. I will then be in a position to investigate whether there are any links between dialogic interaction and the students’ written argument. My research investigation therefore needs to involve first, an exploratory study, where I explore and assess the reality of A level History classrooms naturalistically (Wellington, 2000); before I can go on to create a method of instantiating dialogic interaction.

Although some of the methods of data gathering – observations and interviews – are used during each of the iterations, there are data gathering methods that are peculiar to only one iteration. The way that the data is analysed in each mini-cycle of research also differs. To prevent confusion for the reader, there are two methodology chapters in this thesis (the present chapter and Chapter 7). This chapter deals with the underpinning philosophical approach and the overarching methodology with which the study is conducted, whilst also focusing on the methods used during the first two iterations of the research study – the exploratory study and the teacher trials. The first section of the chapter explains the philosophical underpinning of this research investigation; the second section introduces design-based research – the methodology chosen for the entire research study; the third discusses the research methods and the data gathering instruments of the exploratory study and the teacher trials; the final section describes the forms of data analysis used, which leads to the creation of the second theoretical framework – Design Framework 2 – for the study.
3.2 Pragmatism – A Philosophical Imperative

Creswell (2009) suggests that ‘pragmatism is a world view that arises from actions, situations and consequences.’ Cherryholmes (1992) lists C. S. Pierce, George Herbert Mead, John Dewey, and William James, among others, as proponents of this world view. Garrison (1994) argues that there are many kinds of pragmatism and highlights the difference between Pierce, James, Dewey, and Rorty, but defends the pragmatism of Dewey, arguing that Dewey’s philosophy has much to offer an educational researcher, not least because of its democratic ideals. Cherryholmes (1992) suggests that ‘pragmatists seek to clarify meanings of intellectual concepts by tracing out their “conceivable practical consequences”’ (p. 13). He also argues that pragmatists reject the ‘dualism between positivist/empiricist and phenomenological/interpretivist’ research. Johnson and Onweugbuzie (2004) argue that the ‘project of pragmatism has been to find a middle ground between philosophical dogmatisms and scepticism and to find a workable solution’ (p.18). They also argue that pragmatism is a logical philosophical stance for mixed method researchers because they are not tied to any particular form of research imperative.

In seeking the middle ground, pragmatists view knowledge as both ‘being constructed and based in the reality of the world we experience’ (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). They recognise that the world exists independent of the mind as well as being in the mind (Creswell, 2007). Robson (2002) likens this to a ‘reality which is multiple, complex, constructed and stratified’ (p. 43). Dewey’s view of the natural world, according to Garrison (2004) is organic and not mechanical, where change is omnipresent – this means that human beings are not spectators of a ‘finished universe’, but are instead ‘participants in an unfinished universe’. Garrison’s (2004) interpretation of Dewey’s viewpoint suggests that ‘all human action has ontological significance’ – which is why ‘consequences of actions’ are what matter rather than the ‘insistence on antecedent phenomena’ (Cherryholmes, 1992, p. 13). This viewpoint also suggests ‘that “truths” are provisional and are given through experience and experimenting’ (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004, p. 18).
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My research is an attempt to find a way to help students improve their written argument – so it could be argued that I am motivated if not ‘driven’ by the potential ‘consequences’ of my research study. I want to find ‘what works’ to improve my students’ ability to write argument. I am also aware that although I am trying to find a possible generic form of argumentation for History A level candidates, even if it works with one group of students it might not with another. Culture, history, politics, and environment will all play a pivotal part in the research. The ‘truth’ will be what works at the time (Creswell, 2007). As Megill (2007) suggests I am not attempting ‘to represent things as they really are’ because I recognise that I cannot be utterly detached and objective instead I accept that I will bring a level of subjectivity to my research with an inherent bias – hence a brief reflexive analysis. I am, as Denscombe (2002) suggests, more interested in finding solutions to the research problem than I am interested in ‘sticking to a “positivist” or “interpretivist” epistemology’ (p. 23).

What makes the choice of pragmatism particularly apt is that Dewey – as cited by Garrison (2004) – considers ‘language as a mode of interaction’ and further indicates that ‘meanings do not come into being without language’, but that ‘the heart of language is not “expression” of something antecedent, much less expression of antecedent thought. It is communication; the establishment of cooperation in an activity in which there are partners….’ (p. 6).

Dewey (1910), in discussing language and its role in the ‘training of thought’ suggests the key

… is to direct pupils’ oral and written speech used for practical and social ends, so that gradually it shall become a conscious tool of conveying knowledge and assisting thought (p. 179).

I am trying to get my students to argue together so that they can ‘argue to learn’ and in that way improve their written argument. Deweyan pragmatism seems to be an appropriate philosophical stance on which to base my research.
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3.3 Methodological Choice

The purpose of the study is to determine the role of dialogic interaction by investigating and exploring argument as it is taught and understood in school History lessons. Brown (1992) suggests that classroom interaction and discourse is incredibly rich and diverse, and open to considerable interpretation. Trying to create the same environment within a laboratory, however, would be difficult. The cognitive-scientific paradigm, which relies on experimental methods, would not allow me to access the intricate relationship between spoken and written argumentation nor yet allow me the opportunity to design and develop an educational intervention intended to help improve the written argument of History A level students.

I need a methodological approach that incorporates an on-going iterative process where practice and theory can be tested and developed in response to the participants and environment. It must be pragmatic in outlook and not tied to either the positivistic or interpretive paradigm, nor ‘trapped’ in a mixed methods approach (Collins & O’Cathain, 2009; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2006) which might dictate that there be a balance between qualitative or quantitative methods. What matters is that I be able to explore the problems students have with History argument, design, develop, and then assess a possible classroom intervention that would act as a solution and which could be used by other teachers. Design-based research, with its roots in classroom practice (Brown, 1992) and design engineering (Collins, 1992), seems to be the appropriate methodology to choose.

3.4 What is Design-Based Research (DBR)?

DBR is a methodology designed by and for educators that seeks to increase the impact, transfer, and translation of education research into improved practice. In addition, it stresses the need for theory building and the development of design principles that guide, inform and, improve both practice and research in educational contexts (Anderson and Shattuck, 2012, p. 16).
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In determining how effective DBR had been as a research methodology, Anderson and Shattuck also indicate how DBR has been variously described as design research or development research. The debate about its claims as a methodology, however, continues particularly as the practice of DBR has begun to differentiate and become more disparate (van den Akker, et al., 2006).

Abdallah and Wegerif (2011), in suggesting a simplified version of DBR for the use of PhD researchers, contend that DBR is an independent paradigm tied to neither positivist nor interpretivist approaches. Sandoval and Bell (2004) consider DBR a research paradigm, while Kelly (2004) suggests that it should be considered as only ‘a set of design studies’, or ‘a loose set of methods’ or, at best, ‘research actions’: ‘[u]nless this set of procedures is under-girded by a conceptual structure that forms the basis for the warrants for their claims, design study methods do not constitute a methodology…’ (Kelly, 2004, p. 118). This explains why the development of a theoretical framework is central to DBR as a methodological approach.

Barab and Squire (2004) also highlight how important the advancing of theory is to the proper practice of DBR by suggesting that theories generated from ‘naturalistic contexts’ needs to ‘transcend the environmental particulars’ of the context in which they are generated. Hoadley (2004) qualifies this stance by demonstrating that DBR researchers understand that ‘context’ can be problematic – working within a classroom environment means that there are a multiplicity of variables which cannot be controlled and this will impact on the ‘universality’ of the findings. He does stress, however, that the very ‘enactment’ of the designed ‘intervention’ within a classroom environment is its own strength.

Validity within the DBR framework, Hoadley (2004) contends means more than measurement validity, which is espoused by the positivistic experimental methodological approach, and offers, instead, two other forms of validity: treatment and systemic validity, which are essential to a DBR study. He argues that treatment validity should ensure that treatments (i.e., the intervention in this study’s case) are aligned with the underpinning theories; and that the ‘theories must be communicated in a way that is true to the inferences used to prove them’ (Hoadley, 2004, p. 204). Once again, the importance of the
theoretical framework to underpinning the development of the intervention is highlighted

Sandoval and Bell (2004) suggest, however, an alternative and equally valid question that concerns the practice of DBR and ask to which standards should it adhere. Plomp and Nieveen (in press) are also concerned with what makes ‘good’ DBR practice and how the methodology should be promoted. For the purposes of this study, the ensuing discussion is not on DBR’s claim to be considered methodological, but on the attempts by this researcher to make the DBR practised in this study ‘good’ and pertinent to the research process.

There are five key factors that characterise DBR and give some indication of how ‘good’ the practice has been. These are as follows: first, DBR needs to be situated in classroom practice and conducted in such a way that aspects of the research can be made generalisable; second, DBR needs to produce and develop theory – without a theoretical underpinning, DBR is reduced simply to methods and procedures; third, DBR is about designing educational interventions iteratively – if the process does not involve the cyclical yet progressive development of theory and design then it cannot be considered DBR; fourth, DBR is collaborative – the research relies on the input of researchers and teachers alike to determine theory and design; and finally, DBR involves the dissemination of ideas: the whole purpose of DBR is to work on educational ‘problems’ – theoretical and or practical – in such a way as to improve educational practice.

3.4.1 Situated classroom context. Both DBR and action research (AR) – another iterative and classroom-based methodological approach – rely on being ‘situated in the real educational context’ to conduct their research. Anderson and Shattuck (2012) suggest that AR and DBR share a common meta-paradigm, that of pragmatism. My MEd research (Hilliard, 2002) utilised an ethnographic form of AR to access teacher and student perceptions of resilience. An ethnographic study is also an important element of DBR, however this was not a feasible option for my present investigation because the research was conducted in five secondary History departments at various times of the academic year.
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In setting up her classrooms to become ‘communities of learning’ where students were given opportunities to take responsibility for their own learning, Brown (1992) likened her research to a design experiment. She felt that if the research was to ‘migrate’ to other classrooms, she needed to conduct the design experiments in the classroom. This is also important to my research. Being as close as possible to classroom practice seemed appropriate because I was familiar with the synergism of the teaching and learning environment, and I would be able to access and appreciate the many systems and complex layers of relationships which are implicit in school life. Working in different schools would also help me, as a researcher, to be open-minded about the teaching of History at A level. An intervention designed on the findings of five schools would increase its potential to be a ‘generic’ teaching and learning aid for the teaching of History argument at A level, thus making my findings ‘generalisable’.

3.4.2 The development of theory. Cobb, Confrey, diSessa, Lehrer and Schauble (2003) emphasise that design experiments are not just about ‘what works’ but are conducted to test and develop theories. They suggest that theory generation is essential if long-term educational development is to be sustained; they imply that without theory there would simply be short-term contextualised ‘fixes’. As a teacher I had often created schemes of work to help my students to achieve success in their exams, whilst also offering the ‘soft learning’ necessary for students’ personal development (Claxton, 2001; Dweck, 2000; Noddings, 1992). In the present study I wanted to test a theory through my classroom activities. I wanted to do as Cobb et al. (2003) suggest: put my theory in ‘harm’s way’.

Cobb et al. (2003) however suggest that DBR researchers should not rely on a simple set of activities, which may influence learning, but should instead aim to create ‘design constructs’ on which to underpin the classroom innovation. Kelly (2004) stresses the importance of a conceptual structure and argues that without it an intervention will simply be a ‘list of activities’. It is this ‘intertwining of theory and practice’ that it fundamental to DBR research and was a vital component of my research.

3.4.3 Iterative development of an ‘intervention’. Much of the recent Computer Supported Collaborative Learning (CSCL) research into History
argument (e.g., Chapman, 2003b; Coffin et al. 2005, 2009; Mercer, Hennessey, & Warwick, 2010; van Drie et al., 2005) has been conducted through created ‘tools’ or ‘artefacts’ that were used as part of classroom or extended classroom practice. Although this CSCL research was not conducted within the DBR framework, Gorard and Taylor (2004) confirm that at the core of the DBR approach is ‘the development of an artefact [or intervention] for the purposes of improving teaching and learning’ (p. 100); Kelly (2004), moreover, makes the point that the artefact ‘must survive the study otherwise the iterative process’, which is such a vital component of DBR, ‘simply characterizes the procedures that were followed’ (Kelly, 2004, p. 116). Kelly also emphasises the importance of the iterative development of the artefact – not only must the intervention survive the research study it must also be developed throughout the study.

3.4.4 DBR is a collaborative process. Wang and Hannafin (2005) stipulate that the methodology is a systematic yet flexible approach focusing on collaboration. Anderson and Shattuck (2012) further suggest that although a partnership is formed between teacher and researcher it is the researcher who ‘does the research’ because the teacher is ‘usually too busy’ and may not have the necessary skills to ‘conduct rigorous research’ (p. 17). The teachers’ input was crucial in the exploratory study; their commitment to my research ensured that the intervention could be trialled and tested. The students were also important collaborators – without their insights into their learning of History and History argument, I would only have been able to create an intervention that would be seen as an imposition rather than a tool the students themselves felt comfortable using.

3.4.5 Dissemination of the research findings for others. Key to the practice of DBR is the dissemination of the findings of the study and the research process. DBR produces many opportunities for data gathering and so it is essential to the success of the research process that the methods used, the data gathered, and the ensuing analysis, are done as systematically and as openly as possible. This way other researchers can use the data gathered for further research. I videoed the classroom observations and audiotaped the interviews. I have transcripts of the interview material and key argumentative interactions, and field notes. I also have copies of all the essays that were produced as part of the assessment process.
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In attempting to produce a DBR practice that could qualify as ‘good’ research, it must also be recognised that DBR has advantages and disadvantages that also need to be taken into consideration.

### 3.4.6 Advantages and disadvantages of DBR

In DBR, the research procedure is conducted and developed within an iterative process, which means that the researcher can be flexible and is able to react to the classroom context: ‘design-based research methods respond to emergent features of the setting’ (The Design-Based Research Collective, 2003, p. 6). Not only does the methodology allow for the unexpected within the rich messiness of the classroom (Brown, 1992), but it also allows for the investigation of other aspects of the research field that may not have been the initial focus. This was an important aspect for me because I was aware that some of my initial premises needed to be tested and then be developed in the light of the research process to allow me to develop the theoretical framework further.

Those who follow a DBR approach, however, will also have to deal with large amounts of data. Some of the data will be derived ethnographically whereas other forms will be quantitative in nature (Collins, Joseph, & Bielaczyc, 2004). This means that the data generated should be richly representative of the subject matter under examination. The data analysis process, however, might be longer than in other methodological approaches, which could be a disadvantage to PhD students, and vast amounts of this data may be disregarded. Though some of it could be used by other researchers, there are ethical considerations that need to be taken into account too.

Few researchers involved in DBR extol the virtues of the approach as well as its first proponent, Brown (1992) who was well aware of its advantages and disadvantages. Through its iterations, which at one and the same time are both prospective as well as reflective, DBR allows the research to develop and respond to the imperfections and complexities of everyday research in the classroom. The fact, too, that a major facet of the approach is to find out what works, why it works, and then disseminate the findings is also key in promoting educational development.

DBR, situated as it is within the ‘real-world’ situation, however, does not attempt to control variables as experimental methodologies do. This means
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that DBR studies are complex (Collins, Joseph, & Bielaczyc, 2004). This in itself is a disadvantage, particularly if the focus of the study relates to ‘human interaction’, which itself is not an easy topic to study.

DBR is usually a methodology associated with a team of researchers with the luxury of an extended period of time. Fitting the iterations necessary for the testing of a designed intervention normally takes a year or more and relies on long-term commitment from researchers and participants. Creating and developing her research on communities of learners, Brown (1992) was able to follow her groups over time and to fine tune her design with the same set of participants which makes evaluation easier. I did not enjoy that luxury with my participants: I needed to do things differently. I had to look to another research methodology to create a similar set of circumstances (i.e., the relationship between researcher, participants, the research problem, and the research process). I chose case studies to act as the iterations of the DBR process and the methods associated with the case studies will be discussed in chapter 7.

3.4.7 Adapting the research process into a three-year PhD model.
The form of DBR I used is not comparable to the one proposed by Brown (1992) or Collins (1992), but was closer in spirit and practice to the DBR described by Abdallah and Wegerif (2011) and Herrington McKenney, Reeves and Oliver (2007). Trying to fit the exploratory research, design, testing, and implementation of the intervention into a three-year PhD was challenging. Trying to accommodate the tight exam-driven deadlines of sixth form AS and A2 study within the research timetable was an additional challenge: AS History students take their exams in January and early May which means that both teachers and students are under pressure to complete their syllabuses and prepare for important public exams. Intervention iterations and innovations had to be made around the students’ rather than the researcher’s needs.

A level History is also a subject that does not attract large numbers of students so, in order to get a range of opinion from both teachers and students, four History departments were initially involved in the research – a fifth joined after the Exploratory study. Given the vagaries of A level timetables, having a number of schools involved allowed a degree of flexibility so that if one school
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was unavailable at any given time then other schools could participate instead. Although each school was unique and followed a different syllabus, the actual practice of teaching and learning History was very similar in each school.

My research was thus not pure DBR, nor yet was it pure case study, though each of the five schools offered and brought something different to the research. I was in fact conducting an investigation using DBR with single and parallel case studies. The theoretical aspects and focus for the iterative developments were determined through the DBR aspects of the study. The case studies illustrated and offered insight into the intended developments.

The following diagram, which was designed after Herrington et al. (2007), shows the tasks and processes involved in conducting research to meet the requirements of the adapted DBR methodology. The key highlights the iterative and collaborative nature of the research. It also emphasises another important component of DBR the dissemination process. It is set within the framework of a three-year study programme of a PhD researcher.
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Figure 3.1. Research activities within three-year PhD study
3.5 Methods – Exploratory Study

In this section the methods used within the first two iterations - the exploratory study and the teacher trials - are discussed. The methods that were used during the case study iterations will be discussed in Chapter 7.

Wang and Hannifin (2005) suggest that DBR can draw from a range of methods and in so doing the data generated can increase the ‘objectivity and applicability’ of the research. There were, however, just three key methods used during the early part of the research process: the first underpinned the theoretical aspect of the study while the other two were methods designed to help me access the classroom practice of teachers and the learning experience of the students. The methods used were: reviewing the literature, interviews, and observations. Each of these methods is discussed in the following paragraphs. There were ethical implications to be considered when conducting observations and holding interviews, so there is a short section on ethics before the discussion of interviews and observations.

3.5.1 Literature review. This was an important component of my form of DBR and not just because it is an exploration of the literature that was pertinent to the problem and formed the background to the research questions. DBR is theory-driven and in order to provide the theory for the research conducted in this study, it was necessary to undertake an extensive literature review, which examined cogent and pertinent theory. I had made an initial judgement that there was ‘something’ about the process of the dialogue and interaction that happened in the sessions I conducted with my students. My literature review allowed me to explore that ‘something’ and I was able to begin to put a name to the type of process I was involved in which brought about effective learning.

It also led me to develop and understand the links that arguing has with thinking, so that underpinning my work on argumentation was the important aspect of helping students to argue to help them to think. In these ways the literature review became an important method within my research programme because not only did it establish the background for the research questions it also laid the foundation for the development of the theory. It was the interplay
between theory, literature review, and practice that formed the basis for the intervention and each component was important in and of itself.

In this way the literature review did not only take the conventional form in which gaps in the research were discovered and further developed by the PhD study, but also became a very specific tool. Practical solutions and outcomes are a necessary and pragmatic part of DBR and the literature review formed a basis for much of the exploratory study.

The next two methods, however, although equally important within my DBR study, could only be used within ethical guidelines. Fundamental to the role of ethics is the belief that the welfare of the individuals who participate in research is considered paramount. This means that before the interviews and observations could take place, each participant had to be made aware of the purpose of the research and the role that he or she would be playing in the research process. It was also very important that each participant was given the choice to participate in the process and had the right to withdraw at any stage of the research process. It was essential that each participant gave his or her informed consent before the research process began (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007).

As I intended to conduct research within schools, the consent had to be made by the parents on behalf of their children. This was to cover the premise that children may not be sufficiently mature to appreciate or comprehend all that the research process entails. However, because I was working with sixth formers I felt it appropriate not only to gain the parents’ consent, but also to obtain individual consent from the students themselves. At every stage of the research process I reminded students that they were free to withdraw at any time if they did not feel comfortable with the observation or the interviewing process. I also agreed to preserve the anonymity of the student participants. I could not guarantee complete confidentiality, because of the nature of the research. Before I started the writing up process I asked further permissions of the students whose interview extracts and interactions would feature in the thesis. I have only used information that students were happy for me to use. All the students’ names have been changed and their schools are represented by letters which bear no resemblance to their actual name.
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Collaboration is an important facet of DBR and though I considered the teachers as equal partners in the research process, I did not want to assume that they felt the same. I thus ensured that the teachers also had the right to withdraw from the research at any time and that I had their informed consent too before the research process began.

3.5.2 Interviews

3.5.2.1 Advantages and disadvantages of the method. Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2007) suggest that the interview is a flexible yet powerful mode of research method. They further suggest that conducting an interview allows ‘multi-sensory channels to be used, verbal, non-verbal, spoken and heard’ (p. 349). They suggest furthermore that the researcher is able to access the participant’s perspective and through this interaction an intersubjective appreciation of the topic of the interview can be gained. It is, however, a constructed occurrence and not to be mistaken for an ordinarily occurring conversation. It is important to establish a relationship of trust as well as offering anonymity – these factors create an environment in which the participants will feel supported and be able to respond positively to the questions that will be the subject of the interview. It is necessary if the participant is going to be allowed to offer responses that demonstrate complex and deep understanding.

Interviews can be very time-consuming and challenging for students and teachers, who may feel uncomfortable talking about potential difficulties they have with the teaching and/or learning of argumentation. It is important that the interviewer is responsive to the situation to establish the different interpretations that individuals may have of a similar situation. Interviews allow a range of responses to be aired, the data may not be as rich as it could be if the interviewer does not recognise this potential. It is also true that in a face-to-face interview some participants may feel that they should say what they think the interviewer wants to hear rather than what they actually think.

3.5.2.2 How the method was used. There were three in-depth interviews conducted during the early stages of the research process. These interviews were far-ranging and designed to supplement the gaps I had found in the literature review. They were conducted with history education academics.
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The history education academics had been approached because they were leaders in the field and had been amenable to the idea of being interviewed. The interviews were essentially informal and conversational, and I was able to ask questions that seemed salient and emerged naturally from the discussion. These interviews were not designed to be analysed in-depth – they were instead to help me clarify my thinking and to test my initial interpretations of the literature I had read.

The semi-structured interviews, which were undertaken after this preliminary phase, were conducted with teachers and students, and were either videoed or audiotaped (see Appendices 2 and 3 for teacher and student interview questions). The interview questions were a mixture of structured and open-ended questions designed to ease the actual process of the interview as much as possible for the participant. They were focused on the problems and difficulties students might have with written argumentation. I used similar questions for both teacher and student because I wanted to compare student and staff perceptions of the problems students faced. This was an important aspect of my MEd (2002) study into resilience and I wondered if a similar situation existed in appreciating argumentation in History.

Foster’s (2011) classroom experience suggested that her pupils’ perception of History argument differed from hers, Mitchell et al. (2008) demonstrated that different disciplines conceived of the term ‘argument’ in different ways, and Wineburg (1991, 1998, 2007) has also implied that students deal with historical texts in a different way to historians. The difference in perception regarding History argument might be a factor that I would need to consider. As the teachers all knew that the research was concerned with argumentation and how to improve it, a bias was inevitable. The semi-structured framework, however, allowed the discussions to develop in areas that seemed to be of importance to the participants whilst remaining relevant to the research. It also offered me the opportunity to do a direct comparison of some of the responses. I piloted the teacher interview questions with two PhD students who were also teachers, and I piloted the student interview questions with a sixth form student I was tutoring, who gave me frank and constructive feedback.
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There were 15 secondary school teachers involved in the research: from four History departments. There were nine formal teacher interviews lasting around 30-40 minutes long and three informal in-depth teacher interviews lasting around 40 minutes each, and numerous unrecorded short but pertinent interactions.

The student interviews were either conducted individually or in a group. Some were videoed and some were audiotaped. The participants were Year 13 and Year 12 History A level students and interviews were conducted at different times of the academic year. There were nine individual student interviews and five group interviews. Interviews were usually about 20-30 minutes long.

3.5.3 Observations

3.5.3.1 Advantages and disadvantages of the method. Denscombe (2007) and Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2007) state how the observation method allows the researcher to access what is actually going on rather than having to rely on what people say they are doing or what they think they are doing. It is suggested that this means the data generated in this way are more authentic. However, the data generated can also be overwhelming, particularly if the observations are being carried out within a classroom environment where so much is going on. It is also true to say that it is difficult for the researcher to be objective and to keep a distance from the data, when the researcher is immersed in it (Denscombe, 2007). Though there are ways to counter this by using systematic and structured observations with a research assistant, or another researcher, to corroborate codes and categories, the observation method I used during the exploratory phase was largely ethnographic. I was simply checking whether my understanding of what constituted a history lesson was similar to that of the staff participating in the study.

3.5.3.2 How the method was used. I was able to observe how each teacher who participated in the study delivered a ‘typical’ essay preparation lesson, so I could observe how they planned and delivered ‘writing argument’ in History essays for their students. In this way I was able to appreciate the similarities and differences in their individual practice, but also be in a position to offer an intervention that would help each and every teacher participating in the study if they so wished.
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There were more than 11 hours of videoed sixth form lesson observations; there were a further seven hours of sixth form non-recorded classroom observations. Lessons were generally an hour long; one school ran lessons of 35 minutes, but often had double lessons, making lesson observations 1 hour and 10 minutes.

3.6 Data Collection Effort – Exploratory Study

The following table demonstrates how the two methods of interviews, informal and in-depth, or in semi-structured form, and observations were used during the exploratory study. The table also gives an account of the data collection effort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Participant Expert</th>
<th>Participant Other</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Participant Staff</th>
<th>Participant Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exploratory</td>
<td>Email exchange</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-depth, informal interviews</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 St. teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x 9 Grp. w/</td>
<td>1 x 5 Grp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 x 6 Grp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6 individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>1 P/St. teacher</td>
<td>1 x 3 Grp. w/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(P/St. teacher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 x 3 Grp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>DR</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 Yr 10, 4 x Yr 11, 2 x Yr 12, 2 x Yr 13</td>
<td>1 Yr 10, 4 x Yr 11, 2 x Yr 12, 2 x Yr 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 Yr 12, 2 x Yr 13</td>
<td>1 Yr 12, 2 x Yr 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GV</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2 x Yr 7, 5 x Yr 12, 1 Yr 13</td>
<td>2 x Yr 7, 5 x Yr 12, 1 Yr 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>All Yr 12</td>
<td>All Yr 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. St. teacher = Student Teacher; P/St. teacher = Pre-Student Teacher
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The exploratory fieldwork ran from June to December 2010 and was conducted in four of the five schools within the study.

3.7 Data Analysis

It is necessary to be aware of the fact that design-based research has two forms of data analysis: on-going, intuitive, formative analysis which informs the decisions on how to adapt teaching programmes to further access the theory and develop it further, and retrospective analysis which is carried out after the process is completed (Wang & Hannifin, 2005).

Intuitive, formative analysis usually occurs because of time constraints and the very real need to adapt and interact in an iterative way with the on-going research process. Judgements are made in response to immediate perceptions of what appears to be happening in real time in the real world. It is a messy world and one is unlikely to be able to control all aspects of the design process and participant interaction, which is why Collins (1992) and Edelson (2002) advocate systematic and extensive data gathering so that retrospective analysis can be conducted after the process.

Retrospective analysis is an essential aspect of this research methodology. It is during the retrospective period of analysis that the intuitive adaptations can be analysed and the focus applied to other parts of the ecological environment, which may well have been missed in the active and time-constrained data gathering phase. This is how the theory is developed and how subsequent practice becomes grounded in the theory.

3.7.1 Exploratory fieldwork. The audio recording of the semi-structured interviews with both teachers and students were transcribed ‘intelligently’ – the words were written down, but ‘hums’ and ‘ahs’ were omitted and pauses were indicated if over a certain length. Professional transcribers constructed the transcriptions because of the limited time available and the large amount of data that needed to be analysed. Confidentiality and anonymity were important factors of the arrangement to ensure that ethical considerations

91
Chapter 3 – Methodology

were met. Because the material was generated through semi-structured interviews the turn taking was apparent and any ‘talking over of individuals’ was also indicated in the transcript although little of this occurred.

A form of thematic analysis was chosen to analyse the information generated from the participants. The intention of the interviews had been to gather evidence from teachers and students alike of their perceptions of what caused the difficulties students had in writing argument. I was looking for general themes that might occur between teachers, teachers and students, and students whilst focusing on the differences that might also be prevalent in the different student age groups. I was analysing free-flowing text but I was not attempting to generate a theory from the data, so I was not going to be using a grounded theory approach. Although the underlying themes from the data would be important, I was not going to conduct content analysis – although there is an element of coding and counting involved. The form of thematic analysis used was not an applied thematic analysis (Guest, MacQueen, & Namey, 2012) but was instead a more general form of thematic analysis as advocated by Howitt and Cramer (2008).

The approach was flexible and involved listening to the audiotapes to clarify the initial perceptions gained of the interview, the transcripts were then checked against the audio-recording making sure that any pauses and differences in tone were highlighted in case they altered the meaning. Then, when I was certain that I appreciated the meanings of the utterances, I began to code for underlying themes. I did not code individual interviews – I coded answers to the interview questions to gain a range of opinion and responses and then in that way I could gain an appreciation of what teachers’ interpretations to the answers were. Although I was conducting a form of ‘light touch’ analysis where I was attempting to confirm the theory that dialogic interaction was an important component of the links between spoken and written argumentation, I still wanted to find out what I could about teacher and student perceptions of History argument, following Foster’s assertions (2011). I was therefore deriving the codes from the data inductively and not deductively and the codes were not predetermined (Guest, MacQueen, & Namey, 2012). I followed the same procedure with the student responses whether they were individual interviews or group interviews. I distinguished the student response by age and kept the
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distinctions clear to see if there was an underlying pattern of response to the questions. Once categories were established, I processed the interview responses and was able to measure codes within categories to achieve an indication of the incidence and prevalence of each theme.

Though very dense and rich in meaning, the classroom observations conducted through the exploratory study (ES) and the teacher trials (TT) were not analysed in great depth. The observations in the ES were made for three reasons: to appreciate the relationships between the teacher and his or her students; to re-acquaint myself with A level History teaching and learning to prevent my study being based in pre-conceptions; and finally to determine how argument was taught in History lessons so I could test my original thesis – that students did not engage in argumentation that allowed them to interact dialogically. Analysis of the TT observations focused on the episodes of student collaboration for indicators of ‘dialogic spells’ (Nystrand et al, 2003).

3.8 Summary of Chapter 3

This chapter has presented and discussed the philosophical underpinnings and the overarching methodology for the entire research study. The methodology was an adapted form of design-based research with case studies. The research process involves theoretical frameworks – Design Frameworks – which were tested, implemented and developed through iterations. The methods used to gather the data in the first two iterations – the exploratory study and the teacher trials - were also discussed. The extensive literature review created the initial theoretical framework - Design Framework 1 - for the exploratory study. The fieldwork was conducted through observation and interviews within four secondary school History departments to test the theoretical implications made by Design Framework 1.

A more extensive discussion of the fieldwork and its findings is the focus of the following chapter.
Chapter 4 – Iteration 1: The Exploratory Study

4.1 Introduction

An important element of design-based research (DBR) is the emphasis placed on collaboration with practitioners. Plomp (2010) uses Wademan’s (2005) Generic Design Research Model (GDRM) to illustrate the successive, iterative cycles of research, design, and evaluation. The GDRM model also stresses the importance of practitioner and user input. Wademan’s ‘tentative phase’ sets the initial problem in context using practitioner and researcher collaboration - a consultation phase - which is iteratively conducted with a focused literature review.

Following the GRDM model, this present study also incorporates a ‘consultative phase’ – the exploratory study - to fill in the gaps highlighted in the literature review as well as access, at first hand, practitioners’ and students’ appreciation of History argumentation. This chapter therefore describes and discusses the exploratory study - the ‘expert opinion’ and the ‘exploratory fieldwork’- that follow on from the literature review. The findings from these two stages of the exploratory study combined with the literature review form the second theoretical framework. This in turn underpins the design for an educational intervention that will be the focus of the next chapter.
4.2. The exploratory study.

There are two stages to the exploratory study: a consultative stage where I interview examiners and History education researchers to test my initial assumptions about History argument and a second stage where I undertake fieldwork conducted in four schools to test the basic tenets of Design Framework 1 – which is presented below.

Design Framework 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Framework 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should engage in oral argumentation before they write arguments in their essays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should engage in persuasive argumentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should be encouraged to make judgments about History which will become the basis of their arguments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should follow ground rules to encourage them to engage in dialogic talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should be encouraged to reflect on their oral and written arguments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.1 Stage 1 – Examiners and History education academics.

The lack of specific literature linking History argumentation and dialogic interaction meant that I had found a potential gap in the research literature but I needed to check that my assumptions about History argumentation were tenable. I needed to explore the initial and fundamental premise that there was indeed a problem with the writing of argument in History essays. Next I needed to determine whether the findings of the literature review reflected the current perception of History and History argumentation because of recent government changes to education. So the question I was addressing in this stage of the research is as follows:

How do History A level examiners and History education academics view History argumentation?
Stage 2 – A level History teachers and students. The second stage of the exploratory fieldwork concentrates on exploring the school environment to determine how argument is taught in History A level lessons. In this way I will be testing the theories of Design Framework 1. I need to discover the answers to the following key questions:

1. What evidence is there that History students engage in oral argumentation before they write their essays?
2. If students do engage in oral argumentation, is it a persuasive form of argumentation?
3. Is there evidence of dialogic interaction already present in lessons promoting the writing of History argument?
4. Are students encouraged to reflect on the content and the structure of their History arguments?

In seeking the answers to these questions I need also to determine how to design a classroom intervention that will give the students an opportunity to engage in dialogic interaction so that I can then test whether my fundamental conjecture is feasible. The two overarching research questions for this stage of the exploratory fieldwork are:

1. How is argument taught in History lessons?
   a. How do teachers teach argument in History lessons?
   b. How do teachers and students view argument and argumentation?
   c. What problems do teachers think students have with writing argument?
   d. What problems do students think they have with writing argument in their History essays?
2. How do I design an educational intervention to instantiate dialogic interaction?
a. What do teachers and students think are good ways in which to help students write more effective arguments in their essays?

This was and is an iterative process; my contact with the examiners and History education academics made me reconsider argumentation and History itself, as a discipline, and the schools’ input helped me shape and develop the practicalities of an educational intervention. Both stages of the fieldwork are important because the developed understanding from one and the findings from the other both fed into the design of the second design framework, which formed the basis for the intervention that was subsequently tested and trialled in schools.

4.3 Stage 1 – Consultation.

History examiners were the obvious people to ask about argument in History because the History A level mark scheme (Appendix 5) suggests that the only way to achieve the highest grade in History is to write an effective and coherent argument. It therefore seemed likely that History examiners knew what History argument was or at least what it should look like. I knew, too, that if I were going to help my students to be successful I needed to be able to offer them something that the exam boards would at least recognise as pertinent and would value. It must be understood, however, I was not directly motivated to help students gain higher grades – that was a useful by-product. I was most interested in getting the students to argue to think, and I needed the students to get the credit they deserved for doing so.

To be able to talk with History education academics was also important because school History is in a state of flux and I needed to ensure that whatever work I produced would fit in with the current and prospective future syllabuses. The implications of the most recent educational changes and potential further changes had yet to be written up, so it was necessary to talk to leading History education academics to gain a better understanding of what
the changes might entail. I did not want to design an educational intervention that would prove to be irrelevant and would fit only a previous version of school History teaching and learning.

4.3.1 Examiners. Having worked as an examiner, I was aware that argument in History was highly prized, that in fact the highest grade for History A level candidates was reserved for those that could write the most fluent, cohesive and coherent argument. And yet at Examiner meetings we were not told what constituted a good History argument – there were no grids to say what should be measured – a History argument was meant to be the vehicle for the understanding and knowledge required for success at AS and A2 History. I thought that it would be useful to ask the examiners what they were looking for in a History argument to see exactly what cohesive and coherent argument meant. I felt too that if I were to create an intervention that would help students to write more effective argument it would be valuable in the first place to ensure that whatever was suggested would be considered appropriate by the examination board. At the History conferences I attended, the chief examiners I approached were busy promoting their new syllabuses and were not able to give me the necessary time to discuss History argument. Two of the examiners dismissed History argument as purely a means by which they could measure the success or failure of a History student. They were also unable to define what History argument actually was.

Not satisfied with this response, I then sent a generic email to three key exam boards, AQA, Edexcel, and OCR with whom I had worked in the past either as an examiner or as a teacher helping my students to pass their exams. Only one of the three exam boards responded to my email. The administrator for this exam board sent out a blanket email inviting examiners who worked for his exam board to help me in my work on argumentation (See Appendix 6). Over the space of four months, four examiners responded to his and my request. Each time, an email exchange ensued between an examiner and myself offering the opportunity for them to express their personal views on History argumentation, the role it had within the exams and what could be done to improve the written product.
Each of the examiners confirmed what I had suspected: that the essays had improved in as much as they had structure and looked like an argument but very few of the essays actually constituted an argument. What they said is that, although the standards appeared to have improved, there was also evidence of a kind of ‘generic response’. PEEL (point, evidence, explanation, and linking it back to title) seemed to be foregrounded and in some cases it was evident that some schools had trained their students to offer a counterargument towards the end of the essay, though it was clear that the student did not know what a counterargument actually was. This was anecdotal evidence but led me to believe that what I proposed to do did have value and could help students and examiners alike.

4.3.2 History education academics. As a History teacher I had been used to delivering subject matter in any way that I could to bring about learning for my students. I knew that I was a successful teacher if success is measured in exam grades and in student feedback, but I was reluctant to make the assumption that what I was doing was standard History teaching practice because I also taught Politics and Law at A level and therefore I could not say that my practice was exclusively History orientated. So, before I ventured into schools, I wanted to explore what History education academics thought was exclusively History practice and what had been done to promote effective essay writing and argumentation within History education. I wanted to test what I learned from the literature review and place my own practice within that context.

The first History education academic I approached, whose area of research was close to mine, was unfortunately too busy on projects to help me. The other History education academics approached were identified in a meeting with a conference convener at an annual History conference. I explained that I was seeking ways of improving History argumentation and would like to talk to History education academics who might be willing and able to help. The conference convener recommended three academics. Because School History is currently in a state of flux, he recommended individuals who were ‘movers and shakers’ within the discipline and who would be most au fait with what was happening. Two of the three academics
edited leading journals related to History teaching. One, the editor of a journal dedicated to primary teaching, had been part of the team that had been instrumental in developing and implementing the current Key Stage 3 curriculum. The second, an editor of a secondary teaching journal, had been leading an influential think tank investigating the 14-19 curriculum for the gifted and talented. The third academic had been recommended because he had been doing research closely linked to mine. I was able to interview two of the academics face-to-face whereas the third I communicated with via email.

A pilot interview had previously been conducted with a fellow student who was completing his PhD in European Law. I wanted his insights into the possible responses I might get on argumentation. The interviews with the History education academics were wide ranging and free-flowing, but unfortunately not audio-recorded. My intention had been to ask questions that would help me fill in the gaps in my understanding of History education. I had become conscious that my understanding of the study of History was not necessarily current and this needed further exploration, particularly as I was convinced that argument was at the heart of History and I needed to be clear that my assumption was not unfounded. The face-to-face interviews conducted with two History education academics covered the current debate about what constituted History knowledge, what should be taught in schools, and how it should be taught. Subsequent reading suggested by them also led me to appreciate on a deeper level the epistemological consequences of History learning in schools and the current debate about what History should be taught in schools and why. For me it reinforced even more the importance of teaching History students to argue effectively.

The third history education academic had researched an important aspect of History skills and had hoped to improve his students’ written essays by advocating more effective reading. He also offered important insights into how essays should be structured: he explained the background to PEEL, a mantra that encapsulated much of what sixth form essay writing is about (Point, Evidence, Explanation and Linking it to the title) – how this PEEL or PEE was the current prevailing manner in which History essay writing was conducted in schools and demonstrated how useful it could be in helping
students. There was, however, no mention of verbal argumentation; the emphasis was on structuring a response. Again he highlighted for me the gap that my research could fill and showed me that using an argumentative interaction to promote dialogic interaction to improve History argument was feasible.

**4.3.3 Conclusions from Stage 1.** I had learnt that the changes to the syllabus had meant that argument was still implicitly, if not explicitly, important in the teaching and learning of History. The changes to the curriculum would not impact on the necessity of learning to argue well. I had been reassured that my teaching practice sat well within standard History teaching and learning instruction. I still did not know, however, whether an argumentational interaction promoting History argument would fit neatly into current History A level practice. The only way that I could answer this question was by conducting fieldwork in schools.

I had learnt three other key points which I could take with me into the fieldwork phase. The first was a deeper understanding of the skills associated with History learning and how significant they were. Interpretation, representation, and evidence were all key in understanding History, and argumentation was fundamental to and in the process. This had been evident in the literature, but had been reinforced during the interviews. This led me to a renewed focus on the skills of History learning and to the second point. I felt that if I could ensure that the students appreciated what argumentation was and how significant it was in relation to History learning, that in itself would be a valuable lesson for them. Finally I had been reassured that the so-called debate that History learning was either dedicated to knowledge or to skills was untrue. Teaching the content of History A level through the utilisation of historical skills was an appropriate way of helping students learn.

**4.4 Stage 2 – Fieldwork In Schools**

In this section of the chapter I discuss the research conducted in the schools. Essentially, I needed to test the tenets of Design Framework 1
derived from the literature review and what I had learnt from Stage 1 within the context of a real History classroom. I needed to determine, first, what evidence there was that History students engaged in oral argumentation before they wrote their essays; second, whether they engaged in persuasive argumentation; third, whether there was evidence of dialogic interaction already present in lessons which promoted the writing of History argument; and finally whether students were encouraged to reflect on the content and the structure of their History arguments.

My secondary aim was to investigate teachers’ and students’ perceptions of History argument and the problems students faced in writing argument in their History essays. These findings would help me devise and incorporate appropriate strategies into an educational intervention that might alleviate some of these problems the students faced as well as help them appreciate and use History argumentation.

In this section I will cover how the schools were chosen, ethics, the methods chosen to conduct the research, and the ethical implications. This section will also include a discussion on the interview questions leading to the subsequent data analysis. The data analysis and the findings from the exploratory study will be discussed in the final section of this chapter.

4.4.1 The schools. The participants in the schools’ fieldwork were selected ‘critically’ (Wellington, 2000) and through a process of participant self-selection. History teachers and History students were deliberately selected, but the manner in which this process occurred incorporated elements of participant self-selection.

I chose to use schools in a city in the south west of England, because it was close to where I live and I felt that in a city there would be a lot of schools from which to choose. However having only recently moved into the area I was uncertain which schools to approach. I deliberately chose not to research any of the schools at all because I did not want to have any preconceptions about the schools or their students. However, because it was necessary to work with schools that taught History at A level I could not just pick schools at random from the schools’ directory. It was important to me
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that I worked with schools that were attracted to my research rather than impose my research on them. This suggests an element of random selection but also ‘self-selection’ on the part of the schools that became involved.

In order to speed up the process and give my research the potential for success, I contacted two senior tutors on their respective PGCE courses at the city’s two Universities. I considered asking tutors to suggest schools within their partnerships to be a good way of ensuring that the research might at least be considered.

Similar introductory emails were sent to each tutor. I had briefly met one tutor who asked the members of her partnership team if they were interested in my research but no-one responded – probably because they were primary orientated and my research was specifically aimed at sixth form A Level teaching. The other tutor, whom I had not met, sent me an email suggesting 10 schools that taught History at A level within her PGCE partnership programme (see Appendix 7).

I sent a generic email (see Appendix 8) to each of the 10 schools. Where possible I used the schools’ contact system and each time I addressed the email to the respective Head Teacher. Of these 10 schools, five responded and four of these positively. Preliminary meetings with each school’s Head of History confirmed their interest in the research and their commitment to participate in the research. They agreed to take part on behalf of their respective team members and their students and they had the support of their respective head teachers.

No incentive was offered either to the teachers and students except the opportunity to explore a means by which sixth form students of History could improve their essay skills. Essentially each school opted to work with me because they all wanted to improve the essay writing skills of their students by focusing on developing their argumentation skills. As a consequence it was assumed that perhaps their exam grades would improve correspondingly.

By chance the schools that agreed to work with me represented very different forms of sixth form and school life. Two were inner city schools
though one was a Foundation school and specialist sports’ college (School DR) while the other was a fee-paying, independent school (School GV). The other two were rural schools. One was an 11-16 comprehensive with a separate sixth form centre some way from the main school (School FT) and the other was a Humanities Specialist college with lead subjects of English, History and RE (School ES).

4.4.2 Ethics. Ethical consent had been obtained before the fieldwork phase of the exploratory stage began. I was CRB checked by the University of Exeter before the prospect of working in schools was considered. I also had the approval of the University’s ethics committee before I attempted to contact any schools.

As a member of the British Psychological Society, I was also aware of the added complications of conducting educational research and the impact it might have on both the students and teachers who participated or did not participate in the research. I wanted to ensure that they were treated fairly and with respect. It was important that the participants were treated with openness and should not come to harm. It was important to ensure that the participants were not placed under duress in any way. This was meant to be an experience for the participants that was as far removed from Milgram’s (1963) experiment as possible.

Before the research process began, I discussed the implications of my research with the schools concerned. It was agreed that a template for a parental consent letter designed by me should be used and adapted by each school and sent to the parents of the children involved in the research. It was made very clear that the pupils would be videoed and possibly interviewed during the research process. See Appendix 9 for the generic parental consent letter.

One school already had a standing school policy stating that videos and photographs of children would happen during the school year and if any parent were unhappy with this they should make it known before the child actually joined the school. It was suggested by the teachers that the parental consent letter should be one that placed the onus on the parents to sign if
they did **not** agree rather than sign if they did agree. As a teacher I have known how difficult it is to get children’s consent letters returned before any particular school trip or event, so I could see the advantage in such an arrangement. I was, however, concerned that the fact that we had not received any letters indicating a lack of consent meant we could only assume that the parents all agreed. It could be argued that the parents may not have agreed but had simply forgotten to sign the form and send it back to the school.

I felt it necessary to ensure that the participants themselves were given the opportunity to opt out by signing individual consent forms (see Appendix 10). I also felt that sixth formers – 16-19 years of age – were old enough to give informed consent and would feel able to withdraw that consent if they felt uncomfortable at any stage of the process. I did not want students or teachers to feel compelled to take part in research principally because I wanted the research to be authentic, with willing participants rather than placing students under possible duress and thus potentially skewing results.

**4.4.3 The methods I used and the ethical implications.** I used two methods to gather data: observations and interviews. All but three of the sixth form classroom observations were videoed whilst the interviews were audiotaped and some of the group interviews were also filmed by a video recorder.

The observations were carried out with the explicit approval of the teacher involved – permission was always sought of the teacher and the children involved – and either the teacher or I myself made it clear my presence was simply to gather information about teaching and learning in general and not about specific individuals. The use of the video camera was also negotiated with the teacher and class. It has to be recognised, however, that within a classroom environment it is actually difficult for students to withdraw their consent – I made a point of stressing that I would only turn on the video camera if everyone was willing to participate in the research and was happy to be recorded.
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All students, whether in a group or individual interview, were asked if they were comfortable with being interviewed and reassured that if they wanted to withdraw they could at any stage of the research process. This was important because some of the students had been ‘volunteered’ by their teachers. Consent forms were signed before the interviews took place. All but one of the interviews were audio recorded or video recorded if a group interview; again consent was obtained before the technology was switched on.

Interviews also had to be conducted sensitively. Fully conscious of the legislation designed for the protection of children, I made sure that the interviews were either conducted in groups or in a public area if one-on-one. I also took out public private indemnity insurance on the advice of one of my teaching unions to ensure that I was protected too. One individual interview was conducted in a quiet area of a sixth form common room, the others in a Humanities staff office. It was felt that although anonymity might be compromised a little, child protection was guaranteed. The people that may have been around when the interviews were conducted were members of staff or other students and the interviews themselves were conducted quietly: questions asked were general and did not invite intensely private or personal information so anything overheard could not be considered prejudicial to anyone. The students interviewed were aware of others being around so were able to couch their responses accordingly.

There were 18 separate classroom observations; four of these 18 lessons contained debates or elements of debate. Seven teachers and two student teachers were interviewed formally, whereas three members of staff and one student teacher were interviewed ethnographically – informally. Twenty-five Year 13 and 10 Year 12 students were interviewed. The data gathering took place in the last few weeks of the summer term and the whole of the autumn term of 2010. The following table illustrates the data gathering distribution.
Table 4.2. Data gathering distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Yr 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 grp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 grp + 1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9 grp + teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Grp = group; 1* = student teacher on PGCE programme; 1** = pre-student teacher about to start PGCE programme; Other = other Year 13 students were also interviewed – ex-pupils of mine coming from different schools within the South West area who were not part of the research partnership ethnographically.

4.4.3.1 Observations. Following the pragmatic perspective I carried out observations in the four different schools, sitting in on the lessons of the teachers involved in the study to investigate the questions which had emerged from Design Framework 1. I had made it clear from the start that I was a researcher-observer and was not engaged in any covert observations (Cohen et al., 2007). I was able to take field notes and videos of the sessions. Although there was a danger that what I was observing would not truly reflect what was happening in the History classrooms normally – because of the very fact of me being there – I was able to generate overall impressions of what History lessons at sixth form level were like within the four schools.

Three of the four schools had a rolling two-week programme of work. As was common in my own teaching experience, I discovered that in these three schools History A level lessons occurred between four and five times a fortnight for an hour at a time whilst the teaching was shared by two members of staff. Both members of staff taught a different History module. This meant that although students might get two hours of History a week, it may not necessarily be on the same module. In the fourth school, however, the opportunity for learning History was improved. The students had eight
sessions though they were only 35 minutes long and not all of them were doubles, so the opportunity to develop anything meaningful was sometimes compromised.

Of the 15 participating teachers—nine male and six female—10 had other responsibilities besides classroom teaching such as Heads of Departments, Director of Studies, or Advanced Skills Teachers. Only two teachers other than the trainees had less than five years' teaching experience. All were History graduates or had History as a major component of their degree. Two History teachers were teaching other A level subjects as well: Law, Sociology, and Psychology. There were 122 A level student participants observed: 43 male and 34 female Year 12 students, 23 male and 22 female Year 13 students. Three female students were Sociology A2 level students.

At each of the four schools, I observed each member of the individual departments at least once. I was invited into lessons that individual teachers felt I would appreciate—debates or essay lessons they felt were typical of their teaching style.

Gathering observations from several different schools meant that I was able to experience a range of History lessons displaying individual teaching styles, although interestingly the pedagogy of the History teachers within the schools and across the study did not change a great deal. Though there were whole lessons given over to student debate and student preparation for debate, quite frequently lessons were very teacher led. As this was the autumn term and teachers were trying to help AS students move from GCSE to A level it is perhaps not surprising to observe teachers dominating the learning process. Nor is it surprising to see that the students had to be encouraged to contribute to the learning process; a lot of the teachers’ apparent domination of the discourse were attempts to get students to offer something to the process.

The observations carried out during my exploratory study were to allow me to see what was common practice in History teaching at A level within these schools—how things ‘worked’. It quickly became clear, for example, that no one school followed the same History syllabus, though they had some
periods of History in common. It was generally expected that students had passed GCSE with at least a B grade before entry into A level, although some students in each of the schools were accepted onto the AS and A2 courses with less than a B grade, and a couple were accepted in one school without any previous qualifications in History at all.

The data generated through the observations was very rich and could be interpreted in many ways, but the intention was to conduct a ‘light touch analysis’ of the teaching and learning environment in line with the research questions.

4.4.3.2 **Semi-structured interviews.** I chose to interview both teacher and students because I wanted to gain both perspectives on History, argument and the problems they associated with writing essays. This was a result of Mitchell et al (2008) Wineburg (2007) and Foster’s (2011) research into the different ideas teachers and students have of argument and History respectively and also to determine whether some of the responses could be developmental after Coffin (2004). My intention had been to improve the written responses of the students by helping them to engage in dialogic interaction, which in turn – according to the theory – would then be translated into their written work. But writing essays is a complex process and this ‘catch all’ theory seemed an arbitrary judgement made by me in isolation, so I needed to interview teachers and students to see what other factors should be taken into consideration. In this way I would be able to design an intervention that might meet the different challenges faced by the students.

Wellington (2000) discusses interviewing, highlighting the two extremes of the cosy two-way chat and the unresponsive but complete record of all utterances that may occur within a confined space and time. I wanted to interview teachers and students in such a way as to gain their confidence and prompt them to help me as best they could. My primary purpose was to find out the problems they might have, so gaining their confidence was a necessary first step. At this stage of my research I was exploring issues, so needed to use a method that would allow me to gather nuances of meaning as well as utterances.
The teacher and student questions can be found at Appendices 2 and 3. Although they appear quite specific, I actually used them as stimulus questions. I was trying to make the ‘conversations’ as natural as possible so that teacher and students alike would feel comfortable sharing their thoughts. The interviews were similarly constructed and designed to get the different perspectives of History argumentation from the teacher and student points of view. The interview questions had been checked by two other PhD researchers and a sixth form student to ensure that they were easily understood before being used within the research.

The interview focused on four key areas. The first was designed to set the participant at ease; the second area to explore the interviewees’ attitude to History and to argumentation. In asking participants to define History and explain argumentation, I was trying to see if the views of the History education academics were similarly reflected and shared in the views of classroom teachers. I wanted to know whether the teachers associated argument with product or process. I also wanted to see if a teacher’s perception of argument was the same as that of his/her students. The other areas were specifically geared to understanding the participants’ perceptions of the problems students had writing essays; a key question to see if the students’ responses matched those of their teacher. In addition, I asked teachers what they had done to help students, and students what they thought their teachers had done to help them. Both teachers and students alike were asked to think how they could make learning argument easier and whether technology could be used to do so.

4.5 Teacher and Student Interviews

4.5.1 Teacher interviews. I formally interviewed nine staff participants, six male and three female (two of the latter were student teachers), and I had conversations – ethnographic interviews – with four other staff participants, two male and two female (one male was a student teacher). Eight of the formal interviews were audio-recorded.
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My initial face-to-face contact with the four secondary schools was with the heads of departments who wanted to be involved in the research. As practitioner collaborators, it was important to interview them and to understand their perspectives. I assured confidentiality, so they knew that their responses would not be used unless for the purposes of, and only in the interests of, the research. I did not want my research to become a political tool within, or between, schools, particularly because I was working with several schools. The interviews were intended to give teachers the opportunity to answer questions freely.

4.5.2 Student interviews. Thirty-six students between the ages of 16 and 21 years old were interviewed, 18 male and 18 female.

Table 4.3. Interview distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of schooling</th>
<th>Individual interviews</th>
<th>Group interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nine students were interviewed individually. One male ex-student of mine (Other) planning to read History and Politics at university was interviewed to give his valuable insight into student History learning. Another student of mine was also interviewed; she did not want to study History at university, but still found the subject fascinating and her insights were also useful. The second ‘Other’ male interviewee, 1*, was a History graduate. He was asked by one of the teachers to complete a group of four, the first to be interviewed in the research process. As a very recent History graduate and a prospective teacher, he offered an additional insight into the learning process.

There were four other group interviews, two of Year 13 and two of Year 12 students. All, except the group of four, and two of the individual interviewees, were also observed in their History lessons. Three other
students – Sociology students – were observed in an ‘essay’ lesson and were happy to answer questions as they prepared their responses; they were not formally interviewed and they did not want to be videoed but their responses were invaluable.

I knew that I was potentially in a position of ‘power’ because I was a ‘researcher’ and an ex-classroom teacher, but I wanted the students involved in the research to feel that their contributions were valued and valuable. Group interviews were conducted with students to encourage those who might feel uncomfortable with the experience. It also meant that I obtained a range of responses that I might not otherwise have had, because the interviewees tended to offer something different rather than be satisfied with a similar response to the question. Although the students’ teachers were also present in some cases, the responses given by the students did not appear to indicate that they had censored themselves in any way: the responses were thoughtful and appeared to be appropriately ‘full’.

The student participants had been selected in a variety of ways. Random selection, however, was not one of them. In School ES the whole class was interviewed while the teacher was present but on a subsequent occasion at the same school another group – pre-selected by the teacher to show a range of attitudes and ability – were interviewed without said teacher being present. In School DR, teachers were less involved in the process; one student volunteered himself and a group of five had been organised and volunteered by another participating student rather than a teacher. In School FT the first group interview, in which the graduate was present, was conducted with the teacher present – a subsequent group interview was not. This second group interview, in School FT was conducted with participants who volunteered. In the School GV there were no group interviews and the individual interviews were conducted with students the teacher felt would offer articulate responses and were also representative of a range of ability; this teacher was not present. The two student participants who were pupils of mine expressed an interest in my research and offered themselves as interviewees.
All the interviews were audio-recorded. The group interviews were also video-recorded as an aid to the audio recordings to clarify who said what and when. The interviews were transcribed either from the digital audio recorder or from the videoed material.

4.6 Analysis

4.6.1 Data analysis process – observations. Koschmann, Stahl, and Zemel (2007) offer a systematic and thorough form of analysis for video recorded evidence. This is particularly pertinent because it is analysis of video material generated through DBR research. It is also analysis conducted by a team of researchers who spend time discussing coding and agreeing ways in which to interpret the video evidence. Rose (2012) also offers a variety of methods in which the video material I had accumulated could be analysed. These methods incorporated discourse analysis, psychoanalysis, semiology as well as ethnographic methods. But Mercer (2010) argues for keeping as close to the material as possible – to take it at face value and not to read too much into the evidence. He argues that organising the material to measure it, as in coding for quantitative measures, can actually obfuscate rather than enlighten. The material has been generated within the context of the classroom naturalistically and should be interpreted at face value rather than seek for deeper or hidden meanings.

The data generated by filming will thus be used as a record of the research undertaken, but also as a means to answer the four research questions derived from the theoretical framework.

4.6.2 Data analysis process – thematic analysis. There are many ways to analyse the interview data I had gathered, but I was trying to keep as close to the material as possible. At this stage of my research I intended only to do a ‘light-touch’ analysis – this truly was an pragmatic ‘exploratory’ study. Braun and Clarke (2006) argue that although thematic analysis appears to be a ‘poorly demarcated and rarely-acknowledged analytic method, though widely used’, it offers flexibility to the researcher because it is not tied to a
theoretical or epistemological approach as perhaps conversation analysis is. Guest, MacQueen, and Namey (2012) argue that applied thematic analysis (ATA) with its emphasis on an inductive, qualitative approach offers a rigorous and transparent way in which to conduct data analysis. Because I do not know whether teachers and students have the same perception of History argument, or of the problems they may have in writing essays containing argument, I am not searching for pre-defined themes; I am expecting the themes to emerge from the text. Thematic analysis, or applied thematic analysis to be precise, is the method of data analysis I have followed.

Howitt and Cramer (2008) advocated becoming very familiar with the data before attempting to code. I had conducted the interviews, listened to the audiotapes, and reviewed the transcripts several times before I attempted to make my first set of codes. I did not, however, create a coding manual as Fereday and Muir-Cochrane did (2006), but rather collated the teacher responses separately from the student responses, and divided the interviews even further by analysing them question by question. Only then did I start to code – analysing the responses to the interview questions across the data set rather than confining the responses to individual participant. I began to search for themes that seemed to offer potential overarching explanations for the codes. This took some time and also involved considerable iteration before the themes were finally settled. An example of one of the questions and the raw data can be found in Appendix 11.

4.6.3 Reflexive analysis. An important element of the thematic analysis was my interpretation of the responses and it is essential, therefore, to offer an insight into the basis of my interpretation. Cohen et al. (2007) suggest that it is not possible to eliminate researcher effects and that is an essential part of the research process ‘to hold oneself up to the light’ and acknowledge the influence I am bringing to the research study. There are two factors which need to be understood to allow an appreciation of the perspective I am taking: I am working from a dialogic and pragmatic perspective; I want to give equal ‘voice’ to teacher and student alike, but I am concentrating on the data that helps me gain insight to the problem I am attempting to resolve.
In conducting a ‘light-touch analysis’ I was constrained by the parameters of the theoretical framework I was attempting to test and implement. I had extensive video and interview evidence, but I was using that evidence to answer very specific questions. This means that although the evidence was both dense and very rich, the analysis was focused on answering the fundamental research questions.

In order to answer these questions I had to investigate how History teachers within the research study taught argument and in order to create and design an intervention that would help teacher and student alike I had to discover what problems with writing History argument they had. In choosing a DBR methodology I had to ensure that I was working closely with the participants and sometimes for the participants. My analysis, therefore, was conducted within these boundaries.

What I brought to the analysis was a perspective, apart from being pragmatic and dialogic, which had been tested and influenced in three ways: through my discussions with other History education academics; my experience as a teacher, and as a participant on other courses.

My most recent interactions with History education researchers had confirmed my stance on the teaching and learning of History and had given me additional insights into History as a discipline. I realised that my interpretation of the data concerning ‘what is History’ and ‘how would you define argument’ would be in line with most History education researchers.

The questions however on what causes problems for students which I asked of both teachers and students would perhaps not be interpreted in line with History education academics. Here my experience as a teacher would influence my interpretation of the teacher and student answers. As a teacher who has taught in several sixth form establishments and taught adult learners again in several different places I have gained invaluable insights in the teaching environment and it is this experience that informed the analysis.

The experience I have gained from teaching is also mediated through my additional studies. My MEd (Hilliard, 2002) focused in particular on Emotional
and Behavioural Difficulties that pupils and students might endure; and my MEd AR study focused on aspects of sixth form life. My BSc in Psychology also gained me additional insight into the learning and teaching environment. In discussing problems that students might have with learning History and with writing argument I had insight from practice and from theory to support and inform my analysis.

My analysis therefore was conducted through a pragmatic and dialogic lens which was tempered through my experiences as researcher, teacher and learner.

4.7 Findings

4.7.1 Observations.

My observations were of a range of History lessons where the focus was on essay writing and creating opportunities for debate. From these observations the following research questions were addressed.

1. What evidence was there that History students engaged in oral argumentation before they wrote their essays?

Four of the lessons I observed were geared specifically to ‘debate’, ostensibly to help the students before writing their essay responses. Each one offered a different way of ‘arguing’. One school engaged in an intense student-orientated interaction which took the form of a debate carried out in a boxing ring and yet, although the students thoroughly enjoyed the experience, it was not immediately clear whether they had opportunities to develop oral argumentation expertise. The discourse became a matter of winning or losing a point and most of the student ‘talk’ came from the students outside the ‘boxing ring’ rather than from the protagonists.

Another school’s interpretation of argumentation was also to conduct a debate: this time the class was divided on gender lines and asked to debate which city state was most important in the Renaissance. The debate was
confined to the most eloquent and to students who could shout the loudest, and became a ‘battle of the sexes’.

The discussion in fours, which was a 15 minute activity, was observed in a lesson at another school. Each student stated a point and supported it with evidence from a large A3 piece of paper containing a pool of relevant historical information. The point was made and then another person on the other side of the table made their point, also supported with evidence. I observed the process get quicker and quicker as if I were watching a table tennis match – points being hit across the net backwards and forwards without pause. However, this batting of point and evidence did not seem to be a process in which any point was actually addressed or countered, but simply a sequence of unrelated statements.

The final school offered a paired presentation. The students were to work in pairs and then be prepared to offer both sides of the argument. One member of the pair would present one side of the argument and the second member presented the other side. At no stage did any member of the pair actually counterargue the different viewpoints – they simply found but did not discuss difference.

There is evidence that the students are given opportunities to engage in a form of oral argumentation before they write their responses, but the argumentation, in whatever form it was conducted, was not consolidated or developed – the arguing happened and then they were asked to write an essay for homework. No further preparation was given.

2. What form of argumentation did they engage in – was it persuasive argumentation?

The argumentation that I had been able to observe was difficult to categorise, particularly as in two of the examples it could be argued that little argumentation actually occurred – the presenting to class and the arguing in fours where they made no attempt to counterargue points. It must also be said that the debate which became a ‘battle of the sexes’ was not persuasive,
but was all about point scoring and winning and losing, as was the ‘boxing ring’ debate.

3. Did the teaching of History argument incorporate dialogic interaction?

I did not observe didactic teaching – a person standing at the front of the class dictating notes – quite the contrary. I did, however, observe lessons in which teacher talk was predominant, though a lot of it was geared towards eliciting and developing student responses. Sometimes the students were encouraged to engage in peer discussion, but not about their essay questions. Most often, however, the talk was centred on teacher-student dialogue in what could be considered an Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) cycle (Wells & Arauz, 2006).

Each teacher within the study generated discussions in their ‘essay’ lessons that were centred on making points and backing them up with evidence and explanations, and in some cases students were encouraged to link their points to the essay title. The focus was on structuring the student responses and PEEL was predominant. ‘Argument’ was alluded to in the ‘preparation for essay’ lessons I observed, but only as a passing reminder to keep written responses balanced – ‘on the one hand… and on the other hand’ – which was something the students were all familiar with because it had been taught at GCSE. The language of formal argumentation – claim, warrant, and counterargument – was seldom present. One teacher drew the outline of what a History essay should look like on the whiteboard and suggested that just before the end of the students’ essays they should include a paragraph that would constitute their counterargument. Another teacher wrote the introduction to the essay on the whiteboard and told the students to carry on from that point. Apart from the aforementioned formal debates and presentations, none of the students were encouraged to discuss their points of view or determine what their argument might be. Most of the students were actively engaged in their lessons but there were few opportunities for peer discussion or situations where students could be engaged in dialogic interaction.
4. What evidence was there that students were expected to reflect on the content and the structure of their History arguments?

The classroom observations I made did not produce evidence that students were expected to reflect on the content of their History argument. When essays were returned, most students looked only at their mark and ignored any of the teacher comments that had been made for their future development. One school devoted a whole lesson to thinking about how students could further improve their essays, but it was a teacher-led discussion and the students were passive partners in the lesson. Another school had rigorous feedback strategies, which I discovered through teacher interview, which actively engaged the student in reflecting on his/her work. The students had to produce individual learning points which they then targeted in their next written piece. It is unclear whether the other schools within the research study had such strategies; it was not apparent.

4.7.2 Semi-structured interviews. The questions of the semi-structured interviews will be found at Appendix 3 and 4. The graphs, tables and preliminary findings from the semi-structured interviews will be found at Appendix 14. The questions had been designed to determine two things, in particular, firstly whether teachers and students had the same perception of History argument and secondly whether they shared the same understanding of the problems that students had with writing argument in their A level History essays. Teachers and students were also asked how they would help other students learn to write History argument and if they would consider using technology to help teach and learn History argument. The findings of the interviews will be discussed in the next section.

4.8 Discussion

The evidence generated from the observations and semi-structured interviews demonstrated several things.

4.8.1 Evidence of links between oral and written argumentation. I had found evidence that students engaged in oral argumentation, but not
directly in conjunction with their written essays. I had observed lively debates and paired presentations, but these had not been followed by any form of written work which may have consolidated or developed the ideas that had been ‘floated’ by the debates. It would have been very difficult to prove the ‘snowball hypothesis’ of Anderson et al. (2001) and Reznitskaya et al. (2001). Essays were set after the debates, and the paired presentations but little explicit connection was made between the two events. Quite frequently, too, I observed that the debates were conducted between students who were vociferous and confident, but whilst the debate was going on many of the students were not directly engaged.

The interviews demonstrated differences in perception between teacher and student regarding factors causing difficulties in writing argument. Although teacher and student mostly agreed with the definition that argument was a process and a means of handling difference they differed on how they perceived the problem of how to write essays. Evidence from the interviews suggest that Year 12 students felt overwhelmed by all of the information that seemed to be a basic prerequisite for History A level. They were also worried about being ‘wrong’ in their interpretations of historical evidence. The students across the age ranges all considered it was the process of writing History essays that most concerned them but strangely it was not because they did not know how to structure their responses. Teachers have practised such strategies as PEEL and drawn structures for essays on the board to give visual cues to the structuring of a History essay. The students in each of the schools involved in the research process were very aware of the necessity to structure their responses; for example, Year 12 students in the first few weeks of A level History were plainly using PEEL. What, however, seems to be happening is that students still find it very hard to write essays despite this emphasis on structured responses. One student told me it was more a matter of what to put in the structure that worried him not the structure itself. This suggests that focusing on structure, though important, is not enough to help students write effective argument in their essays.

It is possible that an educational intervention that focused on oral argumentation as a necessary prerequisite to the written argument and that
linked the two modes of argumentation might help students improve their written argument. What becomes clear, however, is that, based on the evidence I had seen, no teacher was attempting to create such a set of circumstances.

**4.8.2 Evidence of persuasive argumentation.** The literature review had highlighted the importance of persuasive argumentation; and fundamental to Wegerif’s (2011b, 2012, 2013 a) dialogic talk is the fact that students should engage in talk which is based in equality and orientated to the dialogue itself and not caught up in a discourse of winning and losing. The observations I had made of the few examples of oral argumentation conducted by the students demonstrated to me that they were not engaged in ‘persuasive’ argumentation. Billig (1996) suggests that it is engaging in persuasive argumentation that brings about opportunities to engage in arguing to learn and to think. The student interviews had shown that some students felt too embarrassed to engage in the argumentation, confirming the research of Schommer-Aikens and Easter (2009). Sometimes this was a confidence issue – Year 13 students in particular noted this, whereas Year 12 students worried instead about their lack of knowledge and showing themselves up. It is recognised that knowledge is an important component in the ability to argue effectively – Black (2011, 2012) had suggested this, as had Means and Voss (1996) and Karras (1993).

I had observed little evidence of persuasive argumentation, nor yet any particular attention being paid to the manner in which students engaged with one another in debate. Some of the debating was pseudo-formal, with such phrases as ‘I put it to you that...’ Other forms of debate were almost slanging matches – particularly within the ‘boxing ring’ debate. It would seem necessary to ensure that any oral argumentation engendered in an educational intervention was founded on democratic ground rules based in respect and equality. In this way it is hoped that persuasive argumentation that leads to arguing to think will be engendered.

**4.8.3 Evidence of dialogic interaction.** I had seen little evidence of dialogic interaction – the intensely animated and/or intensely reflective forms
of interaction in any of the classes I had observed. Even if I were to define ‘dialogic’ as loosely as Wells and Arauz (2006) there seemed to be little dialogic interaction. This is not to say that the students were not actively engaged in the learning process – they were. However, they reacted to the teacher’s input rather than generating spontaneous spells of genuine questions, which Nystrand et al. (2003) suggest would be precursors to a potential ‘dialogic spell’. This might be because the Year 12 students felt overwhelmed by all the information they needed to acquire as History A level candidates. It is certainly true that History A level candidates are expected to know a lot in order to reach the levels of synoptic reasoning which is vital to success in the course.

A common theme that appeared during the teacher interviews was the importance each teacher placed on making sure that their students ‘knew’ their History. As a consequence, most of the teachers in the study felt under pressure to ensure that their students undertook appropriate notes and ‘proper’ reading. Finding time to teach interactively is something these teachers felt they should do, but did not know how to within their crowded timetable.

This meant that I needed to make sure that any intervention I designed could be easily adapted into the History curriculum to help both teacher and student alike.

4.8.4 Evidence of reflection. Reflection is an important facet of my research. Both Billig (1996) and Wegerif (2011b, 2012, 2013a) note the significance of reflection in the development of thought, conceptual change, and cognitive development. The dialogue is thus internalised as thought; the information processed so that it becomes knowledge. However, I had not seen any students being asked to reflect and think about the essay titles – students asked for help whenever an essay title was written on the board but the teacher normally told the students what they should think. Students were not encouraged to think or speculate for themselves. Although some of the teachers reminded their students to plan their essays and to think carefully about their written responses, very few students seemed to plan at all. In one
class, the students were quite happy to declare that they never planned and just wrote whatever came into their heads and seemed to have something to do with the title. This has obvious consequences for the learning of these students.

If students could be encouraged to plan, it is highly probable that their written work would improve. Certainly the Year 13 History students were well aware of how important it was to plan their essays. The Year 12 students implied that they were aware that it was necessary to plan, but most were not sure what to include in a plan – again, this goes back to the problems these students identified with the learning of History. They were not sure what was opinion, evidence, what was relevant, and what was not. This was something that the teachers agreed on – they were aware that their students found handling historical information difficult. They were particularly concerned that their students could not distinguish between opinion and evidence and seemed to find it particularly difficult to make a ‘judgement’ which would then allow them to build their arguments.

4.8.5 Teacher and student perceptions of History argument. The evidence from the interviews suggested that History as a discipline is understood in a similar way by both teacher and student. Both focused on the key role of ‘interpretation’ in the learning of History, most particularly the students in Year 13. The perception of the significance of source material was also shared by teacher and student alike. Again, it was clear that students felt the ability to analyse source material was an important skill to have. The students worried about getting History wrong – a finding that the literature review had also highlighted (e.g., Wineburg, 1991, 1998; VanSledright, 2002).

History argument, however, was something that students and teachers did not agree on. The teachers were all aware of the complexity of argument at A level; one echoed the exam guidance – that History argument at A level, among several other things, needed to be a single strand that ran through the essay whilst taking into account other points of view and being able to counter them. Some students thought that argument was two-sided and needed to be
balanced on the one hand and on the other – surprisingly these were not Year 12 students who would have been fresh from GCSE History where two-sidedness is paramount. It was mostly Year 13 students, but they did qualify the two sidedness by suggesting it was about – “always comparing a point of view with somebody else’s” – so there was a realisation that A level argument was more challenging than a simple two-sided argument.

It is interesting to note that during the observations, arguing and counterargument were alluded to rather than being explicitly discussed. This implicit appreciation of argumentation led to something else that emerged from the data, and that was the realisation that for some teachers and therefore some students, argument became synonymous with essay – the terms were interchangeable. During my classroom observations, I had seen essays being set by three different teachers who went out of their way to make it as easy as they could for their students, but talked about essay structure and did not explicitly mention argument.

All of the strategies suggested by the teachers were designed to remind students how they should structure their essays – although it must be remembered that in most cases the teachers were talking about essay rather than argument structure. And that is possibly where the problem arose. Students writing essays in response to set essay titles asked for help in structuring their responses, they did not ask for help in clarifying their argument. They assumed that answering the essay in a structured way was the argument.

What the evidence highlights is the need for an educational intervention that helps Year 12 students come to terms with what an argument is as well as the different form of argument needed at A level.

4.8.6 Designing the intervention. One of the final questions of the interviews was designed to elicit teacher and student advice on how they would help students learn History argument. The responses to this question led to a return to the literature review because most of the teachers and students felt that some form of technology might be a useful way to promote argumentation. The next chapter deals with the development of an
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An educational intervention which tries to incorporate the findings from the literature review and the fieldwork.

4.9 Considerations

Only a small number of classroom observations were made and very few teachers were observed more than once. This means that the findings cannot be considered typical of History lessons in general. The fact that I was invited to specific lessons which teachers felt would give me an idea of how argument was taught in their schools does mean, however, that the evidence is specific and peculiar to the individuals involved in the research study. Working with four schools does allow for a greater range of classroom evidence, but what I saw happening in the lessons I was privileged to observe cannot be considered the norm for every one of the teachers’ lessons or any other History lesson dealing with argument in those four schools, or anywhere else in the country.

The interviews conducted in the four schools generated a range of responses and probably a greater range than if I had conducted interviews in only one school. There is a temptation to suggest that if there are similarities in responses, particularly associated with the process of argumentation, all students must feel the same. Caution must be observed: there may be similarities in responses, but this is still a small sample, and students’ responses have been analysed dependent on age, just to see if the teachers’ assertion that students eventually learn these skills is linked to development or is learning dependent.

There are, after all, many factors that could influence the student responses. Although students were interviewed individually and in groups to offer a range of responses, it must be remembered that being a member of a group can impact upon the responses made. Students might be more comfortable dealing with a researcher, but the group itself could limit and prevent students actually speaking their mind because they feel the need to conform to group expectations. So, the results gained from the group
Interviews have to be treated with a degree of care. Individual students may also have found the interview process daunting and may have felt uncomfortable in spite of all the strategies to ensure the students did not feel that they were under any form of duress. It must be understood, then, that although there was a good range of ideas, there may be others important to students but unsaid. When I start working with the students piloting the adapted intervention, it is therefore important to state that the adaptations to the intervention were based on the ideas generated by the student interviews, but that there may be other ideas that could be taken into consideration, and give the students the opportunity to add their views to adapt the design further.

4.10 Summary of Chapter 4

In this chapter two elements of the exploratory study were described and discussed: the consultation element with ‘experts’ and the fieldwork conducted in the four different schools. The consultation was conducted to ensure that my interpretation of History teaching and learning fit within current practice, so that any intervention subsequently designed could be easily assimilated into the current History curriculum. The fieldwork was conducted to test the tenets of Design Framework 1, and it was also important to explore what teachers and students felt were problems they encountered in the teaching and learning of History argument.

Classroom observations were made of History lessons which promoted History argument. Semi-structured interviews were undertaken to explore teacher and student perceptions of History and argument and to understand the problems students might have learning History at A level.

The findings of the fieldwork suggest that an intervention that focused on the links between speaking and writing argument and which incorporated an argumentational interaction was a feasible approach to take, though the findings also suggested that other factors would need to be taken into account. For example, the teachers held an underlying assumption that success in History argumentation was linked to ability, which needs to be explored further. The students’ concerns seemed to be predominantly
centred on the processes involved in argumentation. This concern, however, was not just about argumentation, but to do with learning A level History; student confidence may be an underlying factor.

The next chapter – Chapter 5 – deals with the design of a prototypical intervention which arises from a return to the literature to review educational interventions as well as the analysis of the findings of the exploratory phase, which incorporated the initial literature review, the consultation, and the fieldwork conducted in schools.
Chapter 5 – Designing the Intervention

5.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the development of the educational intervention. Design Framework 2, which is derived from the literature review and the findings of the exploratory study, underpins the design for the educational intervention. As a consequence of the exploratory study, however, this chapter starts with a brief literature review to explore educational interventions that incorporate the use of technology. Teachers and students alike had confirmed that the use of technology was of benefit to students’ learning. The teachers felt that when technology was used to promote research skills it promoted interest in the subject and independent learning. Students enjoyed the use of technology because it was a change and helped them appreciate what studying at university might be like. I thought that the use of technology to promote ‘reflection’ during and after the argumentative exchanges would be an important element of the intervention. I was also aware that under-confident and shy students might benefit from using technology to help them communicate without feeling exposed to undue peer pressure.

The chapter will then continue with a discussion of the design of the intervention demonstrating the intertwining of theory and practice to create opportunities for the investigation of dialogic interaction. The findings of the fieldwork are integrated into the design artefact at this point. The chapter will
conclude with a diagrammatic representation of the intervention showing the key stages of the process and how it has been designed to promote dialogic interaction.

5.2 Return to the Literature

I returned to the literature because I wanted to find an intervention that could be adapted and developed to foster face-to-face argumentation that would encourage students to think. It was intended that within the arguing process thus created there would be the opportunity to replicate the intensely animated, or the intensely still interaction, which seemed to be an important element in the transition between spoken and written argument for my students. For me, the intensity of the interaction seemed synonymous with dialogic interaction. It was hoped that by encouraging students to engage in argumentation which led to dialogic interaction, I would be able to discover whether there were links between dialogic interaction and the written argument of A level History students.

The nature of the research – the need to be able to observe and analyse face-to-face interaction, to determine first of all whether dialogic interaction has occurred and what its impact might be – meant that the focus for the renewed literature review would be on research that involved face-to-face interactions. But because the teachers and students had expressed an interest in the use of technology to help their learning, I needed also to review literature associated with the use of technology. The review, however, starts with what has already been used within the History classroom. The literature concerning interventions to promote argumentation in History at A level will be considered first, followed by the literature that discusses the promotion of interaction in classrooms.

5.2.1 Interventions promoting History argument at A level.
Donovan and Bransford’s (2005) publication of extensive fieldwork by several History teachers shows how History lessons can be developed to create opportunities for deeper learning where argumentation is implicit rather than
explicit. In their review, van Drie and van Boxtel (2008) demonstrate clearly that they feel that History argumentation, carried out in whole-class and group activities, is at the heart of History learning. But, once again, the literature on classroom educational interventions in History education associated with argument at A level is not extensive. The literature seems to be divided in two ways: modelling effective argument, novice versus expert, and classroom computer programs designed to explore ‘collaborative’ learning – the argument based in socio-cognitive conflict rather than in taking opposing positions.

Three case studies carried out in America adopt the novice versus expert modelling of History learning. The two teachers in the first case study (Wineburg & Wilson, 1991) each focused on the promotion of historical reasoning in their classes. One had orchestrated a detailed and thoroughly researched historical debate that was student-led and student-dominated and in which she was a silent witness. The other was more active in his practice and also promoted historical argument, but through the use of skilled questioning and modelling explicit and clear reasoning. VanSledright (2002) attempted to engage his (younger) students to use source material as if they were historians rather than History students, but with mixed success. The comparative case study research of Monte-Sano (2008) demonstrates how clear instruction, explicit argument practice, and considerable classroom discussion within peer groups and in teacher-led whole-class discussion could improve the learning experience of students from an underprivileged background. Chapman’s (2006 a & b) research carried out in the UK also used the apprenticeship model – the expert and the novice – but in a different way. He involved secondary school students and historians in discussion boarding to promote students’ appreciation of differing interpretations and perspectives. This research was not, however, explicitly linked to developing written argument and did not involve sixth formers. Although History argument was a fundamental aspect of each research study, there was no focus on written argument.

Van Drie et al. (2005), working in the Netherlands, used computers to support ‘collaborative argumentation’ through the representation of the
process of argument using an ‘argumentative’ diagram. It became clear during the activity, however, that use of ‘the tool’, the argumentative diagram, became integrated into the argument making process whereas the opportunity to ‘chat’ and talk about the argument was not taken up. The basis of the research was that the students would ‘chat’ and collaborate in the ‘chat room’, thus enhancing their skills in arguing and discussing, and would then use the diagram – but this did not happen. Also investigating methods that could help develop ‘collaborative argumentation’, Li and Lim (2008) demonstrated how an online historical inquiry task could promote effective written argument provided it was properly ‘scaffolded’. There are reservations, however, surrounding the findings, because it became apparent that the teacher dominated the proceedings, meaning that it ceased to be an authentic opportunity for student-led collaborative independent learning. Coffin, North and Martin (2009) work with Year 9 pupils’ asynchronous conferencing was, however, designed to promote written argument through engaging in online debate. The intention was to replicate oral argument in online conferencing to see if it could act as a bridge between the informal classroom talk and the formal written task of an essay. The findings were inconclusive, however, and seemed to indicate that although some of the conferencing engineered evidence of historical debate, the arguments themselves were not carried over into the written assignment at the end. There was no clear transference between the two processes.

5.2.2 Interventions that promote ‘dialogic interaction’. Again, little research has focused explicitly on dialogue as part of the arguing process within A level History. Felton and Herko (2004), building on the previous research of Kuhn, Shaw, and Felton (1997) into dyadic interaction, conducted research within the US high school system. They devised an intervention that was designed to help secondary Humanities students improve their written argument by engaging in dialogue before they wrote their essays. The intention was to help the students move from writing one-sided to two-sided argument. The intervention proved successful, but it must be understood that the topics of debate were heavily belief and value laden: they discussed subjects such as the death penalty and abortion, so it is possible that the
model may not transfer directly to A level History argument in the UK. Although the topics studied by A level students are full of argument, the interaction engendered may not be as intense as that generated by the American pro-life debates. I am suggesting that the ‘intensity’ of the interaction is important in the links between spoken and written argument so it might be an important factor to consider.

Kuhn and Udell (2003, 2007) also developed aspects of this research by incorporating different argumentative activities into the intervention. The interaction was still an element, but instead of focusing on the links between spoken and written argument, the research assessed the interaction in terms of argumentative exchanges and used other methods to determine whether their students had appreciated how to write effective argument. These other methods incorporated recognising and choosing appropriate counterarguments to counter the researchers’ chosen arguments. The research, however, was focused on appreciation of the skills of argument, rather than on the end product of the essay and the links between spoken and written argument.

The Argumentum Experience (Greco Morasso, 2009) combined online argumentation instruction and classroom activities conducted through the Swiss Virtual Campus Project. Using the underlying principle of ‘arguing to learn, learning to argue’ (Schwarz, 2009; Rigotti & Greco Morasso, 2009), Masters students engaged in online instruction on argumentation culminating in the re-enactment of an historical controversy. The students were encouraged to imagine they were in a court of law and were to prepare to defend a position in a well-known historical debate, which was then re-enacted, the argument moves analysed as the argument progressed. The combination of online and re-enactment activities was said to improve the students’ argumentation skills and would support the thesis of arguing to learn by learning to argue, but this was at Masters level and the course itself was not a simple educational intervention but a way of being.

Classroom interventions using interactive whiteboards (IWBs) have not been used to directly promote written argument either, though they do
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promote interaction and could be a possible vehicle for dialogue and interaction. Certainly work done by Deaney, Chapman, and Hennessy (2009), Gillen, Staarman, Littleton, Mercer, and Twiner (2007), Mercer, Warwick, Kershner, and Staarman (2010) and Mercer, Hennessy, and Warwick (2010) supporting knowledge co-construction in a History classroom has demonstrated how engaged the students are in the learning process. It has yet to be proved, however, whether these activities, which took place in primary schools and Year 9 classrooms, could be transferred into sixth form classrooms.

The research literature so far reviewed has demonstrated that some technology has been incorporated into the activities, including IWB, discussion boards, asynchronous conferencing, and argumentative representations. These technologies have been used to enhance students’ learning and, in terms of the discussion boards, to encourage debate between students and historians within online debate – practising the skills of a historian. The IWB research explored the potential for dialogic education and students’ engagement in their learning in an interactive and meaningful way. Asynchronous conferencing is also an opportunity to create a dialogic space for learning, the idea being that students would be able to reflect on their thoughts and enter into discussion with their peers without interference from the tutors, so that it was peer-led learning. Felton and Herko’s (2004) intervention incorporates a reflective aspect in their classroom intervention where the students are required to reflect not only on the content of the argument, but also on the way in which it is conducted – a form of meta-analysis. This reflective stage could be replicated and may well be enhanced if the students were encouraged to discuss their comments on the process during an online conference.

5.2.3 Incorporating other forms of technology. In order to discover an intervention which could incorporate both face-to-face interaction and the potential for reflection using an appropriate form of technology, a further review of the research into other forms of technology was undertaken. The research involving computer-supported collaborative learning (CSCL) was briefly considered (e.g., Scheuer, Loll, Pinkwart, & McLaren, 2010),
particularly because most of the current research into the promotion of effective ‘dialogic’ argumentation has been conducted in this field. Because it was difficult to integrate a face-to-face interaction within these arrangements, however, much of this literature has been discarded. This means that the Learning to Argue: Generalized Support Across Domains (LASAD) program funded by the German Research Foundation (Loll et al., 2010) Argunaut, a research and development project sponsored by the Sixth Framework Programme of the European Community, and the dialogue games of Ravenscroft (2007; see also: Ravenscroft and McAlister, 2008; Ravenscroft, McAlistair, and Sagar, 2010) were considered, but will not be part of the review or the study. Other computer programs, such as Belvedere, were investigated for potential to create a series of activities which could include the use of a computer whilst incorporating a face-to-face interaction. Again, however, it was felt that, as the research was to be conducted in schools and within sixth form classrooms, the aim should be to find an educational intervention that was not too complicated and would allow the focus to be on the interaction.

The researchers in History education had used asynchronous conferencing (Coffin, 2007) and online discussion boards (Chapman 2003a). The teachers in my exploratory study had suggested other forms of online discussion – such as conferencing between schools and conducting an online debate on an historical subject. This seemed feasible and the students had also been enthusiastic at the thought of competing against another school. Although each school was following a different syllabus, they were all studying an aspect of 20th century History, but there were no common topics between them. As these students were taking exams, it was important that the intervention should fit neatly into the curriculum. The need to create an online debate on a subject that had no relevance to any of the students prevented the further exploration of asynchronous conferencing.

Other uses of technology had involved IWBs (Mercer et al., 2010; Mercer, Hennessey, & Warwick, 2010) and argumentative diagrams (van Drie et al., 2005). It was discovered, however, that none of the sixth form teaching rooms in the History departments participating in the study were equipped
with IWBs. They also had limited access to computer suites that could have been used for structured argumentative programs similar to Interloc (Ravenscroft, McAlister, & Sagar, 2010) and Digolo (Muller Mirza, Tartas, Perret-Clermont, & de Pietro, 2007), which meant the research of van Drie et al. (2005) was not a feasible option either.

One source of technology which had not been explored in relation to A level History learning, but was suggested by the students themselves was the use of blogs. Again, there is little research literature on the use of weblogs (blogs) in relation to sixth form learning. Most of the research has been conducted in higher education and involves studies on how ‘blogging’ has become more popular and more widespread (Nardi, Schiano, & Gumbrecht, 2004; Efimova & de Moor, 2005), and on who is more likely to engage in blogging activities (Schler, Koppel, Argamon, & Pennebaker, 2006). Other research has been conducted on the use of blogging as an educational tool, notably in reinforcing course engagement and promoting interactivity (Brescia & Miller, 2006; Glogoff, 2005). Bartlett-Bragg (2003) suggests that the blog offers the opportunity for students to reflect on their work and in particular on their own learning. O’Donnell (2006) and Duffy and Bruns (2006) discussed the opportunities that blogging offers to enhance the pedagogical practice of lecturers within universities, suggesting that students can offer constructive feedback on course resources and other such matters. Schmidt (2007) has also suggested ways in which blogging and bloggers can be researched. Kirkup (2010) analyses the use of blogging by researchers and suggests that blogging is an activity that researchers turn to in a non-traditional way to promote their research and enhance the prestige of their universities.

Blogging seems to be embraced within higher education as a useful and increasingly important tool in academic life.

It was not my intention to use technology simply to be ‘fashionable’ and ‘current’, however. I was drawn to blogging because it offered opportunities for students to engage in reflection, which was an important factor in the intervention. I wanted the students to be able to reflect not only on their own learning, but also on the arguments they had been a party to so that they could reflect on the argument and be part of the interaction itself. The
interaction I had experienced with my students in one-to-one tuition was intensely animated but could also be intensely reflective at times. Reflection is an important aspect of dialogism, so giving the students opportunities to reflect in a practice that appeared to be familiar to them seemed a logical step. One school routinely used blogging in their A level History practice. Kuhn (2009) had also suggested that cognitive development would be enhanced if students were encouraged to engage in meta-strategic thinking. Reflecting on the argument itself as well as their role within the argumentative exchanges is an example of evaluative reasoning, which Kuhn (2009) and other researchers suggest is an important aspect of arguing to learn.

5.3 Theoretical Underpinnings – Design Framework 2

Design Framework 2 is derived from the interviews and the observational findings of the fieldwork in schools and is represented in the following table.
### Table 5.1. Developing theory from fieldwork findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Framework 1</th>
<th>Activities carried out during exploratory fieldwork</th>
<th>Fieldwork findings</th>
<th>Design Framework 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>derived from the literature review</td>
<td>Classroom Observations</td>
<td>Little evidence that teachers explicitly link spoken and written argumentation. Debates and paired presentations happened before essay writing, but usually separated by several days and little explicit linking between oral and written argumentation. Theoretical underpinnings neither confirmed nor negated.</td>
<td>Students should engage in oral argumentation before writing argument in their essays. Teachers need to make the links between spoken and written argumentation explicit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should engage in oral argumentation before writing argument in their essays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom observations</td>
<td>Little evidence to demonstrate ‘persuasive argument’ Discourse of ‘winning and losing’ prevalent. Debates and paired presentations did not allow students to counter argue individual points Theoretical underpinnings neither confirmed nor negated.</td>
<td>Student should engage in persuasive argumentation. Students need to be aware of the different forms of argumentation. Students need to learn to argue and counter argue points.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Students should be encouraged to make judgments about History which will become the basis of their arguments. | Classroom observations  
Teacher and student semi-structured interviews. | Little evidence of students making judgements about History controversies or about source material.  
Teacher and/or text book interpretation taken ‘as read’.  
Theoretical underpinnings neither confirmed nor negated. | Students should be encouraged to make judgments about History which will become the basis of their arguments. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Students should follow ground rules to encourage them to engage in dialogic talk | Classroom observations. | Whole class teacher talk predominant and students are passive consumers of information. Interaction was not ‘dialogic’.  
Little evidence of peer interaction – very few paired discussions and even fewer group discussions.  
Difficult to determine what ‘type of talk’ was prevalent among students – discussion dominated by teacher-led discourse and student response to teacher initiated questioning.  
A lot of questions based in recall rather than in ‘developing thinking’ which is a characteristic of dialogic engagement.  
Theoretical underpinnings neither confirmed nor negated. | Students should follow ground rules to encourage them to engage in dialogic talk  
Students should take part in collaborative activities designed to promote positive peer interaction.  
Students should be encouraged to engage in argumentation that is based in dialogic talk.  
Students need to be aware of the way in which to engage in dialogic talk. |
| Students should reflect on their oral and written arguments | Classroom observations.  
Teacher and student semi-structured interviews. | One school did concentrate on involving students in feedback and learning targets, but little evidence of students reflecting on their work or on the elements of argumentation they may have been exposed to.  
Theoretical underpinnings only partially confirmed. | Students should be encouraged to reflect on their written work and on their oral argumentation. |
5.4 The Vehicle for the Interaction

The classroom intervention will be based on Design Framework 2 and incorporate the key findings from the teacher and student semi-structured interviews. I had not observed students engaging in face-to-face argumentation, apart from in one school where they ‘bounced’ evidence and points across the table but did not pause to counterargue each point. I think that an opportunity to encourage face-to-face persuasive argumentation, which allowed for reflection as well, would be an appropriate vehicle for the interaction. I believe that, given the opportunity to discuss their opinions and points of view within an argumentative exchange which is rich in dialogic interaction, the students will be able to acquire their emergent voices which will then be taken into their written argument. I want the students to be able to argue and explore differences in their points of view in an environment based in equality. I want them to be able to be open to the persuasive voice, not an authoritative voice, and to engage in argumentation which encourages ‘witcraft’ (Billig, 1996) which will then lead to concept change and cognitive development.

I propose to use the classroom workshop intervention of Felton and Herko (2004) as a possible model for the educational intervention. Its theoretical underpinning is based in the persuasive argumentation of Billig (1996), Kuhn (2001, 2005), and Kuhn, Shaw, and Felton (1997). Kuhn supports Bakhtin’s (1981) thesis that argument is dialogic, though she defines ‘dialogic’ differently to Wegerif. The intervention is not a perfect fit for History at A level because it was designed for American Humanities students who had not yet achieved two-sided argument in their writing. History A level students have already achieved that level of argumentation at GCSE. Written History argument at AS and A2 in the UK is multi-factored and requires a more sophisticated model than one that is simply two-sided. The Felton and Herko model was potentially a good basis for the intervention, but it needed to be adapted to meet the needs of AS and A2 students. The fact that the intervention incorporates many of the strictures that Andrews et al. (2006,
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2009) suggest should be elements of tuition for effective argumentation also makes it a suitable basis for a classroom intervention.

Although I had the basis for a possible intervention, I knew that the intervention had to be carried out in a certain way because I wanted it to be the vehicle for an investigation into dialogic interaction. I wanted to be able to observe the students interacting, to determine what they said, and to see whether it was carried over into their essays.

So the Felton and Herko (2004) classroom intervention needed to be adapted to offer not only a more sophisticated model for promoting student argumentation, but also to enable me to instantiate dialogic interaction in order to determine whether it had a role in the links between spoken and written argumentation.

5.5 Designing the Prototype Intervention

In this section I will discuss the design of the classroom intervention. In keeping with DBR methodology, the intervention will be considered as a ‘prototype’ which must be trialled by classroom practitioners. The initial workshop design of Felton and Herko will be discussed briefly to show how it can be used as a vehicle for the instantiation of dialogic interaction. This will be followed by a scheme of work which will demonstrate the intertwining of the theoretical underpinnings of Design Framework 2 and the key findings of the exploratory fieldwork carried out in the four schools.

5.5.1 Initial impetus. The workshop intervention of Felton and Herko (2004) involved 36 11th graders (16-17 year-olds) who were following a Humanities course that integrated US History and Literature. Persuasive writing was an important facet of the course, as was being able to argue in ‘multiple meaningful contexts’. The workshop consisted of one 45-minute session followed by two 90-minute sessions (see Appendix 15 for a more detailed account of the workshop).
The workshop successfully demonstrated a method by which students’ written argumentation could be improved, exploiting and developing the ‘snowball hypothesis’ of Anderson et al (2001) and Reznitskaya et al (2001). But I wanted to investigate whether there was a different interpretation for the improvement in written argumentation – was the ‘snowball hypothesis’ the same as dialogic interaction? Felton and Herko (2004) had deliberately manipulated arguing in fours to improve the written argumentation of their students. I wanted to do the same – improve the written argumentation of my students – but I also wanted to find out how and why this process occurred. Working in fours, the students would all engage in the arguing process but in a way that could be easily monitored and observed, not just by the other students in the same four, but by a researcher keen to examine the interaction and the process of the argument itself. I thought, too, that the observing and planning phase would allow me to study the introspective form of dialogic interaction – whose ‘voice’ would be evident in the plan?

5.5.2 Designing the intervention – the classroom activities. The following is a scheme of work which is designed to support the activities created to carry the ‘intervention’ (the associated PowerPoint presentation can be found in Appendix 16). The intention is to produce a generic set of activities that need little adaptation so that teachers can simply incorporate it into their own scheme of work. This was a necessary feature of the work – the DBR methodology advocates designing practical solutions to classroom problems – and it was designed pragmatically to help classroom practitioners in this way simply because of the different A level courses being followed by the five different schools participating in the research.

5.6 The Prototype Intervention

There are seven stages, which are designed to scaffold the students’ work in argumentation, and each stage builds on the learning of the previous stage. It is an integrated programme and although the Felton and Herko (2004) interaction is at the core of the process, there are some important adaptations. These adaptations have been made to enable me to investigate
dialogic interaction without impacting too much on the learning of the students. Fundamental to this work, after all, is the assumption that students’ written work will improve if I can encourage them to argue and reflect dialogically on what they have said within a collaborative rather than an authoritarian environment.

The following table gives an overview of the intervention, highlighting the intertwining of theory and practice; a more detailed explanation will be found below.
### Table 5.2. The scheme of work showing the intertwining of theory from Design Framework 2, additional theory and fieldwork findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Fieldwork findings from teachers and students from 4 schools</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Framework 2</td>
<td>Additional theory from literature review</td>
<td>Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should make their ground rules to encourage them to engage in dialogic talk. Students need to be aware of the way in which to engage in dialogic talk. Students should take part in collaborative activities designed to promote positive peer interaction. Students should be encouraged to engage in argumentation that is based in dialogic talk.</td>
<td>Argumentation needs clear guidelines to prevent harm (Schommer-Aikens &amp; Easter, 2009). Students often lack confidence, so need to be encouraged to engage in the learning process. Yr 13 responses in interviews</td>
<td>Scheme of work Suggested activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student should engage in persuasive argumentation. Students need to be aware of the different forms of argumentation. Students need to be taught to argue and counterargue points.</td>
<td>Teenagers need to be taught to reason Kuhn (2009). Argument has several different interpretations and needs to be clarified (Coffin and O’Halloran, 2008). Persuasive argument leads to concept change and cognitive development (Mason, 2001). Essay and argument often become synonymous – distinction needs to be made. Classroom observations Argumentation confined to winning and losing. Classroom Observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Setting the Ground Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Argument Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whole-class activity – watch YouTube clip. Whole-class discussion – what is a good History argument? Teacher-led PowerPoint presentation – forms of argument demonstrating links to History argument. Arguing practice in threes –</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Students should be encouraged to make judgments about History which will become the basis of their arguments. | Students taking ownership of their own work (Claxton, 2001; Dweck, 2000). | Often students do not know what they think and are passive bystanders in the teaching and learning process. *Classroom observations*

Encouraging students to have the strength of their convictions – daring them to demonstrate what they think. *Teacher interviews*

### 3 Making a Judgement

- **Whole-class discussion** – History essay title – setting an argument in place – brainstorm what title means.
- **Individual decision making in silence.**
- **Physical whole-class participation** – standing on a continuum.

| Students should take part in collaborative activities designed to promote positive peer interaction. | Students do little ‘talking’ in the classroom – they answer questions, but do limited paired or group work. *Classroom observations*

Students want to work collaboratively and think it will help their learning. *Yr 12 and Yr 13 interviews*

### 4 Preparing for the Argument

- **Collaborative paired work** – generating points in preparation for arguing in fours.

Dyads compare their own points and develop others supporting them with appropriate evidence. | two argue and one judges. Judges’ feedback leading to whole class discussion – revisit what makes a good argument. |
### Chapter 5 – Designing the Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students need to learn to argue and counterargue points. Students should be encouraged to engage in argumentation that is based in dialogic talk Students should be encouraged to reflect on their oral argumentation.</th>
<th>Felton and Herko (2004) argumentative interaction with meta-strategic reflection on process of argument.</th>
<th>Students either engage in whole-class debate or boxing ring argument, but with an audience. Only one example of arguing in fours, but was isolated and did not contain reflection on the process of argument. <em>Classroom observations</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative argumentation in fours – structured argument to argue point-by-point and pair-by-pair with other dyads reflecting on process and development of the argument.</td>
<td>Students should be encouraged to reflect on both oral and written argumentation.</td>
<td>Making the monological world of the written word more dialogic – Bereiter and Scardamalia (1982). Though they are advised to, students rarely plan their essays and start their work with no clear idea about what they are going to write or why. <em>Classroom observations Yr 12 Student interviews</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual work – writing plans. <em>Individual work</em> – review other students’ plans – comment on argument and content of essay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should be encouraged to reflect on their written argument</td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Arguing in Fours

- **5 Arguing in Fours**

#### Planning the Response

- **6 Planning the Response**

#### Writing the Essay

- **7 Writing the Essay**
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Stages 1-3 are the preparatory stages to the argumentational interaction and are important because if the argumentation is done well it is possible that dialogic interaction will be instantiated. It is vital, therefore, to create the right environment in which students are encouraged to argue openly and equally without causing harm. Essentially the aim is to help students ‘chase down ideas’ and explore different angles happy in the knowledge that there will be no loss of face or esteem if they change their mind in the face of a more convincing argument.

**Stage 1 – Ground Rules**

This stage begins with finding out how students define argument which is then followed by a group based activity to establish Ground rules.

A Post-it activity – defining ‘argument’

This is the initial part of the process and is key to the rest of the intervention. Before the students have any real idea about what they are going to be doing, it is important to find out what they associate with the term ‘argument’. This is accomplished through a Post-it activity, which is done privately: the students are asked to write down on their ‘Post-it notes the first word they associated with the term ‘argument’ and then with the term ‘essay’.

Apart from being a good introductory and framing activity, as psychological theory has it, the Post-it activity is one that can be returned to when the participants are feeling more comfortable and happy to share their thoughts. It also gives the teacher the opportunity to learn the students’ perceptions of argument and whether they need to tread carefully with them as they eventually highlight the focus on academic argument (Coffin & O’Halloran, 2008; Schommer-Aikens & Easter, 2009).

B Setting the ground rules

Democratically setting the ground rules is absolutely essential. Given that the students will be expected to engage in face-to-face argumentation, it is vital that ground rules are established and that these are not imposed, but emerge from the students. A simple small group activity which acts as an
bridge from teacher-led to student-led interaction is required because it implicitly changes the environment from one in which the teacher is the authority to one in which the teacher becomes facilitator and equal partner in the learning experience. It is also important to establish ways in which students should engage in discussing topics, either during the interactive phase or the preparatory phase. This particular focus on how students talk to each other is based in the theories underpinning the ‘thinking together’ programme (Mercer et al. 1999; Wegerif et al. 1999). They need to engage in ‘exploratory talk’, if not ‘dialogic talk’, which allows differences of opinions to be discussed and explored, leading to the development of an understanding for both parties engaged in the discussion.

Stage 2 is the most teacher-led part of the intervention but it is still important to ensure that the students are aware of what argumentation entails, although the intention is to create opportunities to promote dialogic interaction. This stage, though teacher dominated, ends in a role-play activity to ensure that the students are able to access the theory and begin to practise argumentation.

Stage 2 – focusing on explicit argument instruction

A Video clip from YouTube – ‘the Argument Clinic’

This stage is designed to engage the students in considering the actual nature of argument by watching the well-known Monty Python’s Flying Circus sketch ‘the Argument Clinic’. The idea is simply to frame and develop their thinking on argument. The students’ definitions of argument are still private, but the Cleese and Palin sketch shows the contradictory form of arguing and demonstrates that contradiction rarely leads to resolution. If the students are relaxed enough, a brief question and answer session fed back onto the board or flip chart will help clarify what the students consider to be the characteristics of a good argument.

B Demonstrate formal and informal views of argument

This particular part of the intervention is where a formal teacher-led presentation occurs which relies on a PowerPoint slideshow to support the
learning. Slides show formal argumentation using a syllogism from Aristotle – most of the students do some form of critical thinking, so will probably be familiar with the example used – and then Toulmin’s example of informal argumentation (see Appendix 2) will demonstrate that it is easier to use Toulmin’s data, warrant, claim, and rebuttal thinking rather than Aristotle’s logic. Some teacher-led interaction based on the slides will allow students to appreciate the content, but this is not meant to be the focus of the lesson at all, purely a background to highlight the next section.

The underpinning theories are Andrews et al. (2006, 2009), Kuhn (2005, 2009), Felton and Herko (2004), among others, who suggest that argument structures need to be taught. The intention is to avoid using PEEL and simply to highlight the difference between formal and informal argumentation.

C Including History – making it relevant

Because the intervention is meant to be part of the History curriculum, it is important to integrate it within the on-going study of whichever History A level syllabus is being followed. It is important to remind the A level candidates that the History they are studying is an interpretation and that therefore the practice of the study of History is argument. This is then linked to Walton’s (1999) definitions of argument to determine which form is closest to History argumentation. It is important here to feedback students’ first thoughts about argument and to pinpoint them on the grid and see if their definitions of argument could ever lead to any degree of persuasion whilst acknowledging difference.

D Practising the ‘gentle art of persuasion’ and role-play

The students are encouraged to be actively engaged in the learning environment – hence the role-play, where they have to think hard about persuading each other rather than think about winning the argument. They are expected to convince someone of their point of view so that they become aware of the difference in opinion and their counterarguments have to be taken into account. This is done by addressing that difference and by
showing how a different point of view may be a viable and/or more plausible way of seeing/doing things.

This section of the research is underpinned by the thesis of persuasion and concept change espoused by Mason and others (Mason, 2001; Mason, Boldrin, & Zurlo, 2006; Mason & Scirica 2006). At the heart of it is Bakhtin’s (1981) and Billig’s (1996) work on the assimilation of the ‘other’ which then becomes part of the thinking process and gives rise to the acknowledgement that students should engage in arguing to learn (Andriessen, 2006; Pontecorvo & Girardet, 1993; Schwarz, 2009; Voss & Means, 1991).

This is the final stage of the preparation, which will lead to the arguing in fours. It is also a stage that should prove invaluable for students’ development of the appreciation that History essay titles are couched in terms of argument and are therefore the impetus for an argumentational response. Again this stage is a variety of activities designed to help most students access the learning objective.

**Stage 3 – making a judgement on History**

A Classroom brainstorm/mind shower with an essay title on the board followed very quickly by

B Individual and silent work

The students are invited to make a decision silently and on their own about what they think the question means and what they feel about it – it will invariably be a ‘How far’ question so cannot be answered in a two-sided way. This comes directly from the data analysis – students interviewed wanted the time to think through what they were doing before they committed themselves to the argument or any form of discussion. Also supported by the research Wiley and Voss (1996, 1999)

C Whole-class activity – making a judgement

The students are next encouraged to stand on a continuum representing where they feel they are in terms of opinion. This should not lead to a crowded centre, particularly if it is emphasised that they have to decide either
one way or the other in order to argue more effectively – it is an attempt to
make them think about the ‘thread’ of their argument.

The continuum was based on an activity which I first came across in a
counselling course and realised its value as an activity that would require
students to make a decision and stand up for it. It was also meant to help
kinaesthetic learners – first used when I was doing a TEFL course where the
instructor suggested that getting students up and out of their seats actually
increased the oxygen flow to the brains and helped those that had problems
with concentration.

A continuum based on ‘How far?’ suggests that two opinions on either
side are unlikely to be equal. It also helps when the initial pairs, and
subsequent fours, are set up because they can prepare their arguments with
the person next to them.

The next two stages focus on arguing in fours and are the core of Felton
and Herko’s (2004) interactive argumentation, though there are important
distinctions between their study and the present one.

**Stage 4 – preparing for a debate**

A Discussion in pairs

The discussion should elicit a deeper understanding of each person’s
point of view as well as those most like them – they are likely to be different
and use different evidence. Discussion is also collaborative work but only
becomes dialogic in Wegerif’s sense if the people engaged in the discussion
are open to changing their minds and are caught up in the discussion rather
than in activities that are based in ‘self’. Paired work, both private and public,
also allows students to identify their points of view and prepare their work
without public scrutiny so that even the shyest of people can work without
worrying about making mistakes – again taken directly from the student data
responses. Arranging the pairs based on opinion expressed on the
continuum also breaks up friendship groups and the different arrangements
can be an interesting way of creating opportunities to learn. Because pairing
is not based on ability or teacher pairing but on opinions, and with ground
rules already established the work can be constructive. This is not based on difference or socio-cognitive conflict (Limón, 2001; Schwarz and Linchevski, 2007) but more in the work of Fawcett and Garton (2005), which looked at both Vygotskian and Piagetian elements of collaborative work.

**B Visualisation**

This should be where the preparation for writing comes into force: having played with ideas and having jotted down thoughts, this should be where plans start to be tested although not yet crystallised. All the pairs should have an argument constructed with reasons and supporting evidence. This stage can be conducted in the lesson or set as homework – the important aspect is that it is collaborative work and that notes are in evidence and preliminary plans, which will be the basis of their argumentation and could also be the basis of their subsequent written responses.

**Stage 5 – debating: focusing on the counterargument**

**A Stand in pairs on the continuum again**

This is a way to develop and consolidate the opinions of the pairs/dyads. The pairs are matched on the continuum with the opposing dyads. At this stage of the process the groups will be formed by encouraging the dyads that hold the most extreme differences of opinion to work together as well as encouraging those whose differences are less extreme.

It is very important that this section is a free as possible but should be contained to arguing one point at a time, although two points can be argued, one for each of the dyads, before swapping over. It is important that no more than two points are argued at a time because we are trying to focus on the spontaneity of the argument – the interaction itself, the ‘witcraft’ (Billig, 1996) – keeping the thread of the argument whilst trying to convince the other that one’s own argument is the more plausible. It is in this particular interaction that I hope the interaction becomes dialogic and the students’ find themselves caught up in the argument and exploring differences by orientating themselves not to their interlocutor, but to the dialogue itself.
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After the two points have been argued, the observers of each dyad are encouraged to talk to their respective partners to discuss how the argument went and how the argument could be developed further. The observers have been asked to focus on the evidence used as well as the manner of the argument – did the arguer respond directly to the point made or not? This is part of Kuhn’s (2009) meta-strategic thinking, which can lead to evaluative reasoning.

B Once the discussion between the respective pairs has been conducted, the second members of each dyad are encouraged to argue the further points of their argument. In this situation the person who was the arguer becomes the observer and the person who was the observer becomes the arguer. When the argument comes to a natural end, the students move to the next part of the process.

C Four-way discussion

This should be where further consolidation takes place of not only the content of the argument but also its structure. Each person should have their argument – or at least part of an argument – discussed and reviewed, not only in terms of structure, but also in terms of content as well; this is peer reviewed, not teacher reviewed, at this stage.

The final two stages (6 and 7) are the transition phase of the intervention where the dynamic and dialogic interaction moves onto the written form, initially with a detailed essay plan and then the final essay. The peer reviewing of the planned stage is meant to be a final way of ensuring that voices are taken into what Bereiter and Scardamalia (1982) suggest is a structured and silent monologic world of writing.

Stage 6 – transforming the thinking to the written form

This again should be individual work. Though some discussion may still occur for clarification purposes, each student should be much clearer about what they think and feel about the essay question now and should find it much easier to plan their response. The detailed essay plan should be the plan that forms the basis for their final piece of written work.
A Students should show their plans – including their introduction, the outline of their arguments and incorporating the counterargument – posting them on the blog, if the school is fortunate enough to have a History blog site, or displaying them on sugar paper around the classroom. This is meant to be an opportunity to replicate the cue-rich environment of spoken argument and also an opportunity to once again consolidate their learning and their understanding of what an argument is and what it could look like on paper (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1982). Students are encouraged to read the plans and then to comment on them using Post-its or by adding a comment on the blog. Comments are meant to be confined to checking the structure of the argument and the use of the evidence.

**Stage 7 – writing the essay**

A Armed with their plan and their peers’ comments, the students write their essays

There should be opportunities for the researcher to examine dialogic interaction during the interactive phases – the role-play and the staged arguments, as well as reading the plans which can either be blogged or written on the sugar paper.

Through analysis of the spoken and written arguments, it should be possible to determine whether there are links between what has been said and written and whether ‘other’ voices have been assimilated into the students’ arguments.

This scheme of work, with the PowerPoint presentation, is the basis of the intervention and this is the format in which it was initially presented for consideration in schools.

**5.7 Summary of Chapter 5**

In this chapter, the literature associated with educational interventions was reviewed to suggest a classroom intervention that could be used to promote argumentation rich in dialogic interaction in A level History
classrooms. The theoretical framework – Design Framework 2 – underpinned the design for the prototype intervention which incorporated the argumentational interaction of Felton and Herko (2004). To ensure that the intervention was suitable as a vehicle for instantiating dialogic interaction, and would meet the needs of sixth form History students, the key findings of the exploratory study were incorporated into the design. A table was constructed showing how the theory and the findings of the study were entwined, as well as a detailed scheme of work.

The following diagram gives a pictorial representation of the key stages of the intervention and the processes involved.

![Diagram of the 7 stages of the 'prototype' classroom intervention in procedural order.](image-url)
In the next chapter, Chapter 6, the first trials of the intervention will be discussed. The findings from these trials were fed into the creation of an adapted intervention, which was then piloted in another school - Case Study 1 - which is the subject of Chapter 8. Chapter 7 discusses case study methodology, the methods and the form of data analysis associated with the three case studies of this research study.
Chapter 6 – Iteration 2: Expert Practitioner Trials

6.1 Introduction

The DBR methodology in which this study is being conducted prizes on-going collaboration between practitioner and researcher throughout the research process. The exploratory study had involved examiners, History education researchers, History teachers, and students. In this chapter, following Wademan’s (2005) model, a second consultative stage is discussed. During the exploratory study, the History teachers and students of the four different schools had given me insights into what students might consider problems in writing argument in their History essays. The intervention based in Felton and Herko (2004) had been adapted to accommodate the needs of these students. The second consultative stage, which is the focus of this chapter, explores the trials of the prototype intervention conducted by three teachers in their A level lessons. They were given the opportunity to see if the intervention would improve their students’ lessons whilst I had the opportunity to evaluate the design to see if it was capable of instantiating – creating the environment to engender – dialogic interaction so that I could investigate the links between dialogic interaction and written argumentation. The results of the trials would lead to further developments of both the theoretical framework and the intervention itself.
The chapter starts with the background to the trials, discusses the schools and the participants, and then focuses on each of the lessons. Data on the lessons were gathered through observations by the researcher, and from teacher and student feedback. Two of the three teachers were also able to provide post-intervention essays. The findings from the trials were used to determine the third theoretical framework, which will be discussed at the end of the chapter.

Two research questions were addressed in these trials:

*How did teachers integrate the prototype intervention into their lessons?*

*Did dialogic instantiation occur and, if it did, in what way?*

### 6.2. The Trials

Only one school took part in the trials, a school which had contributed extensively during the exploratory study.

#### 6.2.1 Background

DR is an inner city secondary school with a catchment area incorporating some of the more socio-economically challenged areas of the south west of England. During a Humanities Department meeting held in the spring term of 2011, the researcher fed back the results of the exploratory study to the History teachers of the school’s Humanities team. The intervention was also discussed and the researcher requested volunteers from the team to trial it. Three teachers volunteered to trial the intervention with their A level candidates. They stressed, however, that, as it was such a critical period in the preparation for AS and A2 exams, they would only be able to give limited classroom time to the running of the intervention. On that basis it was agreed that the three trials would be held before Easter 2011.

#### 6.2.2 The participants

Thirty-five participants were involved in these trials; these include the three members of the Humanities team and their respective AS and A2 students. Each teacher has more than 15 years’ teaching experience and holds a position of authority – and not just within the
Humanities department. The students were asked to sign ethics forms before each trial and it was stressed by the researcher that they had the right to withdraw at any time, and that if any student did not wish to be recorded by the video recorder they would not be.

6.3 The Lessons

The trials were conducted during February and March 2011, a critical time in students’ preparation for A level exams. The lessons involved were A2 Law, AS Sociology, and AS History.

6.3.1 A2 level Law. The session was a double lesson of two 50-minute classes on an afternoon in February. The teacher admitted that he would not be able to incorporate all of the intervention into his lesson, but would include what he thought was important to help his students improve their understanding of argument. The lesson was video recorded, though half way through one student said she did not want to be filmed, so the camera was pointed away from her.

6.3.1.1 The participants. There were seven participants, six students (four female and two male) and a male teacher.

6.3.1.2 The procedure. The lesson started with a re-cap of their previous work and then the teacher explained that the afternoon would be a trial for an intervention and asked the students to make observations of the process they were involved in during the session. After the necessary ethics forms had been signed by the students, the lesson proceeded to a discussion of the importance of writing a sustained argument in A2 level Law. This included several elements of the intervention – it differed in some respects, but essentially a large percentage of the earlier part of the intervention was used: the continuum and working in silence, before preparing for the debate together (see Appendix 17 for the PowerPoint presentation which was the backbone of the Law lesson).
There was no arguing in fours, but with just six in the class it became a focused group work activity, two groups of three working collaboratively to prepare for a debate. The argumentational interaction was conducted as if it were a debate, with each side stating their respective cases, but the lesson finished before counter arguments could be made. The reflective process of essay planning and feeding back to the students on their plans was also omitted.

**6.3.1.3 Findings.** Observations made during the Law lesson highlighted three key issues associated with the following aspects of the intervention: the instruction of argumentation, the use of silence and individual work, and the practice of ‘standing on the continuum’.

The PowerPoint presentation, which I had designed to support the process of the intervention and aid ‘delivery of argument instruction’, included reference to Toulmin’s (1958) argumentation pattern and was meant purely to act as a contrast to Walton’s definition of argument. The teacher, however, made a point of focusing on Toulmin’s data, warrant, rebuttal, and backing, and used it to illustrate how argument should be constructed. As this was an A level Law lesson, this was actually appropriate because Toulmin’s format was created in response to legal practice and the arguments constructed in A level Law require a more formal use of evidence and structure than does History. However, the focus meant that the students were reminded of formal argument practice and the need for structure, not the freer forms of dialogic interaction, which I had intended. This was an area that needed to be addressed.

The use of silence and individual work was interesting because it was clear that this class was not used to working individually to make judgements and had embedded effective collaborative working practices. I wondered if, by insisting on individual work, I was actually undoing much that was good. It did allow for reflection, however, which was an important component of the intervention.

The use of the continuum was also interesting: students did not all congregate together in the middle, but when two students who had done so
were challenged for standing in the middle, they recited the traditional stance of argument – on the one hand and on the other. Again, this was something that needed to be addressed. Students were then asked to argue points that they did not particularly agree with, which also went against an underlying intention – students should be able to argue what they believed in that they might be more easily engaged in the arguing process.

Feedback from the students was very good and clear. The argumentational section had been constructed as a debate – one side putting forward their case and then the other side making theirs – with little in the way of interacting to each point. The students wanted to argue each point and wanted the freedom to explore where the argument took them. They were looking for dialogic interaction and insisted that I made sure that I incorporated this into my design – I had, but had not managed to convey how important this element was to the teacher. The teacher’s subsequent feedback was positive and he was able to report an improvement in the students’ essays, which he ascribed to the intervention. The aspect he thought most useful, however, was the use of the continuum. Students are expected to make judgements by themselves before working with like-minded individuals to construct a case which will be tested later against individuals with opposing points of view.

6.3.2 **AS level Sociology.** This was a double lesson of two 50-minute classes held during a morning in March 2011. The session was filmed; all participants were happy to be videoed.

6.3.2.1 **The participants.** There were 23 participants, 22 students (12 female and 10 male) with a female teacher.

6.3.2.2 **The procedure.** The lesson focused on argument in Sociology essays and was geared to create paired discussion work – a precursor to writing an essay. The explanation of the research and the signing of the ethical consent forms were turned into a ‘learning exercise’ for the Sociology students, who would be conducting their own form of research later that term. There was a general discussion on argument in Sociology and emphasis was put on the difference between ideological standpoints, but exam demands
were stressed, which prevented any real appreciation of argumentation in its more general form. The class decided on a generic introduction together and half the class took one point of view while the rest took the other (this was determined by standing on the continuum). Plenty of time was given over to preparing for the discussion and an attempt was made by some pairs to argue against each other. Again, the lesson finished before any planning could be done and no reflection was made on the process of the argumentation.

6.3.2.3 Findings. Observations here demonstrated three things very clearly. Twenty-two is a large group for A level, so setting up arguing in fours needs to be carefully considered. The room was set out in a way that prevented such an activity being carried out easily. Paired discussion occurred in a free and easy way – some were off-task whilst others participated fully. The teacher had taken aspects of the intervention to promote what she thought was important for her students. She wanted two-sided argument and emphasised this with clear instructions reinforced with diagrams on the board, though the intention of the intervention had been to promote more than a simple two-sided model. It was also evident that students were still uncertain what their actual argument was – in constructing a generic introduction they had been prevented from formulating their own response, or a response that meant something to them.

Student and teacher feedback was positive and the teacher stated that she was going to incorporate the discussion element into her lessons in the future. The students found it very useful to be able to discuss complex sociological issues with their peers and benefited from listening to different perspectives; there was limited opportunity, however, for students to discuss in fours or engage in the intense dialogic interaction I had been looking for. The teacher was able, nevertheless, to demonstrate that the students’ essays had improved across the board and she ascribed this to the intervention.

6.3.3 AS History. This was a single lesson of 50 minutes held in March. The teacher was one of three teachers who delivered AS History to the group, and only met these students once every fortnight. Given the time
constraints, the teacher took aspects he felt would be useful and which he could utilise within his session.

6.3.3.1 The participants. There were eight participants: two female and five male students, and a male teacher. One student was absent. All students signed the ethics forms and were happy to be video-recorded.

6.3.3.2 The procedure. The PowerPoint presentation, which acted as the backbone to the History session can be found in Appendix 18. The teacher emphasised that two-sided argument was not appropriate in A level History, but suggested instead that a single thread should be followed throughout the essay incorporating other and several arguments – he visualised this for them by showing a rope. He linked the rope to the continuum, which he asked his students to stand on twice – representing their initial point of view and then their changed perspective following discussion. The discussion was very structured and constituted an examination of evidence rather than being an argument where the students put forward their opinions, which could then be explored and countered by other students. Because one student was absent the teacher joined one of the groups of four to make up numbers, which meant the quality of analysis was improved, but also that one group had less opportunity for peer dialogic interaction.

6.3.3.3 Findings. Observations of this session showed clearly that the focus on the continuum was what mattered to the teacher, though he was also pleased to report that the students’ essay writing had improved. Only one student’s essay marks went down, and that was the student who had been absent during the session.

6.4 Discussion

The research questions had asked two things – how would the teachers use the prototype intervention and would dialogic interaction be instantiated.

6.4.1 Use of the prototype intervention design. It became very clear that although the teachers enjoyed the ‘intervention’ I had designed and
shared with them, I had failed to convince them that getting students to engage in dialogic interaction was a critical aspect of the process. The teachers had accepted that helping students make judgements for themselves was important and they had all incorporated the continuum into their practice and would continue to do so. The discussion part of the intervention was another element that both students and teachers found useful, although the teachers were conscious of the dilemma they faced in trying to fit an extensive syllabus into limited time, meaning opportunities for classroom discussion were rare.

The feedback from the Law students, however, was very useful. They were emphatic that the intervention process they had been involved in should be improved by including the opportunity to argue each point rather than engage in a debate where one side argues all of their points before the other side has a chance to respond. I had created activities that were designed to do this, but unfortunately they had not been incorporated into the teachers’ lessons. Again, I had not made this aspect of the process clear.

The feedback from the teachers suggested that they felt that what they had done in each class had led to improvements in student learning. Two teachers provided essays that demonstrated an improvement, which they felt had taken place across the ability spectrum. One teacher, however, mentioned the Hawthorn phenomenon – the very fact that someone focuses on a process sometimes creates an implicit improvement without any real evidence to prove otherwise. He also wondered whether the improvement would be sustained. Another argument, of course, and one that Coffin (2006a) advocates, is that the improvement may simply have been due to the students’ natural development in the subject. None of this speculation could be proved; it was necessary to gather more evidence. I was also very aware that I needed to try the intervention out for myself, in its entirety, to see if my design actually worked and whether it would indeed instantiate dialogic interaction. There had been too many variables for me to conclude anything valid, although the insights gained in this initial part of the design and development section of my study had been invaluable.
6.4.2 The instantiation of dialogic interaction. The teachers who conducted the trials were very capable and professional. It can be argued that all three seemed to operate from a dialogic stance (O’Connor & Michaels, 2007). Although I had reviewed the videotapes for ‘critical moments’ (Nystrand et al., 2003), I had not seen any evidence of the type of dialogic interaction, an intense interaction, which I suggest is capable of creating a bridge between spoken and written argumentation. This could be for a number of reasons.

First, the form of argumentation used in AS Sociology and A2 Law does not require the same level of sophisticated argument as AS or A2 History, therefore neither teacher felt the need to go beyond advocating a two-sided approach to their students’ written argument. Second, although the scheme of work, which I had devised as the key activities of the intervention, required at least three sessions, none of the teachers was in a position to give the intervention the time required to test all of its features. The AS History teacher had the least time available – only 50 minutes in which to try out what he thought were the most important features of the intervention. This has important implications because the intervention was designed to be a series of ‘scaffolded’ activities leading to the instantiation of dialogic interaction. Only doing a few of the activities might bring about an apparent improvement in the structure of the written responses – the intervention incorporated key features which Andrews et al. (2006, 2009) had advocated would improve written argument – but I had not been able to determine the impact of the interaction itself on the written responses. Third, in each instance the argument generated was either, too structured and controlled, which prevented the free and easy way that ideas could develop, or simply a ‘cumulative’ discussion which Mercer et al. (1999) argue is the antithesis of dialogic interaction.

6.5 Adaptations to the Intervention

The Law and Sociology teachers had explicitly emphasised the two-sidedness of argument as part of their lesson, so one cannot directly attribute
any improvements in the written responses of their students to the parts of the lessons that encouraged peer interaction. I realised that if I was to investigate the interaction and its links to written argument, I needed to ensure that any teaching of argumentation structure should be limited to simply expressing what an argument was, and place more focus on the interaction rather than the theory. I was also aware that, because the teachers had not tested the intervention as a whole, I could not say that the intervention actually worked as a workshop designed to promote argumentation. I had evidence that parts of the intervention worked, or rather appeared to work, based on the teachers’ feedback, but I did not have enough evidence to radically change the intervention. It still needed to be tested as a whole.

I knew that the continuum needed to stay – I now knew, too, that ‘cherry picking’ aspects of the intervention would not instantiate dialogic interaction and I therefore needed to find the means by which I could conduct the intervention as a whole. Erduran et al. (2004) and Simon et al. (2006) had spent at least two years supporting teachers as they learned to teach argumentation; unfortunately I did not have the time to carry out such a detailed and supported Continuing Professional Development (CPD) programme on my own intervention design. The most significant adaptation that I could make to develop the intervention further was to find a school that was happy to allow me to run the activities as a series of workshops and have me deliver the intervention.

6.6 Design Framework 3

I had not been able to run the intervention in the way that I had designed it, so I was unable to test the theory that dialogic interaction had an important role in the links between spoken and written argumentation. Until I could prove otherwise, the theory underpinning the intervention still seemed rational and entirely plausible. However, as the following table shows, I was able to confirm some things. It also shows how Design Framework 3 has been developed from Design Framework 2.
### Table 6.1. Developments to Design Framework 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Framework 2</th>
<th>Activities carried out during Iteration 2 teacher trials</th>
<th>Fieldwork findings</th>
<th>Design Framework 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should make their ground rules to encourage them to engage in dialogic talk. Students need to be aware of the way in which to engage in dialogic talk.</td>
<td>No activities carried out in any of the three trials to test this thesis.</td>
<td>Not confirmed; still needs to be proved.</td>
<td>Students should make their ground rules to encourage them to engage in dialogic talk. Students need to be aware of the way in which to engage in dialogic talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should engage in persuasive argumentation. Students need to be aware of the different forms of argumentation. Students need to learn to argue and counter argue points.</td>
<td>AS Law demonstrated and emphasised Aristotle’s syllogisms and Toulmin’s informal argumentation – structure of argument reinforced. AS Sociology emphasised the two-sidedness of argument. AS History demonstrated ‘single thread against other forms of opposition’ thesis of History argument.</td>
<td>Emphasis on formal argument rules, impacted on the interactive nature of argument. Two-sided argument fine for Sociology NOT for History Standing on a rope emphasised visually the idea of a single thread running through History argument. Teacher instruction of argument needs to be adapted.</td>
<td>Students should engage in persuasive argumentation. Students need to be aware of the different forms of argumentation. Students need to learn to argue and counter argue points. Students should be encouraged to engage in argumentation that is based in dialogic talk. Teacher instruction of argument theory needs to focus on interactive nature of argument and not on formal argumentation. Need to make clear links between History and persuasive argument.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students should be encouraged to make judgments about History which will become the basis of their arguments.</th>
<th>Each teacher made students stand on a continuum to represent their views.</th>
<th>Teachers and students felt that the process helped them work out where they and others stood. Judgement activity confirmed.</th>
<th>Students should be encouraged to make judgments about History which will become the basis of their arguments.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students need to take part in collaborative activities designed to promote positive peer interaction.</strong></td>
<td><strong>A2 Law did work collaboratively to organise their cases – seemed to be well versed in collaborative activities, but engaged in formal debate at the end.</strong></td>
<td>Confirmed that students benefit from collaborative activities – certainly student feedback suggested it was something they wanted to do more of. Teachers less sure because of tensions in time management and syllabus delivery. Did not see students intensely engaged in argumentation which I consider to be a form of dialogic talk leading to concept change. Need to create opportunities for dialogic interaction in collaborative and argumentational engagement.</td>
<td><strong>Students need to take part in collaborative activities designed to promote positive peer interaction.</strong> Need to engage students in collaborative activities that will lead to dialogic engagement, not only in their collaboration but also in their argumentation. <strong>Students should be encouraged to engage in argumentation that is based in dialogic talk.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students should be encouraged to engage in argumentation that is based in dialogic talk.</strong></td>
<td><strong>AS Sociology students engaged in argumentation, but it is difficult to determine what type of talk was exhibited in the groups and dyads.</strong></td>
<td><strong>AS History students engaged in four-way discussion – very structured.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Students should be encouraged to engage in argumentation that is based in dialogic talk.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students should be encouraged to reflect on their arguments in both oral and written forms.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Essays were written after the lessons and no planning was done at any stage – although AS Sociology students had worked collectively on a similar introduction.</strong></td>
<td>Teacher feedback suggested that the essays had all improved. Student feedback not available. No evidence of student reflection on oral or written arguments. So theory has not been confirmed.</td>
<td><strong>Students should be encouraged to reflect on their arguments in both oral and written forms.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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What had been made clear, however, was that the intervention, designed as it was to scaffold the stages of argumentation thus leading to arguing in fours, still seemed a viable vehicle with which to test the theory. If anything, the focus on interaction and student engagement had been reinforced.

6.7 Summary of Chapter 6

This chapter discussed another critical collaboration with classroom practitioners and described how aspects of the prototype intervention were trialled in schools for the first time. The different ways in which the intervention was used in each of the three lessons was described and subsequently discussed. The data gathered included filmed lesson observations and the teacher feedback, which was given to the researcher at the end of the teaching session and after the essays had been marked. At the end of two of the lessons, students also offered feedback on their experience of the intervention.

The classroom observations and the teacher and student feedback from these trials gave further insight into the intervention and how it could be developed further. However, because the prototype intervention had not been delivered in its entirety, it cannot be argued that all the theory underpinning Design Framework 2 has been tested. Design Framework 3 therefore has very marked similarities to Design Framework 2.

The next chapter comprises a methodological discussion of case study research and how its practice makes it a logical partner to DBR. The chapter also discusses the methods used to gather and analyse the data obtained from the three case studies that make up the remainder of this research study.
Chapter 7 – Case Study Methodology

7.1 Introduction

This is the second methodology chapter of the research study, which discusses case study research. DBR is the overarching methodological approach, in keeping with a pragmatic worldview, but because of the nature of my research study a second complementary methodology is necessary.

It must be understood that I chose to work with five schools (another school joined the process after the exploratory study) for several reasons, each of which has a bearing on the study and explains why conducting the latter part of my research through case studies was so important. First, the sixth form environment is very high pressure, with students engaged in taking crucial public exams which could help them obtain university places as well as other forms of employment. Students in Year 12 and Year 13 have two exam periods, AS exams are taken in January and May/June of Year 12 year but most Year 13 students choose to re-sit one or both of their AS exams to gain higher marks. I was allowed access to the schools only when they were not directly involved in exam preparation. Second, Year 13 students are also bound up in the process of university selection and are often absent for interviews or open days. It was not going to be possible to conduct research with just one group of History students, who would be present in school for a whole academic year– the heads of departments who expressed an interest in my research were not in a position to offer me this luxury. As a PhD researcher I was not in a position, nor did I want, to negotiate any other way in which I could conduct my research in sixth form classrooms.

Third, although History is a popular subject at A level some schools have only a few students following an A level course. Of the schools which had expressed an interest in the research, only two had more than one group of AS and A2 students and the group sizes varied from as low as 8 to a maximum of 22. I decided that the best way I could test and develop the
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intervention was to conduct it in different schools, thereby giving myself the time I needed to carry out the research without taking up too much teacher and student study time. No one school was the same, and each offered a different dimension to the research study, so what at first looked like a disadvantage – not being able to work with just one school – became an advantage, because I was working with more students and more teachers and their input was extremely valuable. This is why my research study is not pure DBR and has to incorporate case studies.

The rest of the chapter discusses case study research and its advantages and disadvantages whilst also demonstrating how and why it can complement DBR. An appraisal of the methods used to gather and analyse data during the case studies is also discussed and completes the chapter.

7.2 Case Study Research

VanWynsberghe and Khan (2007) suggest that the term ‘case study’ encompasses a wide range of definitions. They indicate that ‘case study’ has been defined as a method, a research design, and a methodology. They suggest, however, that these terms do not adequately define case study and argue instead that a ‘case study should be considered as a ‘transparadigmatic’ and transdisciplinary heuristic that involves the careful delineation of the phenomena for which evidence is being collected’ (p. 80). They propose that the case study is an ‘interplay between the unit of analysis and the case itself’ (p. 87). Their approach to ‘case study’ offers a rationale for the use of case studies within this PhD research study because it frees me from any one paradigm, which is a particular feature of pragmatic research and a strength of the DBR approach. They also suggest that the use of ‘ongoing data collection, using multiple sources’, allows me ‘to develop and test theory’ (p. 90), which is a fundamental aspect of my research. I am using information from different schools and different participants, but all to help me develop a theory derived from the literature and tested against classroom practice.
Yin (2009) considers a case study to be ‘an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context…’ (p. 18). He suggests that it could be a complementary methodological approach, not least to experimental and scientific approaches, because case study research offers an in-depth approach to the research process. He further suggests that case study inquiry is distinguished by the way in which data are collected and analysed. For example, case studies allow for multiple forms of evidence gathering as well as many variables of interest (Yin, 2009, p.18). Perhaps what is most pertinent is Yin’s suggestion that case study inquiry ‘benefits from the prior development of theoretical propositions to guide data collection and analysis’. This is why I think that using case studies to complement my DBR methodology is appropriate. I have already derived a theoretical proposition from the literature review and partially tested it, but I want now to be able to test and develop it iteratively but within different environments. I am also using different forms of data gathering.

However, Bassey (1999) states that case study research is difficult (p. 44). He makes the point that the data collected will be extensive and even so may not cover all the data required. This reflects a criticism of DBR methodology where extensive data is gathered but DBR researchers are aware that some of the data generated may never be used. Bassey (1999) and Yin (2009) highlight the fact that the research must be systematic and the methods used multiple to offer a form of triangulation: no one single method will suffice. Case studies can incorporate both quantitative and qualitative research, and my pragmatically motivated DBR study already uses mixed methods to address the research problem.

Yin (2009) nevertheless suggests that among the usual applications of case study research, which includes describing, illustrating, and explaining phenomena, is a fourth that I feel has pertinence for my research. He proposes that a case study strategy can be used to enlighten, particularly in the evaluation of an intervention (p. 20). Although I may not be able to state with any degree of certainty whether the intervention I design will instantiate dialogic interaction and be solely responsible for the improvement in students’
written argumentation, I may, however, be able to offer insights into the process – the links between dialogic interaction and written argumentation, and be able to disseminate this learning to other teachers.

7.2.1 **Types of case study research.** Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2007) suggest that there are several types of case study. Citing Yin (1984), they argue that case studies can be identified in terms of outcome – exploratory, descriptive, or explanatory – and suggest that exploratory case studies can be used as preliminaries to other forms of research process, whereas descriptive and explanatory case studies are used to illustrate an aspect of a large scale, perhaps a quantitative study. Creswell (2007) also suggests that there are three types of case study, but instead of considering them in terms of outcome, he considers them in terms of intent. In this way the three types are defined as the single instrumental case study, the collective or multiple case studies, and the intrinsic case study. The differences lie in the purpose of the researcher. Creswell (2007) states that the researcher uses the single instrumental case study to illustrate a concern; the multiple case study, on the other hand offers the researcher the opportunity to take the single issue and consider it from different perspectives. The intrinsic case study, however, simply focuses on the issue itself because it might be unique and or unusual.

I am using case studies as iterations of the DBR approach. Case Study 1 is the first implementation of the intervention in its entirety whereas case studies 2 and 3 are the second and third implementations of the intervention, respectively. Though I am investigating dialogic interaction and its links to written argumentation in each case study, I have introduced variables that are not present in every case study. In this way I intend to test and develop the theory. The only constant in the case studies is the fact that I am ‘delivering’ the intervention. Case Study 1 could be considered an intrinsic case study because I will be investigating the process of the intervention as closely as I can. The other two case studies will use a developed intervention from the findings of Case Study 1, but will also examine different aspects of History learning. So, although these case studies have similar objectives – the investigation of the links between dialogic interaction and written argumentation –
the vehicle for the investigation and the environment changes each time. In one sense I am engaging in a multiple case study research process, but it might be more accurate to acknowledge that each case study is unique yet related.

7.2.2 Advantages and disadvantages of case study research. Creswell (2007) suggests that Case studies can be easily accessible to the reader and offer a ‘strong sense of reality’. As Yin (2009) affirms they can offer insights into a phenomenon that other research methods are unable to achieve, particularly if they are well written up. However, Creswell (2007) also acknowledges that there are disadvantages to using case study research, in terms of the outcomes. It is difficult to generalise from case studies, but in this research study I am conducting three case studies, which might alleviate the problems of lack of generalisability. It is also true, however, that what I am actually doing is not exact replication, which does impact on the ability to state with any degree of certainty that what I have discovered through my research may be discovered again if my methods are repeated. Nevertheless, the opportunity to investigate dialogic interaction within a sixth form classroom and to write up the findings within a case study format is itself a strength that I feel outweighs the disadvantages of case study research.

7.2.3 Case study research and this study. Case studies have been used in research conducted in History (e.g., Chapman, 2011a; Coffin, 2006a; Li and Lim, 2008) and in Education (e.g., Andrews, 2009a; Mitchell et al., 2008). In conducting DBR, Zeng and Blasi (2010) used web-based multi-storyline case studies where the case study became a tool in part of their research. They were testing participants’ reaction to the different case studies presented online. I am not using case studies in this way; I am using case studies as part of an iterative process of DBR. The intervention is tested in three different schools with different participants and under the unique circumstances associated with each event in that particular time and space. Each case study could be considered an intrinsic case study because each one has features that are unique, but they also have features in common, and cannot really be considered multiple case studies as Stake (2006) defines them.
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Key in this process, however, is that four schools took part in the exploratory study. In one, the practitioners also tested aspects of the intervention, described in the last chapter; the intervention was also implemented in two of the other schools. The fifth school only took part after the exploratory study. This means the findings from the fifth school could act as a counter to the bias already present in the study.

Each of the schools in the study is different. The only characteristics that the schools have in common are the fact that the teachers and students are involved in the study of A level History, but even then their syllabuses are not the same. This means that I cannot make generalised findings from my research, but can instead make claims that might be reflected in more than one school. The very difference of the schools offers a form of validity to the research process. If the results from each case study appear similar despite the disparity of the environment and different learning cultures, then the findings have a validity that may not have been present if they had been the product of just one case study.

7.3 Methods of Data Gathering

There now follows a brief discussion of the methods used during the individual case studies. Semi-structured interviews and observations were used during the exploratory study; as they have been discussed in Chapter 3, they are only briefly mentioned here. Other methods of data gathering include questionnaires and pre- and post-intervention essays. The students were also filmed engaging in the intervention, and audio and video recordings were made of the argumentational interactions.

7.3.1 Semi-structured interviews. During each of the case studies, semi-structured interviews were used to access the students’ experience of the classroom activities that comprised the intervention. They were also asked to comment specifically on their argumentational exchanges, to determine whether my interpretation of what I thought I was observing matched what they thought was happening. I wanted to determine whether
dialogic interaction had indeed been instantiated and, if it had, what the students themselves experienced during the process. The students interviewed were those who appeared to have made the most improvement in argumentative writing. Again, these interviews were conducted either one-to-one or in pairs and lasted no more than 20 minutes. During Case Study 1 there were eight single interviews, during Case Study 2 there were two single and three paired interviews, and in Case Study 3 there were five paired interviews.

7.3.2 Classroom observations. During my research study I moved from being a participant observer on the periphery of what was happening to a central player. During the exploratory study, ‘unobtrusive observation’ was conducted as advocated by Robson (2002). During case studies 1 to 3, I was ‘delivering’ the intervention. In this situation, acting as an experienced teacher as well as a researcher, I was observing what was going on around me as I deliberately manipulated the environment in tune with the needs of the learners and in reaction to what I was experiencing.

Classroom observations made during the case studies focused in particular on the argumentational exchanges. These exchanges were also audio-recorded because it was difficult to record and hear single exchanges within the classroom hubbub. It was essential to be able to link actions with words spoken and thus determine the instantiation of dialogic interaction.

7.3.3 Questionnaires. Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2007) observe that questionnaires are a widely used method in gathering data quickly. They note that questionnaires can be used when researchers are not present and although the construction of questionnaires can prove time consuming and needs careful consideration, the results are easily accessible and can be analysed quickly. Bryman (2008) also suggests that questionnaires are easy to use for the respondent if designed well. However, in distinguishing between postal and self-completion questionnaires, Bryman indicates that while questionnaires can generate data, they have poor response rates. Postal questionnaires are frequently ignored.
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To be effective, questionnaires need to be presented and formatted carefully. The questions themselves and the desired responses can range from closed questions requiring tick box responses, demonstrating a range in respondent attitude, to open-ended questions in which the respondent is asked to add comments. Respondents can also be asked to re-arrange statements in order of preference as well as being asked to simply circle a statement that most accurately reflects their opinion within a multiple choice questionnaire.

7.3.3.1 Advantages and disadvantages of the method. Bryman (2008) suggests that questionnaires have several advantages over other methods such as structured interviews. These advantages include being quick to administer and cheaper. Telephone and face-to-face interviews can be costly for both researcher and interviewee in terms of money and time. However, this also means that the researcher has to rely on the questions being particularly well constructed because he or she will not be there to probe further. The choice of questions may also be limited in number and depth. The respondent may fail to answer all the questions, particularly in a long questionnaire, and might only answer questions that mean something to her or him. If the respondent was being interviewed, the researcher could explain some of the questions and also – dependent on how the interview is being conducted – explore other areas of the research that are not covered in the questions but may arise through the interview process.

On the other hand, questionnaires do prevent the chance of interviewer effects or variability because the researcher is absent, so the answers generated can be considered as unbiased as possible. However, this can mean that the questionnaires may not be completed because there is no one to prompt the respondent or help when he or she has a problem.

Questionnaires are also more convenient for the respondent than the researcher because the respondent can determine when he or she completes the questionnaire. This means that the researcher has to work in the knowledge that many of the questionnaires may not be completed and may even be lost.
7.3.3.2 How the method was used. Case Study 1 used a questionnaire specifically geared to gather as many student reactions to the intervention as possible, as quickly as possible. It was a questionnaire that utilised closed questions asking for tick box responses regarding attitudes the students may have felt during the activities, but the questionnaire also included a series of open-ended questions in which the students were encouraged to add comments. These last were at the end of each section to allow the students to add any comments they may have felt necessary.

The questionnaire was short and clearly presented over three A4 pages. The design of the tick boxes purposefully lacked a middle box to prevent students taking a short cut and simply putting a tick in the middle to cover any attitude they may have felt. One of the open-ended questions at the end of the questionnaire was expressly designed to encourage them to offer suggestions on how they could improve the series of activities further.

The questionnaire was meant to be a quick means of recording an immediate reaction from the students. It was important to be able to gather this information so that I could gain a quantifiable appreciation of how the intervention appeared to work for the students. It was administered immediately after the last activity so that the intervention was fresh in their minds. It was also completed individually and before they left the classroom. Following ethical practice, the students were advised that they did not need to complete the questionnaire and could withdraw if they wished to – I did not want to coerce them. No incentive was given, although I did state how grateful I would be for any information they might offer in the questionnaire.

7.3.4 Pre- and post-intervention essays. After the trials described in Chapter 6, it was decided that student essays which had been written before the intervention should be collected as well as those essays that were written as a direct result of the intervention. This was done in each case study and was important as it could be used to directly measure the success of the intervention.

7.3.4.1 Advantages and disadvantages of the method. Kuhn and Udell (2003) discuss the cognitive load that students have to endure in writing
an essay, and in their interventions used different methods to indicate whether students had understood argumentation instruction and how that might improve their written argument.

One of the most important advantages, however, of asking students to submit pre- and post-intervention essays is that differences can be measured directly by comparing one essay with another by the same student. It is equally important, though, to realise that the pre-intervention essay may not have been written directly before, and so the differences found in the two essays might be due to other causes than involvement in the intervention.

Working with the students’ post-intervention essays and the transcripts of their group argumentation can demonstrate possible connections between what was said and what was written. This is important in determining the significance of dialogic interaction and its impact on written argument. It must be remembered that although the transcripts were carefully constructed and were tested against the video recordings of the interactions, sometimes a ‘voice’ can be lost or judged to belong to someone else, with the implication that the connections may not have been made as suggested by the researcher.

7.4 Case Studies – Data Analysis

7.4.1 Measuring written history argument. Essays were used to measure the quality of argument present in the students’ work. It is recognised that essays do not always accurately reflect students’ understanding and appreciation of the subject matter, but as the study was meant to be offering a way to improve essay arguments, it seemed logical to use essays as units of analysis. The students’ respective teachers had marked the pre-intervention essays and then I marked them. Similarly, in case studies 2 and 3, the teacher and researcher marked the post-intervention essays. We used the same mark scheme, AS History or A2 History, depending on whether the student was Year 12 or Year 13. This second marking was to give an indication of how much variation there might
be in teacher and researcher perception of student success. AS and A2 History mark schemes are quite vague and open to interpretation – see Appendix 19 – so I decided to find a different way of testing for improvement in written argumentation.

I adapted a method created by Erduran, Simon, and Osbourne (2004) that was based on Toulmin’s argumentation pattern (TAP). In this form of analysis, spoken and written argument are broken down into the constituent forms of argument, as described by Toulmin (1958), into data, warrants, claims, backings, and rebuttals (Appendix 20 shows levels of TAP). These are not easy categories to establish, however, and are open to considerable interpretation, so I went for a more elegant appreciation of argument and how it was improved by concentrating on the quality of the counterargument and how the two protagonists handled the responses. This counterargument approach was based in the research of Kuhn and Udell (2007), Leitão (2003), and Goldstein, Crowell, and Kuhn (2009). To further support and give a clearer indication of the improvement of argumentation, I also used Oostdam’s (2004) argumentative characteristics to measure indicators of written argument to see if they had increased in number and if they were clustered together in any way. In this way I wanted to be able to clearly indicate changes, or not, in the written argument (See Appendix 21 for a table of Adapted TAP and for a discussion on how the tool combines the research of Erduran, Simon and Osborne, (2004) Kuhn and Udell (2003), and Goldstein, Crowell, and Kuhn (2009)).

7.4.2 How to determine dialogic interaction? Extensive video recordings were made of the intervention process. The data were particularly rich, however, although Rose (2012) offers a range of visual methodologies and ways of reviewing the data, the analysis of the video material will be confined to seeking ‘critical spells’. During my MA in International Relations, I had analysed visual images through Barthian Third Meaning – looking for hidden meanings and the unexpected. Here, however, I was seeking what was in plain view. I was searching for what Nystrand (2003) calls ‘dialogic spells’. These are occasions in the classroom where students feel free to engage in the learning without being drawn, or in some cases dragged, into it.
by the teacher. The students are meant to be ‘caught up’ in the nature of the learning and inspired to engage spontaneously. Although I had constructed an argumentative ‘scaffold’, I still hoped that the students would be able to engage in the intensely animated and/or intensely reflective interaction I had previously experienced with my students. I was looking for dialogic interaction; though there was extensive video footage, I was trying to capture a few choice moments (Appendix 23 shows a table demonstrating the characteristics of what could be considered dialogic interaction based on the 'types of talk' of Wegerif and Mercer (1997).

The transcripts of the argumentational exchanges were analysed for argument using the research of Goldstein, Crowell and Kuhn (2009) and Leitão (2003) which focuses on counter-argumentation. Using this research a successful argument is determined by examining the arguing and counter-arguing to see if the addressees directly respond to each other’s argument. If they do by critiquing the argument and questioning the evidence and the argument exists for more than 6 turns it is considered successful. If, however the students do not directly respond to the other’s argument but instead offer their own argument - i.e. a counter-alternative - then the argument is considered less successful (See Appendix 22 for an example of two students engaged in counter-argumentation).

I was not looking, however, solely for successful argumentation – I was also looking for evidence of dialogic interaction – I was interested in how the ideas were picked up and shared with the other students. The transcripts therefore were also assessed to determine whether aspects of the interaction could be considered dialogic using Wegerif and Mercer’s (1997) ‘types of talk’ disputational, cumulative and exploratory and Wegerif’s (2012, 2013a) dialogic talk.

7.4.3 Whose voice? The interaction that might be construed as dialogic was then analysed to see what components of argument were present and what dialogue actually engendered the dialogic spell. The essays were also looked at again to see if there was any correlation between what was spoken and what was written and to see if a dominant voice
appeared within the interaction. The plans for the essays, either in the form of a blogged comment or on paper, were also considered to determine if there was a dominant student voice. These were determined through the comparison of ‘idea units’ (Reznitskaya et al., 2009a & b) and compared with the students’ argumentation thus measured in their essays by adapted TAP. This was to see if there was any connection or correlation between the acquisition of voice and improvement in the essay.

In this way it was hoped that the analysis of essays and filmed interactions could begin to help the researcher address the central question – what role does dialogic interaction have in the links between spoken and written argumentation?

7.5 Summary of Case Studies in the Research Process

Three schools were involved in the case studies, here referred to as ES, GV, and HM. Three teachers conducted trials of the intervention in School DR. Case Study 1, conducted in school GV, was developed from the findings of the practitioner trials conducted in school DR. Case studies 2 and 3 were conducted in schools HM and ES, respectively. HM had not been part of the exploratory fieldwork so the research conducted there could be particularly interesting and pertinent.

Case Study 1 was carried out in the spring of 2011, just after the January AS modules. Case studies 2 and 3 were developed from Design Framework 4 and conducted consecutively during the autumn and winter terms of 2011 – as one case study finished the next started. However, because the case studies were similarly based on Design Framework 4, and Case Study 3 was not developed from Case Study 2, these case studies are considered parallel. The classroom interventions were all completed by October, but the essay marking and semi-structured interviews were not completed until the beginning of December 2011.
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See Table 7.1 for a comprehensive summary of the data collection effort which was conducted through three parallel trials that were then subsequently developed into one single and two parallel case studies.
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### Table 7.1. Data collection effort during case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Plans</th>
<th>Pre-Int. essay</th>
<th>Post-Int. essay</th>
<th>Argumentative interactions</th>
<th>Semi-structured interviews</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRIAL</td>
<td>DR</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Staff T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 x 50 mins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Debate</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Yr 13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 x 50 mins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Staff T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Yr 12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2 x 50 mins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Paired discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Staff T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Yr 12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 x 50 mins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Structured discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GV</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Staff R + T</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Yr 12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3 x 70 mins</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14 3 X4 &amp; 1 X 3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>HM</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Staff R + RA + T</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Yr 13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3 x 60 mins Workshop</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17 4 x 4 &amp; 1 x 3</td>
<td>2 x 1 &amp; 3 x 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Staff R + RA + T+ST</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Yr 12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3 x 50 mins Workshop</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15 3 x 4 &amp; 1 x 3</td>
<td>5 x 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* R = Researcher; T = Teacher; RA = Research Assistant; and ST = Student Teacher.
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Classroom observations and semi-structured interviews were conducted to gather evidence of the developing ‘close to practice theory’, which was the basis of design frameworks 3 and 4, and to develop the design of the intervention. Feedback was invited from the students to access their experience of the intervention. Feedback included questionnaires, verbal ethnographic feedback, and semi-structured interviews. Plans, pre- and post-intervention essays, and argumentative interactions were the methods of data gathering used to investigate dialogic interaction and its links with written argument.

7.6 Summary of Chapter 7

This chapter discussed case study research and how it has been used as a complementary methodology within the overarching methodological approach of DBR. The different types of case study were discussed briefly to determine which form was being used within this study. This was followed by a discussion of the methods used to gather and analyse the data generated during the three case studies.
Chapter 8 – Iteration 3: Case Study 1

8.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on Case Study 1, which is the third iteration of the research study. The purpose of this third iteration which is underpinned by Design Framework 3 is to determine whether dialogic interaction can be instantiated when the intervention is used in its entirety. Students’ essays will be analysed by measuring for argumentation to determine where and in what way there has been an improvement. The argumentative interactions will also be analysed to determine what links there may be between the spoken and written argumentation.

The chapter is divided into three sections. The first section discusses the school, the methods, and procedure used within this case study. The second and third parts comprise the findings of the study and subsequent discussion leading to the development of the fourth theoretical framework – Design Framework 4. This will then lead to further case studies that will be discussed in chapters 9 and 10.

8.2 Background

The findings from the three trials conducted so far have demonstrated two things: first, teacher feedback suggested that essays were improved across the range of student ability and, second, the number of collaborative activities
were increased but dialogic interaction did not appear to be instantiated. The three teachers who conducted the lessons had not taught all of the activities that made up the intervention, but had focused on different parts of the intervention for three reasons. The differing demands of A level subjects, and time constraints which impacted in two ways: it was a critical time in the students’ exam preparation, and the school’s timetable limited the time available to devote to the research process. The feedback from the teachers and students, and the findings from the observations, led to the formation of Design Framework 3, which, it must be acknowledged, is essentially an affirmation of Design Framework 2.
## Table 8.1. Developments to Design Framework 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Design Framework 2</strong></th>
<th><strong>Design Framework 3</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should make their ground rules to encourage them to engage in dialogic talk.</td>
<td>Students should make their ground rules to encourage them to engage in dialogic talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students need to be aware of the way in which to engage in dialogic talk.</td>
<td>Students need to be aware of the way in which to engage in dialogic talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should engage in persuasive argumentation.</td>
<td>Students should engage in persuasive argumentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students need to be aware of the different forms of argumentation.</td>
<td>Students need to be aware of the different forms of argumentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students need to learn to argue and counter argue points.</td>
<td>Students need to learn to argue and counter argue points. Students should be encouraged to engage in argumentation that is based in dialogic talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher instruction of argument theory needs to focus on interactive nature of argument and not on formal argumentation.</td>
<td>Need to make clear links between History and persuasive argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should be encouraged to make judgments about History which will become the basis of their arguments.</td>
<td>Students should be encouraged to make judgments about History which will become the basis of their arguments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students need to take part in collaborative activities designed to promote positive peer interaction. Students should be encouraged to engage in argumentation that is based in dialogic talk.</td>
<td>Students need to take part in collaborative activities designed to promote positive peer interaction. Students should be encouraged to engage in argumentation that is based in dialogic talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to engage students in collaborative activities that will lead to dialogic engagement, not only in their collaboration but also in their argumentation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should be encouraged to reflect on their arguments in both oral and written forms.</td>
<td>Students should be encouraged to reflect on their arguments in both oral and written forms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The research questions for Case Study 1 are therefore:

Question 1: Would the intervention instantiate dialogic interaction if it were taught in its entirety?

Question 2: Would the students’ essays improve and, if so, in what way?

Question 3: Would there be there a connection between what was said and what was written?

8.3 The Case Study

8.3.1 The school. Case Study 1 was conducted in school GV during the spring term of 2011. Because it was the first complete run of the intervention, the participants were also asked to feed back on the experience as well as being active participants of the research process. The school was an independent mixed gender inner city secondary school for students between 3 and 18 years old.

8.3.2 Participants. There were 17 participants, all of whom were students of AS History and had taken GCSE History the previous year. They were a mixed ability group: their GCSE grades ranged from U through to A. The school practises a policy of accepting students onto A Level courses without them necessarily attaining a GCSE in the specific subject: the motivation to learn is considered sufficient. The intervention was presented as part of their A level learning and as such they were volunteered by their teacher. Parental consent had been obtained, however, before the research phase began and students were asked to complete individual ethics forms before they took part in the research. It was stressed that they had the right to withdraw at any stage and they were assured that anonymity would be preserved.

8.3.3 Procedure. There were three classroom sessions of 1 hour 10 minutes each – these were double periods of 35 minutes. Each session was filmed and audio recorders were also used in the final session. There had been two preliminary sessions which the teacher had led while the researcher
was present. The focus had been on paired collaborative work ending in student presentation so that the students would find the transition to the intervention activities as seamless as possible. The usual format of the lessons was very teacher-led although the groups were small and the students were encouraged to actively participate. However, the norm was teacher-student interaction rather than student-student interaction, and for that reason the researcher led the intervention sessions. See Appendix 24 for Power Point Presentation which supported the three lessons.

The introductory session involved a free association word activity designed to access the students’ perceptions of essay and argument; student groups constructing group rules to be agreed by the whole class to allow ‘safe and constructive’ argumentation and to promote an environment of equality; a researcher PowerPoint presentation explicitly focused on argumentation, and History argumentation in particular; and three groups of four and one group of three students preparing and executing a role-play focusing on using ‘persuasion’ to change a person’s mind. The idea behind the ‘role play’ was to demonstrate how persuasive argument is used in many different social encounters.

The second session started with a Post-it activity that gave the students the opportunity to reflect on whether their perceptions of argument had changed. This was followed by a researcher-led elicitation of the importance of evidence in argumentation, and a researcher-led but student-fed discussion on a specific History essay title and what evidence might be needed to answer it. Thoughts and ideas were fed back onto the classroom whiteboard for all to see. This was followed by an activity which required students to make a judgement and then stand on a continuum, and finally paired work in which they worked with someone who had made a similar judgement on the continuum to prepare their arguments.

The final session was geared towards student argumentation. The room had been rearranged to allow students to sit opposite each other. The classroom whiteboard was covered in the information generated by the students during their last session – this was to act as an evidence base and
as reminders. A brief period was allowed to enable the students to remind themselves of their argument and then they were asked to revisit the continuum so that pairs could be set to argue against each other: in this way two dyads that had opposing views were put together on the tables.

One student from each pair argued a couple of points whilst the others observed the argument and the speaker’s partner made notes on their progress. A period of feedback was initiated where the students fed back to each other. Then the argument continued but the observers had swapped places with the arguers. When the groups had argued themselves out a halt was called. In this way everyone in the room had the opportunity to be involved in an argument as well as to observe an argument in progress. Students were then asked to feedback to their respective groups, after which they were asked to make their essay plans individually. A final stage involved students giving feedback to each other on their essay plans through two Post-it notes, one focusing on the structure of the argument and another on the use of evidence. The students were encouraged to show their plans to as many people as they liked to get as much feedback as possible. Only constructive comments were allowed. Finally, they were asked to write the essay using their plans.

Only 15 students, eight female and seven male, completed the three sessions. Seventeen participated fully in the introductory session; 16 in the second, and 15 in the final session. Four groups of four took part in the role-play and eight pairs took part in the preparation phase. Four groups took part in the final interactive phase – one group of three (one female student and two male) and three groups of four (one female and three male; two female and two male; and four female).

8.3.4 Data collection. Ten essays were submitted pre-test and 14 submitted post-test. All the sessions were filmed and the final argumentative interactive sessions were audio-recorded too. Fifteen questionnaires were returned offering feedback on the process of the intervention and eight post-intervention and essay interviews were conducted.
8.4 Forms of Data Analysis

8.4.1 Written argument. Pre- and post-test essays were marked in three ways. They were assessed using the AS level mark scheme for the question (please see Appendix 25). They were also assessed using an adapted form of Toulmin’s Argumentation Pattern, which included the research of Erduran et al. (2004), and Von Aufschnaiter et al. (2008) (see Appendix 21 for a discussion of the development of this method and the table showing the levels of argumentation). Finally, developing an idea by Oostdam (2004), the essays were assessed for evidence of argumentative indicators – such words as ‘however’, ‘furthermore’ – and whether there were concentrations or clusters of such indicators, which move the writing on (see Appendix 26 for an example of an essay reduced to ‘argumentational’ clusters.)

8.4.2 Dialogic interaction. The interactions were assessed in four ways. Whilst the intervention was underway, the researcher judged intuitively whether a group was engaging in a dialogic interaction based on the level of engagement exhibited by the students in the group, then videos of the classroom interaction were analysed retrospectively for other potential dialogic spells (Nystrand, 2003). The audio recordings of the interactions were transcribed and then assessed in two ways. The first form of analysis was to determine the characteristics of their argumentation based in the research of Goldstein, et al. (2009) (see Appendix 22) The second form of analysis was for ‘types of talk’, as suggested by Wegerif and Mercer (1997): disputational, cumulative, and exploratory with an additional level called dialogic talk as defined by Wegerif (2011b, 2012, 2013a). This latter analytical tool was intended to help determine whether the argumentation did indeed engender dialogic talk and could therefore be viewed as a dialogic interaction. See Appendix 27 for indicators of ‘types of talk’.

8.4.3 Student questionnaires. The questionnaires were issued and completed by the students immediately after the intervention ended (see Appendix 28 for the questionnaire questions). They were completed anonymously, giving the student the freedom to answer without fear of
sanction. It had been stressed that they did not need to complete the questionnaires and could withdraw from the process at any time – in accordance with ethical considerations. It had also been stressed, however, that their views were important and would be of benefit to the development of the intervention. The answers were collated and analysed according to the activities of the intervention. In this way I hoped to gain an insight into how useful the students felt the activities had been. This insight would be instrumental in developing the intervention further to meet the needs of the students.

8.4.4 Student post-intervention interviews. The interviews were conducted some time after the intervention – indeed after their AS exams, so they are somewhat retrospective, but no less valuable because the students were asked to recall what they thought was most valuable about the intervention and how it had helped them develop their skills in argumentation. The analysis will be taken at face value although it will be recognised that the students may have qualified their statements in order to ‘please’ the researcher.

Taken together, the questionnaire findings and the students’ comments should demonstrate what they consider to be valuable about the intervention because the questionnaire offers immediate feedback whereas the interviews offer a more reflective and retrospective insight. If any of the activities is mentioned in both responses then perhaps it can be suggested that that activity may or may not be of benefit in the learning of the student.

8.5 Findings.

Research Question 1: Would the intervention instantiate dialogic interaction if it were taught in its entirety?

8.5.1 Did the intervention instantiate dialogic interaction? The place I hoped to find evidence of this process was in the argumentative phases of the intervention in session 3. All the activities in sessions 2 and 3 had been leading up to the argumentative phase – the arguing in fours. DBR
methodology relies on both intuitive and retrospective analysis and so I knew that I had to make a judgement about what I was observing (as defined by the criteria found in the Appendix 23) whilst I was conducting the intervention. I knew too that after viewing the video data, I might change my mind. In the event, my initial interpretation of the activities in the groups was supported by my retrospective analysis of the videotapes. In this phase, only one of the four groups – Group 4 – appeared to be engaged in a very active and intense interaction that could be described as dialogic. Though the other groups were also deeply engaged in the process, their experience was intense but neither very active nor as deeply reflective. Reviewing the video of the session, it was clear that all of the students’ focus was on the arguments engendered in their group and most lost awareness of anything else going on in the classroom. So they were engaged in argument, but it was difficult to say whether they were orientating their responses to the other person or to the dialogue itself.

8.5.2 What form of argument were they engaged in? The implicit aim of the intervention was to create opportunities for persuasive argumentation on the assumption that within this particular environment dialogic interaction would be a logical next step. I was aware during the course of the intervention that the students in one particular group were very actively engaged in the argument and it appeared at times that their interaction could be dialogic. This was further supported by the video analysis. A closer examination of that group’s transcripts was necessary, however, to determine whether I was right to assume that the students had first of all engaged in persuasive argumentation and that dialogic interaction had also occurred. It was also equally important to try to establish what form of argumentation was happening in the least active groups and determine why this might be so.

Reviewing the transcripts of the argumentative phases it became clear that the argumentation was disjointed in all cases. There was no smooth discussion engendered on each table. There were false starts, pauses, unreturned points, and even elements of eristic argumentation. ‘Eristic’ in this case meant simply stating ‘you are wrong; I am right’ and offering no
explanation at all in defence of a point, but still expecting the other side to agree regardless of their own points. There was often confusion and some students dominated the discourse, even though the activity was structured to follow a turn and turn about process, usually by using a range of evidence to support their points. Although the students had drawn up their own set of ground rules which were supposed to prevent eristic and more harmful forms of argument occurring, they were often ignored. The intervention was a deliberately orchestrated attempt to engender persuasive argumentation and yet students failed to convince each other of their points of view. In fact, of the 15 students in the room, only one admitted to changing their mind, and that was not through her own argumentation process, but by observing others.

The following table offers a visual representation of the form of discourse evident within the groups’ activities using the Adapted Tap analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Phatic/Eristic argument</th>
<th>Irrelevant points</th>
<th>Unreturned points</th>
<th>Rhetorical points</th>
<th>Clarifications leading to developed points</th>
<th>Developed points</th>
<th>Counter-claims</th>
<th>Counter-argument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Eristic means the exchanges which were reduced to ‘I won; you lost’; and phatic means exchanges like ‘it’s supposed to be your turn’.

There are several explanations for the lack of persuasive argumentation. The final session was on the last day of term and students had other responsibilities that demanded their attention. Some had not done the work, or had failed to bring the appropriate books. Even though they had reminders on the board, the students rarely paid attention to what was written there. It is also true that groups 2 and 3 were very close on the continuum and, although
they had different points of view and perspectives, these differences were only slight, meaning that the argument could not be sustained and they agreed on the same point. Group 2 had a very knowledgeable student who was able to present coherent and well evidenced points which few could counter, hence the large amount of phatic language and unreturned points. Group 1, unfortunately, was a group of three and although there was evidence of some counterclaim and counterargument, one of the students had failed to prepare as well as he might and so argument could not be developed further. This was also an issue with Group 3 – there were no counterclaims or counterarguments because one dyad had prepared particularly well while the other had not, and so could not return or develop points; the points developed had been developed by the hard working dyad alone. Group 4, however, is interesting because although there is evidence of eristic argument and irrelevant points, the argumentation on this table did lead to counterclaims and counterarguments. This is particularly interesting because this was the group that was most opposed to each other on the continuum, and thus had most to argue about. This is the group that was most active and if any group within the room could be involved in dialogic interaction, Group 4 would be the one.

8.5.3 What form of talk were they engaged in? The adapted form of Wegerif and Mercer’s (1997) dialogical framework – modified to include Wegerif’s dialogic talk - proved to be a difficult tool to use to analyse the talk because of the nature of the argumentative discourse. There was little evidence of cumulative talk in any of the groups and the predominant discourse seemed to be disputational talk. Exploratory talk was also limited. The false starts and the pauses were not used to reconsider or explore what the other person had just said, but appeared instead to be used to gather further evidence to support a point of view and to consolidate rather than explore a point. Only one group of the four showed evidence of dialogic talk, though there was also evidence of disputational talk. Wegerif and Mercer (1997) suggest that ‘exploratory talk’ is the type of talk that leads to conceptual change and cognitive development whereas disputational talk does not.
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Research Question 2: *Would the students’ essays improve and, if so, in what way?*

**8.5.4 Did the students’ essays improve?** Ten pre- and ten corresponding post-intervention essays were assessed using holistic AS level marking methods and the adapted TAP framework. The teacher’s grades are also incorporated into the table but long-term sickness prevented him offering marks for the post-test essays. The following table shows the marks for the essays assessed by AS mark-scheme and the adapted TAP framework. To protect their anonymity, the students have been given different names, randomly chosen, that bear no relation to their own.

**Table 8.3. Pre- and post-intervention (int.) essay marks using AS and Adapted TAP mark schemes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>GCSE grade</th>
<th>Teacher grade Pre-int. in Levels</th>
<th>My grade Pre-int. levels</th>
<th>Post-Int.</th>
<th>TAP level Pre-int.</th>
<th>TAP Level Post-int.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winona</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilian</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**8.5.4.1 Using the AS mark scheme.** The essay question ‘How important is the pursuit of glory in explaining Louis XIV’s foreign policy in the years 1672–1688?’ had been an exam question so the examiners’ mark scheme was accessible. AS History examiners mark holistically, making value judgements based on experience, and place the student scripts within levels before awarding points. The mark scheme for the essay question can be found in Appendix 25.

The mark scheme’s focus is on historical reasoning and historical skills which are conveyed through argument; an AS candidate therefore needs to
be able to argue effectively in order to do well. The mark scheme, however, does not focus specifically on the quality of the argument; the argument is simply meant to be the vehicle for the historical knowledge and help demonstrate understanding. If we use AS marking as an indicator of success, it is difficult to see from this table whether the intervention had any impact on the students’ marks.

Using the AS level mark scheme, it can be seen that five students’ grades improved, two students stayed the same, and three actually did less well. This suggests that the intervention was only a limited success. It is also clear that the improvements appear to be going up just one level or half a level. However, this does not really give an accurate assessment of what is actually changing in the essays. The criteria for History marking is not prescriptive and there are many ways that a student can achieve a grade. The key to success lies in how well the student demonstrates his or her understanding of an historical period. Their responses conveyed through an argument should be illustrated by carefully selected evidence, which both supports their analysis and demonstrates their historical knowledge. The students’ work is holistically marked based on the judgement of experienced teachers and examiners. Some students, for example, who use a lot of detailed evidence demonstrating good recall and a sound knowledge base, but do not address the demands of the question particularly well, can still be awarded a good grade.

8.5.4.2 Assessing argumentation by adapted TAP. If, however, we are going to measure the change in terms of argumentation present within the essays, then it can be clearly seen that all students benefited from the intervention. Please see Appendix 30 for examples of changes in argumentation measured by the adapted TAP method. It appears, too, that those students who had written mostly narrative responses dedicated to explaining rather than analysing History were now capable of writing what is recognisable as a basic argument with claims and counterclaims. Seven people succeeded in improving by two or more levels. Francis and Chris moved from zero evidence of an argument to 2 and 2/3, respectively, demonstrating that they could write using more claims and counter claims.
Delia moved from 2/3 to 4/5; she was already demonstrating argumentation in her essays, but now her argument was more sustained, integrated and therefore stronger. Edward moved from 1/2 to 3/4; his pre-intervention essay was characterised by extensive use of evidence and implicit argumentation whereas his post-intervention essay clearly defined his argument, although he was determined to make it a two-sided argument and not an integrated argument. Olivia moved from 1 to 3/4, Winona from 2 to 4/5, and Andrea moved the most, from 1 to 4/5. Andrea’s pre-intervention essay had demonstrated understanding and use of evidence, but had not included an argument despite the essay title explicitly demanding an argument in response. Holistically, Andrea’s score suggests that her answer has not improved at all, but in argumentational terms it certainly has.

On the other hand, Joseph and Thomas’s essays had only improved one level. Both of their pre-intervention essays demonstrated evidence of argument. In Thomas’s case, his argument suffered from not creating a sustained response; Joseph was more convincing. Lilian is the only person to demonstrate a limited improvement. Her pre-intervention essay showed a clear argumentative structure that was not really developed enough; her post-intervention essay, which holistically was poorer than the pre-intervention, may offer an explanation. She did not address the demands of the question and, as a consequence, was unable to write a convincing argument. It is also possible that the intervention did not help her at all.

Research Question 3: Is there a connection between what is said and what is written?

8.5.5 Were there any connections between the spoken and written argument? In order to address this question, the essays, essay plans, and transcripts were collated by ‘argumentational’ group. The aim was to determine if there were any similarities between what was said and what was then written in the plans which were subsequently translated into the essays. I was not looking for similarities of words – there would be many connections, which is only to be expected. I was focusing on ‘idea units’, as suggested by Reznitskaya et al. (2007, 2009a). I wanted to see whether
there was a crossover in the ideas generated and how they might be presented in the essay. I also wanted to see if it were possible to determine who first expressed a given idea and how it was used within the group discussion and translated into the written arguments of each member of the group. I am suggesting that the way the idea is developed and by whom might be an indicator of conceptual change and possible cognitive development.

The spoken argumentation was fragmented in all of the groups so it was difficult to follow any specific idea and how it was developed. Group 4 was the only group that appeared to argue and bounce ideas around; the other groups were not so actively engaged in the arguing. Few plans reflected the argumentation within the groups and fewer still were directly translated into the essays. The only group that seemed to show any evidence of a connection between spoken and written argument was Group 4.

8.6 Student Insight Into Argumentation

The students’ questionnaire responses were collated and tables made of their responses which can be found in Appendix 29. The post intervention interviews were conducted some time after the intervention – in fact after their exams so what the students recall of the intervention has pertinence. This and the other aspects of the student interviews are discussed in Appendix 32. The findings from both questionnaires and student interviews are included in the development of the next design framework and will be instrumental in developing the intervention further.

8.7 Discussion

In this part of the chapter a discussion of the findings will lead to a discussion on how to develop the framework to create Design Framework 4 and also how to develop the intervention further.
8.7.1 Was dialogic interaction instantiated? Studying the transcript, listening to the audio tape repeatedly, and replaying the video several times over, it becomes clear that there are a couple of significant passages in the discourse of Group 4 – the one group that appears to have been most actively engaged in the argumentational process. The first is based in the rather confusing section over the building of Versailles and foreign policy. Andrea suggests rather obliquely that *la gloire* and the building of Versailles is rather expensive, but she does not state this clearly the first time. Crucially, before she can clarify what she has said, the researcher interrupts her, asking the other class members to move on to new points. Strangely, what she says is picked up and repeated by Xanthe before Andrea can clarify her points (the voices are not very clear on the audio, but repeated viewing of the video recording whilst listening to the audio tape suggests that it is Xanthe who starts the sequence off and not Andrea, which would have been the logical assumption). This is highlighted green and yellow in the extract below, and suggests that there is a changing of voice – an aspect of dialogic interaction. Andrea develops the point that glory costs a lot of money. This point is being bandied about and we return to the building of Versailles – the point that Delia had dismissed earlier in the interaction as being irrelevant to the discussion on foreign policy (see Appendix 33 for an extract of this earlier part of the interaction). It was Olivia who had introduced Versailles as relevant and who started to become involved in the argument, even though this was supposed to be a dialogue between Xanthe and Andrea – Delia and Olivia are supposed to be quietly observing.

**Xanthe** You can start.

**Andrea** What about glory? Then Louis would have to base his FP [foreign policy]... [Unclear from tape]

**Xanthe** His what?

**Andrea** On substance and what was good for his PPL [people] keeping it out. When considering France was in so much debt, glory was more important than a strong economy plus defending the country.

**Xanthe** That’s cool. But I don’t understand what you just said.
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Andrea Why, do you want me to repeat that then?

Xanthe Yes, please.

Researcher [General comment made to the whole class] Excuse me! [shouts – there is quite a hubbub] It’s lovely that you want to get into it. That’s fantastic, however the other points that have not yet been raised should now be argued by the other pair. And again, I want you to pay attention to those observing – how strong is the argument, the use of evidence; does it actually react to the other point of view. Okay. Right, if you’re all ready, shall we begin? Off you go.

Xanthe So, without glory, Louis then would have to base his foreign policy on substance and what was good for his people. When considering France was in so much debt, glory was more important than a strong economy and country.

Andrea Well no, because glory costs a lot of money so the debt would be…

Xanthe Glory doesn’t have to cost money. Glory can come from poor people.

Andrea His main way of showing la gloire was building Versailles, which cost a hell of a lot of money, which meant they went further into debt…

Olivia Where’s your evidence?

There then follows a three-way interchange between Andrea, Olivia, and Xanthe, some of it based in sound historical reasoning and use of relevant evidence some of it not. (See Appendix 33) whereas the dialogue on the impact of Catholicism is relevant and interestingly developed (by Olivia) to demonstrate the link with glory.

Andrea They were a Protestant, and a republican…

Xanthe And a Republican? That’s American.

Olivia Yeah, that’s not a religion actually, that’s a democratic process.

Andrea Yeah, they weren’t Catholic. They were Protestant, which he didn’t like because they had a very, very strong work ethic, which meant they were more successful and produced more things than the Catholic people did. So he was, like, you’ve got to die.

Olivia I don’t think he said that. I think you should get your stories [straight]. I don’t see how it keeps us alive in seventeenth-century France [laughs].
Xanthe Imagine if he was, he wears tights [laughing].
Andrea I think our argument’s descended into...
Andrea Okay, I think we’re done now.
Olivia No, we’re not.
Andrea Alright then.
Xanthe He... as you say, he was... we’re looking for Catholicism to be a form across Europe. Would he not become glorious because he’s done what he set out to do? He set out his target. He’d achieved it. Surely, is that not an achievement of glory?

Olivia Actually, that’s a pretty good point.

Andrea That is a good point. I’m not going to lie. I’ll give my personal view. My personal view is that his main reasons were like revenge and natural frontiers, Catholicism but in the end all of them led back to la gloire. La gloire [funny voice].

Body language and the intensity of the interaction suggest that Andrea is under pressure, but the final part of the argumentative session demonstrates something has definitely changed and it does not seem to have come from anything that anyone else has said. It is a continuation of the Catholic theme and Xanthe has been ‘off-task’, trying to distract Andrea by suggesting that she imagine Louis in tights... Xanthe’s summary of the Catholic position is a good one, showing how it links to the development of la gloire. Olivia, her partner, and Andrea accept that she has made a good point. Andrea then gives her personal view – that everything leads back to la gloire. Xanthe claims that Andrea is now arguing for la gloire and against her original stance. Andrea hotly denies this and indignantly refuses to accept that Olivia and Xanthe have won anything. And in attempting to convince Andrea that she has argued against her own points, they suggest that she has used their argument about reaching glory through Catholicism.

Xanthe And your last point was my point so therefore, we won.
Olivia ... Out of us: you argued against your point.
Andrea I didn’t.
Olivia Yes, you did. And I did say this as an objective person. You did argue our point for us. What was it she said? He reached glory through Catholicism.
Xanthe Exactly.
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Olivia  So I think you need to respond to that argument better.

**Delia**  I think what Andrea was trying to do was to make up our minds.

Xanthe  We won, alright, we won.

Andrea  You did not win [*laughing*]. You did that based on the fact you thought Hercules was French.

Olivia  I was drawn into the argument, otherwise you could have got carried away.

Xanthe  Exactly, I added a bit more of a humour side to it.

**[Pause]**

Andrea  It was the first thing that came into your head, wasn’t it? [*laughing*]

It is sorely tempting to say that Andrea’s last aside is the clincher because Billig (1996) would argue that it is the unthinking responses that are more telling than those that are considered and planned. It could also be an example of Bahktinian spontaneity and the orientation to the ‘other’, the openness to change, but I suspect Andrea was simply referring to the wearing of tights that Xanthe had thrown in earlier to distract her. What, however, is significant in what fast descends into a slanging match is the small quiet voice of Delia:

‘I think what Andrea was trying to do was to make up our minds’.

The only one who admitted to changing position in the whole of the class was Delia. No one else, in spite of the intense if disjointed arguing going on at the different tables, admitted to changing their minds in any way. Delia not only admitted to changing her mind, but also said that it was a direct consequence of the argument. Andrea was too busy arguing that she had not lost and had not changed her mind to realise that perhaps she had too.

This was argumentation, but it could be argued that a discourse full of winning or losing is not persuasive or even dialogic; it is more closely akin to disputational talk – something that needs to be examined further. However, what is crucial to remember is that one person was persuaded and the argumentative exchanges did result in someone changing their mind – not through engaging in the dynamic interaction, but through reflection. Again, this needs further investigation.
8.7.2 Were there any links between the spoken and written argumentation? Reviewing the essay plans, the transcripts, and the essays, something becomes clear. The best essay was written by Delia, demonstrating a clear analysis, a keen understanding of the essay title, and a coherent and well-evidenced argument. The fact that her essay is better than the student who normally scores the highest in the class because of his deep knowledge of the period is due to her presenting a very clear argument while he does not. Andrea’s improvement in argumentation is marked – she is the one whose written argumentation improved the most. It is also clear from reviewing the essay plans that it is her ‘voice’ – her ‘everything links back to la gloire’ that is foregrounded in the group’s essay plans and is taken into the essays. (See Appendix 35 for the groups’ plans and essays) Unfortunately, Xanthe’s essay does not have a clear voice: Andrea’s ‘everything links back to la gloire’ is mentioned, but not developed and in fact gets confused, reflecting her confusion at the end of the argumentative phase – being lost in the winning and losing of the argument.

The other students’ gains in argumentation also seem to be linked to the level of engagement they exhibited in the argumentative phases. Although all the students seemed to improve to some degree, those who were least engaged – the student who was attempting to argue against the student who was recognised as the most able – made least gains in argumentation; the group who found themselves agreeing because they were so close on the continuum did not attempt to explore Louis’ la gloire further, but instead agreed to agree and therefore stopped arguing.


The intervention had generated dialogic interaction and it would appear that, in the circumstances peculiar to Case Study 1, dialogic interaction in both the dynamic and active, as well as the still and reflective form, did indeed act as a link between spoken and written argumentation. Delia’s essay was the most analytical of those written by Group 4, demonstrating clear and incisive argument addressing all sides of the argument. Andrea, on the other
hand, whose ‘voice’ was the most dominant within the group, was the one person who made the most improvement in written argument.

I needed to see, therefore, if this could be replicated elsewhere, but I also needed to see if I could encourage more groups to engage in dialogic interaction rather than leaving it confined to just one group in four. The emphasis on persuasion was intended to break through the ‘winning and losing’ discourse. Ensuring there were differences of opinion within the class was a way to encourage active engagement in the argumentation.

This is just one case study. The findings that the written argument in the essays was improved by the intervention and that there appeared to be a link between the spoken and written argument of the group who seemed to have engaged in some form of dialogic interaction cannot, therefore, be considered in a general way. However, there are several questions that need to be examined in both theoretical and practical terms. The discussion will end with a revised theoretical framework – Design Framework 4. The findings from the student questionnaires, and interviews will be instrumental in further developing the intervention that will be trialled in the following case studies.

8.8.1 What form of argument? It has not been proved that persuasive argumentation is a precursor to dialogic interaction. There was evidence of Billig’s wicraft – students countering each other, but within a winning and losing context, not in an open or persuasive context. The one successful argumentative discourse seemed to comprise marked ‘disputational’ sequences. Notwithstanding that, when put under pressure, Andrea was able to produce something that was unexpected and was not a product of the previous discourse. It is also pertinent that the one student who admitted to being persuaded was the one listening to the exchange and could see that argument before her. This has an important bearing for the rest of the research. Wegerif’s dialogic talk acknowledges an internal reflective dimension and that is why in spite of the ‘winning and losing’ discourse it can be argued that dialogic interaction did occur.

However, what must also be considered is that not all the students were arguing in an environment based in equality. Group 4 seemed to be evenly
matched and comments were explored, if somewhat facetiously at times. Group 2’s argumentation, on the other hand, was limited and the student who was perceived to be the most knowledgeable was not considered as an equal – quite the contrary. In this way the argumentation in Group 2 was limited when in practice it could have produced learning of quality (see Appendix 34 for an example of Group 2’s argumentation).

What can be tentatively suggested, then, is that dialogic interaction can be instantiated by the intervention, but not as it was first assumed it would be; this needs further investigation. It can also be suggested that there are links between the spoken and written arguments of those students who were very actively engaged in the argumentation, even if it was a winning and losing discourse; this too needs to be explored further. The written argument did improve, but is it difficult to say clearly that this was an effect of the interaction: all that can be said is that in one group’s case – the noisiest and most active group – something happened. Someone took a conceptual leap about the importance of la gloire as a motivation for Louis’ foreign policy. It was decided through the argument implicitly, which is another indicator of dialogic interaction: the fact that the interaction seems to end up being more than the sum of the two parts. Something more has appeared which could only really have occurred from orientating to the dialogue rather than to the other members of the group. It is this conceptual leap that is ‘voiced’ and taken into the plans and essays of the group. Could this be replicated?

So what will be taken into the next framework is the need to emphasise persuasive argumentation – and reflection. I was aware that winning and losing an argument was a default mechanism, particularly for students who were in their final two years of schooling. It is possible that their earlier associations with ‘argument and debate’ had focused on winning and losing rather than persuading and exploring. I needed to be able to break through the ‘winning and losing’ to see if I could create an environment that was both argumentational and dialogic at the same time, creating an environment in which students were happy to argue their differences but without the need to feel that they had won an argument. In my experience, when a student feels they have won an argument, they simply reject the other's point of view, which
is fundamentally a weakness, particularly if the aim is to develop a sophisticated level of argumentation that allows for multiple differences, not just one opinion.

The key change to the theoretical framework is the emphasis on persuasive argumentation and reflection, which the student interviews highlighted had not occurred as I had planned, with the exception of one key student.

The following diagram shows the development between Design Framework 3 and Design Framework 4.
Table 8.4. Developing Design Framework 4 from Case Study 1 findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Framework 3</th>
<th>Activities from the intervention</th>
<th>Case Study 1 findings</th>
<th>Design Framework 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should make their ground rules to encourage them to engage in dialogic talk</td>
<td><strong>Group work</strong> – established ground rules democratically fed back to class; left on board.</td>
<td>Despite the ground rules, there was evidence of eristic and disputational argumentation. Limited evidence of dialogic talk. Student questionnaires suggested that students liked working collaboratively but were not aware of the significance of talking to each other differently. Students with a reputation for being very able prevented others engaging in argument with them.</td>
<td>Students should make their ground rules to encourage them to engage in dialogic talk. Ground rules should emphasise the importance of democratic rules of respect and arguing against the ideas rather than the person. Students need to be aware of the way in which to engage in dialogic talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students need to be aware of the way in which to engage in dialogic talk.</td>
<td><strong>Students should engage in persuasive argumentation.</strong> Students need to be aware of the different forms of argumentation. Students need to learn to argue and counter argue points Students should be encouraged to engage in argumentation that is based in dialogic talk. Teacher instruction of argument theory needs to focus on interactive</td>
<td>Argumentation associated mostly with yelling and antagonism – student feedback. Teacher led presentation showed the distinction between informal and formal argumentation but students not clear about difference nor yet why it matters. Student questionnaires. Some students enjoyed the role-play, but others did not engage at all in persuading argument. Some of the arguing situations were not relevant to students in the class. Limited links with History argument. Students argued without counter-</td>
<td>Students should engage in persuasive argumentation. Students should practice persuasive argumentation in groups of threes – I student acting as a judge. Students need to be aware of the different forms of argumentation. Need to make clear links between History and persuasive argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students should engage in persuasive argumentation.</strong> Students need to be aware of the different forms of argumentation. Students need to learn to argue and counter argue points Students should be encouraged to engage in argumentation that is based in dialogic talk. Teacher instruction of argument theory needs to focus on interactive</td>
<td><strong>Whole-class activity</strong> – watch YouTube clip. <strong>Teacher-led PowerPoint presentation</strong> – forms of argument demonstrating links to History argument. <strong>Whole-class discussion</strong> – what is a good History argument? Arguing practice in fours – practising persuasive argumentation – using situations that emphasised Billig’s Talmudic persuasive argumentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nature of argument and not on formal argumentation</th>
<th>arguing, simply returning different points with no attempt to argue against the point made by the other person.</th>
<th>argument and not on formal argumentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need to make clear links between History and persuasive argument.</td>
<td>Argumentation tuition needs to emphasise difference between evidence-based argumentation.</td>
<td>Argumentation tuition needs to emphasise difference between opinion- and evidence-based argumentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should be encouraged to make judgments about History which will become the basis of their arguments.</td>
<td>Students need to be encouraged to engage in argumentation that is based in dialogic talk.</td>
<td>Students need to learn to argue and counter argue points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students found it difficult to supply points in a brainstorm situation.</td>
<td>Students need to be encouraged to counter-argue against the point and not the person – orientate themselves to the debate.</td>
<td>Students should be encouraged to make judgments about History which will become the basis of their arguments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole-class discussion – History essay title – setting an argument in place – brainstorm what title means.</td>
<td>Students liked being able to see that other people thought differently than they did. (Questionnaires)</td>
<td>Students should be clear in their judgements but be prepared to change their judgements in light of further reflection and argumentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual decision making in silence.</td>
<td>But some confusion over where people stood on continuum – one person’s 5 out of 10 could be another’s 7 out of 10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students need to take part in collaborative activities designed to promote peer interaction.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Collaborative paired work</strong> – generating points in preparation for arguing in fours. Dyads compare their own points and develop others supporting them with appropriate evidence.</td>
<td>Students liked working collaboratively. Evident in classroom observation and also in student questionnaires. Some students, however, allowed others to take the responsibility for doing the work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Need to engage students in collaborative activities that will lead to dialogic engagement, not only in their collaboration but also in their argumentation.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Physical whole-class participation</strong> – students stand on a continuum to discover if they have changed their minds after discussion and to discover ‘opponents’ points of view. <strong>Collaborative argumentation in fours</strong> – structured argument to argue point-by-point and pair-by-pair with other dyads reflecting on process and development of the argument.</td>
<td>No students had changed their mind after the collaborative work. Only one group of four were able to engage in dialogic interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students should be encouraged to engage in argumentation that is based in dialogic talk.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Individual work</strong> – writing plans. <strong>Individual work</strong> – review other students’ plans – comment on argument and content of essay.</td>
<td>Most of the essay plans were done individually based on the earlier collaborative work. One group that engaged in dialogic interaction took the emergent voice into their essay plans. Only one person in the entire class admitted to changing her mind but through reflection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students should be encouraged to reflect on their arguments in both oral and written forms.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.9 Adapting the Intervention

I was aware that the students appreciated being able to work collaboratively – several questionnaire responses had highlighted this and it was something that had not been the norm in their usual classroom experience. I had been concerned, however, that the students had not fully appreciated the underlying intention of the ground rules to create an environment of equality and an orientation to the dialogue – two key elements of dialogic talk. This was clear particularly in the ‘winning and losing’ discourse that seemed prevalent in their argumentational interactions. This is something that I need to address if I am to create the foundations for dialogic talk.

The next stage of the intervention had focused on the theory of argument, discussing Toulmin and Walton’s interpretations of argumentation. The student questionnaires indicated that the PowerPoint presentation had helped them understand argument better, but some of the students had commented that it had been quite confusing. I was also aware that the role-play may have helped the students understand the niceties of ‘persuasion’ – their comments suggested this, as did the questionnaire responses, but it had not stopped them engaging in the ‘winning and losing’ form of argument. Only one student suggested during his interview that the role-play had helped him understand persuasion. I was aware that this student had had to argue against a particularly persuasive individual who pushed him hard. He had not been with this student in the argumentational interactions, however, so he had not had the opportunity to argue in the way that could have helped him further his historical thinking. This was unfortunate.

I felt that a way to address these points might be to reduce the teacher-led instruction in argumentation and instead emphasise the argumentative activity that would offer the opportunities for students to win and lose an argument, but in so doing discover how that prevented multiple strands of argument being pursued, and how it is that a winning and losing form of argument is the antithesis of what is expected.
The students generally accepted standing on a continuum, but some were unclear about their argument before they did so. The period of reflection had not helped the students who had not been able to make a judgement about the essay question at all. The teachers who conducted the trials described in Chapter 6 had all thought the use of the continuum was particularly important. I knew that if I was to help the students make the most of the opportunity to make individual judgements – the key to beginning to appreciate their individual arguments – more ‘unpacking of the essay question’ should happen first, but not in a way that would prevent the students generating their own ideas. I was also aware that the most active group during the interactive argumentation had been the group which had held the most extreme differences of opinion. The groups that were more closely linked on the continuum had not felt able to argue because they felt their differences were too small – this was overheard during the intervention and mentioned again during the post-intervention student interviews.

This was something that needed to be explored further. I had thought that History, being so multi-layered, would create opportunities for argument even if people seemed to have similar opinions. Often in History similar conclusions can be reached from very different directions. I had wanted to investigate whether closeness in opinion would result in exploratory talk, which may have led to dialogic talk. As it was, it led to a speedy agreement and little discussion of any sort at all.

To prevent this happening again, I decided to ensure that the groups for the argumentational section at the end of the intervention would always be significantly different in opinion. There would thus be opportunities to argue distinct rather than nuanced differences. This meant that I would ask the students to place themselves on the continuum in a range from 1 to 10 and also to give themselves a number before they placed themselves there. In this way I would be able to work with clearly marked differences.

I was also aware that one of the students who appeared most able, as defined by exam grades, was one of those least inclined to engage in argumentative discourse. I wanted to discover if this was a phenomenon
exclusive to this particular case study or whether it was an aspect that needed to be considered in further developments of the intervention. The research of Schwarz and Linchesvki (2007) demonstrates that those students who are considered most able only benefit from dyadic collaborative engagement if they are asked to justify their thinking. Because the students who were in the same group as the most able student felt unable to challenge his thinking, he was not able to engage in a way that could have benefited him and the other group members. The intervention was meant to help all students, not just a select few.

I had been particularly interested in the responses to the student questionnaires and interviews regarding the notion of reflection. Reflection is an important component of dialogic interaction and I had hoped to be able to see instances of it at work within the intervention. Only one student, Delia, admitted to thinking deeply about her response, despite the questionnaire responses that suggested otherwise. This one student, however, was the only one who admitted to changing her mind, and the one who wrote the most thoughtful and most coherent argument in her essay. During her interview she said that she had remembered the interaction quite clearly but, interestingly, stated that Olivia was the most dominant speaker and suggested it was her that had made her change her mind – during the interaction it had actually been Andrea who had made her change her mind. The interview was some time after the intervention, so perhaps it is not surprising that who said what should appear vague. What is perhaps significant is the degree of clarity in Delia’s memory of the argument itself – the dialogue – not the people engaged in it.

I wanted to further explore the more reflective form of dialogic interaction and see if I could create further opportunities for reflection by introducing the notion of using a blog into the intervention. Research has suggested that online conferencing offers students the opportunity to be drawn into a ‘dialogic space’ which allows them to reflect on their learning. I wanted to see if blogging comments could afford the same opportunity. I also wanted to see if the act of blogging itself had any impact on what the students finally wrote in their essays.
The intervention had successfully created opportunities for dialogic interaction but not for every student, only a small group of students. So I wanted to further develop the intervention to determine whether it was possible to engage more students in the process to further test the links between dialogic interaction and written argument. I wanted to run the intervention again, after I had adapted it, to discover whether it would still instantiate dialogic interaction. I wanted to extend the intervention further by testing it with Year 13 students who require a more sophisticated level of argumentation. I wanted to see if the winning and losing discourse appeared and whether the more experienced History students would be able to argue in nuanced ways as well as emphasising difference. I also wanted to test the intervention to see if it could help improve the argumentation of students who were arguing using a different historical skill: that of source analysis. The revised intervention’s scheme of work and the supporting PowerPoint presentation can be found in Appendix 36.
8.10 Summary of Chapter 8

In this chapter the third iteration, based on Design Framework 3, was implemented in Case Study 1. The explicit intention was to determine whether dialogic interaction could be instantiated when the intervention was used in its entirety. The chapter also discussed the school and the procedure in which the case study was conducted. Students' essays were analysed by measuring for argumentation to determine where and in what way there had been an improvement. The argumentative interactions were also analysed to determine the links between the spoken and written argumentation. Initial findings suggested that all of the student essays improved when assessed for indicators of argumentation, but that the improvement was not uniform.
Interaction that could be considered dialogic was instantiated, but only in one of the four groups. The students whose essays improved the most, however, were those who engaged in argumentation that showed evidence of dialogic interaction.

These findings need to be tested further. The fact that only one of the four groups was able to engage in dialogic interaction meant that adaptations needed to be made to the intervention. The focus of Design Framework 4, therefore, is to help the students engage in more persuasive argumentation rather than argumentation that was purely concerned with ‘winning and losing’. It was also necessary to determine whether the adapted intervention could be used to improve written argument when other historical thinking skills were required, for instance when A2 students engage in more sophisticated argument that includes an appreciation of the differing perspectives and interpretations which constitute historical debate, and when AS students use documentary source analysis. These two extensions of Case Study 1 are the subject of Chapters 9 and 10, respectively.
Chapter 9 – Iteration 4: Case Study 2

Does Blogging Create a Dialogic Space for History Argumentation?

Figure A6. Case Study 2 – A2 Argumentation and blogging

9.1 Introduction

This chapter describes and discusses Case study 2, the first of the two parallel case studies which make up Iteration 4. The theoretical framework – Design Framework 4 – underpinning this case study was developed from the findings of Case Study 1.

Dialogic interaction had been instantiated during Case Study 1, but not in all of the student groups and not in the way that was expected. The links between persuasive argumentation and dialogic interaction were not confirmed. It is necessary, therefore, to determine whether dialogic interaction could be instantiated by a revised intervention, particularly after it has been adapted to focus more specifically on the promotion of ‘persuasive’ argumentation.

Case Study 2 is also intended to lead to a greater understanding of the role of dialogic interaction and its links with written History argument because aspects of the intervention have also been changed to focus more specifically on the role of reflection and its purpose within dialogic interaction. The inclusion of blogging as an exercise in reflection will, it is hoped, show clearer links between reflection and written argumentation.
The classroom intervention had been designed to satisfy the needs of AS History students and, because there were four schools involved the intervention, was designed to be a ‘generic’ model for argumentation that could be used in any History classroom. In Case Study 1, the History argumentation created in the four groups was intended to satisfy the demands of an AS ‘causation’ History essay. In this case study, however, the more sophisticated demands of History argument at A2 level are to be investigated to determine how ‘generic’ the model might be.

The chapter is divided into three sections: the first will deal with the school involved, the participants, and the procedures followed; the second section will deal with the findings of the case study; and the final section will discuss the findings briefly. The themes and their possible implications for delivering the intervention in schools in the future will be discussed further in chapters 11 and 12.

9.2 Background

The findings of Case Study 1 suggested two things. First, that greater emphasis should be placed on persuasive argument and second, that reflection was an element of dialogic interaction that had not been sufficiently explored. These two findings led to the development of the theoretical framework which underpins the research study. Whereas Design Framework 3 had almost been a complete affirmation of Design Framework 2, Design Framework 4 is different. Some of the principles are similar, but there are some further additions. The following table shows the difference between design frameworks and the additional changes that were made to the intervention to test it within the A2 History environment. A greater emphasis has been placed on the reflective elements of the intervention by the integration of a blogging exercise.
### Table 9.1. Development of design framework and adaptations to the intervention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Framework 3</th>
<th>Design Framework 4</th>
<th>Adaptations to the intervention for A2 argumentation and blogging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should make their ground rules to encourage them to engage in dialogic talk.</td>
<td>Students should make their ground rules to encourage them to engage in dialogic talk.</td>
<td>Paired or group work – establishing group/class rules democratically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students need to be aware of the way in which to engage in dialogic talk.</td>
<td>Ground rules should emphasise the importance of democratic rules of respect and arguing against the ideas rather than the person.</td>
<td>Establish the importance of talking to each other – even when arguing – with respect and paying attention to what is said rather than to who is saying it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher instruction of argument theory needs to focus on interactive nature of argument and not on formal argumentation</td>
<td>Teacher instruction of argument theory needs to focus on interactive nature of argument and not on formal argumentation.</td>
<td>Whole-class activity – watch YouTube clip.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students need to be aware of the different forms of argumentation.</td>
<td>Argumentation tuition needs to emphasise difference between persuasive and eristic argumentation.</td>
<td>Brief PowerPoint presentation focusing on persuasive argumentation and link to History argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to make clear links between History and persuasive argument.</td>
<td>Students need to be aware of the different forms of argumentation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should engage in persuasive argumentation.</td>
<td>Argumentation tuition needs to emphasise difference between opinion- and evidence-based argumentation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students need to learn to argue and counter argue points</td>
<td>Need to make clear links between History and persuasive argument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should practice persuasive argumentation in groups of threes – I student acting as a judge.</td>
<td>Students should engage in persuasive argumentation.</td>
<td>Arguing practice in threes – two argue and one judges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges’ feedback leading to whole-class discussion – revisit what makes a good argument.</td>
<td>Students need to learn to argue and counter argue points.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students should practice persuasive argumentation in groups of threes – I student acting as a judge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should be encouraged to engage in argumentation that is based in dialogic talk.</td>
<td>Students should be encouraged to make judgments about History which will become the basis of their arguments.</td>
<td>Students need to be encouraged to counter-argue against the point and not the person – orientate themselves to the debate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should be encouraged to make judgments about History which will become the basis of their arguments.</td>
<td>Students should be encouraged to make judgments about History which will become the basis of their arguments.</td>
<td>Students should be clear in their judgements but be prepared to change their judgements in light of further reflection and argumentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students need to take part in collaborative activities designed to promote peer interaction.</td>
<td>Students need to take part in collaborative activities designed to promote peer interaction.</td>
<td>Whole-class discussion – History essay title – setting an argument in place – brainstorm what title means.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to engage students in collaborative activities that will lead to dialogic engagement, not only in their collaboration but also in their argumentation. Students should be encouraged to engage in argumentation that is based in dialogic talk.</td>
<td>Need to engage students in collaborative activities that will lead to dialogic engagement, not only in their collaboration but also in their argumentation. Students should be encouraged to engage in argumentation that is based in dialogic talk.</td>
<td>Whole-class discussion – History essay title – setting an argument in place – brainstorm what title means. Individual decision making in silence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should be encouraged to reflect on their arguments in individual work – writing plans.</td>
<td>Students should be encouraged to reflect on their arguments in individual work – writing plans.</td>
<td>Whole-class discussion – History essay title – setting an argument in place – brainstorm what title means. Individual decision making in silence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Whole-class discussion** – physical whole-class participation – standing on a continuum. Make sure students are asked to think of a number between 1 and 10 before standing on continuum.

**Collaborative paired work** – generating points in preparation for arguing in fours.

**Collaborative argumentation in fours** – structured argument to argue point-by-point and pair-by-pair with other dyads reflecting on process and development of the argument, but only after a revisiting of the ground rules.

**Individual work** – writing plans.
Students of A2 History need to be able to write an effective argument as they do in AS History essays, but they also need to critique the historiographical aspects of the argument. Students therefore need to be comfortable with the different conceptual expectations but also able to contend with differing perspectives of History and how they impact upon the nature and interpretation of History evidence itself. Chapman (2011a&b) concentrated on the skills of interpretation to promote historical reasoning and used a critical thinking model for argumentation, whereas Black (2012) focused on ‘diversity’ with her A level students and argument was incidental but based on a model that combined social interaction with the acquisition and implementation of History knowledge.

The intention of this case study is to test the intervention as if it were a generic model of sixth form History argument, to see whether engaging students in the process of argumentation can still improve their written responses, even under the different demands of A2 ‘causation’ essays. In an attempt to appreciate how reflection impacts on the transition between spoken and written argument which had not been clearly demonstrated in Case Study 1 – as evidenced by the student interviews and questionnaires – Case Study 2 also incorporates ‘blogging’.

Encouraging the students to engage in blogging was intended to allow a ‘dialogic space’ for reflection. Bartlett-Bragg (2003) suggests that blogging could be a useful tool to engage students in thinking about their learning; Glogoff (2005) and Brescia
and Miller (2006) thought that their use of blogging had increased the student engagement and interactivity in their courses. Although these studies were conducted in higher education, their findings are of relevance. Evidence from the student interviews during the ‘exploratory study’ had also highlighted that ‘blogging’ was seen as a useful aid to learning. In this Case Study the students were therefore expected to blog their essay plans during the week after the intervention. Although there would be time allowed in class to prepare the blog, they were required to blog two comments on their peers’ work at a later stage – one comment to critique the argument, the other to critique the use of evidence. Again, this was intended to engage the students in the meta-strategic thinking that Kuhn (2009) thinks is a necessary way to teach reasoning. It was hoped that studying the blogged essay plans and the comments would provide further insight into the nature of the planning process and its role in the transition from talk to writing could be assessed.

The research questions are as follows:

Research Question 1. **Will dialogic interaction be instantiated through the revised intervention?**

Research Question 2. **Can focusing on argument as persuasion break through the ‘winning and losing’ discourse that was prevalent in Case Study 1?**

Research Question 3. **Does engaging in blogging offer the opportunity to reflect dialogically, thus helping the transition between spoken and written argumentation?**

Research Question 4. **Can an intervention designed to address the needs of AS students also help A2 History students improve their written argumentation?**

Research Question 5. **How does difference of opinion impact on the argumentative process and therefore on the instantiation of dialogic interaction?**
9.3 The Case Study

9.3.1 School. This case study was conducted in school HM, which had not been involved in the research before.

9.3.2 Participants. There were 19 Year 13 students aged 17 and 18 years old, eight female and 11 male. The group’s AS grades ranged from E to A (2 Es, 7 Ds, 5 Cs, 3 Bs and just 1 A). One student had not sat AS exams the previous June. They were studying Stalin’s role in the Russian victory during World War II. The teacher had been keen to join in the research process because he felt his students might benefit from the experience.

All the students had signed individual ethic forms before they participated in the research. They were assured that anonymity would be preserved and were reassured that they had the right to withdraw at any stage.

9.3.3 Procedure. The intervention was conducted during the first six weeks of the academic year. Changes had been made to the intervention: the argumentative groups were going to be devised in such a way that opposing viewpoints would not be too similar. There was a tacit intention to highlight and focus on ‘persuasive argument’ and the students were going to blog their essay plans and comments. I was going to be delivering the intervention so that the procedure followed would be very similar to Case Study 1.

However, before I conducted Case Study 1 I had worked with the students’ teacher to make the transition to the different mode of teaching that was central to the intervention as seamless as possible for the participants. This also meant that I was familiar with and to the students. I had not met the participants of Case Study 2, however, before the intervention began. I had made no classroom observations in the school so I did not know how the students were usually taught. This may have had a bearing on the results of the intervention.
The intervention comprised three sessions: the first was an hour-long session during the morning followed by two hour-long sessions either side of lunch five days later. The ensuing blog entries were written as homework and the essay written a week after that, also as homework (see Appendix 36 for the PowerPoint presentation)

The intervention was made up of the following activities: the first session involved a free association word activity designed to access the students’ perceptions of essay and argument; a paired activity, which was designed to help construct group rules to be agreed by the whole class to allow ‘safe and constructive’ argumentation and to create an environment of equality; a short video clip of Monty Python’s ‘Argument Clinic’ showing what an argument is not; and an individual Post-it activity about what constitutes a good argument, which students fed back to the class and which led to a brief classroom discussion. A very brief PowerPoint presentation followed which explicitly focused on argumentation and History argumentation whilst also stressing the importance of persuasive argumentation.

Further sessions were geared for more concentrated collaborative and argumentative student-focused work. The pre-lunch session involved the students making a judgement about the essay title, the statement ‘Stalin’s leadership was the most significant reason for the Soviet victory over the Germans in the 1941-45 war’. Assess the validity of this view. They were asked to place themselves physically on a continuum and to consider where they would place themselves on a scale of 1 to 10. The students were then asked to work in collaboration with others who had made similar judgements on where they stood and what number they considered themselves to be. They were asked to prepare a case collaboratively using
evidence based around the reasons they had made their judgements. Ten minutes were given for this preparation. The groups were then reconfigured. Each group was made up of two opposing dyads based on differences, not similarities, in judgement. When the groups were settled, the first argumentative interaction was initiated. After about seven minutes, when most of the groups seemed to have stopped arguing, a halt was called and feedback was made to the researcher and the rest of the class.

The final session allowed for a short period of peer group feedback and consolidation before the dyads were encouraged to take part in the second stage of the argumentative interaction. Two groups were reconfigured a second time because the participants felt they had nothing left to say. The second phase was initiated but lasted only 3 to 5 minutes. Feedback was given once more to the researcher and the rest of the class; this incorporated whether their opinion had changed or not – and if it had, what aspect of the other students’ arguments had most convinced them.

Their usual classroom teacher and the researcher made comments on the feedback offered, which was designed to develop the insights of the Year 13 students further. The students were then asked to refocus on the essay title and a brief discussion of the demands of A2 essay writing ensued. It was a student-led discussion and the researcher made sure that she did not tell them how to write the essay, which would have defeated the object. The classroom teacher then stepped in to reinforce the fact that the focus was to be on a student structured essay response to give them the freedom to think through what they were thinking and to allow them to prepare a suitable response. Students spent the last 15 minutes planning their responses, which were then to be placed on the blog previously created by the classroom teacher. Deadlines were established for the blogging of the essay plans, the subsequent two comments, and the final essay. These were to be homework activities over two weeks.
Nineteen students took part in the activities. There were four groups of four: two groups of two girls and two boys, one group of four boys, one group of one girl and three boys, and one group of three girls.

9.3.4 Data collection. Only 17 post-test essays were handed in. Fifteen students posted their essay plans on the blog. Only 12 comments were made. Four essay plans did not receive comments; one essay plan had three comments, while all the rest had one comment only. Because the comments on the blog plans were made anonymously, it was difficult to work out just how many students took part in the blogged comment activity. Twelve pre-test essays were handed in, but three students handed in two different essays each, so only nine pre-test essays could be used. Two of these were AS exam script essays, which were the most recent essays that one student had written, but as these were written under exam pressure the results could be skewed. The pre-test essays were all Year 12 AS essays as the essay they were working on was their first Year 13 essay.

All the sessions were filmed with three cameras but only the last argumentational interactions were audio recorded as well. Eight students were interviewed post-intervention and post-essay; two were interviewed one-to-one, six in pairs. The classroom teacher was also interviewed at the conclusion of the intervention.

9.4 Data Analysis

9.4.1 Dialogic interaction. The interactions were assessed in three of the four ways used in Case Study 1. Whilst the intervention was being conducted, the researcher intuitively judged whether groups were engaging in a dialogic interaction based on the level of engagement exhibited by the students in the group. Next, videos of the classroom interaction were analysed retrospectively for other potential dialogic spells (Nystrand, 2003). The audio recordings of the interactions were transcribed and were then assessed for types of argument, as in Case Study 1, and for dialogic talk, based on the adapted form of Wegerif and Mercer’s (1997) dialogical framework (See Appendix 27). This analysis was intended to determine
whether ‘dialogic talk’ was present in the argumentation, as suggested by Wegerif (2013a), and in this way to confirm dialogic interaction.

### 9.4.2 Written argumentation

Pre- and post-intervention essays were marked in two ways. Both researcher and teacher marked them using an A2 level mark scheme (see Appendix 37 for the mark scheme). As before, the essays were also assessed using an adapted form of Toulmin’s Argumentation Pattern (TAP) (see Appendix 21).

### 9.4.3 Post-intervention and post-essay student and teacher interviews

The semi-structured student interviews were intended to confirm the researcher’s opinion of dialogic interaction and to ask for student feedback for the further development of the intervention. The classroom teacher was also asked to feedback his opinions of the intervention and the impact it had on his students.

### 9.5 Findings

#### 9.5.1 Dialogic interaction

The groups were organised based on where the students placed themselves on the continuum which represented the range of opinions from ‘Stalin was the most important reason for the Soviet victory’ (1) to ‘there were more important reasons than Stalin’ (10). The initial ‘collaborative’ groups were student assigned and comprised two groups of four, two groups of three, one dyad, and someone happy to work on their own. Ned, Alex, Lois, and Beatrice worked together as they had put themselves at 3 on the scale; Andrew, Marcus, Connor, and Daphne worked together as they had chosen 4. Sophie, Edmund, and Alison, all 3s, worked in a loose group, as did Cherry, Terence, and Yvonne (5 on the scale). David and Nick worked together while Rosie, a 4, worked quietly on her own.

The argumentative groups were organised by the researcher to promote as much difference as possible, given that there was little marked difference in the student judgements. Group 1 comprised Ned and Alex arguing against Cherry and Terence: 3s against 5s. Group 2 comprised Alison and Edmund against Connor and
Daphne: 3s against 4s. Group 3 was made up of Lois and Beatrice against Robert and Trevor: again, 3s against 4s. Group 4 was a group of three: Rosie, a 4, argued against Sophie, who was initially a 3 but then realised she was a 7. Yvonne (a 5) acted as judge initially, then second arguer against Rosie. Group 5 comprised Andrew and Marcus arguing against David and Nick: two 4s against a 7 and an 8. Unfortunately this group submitted no pre-test essays, and as a consequence their findings can only be used to determine whether dialogic interaction was instantiated.

The room was an awkward shape and, in spite of the presence of three cameras, not every group was filmed clearly – which makes it difficult to confirm the researcher’s intuitive analysis. Argumentation appeared to be going on but to varying degrees of intensity. What was clear was that Group 5 was engaged in a heated interaction and Group 3 was the least engaged. Group 2 which, like Group 3, consisted of an interaction between 3s and 4s, was intensely engaged, but not in a heated manner. Group 4 was an interesting study in argumentation because one of the arguers had a class reputation for being impossible to argue against. The final group, Group 1, were initially engaged but quickly gave up. The following table shows the types of argumentation that were present as the students argued their points.
Table 9.2. Types of argumentation – an amalgam of TAP, Simon (2008), and Goldstein et al. (2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Phatic/Eristic argument</th>
<th>Irrelevant points</th>
<th>Unreturned points</th>
<th>Rhetorical points</th>
<th>Clarifications leading to developed points</th>
<th>Developed points</th>
<th>Counter-claims</th>
<th>Counter-argument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Eristic means the exchanges which were reduced to ‘I won; you lost’; and phatic means exchanges like ‘it’s supposed to be your turn’.

The transcripts demonstrate how Group 5’s argumentation is disputational full of short responses of yes he was and no he wasn’t – with a little bit of History thrown in but very little. The developed points were presented early in the argument but it fast descended into a heated altercation where no-one was prepared to agree on anything. Group 2’s discussion was quite different – there were a lot of claims but not developed although the two girls in the group covered a lot of ground. It was as if they were starting a sentence which the other finished although there was a tacit different – yes but no but – not complete agreement but neither complete opposition. It was exploratory in nature and as the discussion continued the teacher was pleased to discover how it gradually became more perceptive and the topics covered were conceptually more demanding. This was a co-construction of knowledge based in slight differences. Group 1 started with one person stating a clear case which was well developed but was not responded to with anything other than a simple claim that was unsupported – and that became the pattern for the interaction. The group of three girls – Group 4 however were engaging in a different form of argumentation to Group 2. Here one of the group members - Rosie - was building a case and developing points with the help of her protagonists so that a claim was responded to by a counterargument which then was turned into a developed point.
This pattern continued when either of the two other girls, Sophie or Yvonne argued with Rosie. It is a great shame that the camera could not pick up their interaction.

Checking the audio recordings against the transcripts and the video evidence from three different angles, an analysis for dialogic interaction can be attempted, though only tentatively. The findings are presented in table 9.3 below.

Table 9.3. Links between difference and impact on argumentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Composition based on difference</th>
<th>Argumentation length</th>
<th>Types of talk</th>
<th>Dialogic interaction y/n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 v 5</td>
<td>7 mins</td>
<td>Exploratory/ Cumulative/Dialogic</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 v 4</td>
<td>6 + 6 mins</td>
<td>Exploratory/Dialogic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 v 4</td>
<td>Non relevant</td>
<td>Exploratory/Dialogic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3/7 v 5 v4</td>
<td>16 mins</td>
<td>Exploratory/Dialogic</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 v 7/8</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
<td>Disputational</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Using Wegerif and Mercer’s (1997) three types of talk and Wegerif’s (2012 2013a) dialogic talk as indicators of argumentation.)

Group 1’s interaction was an interesting exchange because the argument began with a recognised difference between the two opposing dyads, but concluded with their recognising similarities and also agreeing. Although there are points where certain individuals within the group may have engaged in dialogic interaction, it is not clear. For example, Alex pushes Cherry to defend her position, which she does in such a way that Alex acknowledges, in his post-intervention interview, that he had not considered her viewpoint at all. This is where it possibly becomes dialogic. The argument quickly peters out, however, because although Alex acknowledged that Cherry had something different to say, he was not prepared to explore it further and he states clearly on the tape that their opinions are very close so there is no need to discuss things further. They agreed a stance.

Group 2’s interaction is interesting because it is the females in the group who develop and explore the argument ranging across diverse elements of Stalin’s leadership and offering explanation for and against his success. They do not get heated, but they do explore difference and allow each other to maintain difference whilst doing so. There is no attempt to agree; instead they are extending each
other’s appreciation of the arguments which concern Stalin’s role in the success of the Soviet resistance to Hitler during World War II. It looks from the outside as if they are being consensual, but they are not. The sustained exploration of difference and the way that the dialogue takes turn and turnabout almost equally with no one person dominating suggests that this is a form of dialogic talk. Difference is observed but not attacked – exploring differences in argument is what matters.

In contrast, Group 3’s interaction, although plainly enjoyable, was limited to a discussion on parties and the derivation of their respective names and very little attempt was made to engage in the argument set up for them. Group 4, on the other hand, is another example of argument which is at one stage exploratory and then becomes dialogic. The person who was recognised as the most persuasive arguer defends her position against the other two girls and in the process one begins to recognise and consolidate her own argument even though she starts thinking that she has no argument at all. Unfortunately, this interaction was not filmed clearly; it was only through the audio recording, researcher observations, and the transcripts, that the researcher could see that the argumentation engaged in appeared, for one of the students, at least, dialogic.

The final group, in which four males argued intently and heatedly, was not the same. Although the same points were generated as in the other groups – apart from Group 3 – there was no meeting of difference and exploring it. Instead their argument was more disputational: flatly denying the other’s position and not even finding areas of agreement. Although they agreed there were other factors that needed to be discussed, they found themselves lost in what constituted a good leader.

9.5.2 Written argumentation. The essay marks were assessed using an A2 mark scheme and the adapted TAP framework. Table 9.4 below presents the A2 mark in levels in keeping with the mark scheme, the actual mark awarded by teacher and researcher after. This was to make it easier to compare the Adapted TAP and A2 Levels.
Table 9.4. School HM: Pre- and post-intervention essay marks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>AS exam grade</th>
<th>AS points and level</th>
<th>TAP level</th>
<th>A2 Points and level*</th>
<th>A2 Points and level</th>
<th>TAP level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-int.</td>
<td>Post-int.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>L4 26</td>
<td>L3 20</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>L3 13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L4 32</td>
<td>L3 20</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>L3 25</td>
<td>L3 24</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daphne</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>L3 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosie</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L4 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L3 25</td>
<td>L3 23</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>L2 15</td>
<td>L3 24</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>L3 16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L3 24</td>
<td>L4 26</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terence</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>L4 30</td>
<td>L3 25</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>L3 13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L4 30</td>
<td>L3 16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L4 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L3 20</td>
<td>L3 20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2 15</td>
<td>L3 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>L5 42</td>
<td>L5 41</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>L4 26</td>
<td>L4 35</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>L4 20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>L4 30</td>
<td>L4 36</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>L2 12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L4 26</td>
<td>L3 20</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>L3 12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L4 26</td>
<td>L3 17</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ned</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>L4 21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>L4 34</td>
<td>L4 30</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * = Harmonised teacher marks. All names have been changed and bear no relation to the students’ real names or initials.

Two students did not submit pre- or post-test essays (Beatrice and Connor); Daphne did not submit pre- or post-intervention essays. Marcus had not sat an AS exam before joining the class.

The table suggests that, of the nine students who submitted both pre- and post-intervention essays, all but one improved their argumentation skills. Lois’s essay showed no improvement in argumentation at all. There is a discrepancy in the teacher/researcher result for Alex – the essay was more argumentative but the researcher could not agree with the teacher’s results, so the level stayed the same – but for a different reason, which will be discussed later. The students who improved most were Alison, Cherry, and Robert, who went from 2 to 3/4, and Edmund who
went from 3 to 4/5. Ned, Yvonne, and Rosie improved only slightly, Rosie improving from 3 to 3/4, and Ned and Yvonne from 4 to 4/5.

If, however, the links between the interaction and the essay grades are also factored into the analysis, it becomes clear that the one group – Group 2 – that seemed to be involved in dialogic interaction had two group members whose written argument improved by at least 1 level, as measured by Adapted TAP. It is a shame that the other two members did not offer pre-intervention essays. The two groups whose participants may have been involved in dialogic interaction, Group 1 and Group 4, also showed gains in their written argument. Cherry seemed to gain the most from Group 1; Alex did not improve whereas Ned improved a little, as did Rosie and Yvonne in Group 4. Again, without the other group participants’ essay contributions, it is difficult to prove how influential the argumentative exchanges have been. It is a great shame that Group 5 did not offer pre-intervention essays because it would have been good to have been able to determine whether the disputational nature of their argumentation impacted on their essay grades.

Table 9.5 The following table demonstrates the potential links between the nature of the argument, whether there is evidence of dialogic talk or not, and the improvement in written argument. It also highlights the length of argumentation and whether that too could have an influence on the improvement of the essays. The length of argument, however, should not be considered a pre-cursor for dialogic engagement. What is easily shown is that even though the differences in opinion are minor this does not prevent argumentation. Group 2 and Group 4 argue for almost as long as Group 5. Group 3 choose not to argue.
Table 9.5. Links between argument length, dialogic interaction and improvement in essays by TAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Length of argument</th>
<th>Dialogic Y/N</th>
<th>Essay grades</th>
<th>Change from pre- to post-intervention by TAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ned**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7 mins</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>+1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alex**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Same level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cherry*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>+1 I/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terence*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>No pre- essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6 +6 mins</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edmund</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No essay</td>
<td>No essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daphne</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>No pre- essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lois**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non relevant</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Same Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beatrice**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No essay</td>
<td>No essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trevor*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>No pre- essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rosie</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16 mins</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>+1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>3 – 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>No pre- essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>+1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>No pre- essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marcus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>No pre- essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>No pre- essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L5</td>
<td>No pre- essay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Robert* and Trevor* argued with Cherry* and Terence* when Alex** and Ned** moved to argue with Lois ** and Beatrice**. Alex and Ned had previously prepared their arguments with Lois and Beatrice – not an ideal move guaranteed to promote argumentation.

9.5.3 Post-intervention and post-essay student interviews. Andrew, David, and Nick from Group 5 agreed to be interviewed; Marcus was absent. Andrew was interviewed alone; David and Nick were interviewed as a pair. Because they had not handed in pre-test essays, I was interested to hear whether they had benefited from the intervention or not. Yvonne from Group 4 was happy to be interviewed and she was interviewed with Alex from Group 1. Connor, Edmund, and Alison from Group 2 were interviewed. Connor and Alison were interviewed together; Sam was interviewed on his own.
Essays were returned with my comments on them and part of the video recording of the intervention comprising the argumentational interaction was played to the students to help them remember and to gain their insight into what they thought had happened. The comments on the essays had been designed to help the students further develop their written argument. They were not focused on how much evidence the students used to support their point of view, but rather on how effectively they had managed to illustrate their points and answer the question.

In Group 5, Nick’s essay was exceptional, but those of Andrew and David were less convincing. Andrew’s essay did reflect a little of the argument that they had had, but without pre-test essays it was difficult to determine whether any of the students had benefited from the intervention at all. During the interview, however, both David and Nick stated that the arguing helped them see the other side of the argument. David and Nick had been one dyad opposite Marcus and Andrew. David and Nick suggested that Marcus and Andrew had made a few good points – ‘how Stalin ultimately was the leader so he did oversee the victory against the Germans so that was quite a good point but it still didn’t persuade me much’. Andrew, however, felt the argument ‘had become circular’. He suggested that David and Nick were ‘arguing that it was Stalin’s advisors and generals who were good, and I was trying to argue that if it wasn’t for Stalin they wouldn’t have been able to’. He then went on to say that ‘they were both having the same points I was doing, so I just had to look for evidence and I suppose that did give me ... a big body of material I could use in the essay’. Andrew suggests, however, that David and Nick’s arguments were very similar to his own even though they were the group whose difference of opinion was most marked. It was also the group whose argument was most heated.

The members of Group 2 who were interviewed – Daphne did not want to participate – had been very close on the continuum. Alison and Connor felt that they were too close to argue more than a few points, but that during the discussion ‘more stuff comes out and you get other people’s views as well which you can put in the essay’. Edmund also thought that ‘you’re learning how to argue for both sides in a way, more effectively than having just to argue one side versus the other side’.
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Most of the students interviewed felt that the intervention had been useful, but would have liked it ‘speeded up’, delivered not over three sessions but over two. A couple of students suggested arguing points of view they did not hold so that they could learn even more about the process of arguing and how they might use the evidence differently.

On the whole, everyone interviewed felt that they had been able to develop their written argument further and this was a sentiment supported by their classroom teacher.

9.6 Discussion

In this section the research questions are revisited and addressed in turn.

Research Question 1.  Will dialogic interaction be instantiated through the revised intervention?

9.6.1 Was dialogic interaction instantiated? My unfamiliarity with the students was a disadvantage because I was not able to say with any degree of certainty that the interactions I was viewing were in any way different to their usual behaviour. I had thought that I could gain some insight into how they interacted in the role-play activity, but the argumentation that they engaged in then seemed markedly different to the argumentational interaction at the end of the intervention. It seemed that insisting that they support their arguments with evidence had an effect on the level of engagement. The interaction became more studied and in those students who were properly engaged in History argument there was an element of intensity that I had seen practiced by the students of Case Study 1. I can only assert tentatively that dialogic interaction was instantiated and that based only on the retrospective video analysis. It would also be difficult to state that the lack of clear evidence of dialogic interaction was due to the revised intervention.
Research Question 2. Can focusing on argument as persuasion break through the ‘winning and losing’ discourse that was prevalent in Case Study 1?

9.6.2 Does argument as persuasion stop the ‘winning and losing’ discourse? Persuasive argumentation was emphasised and although there were elements of argumentation that did not progress past disputational – as in Group 5 – there was little evidence of ‘winning an argument’. Daphne and Alison’s argumentative exchanges were thoughtful and the video evidence shows how intently they were focused on each other and on what they are saying. At times their argument becomes a combined argument and one person appears to finish off the thinking of the other. This can be illustrated in the following exchange, where they are discussing the complicated nature of the end justifying the means.

Daphne: Yeah.
Alison: …because I don’t agree with cruelty, but as a war leader he...
Daphne: But to be fair, he...
Alison: Like, made his army, like, incredible.
Daphne: Like, I know the whole thing about, ‘the end justifies the means’, like, for the majority of the stuff that he did, [he] killed a lot of people anyway...
Alison: Yeah, but everything that happened more through him...
Daphne: Like, just because of him… Like, he probably killed...
Alison: …because he was a dictator.
Daphne: …more people that, like… actually died and [laughs]… in some of, like, the strategic things he, like, made. Like, I don’t think it was all him, because also he, like, I know he had, like, a good following and stuff…
Alison: [Laughs]
Daphne: …but is that all fair? Because he was going to sack everybody...
Alison: Yeah, but as the dictator he made the decision and everything, so, like, all the good things, like he reopened the
churches so that there was, like, the religious people, like, supported the war and it created patronage, so he created patriotism; he commissioned the [unclear from the tape] he made the women work; he put the soldiers into armies so that everyone think [sic]… Like, even if he did it in a bad way and not everything that he did was, like, morally correct, everything was because of him.

The discourse was disjointed and the transcript cannot convey the nature of the body language demonstrated by the group. The two girls were leaning in to each other and their heads were virtually touching so intent were they in ‘pulling out their individual ideas’ and ‘pooling’ them together. They were only slightly opposed to each other: Daphne was a 4 and Alison a 3 on the continuum. Their discussion was exploratory in tone and it went on for some time. Connor and Edmund were listening intently; their own exchange had been short, rapidly coming to the conclusion that their points of view were similar. The fact that they were so engaged in what Daphne and Alison were doing was therefore particularly interesting. The incomplete data set prevents me from being able to suggest that there is anything significant happening although it is important to note that Edmund’s essay presented a particularly well written argument. It also has to be said that it is not clear that this is argument full of rich counterargument or even counterclaiming (Crowell, Goldstein, & Kuhn, 2009). What they seem to be doing is co-constructing: developing and sharing ideas. The ‘but’ and ‘because’ highlight difference, but there is also an element of consensus to the interaction. The fact that the exchange goes on for some time is also of note – and it was all focused on the question.

The other interesting interaction worth reporting is that between Rosie, Yvonne, and Sophie. Rosie is a particularly knowledgeable and articulate student. She has a reputation for never losing an argument and her historical knowledge is considered formidable. Sophie felt she could not argue against her, and yet Rosie could not convince her or persuade her to change her opinion. Rosie used a lot of evidence to support her point of view and illustrate her points, but it seemed that the evidence dominated the discourse rather than the reasons and as a consequence there is no
meeting ground between the three girls. Sophie's interjections may not appear to present a coherent counterargument, but she was making Rosie explain her point of view. Rosie, as a recognised exponent of argument, was not attempting to persuade Sophie by countering her points but by ‘throwing evidence at her’.

**Rosie** Yeah, alright. So Stalin was a good war leader because he listened to his generals…

**Sophie** But he didn’t at first; at first they were too afraid to take their own initiative and he made bad decisions.

**Rosie** I agree with you that he did make bad decisions, but the fact [is] that he recovered overall towards the end of the war and he spent the majority of the war being a very good war leader.

**Sophie** Really?

**Rosie** Yeah, I mean because if you look at examples… Because, I mean he didn’t know what he was doing and then he realised that, and then he would let other men take control which shows good leadership, because…

**Sophie** But he wouldn’t trust them at first and then…

**Rosie** Yeah, but he learnt to…

**Sophie** …he listened to the intelligence, which made him…

**Rosie** Yeah, but when you compare him with Hitler, Hitler never changed his strategies and he never listened to his generals.

**Sophie** A very valid point.

**Rosie** [Laughs] And his [Stalin’s] economy was better suited to war than many of the other countries competing, more I suppose? I mean, because he raised 29% of the budget to 56% of the budget dedicated to the war effort and he managed to mobilise the factories very quickly and effectively which, in the end, meant that they could massively out-produce the Germans.

**Sophie** And his five-year plan helped it in the long run.

**Rosie** Yeah.

**Sophie** I don’t think it’s possible to argue with you. You have like the perfect argument.

**Rosie** So you’re a 3, so why do you think that he’s more important than I do?

**Sophie** I thought it was the other way around? Like, because I think
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the main reason was, like, the winter and the fact that Hitler…

Rosie  Oh, so you’re a 7?
Sophie  Yeah, yeah.
Rosie  Okay, right!
Sophie  That changes everything. Well it could be – I don’t even care, but basically I think the main reason is the fact that they probably – the winter hit and then Hitler’s choice to go to… to try and take, what’s it called?

Rosie  Kiev.
Sophie  Kiev, yeah, rather than go straight to Moscow. Because if he’d gone straight to Moscow, he probably would have got it or taken it.

Rosie  But at the same time I think that Stalin could have effectively handled protecting Moscow because he had competent generals because, unlike Hitler, he managed to fire incompetent ones.

Sophie  No, but at the start, Stalin… he never really… he only wanted to do things his way and he didn’t listen to the generals… [unclear from the tape] Oh yeah, he fought the war… like he was a civil… like, in the way that they fought the war in 1917, because at the beginning if Hitler went for Moscow, Stalin probably wouldn’t have been able to, like, fight for it.

Rosie  Were they using civil war tactics?
Sophie  Yeah, because they would have used civil war tactics.
Rosie  That’s true, but I mean the fact that Hitler failed to exploit that opportunity is an argument that Stalin was not the best…

Sophie  Such a valid point.

It becomes clear too that although Sophie does not consider herself an arguer as astute as Rosie, her contributions move the discussion along. This ‘argumentation’ was just as intense as Alison and Daphne’s, but Rosie and Sophie sat apart from each other, although they rarely broke eye contact and their bodies were turned towards each other. Yvonne sat slightly apart from them, but was listening intently to the exchange. I felt that they were arguing and exploring different points of view rather than arguing against each other – there is an attempt at counterarguing, but it
is more counter claiming. The fact that Sophie, who felt that Rosie was such a good ‘arguer’, but still felt able to find the means to engage with her, suggests that she was orienting herself to the dialogue not ‘against’ Rosie. Their argumentation was full of short reactive exchanges but I would submit that Sophie was exploring Rosie’s point of view whilst tentatively offering her own perspective – this was not persuasive argument, more an exploratory stating of differing opinions.

Evidence from the student interviews after the intervention suggests that most of the students thought that the arguing led them to consolidate their initial positions, rather than helped them seek a greater understanding of the alternative points of view. No one admitted to changing his or her mind, although Sophie became clearer about her position. So although there may not have been a discourse of ‘winning or losing’, it is not clear that ‘persuasive argumentation’ was the predominant form of discourse. It needs also to be understood that this was a Year 13 class and the explicit recognition that they had to argue on so many different levels may in itself be the reason why the winning and losing discourse was not evident.

Research Question 3. Does engaging in blogging offer the opportunity to reflect dialogically, thus helping the transition between spoken and written argumentation?

9.6.3 Does engaging in blogging offer the opportunity to reflect dialogically? Fifteen essay plans and 17 essays were handed in. Beatrice took part in the interaction but offered no written input whatsoever, neither pre- or post-intervention essays nor blogged entries; because the comments were anonymous I do not know whether she made any comments or not either. Connor wrote an essay plan, but did not hand in an essay. Daphne, Sophie, Marcus, and Nick did not submit essay plans, but did write post-intervention essays, though Daphne’s was missing.

Alison from Group 2 was the first to post her essay plan (see Appendix 38). It is simple and states clearly that she thinks that Stalin’s leadership was the most
significant reason for the Soviet victory. There is no counterargument, her plan is simply a demonstration showing her point of view, it is one-sided. Whilst acknowledging the contradictions in Stalin’s forms of governance, it does not allow for a clear examination of other more significant factors, just his role in what occurred. Daphne, Alison’s opponent in the interaction, did not submit a plan. Alison’s plan is a brief summary of the points she and Daphne discussed.

Alison’s essay demonstrates the essay plan and presents a clear point of view, but she writes her points in a narrative way and does not attempt to be analytical but rather expositionary instead, despite the argumentative exchanges she had with Daphne. Edmund, whose argumentation improved the most, also presents a very brief essay plan. Whilst exploring the same issues as Alison, he also demonstrates a clear counterargument and explores different factors that could have been responsible for the Soviet victory, although he acknowledges Stalin’s role as Soviet dictator. Connor is the only person to put his name to a comment: he commented constructively on Edmund’s essay plan before posting his own plan, which is appears to be a synthesis of the arguments presented by Alison and Edmund (see Appendix 39). It is a great shame that he did not offer an essay because if it had been based on his plan it would have demonstrated sophisticated and perceptive reasoning. His argument with Edmund, however, was not as consensual as Alison and Daphne’s, but was certainly far ranging, demonstrating good factual deployment and a good basis for the further development of the discourse raised by Alison and Daphne.

The members of Group 1 offered plans that differed in viewpoint and were based more in their previous learning than in the interaction. Ned’s essay plan was very detailed and was accurately reflected in his essay, as was Alex’s. Cherry, who was part of the first and more successful interaction, appeared to benefit the most. Significantly, her blogged plan follows immediately after Alex’s and covers most of the same points, but she takes a more sophisticated stance than Alex.

Bearing in mind that Lois’s interaction was the least successful – she was a member of Group 3 – it is interesting that her blogged essay plan includes balanced
argumentation with counterarguments appearing in most of her paragraphs. This can only really be attributed to previous learning because there seems to be no link whatsoever between what she said and what she wrote. This is an interesting point to bear in mind when making any claims for the success of the intervention and might be worth exploring later in a different study.

Most of the students did engage in the blogging activity. The intention had been to give the students the freedom to make comments that reflected their thinking and also showed clear reasoning. They were meant to comment on the use of evidence and the essay plan as an indication of a well thought out argument. Unfortunately, most of the comments were short and showed little reasoning at all. This may have been due to the fact that they were unused to blogging in terms of educational use, though their teacher was most proficient in blogging and used different forms of technology in his usual classroom practice. Although blogging is increasingly used to express opinions on many different topics, it is possible that the blog as diary metaphor (Nardi et al., 2004) was predominant in the students’ minds and knowing that both teacher and researcher would be reading their personal reflections may have prevented the students engaging in the way they may have done if it had simply been a blog confined purely to the students readership. Kirkup (2010) also highlights the fact that although blogging is a common practice, to use it educationally is to make an informal process formal and this transition might have been too difficult for the students to make. It is also possible that the students were simply not used to blogging, as a matter of course, so learning to use it in their History lessons may have been a step too far for some. Their willingness to contribute may have been circumscribed by their lack of technological expertise.

It is difficult to prove any degree of reflection from the blog entries. None of the blog comments on the essay plans were longer than a couple of sentences, except for Connor’s on Edmund’s essay plan. It is also difficult to determine whether the students had reflected further on the stances they had adopted in class because the comments were anonymous. Though they were developed in class and then put onto the blog, the essay plans were not handed in. If there had been any changes between essay plan and blog then it is possible that there may have been some
reflection, but the evidence was not there. It is also difficult to prove whether all the entries were directly attributable to the individual’s thinking in relation to the interaction or were caused by reading the blog and the necessity of commenting on the other essay plans. This is also worth investigating further because the structure of the case study did not consider these possibilities.

Research Question 4. Can an intervention designed to address the needs of AS students also help A2 History students improve their written argumentation?

9.6.4 Can the intervention be used to improve A2 History argument? It would appear that the intervention is a qualified success. Only two student’s argumentation did not improve – Alex and Lois. An analysis of the discourse in Alex’s group (Group 1) showed that he was unprepared to move from a two-sided response. In fact, he responded to a multi-factored question by simply concentrating on Stalin’s leadership and comparing it with Hitler’s. He did incorporate some of the other factors to a certain extent, but did not develop them into a coherent counterargument, simply introducing them as asides. His teacher gave him a higher A2 mark than I did. This was because he did demonstrate sound historical knowledge and covered a range of information; I felt, however, that his argument was unsupported, so I was not prepared to give him a higher grade. This says more about the vagaries of History marking than it does about History argument.

It is also true that this student demonstrated a closed attitude to the arguing in class, partly because in an effort to develop his argumentation further, I suggested he argue with a second dyad after the first stage of argumentation. Unwittingly I put him with a dyad he had actually collaborated with earlier. The opportunity to develop any of their arguing skills further was lost. This is particularly clear in the video and audio evidence. It must also be accepted that during the collaborative phase the group had not discussed anything other than parties; just how much Alex got out of it in terms of argumentation is highly questionable. During the post-intervention interview, however, he suggested that in fact he found it very useful arguing with
Cherry; this was during the first argumentative phase where the interaction is positive, if somewhat ‘closed’.

Alex said that the interaction did not help to develop his knowledge but rather to make him think more carefully about how he expressed himself. He suggested that Cherry was capable of expressing herself succinctly whereas he felt he always took a long time to say what he wanted to say. His comments were reflective, considered, and seemed to indicate an appreciation of what the intervention was trying to achieve. Ned, who was a member of the same group, only improved in argumentation a little, although his argumentation at level 4 was particularly clear and well expressed. Cherry, who argued against Alex, was one of the students who improved more than one level. She went from 2 to 3/4. So although Alex may not have gained from the interaction, and Ned only a little, Cherry appeared to gain a lot. Terence did not submit a pre-test essay so it is difficult to determine whether the interaction improved his written argumentation at all.

Lois was in a group comprising of 3s and 4s. She was working with Beatrice, Robert, and Trevor. The interaction is markedly different. Instead of arguing with Robert and Trevor, Beatrice and Lois spent more time discussing their respective names and the various parties they had attended. Lois and Beatrice were then moved to discuss their second phase with Alex and Ned, while Robert and Trevor joined Terence and Cherry. The audio material is not clear but the video evidence suggests that Trevor and Terence engaged in discussion and Robert, who had been largely passive throughout most of the lesson, was seen volunteering and offering input into the interaction. Unfortunately, we cannot know what they were discussing, but again it would be logical to assume that the interaction between Robert, Trevor, Terence, and Cherry was more successful than that between Robert, Trevor, Lois, and Beatrice. Robert and Cherry both produced essays demonstrating improved argument skills, whereas Lois did not; Beatrice did not hand in pre- or post-test essays. Lois is the only student who achieved an A at AS, so although her written argument does not demonstrate the insight that one would expect of an A grade student, it is possible that her disengagement in the lesson could be compensated for by her perceived already acquired skill base.
Alison and Edmund, on the other hand, were in the same group as Daphne and Connor. Unfortunately, Connor did not offer any essays and Daphne submitted an essay to her teacher which was lost in the post. Nevertheless, the level of argumentation engendered in the group and by them was eloquent and far-reaching. It showed astute understanding of the subject matter and also presented clear insight into the nature of the argument. Daphne’s argument was considered and mature, and well supported by the evidence. She was persuasive and authoritative. Her teacher told me that she had been suffering a crisis in confidence following poor results in the AS exams, but he was very pleased to tell me that although she did not submit essays to me, her essays since the intervention had come on in leaps and bounds. He felt her success was based on the opportunity to recover some of her confidence, which she appears to have found during her arguing phase. Alison argued against Daphne and together they were able to develop an insightful argument, which was reflected in Alison’s written response. Edmund is the student who improved the most and it is logical to assume that the contributions of Connor, Alison, and Daphne helped him to do so. Certainly of all the groups in the room this was the one that was most engaged in the process and seemed to gain most from it.

It is a great shame that Group 5, which had most difference in opinion, did not submit any pre-test essays. I cannot know if the heated debate that seemed to make up part of the interaction improved their written argumentation – it is also true that there were periods of the discussion where they were discussing parties as well.

What I can conclude from this case study is that when students actually engaged in the argumentative interaction, their written responses showed evidence of improved argumentation. This improvement was not confined to students more able than others. Lois was the only student who had an A at AS but her lack of engagement meant she made only limited improvement. The students who made most improvement were Edmund – who only had a C grade at AS and moved from a level 3 form of argumentation to Level 4/5, writing very persuasive and well supported argument – and Alison, Cherry, and Robert who all moved from level 2 to levels 3/4 of argumentation. It could be argued that this is important because Cherry and Alison only achieved D grades and Robert only managed an E. However, the
problem with using exam grades as indicators of possible achievement is that they are not the most accurate ways of measuring a student’s intelligence, all they indicate really is a student’s ability to pass exams.

Engagement seems to be the indicator of success. This will be examined further.

Research Question 5. How does difference of opinion impact on the argumentative process and therefore on the instantiation of dialogic interaction?

9.6.5 How does difference of opinion impact on the argumentative process? Case Study 1 had suggested that the more dialogic and more actively engaged groups were the ones most diametrically opposed on the continuum. Here this was not quite the case. Admittedly groups 1 and 3 did not argue for long, or in Group 3’s case did not argue at all, so their engagement might be considered to do with lack of significant difference but the reality is markedly different. Group 1 argued but then I divided them and part of the group went to the group they had initially collaborated with, so difference was not the issue. Engagement in Group 3 was elsewhere and not in the classroom activities. Group 2 were closely linked 3s and 4s and yet they were able to produce good argumentation that led to marked improvement in written argument for two of their group. Group 4 was an interesting group – ostensibly 3, 4, and 5, but by the end of the discourse one was 3, another was a 7, and the 5 who was acting as a judge had really explored the angles as her essay indicated. Group 5, which contained the most extremely opposed individuals, seemed to engage in a disputational rather than dialogic form of argumentation. No pre-test essays were offered so I cannot know if there was an improvement in their written argument. Group 2 and Group 4’s discourse, as well as the initial discourse of Group 1, did seem at times to offer opportunities for dialogic interaction, but this was a quiet, intense, and reflective form of interaction. It would appear that difference in the positions on the continuum does not necessarily dictate the type of
interaction or level of argumentation although that assertion has to be qualified by
the lack of evidence, which suggests that either could be possible.

9.7 Summary of Case Study Findings.

It is difficult to prove that the intervention was able to produce dialogic interaction
in any of the groups; it is likely that it did to a certain extent in Group 2, but it is
difficult to prove conclusively. The lack of complete data sets for each group makes
it difficult to say with any degree of certainty what the intervention was able to
achieve. More indicators of written argument were found in the essays post-
intervention than in the pre-intervention essays. As this was the first essay they had
written at A2 level, it is possible that the improvement may have been due to other
factors instead of the intervention.

Again a link was established between those who improved the most and the
level of interaction and engagement in the argumentative section of the intervention.
But this can only be a tentative assertion because more essay evidence would be
required to firmly establish this point. As it is, this result cannot be considered
significant.

The inclusion of blogging to help demonstrate the role of reflection within dialogic
interaction cannot be considered successful. Perhaps if the blog had been used as
an opportunity for the students to freely discuss the intervention and their thoughts
on what had happened it would have been more successful – there would have been
more evidence of reflection. Asking them to make specific comments in an attempt
to help them think meta-strategically had not led to reflective posts – quite the
contrary.

It is also possible that, if the students had been part of the exploratory study and
had formed a relationship with the researcher prior to the trial, more may have
engaged in the research differently. Talking about parties and other inconsequential
things during the argumentative exchanges did not occur in Case Study 1.
It cannot be said from the evidence of this case study that using an intervention which focuses on the process of the argument in a hope to generate dialogic interaction has helped students learn any more effectively than the models used by Chapman (2011a) or Black (2012).

9.8 Towards Design Framework 5

Persuasion is still an important element to emphasise in the intervention to create the opportunity for a more dialogic engagement, although there is little evidence of persuasive argument occurring. The groups in this case study demonstrated limited counter argumentation although one group appears to offer evidence of dialogue rich in co-construction. This does need further investigation. Is there a relationship between persuasive argumentation and dialogic interaction – in theory there should be, but is there in practice?

Establishing a working relationship with the students is also important – this must not be a stand-alone series of activities, but integrated into the teachers’ scheme of work. Although the intervention was run in the school at an appropriate time within the curriculum, it is possible that more preparatory work could have been done to engage all of the students in the process.

It is also interesting to note that most of the students found themselves nestled in one area but for different reasons. It might be valuable to get students to argue a position they are not comfortable with to see what happens – as suggested by some of the students in the post-intervention interview. At this stage, the idea had been to ensure that the students felt comfortable with what they were arguing for and that it came from a position of belief so that they could explore why they felt the way they did before engaging in a more challenging form of argumentation.

These points will be further developed in Chapter 11.
9.9 Summary of Chapter 9

This chapter discussed Case Study 2, which is the first implementation of Design Framework 4. Case Study 2 is an extension of Case Study 1 because it explored whether the revised intervention would be of benefit in the teaching of argument to Year 13 History students. Again, only one of five groups engaged in argumentation that at times became dialogic. The pre- and post-intervention essays demonstrated an improvement but it was difficult to prove whether there was a link between the arguments and the essays and essay plans. The findings from the blogging exercise, which had been designed to create a dialogic space for reflection, which might also play a part in the links between spoken and written argumentation, were equally inconclusive.
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Does using Documentary Evidence Impact on Dialogic Interaction?

Figure A7. Case Study 3 – using documentary sources

10.1 Introduction

This chapter describes and discusses Case Study 3, the parallel study to Case Study 2, and is therefore the second part of Iteration 4 – the implementation of Design Framework 4. The focus of this case study is to explore whether a model for argumentation designed to help Year 12 AS students improve their written argument in causation essays can still be used with the more complex needs of documentary source-based argumentation.

The chapter is divided into two sections: the first will deal with the school involved, the participants, and the procedures followed; the second will deal with the findings of the case study and will discuss the findings. The implications of the findings and the potential improvements to the theoretical framework will be discussed in chapters 11 and 12.

10.2 Background

Case Study 1 was the implementation of Design Framework 3 and led to the development of Design Framework 4. The participants in Case Study 1 were Year 12 students engaged in an intervention designed to help them write more effective
‘causation’ essays. The underlying premise had been that the students would engage in face-to-face argumentation rich in dialogic interaction which would enable them to undergo the conceptual changes necessary to write a coherent argument in their History essays. Case Study 2 also focused on the writing of a ‘causation’ essay, although the participants were Year 13 students. The intervention had been revised to focus on more persuasive argumentation and included opportunities to blog so that insights into reflection, an important aspect of dialogic interaction, could be investigated. Case Study 3, which is still based on Design Framework 4, is focused on the writing of essays that include source analysis as the following table highlights.

Table 10.1 From DF 3 to DF 4 and the changes to the intervention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Framework 3</th>
<th>Design Framework 4</th>
<th>Adaptations to the intervention for AS Source Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should make their ground rules to encourage them to engage in dialogic talk.</td>
<td>Students should make their ground rules to encourage them to engage in dialogic talk.</td>
<td>Paired or group work – establishing group/class rules democratically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students need to be aware of the way in which to engage in dialogic talk.</td>
<td>Ground rules should emphasise the importance of democratic rules of respect and arguing against the ideas rather than the person.</td>
<td>Establish the importance of talking to each other – even when arguing – with respect and paying attention to what is said rather than to who is saying it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher instruction of argument theory needs to focus on interactive nature of argument and not on formal argumentation</td>
<td>Teacher instruction of argument theory needs to focus on interactive nature of argument and not on formal argumentation.</td>
<td>Whole-class activity – watch YouTube clip.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students need to be aware of the different forms of argumentation.</td>
<td>Argumentation tuition needs to emphasise difference between persuasive and eristic argumentation.</td>
<td>Brief PowerPoint presentation focusing on persuasive argumentation and link to History argument.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Need to make clear links between History and persuasive argument. | Argumentation tuition needs to emphasise difference between opinion- and evidence-based argumentation.  
Need to make clear links between History and persuasive argument.  
Students should engage in persuasive argumentation.  
Students need to learn to argue and counter argue points.  
Students should practice persuasive argumentation in groups of threes – I student acting as a judge.  
Students should be encouraged to engage in argumentation that is based in dialogic talk  
Students need to be encouraged to counter-argue against the point and not the person – orientate themselves to the debate. | Arguing practice in threes – two argue and one judges.  
Judges’ feedback leading to whole-class discussion – revisit what makes a good argument.  
Draw out use of evidence and counterarguing the point. |
| Students should be encouraged to argue and counter argue points | Students should make judgments about History which will become the basis of their arguments.  
Students should be clear in their judgements but be prepared to change their judgements in light of further reflection and argumentation. | Whole-class discussion – History essay title – setting an argument in place – brainstorm what title means.  
Individual decision making in silence.  
Physical whole-class participation – standing on a continuum. Make sure students are asked to think of a number between 1 and 10 before standing on continuum. |
| Students should engage in persuasive argument. | Students need to take part in collaborative activities designed to promote peer interaction.  
Dyads should be encouraged to work together as equals – based in dialogic education – emphasise ground rules. | Whole class discussion on source analysis and how best to approach it in essays not a structured activity but a reminder to help students to integrate sources into answers  
Collaborative paired work – generating points in preparation for arguing in fours.  
Dyads compare their own points and develop others. |
| Students should be encouraged to engage in argumentation that is based in dialogic talk. | Students need to take part in collaborative activities designed to promote peer interaction. | |
Using sources effectively in an A level essay is a skill in which all History students need to be proficient. Research by Wineburg (1991, 2007), Perfetti et al. (1994), Stahl et al. (1996), VanSledright (2002), and de la Paz and Felton (2010) has demonstrated how problematic the handling of source material can be for students, so this was not going to be a simple test for the intervention. Case Study 3 therefore focuses on argumentation and how students integrate the use of historical source material into their written essays.
Although Case Study 2 incorporated blogging to attempt to determine the role of reflection in dialogic interaction, it was not possible to engage in blogging comments during Case Study 3. Simple Post-it notes were used instead to record comments and had proved valuable in Case Study 1. The Post-it notes were to be used during and immediately after the planning aspect of the intervention. In this way it was hoped that further insight into the nature of the planning process and its role in the transition from spoken to written argument could be assessed. The research questions to be addressed in this case study therefore are as follows:

Research Question 1. *What impact does the use of documentary sources have on the instantiation of dialogic interaction for Year 12 students?*

Research Question 2. *How does using Post-it notes help as an aid to reflection in the planning of the student responses?*

### 10.3 The Case Study

**10.3.1 School.** The final school involved in the research is school ES – a rural community school in the south west of England which had been part of the exploratory study.

**10.3.2 Participants.** Seventeen Year 12 students aged 16 or 17 years old participated: six female and 11 male. The group’s GCSE results ranged from D to A* (1 D, 2 Cs, 4 Bs, 5 As, and 3 A*s); one student had not taken History at GCSE and another had only just moved into the area, meaning her grades were not available. The students were studying Henry VIII and his relationship with Thomas Wolsey. It was also their first real work on using documentary source analysis at AS level.

All the students had signed individual ethics forms before they participated in the research. They were assured that their anonymity would be preserved and reassured that they had the right to withdraw at any stage. One student chose to withdraw from the research.

**10.3.3 Procedure.** As in Case Study 2, the intervention was conducted within the first six weeks of the academic year. No changes had been made to the
intervention in light of Case Study 2’s findings – Case Study 3 was a parallel study. Any changes made were minimal and intended to meet the different focus of the research questions. The delivery of the intervention was therefore very similar, although the preparation prior to its delivery was different. The students had been given an extensive note taking and reading programme by their classroom teacher (see Appendix 40 for the pre-Intervention Scheme of work, Appendix 41 for example of Lesson Plan and Appendix 42 for supporting Power Point Presentation and 43 for AS Mark Scheme). I had not been instrumental in working with the students before the intervention began – the previous year’s students had taken part in the exploratory study and I was unknown to these students.

Similar to Case Study 2, the intervention comprised of three sessions. The first two were held during one afternoon, and the final session was an extended period on a morning four days later. The source work essay was written as a timed response on the afternoon two days after that.

The intervention comprised the following activities: the first session, involved a free association word activity designed to access the students’ perceptions of essay and argument; a paired activity designed to help construct group rules to be agreed by the whole class to allow ‘safe and constructive’ argumentation and to create an environment of equality important in the promotion of dialogic talk; a short video clip of Monty Python’s ‘Argument Clinic’ showing what an argument is not; and an individual Post-it activity on what constitutes a good argument, which was fed back to the class. A very brief PowerPoint presentation followed which explicitly focused on argumentation and History argumentation whilst also stressing the importance of persuasive argumentation. The session concluded with student argumentation in threes. One student in each group acted as a judge whilst the other two argued for and against the raising of tuition fees. The judges fed back to the class presenting a summary of the points argued and a judgement on who was the most convincing arguer and why.

The other sessions were geared for more concentrated collaborative and argumentational student-focused work. Based on what they had already covered in
their preparatory work on Henry VIII and Thomas Wolsey, the students were asked to make a judgement and place themselves on a continuum and assign themselves the appropriate corresponding number between 1 and 10. The statement they had to react to was *Do you agree with the view that in the years 1515-25 Henry VIII wholly surrendered power in government to Cardinal Wolsey?* Because this was the first time students had been asked to work with documents at AS level, they were reminded of what constituted good source analysis, however, this did not incorporate explicit instruction in source analysis in the same way as de la Paz and Felton (2010). The focus was on the interaction and I did not want to confound the findings by introducing such a model. The students were then encouraged to work through the sources together and prepare their arguments, basing them not only on the judgements they had made, but also on the source material they had been given. The source material was part of a past exam question and the students had been given focused reading homework by their classroom teacher to ensure that they had an understanding of the background to the relationship between Henry VIII and Thomas Wolsey.

The collaborative dyads were then placed in groups of four – each dyad in opposition to the other. Unfortunately, only a brief period of argument was initiated at the end of the session, but they were told to prepare for a more thorough argument during their next session.

The final session allowed for a short period of feedback and consolidation before the dyads were encouraged to take part in the second stage of argumentative interaction. After the final argumentative interaction, the students were asked to write their essay plans. They were asked to make sure that they used their source material rigorously. They were not told how to write the essay; they were simply reminded that as the essay title asked them to answer the question using their own knowledge and the documents, they must make sure that they did so. The students spent some time planning their responses, which were then passed around the classroom for peer review and Post-it note comments were attached to them. The session finished when the classroom teacher reminded the students to bring their
documents and essay plans with attached Post-it notes to the session on Thursday where they would be expected to write the essay as a form of timed response.

Seventeen students were involved in this case study, but only 12 took part in all the activities. One student did not participate in any of the activities; one was ill for the Friday sessions, participated in the argumentation but did not write an essay; and another student had to leave for a music lesson halfway through the session. One student was present only for the first session and the essay, and another was present for the last session and the essay. There were three groups of four: two groups of two girls and two boys, one group of four boys, and one group of one girl and two boys.

10.3.4 **Data collection.** There were 13 pre-test essays with plans and 15 post-test essays, 13 of which had plans and 12 had Post-it notes attached. Only 11 participants submitted both pre- and post-test essays.

All the sessions were filmed with three cameras, but only the last argumentative interactions were audio recorded as well. Ten students took part in five paired post-intervention and post-essay interviews. The classroom teacher was also interviewed.

10.4 **Data Analysis**

10.4.1 **Dialogic interaction.** The interactions were assessed in four ways using the methods of Case Study 1. Whilst the intervention was being conducted, the researcher intuitively judged whether a group was engaging in a dialogic interaction based on the level of engagement exhibited by the students. The videos of the classroom interaction were then analysed retrospectively for other potential dialogic spells (Nystrand, 2003). The audio recordings of the interactions were transcribed and then assessed in two ways, using adapted TAP and Wegerif’s definition of ‘dialogic talk’ (2012, 2013a), to determine first of all the level of argument students had been engaged in and then whether the argumentation involved dialogic interaction.
10.4.2 Written argumentation. As in Case Study 2, pre- and post-intervention essays were marked in two ways. Both researcher and teacher marked them using an AS level mark scheme (see Appendix 43). As before, the essays were also assessed using an adapted form of Toulmin’s Argumentation Pattern, TAP (see Appendix 21). The pre-intervention essay was the first essay the students had written at AS level and the post-intervention essay was the first documentary sources essay, but the second involving written argument.

10.4.3 Post-intervention and post-essay student interviews. After the essays had been marked by both researcher and teacher, several students were interviewed to gain insight into the student experience of the arguing process. Students were asked how they would further develop the intervention.
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10.5 Findings

10.5.1 Dialogic interaction.

The argumentative groups were researcher organised so that in Group 1 Brenda and Richard, 7s were arguing against Rowena and Stephen, who were 8s. Group 2 was made up of Teresa and Helen, 6s, who argued against Jonathan and Alisdair, who were 7s – a great shame that this dyad did not offer pre-test essays. Group 3 was made up of Edgar and Robin, 7s, who argued against Todd and Lawrence 6s. Finally, in Group 4 Megan, an 8, was both judge between Alfie, an 8, and Frank, a 7, and then she too argued with Frank.

Table 10.2. Form of argument table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Phatic language/Erastic argument</th>
<th>Meta Irrelevant points</th>
<th>Unreturned points</th>
<th>Concessions</th>
<th>Clarifications leading to developed points</th>
<th>Developed points</th>
<th>Counter claims</th>
<th>Counter alternative</th>
<th>Counter critique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6M4E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4P2M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above demonstrates the quality of argument: apart from Group 3, who did not argue for any measurable time, so are not represented in the table, none of the groups engaged in irrelevant points – there was no discussion of parties. The column discussing the type of comments made (phatic/eristic and meta) were comments students made during the interaction that reflected on the engagement in which they were concerned. They could easily be considered as procedural, but the meta comments concern the nature of the source analysis and how it could be interpreted. Unsurprisingly, Group 2, who engaged in the most argumentation, showed the highest number of concessions and counterarguments. It is also interesting to note that their arguing did not contain any unreturned points.
If we consider the interaction in terms of the dialogical framework, it becomes clearer that the group that engaged in argument richest in several forms of counterarguing is the one that appears to engage in dialogic interaction. It is equally clear, though, that all of the students engage in argument that is exploratory and at times dialogic. It also becomes apparent that although there is a limited difference in stance i.e. the students arguing against each other are very close on the continuum, this does not impact on the quality of the argument as can be seen from the following table 10.2. Group 2 argues the longest closely followed by Group 4. The differences in stance in both cases is minimal.

Table 10.3 ‘Difference’ and impact on argumentation using Wegerif’s indicators for dialogic talk (2012, 2013a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Composition based on difference</th>
<th>Argumentation length</th>
<th>Levels of talk</th>
<th>Dialogic interaction y/n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 v 8</td>
<td>5 + 3.5 mins</td>
<td>Exploratory/Dialogic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 v 7</td>
<td>7 + 7 + 3 mins</td>
<td>Exploratory/Dialogic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7 v 6</td>
<td>Non relevant</td>
<td>Exploratory/Dialogic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8 v 7 v 8</td>
<td>4 +6 + 6 mins</td>
<td>Exploratory/Dialogic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.5.2 Written argumentation.

The results from school ES differ quite markedly to the results from case studies 1 and 2. They show negative as well as positive differences between the pre- and post-intervention essays. Todd, Alfie, and Richard’s arguments were more convincing in their pre-test essays. Rowena and Helen’s arguments did not improve. Brenda and Megan’s arguments improved only slightly whereas the arguments of Edgar, Teresa, and Frank improved by more than one level. Bryan’s argumentation improved the most, going from level 2 to 4. It must be appreciated, however, that Bryan’s absence meant that he received a lot of teacher and researcher input to enable him to catch up, which may explain the fact that his response demonstrated the most improvement in argumentation. The following table – 10.4 - shows the differences in pre and post essay grades.
Table 10.4. Essay grades by AS mark scheme and by adapted TAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>GCSE exam grade</th>
<th>AS points and level Pre-test</th>
<th>TAP level</th>
<th>AS points and level</th>
<th>TAP level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rowena</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L3 18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L2 20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alisdair</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L4 26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfie</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L4 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L3 19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3 22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L2 12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L3 26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgar</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>L2 12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L3 23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>No GCSE</td>
<td>L4 21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L3 17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>L4 21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L4 35</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L4 29</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L3 13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L3 22</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>Moved into area</td>
<td>L3 16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L3 25</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>L4 20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>L4 30</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L3 13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L3 28</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L2 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2 14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L3 16</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>L2 12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L3 24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in case studies 1 and 2, the pairing of arguers may have had a bearing on the results. The collaborative groups were student organised based on their places on the continuum. The first collaborative group was made up of Brenda, Teresa, Rowena, and Helen, even though Teresa and Helen were 6s, Brenda a 7 and Rowena an 8. Edgar, Frank, Richard, Alisdair, Jonathan, and Robin worked together as they were all 7s; Megan and Stephen both 8s prepared their cases on their own, while Lawrence and Todd as 6s also worked as a dyad.

10.5.3 Written argumentation and dialogic interaction?

It is difficult to state clearly which group benefited most from the intervention. The arguing was short but focused. In Group 1, Richard did not write argument as
effectively as he had in his first essay, Rowena’s essay stayed the same, and Brenda improved slightly. Their interaction was brief and Richard only focused on it for a very short time. In Group 2, Teresa and Jonathan argued extensively but she improved only slightly while neither Jonathan nor Alisdair submitted a pre-intervention essay. Helen was absent for part of the interactive part of the intervention. Frank from Group 4 appears to have benefited most from the interaction, but that might be because he had to argue against both Megan and Alfie – it is difficult to be sure. Group 3 did not engage in the intervention in quite the same way as the other groups, so cannot be included in the discussion; but the fact their results went up and down as the others did suggests that there were other factors involved which impacted on the students’ written argument. The following table - 10.5 - shows the potential links between dialogic interaction and improvement in written argument as measured by Adapted TAP.

Table 10.5. Links between argument length, dialogic interaction and improvement in essay in TAP levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Length of argument</th>
<th>Dialogic Y/N</th>
<th>Essay grades</th>
<th>Change from pre- to post-intervention by TAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5 + 3.5 mins</td>
<td>Exploratory/Dialogic</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>+1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rowena</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Same level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No essay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7 + 7 + 3 mins</td>
<td>Exploratory/Dialogic</td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>+1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>No pre-essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alisdair</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>No pre-essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Edgar</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Non relevant</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>No pre essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>-1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>No pre-essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 + 4+ 6 mins</td>
<td>Exploratory/Dialogic</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>+1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alfie</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>+11/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.5.4 Student insight into interaction. Ten students were interviewed in five pairs. Robin, who had not written an AS essay before, and Edgar, Lawrence,
and Todd from Group 3, because they had not engaged in any form of peer interaction. All of the students from Group 2 – Teresa, Helen, Alisdair, and Jonathan – because they had been the most successful group. Finally, Brenda from Group 1 – the most engaged in that group – and Megan from Group 4, because she had been both judge and arguer and her insights into the argumentation within her group would be interesting.

Five questions constituted the interview, which can be found in Appendix 29. Group 3, who had engaged in the least interaction, very little of it was peer interaction, suggested that they had been too close on the continuum to argue well. All four of them found that planning was an issue and admitted that it was something that they rarely did. Robin was the most keen to engage in developing his arguing skills further, whereas Lawrence and Todd, having both achieved A* at GCSE, felt that they were already proficient in argumentation. They suggested that arguing from a greater range of difference might have helped them argue and develop their own thinking.

The Group 2 interviews were interesting in as much as Helen had done the least arguing in the group because she had had to leave during the session and she was least confident in her ability to argue and to write History argument. She had made no improvement to her written argument. Teresa, who had written the best essay in the class, was keen to find out how she could further improve her History writing. She had argued the most and made an improvement in her written argument. Unfortunately, Jonathan and Alisdair had not submitted pre-test essays, but both felt that the arguing helped them to understand the source material and to see alternative points of view, even though they were very close in their opinions. Jonathan and Teresa had argued the most whilst Alisdair had listened intently to the proceedings. Jonathan and Teresa were capable students so it is surprising that Jonathan’s essay only achieved a measured success.

Megan and Brenda were interviewed together to offer insight into the nature of the argumentation in their respective groups. In the audio recordings both girls had been heard to express their disappointment that they had not had the opportunity to
argue further. Both had made improvements in their written argument, but it was Frank, the student who argued against both Megan and Alfie, that made the most improvement.

All students found the intervention useful and appreciated how important planning was to the process, though this was not always evident from the essays.

10.6 Discussion

Research Question 1. What impact does the use of documentary sources have on the instantiation of dialogic interaction for Year 12 students?

10.6.1 Does source analysis impact on dialogic interaction? The results of this case study suggest that the intervention was only a mixed success and in some cases did not generate an improvement in the written responses. The first thing that needs to be taken into consideration, however, is that this was only the second essay and the first source analysis question the students had tackled at AS level. The difference between GCSE and AS source analysis is quite marked and one or two of the responses showed that some of the students had not made a clear distinction between their GCSE and AS documentary source analysis. Some of the responses reflect this inexperience and were marked accordingly.

It is also true that documentary source analysis is a complex skill, which takes practice, and incorporating the source material into a clear and coherent argument is more challenging than simply writing an argumentative essay, as the research of Wineburg, (2007) de La Paz and Felton (2010) confirms. Inevitably, this would have an impact on the students’ responses. However, what must be made clear immediately is that every student in the classroom was actively engaged in the learning process and the video and audio evidence reflects a level of commitment to the learning activities which is in direct contrast to the engagement of some of the students in the Year 13 classroom in Case Study 2.
Todd, Alfie, and Richard’s argumentation was better in their first essay than in their documentary paper. Todd was a particularly able student who proved adept in argumentation, capable of level 4, but his documentary paper lacked a clear counterargument, which had been explicit in his pre-test but only implicit in his post-test essay. The explanation for the lack of improvement in the essays of Alfie and Richard is different. Richard had had no previous experience of writing any form of History source analysis save that which he learnt at Key Stage 3. The leap from Key Stage 3 to AS source analysis is a particularly large one and not surprisingly he received an E grade from his classroom teacher. His argumentation skills suffered in trying to master a complex historical skill. Alfie, on the other hand, is the one student in the group of three who found it difficult to verbally articulate his argument and this may have an impact on his written work; the other members in the group – Megan and Frank – showed improvement in their written skills, Frank more noticeably than Megan. It might also be significant that as the judge, Megan was able to reflect on what Frank and Alfie had said and was then in a position to argue further and push Frank into developing his argument to a higher level. Certainly the audio recordings indicated that Megan felt that she had not argued enough.

Helen and Rowena’s written argument seemed not to have improved at all, which might be because Helen did not actually engage in any real argumentation: although present for the collaborative work, she had to leave for a music lesson. Rowena’s group – Group 1 – were very similar in viewpoint. While Brenda was able to discuss alternative points of view with Stephen, Rowena and Richard quickly agreed on their points, choosing not to explore their differences further, which may also explain why Richard did not make any gains in his argumentation.

In Helen’s absence, Teresa was pitted against Alisdair and Jonathan, who unfortunately did not submit pre-test essays. Alisdair had received extensive help with his written work from the History department as a whole, so the progress he made in his essay work could be attributed to that rather than the intervention. He was not particularly articulate in verbal argumentation. Jonathan, however, was an excellent match for Teresa, arguing with real determination and vigour. They both
argued keenly and with conviction, evidently enjoying the sparring and, it must be said, appearing to benefit from the experience.

If we look at the interaction between Jonathan and Teresa, we see that they are arguing quite intensely. Teresa achieved an A* at GCSE and Jonathan achieved an A: they are evenly matched in ability.

Teresa: Well, I think the important thing to accept here is that we are, erm... can you not, erm, talk while I’m doing my argument? [An aside to Alisdair and Jonathan who were putting their heads together to think about the next point...]

We need to accept that we are very close on the scale, but I think that sometimes we, erm, assume that just because Henry had royal blood that he didn’t have as much power... like he had more power than Wolsey ever did, but really you could see it as like a complete change in government because it showed that intelligence and ambition was starting to overrule just luck, and winning the genetic lottery.

Jonathan: Fair enough. I have a point that says that he didn’t and that is that Wolsey lacked like daily contact with the king because obviously the king was obviously off gallivanting and everything and doing what he wants – getting laid and all that stuff.

Teresa: But I don’t think that their relationship is a complete... [coughs]

Jonathan: Nice cough.

Teresa: ... I don’t think that their relationship is particularly relevant in the fact that Henry surrendered his power, because he’s not going to surrender power to a close friend is he?

Jonathan: He’s not a close friend though, is he? Well, one of his close friends because otherwise he’d have been caught up with, like, partying with Henry in his chamber and everything and all that with him – he’d have been one of them instead, and not left him doing the boring stuff and government, which you could say...
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Teresa  But that shows that Henry’s got a certain amount… like, a large amount of trust that he has… he has got a lot of power there.

Jonathan  Yeah, but another way… or you could say that he was using him so that he could have fun and still do what he does.

Teresa  But even if he was using him, he still had to make it worthy for him.

Jonathan  Yeah, but he still, like, always had the final say in decisions didn’t he? For example, why was he appointed some Head of the Monastery – like nunneries or whatever they were called?

This argument goes on for some time and eventually they agree to differ. Unfortunately, Jonathan did not write an essay and as a consequence we do not have an essay plan from him either. Teresa’s written response reflected both her insight and her understanding and was most persuasively articulated: a distinct improvement on her pre-test essay. Brenda, however, her close friend and someone with whom she was paired during the collaborative phase of the research process, had a different experience of argumentation. She was arguing with Stephen – both students achieved B grades at GCSE. Rowena, who joins in later, achieved an A whereas Richard has no GCSE in History, so these skills are very new to him.

Stephen  Right, at the end of the day, Henry was the ultimate man and without Henry, Wolsey was nothing.

Brenda  That’s true, but although Henry did, overall, most of Wolsey’s decisions, he couldn’t have done it without Wolsey…

For example, Wolsey helped Henry with the invasion of France and he co-ordinated that and organised it and Henry couldn’t have done that without Wolsey.

Stephen  Good point. I’ve got another point that’s different. When Wolsey… Wolsey’s last words were, ‘If I had served God as diligently as I did Henry, he would not have given me as many grey hairs’. This shows that… even if Wolsey realised that… it shows that Wolsey realised that Henry
had worked him really hard just for his own good.

Brenda Can you repeat the statement again?

Stephen Wolsey’s last words were, ‘If I served God as diligently as I did Henry, he would still not have given me as many grey hairs’. This shows that Wolsey realised that Henry had worked him really hard, just for Henry’s own good.

Brenda So isn’t that making Henry look bad because if Henry’s doing… Henry liked… Let me… From source 5 it says that – if I can find it – no, source 4, it says, ‘Henry hawked and hunted; jousted, played tennis, made music, danced and banqueted. It must have seen [sic] that an indulgent king had wholly surrendered the cares of the state into the cardinal’s hands’. Because Henry was such a young king, he wanted to keep going with his life and enjoying the leisure of life, so he wanted somebody else to do all the work for him and that’s why Wolsey had such a bad position – because he did most of the work.

Stephen Yeah, but at the end of the day, Henry had all the power and he was, like, using Wolsey just to cover the hard stuff, like all the paperwork on…

Brenda Pardon?

Brenda would have benefited from being able to argue longer and with someone who could perhaps have challenged her further. The argument does not involve counterargument, simply claims, which unfortunately seem to go unchallenged and undeveloped. Stephen appeals to Rowena to say something – anything – to continue against Brenda and develop the points, but the argument lacks the fluidity of Teresa and Jonathan. Richard, though new to using sources, appears to be able to hold his own, though he cannot translate this into his written work – he is one of the students whose work shows less competence in argumentation after the intervention than before.

Similarly, in Group 4’s interaction, Alfie cannot challenge Megan; although Frank begins to, Megan runs out of time. The interactions were encouraged again but were not developed further, unlike Jonathan and Teresa, who, given half an opportunity, carried on arguing when everyone else was silent. It is also clear that in
Group 1’s interaction the source material actually gets in the way – they are reading from the source material as they make their points.

The four boys in Group 3 – Todd, Lawrence, Edgar, and Robin – needed a lot of help, both in terms of teacher and researcher input, and because of this they did not actually argue amongst themselves for any significant length of time, but engaged in question and answer about factual deployment rather than argumentation, so the quality of their essays they wrote cannot be directly attributable to the argumentation. Edgar and Robin felt unable to argue against Todd and Lawrence because they recognised how able these boys were in History learning. That said, Todd and Lawrence seemed unable to create opportunities to draw out the learning of Edgar and Robin. Todd and Lawrence seemed to know intuitively how to answer questions and implicitly knew which parts of the sources would support their reasoning, but could not express this to the other two boys, hence the researcher and teacher input.

Lawrence and Todd, the other A* candidates, were on the table which received a lot of help from the researchers and so did not get the opportunity to engage in peer argumentation, which might be an explanation for Todd’s lack of progress. We cannot know whether Lawrence’s mark indicates an improvement or not because he failed to hand in a pre-test essay. Bryan, as a C candidate, appeared to benefit the most – his argumentation moving from level 2 to 4, but then he was the student who missed most of the intervention and had considerable help in handling sources from the researcher, so that result is skewed.

What becomes clear again in this case study is that the argumentation is not confined to the most able, although it has to be acknowledged that Teresa is a very able student with a passion for History. She was engaged throughout, asking perceptive and insightful questions as well as evidently appreciating the nuances of History evidence and its use. The video and audio evidence demonstrate how articulate Jonathan was, perhaps not as knowledgeable or as fiercely engaged as Teresa, but nevertheless determined to push her to develop her argument further. It is a great shame that he did not present a pre-test essay because it would be very interesting to appreciate what was happening for him in the interaction. Based on
exam grades, it could be argued that they were well matched, but Teresa produced a written argument of level 4/5 whereas Jonathan only produced level 3 argumentation when measured through adapted TAP indicators.

It seems that engagement is key to the development of arguing skills and this will be explored further as we consider the next research question.

Research Question 2. *How does using Post-it notes as aids to reflection help in the planning of the student responses?*

**10.6.2 Does using Post-it notes as aids to reflection help planning?** The Post-it notes were used to offer the students the opportunity to make comments on their peers’ essay plans and in that way reflect upon their own work as well as others. This is an important part of the research and will be discussed further in Chapter 11, when the blogging and Post-it activities are examined as possible aids for reflection. It is suggested that reflection is important in dialogic terms and could be an important part of the transition between spoken and written argument.

In Case Study 1 it was easy to see how a voice was acquired and how that permeated through one group’s essays and could be linked to the Post-it activity. However, because of the use of documents, it is not at all clear whether any one group had an interaction that offered the opportunity for someone to acquire a voice and therefore lead the learning for others and in particular for themselves.

Teresa’s essay plan is comprehensive and the corresponding essay is particularly well reasoned and does reflect the argument she engaged in with Jonathan. Although her interaction with Jonathan was intense, and at times Alisdair was a party to it, most of the time it was directed at Jonathan, who produced neither pre-intervention essay nor essay plan and we cannot know whether he wrote any Post-it notes on their essay plans either. No other group achieved the same level of argument and there is no acquisition of voice, so although there may be similarities in essay responses, it is not due to something that happened during the
arguative interaction. It is likely to be the result of the collaborative activities earlier.

The potential for interaction was there but the students appear to lack the confidence in their ability or a suitably articulate respondent. The students were all hardworking, but the fact that one group of boys was reluctant to argue, and the boys in the other groups all felt incapable of offering more than a couple of points, is not down to ability but more to do perhaps with the newness of the A level experience and the different requirements. That, coupled with the requirement to use source material to support their points, may also be a factor.

Unfortunately, this means that is difficult to establish what role reflection played in the students’ experience. Brenda’s plan is comprehensive, like those of other students in the class, and her argumentation did improve, but her plan was not executed in quite the way it could have been in her essay and it is difficult to determine whether that was due to the pressures of a timed essay response, continued reflection, or something else.

These themes will be further explored in the discussion chapter.

10.7 Summary of Case study Findings

The students were all hard working and motivated. The fact that the intervention did not work in some cases is not down to the students’ lack of engagement in the process. The students’ scheme of work had planned for the intervention and they were well aware of the process. The school itself had been part of the exploratory study, so there was a good working relationship between researcher, teacher, and students although I had not previously worked with this group of students.

A possible explanation for the lack of success in some cases is the additional use of evidence. Students were unfamiliar with the way that documentary analysis should occur at AS level and so they were trying to use the evidence appropriately as well as incorporate into their argument. The video records show how students
are actually holding up the text and reading from it – to prove that the evidence is sound perhaps – but in reading the evidence they are losing eye contact with the person they are arguing against. Teresa and Jonathan’s interaction has Teresa eyeing her material obliquely having highlighted clearly what she wants to say and pausing in her argument if she wants to check something before she counters a point. Jonathan is simply out to push her and tests her interpretations of the evidence. Stephen is not able to do this with Brenda and is not comfortable in the exchanges. He did not submit pre- or post-test essays.

It must be said, however, that some students did handle the new skills and the argumentation particularly adeptly and there was a stage where several of them would have liked additional time to discuss and develop their points further. Although the students suggested during their interviews that a greater difference may have helped them argue for longer and more intensely, it is clear that limited differences between the students’ point of view did not prevent argument happening – in some cases quite the contrary.

These findings on the use of documentary source material would tend to support Stahl et al.’s (1996) contention that using more than two sources does not aid the development of historical thinking. However, Stahl et al.’s study was conducted with younger children, which factor alone may have made a difference. VanSledright’s (2002) use of historical sources led his students to distrust everything which was not what he intended. The students in the present study did not distrust the evidence before them, they just found it difficult to integrate it into their discussions and then into their subsequent written argument.

10.8 Towards Design Framework 5

What needs to be discussed and reviewed carefully is the role of reflection in the process. Interaction and engagement appear to have some positive effects on the students’ written work, but what also needs to be developed and studied further is the role of reflection, manifest perhaps in the form of Post-it notes and blogging, but also in the interplay of the group. There are tantalising instances where reflection appears to have a very positive role to play – certainly in Case Study 1, where the
best essay was written by the most silent member in the group engaged in the most interactive process.

These points will be developed further in the next chapter.

10.9 Summary of Chapter 10

This chapter discussed Case Study 3, which was a parallel study to Case Study 2. The focus of this case study was the exploration of whether a model for argumentation designed to help Year 12 AS students improve their written argument could still be used for the more complex needs of documentary source-based argumentation. Case Study 3 focused on how students analysed and used historical evidence to create and support their own argument. The research was conducted early in Year 12 when the skill was still new to AS History students. The findings suggest that it is possible that the acquisition of this new skill impacted on the opportunities to generate dialogic interaction within an argumentative exchange. The pre- and post-test essays only demonstrated a partial improvement in written argumentation and in some cases the ability of students to write argument was impaired. Again, only a small minority of the students were able to engage in an argumentative exchange that at times became dialogic. The essay which showed most improvement was written by a student who engaged in little peer interaction but may have been in a position to reflect on the argument in which those on his table were engaged. However, it cannot be clearly established that that was as a result of the intervention.
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Figure A8. Discussion of intervention and cross case analysis

11.1 Introduction

This chapter is the beginning of the final part of the thesis in which I discuss the findings, review the study, and offer recommendations for the future. In this penultimate chapter I will be discussing how the intervention and the theoretical frameworks developed throughout the research process. In keeping with case study research methodology (Stake, 2006; Yin, 2009), I will also be conducting a cross-case analysis to highlight the evidence of the development of both the theory and the educational artefact (Gorard & Taylor, 2004).

This chapter has three sections. The first discusses how the intervention developed over the trials and the three case studies. The second addresses the key research questions to determine whether the intervention has proved successful in instantiating dialogic interaction to allow exploration of the links between spoken and written argument. Also to be discussed in this section is whether the written arguments in the students’ essays have improved as a consequence of the intervention. This is of particular importance to a pragmatic researcher who considers the consequences of the action rather than the antecedent phenomena. The final section covers the other themes which emerged through the research process.
11.2 Reviewing the Development of the Intervention

The initial intervention was a ‘scaffolded’ series of classroom activities which were based on the principles which underpin Design Framework 2, additional theory derived from a return to the literature review, and the findings of an exploratory study which incorporated semi-structured interviews and classroom observations carried out in four secondary History departments (please see Chapter 5 for the original plan for the ‘intervention’.) The intervention was designed to be implemented in a series of seven stages as illustrated by the following diagram.

Figure 11.1. The seven stages of the intervention
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How each stage was tested and developed through the research process will now be reported.

Stage 1 – Setting the ground rules.

This initial stage was important because the ground rules were supposed to serve two purposes. The first was to ensure that before the students engaged in any argumentational activity, guidelines had been agreed to prevent them arguing in a way that might prove harmful. It was important that these ground rules came from the students themselves. Democracy is an important element within Deweyan pragmatism and equality matters for dialogic engagement. The second purpose was to ensure that the students ‘bought into’ the different classroom environment, but more importantly were made aware of how they should conduct themselves to create the environment in which exploratory and dialogic talk would be engendered.

During the teacher trials reported in Chapter 6, the ground rules stage was missed out. The teachers held the ultimate authority in the classroom and the students were not asked or expected to talk in any other way than their usual form of discourse.

Although the ground rules were easily brokered by the students in case studies 1, 2 and 3 – reported in Chapters 8, 9, and 10, respectively – the students seemed only to abide by the rules they had set themselves within the first session. By the second and third sessions, particularly if there was a week in between sessions, the extent to which the students were abiding by the ground rules was not so clear – even after they were reminded of them at the beginning of each session.

Wegerif et al. (1999) ensured that the pupils in their classroom study were well versed in ‘exploratory talk’ before their classroom intervention was introduced. Working in primary schools where the pupils stay with the same teacher and in the same environment all of the time, it is easier to establish ‘ways of talking’ for the group. In the sixth form environment where the students are constantly moving from room to room and have several teachers, establishing ways of talking within collaborative and argumentational activities is more difficult. Work across the sixth
form curriculum rather than in individual subject areas might be a way to ensure that exploratory and dialogic talk are more likely to be engendered in peer discussion.

As the development of the intervention was designed to be cumulative, each stage building on the previous one, the inability to embed the ground rules which emphasised a different way of talking – exploratory and dialogic talking – may well have impacted on the later stages and prevented everyone engaging in interactions which were predominantly dialogic.

Stage 2 – Argument instruction

Argument instruction has been an important stage in most of the educational studies which were designed to help students argue more effectively (e.g., Andrews et al., 2006, 2009; Felton & Herko, 2004; Kuhn & Udell, 2003, 2007; Mitchell & Andrews, 2001). This was the stage that underwent most adjustment throughout the research process. The initial teacher trials had shown how teaching the different forms of argument – on formal and informal axes – was confusing for the students. This was notable in the films made of the teacher trials and in the student questionnaires of Case Study 1. So, as the research process continued through the case studies, the emphasis on argument instruction was limited to focusing on the different forms of informal argument based on Walton’s six types of dialogue and their respective goals (See Chapter 2, page 45), and was only used as a bridge to focus the students on the similarity of persuasive and enquiry dialogues to History argument.

The role-play in which the students were asked to persuade others was used in Case Study 1 with four students per group but as two of the students in each group spent some time not being active or reflective, the role-play/arguing practice was changed in case studies 2 and 3. This was based on evidence from the student questionnaires as well as researcher observations from Case Study 1. In case studies 2 and 3, the students were divided into groups of three where one person acted as judge whilst the other two argued about tuition fees or any other subject that mattered to them. This activity did bring about engaging opinion-based argument and the judges were fair minded and made judgements based on the
arguments they had heard, and not on group or peer identity. They were also able to elicit improvements to the arguments based on their experiences of arguing as evidenced in their feedback to the researcher and the rest of the class.

This section will be developed further in Design Framework 5 to focus on arguing and counter-arguing points and more emphasis will be placed on the active engagement of the students arguing and judging in groups of three.

Stage 3 – Making a judgement

Research (de la Paz & Felton, 2010, Wiley & Voss, 1996,1999) had emphasised that students engaged in making judgments and arguing about historical evidence made most improvement in understanding History. Evidence from the teacher and student interviews stressed how difficult students found it to make a judgement. Teachers were concerned because they wanted their students to think for themselves and, in making a judgement about an essay title, to be able to start forming their own arguments. Students on the other hand – in Year 12 in particular – did not know what to think. They were frequently overwhelmed by all the material they were supposed to know and were also hampered by their belief that they could be wrong in whatever judgement they made. They associated judgements with being either ‘right or wrong’ and not with exploring different interpretations or beliefs.

Having students make a judgement about what they thought of an essay title was considered a very valuable exercise by the teachers who carried out the trials. Each one said that they would incorporate it into their future lessons and the students themselves also appreciated being able to see a range of differences. This emphasised for them – particularly when invited to stand on a continuum – how History at A level is not a matter of a black and white two-sided argument on a fifty/fifty basis, but more shades of grey across a range of possibilities. This ‘making a judgement’ proved a successful feature of the intervention, as evidenced by teacher feedback in the teacher trials, by student questionnaires in Case Study 1 (apart from one student who said that it was difficult making a judgement when (s)he did not know what to think), and by the researcher, student, and participating teacher observations in case studies 2 and 3.
Stage 4 – Preparing for the argument

The students across all the age ranges in the exploratory study had emphasised how much they wanted to work with others. Some were motivated by shyness, whereas other students wanted to hear what others had to say. Stage 4 was an important element of the intervention, encouraging the students to work collaboratively, but not until they had all made an individual judgement which they could support with reason and evidence. Then, with a clear mandate to explore and arrive at a consensus on how to prepare for the following debate/argument, the students were able to work in a focused and motivated way.

Video recordings and student feedback of the teacher trials and the student questionnaires in Case Study 1, as well as teacher and researcher observations in case studies 2 and 3, demonstrated how effectively the students worked in this stage. In only one case study was there one group of students who did not engage in the work as well as they might. Student questionnaires indicated the students’ desire to work collaboratively, and there are certainly many advantages in preparing for a debate/argument in dyads where students may feel less intimidated.

There is a lot of research showing how important collaborative work is for consolidating learning and offering the potential for conceptual development, particularly if the dyads are arranged to in a socio-cognitive way (Fawcett & Garton, 2005; Mercer et al., 1999; Schwarz & Linchevski, 2007; Wegerif, 2005).

Stage 5 – Arguing in fours

This stage was adapted during the teacher trials, although the teachers acknowledged the virtue of encouraging students to explore differences of perspective through argument was generally accepted as a worthwhile exercise. The student questionnaires in Case Study 1 also showed that arguing in fours was an effective way of encouraging everyone to get involved. Students felt happier arguing in small groups rather than in whole-class debates in front of everyone. The teacher in Case Study 2 suggested that the arguing had helped one student in
particular regain her confidence, who since the ‘arguing’ had gone on to be more successful in her studies.

It is recognised that the process of arguing is challenging and some students were happy to engage in the process whilst others were less so. This meant that some students – in particular in Case Study 3 – were not in a position to argue and explore the differences of the other side, because the other dyad was not necessarily as prepared as they could have been, or felt too inhibited to argue even within a small group. This has more to do with fact that the perception of being right and wrong, and having to win, was most prevalent in the student discourse. More work needs to be done to break away from the winning and losing discourse and more emphasis needs to be put on exploring difference rather than ‘arguing to beat the other side and to force them to agree with your point of view’.

It is also important to note that difference in opinion on a continuum is no guarantee of an argument. Felton and Herko (2004) reported that the greater the difference in opinion the more marked the argument could become. It is certainly true that in Case Study 1 the argument which engendered dialogic interaction was generated between students who had a greater difference of opinion. This was not supported in Case Study 2, however, nor yet in Case Study 3. This is partly because there was not a great range of difference between any of the students in Case Study 3, and in Case Study 2 the argument which was created from the greatest difference ended up being eristic in quality – prone to ‘you’re wrong, I’m right’ statements.

It was also clear that difficulties arose when students were asked to use source material to support and develop the points they were making in their arguments (i.e., Case Study 3). To some extent, this was to do with the physical handling of the material, which prevented the actual process of the argument; some of it was to do with the knowledge needed to argue. There was also an interesting tension in the ‘arguing to learn, learning to argue’ thesis. The students were able to argue more effectively if they were comfortable with the History, but in arguing the History they actually began to learn it as well. An interesting conundrum.
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It is also interesting to observe that the opinion-based arguments that were engendered in Stage 2 were markedly different from the evidence-based arguments of Stage 5. This was found across all of the case studies. The use of evidence changes the tenor of the entire interaction and this needs to be explored further.

Stage 6 – Planning the response

This stage was just as important in the research study as the arguing stages because it was necessary to see how the ideas generated by the argument would be translated into the written word. The planning stage was meant to be part of the transition. Observations during the exploratory study had demonstrated how little students planned their essays and, perhaps more pertinently for this research, how they failed to capitalise on ideas and discussion points and translate them into the written word.

The teacher trials did not incorporate the planning stage, but the case studies did. Case Study 2 integrated the use of blogging to highlight the importance of planning essays. Constructive comments from peers were also encouraged on the written argument, either in comments on the blog or comments written on Post-it notes which were attached to essay plans. In only one instance – during Case Study 1 – ideas generated through the students’ arguments were carried into the plans and into the essays of all the other members of that particular group.

Stage 7 – Writing the essay

The teachers in the teacher trials, reported in Chapter 6, each said that the essays which were written after the intervention all showed signs of a clear improvement. Only one History student’s essay did not improve and that was a student who had been absent for the argumentational interaction. Generally, the students’ essays improved across case studies 1 and 2. It is only in Case Study 3, with the introduction of source analysis and the need to integrate this into the written essay, that the essays do not improve – although the students who were most engaged in the intervention still made improvements in their essays (as can be seen
in Chapter 10). This will be discussed further when the fundamental research questions are addressed.

The on-going development of the intervention will be considered in Chapter 12, when future research is discussed. Design Framework 5 which will form the theoretical basis for the continued research process is presented here and shows the findings of Case Studies 2 and 3. The parallel case studies 2 and 3 together constituted the fourth iteration based on Design Framework 4 derived from Case Study 1, in which it was suggested that persuasive argumentation which is rich in counter-arguing could be a precursor to dialogic interaction. Unfortunately, little evidence of this form of counter-argumentation was engendered. I am able, however, to tentatively suggest that there are links between the level of engagement in interaction and the success of their written work. The role played by reflection in the improvement of the written argument, however, remains unclear, the results from the blogging and the post-it activities in Case Study 2 being inconclusive. It was clear that students asked to engage in source analysis for the first time at AS level and engage in argumentation found it difficult. Their plans and Post-it comments seemed lost in their focus on attempting to assimilate the information of the source material.
## Table 11.1. Findings from Iteration 4 used to develop Design Framework 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Framework 4</th>
<th>Adaptations to the intervention for AS source analysis &amp; A2 argumentation and blogging</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Design Framework 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should make their ground rules to encourage them to engage in dialogic talk. Ground rules should emphasise the importance of democratic rules of respect and arguing against the ideas rather than the person. Students need to be aware of the way in which to engage in dialogic talk.</td>
<td><strong>Paired or group work</strong> – establishing group/class rules democratically. Establish the importance of talking to each other – even when arguing – with respect and paying attention to what is said rather than to who is saying it.</td>
<td>Group rules are established but are not being adhered to throughout the three sessions in CS 2 – ground rules need to be embedded in the practice of the class and not just for the intervention CS3 shows evidence of adhering to group rules.</td>
<td>Students should make their ground rules to encourage them to engage in dialogic talk. Ground rules should emphasise the importance of democratic rules of respect and arguing against the ideas rather than the person. Ground rules should become embedded in classroom practice and should not be used just occasionally. Students need to be aware of the way in which to engage in dialogic talk. Teacher demonstrates the difference between dialogic talk and disputational talk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Students should engage in persuasive argumentation. Students should practice persuasive argumentation in groups of threes – 1 student acting as a judge. Students need to be aware of the different forms of argumentation. Need to make clear links between History and persuasive argument. | **Whole-class activity** – watch YouTube clip.  
**Brief PowerPoint presentation focusing on persuasive argumentation and link to History argument.**  
**Arguing practice in threes** – two argue and one judges. | Argumentation tuition includes the links between persuasion and History argument and seems clearly understood. Evidence from student interviews. but arguing practice does not reflect persuasion in either case study, for different reasons. Case study 2 most groups engaged in winning and losing discourse. | Students should engage in persuasive argumentation. Students should practice persuasive argumentation in groups of threes – 1 student acting as a judge. Students need to be aware of the different forms of argumentation. Need to make clear links between History and persuasive argument. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher instruction of argument theory needs to focus on interactive nature of argument and not on formal argumentation.</th>
<th>Judges’ feedback leading to whole-class discussion – revisit what makes a good argument. Draw out use of evidence and counterarguing the point.</th>
<th>CS3 natural reticence of young adults in early weeks of A level tuition.</th>
<th>Teacher instruction of argument theory needs to focus on interactive nature of argument and not on formal argumentation. Argumentation tuition needs to emphasise difference between opinion- and evidence-based argumentation. Argumentation tuition needs to emphasise difference between persuasive and eristic argumentation. Students should be encouraged to engage in argumentation that is based in dialogic talk. Students need to learn to argue and counter argue points. Students need to be encouraged to counter-argue against the point and not the person – orientate themselves to the debate. Talk aloud protocol to highlight countering points in an exploratory way.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argumentation tuition needs to emphasise difference between opinion- and evidence-based argumentation. Students should be encouraged to engage in argumentation that is based in dialogic talk. Students need to learn to argue and counter argue points. Students need to be encouraged to counter-argue against the point and not the person – orientate themselves to the debate.</td>
<td>Whole-class discussion – History essay title – setting an argument in place – brainstorm what title means. Individual decision making in silence. Physical whole-class participation – standing on a continuum. Make sure students are asked to think of a number between 1 and 10 before standing on continuum.</td>
<td>Most students able to discuss the demands of the History question in both case studies. Making judgement on what they thought to form basis of individual argument. Evidence demonstrated that it works well.</td>
<td>Students should be encouraged to make judgments about History which will become the basis of their arguments. Students should be clear in their judgements but be prepared to change their judgements in light of further reflection and argumentation. Students should be clear in their judgements but be prepared to change their judgements in light of further reflection and argumentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students should be encouraged to make judgments about History which will become the basis of their arguments. Students should be clear in their judgements but be prepared to change their judgements in light of further reflection and argumentation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students need to take part in collaborative activities designed to promote peer interaction.</th>
<th><strong>Collaborative paired work</strong> – generating points in preparation for arguing in fours. Dyads compare their own points and develop others, supporting them with appropriate evidence from written sources given as part of the exercises CS 3. <strong>Students worked collaboratively</strong> on creating evidence in CS 2 although one group disengaged.</th>
<th>Students need to take part in collaborative activities designed to promote peer interaction. Dyads should be encouraged to work together as equals – based in dialogic education – emphasise ground rules.</th>
<th>Students need to take part in collaborative activities designed to promote peer interaction. Dyads should be encouraged to work together as equals – based in dialogic education – emphasise ground rules.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dyads should be encouraged to work together as equals – based in dialogic education – emphasise ground rules. Whole-class discussion about using source material in essays. CS 3.</td>
<td><strong>Collaborative argumentation in fours</strong> – structured argument to argue point-by-point and pair-by-pair with other dyads reflecting on process and development of the argument, but only after revisiting the ground rules. CS 2. 1 group disengaged; the rest arguing within their groups. 2 groups involved in exploratory argumentation. But 1 group heated argument stuck in consolidated positions not exploring difference. CS 3. 1 group not arguing; others trying to argue but find using source material difficult to integrate into their argument.</td>
<td>Need to engage students in collaborative activities that will lead to dialogic engagement, not only in their collaboration but also in their argumentation. Ensure that dyads work equally and remind them of their initial viewpoints. Students should be encouraged to engage in argumentation that is based in dialogic talk.</td>
<td>Need to engage students in collaborative activities that will lead to dialogic engagement, not only in their collaboration but also in their argumentation. Ensure that dyads work equally and remind them of their initial viewpoints. Students should be encouraged to engage in argumentation that is based in dialogic talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to engage students in collaborative activities that will lead to dialogic engagement, not only in their collaboration but also in their argumentation. Ensure that dyads work equally and remind them of their initial viewpoints. Students should be encouraged to engage in argumentation that is based in dialogic talk. Need to emphasise the ground rules that support the argumentation.</td>
<td><strong>Individual work</strong> – writing plans. <strong>Individual work</strong> – place plans on teacher-prepared blog within a week of intervention. Plans were written in class during both case studies. Not all students blogged their essays plans and even fewer added comments – those who did wrote constructively.</td>
<td>Students should be encouraged to reflect on their arguments in both oral and written forms. Plans should be made individually and then compared. Students encouraged to reflect on Individual work – writing plans.</td>
<td>Students should be encouraged to reflect on their arguments in both oral and written forms. Plans should be made individually and then compared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Individual work</strong> – writing plans. Plans were written in class during both case studies. Not all students blogged their essays plans and even fewer added comments – those who did wrote constructively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 11 – Discussion

| Individual work but collaborative – review other students’ plans – comment on argument and content of essays and place comments on the blog next to the essay plans. CS3 Use Post-its instead of blog posts. Individual work – Essay to be written as a homework assignment within a fortnight of the intervention. | CS 3 Post-it comments on the essay plans were constructive and mentioned use of source analysis as well. Most essays written in CS2 show improvement; only a few show improvement in CS3 – the integration of source material was difficult. | Students encouraged to reflect on their work, that of their partners, and of the rest of the class. Students should keep either a learning log or a reflective blog to engage in reflection of the learning experience as well as of the subject content. |
Chapter 11 – Discussion

The following section discusses the overall success or failure of the intervention.

11.3 Returning to the Research Questions

This thesis was an investigation into the links between dialogic interaction and written argument because I had wondered if there was something about the talk generated between my students and myself which led to an improvement in my students’ essays. I designed a classroom intervention that would instantiate dialogic interaction so that I could explore the potential links between the spoken and written word, whilst ensuring that the students’ essays improved.

11.3.1 Did the intervention instantiate dialogic interaction? I have defined dialogic interaction following Wegerif (2012,2013a) who emphasises the inside-outness and outside-inness of dialogue and in so doing suggests that the exchange created between individuals is based in an orientation to the dialogue itself. The nature of the dialogue, Wegerif suggests, is that the two addressees are not only listening to each other, they are also in a position to listen to themselves, thus creating a third dimension. The dialogue is then full of potential, past, and present meanings, and it is that ability to listen to oneself as well as the other within a dialogic space that creates the opportunity for cognitive development. I am suggesting that the more dialogic the interaction, the greater the likelihood of conceptual change.

It is assumed that the interaction is being conducted in an environment which promotes equality. In this way both addressees will be open to change and so have the confidence to change their minds based on their dialogue. The exploratory nature of the talk is acknowledged because it is assumed that the addressees, in orientating themselves to the dialogue, are exploring difference rather than attempting to come to a consensus. If agreement is reached, it is through one of the addressees being persuaded whilst reflecting on the dialogue itself, rather than being coerced by the other person into agreeing. This means that dialogic interaction has the capacity to be both reflective and active.
It could be argued, therefore, that in Case Study 1 the intervention did instantiate dialogic interaction. The intervention had been designed to help AS students write causation essays. Instead of using Chapman’s (2006a) critical thinking model of argumentation in History causation essays, the students were to develop their arguing skills through engaging in the process of argument. One of the four groups was able to engage in an interaction that at times became dialogic. What is interesting is that both aspects of dialogic interaction were achieved. In other words, there was a very active dynamic interaction that resulted in one student making a quite obvious leap in thinking and, consequently, another student, who had played the role of passive yet intent observer, was also able to make a leap in thinking. The second student acknowledged that she had changed her thinking by reflecting on the argument she had observed.

Case Study 2 also involved causation essay writing but, instead of simply meeting the needs of Year 12 AS students, the aim was to use the intervention to help Year 13 A2 History students, who must write a more sophisticated form of written argument. The intention was to see if the intervention could be used as a generic model of argumentation to meet the differing demands of A level History students. Unfortunately, despite there being three cameras in the room during Case Study 2, not all the interactions were recorded. Of the five groups involved in the preparation for an A2 causation essay, only one experienced an interaction that was at times intensely heated and noisy. However, this was not similar to the dialogic interaction observed in Case Study 1. This argument was more disputational and there was no apparent leap in the students’ thinking. Another of the five groups did not engage at all in the activities, and a third only engaged for a brief while. The other two groups, however, did take part in what appeared to be an intent and open argument. The argumentation, however, did not appear to be the same as that in Case Study 1. It was not as intense; but nevertheless the arguing was free-ranging and exploratory in nature. There was a form of consensus, almost a co-construction of learning, in one group, although it was not total. Although differences were being explored, there was an implicit understanding that they would not agree totally – which is what differentiates Wegerif and Mercer’s (1997) and definition of exploratory
talk from dialogic talk. There were elements of reflection, too, that incorporated both the process of the argument, which suggests meta-strategic thinking, as well as an appreciation of content of the argument. These two factors appeared to be important for the students engaged in the process.

In Case Study 3 the students were all hard working and committed; they were all fully engaged in the learning process. The intervention was used to determine whether it could still instantiate dialogic interaction when AS students engaged in documentary source analysis. The argumentational interactions in most of the groups, however, were short and limited. Only one group managed prolonged and sustained argumentation. The brevity of the exchanges was due in part to the timing of the interaction – the students took a long time to prepare their cases, and even then some felt underprepared to engage in an argument. However, one exchange could be considered dialogic and one person in another group could have happily engaged in an exploratory dialogic exchange if the other members of her group had been in a position to challenge her.

What becomes clear is that dialogic interaction can be instantiated by the classroom intervention, but not for everyone; this needed further investigation.

11.3.2 Did the written argument improve? The workshop intervention incorporated explicit instruction in argumentation as well as argumentative interaction and both aspects of the intervention had been successfully used elsewhere (Andrews et al., 2006, 2009; Felton & Herko, 2004; Kuhn & Udell, 2003, 2007). It is therefore not surprising that the three teachers who trialled the parts of it that they felt they could use most effectively in their classroom practice could see an improvement in the essays. Although each teacher was clear that their students’ essays had improved, they were not specific on how they had improved. They did say that the improvement was across the ability range, which is interesting and useful to hear because the research of Schwarz and Linchevski (2007) and Fawcett and Garton (2005) suggests that, of the students working collaboratively in dyads, only the one deemed less able improves while the most able only improves if (s)he is asked to explain his or her reasoning for his or her decisions. However, the students
in the trials and case studies are A level students and so considered ‘able’ students, so ‘across the ability range’ might be very narrow.

The designed intervention incorporated important aspects of Wegerif’s research on dialogic talk. Wegerif and Mercer’s (1997) types of talk thesis had demonstrated that those pupils who engaged in exploratory talk made cognitive gains when tested individually and collaboratively. This is an important finding because I was attempting to find a model of argumentation that I could suggest aided cognitive development to support the thesis of learning to argue and arguing to learn (e.g., Schwarz, 2009; Kuhn, 2009) I have not, however, used Ravenscroft’s measuring device, but instead thought to use the A level essay. History examiners after all use History essays as indicators of cognitive attainment.

However, there are issues with using History essays as indicators of change because History mark schemes are not just about the ability to write effective arguments – they also measure History knowledge. Key to success at A level is the ability to ‘operationalise’ historical knowledge by applying it within an argument which is designed to demonstrate skills in historical thinking. History examiners are also encouraged to mark holistically, placing responses on levels of attainment and awarding marks within a band level. Working as a teacher and as an examiner, I was aware that there could be discrepancies in the way that students’ work was marked. Bearing this in mind, it still seemed an expedient device, particularly when I also included a second means of assessment (adapted TAP), and even a third – Oostdam’s (2004) argumentative features of measuring the argument in the essay – to triangulate and reinforce the adapted TAP levels.

In Case Study 1, the pre- and post-intervention essays demonstrated a change in tone rather than specific improvements when marked against an A level mark scheme; though some students did improve their grades others did not. However, when the pre- and post-intervention essays were marked against a mark scheme specifically geared to measuring argumentation, it became clear that every student’s written argumentation had improved. It was not a blanket improvement; there was a range of changes: some students’ written argument only improved by one level while
others improved by two according to an adapted TAP mark scheme. The following table 11.1 shows this clearly.

Table 11.2. School GV: Pre- and post-intervention essay marks – Case Study 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>GCSE grade</th>
<th>Teacher grade pre-intervention in levels</th>
<th>My grade pre-int. levels</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>TAP level pre-int.</th>
<th>TAP level post-int.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winona</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilian</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This pattern of essay improvement seemed to be replicated in Case Study 2, if we ignore the two essays produced by students who had not engaged in the intervention as can be seen in the following table 11.2.
Table 11.3. School HM: Pre- and post-intervention essay marks – Case Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>AS exam grade</th>
<th>AS points and level</th>
<th>TAP level</th>
<th>A2 points and level*</th>
<th>A2 points and level</th>
<th>TAP level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pre-int.</td>
<td></td>
<td>post-int.</td>
<td>post-int.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>L4 26</td>
<td>L3 20</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>L3 13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L4 32</td>
<td>L3 20</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L3 25</td>
<td>L3 24</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daphne</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosie</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L4 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L3 25</td>
<td>L3 23</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2 15</td>
<td>L3 24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>L3 16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L3 24</td>
<td>L4 26</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terence</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L4 30</td>
<td>L3 25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>L3 13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L4 30</td>
<td>L3 16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L4 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L3 20</td>
<td>L3 20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus</td>
<td></td>
<td>L2 15</td>
<td>L3 16</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L5 42</td>
<td>L5 41</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L4 26</td>
<td>L4 35</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>L4 20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>L4 30</td>
<td>L4 36</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>L2 12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L4 26</td>
<td>L3 20</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>L3 12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L4 26</td>
<td>L3 17</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ned</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>L4 21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>L4 34</td>
<td>L4 30</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **Year 13 essays** *Harmonised teacher marks. All the names have been changed and bear no relation to their real names or initials.

Case Study 3, however, did not generate the same level of success. It was as if the documentary source material actually prevented improvement in argument practice as table 11.3. shows.
Table 11.4. School ES: Pre- and post-intervention essay marks – Case Study 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>GCSE exam grade</th>
<th>AS points and level pre-intervention</th>
<th>TAP level</th>
<th>AS points and level post-intervention</th>
<th>TAP level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rowena</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L3 18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L2 20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alisdair</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfie</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L4 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L3 19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen ¹</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L2 12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L3 26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgar</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>L2 12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L3 23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>No GCSE</td>
<td>L4 21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L3 17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>L4 21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L4 35</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L3 13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L3 22</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>Moved into area</td>
<td>L3 16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L3 25</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>L4 20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>L4 30</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L3 13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L3 28</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace ²</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L2 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin ³</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2 14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen ⁴</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L3 16</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan ⁵</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>L2 12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L3 24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the whole, the essays did improve across the three case studies, but there are several explanations that could account for the students’ improvement and which may have nothing to do with the intervention. Coffin (2006a&b) conducted a study into History argumentation suggesting that argumentation improves as students naturally develop, so the improved essay marks that appeared to be a result of the intervention could simply be the result of the students’ natural progression. Kuhn would argue that students – particularly sixth form students – need to be taught to argue, so the developmental explanation, interesting as it is, may not be the reason for the students’ improvement.

Brown (1992) mentions the Hawthorn effect, which offers of course the explanation that simply focusing on an element that appears to need improving will
bring about some improvement, thus meaning any improvement may bear no relation to the intervention whatsoever.

Further examination of the data may offer situations in which the intervention could be considered a success. If one includes the analysis of the argumentative interactions, it becomes clear that the students who seemed to improve the most in terms of argumentation were those involved in the interactions which demonstrated more student engagement. These interactions were considered successful if the arguments engendered were more than four ‘turns’ long and led to an exploration of both sides of the argument. In some cases the engagement was highly charged, as in Case Study 1 and Group 5 in Case Study 2, whilst in others, Group 2 and Group 4 in Case Study 2, the exchanges were very sensitively conducted.

11.3.3 What is the role of dialogic interaction? The focus has been explicitly on generating the right kind of interaction to ensure the students get the opportunity to explore different points of view. This exploration is ostensibly to allow them to consolidate and to develop their learning in collaboration with others – particularly those who express a difference of opinion – based on the notion of socio-cognitive conflict which both Vygotsky and Piaget espouse but in different ways. Wegerif would argue, however, that this form of conflictual difference, and the learning that comes from it, is actually beyond Vygotsky and is Bakhtinian, leading to an exchange of ‘voices’ that can be physical but also ‘cultural’ and a dialogue that has both an ‘inside and an outside’ and creates an ‘unbounded’ dialogic space for learning (Wegerif, 43/44, 2013b). The physical manifestation of this dialogic interaction is ostensibly an openness to change and a willingness to explore different interpretations within an equal and democratic, multifaceted yet universal environment and within a relationship based in trust which allows the other to explore without becoming vulnerable or exploited. This is a complex interaction, but achievable, and facets of it have been demonstrated in the classrooms for moments at a time within a persuasive argumentational dialogue.

The problem with this interaction is that it is all-encompassing – the dialogue is what matters. Note taking is not an option, which is why the students were asked to
make essay plans after the interaction and certainly not during it, and will offer a partial explanation for why students unused to handling documentary evidence would find it difficult to engage in such an interaction. So the plans are an integral but secondary part of the process and it is important to discover whether the plans generated by the students show the influence of the interaction in which they were engaged and whether this was taken into the essays or not.

11.3.3.1 Spoken interaction – dynamic active. In Case Study 1 it became clear that the emergence of a ‘voice’ is an important element in the argumentation process and it is this ‘voice’ that is taken into the essays – the more persuasive the voice, the more clearly it dictates the construction of a reasoned argument. Andrea’s voice was most persuasive, not because it was loudest (it was not), it was the voice that offered a logical explanation to the discussion on Louis XIV and whether $l\g l\o i r e$ was important or not as a motivation for his rule. Her voice also offered a more sophisticated level of reasoning because it suggested that $l\g l\o i r e$ was an underlying factor and linked to the other factors that motivated Louis. It was the development of a more conceptually challenging appreciation of Louis that actually made Andrea’s voice heard above the diatribe of ‘winning and losing’.

In Case Study 2, when the focus was placed on difference as a consequence of Case Study 1, the results are different. There is evidence of a form of interaction which is dialogic in nature as it is open and exploratory. But it is not argumentation, rather co-construction, which suggests that this is a form that might not lead to conceptual change but, as one member of Case Study 2 suggested, a consolidation of knowledge. The following table shows the links between length of argument, potential dialogic interaction and improvement in written argument.
Table 11.5. Links between argument length, dialogic interaction and improvement in essays by TAP Case Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Length of argument</th>
<th>Dialogic Y/N</th>
<th>Essay grades</th>
<th>Change from pre- to post-intervention by TAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ned**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7 mins</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>+1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alex**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Same level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cherry*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>+1 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terence*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>No pre-essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6 + 6 mins</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>+11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edmund</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>+11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No essay</td>
<td>No essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daphne</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>No pre-essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lois**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non relevant</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Same Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beatrice**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No essay</td>
<td>No essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>+11/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trevor*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>No pre-essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rosie</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16 mins</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>+1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>3 – 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No pre essay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>+1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>No pre-essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marcus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>No pre-essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>No pre-essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L5</td>
<td>No pre-essay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robert* and Trevor* argued with Cherry* and Terence* when Alex** and Ned** moved to argue with Lois **and Beatrice** – Alex and Ned had previously prepared their arguments with Lois and Beatrice – not an ideal move guaranteed to promote argumentation.

In Case Study 2 the interaction between Daphne, Alison, Edmund, and Connor appeared to be most dialogic but unfortunately only three of them offered essay plans and only two offered pre- and post-intervention essays. It is impossible to determine whose voice was predominant, but this was a mature and sophisticated interaction and the exchanges between Delia and Alison were particularly pertinent, appearing to be ‘drawing forth the reasoning and thinking’ from the other person as they constructed their argument.

In Case Study 3 there were few interactions that could be considered dialogic. The exchanges between Teresa and Jonathan are the most dialogic and far ranging but, again, only one of the two offered pre- and post-intervention essays. The
Chapter 11 – Discussion

following table shows the links between potential dialogic interaction and improvements in written argument.

Table 11.6. Links between argument length dialogic interaction and improvement in essays by TAP Case study 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Length of argument</th>
<th>Dialogic Y/N</th>
<th>Essay grades</th>
<th>Change from pre- to post-intervention by TAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5 + 3.5 mins</td>
<td>Exploratory/Dialogic</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>+1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rowena</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Same level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No essay</td>
<td>No essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7 + 7 + 3 mins</td>
<td>Exploratory/Dialogic</td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>+1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>No pre-essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alisdair</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>No pre- essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Edgar</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Non relevant</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>No pre essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>-1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>No pre- essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 + 4 + 6 mins</td>
<td>Exploratory/Dialogic</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>+1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alfie</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>+11/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.3.3.2 Written interaction – planning. Reflection – the internalisation of the external voices – is important in dialogic interaction, and has been an implicit part of the exploration of case studies 2 and 3. What role does reflection play in the process between spoken and written argumentation? It was Andrea’s ‘voice’ in Case Study 1 that was heard loud and clear and four essays reflected that voice to varying degrees of success, but it was Delia, the silent observer who admitted that through her observation of Andrea’s argument with Olivia in particular, she was able to appreciate the situation further. Delia was the only one in the class to admit to changing her mind. Andrea’s improvement in written argumentation was the greatest in the class whereas the best essay, demonstrating cool, well-reasoned, and the most sophisticated level of argumentation was Delia’s. In Case Study 2, the exchange between Daphne and Alison was witnessed by Edmund, who made the most improvement in his written argumentation. Unfortunately, this pattern cannot be followed in Case Study 3 because the other members of the group, which
contained Jonathan and Teresa, were either in a music lesson or were ill, so we cannot say what might have happened to the observers of their interaction.

The plans themselves are also important. In Case Study 1, Andrea’s voice is reflected in the plans of each group member. Case Study 2 used blogging, which meant that there was time between the interaction and the blogging that might allow for a level of introspection and reflection, particularly when there was a two-week period between the spoken and written argumentation. It must be remembered, however, that the students were offered the opportunity to plan in class directly after the intervention as well. Alison was the first person to write a plan; Edmund and Connor wrote plans later, which were more sophisticated than Alison’s. It is impossible to know whether they read her plan and developed it or whether they wrote their own plans independently. What is certain is that Connor wrote his plan after Edmund posted his, and blogged particularly astute and thoughtful comments on Edmund’s plan. This may have been why Edmund’s essay was so improved; it is difficult to determine.

During Case Study 3, however, the students had just one day between the interaction and the essay writing. The written essay planning and Post-it comments came immediately after the interaction. There were no clear ‘voices’ heard and as Jonathan did not write a plan, we cannot know how he was influenced. Teresa wrote the best essay of the class.

By studying the essays in the groups, looking at the plans, blogged or otherwise, listening to the audiotapes and reading the transcripts of the interactions, it can be seen that there is a relationship between what was said in the interactions and what was written. If the essays are marked in the argumentative clusters of four, the level of engagement becomes clear. Those groups in which there was a real exchange of ideas and opinions demonstrate clear and sustained responses, whereas those that did not engage in such an interaction do not demonstrate a clear voice at all and the quality of the responses and argumentation is reflected. The students who seemed to improve the most were those who were not the most able but were the most engaged and the most willing to put forward a point of view. The more dialogic the
interaction, the better the written response. However, this is only a limited study so this finding needs to be tested further.

Emerging from the research process associated with the instantiation of dialogic interaction came two questions.

11.4 Emergent Questions

11.4.1 How did difference of opinion impact on the argumentation?
Research by Felton and Herko (2004) and Kuhn and Udell (2003) had suggested that students who had held opinions which were the most extreme on the continuum would engage in argumentation that was more intense than students who were closer on the continuum. It must, however, be remembered that the Felton and Herko (2004) model had been designed for students engaged in a US Humanities course and the topics of argument were deeply contentious, for example dealing with issues such as abortion, or the death penalty. These issues were heavily value-laden and it is perhaps not surprising that the most intense arguments would be between students who were diametrically opposed to each other on such issues.

Initially, the research presented by Felton and Herko (2004) and Kuhn and Udell (2003, 2007) seemed to be reflected in my own research. Those students who were most actively engaged in the arguing process were in the groups that contained the biggest difference of opinion. In two of the three case studies, the students who were most opposed did engage in more heated debates. But that did not mean that the noisiest students engaged in dialogic interaction – this was not a finding that was replicated. Dialogic interaction was instantiated in Case Study 1, but not in Case Study 2. In Case Study 1 there was an apparent leap in thinking, whereas the noisiest group in Case Study 2 seemed to become more and more entrenched in their thinking rather than examining an alternative point of view. Case Study 3 did not generate noisy or heated debate, but it was still able to create the potential for dialogic interaction. In most of the groups within the research study the difference in opinion or stance on the continuum was only slight and yet the arguing did go on for some time. In their post-intervention interviews, the students all expressed the desire to argue against someone who had a more pronounced difference of opinion,
but having said that, the Year 13 students who were very close together on the continuum stated that they found more and more reasons to be different as the argument went on, which they may not have appreciated in quite the way I did. I think, too, that the fact that they often found that they were closely placed, but for different reasons, was an important lesson in History, because often Historians will reach the same conclusion about events for entirely different reasons.

What seems to be most important in these interactions is the implicit expectation of exploration. In Case Study 2 in particular, two of the groups were engaged in an interaction that appeared to be more a collaborative form of argument – their differences were slight but they were able to gain a great deal from the interaction. During the post-intervention interview, their teacher had remarked on how well he thought Group 2 had discussed the issues. The fact that they were discussing rather than arguing could be because they were not familiar with the material or with one another: the group was newly formed and it was early in the autumn term. But the two girls engaged in the interaction Group 2 in Case Study 2 were certainly absorbed.

It has also been suggested that arguing in fours (Felton & Herko, 2004) is more appropriate, particularly in the reciprocal reflection activity - where a member of each dyad was supposed to be reflecting on the argument being conducted by the other member of the dyad - but each case study had a group of three students and the argumentation conducted in the trio is worth considering. One of each trio seemed to benefit in particular from the arrangement. Winona in Case Study 1, Sophie in Case Study 2 and probably Frank in Case Study 3 were the members of the trios that seemed to gain most from the arguing. Equally it has to be said that those who were ostensibly the better arguers in their trio were able to help the learning of the other two. Rosie helped both Yvonne and Sophie in Case Study 2, whereas it was difficult to be really clear who benefited in Megan, Alfie, and Frank’s arrangement in Case Study 3, although Megan was disappointed not to be able to argue for longer. Certainly Winona was more than a match for the boys she argued with during Case Study 1.
11.4.2 **What form of argument?** Dialogic interaction had not been instantiated for all of the students and I was concerned – particularly as I felt that it was an important element in arguing to learn. I had thought that engendering persuasive argumentation would be a logical precursor to the instantiation of dialogic interaction. Kuhn, Shaw, and Felton (1997), Anderson et al. (2001), and Reznitskaya et al. (2001, 2007, 2009b) based their work on Billig’s interpretation of persuasive argumentation based in the two-sided notion of arguing as thinking. I had thought that, as History knowledge is provisional and uncertain and based in the argument of historians, persuasive argument was what should be practiced in the classroom. The idea was that the students would be able to engage in a form of arguing that would ‘accept a persuasive voice that would stimulate their own words’ (de Laat & Wegerif, 2006)

I discovered that dialogic interaction was difficult to achieve within this format for two reasons. The first is that most of the students within the study, certainly in the first case study, were engaged in a form of argumentation that was anything but persuasive. They were caught up in the discourse of winning and losing. Even the group, Group 4 in Case Study 1, that was able to engage in dialogic interaction, which appeared to lead to conceptual change and cognitive development if measured by improvements in essay grades in terms of argumentation, became caught up in the discourse of ‘winning and losing’. In Case Study 2 Group 5 engaged in more than a winning and losing discourse, this was almost all-out war in spite of brokered ground rules. Although it was never reduced to personal attack, it was obvious that neither side was prepared to explore their differences.

When asked about this, one student said that instead of making them change their minds, arguing actually strengthened their own preconceptions. There was an unwillingness to admit to changing one’s mind because of the fear of (being perceived to be) losing. This loss of face and reluctance to change is the antithesis of a dialogic engagement where the ideas generated become more important than anything within that particular moment in time. This refusal to recognise the other side also reflects the work of Furlong (1993), who suggested that students tended to
write only one-sided argument because it was considered a sign of weakness to recognise an alternative point of view.

What became clearer over the three case studies was the realisation that students whose argument was rich in counterargument which both counter-critiqued (Goldstein, Crowell, and Kuhn, 2009) as well as counter-argued rather than simply counterclaimed, were the students more likely to engage in dialogic interaction. It is the very act of responding to the other’s point of view, the argument itself, which draws the two respondents into arguing to learn and into dialogic interaction. It is the richness of the argument rather than the type of argument that seems to make the difference.

The other reason that dialogic interaction proved difficult to achieve is to do with the nature of the intervention itself: I had thought that the argumentation would be the vehicle for dialogic instantiation, but insisting that they stick to a format of one arguer against the other to ensure that one member of the dyad was reflecting on the argument itself – to promote an aspect of meta-strategic thinking – actually seemed to stop the flow of the argument. I did notice that when I deliberately refrained from insisting on keeping to the format of dyads arguing whilst their partners monitored and reflected on the process, argument ‘broke out’ naturally and in that environment things started to happen. It could be argued that the looseness of the structure provided ‘dialogic spells’. However, in the natural breaking out of argument, some students ceased to reflect on the argument. This needed to be addressed.

Students who were reluctant to engage for whatever reason – whether they were too nervous because they lacked confidence even in a small group situation, or those who felt disinclined because they were engaged in the ‘winning and losing’ style discourse – made the least improvement in terms of argumentation. Engagement was key, and those who were most open to change appeared to improve the most. It is also important to appreciate that the students who were most able were sometimes inclined to close an argument down, or prevent an argument occurring, simply because the other students felt that they were unlikely ‘to win’ against them and so offered no response, greatly limiting the interaction. The
winning and losing discourse seemed to be a default mechanism no matter how often it was emphasised that the students should be trying to persuade others of their arguments. Some of the more able students – as determined by exam grades – were able to engage in argumentation that developed the learning, not only for themselves, but for the other students within their group.

In hindsight, it was perhaps unrealistic to assume that sixth formers would be able to change the mode of their argumentation from their cultural ‘winning and losing’ mode to a more persuasive and willing-to-change mode without offering several steps first. Time was an issue within this study, but in the future I would suggest working on persuasive argumentation lower down in the school so that when it comes to sixth form learning they are aware and are easily able to transfer from debate mode to persuasive argumentation mode.

It is, however, becoming clearer that arguments are never wholly one thing, but rather seem to move through phrases and sometimes the most unlikely of interactions produces a pure Bahktinian moment. Nystand talks about dialogic spells being very rare, and it seems to hold true when even an intervention that is designed to inculcate a higher rate of these occurrences cannot make them appear more readily either.

11.5 Summary of Findings

Dialogic interaction was instantiated in all of the case studies, but not for every group, and this needs to be addressed. The extremes of difference of opinion may have created the opportunity to explore difference, although what I discovered was that the groups in case studies 2 and 3 were very close in opinion but still able to generate extensive discussion – it is more to do with the willingness to explore ideas with, rather than beat, an opponent.

Planning was an important aspect of the process, but was perhaps not emphasised enough, and the comments made on the essay plans were also not as
astute as they could have been. If this became a common practice in the learning environment, however, I suspect it would improve further.

What did come to light in relation to planning was the fact that PEEL – or whatever the structure the school advocated for organising the students’ work – was highly prevalent, which is why I did not offer comments on the structure of the students’ work, but rather on the argument and how it was developed. A key aspect of the exploratory study had been that the students knew how to write essays, they just did not know what to write in them because they had not had a chance to think and talk it through.

It was difficult – and this did impact on the study – to get evidence of the students’ work. Essays were used, but what becomes clear is that very few essays were written and it was unusual to find a school that had managed to get its students to write two essays so early in Year 12. It also became clear that students do not keep copies of their work and that there was a certain haphazardness to the way that essays were produced. The Year 13 essay gathering was particularly difficult. Very few students seemed to have any essays at all that they could submit to be assessed for a pre-intervention assessment. I had thought of using other forms of measuring argumentation – Kuhn and Udell used argumentative paragraphs and how they may be more appropriately arranged – but I personally thought that the only way I could judge improvement of argument in essays was to do so through essays. If I had known the students for longer and had been able to work exclusively with one set of students, I would have waited for a whole term of essays before doing the intervention so that I could determine what the usual form of essay was for the students and what was not. I would also have checked essays from the students later on in the year to see whether any improvement was actually sustained and not just a temporary advance.
11.6 Summary of Chapter 11

This chapter discussed the development of the intervention and returned to the original research questions to discuss the overall findings of the research process. It also discussed the themes that emerged through the investigation. It can be seen that claims can be made that dialogic interaction was instantiated through the ‘argumentative’ exchanges, but only in some cases. Links have been found between what was spoken and what was written, but these claims could not be substantiated in further case studies for a variety of reasons – one was associated with the mechanics of the procedure itself, another is the complexities of historical source analysis.
Chapter 12 – Conclusion

12.1 Introduction

This is the final chapter of the thesis and will complete the review of the research study that was started in Chapter 11. Chapter 11 was a cross-case analysis of the three case studies as well as the analysis of the changes made to the intervention in response to the developments of the design frameworks. This chapter highlights the main findings whilst acknowledging the limitations of this DBR and case study research process. The contributions to knowledge will also be discussed. The chapter concludes with a discussion of Design Framework 5, which is derived from the findings of case studies 2 and 3, the associated research questions, derived from the research process, and with suggested adaptations to develop the intervention into a more effective research instrument for the future.

The chapter is in four sections: the first discusses the main findings, the second discusses the study’s limitations, the third recognises its contributions to knowledge, and the final section puts forward future research proposals.

12.2 Summary of Findings

12.2.1 Revisiting the aims of the research. The aim of this research study was to investigate the links between dialogic interaction and written argument. I had been aware that History A level students often write essays that look like arguments,
but in fact are not. The essays have paragraphs that make points supported with evidence and yet they lack coherence and seem half-formed, as if a stage has been missed out. This observation had been confirmed in my discussions with A level examiners during the first – consultative – stage of my exploratory study. Teacher and student interviews conducted in the second stage of my exploratory study had described the problems students faced in attempting to write effective argument in A level History essays.

12.2.2 Recalling the research questions. My initial conjecture derived from my teaching practice, reinforced by an extensive literature review and subsequently confirmed by the exploratory study is that:

The essays of A level History students will improve if they are encouraged to engage in dialogic interaction before they write their essays. This, I suggest, is because when engaged in dialogic interaction the students will be arguing to learn, which could bring about cognitive development

This was broken down into three related research questions. First, is there a connection between dialogic interaction and written argument? Second, do the essays of students who engage in dialogic interaction improve more than those who do not? And third, could I create an educational classroom intervention that would allow me to investigate the connections between dialogic interaction and written argument?

12.2.3 Is there a connection between dialogic interaction and written argument? In Case Study 1 four groups engaged in argumentational exchanges prior to planning and writing their essays. One of the groups appeared to engage in an interaction that was at times dialogic. After the video and transcript of the interactions were reviewed, and the plans and the essays were compared, it became clear that there were indeed links between what was said and what was written (described in Chapter 8). One of the students made a breakthrough in her thinking through the interaction, a conceptual leap by which she realised that several of the aims for Louis XIV’s foreign policy had an underlying and similar motivation. And this realization was taken into the argument and claimed by all four students in her
group, but it is clear that the idea originated with just one student. The essays of this group all focused on the learning point to varying degrees of success; the student who made the conceptual leap showed the most improvement in her essay. Case Study 1 offered this clear indication that there were links between dialogic interaction and written argument.

The parallel case studies 2 and 3, which were based on Design Framework 4, involved groups engaging in argumentation that at times could be considered dialogic, but the links between what was said and what was written could not be established because key members of the group either did not or could not provide pre- and post-intervention essays. In Case Study 2, where the essay plans were blogged a few days later, it was difficult to prove links because the plans were not presented in their arguing groups, but rather individually, and this seemed to break the connections. In Case Study 3 the students found the use of documentary source material difficult to integrate into their essays and arguments, so there is little to indicate the connections between dialogic interaction and written argument there.

12.2.4 Whose essays improved the most? My research demonstrated [see Chapter 8] that when dialogic interaction was instantiated, the students who engaged in it were able to make clear improvements in their written essays when measured for argumentation. This is an important finding. A tool created to measure argument through the measuring and appropriation of argumentative clusters, based in the research of Oostdam (2004), was able to verify the Adapted TAP tool which had been created from Toulmin’s Argument Pattern (Erduran, Simon, and Osborne, 2004) and the methods of Kuhn and Udell (2003, 2007) and Goldstein et al. (2009) to measure argument rich in counter argument. What is particularly relevant here is that all the essays produced in Case Study 1 (reported in Chapter 8) showed more of these argumentative indicators after the classroom intervention, though explicit instruction in the writing of argument had not been an element of the classroom intervention. This suggests that the argumentational interactions were a method of ‘operationalising’ the implicit instruction in argument – PEEL – with which the students had been familiar before participating in the intervention. It is also clear that the students whose essays showed the most and clear improvements in argument –
improving by at least two levels – were the students who engaged in an interaction that was mostly dialogic (Group 4 – Case study 1 – Delia, Olivia, Xanthe, and Andrea).

Another discovery demonstrated that students who were part of a group engaged in dialogic interaction, but not necessarily directly involved in that interaction, made gains too. That is, students also benefited from being a party to the interaction, observing, and reflecting on the process on a meta-level (Kuhn, 2009). This suggests that anyone watching a debate could be similarly drawn in, but there is something about the immediacy of the interaction in a group of four rather than a whole classroom that draws the observers into the argument: they are outside and yet inside of the interaction – the outside-inness and the inside-outness of dialogic space (Wegerif, 2013a&b). The words and the action are around them, they are part of it but slightly detached (e.g., Delia in Case Study 1, and Edmund in Case Study 2).

Unfortunately, not every student could engage in this process. There are several reasons why. Initially it was felt that students who did not differ a great deal in their opinions would be unable to argue and develop their understanding further – this was the finding of the first case study, but did not hold true in case studies 2 or 3 (reported in Chapters 9 and 10, respectively). In fact, when the students were most – even diametrically – opposed, the argumentation was most intense, but it appeared that positions were being entrenched rather than differences being explored (e.g., Group 5 in Case Study 2, reported in Chapter 9.)

A ‘winning and losing’ discourse prevented several students engaging in an exploratory form of argumentation (e.g., Case Study 2, Group 5). Some of the students were able to concentrate on persuading and exploring points when reminded, but the ground rules based in equality and respect that they had agreed were often ignored. This suggests that ground rules need to be embedded in the students’ relationships with their peers and in their attitude to learning.

Willingness to engage with the argument and with each other, however, seemed to be the most important factor in determining whether students managed to achieve
an interaction that was mostly dialogic (Group 4, Case Study 1; Group 2, Case Study 2; Group 1, Case Study 3).

12.3 Limitations to the Study

This research study was set up to explore and attempt to resolve what appeared to be a common problem – the lack of argument in A level History essays. It can be considered a complex study where the initial research question – ‘Does engaging students in dialogic interaction improve their written argument?’ – generated new questions as the research continued. Yin (2009) warns that this ‘slippage’ away from the original research question can detract from the overall research design, particularly in case study research. This flexibility can, however, be regarded as the natural development and a strength of a study which is based in DBR methodology (Wang & Hannafin, 2005). Yin (2009) also talks about multiple case studies where the core of the research design is tested in a variety of ways over a series of related case studies. He suggests that the weakness of such a study is that the ‘embedded’ element, which is tested through the different case studies, is often ignored. He asserts that the strengths and weaknesses of the artefact must also be considered. This study, however, is not a multiple case study by Yin (2009) standards. This study involved a single case study, Case Study 1, which was executed as an entity in its own right though within the iterative process of DBR. It was not just a ‘bounded system’ to be examined; it was the third iteration of the research study and had been organised and designed to specifically implement and test Design Framework 3. Although it has been analysed as an independent case study, the findings of Case Study 1 were used to develop Design Framework 4. Case studies 2 and 3 are not comparative case studies – they are parallel case studies and are designed to implement and test Design Framework 4 in different ways. They can be considered independent of each other because they focused on different aspects of History learning. The classroom intervention – the ‘artefact’ of the DBR methodology or the ‘embedded’ feature of the three cases studies – was also adapted after Case Study 1 and would be adapted again in response to the findings of case studies 2 and 3.
Nevertheless, Yin (2009) makes a valid point and this thesis would be incomplete without an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the designed artefact – the intervention – even though it must be recognised that the intervention was also developed and adapted iteratively as the research process continued.

12.3.1 **The intervention.** Chapter 11 has a detailed description of the different stages of the intervention and how it was developed in line with the development of the Design Frameworks. The seven stages of the classroom intervention are shown below. The red marking on the diagram represents the focus of case studies 2 and 3, emphasising the stages that have been adapted to explore the different needs of students involved in A2 History argumentation and AS students using source analysis. Focusing on persuasion in the argument instruction and during the interactive stage was meant to prevent the winning and losing discourse that had been a product of Case Study 1. Focusing on the planning stage was also a feature of Case Study 2 because in Case Study 2 they were going to use blogging as an opportunity to reflect on their essay plans and the plans of their fellow students.
The intervention was originally derived from the literature review but was then adapted through interviews and discussions with A level teachers and students to ensure that it met the needs of the A level students of the study. The intervention incorporated successful aspects from other interventions – argument instruction had been an important element in most of the educational interventions reviewed in the literature. What was different about this intervention was that at the core of the intervention was an activity – arguing and reflecting in fours – which had been used successfully by US researchers (Felton & Herko, 2004, Goldstein, Crowell, & Kuhn, 2009; Kuhn & Udell, 2003, 2007). Each time it was adapted, in this study, it still

---

**Figure 12.1.** The seven stages of the intervention showing the particular focus for the next investigation – counter argument in Design Framework 5
proved to be a successful classroom intervention for the promotion of skills in argumentation.

An obvious criticism of the classroom intervention is that it takes longer than a normal 50-minute lesson. This means that it would be challenging for teachers to integrate it into their lessons, particularly if their pedagogy is based in the transmission model. However, this intervention is firmly based in a ‘dialogic’ stance. Throughout its course, from democratically establishing the ground rules to promote dialogic engagement, to the final reflections on the students’ essay plans, the intervention promotes student-centred learning. The only part where the teacher is predominant is in the second stage, which features a brief PowerPoint presentation to establish how persuasive and History argument are connected. For those teachers unused to teaching in such a student-centred way this can be challenging. Managing the class whilst the intervention is in its collaborative and argumentational phases takes dexterity and astute understanding of the processes involved. It is suggested that the intervention be incorporated into lessons when the teacher has developed a good working relationship with his/her students.

It could be argued that the instruction in argument is unnecessary, but Mitchell and Andrews, (2001) among others, have established that students need to be made aware of the nature of academic argument. This also echoes the findings of Schommer-Aikins and Easter (2009), which clearly demonstrate that students’ perceptions of arguments as being violent altercations prevent some students from engaging in an important aspect of their learning – arguing to learn. Student questionnaire responses, student interviews, (Chapter 8) and feedback (Chapter 4) highlighted how students had been unaware of the different forms of argument and had felt clearer about what was expected in an academic argument after this instruction. It was also considered important to avoid giving instruction in how to structure the written argument. This was because the participants were sixth formers who were very familiar with PEEL and used it almost as a mantra to support the structure of their written responses. It was also important to focus on the process of arguing rather than on the structure of an argument.
The original intention of encouraging the students to engage in opinion-based argumentation was to establish the necessity of using evidence to support their points of view. The activity did generate very active and noisy argumentation, which is why it was essential that the ground rules were established before beginning. Interestingly, Felton and Herko (2004), who designed the core of the intervention, had used it to create just such a noisy altercation – the emphasis in their study, and in Kuhn and Udell (2003, 2007), was on value laden and opinion-based argument. Their contention was that this intense form of argumentation was important in helping their students move from one-sided to two-sided argumentation.

Insisting that the students in my intervention used evidence to support their points of view, so that it was never a simple opinion-based argument, however, may well have generated an unexpected tension. The students in Case Study 1 (reported in Chapter 8) participated in the intervention process during the spring term when they were familiar with the topic area and their knowledge was in some cases extensive. Case studies 2 and 3 (reported in Chapter 9 and 10, respectively) were held early in the autumn term, and the students were new to the practice of AS and A2 History; this was particularly noticeable in Case Study 3 (Chapter 10). The information was not ‘embedded’ enough to be easily ‘operationalised’ in an argument.

This also made it harder for the students to make the initial judgements about what they thought. The participants in Case Study 2 were A2 candidates revising their knowledge of Stalin, so they should have been able to argue more easily. In some cases they did, but it was significant that the A2 class had only recently been formed and many of the students did not know each other at all. Perhaps this offers an explanation for the discussion of parties and off-task talk (Group 3, Case Study 2) rather than Stalin in some cases. What this emphasises is the need to establish ground rules – and ensure that they become implicit in all that the students do – not just in the argumentation.

The least successful aspect of the intervention was that concerning ‘reflection’. The questionnaires and post-intervention interviews in Chapter 8
showed how unimportant reflection seemed to be to most students. Some students found it difficult to make an initial judgement about the essay title itself. This may have been due to lack of knowledge, but other times it may have been the effect of the transmission model of teaching. Some students expect to be told what to think whilst others worry that what they think might somehow be wrong – this is not a new finding; History researchers have already written about this phenomenon. It could, however, be an aspect of absolutist reasoning (Kuhn, 2009) by which issues are perceived in terms of ‘right or wrong’ or ‘black and white’, not nuanced shades of grey, which is what is expected of students who are thinking evaluatively. The design of the intervention allowed for aspects of reflection – ostensibly on the process of the argument – and on the essays plans of their fellow students. In other words, they were being encouraged to engage in meta-strategic thinking – thinking about the learning they were doing as well as the subject matter itself. This proved challenging for most students and could be a failing of the design.

The blogging that was instigated in Case Study 2 was intended to replace and somehow extend the potential for learning as the Post-it activity had done in case studies 1 and 3. It may have done, but it was difficult to prove how instrumental either activity had been to the development of the learning. This needs further investigation.

12.3.2 Credibility. Silverman (2010) makes the point that qualitative research is often considered as research in which ‘anything goes’. However, this study attempted to be systematic in terms of its data gathering and rigorous in data analysis. As a pragmatic researcher, I have tried to keep as close as possible to the most ‘real’ data I can – which means that I have taken what History students, examiners, teachers, and education researchers have told me at ‘face value’. This is not to be disingenuous, because I am not ignoring the fact that they will have responded to my questions in a way that they may not have done had someone else asked them the same question. But a very important aspect of my DBR research is that it was conducted in a real world setting (Wang & Hannifin, 2005) and that I collaborated closely with my participants.
All the student and teacher interviews were recorded. Although I had many conversations with different teachers during the course of the research study that were not recorded, I tried to ensure that I noted the gist of what was said. Any analysis during the exploratory study, however, was based on the interview and video recordings alone. The analysis during the trials was performed on observations, which were filmed, and student feedback. The data gathering conducted during the case studies included: pre- and post-intervention essays, video recordings of the stages of the intervention, audio recordings of the argumentational exchanges, and post-intervention student interviews.

The transcripts were professionally carried out on the audio and video material following strict ethical guidelines, but were rechecked against the audio and video material by the researcher.

The essays were analysed for argumentation using tools derived from other researchers investigating argument – for example, Oostdam (2004) Simon (2008) Goldstein et al. (2009) - as well as AS and A2 mark schemes. Both teacher and researcher marked the pre- and post-intervention essays and where there was a marked discrepancy in marks discussions about the differences ensued. The analysis, however, was based on my marking, to create a sense of continuity and to ensure the same level of bias.

12.3.3 Generalisability. This study combines DBR and case study research and has used mixed methods to gather and analyse the data generated. It has not used statistical analysis, however, which suggests that any results gained from my research will lack generalisability. Flyvbjerg (2006) suggests though that to assume that case study research cannot contribute to scientific development simply because it cannot offer results that are generalisable is to misunderstand the purpose of case study research. It is an approach that aims to offer a ‘nuanced view of reality’ and, like DBR, its strengths lie in getting close to real life situations (Silverman, 2010). Wang and Hannifin (2005), on the other hand, suggest that in attempting to validate the‘generalisability of the design’, DBR researchers balance the design principle and theory development with local effectiveness. In my research I have highlighted how
the design frameworks are developed in line with the findings from each iteration. In
the first iteration the design framework - Design Framework 1 - was tested through
the exploratory study, which included fieldwork in four schools and interviews with
‘experts’. In the second iteration the Design Framework 2 developed from the
findings of Iteration 1 was tested, this time by classroom practitioners who used
aspects of a design artefact which was intended to be the vehicle for the
investigation. Design Framework 4 was developed through the findings of Case
Study 1 and Design Framework 5 will be developed from the findings of case studies
2 and 3. The theory has been put in harm’s way and tested in the crucible of real-life
expectations. In so many ways this process makes the findings more generalisable
rather than less.

12.3.4 Reliability. Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2007) suggest that the
quantitative research relies on its being replicable. An indicator for reliability is if the
same methods are used with the same sample the same results should occur no
matter who carries out the research. Qualitative research, which relies on its
‘uniqueness and idiosyncrasy of situation’, cannot replicate its studies, which
suggests that it has no claims to reliability. However, Cohen, Manion, and Morrison
(2007) submit that if elements of studies can be repeated and the research is
conducted in such a way that it could be replicable, then qualitative research can be
considered ‘reliable’. Barab and Squire (2004), on the other hand, suggest that DBR
research does not attempt to replicate its studies, but instead tries to ‘lay open … the
design and resultant implementation in a way that provides insight into local
dynamics’ (p. 8).

There are elements of my research that could be considered attempts to
promote replication. Although the parallel case studies - Case Studies 2 and 3 -
were not similar, the procedure followed was very similar, and the ultimate aim of
both was the implementation of Design Framework 4 to gain greater insight into the
underlying principles of the study – the connection between dialogic interaction and
written argumentation. Wang and Hannifin (2005) state categorically that a
researcher should not become involved in the research in such a way that they will
impact on the success of the effort. In case studies 1, 2, and 3 I delivered the
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This might seem to be flying in the face of Wang and Hannifin's (2005) strictures, but I was the one constant in the research process. Ultimately each situation was different, but at least I followed the same procedure each time and was present to observe the interactions of the students. The trials demonstrated how differently each teacher had interpreted the intervention, and I knew that if I was to create situations that might bear some comparison I should be the one to present the intervention.

12.4 Contributions to Knowledge

This was a complex study which crossed several disciplines; school History, History education, sixth form research, informal argumentation, dialogic education, DBR, and case study research. In showing how this study has made contributions to knowledge it is also important to set the study within its different contexts.

12.4.1 Arguing in History A level. History argument within school History has so far been considered within a critical thinking model, which relies heavily on Toulmin's (2003) practice of claim, warrant, rebuttal, and backing (Chapman, 2011a; Fordham 2007). These terms are difficult to apply and frequently interchangeable, as well as being open to interpretation. The present study offers an alternative view of History argument. It does not rely on a critical thinking model, but instead offers a more accessible model – a dialogic model.

The model is not intended to supplant the present models for learning History argument; it is simply offering an alternative, if not complementary, way of helping students learn to argue. The strength of this model is that it helps the students who do not know what to put in their essays by engaging them in the process of argument. A dialogic model wherein the dialogue is foregrounded and the quality of the interaction focused on exploring difference, and not attempting to reach a consensus, is a more elegant approach to take than asking students to label utterances in an attempt to teach them how to argue on paper. History argument is evidence-based and in preparing for ‘arguing sessions’, using this model for teaching
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History argument, students are encouraged to consider the evidence on many different levels. In this way, by encouraging them to engage in collaborative and argumentational exchanges about History evidence in response to History questions, the students will at least consolidate their learning, appreciate the differences between opinion and evidence (which student and teacher interviews in the exploratory study, Chapter 4, suggested was a major problem) and probably engage in conceptual change. It is a return to learning through doing, whilst emphasising the importance of dialogue.

A second aspect of this model for argumentation is the fact that it attempts to be a generic model for argumentation at A level. History education researchers have so far concentrated on an historical concept and taught argument in line with the learning of the concept – for example, Black (2012) on diversity, and Chapman (2011a&b) on interpretations. This model for argumentation developed through the findings of research conducted in five schools was designed to be generic so that it could meet the teachers’ and students’ needs because all five schools were following different History syllabuses. It is also possible that in focusing on the process of the arguing rather than tying argument to a conceptual area, this model might be useful within other A level disciplines, for example socio-scientific argumentation (Sadler, 2004; Simon, Erduran and Osborne, 2006).

12.4.2 Sixth form research. This study incorporated exploratory fieldwork conducted in four schools into what students find difficult in writing History argument. The study involved both teachers’ and students’ explanations for problems, ensuring a more complete picture of the research problem. The student sample was not large but it did come from both year groups, across the ability range and from each participating school. The literature on research into sixth form History learning, particularly that associated with argumentation, is not large and this empirical study is a contribution to this small field.

12.4.3 Informal argumentation. The model for argumentation used within this research study sits across three potential axes within argumentation research: the informal and formal axis; the logical and rhetorical axis, and the monologic and
dialogic axis. There are many studies in argumentation by theorists, philosophers, lawyers, and computer analysts, but this research study is a very small-scale application of argumentation research based firmly in dialogic theory that likens dialogue to thought (Billig, 1996; Wegerif, 2010b, 2013a). Based in this theory I have been able to use a model that relies on persuasive argumentation rich in counterargument to instantiate dialogic interaction. I have demonstrated that those students, who were able to engage in dialogic interaction, even if only for a brief exchange, were able to improve their written argumentation.

12.4.4 Dialogic education. This study has investigated the links between dialogic interaction and written argumentation. In so doing, ‘dialogic education’ was redefined using Wegerif’s (2012, 2013a) interpretation of dialogism rather than that used by Kuhn (2009) or Wells and Arauz (2006). This was a study which followed the tradition of Mercer and Wegerif in concentrating on groups of students interacting rather than focusing on whole-class interaction. Working in this way with A level students within History classes, I can offer something to a research field which has so far focused on primary schools and lower secondary pupils.

12.4.5 Methodological – parallel DBR and case study. Design-based research is a methodology that offers a flexible approach to research within classrooms. Its first two proponents – Brown (1992) and Collins (1992) – realised that the cognitive approach did not offer the opportunity to conduct research in the rich messiness of a real classroom. The capability to ‘design’ learning artefacts that can be tested and trialled and developed within a classroom is one of the strengths of this particular methodological approach. It is an approach, however, that few PhD students use because it tends to generate a lot of data which is often discarded and needs systematic and rigorous record keeping, as well as the opportunity to devote cycles of time so that the ‘intervention’ can be tested with different groups of students and more time can be given over to development.

To get round the time issue of committing to one school for an extensive period and only ever having a limited number of participants, I was fortunate enough to find five schools that were happy to take part in my research. The work with the different
schools became separate case studies and, because I was able to develop some of my thinking between school case studies, I could use them as iterations. The intervention with its seven stages meant that I was not focused on just one aspect of study I was actually engaged in testing, developing, and exploring a range of aspects within parallel and iterative cycles. This was an adapted form of DBR which met the demands of the participants, who are either teaching or learning within an exam-dominated sixth form, and PhD researcher alike.

12.5 Future Research

The next set of principles to be tested through the intervention in Iteration 5 are indicated below in Table 12.1. The need to embed the ground rules which focus on equality, respect, and dialogic engagement are mentioned, as is a more specific focus on counter-argumentation and a re-examination of the students' reflection of the argumentation process.

Design Framework 5

The table presented below represents the end point of this research process and the beginning of another. Ideas for future research are discussed based on the findings below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Framework 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should make their ground rules to encourage them to engage in dialogic talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground rules should emphasise the importance of democratic rules of respect and arguing against the ideas rather than the person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground rules should become embedded in classroom practice and should not be used just occasionally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students need to be aware of the way in which to engage in dialogic talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher demonstrates the difference between dialogic talk and disputational talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should engage in persuasive argumentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should practice persuasive argumentation in groups of threes – I student acting as a judge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students need to be aware of the different forms of argumentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to make clear links between History and persuasive argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher instruction of argument theory needs to focus on interactive nature of argument and not on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
formal argumentation

Argumentation tuition needs to emphasise difference between opinion- and evidence-based argumentation.

Argumentation tuition needs to emphasise difference between persuasive and eristic argumentation

Students should be encouraged to engage in argumentation that is based in dialogic talk

Students need to learn to argue and counter argue points

Students need to be encouraged to counter-argue against the point and not the person – orientate themselves to the debate.

Talk aloud protocol to highlight countering points in an exploratory way.

Students should be encouraged to make judgments about History which will become the basis of their arguments.

Students should be clear in their judgements but be prepared to change their judgements in light of further reflection and argumentation.

Students need to take part in collaborative activities designed to promote peer interaction.

Dyads should be encouraged to work together as equals – based in dialogic education – emphasis ground rules

Need to engage students in collaborative activities that will lead to dialogic engagement, not only in their collaboration but also in their argumentation.

Ensure that dyads work equally and remind them of their initial viewpoints.

Students should be encouraged to engage in argumentation that is based in dialogic talk.

Need to emphasise the ground rules that support the argumentation.

During argumentation which includes source analysis students need to be familiar with source material before engaging in argumentation.

Students should be encouraged to reflect on their arguments in both oral and written forms.

Plans should be made individually and then compared.

Students encouraged to reflect on their work, that of their partners, and of the rest of the class.

Students should keep either a learning log or a reflective blog to engage in reflection of the learning experience as well as of the subject content.

The table mentions a talk aloud protocol this is based in the research of Crasnich and Lumbelli (2004, 2005) and I would use it to demonstrate the difference between exploratory, dialogic argumentation and eristic argumentation. It would be a very brief exercise after the students had practiced their opinion based arguing to emphasise the different nature of counter arguing to explore and counter arguing to beat someone in an argument.
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As a researcher, I would want to investigate the opinion-based form of argument expressed by the students in their role-play activity and compare it with the evidence based argumentation they engage in later in the intervention. There is distinct change in the argumentation and I want to investigate what is changing and why. whether dialogic interaction is engendered in this freer form of argument.

Following the developments created by Design Framework 5, I would develop the intervention to focus more closely on reflection as an essential part of dialogic interaction and the role it has in the transition between spoken and written argument. I would do this in two ways: by encouraging more groups to engage in exploratory persuasive argumentation which may turn into dialogic interaction, and to emphasise the importance of observing what is going on – in terms of content exchange and forms of argumentation. I would also like to determine whether time is an element in the reflective process.

I would like to explore further the connection between the planning and writing of essays. In Case Study 3, the plans and comments were written immediately after the interaction, whereas there was a delay in Case Study 2. It would be useful to establish what impact this extra time for reflection has on the transition from spoken to written argument. I would also like to try the blogging aspect for planning and commenting as part of the intervention again, in a school where blogging is common practice, to see if that makes a difference to what is written.

The idea of a learning log is to create opportunities for students to become more engaged in the learning process and engage them in meta-strategic thinking needed to help them become more ‘evaluative’ in their thinking.

12.7 Summary

This final chapter assessed the study in terms of the contributions it has made to research. A fifth framework was suggested and ways in which the intervention could be further developed to test the connections between dialogic interaction and persuasive argumentation and how they impact on A level History students’ spoken and written argumentation. Suggestions for further research were also made.
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The final words I leave with Angela:

“I just like talking, in fact I do actually prefer to argue, talking about it, so … that’s what’s really helped me” (extract from Angela’s interview).
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these individuals will be over 16 years old and individual informed consent will be confirmed before interviews take place — although the school’s policy on consent will also be adhered to.

Keystage 3 children who have not experienced History at secondary level will also be interviewed but in a group interview to reflect the group interview of Yr 13 students. If it is feasible Yr 12 History candidates will be interviewed early in the Autumn term to reflect the differences perceived between GCSE and AS/A2. Parental and school consent will be gained before interviews take place.

Observations

Classroom observations of Yr13 students tackling a History question individually and in paired work will be video and audio-taped. The same procedure will be carried out with Keystage 3 and AS students in order to make a form of comparison.

Assessing written work

Samples of work from each of the age ranges will be assessed to determine written argumentation skills and whether there is a correlation between oral and written argumentation.

Pilot Study

1. Observations – baseline

   Observations of Keystage 3, GCSE, AS and A2 lessons will be carried out to form a baseline from which to measure whether the interventions are working.

2. Observations – interventions in action

   Observations of the same classes will take place when the intervention is in operation.

3. Semi-structured interviews and questionnaires

   Questionnaires will be conducted with these groups and the semi-structured interviews will be conducted to investigate the reflections of the participants.

4. Assessed written work

   Written work will be assessed to determine whether there are links between oral and written argumentation

Main Study

After the interventions have been modified and it has been decided which intervention works most effectively the above process 1 - 4 will be repeated but with other schools to test the intervention in a new environment.
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I will be following the Code of Ethics and Conduct set out by the British Psychological Society (BPS, 2006) and the Ethics Code of the University of Exeter.
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Appendix 2 – Example of Toulmin’s Model of Argument (Chapter 2)

Harry was born in Bermuda therefore Harry is a British subject –

  can be written with warrants and rebuttals like this

\[
\begin{align*}
  &D \rightarrow \text{(data)} \rightarrow \text{So Q, (Qualifier) C (Claim or even conclusion)} \\
  &\quad \text{Since } W & \quad \text{Unless } R \\
  &\quad \text{(Warrant)} & \quad \text{(Rebuttal)}
\end{align*}
\]

Which can be written like this:

Harry was born in Bermuda \----------\text{So presumably Harry is a British subject}

\[
\begin{align*}
  &D \rightarrow \text{So Q, C} \\
  &\quad \text{Since} & \quad \text{Unless} \\
  &\quad W & \quad R \\
  &\text{A man born in Bermuda will generally be a British subject.} & \text{Both his parents were aliens/OR he has become a naturalised American/…}
\end{align*}
\]

Toulmin (2008) (pg 94)
Appendix 3 – Interview Questions for teachers (Chapter 3 & 4)

Background Information

What position do you hold within the school? Within the department? What years groups and subjects do you teach?

How long have you been teaching History? In what context?

What is your main degree in? Have you studied history or a related subject at degree level?

Position statement

How would you define History?

Why do you think it is important for young people to study History?

Research specific questions

My research focuses on argumentation in History.

There seems to be a common perception backed up by substantial research that children find writing argument difficult. Would you agree with this statement? What is your experience of teaching students how to construct written arguments?

In your experience what proportion of any class that you have taught find writing History argument difficult.

Less than a quarter (1-4 out of 20)

Less than a half (5-9 out of 20)

Less than three quarters (10-14 out of 20)

Most of the class (15-20)

Of those children that find writing History argument difficult what do you think are the reasons for this?
Appendix 3 – continued

Designing an intervention

What strategies have worked for you?

Have you used technology to help you – if you have how did you do so and how successful was the process?

Is there anything else you think I need to know or should do that would help me design an effective intervention that will help History students write more effective argument?

Thank you for your time
Appendix 4 – Interview Questions for 6th formers (Chapter 3 & 4)

Background Information

What year are you?

Do you have a GCSE in History and if so what grade did you get?

Why are you studying History?

Are you intending to study it in the future at University or elsewhere? If so, what area/ period of History?

Position statement

How would you define History?

Do you think it is important for young people to study History?

Why do you think it is important?

When should you study history in school? (What Key Stage etc)

Research specific questions

My research focuses on argumentation in History.

How many of you find writing arguments in History essays easy?

Easy in what way?

Do you find it easier to argue a point out loud?

Could you tell me what you think makes writing History argument difficult?

Designing an intervention

Have your teachers done that have helped you to be more comfortable in writing essays? If so, what did they do?

Have you used technology to help you – if you have - how did it help you and just how successful was the process?
Appendix 4– continued

How would you help future A-level History students learn to write History arguments?

Is there anything else you think I need to know or should do that would help me design an effective intervention that will help History students write more effective argument?

Thank you for your time
Appendix 5 – Criteria for marking GCE History (Chapter 4)

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS June 2010 + level descriptor for a question on Louis XIV
Downloaded from AQA website © AQA 2013

General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options. The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that candidates might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other candidates’ responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered in relation to the level descriptors. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

• The accuracy of factual information
• The level of detail
• The depth and precision displayed
• The quality of links and arguments
• The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
• Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
• The conclusion

History - AQA GCE Mark Scheme 2010 June series

Level descriptors for AS Question

04 How successful was Louis XIV’s foreign policy in increasing the security of France in the years 1685 to 1715? (24 marks)

Target: A01(a), A01(b), A02(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. 0

L1: Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the
Appendix 5 – continued

focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak.

L2: Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured.

L3: Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material.

L4: Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication.

L5: Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary.

History - AQA GCE Mark Scheme 2010 June series

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates should consider reasons in favour and against success. In addition, there should be some attempt to define security. The very best responses may in addition differentiate or explain links between the security of France and other forms of security such as dynastic and religious. However, there should remain a clear focus on the security of France within the set period.

Factors in favour of success:

• if Louis XIV’s later foreign policy is interpreted as one of self defence against aggressively minded neighbours, then he must be credited with at least maintaining the integrity of France’s borders despite temporary incursions

• the major treaties of the period and especially Ryswick did apparently weaken France’s territorial hold, effectively reversing all of France’s territorial gains since Nymegen, but Strasbourg did remain in his hands

• the War of Spanish Succession can be seen as having increased France’s security, especially in breaking the possibility of Habsburg encirclement. In addition, the presence of a Bourbon on the Spanish throne created the potential of a Bourbon dominated Europe

• the very fact that Louis XIV proved willing to defend the terms of Carlos I’s Will increased France’s security in the face of a European threat from powers that had recovered from the ravages of the Thirty Years War many decades before
• the security of France may not have been the foremost motive of Louis XIV’s foreign policy; certainly this nationalistic motivation was slow in developing. However, France remained strong in 1715. The very events of 1685 to 1715 may be interpreted as evidence of the concern that an increasingly secure France was causing the major powers.

Factors against success:

• territorial loss was substantial and France’s north eastern border remained vulnerable; key positions such as Luxembourg had also had to be sacrificed. Moreover, the gains that foreign powers made at France’s expense were substantial and went beyond the more territorial. For example, Louis XIV’s forced recognition of William of Orange as William III

• Louis XIV’s foreign policy might be considered to have actively damaged France’s security. The alignment against protestant powers did nothing to convince Europe that Louis was not bent of the aggressive pursuit of religious uniformity. Louis XIV’s pursuit of the unrealistic Will of Carlos II may have provoked the very war that damaged France’s position

• it was more than material losses that did so much damage. The Nine Years War proved that France could be stopped and that her armies could be defeated. Louis XIV himself convinced Europe that in this period that it was necessary to stop France

• the damage to France’s security may well have been felt most at home. The immense cost of the wars of the period clearly put huge strain on an inequitable taxation system. It was largely this period that accounts for the large debt bequeathed to Louis XV. The subsequent domestic instability was therefore directly linked to Louis XIV’s foreign policy.
Appendix 6 – Email exchange with Exam Board Administrator (Chapter 4)

----- Original Message -----
From: XXXxxx
To: Dani Hilliard
Sent: Thursday, October 28, 2010 9:20 AM
Subject: RE: PhD Research into Argumentation 2

Dear Dani

For my own peace of mind – since none of them have said anything to me – were any of our Principal Examiners able to assist you?

XXXXX

From: Dani Hilliard [mailto:XXX]
Sent: 17 September 2010 18:14
To: XXXX
Subject: Re: PhD Research into Argumentation 2

Dear XXXX

Thank you very much - what is that they say about 'great minds'.....?

I appreciate you taking the time to contact a number of your Principal Examiners and that you have chosen them from a range of backgrounds and experiences...I will be very interested to hear their views.

I acknowledge too that they are not employed by AQA and are no obligation to you - but I am grateful nevertheless for your time and your efforts.

Very best wishes

Dani Hilliard

----- Original Message -----
From: XXXX
To: Dani Hilliard
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2010 5:07 PM
Subject: RE: PhD Research into Argumentation 2

Dear Dani

By coincidence... with the time period for urgent reviews of A Level marking now complete, I earlier today emailed a number of my Principal Examiners to see whether any of them would be willing/able to contact you regarding your request. I went for senior examiners from a range of backgrounds and experience, and I hope that some of them will be able to contact you soon. You will appreciate that they are not employees of AQA per se, and thus are under no obligation to me to respond to my request – but I'm certain some of them will. If so, I'm sure you will find their input useful.

Best of luck with you research.

XXXXX
Subject Manager for A Level History

From: Dani Hilliard [mailto:XXX]
Sent: 17 September 2010 15:13
To: XXXX
Subject: PhD Research into Argumentation 2

Dear Mr XXXX

I emailed you 27th August 2010 having spoken with you during that morning. I realised that you and the other History examiners would be very busy and really unable to deal with my query at that time... however it is now a few weeks later and I would very much appreciate talking with/meeting with/communicating with an examiner who feels happy to help me in my PhD research.
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As I explained then and to save you trawling through your emails I will repeat what I sent to you:

I am a very experienced History (and Politics) teacher. I have been working for the past 4 years as a private tutor with 6th form students who have failed to get the grades they need in their History exams and need extra help. Most of these students have been wonderfully articulate, demonstrate very clear understanding and in oral discussions are very competent. However their written work does not reflect the same levels of sophistication and I spend quite some time helping them learn to write effective argument. Interestingly enough they all know how to write essays and show good structure in their responses but they don't argue. I became fascinated by this particularly as I was dealing with 6th formers who had been through the whole system and needed to do re-sits. Hence my PhD topic area - I am investigating the links between spoken and written argumentation.

My intention is to develop an 'intervention', with the help of teachers and students alike, which will 'scaffold' the transition between spoken and written argumentation so that students write History arguments more effectively. As an educationalist I am not just interested in helping students get good grades; I am interested in the processing involved associated with argumentation that allows and promotes cognitive development. Ultimately I am interested in helping students to think critically and I can't think of a better vehicle for creating critical thinkers than arguing in History.

What I would like to discuss with interested examiners is what constitutes a good History argument - and ultimately how argument is assessed? This latter point is particularly important because during my fieldwork, which will be carried out in schools where I test my intervention, I will need to have an effective assessment tool to measure History argument.

I would very much appreciate any advice or input any examiner has time to offer.

If any of what I have written needs clarification please do not hesitate to contact me...-

My email addresses are XXXX and dmh210@exeter.ac.uk

Thank you once again for your help

Dani Hilliard
PhD Researcher in Education
College of Social Sciences and International Studies
University of Exeter
Visit our website at aqa.org.uk

Or try Ask AQA at aqa.org.uk/askaqa to see answers to FAQs, ask questions for a personal reply, and register for e-mail updates.

**********************************************************************************************************************************************

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334).
Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX

AQA are fully committed to protecting your privacy and complying with the eight principles enshrined in the Data Protection Act 1998 and related legislation. Your personal information will be treated confidentially by AQA at all times. For full details on how your personal information will be used, stored and protected, and how to request further information from AQA, please read AQA's Privacy and Fair Processing Statement - aqa.org.uk/privacy.php.

DISCLAIMER:

This e-mail is intended solely for the addressee, is strictly confidential, and may also be legally privileged. If you are not the addressee you may not read, print, re-transmit, store or act in reliance on it or any attachments. Please also destroy this message and notify us immediately by reply.

This footnote also confirms that this email has been swept by multiple security layers for the presence of computer viruses.
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Appendix 7 – Email Exchange asking PGCE tutors for possible contacts (Chapter 4)

Hi XXX

Many, many thanks for responding so quickly and for the very useful list - I do appreciate it!

Yes it would be great to meet up and 'bounce' ideas - perhaps sometime during the Summer when the pressure is off a little - what do you think? I am also more than happy to come and present my ideas - but probably wisest when I have some preliminary results and can offer something more concrete - at the moment my ideas are based in experience and theory and I would feel happier if I had some evidence to support my arguments before I stand up in front of an audience! I suspect that’s my History training!!

I will let you know which schools want to engage with me in my research and when.

Hope to see you sometime over the Summer?

Many thanks again

Dani

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Xxxx
To: "Dani Hilliard" <XXXX>
Sent: Thursday, June 10, 2010 4:20 PM
Subject: Re: Conducting research in XXX and the environs

> Hi Dani
> >
> > This does sound interesting. I would be happy to meet up sometime if you
> > want to bounce ideas around or talk more about your research and mine.
> > Perhaps you might like to come and present to a slightly wider audience at
> > some point too??
> >
> > In terms of local schools, the following are schools I think you should
> > approach, and by all means mention that you have been in touch with me
> > about this - these are all schools we work with on the history PGCE
> > programme and all have post 16 provision, most are high achieving but not
> > all, and most have strong history departments:
> >
> > XXXX (XXX)
> > XXXX
> > FT
> > ES
> > XXXX
> > HM
> > XXXXX
> > DR
> > XXXX
> > GV
> >
> > I look forward to hearing from you.
> >
> > XXX

344
> On Thu, June 10, 2010 9:19 am, Dani Hilliard wrote:
>> Dear Ms XXXX
>>
>> As a Senior Lecturer in Education (History) I am hoping that you will be
>> able to help me. There are two matters that I wish to discuss with you;
>> the first is accessing schools and the second is discussing research - I
>> understand that you are particularly interested in History 'narratives'.
>>
>> I am a PhD Researcher studying at the University of Exeter. My research
>> area is 'speaking and writing argumentation in History'. I am
>> particularly
>> interested in trying to work out why students find it difficult to write
>> effective and coherent arguments at AS and A level although I suspect
>> that
>> the 'problem', such as it is, could be resolved earlier in their History
>> training.
>>
>> I am contacting you because I am planning to construct some form of
>> 'intervention' which may help 6th form students in their argumentation.
>> To do this I want to be able to work closely with both students and
>> teachers alike so that my research becomes pragmatic and has real life
>> practical implications. Although I study at Exeter I live in XXXX
>> and because I know that my work in schools will be intensive and ongoing
>> for a time I was hoping to find a schools closer to me than Exeter.
>>
>> Are there any schools that you know in XXXx and the area that would be
>> open to such an arrangement - conversely are there any schools that you
>> would not recommend me approaching? I ask because I haven't lived in
>> XXXX for very long and my teaching experience was XXXX based - I
>> know exactly which schools to approach in XXXX and surrounding area
>> but
>> it is rather a long way to travel!
>>
>> Secondly as a history education reseacher I am very much on my own and
>> would value being able to bounce ideas of fellow History education
>> researchers - XXXXXXX
>> XXXX every so often it would be good to exchange views. I feel
>> that History narrative and argumentation are inextricably linked so I am
>> particularly interested in discovering more about your research.
>>
>> I hope you will be able to help me but if you can't could you recommend
>> someone I can contact instead?
>>
>> Thank you - any help you can offer will be very much appreciated.
>>
>> Kind regards
>>
>> Dani Hilliard
>
>
Appendix 8 – Example of email sent to ten schools (Chapter 4)

For the attention of....

I am a PhD researcher studying at the University of Exeter. My topic area is 'speaking and writing argumentation in History'. As an experienced History and Politics teacher I have become increasingly aware that students who are persuasive and eloquent in classroom discussion are sometimes unable to replicate the same level of competence in their written work. I want to know why and to design an 'intervention' that will help students with this transition from verbal to written argumentation.

I am contacting you because I am looking for schools close to where I live who would be willing to become involved in my research. Ms XXX at the University of XXXX recommended you to me, because she knows that I want to work closely with pupils and staff alike so that the 'intervention' is effective whatever form it takes, whether it be through technology or not. I want to help students studying History argue effectively in whatever form of discourse they choose.

I am particularly interested in working with 6th form History students because argumentation is particularly significant at A Level.

Would it be possible to arrange an appointment to discuss my research with you next week?

My phone number is XXXXX if you wish to discuss this rather than send an email.

Looking forward to hearing from you.

Diana Hilliard
Appendix 9 – Generic Parental Consent Letter (Chapter 4)

School Heading

Consent for participation in Educational Research into History learning being conducted in the school

Dear Parent/Carer,

During this academic year a PhD researcher from the University of Exeter will be working in collaboration with the teachers and students in the History department on a project to help current and future History students write more effective written argument in their A Level responses.

As part of the project classroom lessons will be videoed and audio-taped. Teachers and students will be interviewed either individually or in group interviews which will also be videoed and audio-taped. The conversations will be transcribed. The information from the interviews and observations will be instrumental to the research project.

No participant is compelled to participate in this project and has the right to withdraw at any stage. Any information generated through the research process will be used solely for the purposes of this research project – this may include publications but each participant has the right to refuse permission for the publication of any information about him/her self.

The information may be shared between other researchers participating in this project but it will be anonymous. All information will be treated as confidential. All video material will be locked away in a secure area and destroyed as soon as the research project is complete.

If you wish to find out more about this project please contact Mrs Diana Hilliard, PhD Researcher in Education, College of Social Sciences and International Studies, University of Exeter – dmh210@exeter.ac.uk or, if you have any other concerns please contact XXX at the school ... (email address)...

If we do not hear from you before October 12th 2010 which is when the research is scheduled to start, we will assume that you have no objection to your child taking part in this research project.

Yours sincerely

XXXX (Head of History)

D M Hilliard (PhD Researcher)
CONSENT FORM

I have been fully informed about the aims and purposes of the project.

I understand that:

there is no compulsion for me to participate in this research project and, if I do choose to participate, I may at any stage withdraw my participation

I have the right to refuse permission for the publication of any information about me
any information which I give will be used solely for the purposes of this research project, which may include publications

If applicable, the information, which I give, may be shared between any of the other researcher(s) participating in this project in an anonymised form

all information I give will be treated as confidential

the researcher(s) will make every effort to preserve my anonymity

..................................................
...........................................

(Signature of participant)
(Date)

...........................................

(Printed name of participant)

One copy of this form will be kept by the participant; a second copy will be kept by the researcher(s)

Contact phone number of researcher(s): 01275 849390
Appendix 10 – continued

If you have any concerns about the project that you would like to discuss, please contact:

Dani Hilliard: PhD Researcher, Graduate School of Education, University of Exeter

………..

OR

Professor Rupert Wegerif: Director of Research, Graduate School of Education, University of Exeter

………..

Data Protection Act: The University of Exeter is a data collector and is registered with the Office of the Data Protection Commissioner as required to do under the Data Protection Act 1998. The information you provide will be used for research purposes and will be processed in accordance with the University’s registration and current data protection legislation. Data will be confidential to the researcher(s) and will not be disclosed to any unauthorised third parties without further agreement by the participant. Reports based on the data will be in anonymised form.
Appendix 11 – Teacher Responses Raw Data (Chapter 4)

Do children find writing argument difficult?

Yes.

[Pause] Well, I think it’s very difficult to generalise about that [laughs]

Erm, most of the less-able students find it very hard to reach beyond the concrete in any way, shape or form. So they're happiest with factual information; descriptive information; any kind of analysis is difficult. Reaching beyond analysis to recognising that there could be completely different interpretations of events, is even harder. Erm, and interpretations, as you may have seen, is a word that we do use quite a lot … … they’re now representations, erm ….. as well as interpretations. Erm, I suppose it depends how much of an argument you mean? If you mean an argument, as in a history title that might say, erm, ‘How important were changes in transport in helping the industrial revolution?’ That’s an argument of a sort, erm, but quite a simple … quite a simple one. Erm, but that’s typical of the sort of level of argument that school children - certainly up to GCSE - are asked to do. So at [pause] at GCSE that would translate into ‘How successful were the military tactics of the USA in the Vietnam War?’ Which requires argument; it requires you to make an evaluation; to look at the evidence; to analyse it; to judge it; to reach a conclusion.

Erm, yes. Yeah I would. Yeah on the whole.

Um, drawing on my experience from my own education rather than as a teacher, so far, I think … I think so, yes. I mean, I was … it sounds arrogant, but I was probably always one of the more able in a classroom, but I do remember, um, classmates struggling especially when they weren’t given much structure. I think when children have guidelines or are offered starting sentences for paragraphs and things like that, they can … they … most of them can get on with it, but, ah, when they’re not given any guidance I think a lot do struggle and, I mean, from my own teaching, I have… I haven’t really done argument in any depth yet, so I probably wouldn’t be able to comment really.

Um, yeah, kind of. It’s an odd exam. It’s, um, primarily sources based and it asks them to make inferences from what they read more or less and, you
know, the rubric quite clearly states it doesn’t matter if what they write is wrong as long as it’s logical and well reasoned. So, there is a level of argument in there in that they are incepting a source and putting forward one way in which that source, you know, can be read. Um, but it’s not traditional argument in that they’re not familiar with the things they’re writing about at all. It’s all very creative if you like. Um, and then the ... there is a... there is an essay set there always which asks them to write about something they already know basically. So, that’s very similar to what they’re doing in A level anyway kind of thing.

Initially difficult would be my opinion. Um what we find I think is when our students work at GCSE they can get an A star without ever having really to argue, much. They can just give their opinions at the end of their answers where they’ve explained, you know, information and that’s it. And then they come up to A Level and it’s very clear that if they don’t have an argument at A Level, particularly in the ... err the Unit 1 for Edexcel that I’m teaching, err then they’ll be very lucky to get a C, you know. Um and initially students that err a difficult step up. They’re too knowledge focused, so their ... the essays or the assessments they work on are focused far too much on telling the story; they’re too narrative. There’s not enough analysis that is there err and quite often because they don’t have that argument. And that comes from loads of different reasons.

Maybe some of them have been naturally gifted up until this point, you know, and you sort of reach a point where all of a sudden you have to work err and they haven’t planned properly before, and all of a sudden, you know, an argument has to be planned; it can’t be off the cuff. Um so initially I think the idea of having a really good plan which isn't just, “Oh I'll talk about this, this and this,” but, you know, shows real evidence of thinking, um that’s challenging for them. Analysing that detail rather than telling the story is challenging for them. Err and then they’re just not used to writing, if it is in terms of writing, in the style of an argument. You know, an assertive opinion at the start stating this isn’t, you know, what’s going on and then err analysing evidence and assessing significance in a way that backs up what they’re saying. And they’re just not used to writing in that way. So um I think initially it’s difficult.
Appendix 11 – continued

I mean however, I would argue that the current Year 13 err who are in the room now, um their argument skills are improving. Err I think I’m quite harsh in my marking in … in the lower sixth. Err I will just … you know, line by line ‘narrative’, you know, ‘this has got to be analysed’, ‘argument’s not clear.’ Um and by this point I feel that they are much better, um not the finished article of course, but they are better at understanding right, well I need to have an opinion and I … it’s got to be a reasoned opinion not just a, “Oh I’m going to do that one,” um and I think they are better at presenting it. So I would say initially it’s poor, however, you know, there’s evidence on differing degrees that they are able to do it err with the right err assistance.

Yes certainly. (they need to be taught) There’s very few students who I’ve found who can naturally argue, err that would be my opinion.

I would say many, you know, loads, unless it’s taught to them very early, lots of them it difficult, although our 6th form, still, you know, you talk about multi-causal answers, and things like that, they still struggle with how that, how that is done and how you go about it and how you use precise evidence to back up the things that you’re saying.

By writing of, yeah, definitely.

Um yes, they find it more difficult, maybe, especially if they’re being asked to show that there is a debate. They find it quite easy, maybe, to put an opinion, but they find it more difficult to look at different sides of opinion. I find.

Yeah, I mean are we talking right across key stages, or are we focusing on the 6th form only here?

No, they do, they do, they find it difficult to … I say more difficult and, you know, and especially in terms of exams, we expect them to do it in a particular way and a lot of them don’t necessarily do it in a particular way. They encourage GCSE to a certain style, which is sort of frame working for them, and then A-levels a lot more free. But yeah, they don’t necessarily get it, it’s not [that they 4.03] find it easy, like they, they understand that things happen, but they don’t necessarily get any idea that are different and interpretations of why that happened. They find it harder to, to, to write and to talk about.
Yeah, it’s complete, it’s the next level up, definitely.

I think they do. I think you’ve probably seen that um … I would say in many ways it’s because of the constraints of the courses that doesn’t encourage that. Um that actually we’re … and where it does I find it to be quite artificial um in that you’re … you’re almost having to construct an argument where there isn’t one in order to gain points in an examination mark scheme. I think children don’t read a lot. Um I think that actually the courses don’t particularly stretch them into um having to do that and where it … where they do it’s very superficial, so I think they do find it difficult. That’s the leap up at A Level, where at GCSE you’re probably only ever going to be required to write five minutes and basically it’s … as long as you have a balanced answer; on the one hand, on the other, how … and you’re literally taught for/against a balanced answer. But I’m … that … that’s why because I find it … I think it’s fairly superficial. But I think the textbooks are superficial, I find the television superficial. Things like Newsround are better than nothing, but children are not reading, they’re not aware of it because there is no time now to do that. I think we try and make time um but actually it’s … it’s … education is secondary to exams now and I would say that from my own children, in that from Year 9 onwards it’s just a marathon of petty things rather than anything meaningful. Um and not necessarily here, but I think a lot of people are under pressure to perform in terms of gaining grades um which means that you will end up doing … prostituting yourself and doing what the exam board wants.
Appendix 12 – Year 12 Student Response Raw Data (Chapter 4)

How many of you find writing arguments in History essays easy?

Er, not easy but it’s not [pause] it’s not sort of like the hardest thing that I’ve had to do.

You, you do engineering so… Yeah exactly yeah.

I find the writing easy, but I don’t find the time-keeping easy, but that’s because I tend to stray-off and just mumble on. No, not necessarily, not time-keeping but when you’re just supposed to write a … I just tend to stray off and just ramble on, as opposed to get to the point and do it all clear and like make the most of it. But I just waste stupid amounts on writing some random stuff [laughs]. Yeah, but I could do it in a more precise, to the point way and it would just save me time, personally. I’ve written like one and sort-of another.

Erm, alright, but I sometimes contradict myself, like I’ll end up saying something like … or argue against what I’m trying to argue for. And then I sort-of realise that I’ve done it wrong and I don’t really change it, I just leave it. Yeah, it’s like you have to plan it before as we did about an essay a few weeks ago; we had to plan it first and then write off that in more detail and stuff to make it better.

I find them okay, it’s just I generally don’t plan like really at all, officially, and then I don’t know the right facts and I don’t try to argue, like “oh that happened” and I realise, “no, it actually didn’t”. And I always get like everything all confused and then I would waffle on with that one point and it just … you-know, then I just go astray and just don’t … yeah …

Erm, I find it quite difficult to be like really concise about something, because I’m trying to sort-of expand my argument by putting loads of narrative background in and then it may end up straying off somewhere and not really being completely clear about the actual argument I’m trying to put forward. Mm, yeah, it’s been hard.

I find History essays more enjoyable than essays in other subjects, because it’s like, it’s just more like if you can make your own point so you can … but, if you forget something, then your argument doesn’t make sense. So, because
you’re making your own point; because it’s not facts, it’s like you can’t … there’s not like a laid-out of way of doing it. Because like in Biology you have like an argument and you’re saying (21.44) or something works, so it’s like you know, so it’s like you can think it through a bit. But in History you’ll be like, I’ve skipped to (21.52) and you’ve missed it and it’s like in the wrong order and it doesn’t make sense.

Erm, sometimes I tend to ramble on and then I’ll find that I’ve run out of time and then I don’t have time to check over it or are likely to finish it – sometimes. Yeah, it’s not like sort of like a structure that you can sort-of work with as such, because you’re learning so much more and such more detail, trying to find the bit that actually is really important to when you’re trying to write your essays that are to the point.

Maybe, to me, how your lessons are structured. What we do with Mr xxx is of no relevance at all to what we do with Miss xxx. So, after I’ve had a double with Miss xxx I go to Mr xxx, then I would have forgotten what Miss xxx said. Like, I’ll have to re-read it or whatever, but it’s just the way going from Tudors to Russian Revolution just … Yeah, it just like mess you up, but that’s just me personally.

I don’t think it’s that easy, because I think it’s quite difficult to answer … well, to … Because you can get like side-tracked really easily …… so I think it’s quite difficult to stay focused.

Yeah, and when you’re writing something you could start with one point of view and then you write one point and then you realise, actually there’s so much more that you haven’t considered and you’ve just not enough to fit it all in because it’s such a wide argument and just to pick a few things and that knowing there’s so many other things affecting it, it’s quite hard to stay focused to your idea, when you know there’s so many other factors.

I think as well, when you’re making an argument, it’s difficult to be quite specific and have examples of everything and still focus on the kind of general time period and … it’s just so broad you can’t …

get the context or something like that.
Appendix 13 – Example of categories and supporting data (Chapter 4)

Taken from Year 13 responses to one of the interview questions.

What problems do people face in learning argument?

Themes emerging from the scripts

**Fear of being right or wrong**
frightened of being wrong
students rely on the teacher telling them what's right and wrong
considering right and wrong in history

**Understanding demands of AS and A2**
GCSE does not do argument in the same way AS and A2 do
you believe you want to show everyone everything you know
writing argument is huge

**Fear of Essay writing itself**
essay scares people off
change perception of essay make it clear argument in form of an essay

**Confidence**
reassurance
confidence to risk not to sound stupid
deciding which side to come down on but having confidence to say so
Build confidence first discusses speaking out
too shy
confidence

**Argumentation categories -Teacher Questions**

Emergent processing - reading and then underlining what seemed to emerge
Raw data phrases
There seems to be 7 Areas that appear to emerge from the data

**Characteristics of an argument**
**Two sidedness**
history is arguing ad infinitum
argumentation is ongoing debates
not critical thinking because it needs context
two sided debates
appreciate both sides of the argument

**Logic**
think logically
logical thinking
logical way
argument rational construction

**Structure**
set of facts
look at facts
support with evidence
support with evidence
weighing the evidence
Appendix 13– continued

thread of an argument
make an evaluation look at evidence analyse judge it which conclusion
with empathy to context and now

**Handling differences**
different meanings
different conclusions
different people see different things in same situation
look at different interpretations
looking at different interpretations and assessing why they are different from same era
not the difference between right and wrong
different viewpoints

**Interpretation**
Historians' opinions
make your own opinion
express opinion
opinions
want them to form opinions
significant
evaluations

**Processes**
Ability to teach them
how to teach it
consistent
building together
piece things together
come up with own point
Oxford definition logical and well reasoned
reasonable conclusion
argue with conviction
assertiveness
present with clarity and conviction
difficult to counter
concise
persuasive
acquire skills to construct and respond
internalising it more
not repetition nor regurgitation
process
no originality

**Related to ability**
only very bright
difficult
Appendix 14 – Findings of Semi-structured Interviews (Chapter 4)

The following material are the findings of the Semi-structured interviews conducted with the teachers and students of the History departments in four secondary schools in the South West of England.

Question 1 – How do you define argument? This provided an extensive range of responses which, after thematic analysis, could be reduced to seven key categories. These in turn could be reduced to three overarching ideas: characteristics of an argument, characteristics of History argument, and other aspects which were closely associated with ability. When teachers discussed the characteristics of an argument such things as ‘logic’, ‘rational’, ‘debate’, and ‘two-sidedness’ were mentioned. Distinctions were clear though between argument in general and the uniqueness of History argument. Here such themes emerged as ‘being able to handle differences’ in time and viewpoint and to recognise ‘different interpretations’ and yet still being able to ‘carry the thread of an argument’ all the way through a response. The teacher categories are best represented in the following table.

Please note that the colours will remain constant throughout all of the tables and charts so that easy comparisons can be made across the teacher and student responses. This is particularly relevant when considering how ‘argument’ is understood and how ‘argument’ could be taught in schools where process and structure recur frequently.

Table A14.1. Number of themes associated with each category responses to ‘What does “argument” mean to you?’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th># of Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-sidedness</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logic</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling difference</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This data can be represented visually as a bar chart:
It is clear from the chart that the teachers were more interested in the ‘processes’ of argument, with structure being a poor second. All of the teachers were concerned about the processes of argumentation, discussing such things as recognising the difference between opinions and using evidence. Again, structuring an argument was implicit in their discussions but only three teachers explicitly mentioned the structure of an argument. There was a tacit agreement that arguing well seemed to be in the province of the gifted and most able but only two teachers explicitly stated this, one of them going so far as to suggest that it was an innate quality because some of their students ‘got it’ without seemingly needing to be taught.

However, of the nine members of staff only three explicitly associated argument with two-sidedness, although one teacher’s interpretation of argument suggested that History argument was an on-going debate with the past. Only two explicitly mentioned logic in association with argument and two different members of staff wanted to ensure that children didn’t associate History argument with being either right or wrong.
Table A14.3. Number of themes associated with each category based on thematic analysis of student responses to ‘What does “argument” mean to you?’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th># of Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>11 Yr12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-sidedness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>3 Yr13gp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-sidedness</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>1 Yr13i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-sidedness</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.
Yr 12 These were the collective responses of Year 12 interviews only 1 individual the other were groups
Yr 13gp. These were the collective responses of Year 13 group interviews
Yr.13i. These were the collective responses of Year 13 individual interviews

This can be visually represented as follows:

![Bar Chart](image)

Figure A14.2. Student responses to ‘What does “argument” mean to you?’

The student responses were interesting and worthy of considerable analysis, but I was interested solely in whether the students’ interpretation and understanding of argument reflected their teachers’ perspectives and whether
this perception might vary depending on age and how far into a History course the students might be. All the students asked this question were interviewed during the autumn and winter terms. The collective responses from the Year 12 students showed that in their minds argument was predominantly associated with process: there was only one mention of argument in terms of ‘something with two sides’. They mentioned such things as seeing and understanding other perspectives and needing to use evidence. The Year 13 groups interviewed associated argument with process and two-sidedness, as did Year 13 individuals. Year 13 individuals did not mention process explicitly (although it is implicit in their responses); structure and interpretation, however, appear more prevalent in their discussions.

The table and chart are interesting and suggest that there may be development across the year groups in as much as students mention structure and interpretation in Year 13, though this appears to be only when individuals were interviewed on their own. What I think becomes clear is that process is a factor associated with argument across both year groups and in every condition, and even if we consider some of the responses of the Year 13 individual interviewees, process seems to be implicit even though they are discussing specific aspects of History argumentation, such as interpretation and using historiography. Two-sidedness is an interesting association because it does not appear as a major factor in Year 12 responses, even though they have only recently completed their GCSE, which is geared to two-sided argument. However, the way in which two-sidedness is discussed at Year 13 is more sophisticated. For example, one student talks about ‘always comparing a point of view with somebody else’s’ or ‘a historian makes an argument by giving their interpretation of the evidence and criticising another argument’.

It is also interesting to note that the students discussed the process of thinking about and preparing to write an argument which actually reflects important facets of the teachers’ own preoccupation with argument. It would, however, be difficult to prove that the students have learnt about argument and argument details from the teachers who were interviewed, because these are sixth form students and have encountered argumentation in other subject disciplines – English, for example. Perhaps what is more significant is that the Year 13 students mentioning interpretations and historiography is an indication
of History-specific learning which could only really come from the input of the History teachers themselves.

**Question 2 – Is there a discrepancy between what teachers and students think are the problems students have with writing History argument?** Again, the responses varied. Please see Appendices 10 and 11 for examples of the responses to these questions. Examples of the emergent categories can be found in Appendix 12.

In summary, there seemed to be seven areas, taken from the data, which the teachers offered as reasons for the difficulties that students faced in writing History argument and these are: nature of argumentation, nature of History argumentation, related to ability, skills, confidence development, and exam demands.

Nature of argumentation covered such statements as ‘argumentation taught to politicians so not surprising that sixth formers find it difficult’ and ‘taking apart something they do naturally to make them understand process difficult’. History argumentation covered such statements as; nature of history answer – explain the examples they use but need to synthesise and discuss interpretations to fully answer the question’ and ‘what is more significant than the other and why’. Though there were also simple statements that concerned the nature of sixth formers simply writing essays ‘they don’t seem to be able to decide and then argue’ and ‘haven’t planned before and don't realise that arguments need to be planned. ‘Ability’, ‘skills’, and ‘development’ seemed to be linked and a deeper analysis would have resulted in reducing the responses still further to those that favoured a Piagetian philosophy to teaching (i.e., ‘Piaget's concrete operations to abstract operations can prove difficult’). The single most important factor, however, in determining whether students were able to write argument effectively or not, according to most of the teachers interviewed was ‘ability’.

Students, on the other hand, offered slightly different explanations for why they might find writing essays easy or not and why writing History argument might be difficult. The process of writing argument is a factor that concerns all of the students from each age and experience range – although post-exam students feel most comfortable with the way they write argument. Other factors include the nature of History argument, skills, exam demands, personal
attributes, processing information, and the difficulty of moving from oral to written argumentation.

The following tables and graphs highlight the differences in perception about the problems students have with writing History argument across the age range, and incorporate the responses from the staff too. The factors are the categories taken from the thematic analysis of the interview data. They have been reduced to the top five categories of teacher and student responses.
Table A14.5. Teacher and student themed response to ‘What do you think makes History argument difficult?’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulties in writing History argument</th>
<th>Yr 12*</th>
<th>Yr 13 grp</th>
<th>Yr 13 ind</th>
<th>Yr 13 post</th>
<th>TCH *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of History argument</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of argument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam Demands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference from oral to written argument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being right or wrong and 'essay'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related to ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Yr 12 responses were amalgamated because there was only one individual response. Tch* = teacher.

Figure A14.3. Teacher and student categories of themed responses to ‘What do you think makes writing History argument difficult’
The teachers offered a lot of explanations for students’ difficulties with writing effective argument, some of which are echoed by the post-exam Year 13 group – notably lack of confidence. Exam demands were also cited by the Year 13 individuals. The process of History argument, however, is not recognised as a problem by the staff, though it clearly is for most of the students. The nature of History argument is considered very important by teachers and students although it is only the students that consider the process of argument itself problematic.

It becomes clear that there are differences in staff and student perceptions of the students’ problems with writing History essays, and an intervention that focuses on what students perceive to be their problems may be more successful than one based purely on teacher perceptions.

Questions 3 and 4 address the strategies teachers have already used to promote written argumentation in History. I did not want to repeat strategies that they already practised, the design for the intervention should offer something new. Student questions concentrated on what worked for them. Both teachers and students were also asked whether technology could play a part in helping students learn to write more effective argument. This latter question was to exploit the current Computer Supported Learning strategies that had been used by Coffin (2007) Chapman (2003b) and van Drie et al. (2008) to investigate History learning and/or dialogic education.

Question 3 – What strategies have teachers used to help students write effective argument in their History essays? It appeared to me that there were four key categories emerging from the interview scripts and these were: general skills training; prior learning; focus on the structure of written argument; and focus on developing thinking through argument.
Table A14.6. Categorised themes of strategies used by teachers to promote argument learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th># of Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General skills training</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior learning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focusing on structure of argument</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing thinking through argument</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These responses can also be represented in this way:

![Graph showing categorised themes of strategies used](image)

Figure A14.4. Categorised themes of strategies teachers have used to promote argument learning

The teachers’ responses were detailed, ranging through each of the categories. Some teachers felt that to improve argumentation ‘sheer hard work’ was necessary as well as ‘repetition’. Although not explicitly stated, there was an underlying assumption that this was a necessary precursor to the improvement of written argument. Two out of nine teachers explicitly stated this, while for most there was a recognition that for some students learning to write argument was particularly difficult and therefore would require even more ‘hard work’. These statements, however, reflected more general attitudes to learning rather than being specifically focused on the teaching and learning of argument as an entity in its own right. It could also be argued that ‘needing guidance’ and ‘a framework’ could also be considered general aspects of the
learning experience and not exclusive to argumentation nor yet just History argumentation.

One teacher felt that teaching argument lower down in the school was a good way to improve argument training and mentioned an activity in which children were encouraged to draw round their hands to visualise what was needed to produce a good argument – the thumbs being reasons and the fingers being evidence. This method inherently supports a two-handed if not two-sided approach to argumentation. Certainly GCSE History requires students to demonstrate both sides of an argument in their written responses. Unfortunately, as previously stated in the introduction, this does not prepare AS and A2 candidates for the different form of argumentation that is necessary for success in History at these levels.

What does immediately become clear, however, is the onus all of the teachers (including the student teachers) put on structuring a written response. Modelling and talking through the essay question within classroom discussion was suggested by a majority of the teachers. One teacher concentrated rigorously on feedback strategies and detailed notes after each written exercise, setting targets for each student to develop their own learning – although feedback was recognised by all as being an essential part of the process of teaching. Several teachers used scaffolding techniques to help students write more effectively – specifically paragraph structures with connectives and headers. All paid particular focus to the structure of the student responses. Seven out of nine teachers talked about PEEL (Point, Evidence, Explanation and Linking it back to the title) or just PEE (Point, Evidence and Example), or even the Hamburger approach (the introduction and the conclusion being the two pieces of a bread roll and the ‘meat’ of the essay the burger).

The students’ responses reflect the teachers’ input. Year 13 group responses were varied but because of the nature of the semi-structured interview a clear question asking for specific details of what teachers did for them was omitted. Nevertheless, in points made generally during the interviews it was demonstrated clearly that structuring essay responses was paramount and PEEL was mentioned on more than one occasion. However, because the
information was difficult to evidence with clarity, their responses have been omitted from the table and subsequent chart.

Table A14.7. Categories of strategies with which students feel teachers have helped them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th># of themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr 12</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skills training</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 13 individual</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This can be represented as follows:

![Which strategies used by teachers worked for you?](image)

This chart shows how the teachers’ focus on structure of argument had been clearly appreciated by the students. All the Year 12 students cited PEEL as the way in which they should do their essays – and these were students in three different schools. They also clearly recognised the teachers’ attempts to help them with the process of learning how to structure an essay, if not necessarily an argument. Two mentioned the feedback teachers gave them as being particularly useful and were conscious of the importance of planning their responses even if most admitted they did not practice that particular skill. Year 13 individuals were also very conscious of the focus teachers put on the
structuring of essays. One student went as far as to say that the teacher drew the outline of what an essay should look like on the board so they could visualise the format.

**Question 4 – Have these strategies included technology?** There was a wide range of responses associated with this question. Most teachers included technology in their practice in one form or another and all used computers with whiteboards – using PowerPoint presentations as part of their lesson ‘delivery’. They also used other forms of technology which can be reduced to the following three categories: computer programs, blogging, and e-conferencing, and using technology specifically geared to skills development, which included for example different note-taking strategies – the technology exploited to make note taking easier for students.

**Table A14.8. Categories of forms of technology used in the classroom**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th># of themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer programs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogging and e-conferencing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other forms of technology</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These findings can be represented in the following way:

![Use of technology](image)

**Figure A14.6. Use of technology within History teaching and learning**

Recent research into technology-enhanced learning focuses on Interactive Whiteboards (IWBs). Only one school of the four actually had an IWB within the History department and that was in the Lower School, despite recent legislation designed to ensure IWBs are present in classrooms around the country. It would appear that schools’ policies did not extend to supplying IWBs to History and Humanities departments – I was told that each school had IWBs, but in the Science departments. The teachers did make the point that any technology they used within the lessons was integrated into the lesson objectives and was not used simply for its own sake. These were experienced teachers, used to using many different methods to make History accessible to their students, as can be seen by the range of technology used in the classroom: EBSCEO post database, intranets, GCSE website, drag-and-drop technology, asynchronous conferencing, videos, podcasts, blogging and in particular Oxford blogging, PowerPoint presentations, and interactive whiteboards – when they were given the opportunity to use them.

Students’ responses to the same question were illuminating because, not only did they show the input of the teachers’ strategies in using technology, they also considered other aspects of using technology which had not been mentioned during the teachers’ interviews, perhaps because it was implicit.
They emphasised the importance of collaborative work. They felt that the blogging and e-conferencing was an opportunity to discuss with other students matters that concerned them related to their History learning. Although some of the students had not been involved in an online debate with another school, most of the Year 13 students were happy to consider it and felt that the debating process would be a very good experience and would help their learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th># of themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr 12</td>
<td>Blogging and e-conferencing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 13 Groups</td>
<td>Blogging and e-conferencing</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning points</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 13 Individual</td>
<td>Blogging and e-conferencing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General use</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual use</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A14.9. Student responses to technology use in History showing categories and themes
The table can be depicted in this way:

![Use of technology](image)

**Figure A14.7. Student responses to use of technology in History teaching and learning**

The Year 13 students, whether in groups or individually, did stress the need for confidence as a necessary facet of their interface with the technology. One student in particular was concerned that during an online debate they would feel reluctant to contribute because they were worried about appearing wrong or not clever enough let alone dealing with the new form of technology. This fear was also evident when we discussed debating in general – and there was a common feeling across all of the conditions that shyness was a problem and did prevent students contributing.

Like the teachers, students also felt that technology should be a tool and only used if it was appropriate and added to the learning process and was not just being used for technology’s sake. Some students also mentioned the ubiquitous use of word-processors to write essays – given that the final exam is handwritten and there are not opportunities for cutting and pasting, the value of typed essays was questioned.

One further question was asked of the teachers and students. This was a means to ensure that every aspect of History argumentation that was common practice within the schools I was working with was made explicit before I designed the intervention.
In these responses I have also included interview material from students who had actually taken their A2s and were thinking/reflecting on the experience and how they would help other History students to succeed. They were asked to consider the following question:

*Is there anything else you think I need to know or should do that would help me design an effective intervention that will help History students write more effective argument?*

Table A14.10. Categorised themed teacher responses to ‘How would you help students learn argumentation?’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th># of Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technologies and teaching materials</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This can be depicted as follows:

Figure A14.8. Categorised themes of teacher responses to ‘How would you help students learn argumentation?’

The suggestions range from focusing on the process of learning how to argue and making argumentation a specific goal of assessment purposes in its own right rather than just a way of measuring a person’s ability to reason and use history knowledge and understanding appropriately. It is also clear that the
teachers focus on different types of materials to help them deliver their lessons making them more ‘user-friendly’ for the students.

Where the teacher responses seemed to be easily confined within three categories, the student responses were quite markedly far ranging, particularly when the responses from the post-exam Year 13 group are included. Their responses are of especial interest because they reflect on the whole of their A level History experience. Therefore, since they have also sat the exams, what they have to say could be valuable. Again, it is only a small sample of students who were able to spare the time, so it cannot be considered representative but at least it can offer an indication into what matters to these particular students.

**Table A14.11. Categorised themes of student responses to ‘How would you help A level students learn argumentation?’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>#of themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr 12</td>
<td>Personal attributes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debates</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 13 Individual</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Argument-specific</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal attributes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debates</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 13 Group</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Argument-specific</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal attributes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debates</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning styles</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr 13 Post-exam</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature of History learning</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The teacher responses focus on methods and different ways of learning History; student responses, however, do not. In each condition, ‘collaboration’ appears to be important although it does not appear explicitly in the Year 12 responses; the fact that debates and group presentations are discussed shows the awareness of, and engagement in, collaborative work. It is however curious that the teachers do not mention collaboration as an important element of a student’s learning – in fact it is not mentioned at all. The students also offer insight into working collaboratively, showing the advantages and disadvantages – emphasising the need for clear targets, goals and the ever-present guidance when necessary.

It is important that the post-exam students recognise that ‘confidence’ is an underlying issue which, if not addressed, prevents students from being able to do the best they could in the subject. Confidence is explicitly discussed in the post-exam Year 13 group, while it is only hinted at when the students in the other conditions discuss personal attributes. For example, Year 12 students talk about being overwhelmed by the whole process of learning History, and specifically mention how they are faced with extensive reading and note-taking, skills for which GCSEs do not prepare them. Teachers mention that students
find it difficult to distinguish between opinion and evidence, which is not really surprising because a few of the students state how difficult it is for them to be able to synthesise any of the information, let alone distinguish the different forms in which it can be found. It is also more than apparent that students, even in Year 13, find it difficult to reconcile themselves to the fact that History is not about being right or wrong but about argument, which makes being right and wrong a false dichotomy – again something for which previous learning had not prepared them. Unsurprisingly, process and structure also appear in the student responses, but the Year 13s stress that the specific practice of writing History argument is of more value than trying to follow the PEEL or PEE models. It is also clear from the student interviews that debates are enjoyed and considered a ‘good way to learn’, although it is acknowledged that shy students do not contribute in the debate process, preferring others to speak for them.
Appendix 15 – Felton and Herko’s workshop (Chapter 5)

Although Billig’s contention is at the heart of their research their first session contained explicit instruction in argument structure based on Toulmin’s (2008/1958) essential and simplified form of argumentation – position, claim, warrant and data – which they further reduced to the acronym PREP: “a position on a topic, one or more reasons to support that position, explanation for those reasons and proof to support both reasons and the explanation” (p876).

Using a sample argument about the minimum drinking age in the USA they proceeded to demonstrate in a whole class activity how the arguments generated in their discussions could be represented using PREP.

Two-90 minute sessions dealt with each of the following topics: - hate speech, abortion and gun control. In the first 90-minute session the students were given ample time to read around the particular topic area taking in different perspectives both contemporary and historical. They were allowed to engage in discussion about different points of view and were then assigned positions which they were meant to prepare as a form of written argument using a PREP graphic organiser as a visual aid to help them appreciate the structure of the argument. The next session was an opportunity for the students to debate their position, but they debated in groups of fours. Working in pairs the argument is carried out whilst one of the pair observes and makes notes on the progress of the argument. The argument is concluded and then the observers of each pair feeds back on the process of the argument in terms of content and process. The argument is then continued but the roles are reversed – those of the pair that previously argued become observers whilst the observers become arguers. Only when all participants have argued and observed does the process end. Then the essay is written using the PREP sheets as guides and plans. Felton and Herko (2004) demonstrate that there is a marked improvement in the written argumentation of the group and at the very least the students offer two sides to the argument.
Appendix 16 – Initial Power Point Presentation to support Intervention (Chapter 5)

**THE GENTLE ART OF PERSUASION**

**STAGE 1**

**Introduction**
- Getting to know you
- Give, get, ghastlies, and ground rules

---

**SO WHAT IS AN ARGUMENT?**

**STAGE 2**

**MAKING THE IMPLICIT EXPLICIT**
- Watch the following clip
- Is this an argument?
- What do you think are the characteristics of an argument?

---

**INFORMAL ARGUMENTATION**

Harry was born in Bermuda therefore Harry is a British subject – can be written with warrants and rebuttals like this:

D - (data)
Q (qualifier)
C (claim or conclusion)
Since W (warrant) Unless R (rebuttal)

Which can be written like this:

Harry was born in Bermuda ----> So presumably Harry is a British subject
D
Since W A man born in Bermuda will generally be a British subject
Q
R Both his parents were aliens/ His birth was not registered American...

---

**TRADITIONAL IDEAS ABOUT ARGUMENT**

**FORMAL ARGUMENTATION**
- Based on logic and rational thought

**Aristotle’s Syllogisms**
- Socrates is a man
- All men are mortal
- Socrates is mortal

(Toulmin (2008) p.100)

Any problems with this idea?

---

**HOW DOES THIS RELATE TO HISTORY ARGUMENT?**

- Formal argumentation is based on the application of logic and rational thought
- Informal argumentation is an attempt to relate logic and rational thought to ordinary life
- Both forms suggest that argument can be all about winning and losing.
- But is this History argument?
AN INTERESTING DEFINITION

- Let’s remember that

- “If History is pre-eminently interpretation, the practice of History is argument.”
  - (McGill 1973 pg 115)

WHAT IS HISTORY ARGUMENT?

- It can be argued however that History Argument isn’t about winning or losing, it is about interpreting the past based on partial and incomplete evidence from a variety of different sources. Each interpretation attempts to explain and analyse a form of human, social and/or cultural behaviour from the past.

- We cannot know completely what actually happened in the past. We can only begin to understand the past when we analyse the evidence and other people’s interpretations.

Which type of argument is closest to History argument?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Dialogue</th>
<th>Initial Situation</th>
<th>Participant’s Goal</th>
<th>Goal of Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>Conflict of opinions</td>
<td>Persuade other party</td>
<td>Resolve or clarify issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry</td>
<td>Need to have proof</td>
<td>Find and verify evidence</td>
<td>Prove (disprove) hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>Conflict of interests</td>
<td>Get what you most want</td>
<td>Reasonable settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information-seeking</td>
<td>One party lacks information</td>
<td>Acquire or give information</td>
<td>Exchange information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberation</td>
<td>Dilemma or practical choice</td>
<td>Co-ordinate goals and actions</td>
<td>Decide best course of action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eristic</td>
<td>Personal conflict</td>
<td>Verbally hit out at opponent</td>
<td>Reveal deeper conflict</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ARGUING AND THINKING

- Making the move from GCSE – two sided argument – to:
  - AS and A2 – following the thread, supporting with evidence and acknowledging other views.

- Role Play
  - You are babysitting but the child won’t settle, insists on being allowed to walk down a busy road to buy some sweets or may wish to watch a film he shouldn’t.

- One of you is the babysitter – one of you is the child...

- What arguments are you going to put forward?

- Judge on strength of arguments. Would you allow the child to watch the film/ walk along the road/ have the extra food?

MAKING A JUDGEMENT

STAGE 3

HOW FAR DO YOU AGREE.....?

- Class brainstorm of factors onto board

PRIVATE SILENT WORK - REFLECTION

- Do you or do you not agree with the statement?
- 3 reasons for your point of view
- Support with 2 pieces of evidence

DO NOT SAY A WORD

HAVE YOU THE STRENGTH OF YOUR CONVICTIONS!!!

- Still without saying a word

- Standing on the continuum work out where you stand in agreement with the statement – almost at one end almost entirely not at the other – or somewhere in the middle?

- It’s Ok to have an opinion but can you support it?
PREPARING FOR THE DEBATE

Stage 4
- Pair up with person next to you
- Discuss how far you agree with the statement and give your reasons why
- Compare reasons and the use of evidence
- If there are different reasons work out why you both differ in the reasons you are using even though your judgement is very similar
- Have these further points + reasons + evidence strengthened or weakened your standpoint?

DEBATING – FOCUSING ON THE COUNTERARGUMENT

Debating in fours
- On the continuum match with the pair that corresponds to the opposite of your point of view
- I person from each pair argues the first 2 points while the other person of the pair silently watches and takes notes
- The pairs meet to discuss the progress of the debate – did No 1 put forward their case and did they respond to the other side before they made their second point.

KEEPING THE THREAD OF THE ARGUMENT CLEAR!!

- Write down your points of view with their supporting reasons and evidence
- Discuss together and add 2 more reasons with corresponding evidence to support your points of view
- Together work out which are the strongest and weakest reasons which support your respective point of view
- Remember to keep the thread of your argument clear by linking your reasons correspondingly

TRANSFORMING THIS TO WRITTEN ARGUMENT

Stage 6
- Consider your initial position – has it changed and why? What is your judgement now?
- Plan your written response using whichever written structure you feel most comfortable with
- You have made a judgement and your introduction should reflect this so state how far you agree and disagree with the statement including reference to the points you have discussed in your discussion
- These naturally will be different reasons and will include reasons from the pair that were ‘opposing you’
- Your plan should demonstrate a convincing argument which means that the thread of the argument should be clear in writing. Your response should also incorporate the different reasons which you have chosen to use for demonstration to the examiner that you are aware that there are different and sometimes opposing points of view but nevertheless this is your point of view and you are sticking fast

WITH A LITTLE HELP FROM YOUR FRIENDS

- Put your plan showing your introduction, the outline of your argument, incorporating the counterargument and post it on the blog
- Or put it on sugar paper and stick it around the classroom wall
- Everyone should read each other’s plans and post 2 comments one that focuses on the argument – is the thread clear, do the points support the argument and is there a counterargument present. These posts are in the form of post-its and posts on the blog
- The comments should be constructive and if the plan isn’t clear then kind words should be used to offer assistance in making it clearer
- The other comment should focus on the use of evidence and how well chosen it might be to reflect the argument – and if it is evidence that is new to you – thank the planner and offer evidence that s/he could use in return
The final part

- Now write the essay using your plan and the comments from your friends.

- The essay will be assessed not only using the AS level mark scheme but also looking at how you have developed your response from the comments of your friends.
How to write a Law argument effectively.

Stage 1
Introduction
- Getting to know you (THAT WON'T TAKE LONG)
- Ground rules (WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO DO)

Stage 2
Making the implicit explicit
- Watch the following clip
- Is this an argument?
- What do you think are the characteristics of an argument?

Traditional ideas about argument
- **Formal Argumentation**
  - based on logic and rational thought
  - Aristotle's Syllogisms
    - Socrates is a man
    - All men are mortal
    - Socrates is mortal
      (Toulmin (2008) p.100)
- Any problems with this idea?

Informal argumentation
- Harry was PROVOKED therefore Harry is GUILTY OF MANSLAUGHTER NOT MURDER –
  - D – (data) ——— So ——— ——— (conclusion)
- The argument can ALSO be written with warrants and rebuttals
  - Since /Because
  - Unless /However
  - (Warrant)
  - (Rebuttal)
  - D – (data) – Harry was PROVOKED and because provocation is a partial defence, (warrant) therefore Harry is GUILTY OF MANSLAUGHTER NOT MURDER (conclusion)
INFORMAL ARGUMENTATION

Harry was PROVOKED therefore Harry is GUILTY OF MANSLAUGHTER NOT MURDER –

Since /Because
(Warrant)

Unless /However
(Rebuttal)

D – (Data) – Harry was PROVOKED and, because provocation is a partial defence (Warrant) therefore Harry is GUILTY OF MANSLAUGHTER NOT MURDER (Conclusion) unless he was acting from revenge or there was a long time lapse. (Rebuttal)

How does this relate to LAW argument?

In a courtroom, the prosecution and defence are only interested in winning. The system is adversarial.

This isn’t useful for investigating a concept like Justice and trying to develop our thoughts.

We’re interested in first of all developing our ideas and secondly in seeing if we can persuade others of our opinion.

WHERE TYPE OF ARGUMENT ARE WE INVOLVED IN TODAY?

Type of Dialogue | Initial Situation | Participant’s Goal | Goal of Dialogue
--- | --- | --- | ---
Persuasion | Conflict of opinions | Persuade other party | Resolve or clarify issue
Inquiry | Need to have proof | Find and verify evidence | Prove (disprove) hypothesis
Negotiation | Conflict of interests | Get what you most want | Reasonable settlement
Information-seeking | One party lacks information | Acquire or give information | Exchange information
Deliberation | Dilemma or practical choice | Co-ordinate goals and actions | Decide best course of action
Eristic | Personal conflict | Verbally hit out at opponent | Reveal deeper conflict

Making a judgement

Stage 3

How far do you agree......?

The Law always tries to uphold Justice (be fair)
Class brainstorm of factors onto board
Class – Think about procedures and outcomes. Remember hard cases.

Private silent work - reflection

Do you or do you not agree with the statement?
2 reasons for your point of view
Support with 2 pieces of evidence

DO NOT SAY A WORD

Have you the strength of your convictions!!!

Still without saying a word

Standing on the continuum work out where you stand in agreement with the statement – almost - at one end almost entirely not at the other – or somewhere in the middle?

It’s Ok to have an opinion but can you support it?

Preparing for the debate

Stage 4

Form 2 teams
Discuss how far you agree with the statement and give your reasons why
Compare reasons and the use of evidence
If they are different reasons work out why you both differ in the reasons you are using even though your judgement is very similar
Have these further points + reasons + evidence strengthened or weakened your standpoint?
**Keeping the Thread of the Argument Clear!!**
- Write down your points of view with their supporting reasons and evidence.
- Discuss together and add 2 more reasons with corresponding evidence to support your points of view.
- Together work out which are the strongest and weakest reasons which support your respective point of view.
- Remember to keep the thread of your argument clear by linking your reasons correspondingly.

**Debating**
- One Speaker + Observers
- Two “Speeches”
- The observers’ job is to monitor what points are made both by their speaker and the other one.
- Using the notes, the team can discuss which points need to be addressed in the second “speech.”

**There is No Right or Wrong Answer**
- However….Are we clearer about the issues?

**Transforming This to Written Argument**
- **Stage 6**
  - Consider your initial position – has it changed and why? What is your judgement now?
  - Plan your written response using whichever written structure you feel most comfortable with.
  - You have made a judgement and your introduction should reflect this so state how far you agree and disagree with the statement including reference to the points you have discussed in your 4.
  - These naturally will be different reasons and will include reasons from the pair that were opposing you.
  - Your plan should demonstrate a convincing argument which means that the thread of the argument should be clear throughout. Your response should also incorporate the different reasons which you have chosen to use and demonstrate to the examiner that you have considered the different perspectives which may have been presented during the debate. The best plan will be one which shows your ability to support your own point of view that nevertheless is your point of view and you are sticking to it.

**With a Little Help from Your Friends**
- Put your plan showing your introduction, the outline of your argument, incorporating the counterargument and post in on the blog.
- Or put it on sugar paper and stick it around the classroom wall.
- Everyone should read each other’s plans and post a comment that focuses on the argument – is the thread clear, do the points support the argument and is there a counterargument present. These posts are in the form of post-its and posts on the blog.
- The comments should be constructive and if the plan isn’t clear then kind words should be used to offer assistance in making it clearer.
- The other comment should focus on the use of evidence and how well chosen it might be to reflect the argument – and if it is evidence that is new to you – thank the planner and offer evidence that she could use in return.

**The Final Part**
- Now write the essay using your plan and the comments from your friends.
- The essay will be assessed not only using the AS level mark scheme but also looking at how you have developed your response from the comments of your friends.
Persecution and Control: Interpretations of the Great Purges

Learning objectives:
- To understand the two main interpretations
- To develop the skills of using argument
- To apply these skills to writing an essay (assignment 15)

Lesson plan
1. Trident diagrams due in today
2. The main interpretations of the Great Purges
3. Essay titles
4. Argument: continuum line exercise
5. Argument: debate
6. WHWL?

Assignment 16
PERSECUTION AND CONTROL: Interpretations of the Great Purges

The point of the assignment is to understand the different interpretations of the Great Purges (also called the Great Terror by some historians), as well as getting some essay writing practice.

Deadline: Friday 25 March
Reading:
- Laver (the Noddy book) pp110-114
- Corin (the Argos catalogue) pp 221-228 (a good starter summarising the broad interpretations is on p222)

The Totalitarian Interpretation

- Stalin planned the Great Purges
- He used the NKVD to carry out his orders
- He used violence to control the Communist Party and the people
- He wanted to get rid of old Bolsheviks who could have threatened his leadership
- Stalin’s personality was an important reason for the Purges
- Example: Robert Conquest (1990)
The Revisionist Interpretation

- Stalin began the Purges, but did not control events.
- He did not plan the Purges in advance.
- The USSR was a big country and one man could not control everything.
- The NKVD often acted on their own initiative.
- As the terror escalated, people informed on each other.
- Example: John Arch Getty, 1985

Argument: Making a Judgement

Essay title: How far was Stalin’s personality the main cause of the Great Purges?

1. Rephrase the question to a statement
2. Class brainstorm of factors onto board
3. Private silent work - reflection

- Do you or do you not agree with the statement?
- Think of two reasons for your point of view; jot them down
- Support your point of view with two pieces of evidence

Have you the strength of your convictions!

- Still without saying a word, figure out where you will stand on the continuum line
- Stand on the continuum line.
- Can you support your opinion with evidence?

Preparing for the debate

- Pair up with person next to you
- Discuss how far you agree with the statement and give your reasons why
- Compare reasons and the use of evidence
- If you have different reasons, discuss why you differ in the reasons you are using- even though your judgement is similar
- Have these further points, reasons and evidence strengthened or weakened your standpoint?
**Keeping the thread of the argument clear**
- Write down your point of view with their supporting reasons and evidence.
- Discuss together and add two more reasons with corresponding evidence to support your point of view.
- Together work out which are the strongest and weakest reasons which support your point of view.
- Keep the thread of your argument clear by linking your reasons.

---

**Debating – focusing on the counterargument**
- On the continuum line, match with the pair that holds the opposite of your point of view.
- One person from each pair argues the first two points while the other person of the pair silently watches and takes notes.
- The pairs meet to discuss the progress of the debate: - did number one put forward their case?
- did they respond to the other side before they made their second point?

---

**There is no right or wrong argument, but the strength of your argument will score higher marks**
- Try the continuum line exercise again.
- Has anyone changed their mind based on other peoples’ reasons and evidence?
- Has anything new come up?

---

**WHWL?**
- WHWL about the interpretations of the Purges?
- WHWL about argument, using evidence and debate?
Appendix 19 – A2 Question and Mark scheme (Chapter 7)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE. GCE HISTORY A F961QP Extract from OCR

History paper © OCR 2007

Unit F961: British History Period Studies

Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1035-1642

Specimen Paper

Morning/Afternoon

Time: 1 hour 30 mins

INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

• This paper contains questions on the following 6 Study Topics:
  
  • From Anglo-Saxon England to Norman England 1035-1087
  • Lancastrians, Yorkists and Tudors 1450-1509
  • Henry VIII to Mary I 1509-1558
  • Church and State 1529-89
  • England under Elizabeth I 1558-1603
  • The Early Stuarts and the Origins of the Civil War 1603-1642

• Each question is marked out of 50.

• You should write in continuous prose and are reminded of the need for clear and accurate writing, including structure and argument, grammar, punctuation and spelling.

• There are 3 questions for each Study Topic. You may select your two questions from any one or two of the Study Topics.

Answer any two questions

From Anglo-Saxon England to Norman England 1035-1087

1 Assess the problems that faced Edward the Confessor in controlling the Godwin family. [50]

2 How far was the leadership of William of Normandy responsible for the defeat of the Anglo-Saxons at the Battle of Hastings? Explain your answer. [50]
Assess the reasons why there were rebellions against William I from 1067 to 1071. [50]

Mark – Scheme

GCE History Marking Guidance OCR

Marking of Questions: Levels of Response

The mark scheme provides an indication of the sorts of answer that might be found at different levels. The exemplification of content within these levels is not complete. It is intended as a guide and it will be necessary, therefore, for examiners to use their professional judgement in deciding both at which level a question has been answered and how effectively points have been sustained. Candidates should always be rewarded according to the quality of thought expressed in their answer and not solely according to the amount of knowledge conveyed. However candidates with only a superficial knowledge will be unable to develop or sustain points sufficiently to move to higher levels.

In assessing the quality of thought, consider whether the answer:
(i) is relevant to the question and is explicitly related to the question’s terms
(ii) argues a case, when requested to do so
(iii) is able to make the various distinctions required by the question
(iv) has responded to all the various elements in the question
(v) where required, explains, analyses, discusses, assesses, and deploys knowledge of the syllabus content appropriately, rather than simply narrates.

Examiners should award marks both between and within levels according to the above criteria. This should be done in conjunction with the levels of response indicated in the mark schemes for particular questions.

At the end of each answer, examiners should look back on the answer as a whole in the light of these general criteria in order to ensure that the total mark reflects their overall impression of the answer’s worth.

Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level

The first stage is to decide the overall level and then whether the work represents high, mid or low performance within the level. The overall level will be determined by the candidate’s ability to focus on the question set, displaying the appropriate conceptual grasp. Within any one piece of work there may well be evidence of work at two, or even three levels. One stronger passage at Level 4 would not by itself merit a Level 4 award - but it would be evidence to support a high Level 3 award - unless there were also substantial weaknesses in other areas.

Assessing Quality of Written Communication

QoWC will have a bearing if the QoWC is inconsistent with the communication descriptor for the level in which the candidate’s answer falls. If, for example, a candidate’s history response displays mid Level 3 criteria but fits the Level 2 QoWC descriptors, it will require a move down within the level.

Unit 1: Generic Level Descriptors

Target: AO1a and AO1b (13%) (30 marks)

Essay - to present historical explanations and reach a judgement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>Candidates will produce mostly simple statements. These will be supported by limited factual material which has some accuracy and relevance, although not directed at the focus of the question. The material will be mostly generalised. There will be few, if any, links between the simple statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks&lt;br&gt;The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth&lt;br&gt;Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks&lt;br&gt;As per descriptor.&lt;br&gt;High Level 1: 5-6 marks&lt;br&gt;The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 1.&lt;br&gt;The writing may have limited coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>Candidates will produce a series of simple statements supported by some accurate and relevant factual material. The analytical focus will be mostly implicit and there are likely to be only limited links between the simple statements. Material is unlikely to be developed very far.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks&lt;br&gt;The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth&lt;br&gt;Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks&lt;br&gt;As per descriptor.&lt;br&gt;High Level 2: 11-12 marks&lt;br&gt;The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 2.&lt;br&gt;The writing will have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. Some of the skills needed to produce effective writing will be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 19 – continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 3 13-18</th>
<th>Level 4 19-24</th>
<th>Level 5 25-30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates' answers will attempt analysis and will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will, however, include material which is either, descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question’s focus, or which strays from that focus. Factual material will mostly be accurate but it may lack depth and/or reference to the given factor.</td>
<td>Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. The selection of material may lack balance in places.</td>
<td>Candidates offer an analytical response which directly addresses the focus of the question and which demonstrates explicit understanding of the key issues contained in it. It will be broadly balanced in its treatment of these key issues. The analysis will be supported by accurate, relevant and appropriately selected factual material which demonstrates some range and depth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks</td>
<td>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks</td>
<td>Low Level 5: 25-26 marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</td>
<td>The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</td>
<td>The qualities of Level 5 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range/depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks</td>
<td>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks</td>
<td>Mid Level 5: 27-28 marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As per descriptor</td>
<td>As per descriptor</td>
<td>As per descriptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Level 3: 17-18 marks</td>
<td>High Level 4: 23-24 marks</td>
<td>High Level 5: 29-30 marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 3. The writing will be coherent in places but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. Only some of the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are likely to be present. Syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</td>
<td>The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 4. The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes may not be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing but there may be passages which lack clarity or coherence. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</td>
<td>The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 5. The exposition will be controlled and the deployment logical. Some syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but the writing will be coherent overall. The skills required to produce convincing extended writing will be in place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: The generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.

Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication

Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be
Appendix 19– continued

awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.
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Indicative Content
From Anglo-Saxon England to Norman England 1035-1087

1
Assess the problems that faced Edward the Confessor in controlling the Godwin family.
Focus: Assessment of important problems of a ruler.
No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.
Candidates might consider the strength of the Godwins and the complementary weaknesses of Edward the Confessor. The Godwins had their centre in Wessex, historically a strong earldom. They had connections with other powerful families through marriage. Earl Godwin’s criticisms of the prevalence of foreigners especially Normans, at Edward’s court and in the Church evoked a popular response. There was a danger of civil war in 1051 before Earl Godwin fled to the continent and was outlawed before being restored a year later. The succession of Harold as head of the family in 1053 continued the importance of the Godwins. By 1063, Harold was the dominant English noble and candidates can explain his claim to the throne, which caused problems to Edward. The King himself was often unable to assert himself. He had to rely on the co-operation of others who were hostile to the Godwins. Although his final years were peaceful, this stability was at the expense of recognising the position of Harold and the Godwin family.

[50]

2
How far was the leadership of William of Normandy responsible for the defeat of the Anglo-Saxons at the Battle of Hastings? Explain your answer.
Focus: Assessment of the reasons for an important military victory.
No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.
‘How far ..?’ means that candidates should consider the stated factor but also examine alternative explanations. They may, or may not, agree with the prior importance of the claim in the question. This will affect the balance of the question but Band 3 will normally require an adequate paragraph on the stated factor. It is undeniable that William’s role was important although there is debate about the sequence of events: the planned retreat of the Normans at one point or a disorderly and hazardous flight that was stemmed by William personally? William had prepared well for the invasion and strengthened his position after landing. He was an experienced military commander. On the other hand, Harold’s role should be examined. He also had a high military reputation but candidates might wonder whether he was wise to advance so quickly on the invaders after Stamford Bridge. Candidates might compare ther respective strengths of the armies at Hastings. Some might consider the element of luck; William benefited from the simultaneous invasion of Harald Hardrada.

[50]

3
Assess the reasons why there were rebellions against William I from 1067 to 1071.
Focus: Assessment of the reasons for rebellion in a specific period.
No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.
Most disorders were local and reflected local grievances, rather than wholesale and co-ordinated resistance against William I’s government. The rebels have been described as ‘aimless malcontents, selfish adventurers or freebooters’ (not a quotation that candidates are expected to pick up but a fair assessment of their usual qualities). Reference might be made to Edgar Aetheling and Hereward the Wake. The distant provinces saw more unrest, including the Welsh Marches, Devon and Cornwall, and the far north. The Scots were willing to chance their arm. Some risings were assisted by discontented men such as Eustace of Boulogne. The Danes resumed their threats, for example sacking York. After 1067, William I took steps to assert his authority over the whole of England, but was not fully in control until about 1071.

[50]
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Appendix 20 – Levels of TAP from Erduran, Simon and Osborne (2004) (Chapter 7)

Toulmin’s Argumentation Pattern (TAP) Analytical Framework used in assessing the quality of argumentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Argumentation consists of arguments that are a simple claim versus a counterclaim or a claim versus claim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Argumentation has arguments consisting of claims with either data, warrants or backings but do not contain any rebuttals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Argumentation has arguments with a series of claims or counterclaims with either data, warrants, or backings with the occasional weak rebuttal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Argumentation shows arguments with a claim with a clearly identifiable rebuttal. Such an argument may have several claims and counterclaims as well, but this is not necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Argumentation displays an extended argument with more than one rebuttal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 21 – Developing Adapted TAP (Chapter 7)

TAP Analytical Framework used in assessing the quality of argumentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Argumentation consists of arguments that are a simple claim versus a counterclaim or a claim versus claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Argumentation has arguments consisting of claims with either data, warrants or backings but do not contain any rebuttals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Argumentation has arguments with a series of claims or counterclaims with either data, warrants, or backings with the occasional weak rebuttal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Argumentation shows arguments with a claim with a clearly identifiable rebuttal. Such an argument may have several claims and counterclaims as well, but this is not necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Argumentation displays an extended argument with more than one rebuttal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This tool is based on Toulmin’s model of argumentation that suggests that spoken (naturally occurring argument) and indeed written argument can be reduced to claims, counterclaims, data, warrants and rebuttals. How this ‘tool’ works to determine levels of argumentation can be demonstrated in the following example

Levels of argument and examples (Erduran, Simon and Osborne, 2004) pg 111

Level 1 argumentation consists of arguments that are a simple claim versus a counterclaim or a claim versus a claim

Example
S1: Right “for” (claim)
S2: We are not for (counterclaim)

Level 2 argumentation has arguments consisting of a claim versus a claim with either data, warrants or backings but do not contain any rebuttals

Example
S1: I don’t think they would hurt them in a professional zoo (Claim)
S2: But they might scare the other animals by seeing some sedated animal being dragged off (claim+data)

Level 3 argumentation has arguments with a series of claims or counterclaims with either data, warrants or backings with the occasional weak rebuttal

Example
Summary of Discourse Codes (from Felton & Kuhn, 2001)

Agree-? A question that asks whether the partner will accept or agree with the speaker’s claim.
Case-? A request for the partner to take a position on a particular case or scenario
Clarify-? A request for the partner to clarify his or her preceding utterance
Justify-? A request for the partner to support his or her preceding claim with evidence or further argument
Meta-? A question regarding the dialogue itself (rather than its content).

This example is taken from a Science classroom – with younger children than A level students. The tool is quite complicated to use particularly when trying to determine what a warrant is and data because in more complicated sentences words can be both data and warrant thus making it difficult to measure easily.

A different way of dissecting spoken argument is based in focusing on the purpose of the utterance within the argument. To a certain extent it can complement TAP because it can make more sense of what it being ‘discussed’ whilst giving the researcher the opportunity to measure such incidents. The model can be easily used to show argumentation in a hierarchical manner such as TAP does.
Appendix 21– continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position-?</td>
<td>A request for the partner to state his or her position on an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question-?</td>
<td>A simple informational question that does not refer back to the partner’s preceding utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond-?</td>
<td>A request for the partner to react to the speaker’s utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add</td>
<td>An extension or elaboration of the partner’s preceding argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>An extension or elaboration that advances the partner’s preceding argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>A statement of agreement with the partner’s preceding utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aside</td>
<td>A comment that does not extend or elaborate the partner’s preceding utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify</td>
<td>A clarification of speaker’s own argument in response to the partner’s preceding utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coopt</td>
<td>An assertion that the partner’s immediately preceding utterance serves the speaker’s opposing argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-A</td>
<td>A disagreement with the partner’s preceding utterance, accompanied by an alternate argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-C</td>
<td>A disagreement with the partner’s preceding utterance, accompanied by a critique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>A simple disagreement without further argument or elaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismiss</td>
<td>An assertion that the partner’s immediately preceding utterance is irrelevant to the speaker’s position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpret</td>
<td>A paraphrase of the partner’s preceding utterance with or without further elaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>An utterance regarding the dialogue itself (rather than its content)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null</td>
<td>An unintelligible or off-task utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse</td>
<td>An explicit refusal to respond to the partner’s preceding question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantiate</td>
<td>An utterance offered in support of the partner’s preceding utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue</td>
<td>A continuation or elaboration of the speaker’s own last utterance that ignores the partner’s immediately preceding utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconnected</td>
<td>An utterance having no apparent connection to the preceding utterances of either partner or speaker.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taken from pages 1259-1260

Later work by Goldstein, Crowell and Kuhn (2009) builds on this model but clarifies thinking about counter-arguments in the forms of counter-alternative or counter-critique

**Forms of Counterarguments** Goldstein, Crowell, & Kuhn (2009)

“This assessment is based in the function of the utterance in relation to the immediately preceding utterance

The weaker form of Counterargument is a Counter-Alternative which expresses disagreement by advancing a different argument in support of one’s own position but does not directly address the argument put forth by the opponent which means that the other argument still retains its force

The stronger form is a Counter-Critique which disagrees by responding directly to the opponent’s argument with an argument designed to weaken its force”.

So ‘adapted TAP’ uses the hierarchical levels of TAP to measure arguments in levels but uses Kuhn and Udell’s appropriation of Felton & Kuhn (2001) and focuses in particular on the counter arguing clarified by Goldstein, Crowell & Kuhn (2009).
Appendix 22 – Assessing argument by considering the form of counter-argumentation.

Teresa … I don’t think that their relationship is particularly relevant in the fact that Henry surrendered his power, because he’s not going to surrender power to a close friend is he? Teresa is responding to a point about relationships made earlier considering it irrelevant because she suggests that Henry would not surrender power to a close friend – but she does not explain why.

Jonathan He’s not a close friend though, is he? Well, one of his close friends because otherwise he’d have been caught up with, like, partying with Henry in his chamber and everything and all that with him – he’d have been one of them instead, and not left him doing the boring stuff and government, which you could say… Jonathan counters ignoring the point made about surrendering power but develops the point about Wolsey’s relationship with Henry and whether he is a close friend or not. He uses evidence from the documents to suggest that Wolsey cannot be a close friend otherwise he would have been partying with him. In this exchange Jonathan ignores a critical point but counters and develops the second point of closeness as a friend. This is an example of counter-critiquing the other person’s argument.
Appendix 22—continued

Teresa But that shows that Henry’s got a certain amount… like, a large amount of trust that he has… he has got a lot of power there.

_Teresa responds to Jonathan—in fact she interrupts him tacitly accepting his point about Henry’s friends who would ‘all be partying with him’ but counters Jonathan’s ‘not left doing the boring stuff’ by developing his point further and going back to the initial point about where power rests.

Henry trusts Wolsey with government— not only does he have a lot of power but the level of trust Henry places in Wolsey should indicate a level of ‘closeness’ in a relationship.

Again this is counter-critiquing—he is showing how Jonathan’s evidence could be construed in a different way and in so doing reinforces her previous argument.

Jonathan Yeah, but another way… or you could say that he was using him so that he could have fun and still do what he does.

_Jonathan’s responds but does not fully accept Teresa’s interpretation and offers an alternative interpretation—this is not a new or alternative argument but a development of his previous counter-argument—Henry is using Wolsey—so that he has fun while someone else does the work….

Teresa But even if he was using him, he still had to make it worthy for him.

_Teresa quickly responds and makes the point that to leave someone else to do the work of ‘government’ must mean that Wolsey had to be worthy of the trust that Henry placed in him.

_These are short exchanges with barely a breath taken before the next utterance is made._
Appendix 22– continued

Jonathan Yeah, but he still, like, always had the final say in decisions didn’t he? For example, why was he appointed some Head of the Monastery – like nunneries or whatever they were called?

Jonathan makes a very important point – he always had the say in final decisions…. But his evidence does not support the point he makes and Teresa tells him so….

This is an example of argumentation where each student is countering the other’s argument sometimes directly questioning the evidence and other times reinforcing their own argument by referring back to earlier points in an effort to counter what has just been said. This is an extract taken from a much longer piece so the argumentation can be considered successful because it is certainly more than six turns long.

Although points are not always referred to in an exchange it can be seen that the exchanges are dealing with pertinent and relevant information – they are directly responding to each other’s points they are not introducing new arguments – as in a counter alternative where the argument of one person is not considered before the respondent simply states their case. The example of argumentation demonstrated above is the kind of argumentation where the matter of the argument means more than the group of self identity and in this way the exchanges between Jonathan and Teresa can be considered to be rich in dialogic talk.
### Appendix 23 – Indicators of dialogic interaction

#### Table of indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appearance</th>
<th>Indicators in argumentation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Body Language</td>
<td>Intent, leaning forward, open stance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animation</td>
<td>All in group actively engaged either in discourse or avidly listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye contact</td>
<td>Good eye contact – direct gaze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Awareness of individuals</td>
<td>So wrapped up in the discourse oblivious to anything else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise levels</td>
<td>It is noisy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularity of turn taking</td>
<td>Not always observed carried away in the discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauses?</td>
<td>Sometimes but an active pause – perhaps symbolic of thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal?</td>
<td>Fluent although words not always clearly spoken but response suggests meaning understood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anything new come up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does interaction take an unexpected turn?</td>
<td>Students acquire their own voice which can be measured or demonstrated in their essays.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 24 – Power Point Presentation – Case Study 1 (Chapter 8)

So you think you know how to argue Huh?!
How to write History argument effectively.

And pass your exams as well!

Diana M Hilliard

The gentle art of persuasion

Stage 1

Introduction

- Getting to know you
- Give, get, ghastlies, and ground rules

Stage 2

Making the implicit explicit

- Watch the following clip
- Is this an argument?
- What do you think are the characteristics of an argument?

Traditional ideas about argument

- Formal Argumentation
  - Based on logic and rational thought
  - Aristotle’s Syllogisms
    - Socrates is a man
    - All men are mortal
    - Socrates is mortal
    - (Toulmin (2008) p.100)

Any problems with this idea?

Informal Argumentation

- Harry was born in Bermuda therefore Harry is a British subject – can be written with warrants and rebuttals like this
- D (data)
- Q (qualification, C (claim or conclusion)
- W (Warrant)
- R (Rebuttal)

Which can be written like this:

- Harry was born in Bermuda – So presumably Harry is a British subject
- Since A man born in Bermuda will generally be a British subject
- Both his parents were aliens/He has become a naturalised American...

How does this relate to History argument?

- Formal argumentation is based on the application of logic and rational thought
- Informal argumentation is an attempt to relate logic and rational thought to ordinary life
- Both forms suggest that argument can be all about winning and losing.
- But is this History argument?

How to write History argument effectively.
And pass your exams as well!
An interesting definition

- Let’s remember that

- “If history is pre-eminently interpretation, the practice of history is argument.”
  - (McGill 1973 pg 115)

What is History Argument?

- It can be argued however that History Argument isn’t about winning or losing, it is about interpreting the past based on partial and incomplete evidence from a variety of different sources. Each interpretation attempts to explain and analyse a form of human, social and/or cultural behaviour from the past.

- We cannot know completely what actually happened in the past. We can only begin to understand the past when we analyse the evidence and other people’s interpretations.

Which type of argument is closest to History argument?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Dialogue</th>
<th>Initial Situation</th>
<th>Participant’s Goal</th>
<th>Goal of Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>Conflict of opinions</td>
<td>Persuade other party</td>
<td>Resolve or clarify issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry</td>
<td>Need to have proof</td>
<td>Find and verify evidence</td>
<td>Prove (disprove) hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>Conflict of interests</td>
<td>Get what you most want</td>
<td>Reasonable settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information-seeking</td>
<td>One party lacks information</td>
<td>Acquire or give information</td>
<td>Exchange information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberation</td>
<td>Dilemma or practical choice</td>
<td>Co-ordinate goals and actions</td>
<td>Decide best course of action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eristic</td>
<td>Personal conflict</td>
<td>Verbally hit out at opponent</td>
<td>Reveal deeper conflict</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arguing and thinking

- Making the move from GCSE - two sided argument – to:
  - AS and A2 – following the thread, supporting with evidence and acknowledging other views.

Stage 3

- Louis XIV’s Foreign policy

  - Nine Year’s War
  - Spanish War of Succession

- What were the origins?
  - What were the consequences?

What do you remember?

Stage 3

- Louis XIV’s Foreign policy

  - Some memory joggers....

  - Nine Year’s War
  - Spanish War of Succession

Understanding the question

- How important is the pursuit of glory in explaining the motives of Louis XIV’s foreign policy in the years 1672 – 1688?

Silent work - Reflection

- Think about this carefully then write it in your own words.

Underline the key parts of the essay question
**Appendix 24— continued**

### Making a Judgement
- **Reflection and silent work**

**Key question**
- Do you or do you not think that the pursuit of glory is important in explaining the motives with the statement?
- 2 reasons for your point of view
- Support with 2 pieces of evidence

**Do not say a word**

### Have you the strength of your convictions!!!
- **Still without saying a word**

- **Standing on the continuum work out where you stand in relation to the statement — very important at one end not important at the other — or somewhere in the middle?**
- **It’s Ok to have an opinion but can you support it?**

### Recap: What is an Argument?

### Preparing for the debate

**Stage 4**
- Pair up with person next to you
- Discuss how far you think the pursuit of glory explains Louis XVI’s foreign policy give your reasons why
- Compare reasons and the use of evidence
- If they are different reasons work out why you both differ in the reasons you are using even though your judgement is very similar
- Have these further points + reasons + evidence strengthened or weakened your standpoint?

### Keeping the thread of the Argument Clear!!
- Write down your points of view with their supporting reasons and evidence
- Discuss together and add 2 more reasons with corresponding evidence to support your points of view.
- Together work out which are the strongest and weakest reasons which support your respective point of view
- Remember to keep the thread of your argument clear by linking your reasons correspondingly

### Debating — focusing on the counterargument

*Debating in fours*
- On the continuum match with the pair that corresponds to the opposite of your point of view
- I person from each pair argues the first 2 points while the other person of the pair silently watches and takes notes
- The pairs meet to discuss the progress of the debate — did No1 put forward their case and did they respond to the other side before they made their second point.
There is no right or wrong reason just the strength of argument

- The second person of the pair follows the same procedure

Four-way discussion
- The pairs that were arguing meet – has either of them changed their mind based on the other’s reason and evidence?
- Did they change their argument to meet the demands of the other’s point of view?
- Has anything NEW come up?
Collectively they discuss whether anyone has changed their position and why

Transforming this to Written argument

Stage 6
- Consider your initial position – has it changed and why? What is your judgement now?
- Plan your written response using whichever written structure you feel most comfortable with.
- You have made a judgement and your introduction should reflect this so state how far you agree and disagree with the statement including reference to the points you have discussed in your 4s.
- These naturally will be different reasons and will include reasons from the pair that were opposing you.
- Your plan should demonstrate a convincing argument which means that the thread of the argument should be clear throughout. Your response should also incorporate the different reasons which you have chosen to use to demonstrate to the examiner that you are aware that there are different and sometimes opposing points of view but nevertheless this is your point of view and you are sticking to it.

With a little help from your friends
- Put your plan showing your introduction, the outline of your argument, incorporating the counterargument and post it on the blog.
- Or put it on sugar paper and stick it around the classroom wall.
- Everyone should read each other’s plans and post a comments one that focuses on the argument – is the thread clear, do the points support the argument and is there a counterargument present. These posts are in the form of post-its and posts on the blog.
- The comments should be constructive and if the plan isn’t clear/them kind words should be used to offer assistance in making it clearer.
- The other comment should focus on the use of evidence and how well chosen it might be to reflect the argument – and if it is evidence that is new to you – thank the planner and offer evidence that s/he could use in return.

The final part
- Now write the essay using your plan and the comments from your friends.
- The essay will be assessed not only using the AS level mark scheme but also looking at how you have developed your response from the comments of your friends.
Appendix 25 – AS Questions and Mark Scheme for Louis XIV (Chapter 8)

1 (a) Explain why, in 1661, Louis XIV decided to rule without a principal minister. (12 marks)

(b) How successful was Louis XIV in maintaining the authority of monarchy within France in the years 1685 to 1715? (24 marks)

2 (a) Why did Louis XIV begin the War of Devolution? (12 marks)

(b) How important is the pursuit of glory in explaining the motives of Louis XIV’s foreign policy in the years 1672 to 1688? (24 marks)

3 (a) Why did the death in 1700 of Carlos II, King of Spain, increase international tension? (12 marks)

(b) How far was the failure of French foreign policy in the years 1688 to 1715 due to the over-confidence of Louis XIV? (24 marks)

Target: A01(a), A01(b), A02(b)

Generic Mark Scheme Nothing written worthy of credit. 0

L1: Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. 1-6

L2: Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. 7-11

L3: Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. 12-16

L4: Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good
Appendix 25– continued

understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and 
good skills of written communication. 17-21

L5: Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely 
selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed 
understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully 
organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. 22-24

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material 
contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to 
the generic levels scheme.

In 'how important' questions, candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points 
supporting importance against others which do not and the answer could be exclusively based on 
the focus of the question.

History - AQA GCE Mark Scheme 2010 January series

Factors arguing for la Gloire.

Louis XIV had clearly established a desire for personal renown in the construction of Versailles and 
also the manipulation of imagery. This might be used as general commentary to support the 
statement

The Dutch War, 1672–1679 had few discernable motives beyond those of revenge and glory. Louis 
XIV’s desire to teach the Dutch a lesson whilst simultaneously furthering his international renown 
may be considered the prime motive for war 
the pursuit of the Dutch War further supports the motive of glory. Even though Louis XIV had 
realised his initial objectives by June 1672, and despite the generous terms offered by Jan de Witt, 
Louis refused to cease hostilities

the Wars of Reunion were conducted under the premise of legality, yet Louis’ triumphant entry to 
Strasbourg in 1681 clearly illustrates a desire for renown

the Nine Years’ War was to a degree brought upon Louis XIV by himself. It was the fear that Louis 
XIV’s previous foreign policy had engendered that explains to some extent the union of powers 
against him. Louis XIV’s previous triumphalism, especially whilst the siege of Vienna was being 
conducted, was the very thing that convinced Europe of his desire for a universal monarchy and 
continental domination. Factors contesting the statement:

Factors contesting la Gloire

whilst the desire for personal renown and glory is difficult to dismiss, it is equally difficult to 
maintain that Louis XIV’s only desire was for prestige. Whilst the defence of national frontiers and 
the extension of territory certainly brought prestige, this may be seen as a consequence of, and not 
the motive for, foreign policy in this period

The Dutch War, 1672–1679 was motivated from a desire for revenge, not necessarily glory. In 
addition, the economic benefits of defeating so powerful a maritime nation was not lost on Colbert 
whose support for the war suggests motives other than Louis XIV’s personal renown

the Reunions did have a legal basis, which whilst dubious, may well have been one that Louis XIV 
eventually became convinced of. To have allowed such claims to pass uncontested would have 
damaged Louis XIV’s international position

the Reunions were motivated at least in part by opportunism. That many of the European powers 
were occupied by Vienna provided Louis XIV with the chance to strengthen his weak eastern border
Appendix 25– continued

Louis XIV was suspected of having religious motives, especially as a consequence of the Te Deum held in Strasbourg cathedral. This was a common charge levelled at Louis XIV by contemporaries and may have some validity.

by the end of the period, Louis XIV had much less interest in conducting an aggressive foreign policy. The Nine Years War may be seen almost purely in defensive terms. In this respect, glory had little if any role to play.
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Appendix 26 – Example of essay reduced argumentational clusters (Chapter 8)

Comparing essays by Adapted TAP

Andrea

Pre-test – Colbert - TAP Level 1 but with evidence no real argument at all

Introduction does not set up an argument – explanatory not argumentative
3 paragraphs packed full of evidence but explanation not argument
and a conclusion which almost answers the question – to what extent is not addressed at all.

1 Therefore
2 However
2 Although
1 but

1 loose cluster therefore in factual sentence followed by although and however in the next sentence.

Post test - TAP level 4/5 short argumentative paragraphs as counterclaims/rebuttals

Introduction clearly addresses the demands of the question and sets up an argument using an
underlying theme as explanation for the other motives

6 paragraphs in the body of the essay 3 essays demonstrating claims and 3 essays showing counterclaim
and linking it to the question – argumentative short paragraphs

Conclusion argues for what was suggested in the introduction but doesn’t quite prove it.

1 It could be argued
1 My view
1 In my opinion
1 I believe
2 However
1 Therefore
1 But
1 Although

Versailles paragraph doesn’t actually add to the argument but it is there.
Appendix 27 – Wegerif and Mercer (1997) Types of talk (Chapter 8)

Extract taken from Chapter 5 A Dialogical Framework for Researching Peer Talk


- **Disputational talk**, which is characterised by disagreement and individualised decision making. There are few attempts to pool resources, or to offer constructive criticism of suggestions. Disputational talk also has some characteristic discourse features - short exchanges consisting of assertions and challenges or counter assertions.

- **Cumulative talk**, in which speakers build positively but uncritically on what the other has said. Partners use talk to construct a 'common knowledge' by accumulation. Cumulative discourse is characterised by repetitions, confirmations and elaborations.

- **Exploratory talk**, in which partners engage critically but constructively with each other's ideas. Statements and suggestions are offered for joint consideration. These may be challenged and counter-challenged, but challenges are justified and alternative hypotheses are offered (cf. Barnes and Todd, 1978). Compared with the other two types, in exploratory talk knowledge is made more publicly accountable and reasoning is more visible in the talk.
Appendix 28 – Questions for the Questionnaire (Chapter 8)

PhD Research Intervention Evaluation

There are series of questions I would like you to answer about the activities you have undertaken. It is a simple tick box evaluation but there is a note section after each set of questions in which you are invited to add comments about each activity if you wish.

Activity 1
Establishing the Ground Rules

• How important was it for you to establish the ground rules before we started the activities?

• How important was it for you to decide the ground rules collectively?

Notes

Activity 2
Powerpoint presentation on forms of argumentation

• Did you feel clearer about what ‘argument’ meant after the powerpoint presentation?

Notes

Activity 3
Role Play – babysitting?

• Did the role play help you understand ‘argument’ better?

• If you answered strongly agree or agree could you tell me in what ways it did help?

• Did the role play help you appreciate the idea of persuasion more clearly?

Notes

Activity 4
Working with the History

• Did working collectively to generate ideas help you feel more comfortable about what you know?

• Did unpacking the title’s meaning help you understand where the argument might be?

• Did giving you time to reflect individually on the question’s demands help you understand what it was asking and how you might begin to formulate an answer?

• Did standing on a ‘continuum’ help you clarify your ideas?
Appendix 28– continued

Notes

Activity 5

The Debate

• Did working in pairs help you clarify your ideas before the debate began?

• Did working in 4s arguing against each other help you clarify your ideas further?

• Did reflecting and discussing with the other members of your group how the debate went help you develop your argument?

Notes

Activity 6

Planning the Essay

• Were you clearer about how to answer the question after the debate?

• Did reviewing other people’s plans help you develop your answer still further?

Notes

Thank you very much for your input – it is very important to my research
If you would like to be interviewed about your experiences of the intervention please put your name on the bottom of the page and if there is anything else you would like to discuss about my work please let me know.
8.6.1 **The student questionnaire.** All 15 questionnaires were handed in (please see Appendix 26 for a copy of the questionnaire). The intervention comprised six activities and the students were asked to determine how important they considered the two aspects of the first activity – the setting of ground rules and doing so collaboratively – followed by determining how far they agreed with a further 11 statements associated with the other activities. They were also asked to comment generally on the intervention as a whole at the end of the questionnaire.

The students were asked to reflect on the activities and, in the case of Activity 1, to answer how important ground rules were, choosing from the range ‘very important’, ‘important’, ‘not very important’, and ‘a waste of time’. There was no middle tick box. Similarly, there were only four tick boxes asking the students to reflect on how much they agreed with the statements associated with the other activities. They were asked to choose whether they strongly agreed, agreed, disagreed, or strongly disagreed. They were also invited to add comments about the individual activities as well as an overall comment on the intervention as a whole. The six activities were as follows: establishing the ground rules; the presentation on forms of argument; the persuasive role-play; working collectively to understand what the essay question was asking and then making an individual judgement; the argument itself; and planning the essay. The responses to the questionnaire are presented by individual activity so that the students’ comments associated with the responses are not lost.

Responses to: Activity 1 – Establishing the ground rules

1. How important was it for you to establish the ground rules before we started the activities?

2. How important was it for you to decide the ground rules collectively?
Table A29.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How important?</th>
<th>Question 1</th>
<th>Question 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very important</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste of time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were three comments in response to Activity 1:

‘*Was useful as it allowed us to see what we had to do’*

‘*Helped improve our ability for sensible discussion over normal lessons. Less one-sided than normal lessons, greater freedom of expression’*

‘*By establishing the ground rules everyone knew what to expect from each other’*

Figure A29.1

It appears that 11 students agreed that ground rules were important, two thinking it was very important, whereas 13 thought that working collaboratively to negotiate ground rules was important, five of that number considering it very important. However, four students, almost a third, did not think that ground rules were important, and only two thought that working collaboratively to broker ground rules was not very important. None of the students thought it was a waste of time.

Responses to: Activity 2 – PowerPoint presentation on forms of argument
Appendix 29– continued

3. You feel clearer about the definition of ‘argument’ after the PowerPoint presentation.

Table A29.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How far do you agree?</th>
<th>Statement 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were five comments in response to Statement 3:

‘I was a bit confused at the time, but looking back I understand more than I thought I did’

‘PowerPoints are an extremely good way to show something and display it’

‘Helped clarify’

‘Helped identify the different types of argument and what we are aiming for in essays’

‘I did become confused for a while we had been told to find a balanced argument instead of a one-sided with some of the other points’

Responses to: Activity 3 – Role-play – babysitting?

4. The role-play helped you better understand ‘argument’.

5. The role-play helped you appreciate the idea of persuasion more clearly.

Table A29.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How far do you agree?</th>
<th>Statement 4</th>
<th>Statement 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were seven comments for Statement 4 (students were asked to comment only if they had answered ‘strongly agree’ or ‘agree’):
Appendix 29– continued

‘To structure an argument. To think about questions before you asked them’

‘I now understand the different types of argument and how it is not simply contradiction’

‘Helped to see that using the other side’s argument to form your response is important’

‘Showed how to counter argument (sic) a point, not just move onto the next point’

‘Helped develop the idea of point and response, as well as the benefit of undermining the other person’s evidence’

‘Made me realise how complex they can be’

‘More understanding of different ways people argue’

There was only one comment for Statement 5:

‘Helped highlight useful techniques for persuasion’

![Graph showing responses to statements about understanding argument and persuasion](image)

**Figure A29.2**

It is clear that most students were agreed that they were clearer about the definition of argument after the presentation, but the role-play activity was more helpful in illustrating persuasion than argument. The comments suggest that at
Appendix 29– continued

least one student understood the importance of countering an argument before moving on to the next point.

Responses to Activity 4 – Working with the History

5. Working collectively to generate ideas helped you feel more comfortable about what you know.

6. Unpacking the title’s meaning helped you understand where the argument might be.

7. Being given time to reflect individually on the question’s demands helped you understand what it was asking and how you might begin to formulate an answer.

8. Standing on a ‘continuum’ helped you clarify your ideas.

Table A29.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How far do you agree?</th>
<th>Statement 5</th>
<th>Statement 6</th>
<th>Statement 7</th>
<th>Statement 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were four comments:

‘Time to reflect isn’t always useful if you don’t know what to do’

‘Continuum was v. useful to see where everyone was’

‘I knew how to “unpack” the title before, but it was very good to have a reinforcement. Standing in a line makes you think about how strong your opinions are’

‘Working together generated more ideas, collective arguments.’
All the students agreed that working collectively to generate ideas helped them, and half of those who agreed strongly agreed that working collectively made them feel more comfortable with what they were doing. A third of the students strongly agreed that unpacking the essay title helped them understand where the argument was; one student disagreed. Twelve out of 15 agreed that time for personal reflection was useful, though no one strongly agreed. Three students disagreed, and the comment that ‘time to reflect isn’t always useful if you don’t know what to do’ may give an indication of the role of reflection within the intervention process. Most students agreed that standing on a continuum helped them clarify their thinking and realise ‘how strong their opinions were’. Two students strongly agreed and two disagreed with the statement that the continuum helped them clarify their ideas.

Responses to Activity 5 – The debate

9. Working in pairs helped you clarify your ideas before the debate began.

10. Working in fours, arguing against each other, helped you clarify your ideas further.

11. Reflecting and discussing with the other members of your group how the debate went helped you develop your argument.
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Table A29.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How far do you agree?</th>
<th>Statement 9</th>
<th>Statement 10</th>
<th>Statement 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was only one comment:

‘Much easier to discuss in fours than in front of the whole class’

![Bar chart](image.png)

Figure A29.4

It is not surprising that all of the students agreed that working in pairs helped them clarify their ideas before the debate began. This reflects their collective attitude to working collaboratively and it is interesting that over a third of the class strongly agreed that it helped them clarify their ideas. It is also
interesting to note how only one student disagreed with the statement that arguing in fours help develop their ideas. In some of the groups the arguing was not extensive, so this response might reflect the student’s personal experience of the intervention. The four students who strongly agreed may have had a good experience of the intervention. The last statement, reflecting and discussing how the argument went, received an interesting response and to a certain extent indicates the negative attitude to reflection that has been seen before. That said, the fact that more students strongly agreed than agreed is pertinent.

Responses to Activity 6 – Planning the essay

12. You felt clearer about how to answer the question after the debate.

13. Reviewing other people’s plans helped you further develop your answer.

Table A29.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How far do you agree?</th>
<th>Statement 12</th>
<th>Statement 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were five comments:

‘By reviewing other plans I could see what points/evidence I had missed out in my own’

‘Other people’s essays had same ideas’

‘Looking at other people’s plans helped see other ideas that could help’

‘It offered ideas that I hadn’t thought of, including evidence’

‘Working in smaller groups, I am more able to contradict points directly’
Figure A29.5

Bearing in mind that the last question had generated a response which indicated that more students strongly agreed that reflecting and discussing how the debate went helped them clarify their argument, it is a somewhat surprising to see the response to ‘you felt clearer about how to answer the question after the debate’. Less students disagree, down from four to one, but fewer students strongly agree (down from six to four). Most students agreed that reviewing the plans helped: the comments suggest they helped by providing evidence and ideas which either developed their thinking or consolidated it.

14. General comments on the presentation

There were five comments:

‘Very good presentation’
‘Thank you, I learned a lot’
‘Overall it was good, but some things were quite confusing and could have been a bit less detailed (types of argument)’
‘Very useful in developing argument technique and consolidating knowledge’
‘Was very helpful’
Appendix 30 – Example of changes in written argument– Adapted Tap (Chapter 8)

Comparing essays measured by Adapted TAP

Pre intervention Essays measured in argumentation clusters.

Figure A30.1

Post Intervention essays – Measured by TAP and Argumentational Clusters

Figure A30.2
Appendix 30 – continued

Delia

Pre test - Spring Colbert TAP 2/3 claim v counterclaim

There is an introduction, which offers an explanation but does not set up an argument

Clear paragraphs however which do make points for and against although implicit rather than explicit

Does use evidence and offers some explanation for points

Conclusion states the argument

Post test – Spring – TAP level 4/5 hints of nuanced argument

Argument clearly expressed in the title

4 clear paragraphs with clear argument expressed in each paragraph which links to the next one.

Conclusion clearly re-states argument.

Winona

Pre-test – Reformation TAP level 2 - no counter claims

Introduction which gives a reason for the Reformation but not an argument

3 paragraphs which offer 3 reasons for the Reformation but argument is unformed and there are no counter-claims at all.

Conclusion ties in the 3 paragraphs but that is all

‘A main reason’ but not expanded on

Furthermore

Finally – argumentative connectives but not really exploited

I paragraph which mentions Versailles – a bit of a red herring but does demonstrate motivations for “la gloire”
Appendix 30 – continued

Post–test – TAP – 4/5 strong argument sustained throughout

Introduction sets up nuanced argument
4 paragraphs – powerful first paragraph with lots of evidence to support claims to first reason – second paragraph linking counter-argument
3rd and 4th paragraphs contains claim and counter claims

Conclusion carries through the argument and develops it further.
1 Firstly
1 Furthermore found in body of paragraph to develop points not a rhetorical device
1 Finally
1 I do think incorporated with ‘though’
3 However
3 Although/

Thomas

Pre-test – social policies TAP Level 2 some argumentation but limited to end of paragraphs

Introduction acknowledges differing interpretations of Louis but doesn’t set up an argument even so. Acknowledges problems but doesn’t address to what extent?

4 paragraphs which looks at different reasons supported by evidence but counter claim is against evidence at the end of each paragraph.

Conclusion limited and deals only with interpretations not actually extent of success or failure.
3 However
4 Although/though

Post test – TAP Level 3/4 Balanced 2 sided argument

Introduction set up argument

8 paragraphs where first part of essay builds an argument for pursuit of glory and the second part argues against it

Conclusion reaffirms introduction’s stance.

There are many reasons
This is further emphasized
It could be argued
On the other hand
I would argue
Many who….. would agree
Overall in conjunction with ‘I believe’
I believe
I feel
2 However
2 But
3 Therefore
3 Though
Firstly in body of paragraph to set up counterclaim followed rapidly with a but.
Appendix 31 – Student Post Intervention Interview Questions (Chapter 8)

Student questions - Case study 1

- Can you remember the intervention?
- If so what for you stood out and why? It can be negative if you wish
- Do you think it has helped your essay writing?
- Which group were you in?
- Were you the first arguer?
- Did you get a chance to reflect on the essay question before writing your essay answer?
Appendix 3 – Post-intervention student interviews  (Chapter 8)

These interviews were conducted some time after the intervention; in fact, they were conducted after the students’ AS exams. I was able to interview eight of the 15 participants one-to-one (see Appendix 31 for the questions, which were the core of the semi-structured interviews).

I have grouped the students’ responses into their arguing groups for the final phase of the intervention. Interviews were held with Delia, Andrea, and Olivia from Group 4. Unfortunately, Xanthe was not available for interview, and had not handed in a pre-intervention essay. From Group 1, I interviewed Winona, who was a pivotal member of the group which also contained Francis and Xerxes (who did not offer pre- or post-intervention essays). From Group 2, Chris and Edward were interviewed; the other two members of the group did not offer pre-intervention essays. From Group 3, Lilian and Joseph were interviewed; Thomas was unavailable and the fourth member of the group did not submit pre- and post-intervention essays.

8.6.2.1 What did they recall most? Group 4 participants Andrea and Olivia remembered the arguing in fours and Andrea remembered it in particular as being the ‘big argument’. Delia, on the other hand, remembered the arguing but suggested that learning about setting out an argument, in particular counter-arguing points, was the most important part of the whole intervention. Similarly, Joseph from Group 3 also thought that the main thing he learned was to counter points rather than dismiss and ignore them, and how to incorporate other people’s arguments into his own. Lilian, from the same group, remembered the PowerPoint presentation first of all and then, when questioned about the arguing in fours, mentioned the importance of counterarguing by making points relative to other people’s points. Winona, on the other hand, remembered the mind-map and how it helped her realise the importance of the links between points and how it could trigger other connections she may not have made. She felt that she was a visual learner and also stated that the planning of the essays helped her consolidate her learning. Edward from Group 2, who has an extensive range of historical knowledge, was able to recall most of the intervention unprompted and in all of its different stages. He was able also to reflect on the activities, clearly demonstrating what helped him and what did not.
He felt that the aim of the intervention – to promote a different form of argumentation to encourage students away from the two-sided form of argument to one which could incorporate multiple perspectives – was not necessary. He felt that all arguments should be balanced and he felt justified in continuing to write essays following the rubric of ‘on the one hand and on the other hand’ rather than attempt a synthesis – which is exactly what he had done in his essay. Chris did not remember the intervention in any great detail, but did remember the role-play and stated that that activity had shown him that arguing was not about winning and losing, but about persuading.

8.6.2.2 Has the intervention helped the writing of argument? Group 4 participant Olivia felt that the intervention had helped her structure her written argument and shown her how to turn an argument around before starting a new point. Delia reflected on the importance of planning and how to incorporate counter-arguments, as did Andrea. Winona, from Group 1, also felt that, post-intervention, she was better able to structure her argument point-by-point supported by evidence. She felt that she had already learnt the importance of structuring her points, but it was the intervention that made her realise why she needed to structure her response and not simply ‘splurge it’ onto paper (her own words). Similarly, Lilian from Group 3 felt that she already knew how to structure her essays, but that the planning and the preparation before writing her responses mattered to her now more than it had before the intervention. Joseph felt that the intervention had helped him be less one-sided and more likely to offer the other side of an argument before he dismissed it, and he too felt that the planning of the essay responses so that he could see the argument was important. Although he did stress that in the verbal interaction he was caught up in the arguing, so did not follow a plan, but instead responded to what was said to him. Edward from Group 2 had similar feelings to Joseph: that the verbal argument was freer than the written argument and in the verbal argument he felt able to justify his position more cogently. He suggested that he had a clear argument structure and that the intervention had helped him improve his argument. He also added that he had learned to adapt his essays in response to the different demands each A level discipline required. He was very clear that the structure he was creating was a mental structure, which was reflected
in his writing. Chris felt that the interaction had helped him consolidate his understanding, but had not really developed his written argument.

8.6.2.3  **Who had the dominant voice?** Sometimes this was asked outright during the interview; sometimes, in other interviews, the dominant voice in the interactive arguing emerges through the discussion. Group 4’s participants were equally matched and each of those interviewed attested to the active part they all played in the interaction. They remembered how they all contributed to what was a lively argument where each participant was quite prepared to argue against the other in any way they could. Only one of the participants, Delia, admitted to changing her mind and remembered that it came to her as she was reflecting on her own argument. Olivia intends to become a lawyer so she was particularly motivated to respond to and counter all the points made. However, she was also determined to win the argument, whereas Delia was more involved in the argument itself. Interestingly, Andrea thought that both Olivia and Delia were the chief arguers and that it was difficult to get a word in edgeways. She also felt that Xanthe and Olivia ‘won’ their argument, rather than Delia and herself. Winona, arguing in the group of three with Francis and Xerxes, found her interaction with Francis interesting. Xerxes, she said, simply agreed with her without arguing, whereas Francis kept making her think about things differently. She hoped she had been able to make Francis think differently too. Joseph and his partner Thomas had prepared their responses particularly well and were able to counter Lilian and her partner most effectively. Joseph did, however, admit to underhand tactics, which meant that if Lilian had presented an argument Joseph could not counter, he simply dismissed it out of hand and moved on to a new point. He also accepted that he was attempting to win the argument, not explore different points of view. Chris and Edward were in a group where the other dyad was only slightly more opposed to the statement than they were. Edward has a reputation for being ‘masterful’ in classroom debate, so Chris acknowledged that there was little in the way of interaction on that particular table.

8.6.2.4  **Did they reflect on their arguments?** The last question ‘did the intervention offer you the opportunity to reflect on your argument?’ was not particularly well addressed. Delia from Group 4 was keen to demonstrate how much she reflected on her argument, but had to admit that she did not do so
Appendix 32 – continued

during the interaction when the participants were supposed to feed back to the other member of their respective dyads how well they thought they were doing. Working on her own against Xerxes and Francis, Winona did not have the opportunity to reflect back to anyone on how well the argument was going. Joseph did not reflect on how well he had argued, but did say that during the planning stage after the interaction he was able to see how the argument had evolved and how the points linked into other points. Lilian did not reflect back to her partner because her partner was not well during the interaction, but she felt that she had been able to counter some of Joseph’s points before he closed down arguments. In Group 2, Chris and Edward only argued for a minimal period so reflecting on the progress of the argument did not occur.
Appendix 33 – Extract from interaction – Group 4 (Chapter 8)

Teacher  Okay. So, the first two argue the first two points and the….
Delia  Am I starting? Right. Okay. I believe that…..
Oliva  Go on. It’s good. Start your own speech. Okay.
Delia  [laughs]…. No, I’m making it up.
Olivia  Good.
Delia  I believe that the pursuit of glory was not the most important reason for Louis’ foreign policy, from 1672 to 1688.
Olivia  Oooh, and so (0.57)
Xanthe  1672. When was the finish?
Delia  1688 [laughing].
Olivia  (1.04) Right. Ahh, well you may think that Delia but we think otherwise. We think ones the most important. So these, if we believe that and you don’t believe that it is the most important then explain why he had build the Palace of Versailles in his Hall of Mirrors?
Delia  Well, I don’t believe that was anything to do with foreign policy.
Olivia  Yeah, well, it’s all about his image rather than his substance. So that contributes to his glory.
Delia  I’m not saying… I’m not suggesting that he didn’t have an interest in la gloire but I’m just saying that it wasn’t his main motive in foreign policy. Yes, Louis believed that his image was important and yes, Versailles was built to portray this, but it was nothing to do with his foreign policy and la gloire within his foreign policy.
Olivia  Well, we believe that glory was important to his foreign policy because when Louis went to the wars, when expanding his natural frontiers, there were paintings of him at the front when he wasn’t actually there, to display how glorifull he was in his fighting and how much glory there was in these matters. So there must have been some glory in his foreign policy.
Delia  If there was glory in his foreign policy then why did he have the Reunions? They were completely non-aggressive and they were a political talk. The earned him privilege that the crown would then only give privilege through warfare.
Olivia  Ah, but, he was sneaky about it, because he knew people in high places.
Xanthe  And because he was the king [laughs]
Delia  [laughing] Yeah, he was at high places.
Olivia  Glory in that, because he’s king.
Delia  But he wasn’t doing that for glory, he was doing that to promote his natural frontiers and therefore secure France.
Olivia  Explain then, his hatred of the Dutch and how that is not to do with glory.
Delia  I will. With pleasure [laughing]
Andrea  Alright Delia [laughing]
Delia  Louis wanted to humiliate the Dutch as they had let him down in the War of Devolution and he had lost a lot of land, e.g. [laughing] the Franche-Comte and he wanted to reclaim it. It was revenge rather than glory.
Xanthe  How comes he was so jealous of their tulips.
Olivia  He wanted to make them because he thought tulips were (3.46)
Delia  I think that was more for mechantalry.
Delia  No I think that was more…..
Olivia  Like you said Delia it’s
Delia  …. No, no, no, I think that was order of mechantalism and (3.55)
Xanthe  Ssshh.
Dani  Okay.
Francis  She’s all for the religion and expansion.
Chris  Yeah, do that. You could like that back.
Chris  Yes, that’s true. I think that’s true. Go for it.
Francis  What’s the argument then?
Edward  Right, our first point is that La Gloire wasn’t his own reputation, because he was focused on the defensive borders and evidence of this is after the Dutch war he gives back a lot of his territory which shows that he wasn’t concerned with glory because if he’d wanted glory he would have kept that.
And the second he uses …
Francis  Er, er, it’s point-by-point [laughter]
Edward  This is more evidence of saying the point that he uses (00.56) which are a legal way of getting land and it’s not as glorious as using war.
Edward  As well as securing his borders, you’ve got to think he did it for expansion; he wouldn’t have just secured these borders if he didn’t want to expand – not for glory – but he wanted to expand. For example, in 1678 he gained the French frontier and in 1681 Strasburg, from the (1.24) and gained that.
Francis  Isn’t that on his frontier though?
Edward  Yeah, but it’s also expanding … Yeah, but it’s secured expansion. He wouldn’t have wanted to gain his land if he didn’t want to expand.
Edward  Strasburg was where the Imperial armies crossed, so by controlling Strasburg …
Chris  That sounds like Star Wars [laughter]
Edward  … by controlling Strasburg he controls his natural frontier.
Francis  Yeah, that may be the case, but …
Edward  … he wanted to expand.
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Francis If he did then why didn’t he besiege Amsterdam when he had the chance?
Chris Oh, no, he didn’t want to [laughter].
Edward Because if he wanted to expand, would you take it?
Francis Yeah, but he knew it was too bigger risk, he knew in his heart it was a too bigger risk.
Edward If he was concerned with expansion then why did he give back the land?
Francis Because … (2.21) [laughter]
Chris The man was an idiot.
Dani Your points done yet?
Xanthe

Important is the pursuit of glory in explaining the motives of Louis X10 foreign policy in the years 1672-1688?

(24 marks)

Leou's X10's foreign policy was carried upon ensuring that France had adequate forces and was secure in this, as well expanding and making France a great country. One of his motives was to obtain "la glorie" but that is obviously not the only motive as he had to ensure that he did his duty as King for France.

As an absolute ruler of France Louis believed that his Kingstep came directly from God and so he should do it's best to protect the people of France and make France great. And so power probably helped him to make his policy of natural frontiers and secure the country without causing wars.

Also as he used a process of "reunions" he was using a peaceful method which didn't have any glory in it as he was reclaiming land that was already his own.

Louis involvement with the Dutch war made his motives for foreign policy seem like it was for "la glorie". As one of his reasons for going to war with them was that he thought that they had abandoned him during the war of the Spanish succession. Therefore he seemed to be seeking revenge which would help towards his pursuit of "la glorie". Louis also intended on spreading catholism throughout Europe, also contributing to his pursuit of "la glorie". But fundamentally all of his motives seem to lead back to his pursuit of "la glorie", and so in
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Conclusion: I think that La Gier was the main motive per Louis X's interest in foreign policy.

Now since it is commonly agreed that:

Show's argument:

10 Level 2

TAP Level 1/2

...
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Xanthie

How important is the pursuit of glory in explaining the motives of Louis XIV’s foreign policy in the year 1688?

Good start, but I’m not sure I fully understand the motivation behind Louis XIV's foreign policy. He was a king and therefore he needed all power to be a king, automatic ruler. However, he needed substance at times to achieve things, can’t solely rely on image.

Use evidence: Good start, counter argument.

Dutch war: Dutch war = revenge, glory, spreading autocracy.

Development: be more explicit. Reckless expansion, expansionist war plan is better.

Handwritten thought: The...
How important is the pursuit of glory in explaining the motives of Louis XIV's foreign policy in the year 1672-1685?

Throughout Louis' reign, the Sun King valued la gloire. One of the reasons that he built the Palace of Versailles in 1672 was to show his power and glory in a lavish and frankly intimidating way. The pursuit of glory was also important in Louis' Foreign Policy. However, it was not always the most important raison for starting a conflict; la gloire remained an underlying aim in foreign policy and all other aims can be linked back to it.

Achieving la gloire is normally linked to bravery and skill in a battle or war. However, the Reunions (1660-83) were non-aggressive political manoeuvres. Therefore, it can be argued that the Reunions were not for glory as they were a defense mechanism in order to protect the natural frontiers of France. On the other hand, what started as defense would quickly turn into more land and therefore more power, so more glory—although this may not have been Louis' initial aim. There may have also been an element of revenge as Louis sought to reclaim land lost in treaties such as Aix-la-Chapelle which concluded the War of Devolution.

Revenge and la gloire, however, often went hand in hand where Louis' foreign policy was concerned. For example, the Dutch War (1672-78) was caused by Louis wanting to make up for the loss and humiliation France suffered at the War of Devolution. At the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, France may have gained 11 fortified in Flanders, they still lost a lot of land gains.
during the war. (For example, the Franche-Comté) However, this was an aggressive and potentially glorious campaign which would not only avenge the Dutch but would regain land and glory to the French.

However, revenge was not the only cause of the Dutch War. It can be argued that religion was another key factor. The Dutch were Protestant and Louis admired their work ethic and the prosperity within the country. However, as with revenge, although the hatred of Protestants may have started the war, it inevitably led to battles and victory and therefore glory.

In conclusion, la gloire was not the main reason for every battle and campaign during the years 1672–1688. However, almost every other reason or aim can be linked back to glory and Louis’ obsession with pursuing it.
HOW IMPORTANT IS THE PURSUIT OF GLORY IN EXPLAINING THE
MOTIVES OF LOUIS XIV’S FOREIGN POLICY IN THE YEARS 1672 –
1688?

The pursuit of glory was important in some aspects of
Louis’ foreign policy, but was not the most
important factor. However, the majority of the other
factors can all be linked back to la gloire:

• Reunions: non-aggressive 1680-3
  Political tool rather than glory through war
  A defense mechanism to protect natural
  frontiers rather than a glorious battle
  Link to glory: more land = more power
• Revenge: Dutch War caused by humiliation from
  War of Devolution in which he lost a lot
  of land (e.g. Franche-Comte)
  Link to glory: battles and lost land to be regained
• Religion: Dutch War again. He enjoyed the work
  ethic of the Protestant Republic
  Link to glory: to defeat them!

Nicely balanced. Good points around.
Hello! Linking is well done.

Good use of evidence.
How important is the pursuit of glory in explaining the motives of Louis XIV’s foreign policy in the years 1672 - 1688?

During the years 1672 and 1688, Louis’s foreign policy motives were to expand France to her natural frontiers, to break the encirclement of the Hapsburgs, to spread Catholicism and to build mercantilism and trade in France. It can be argued that underlying these motives was Louis’s main reason: the pursuit of glory.

‘La Gloire’ was extremely important to Louis as a monarch, and is, therefore, important in explaining Louis’s motives to his foreign policy. When expanding France’s boundaries to her natural frontiers, if Louis was questioned upon his motives, he would say that his actions were offensive to be defensive. However, Louis’s deathbed confession was that he had “loved war too much”, proving to us that war was an exciting event that provided France with glory, but more importantly, with Louis, as the absolutist monarch of France. Even if Louis was not present at these frontiers battles, he would still use paintings as propaganda for his own pursuit of glory, presenting him gloriously at the battles, suggesting that all Louis wanted from the battles was the glory.

The Dutch War was advertised as an attempt to expand Louis’s territory in order to protect France. However, Louis and the Dutch had not always had a friendly relationship, particularly because Louis had always been jealous of the Dutch and their success. The reason that this supports the theory that the pursuit of glory was the underlying reason to Louis’s foreign policy, is because to Louis, the Dutch posed as a real threat to his power and his reputation. He wanted to be the most powerful and glorified monarch in at least Europe, and the Dutch were threatening that image he was trying to build up and maintain. He could have just been using the idea expanding territory to be defensive as an excuse to fight the Dutch and destroy them as his opposition.

Furthermore, if Louis was trying to increase the trade and mercantilism within France, then why did he exile the Huguenots, the population segment renowned for their work ethic and success? 400,000 of Louis best workforce were exiled from France by him in 1685, to his enemies overseas, because he was too blinded by his obsession with his power and glory and anyone who went against him. If he hadn’t had done this, then he would have had more success with this aspect of his foreign policy, showing that this wasn’t a main concern to him as he exiled the solution.

In addition, if the pursuit of glory was not important in explaining Louis’ foreign policy motives, then he would have had to base his policy on true substance, for the good of his people and country. Considering that Louis plunged the whole of France into crippling debt, particularly by building the Versailles Palace, it shows that his pursuit of glory overrides the needs of his people and his country.

On the other hand, the way that Louis managed the Reunions implies that glory was not the main reason in explaining the motives of his foreign policy.
as, there was no glory in a peaceful petition and legal arguments. Glory was in the war and physically defeating the enemy. Surely if glory was behind his motives then he would have secured extra land through fighting rather than going through monotonous legal documents trying to find tiny loopholes?

Some would also argue that despite his battles appearing to for the glory and for his love of war, Louis may have truthfully wanted just to protect his country and to be offensive to be defensive. France was surrounded by countries that wanted the power France had or wanted to decrease it. Also, Louis’s views and actions, particularly religiously, gave him some very near and strong enemy alliances, meaning he had to protect his frontiers and break the encirclement of the Hapsburgs.

Overall, I would personally say that Louis’s pursuit of glory is very important when explaining his motives in his foreign policy. This is because, during that era, monarchs had certain expectations to fill, and being a figurehead of glory was one of them. As the king of a powerful nation, Louis was constantly on display and so were his actions, the people wanted a King they could admire and he wanted to give that to them but still to himself. Proof of his constant lack of privacy is that no rooms in his palaces had doors. However, it is important to remember that Louis wanted the personal glory as well, explaining his love of war and the reason driving him to achieve his foreign policy.
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How important is the pursuit of glory in explaining the motives of Louis XIV's foreign policy in the years 1673–1688?

PLAN:

- Yes, it was very important:
  ✓ In expanding frontiers - yes could be defensive for the sake of country, BUT if he wasn't that done well have paintings done of the battle to show how glorious it was, we know he loved war so must love glory too?
  ✓ If glory was not most important reason, then he would have had to have his foreign policy of substance and the good of his people & country. This obviously is not most important to him cuz France is in so much debt because of fighting it wars and purchasing Versailles & refurbishing it largely putting France in debt - Glory obviously an important contributor to his foreign policy.

- Versailles Palace - Hall of Mirrors = Glorious Evidence.
  ✓ Dutch war - was that expanding hiring or revenge for was it about jealousy of how better they Louis' glory he'd built up, then expand.
  - More evidence needed for Versailles (how does it link to overall great evidence?)

Some historians may argue it was structured, reunions example, etc. written after debate/arguing.

Conclude - yes major underlying reason - era made Louis expect to be glorious! - no rooms doors, etc. always on display.

Great counter-arguments on first point. Excellent 2nd point (hadn't thought of that - more evidence?) - eg what was obvious have substance? Evidence? Great structure in country, well.
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How important is the pursuit of glory in explaining the motives of Louis XIV’s foreign policy in the years 1672-1688?

Many historians believe that Louis XIV was obsessed with finding ‘La Gloire’ and that this was his main motive in all of his foreign policies especially in the years 1672-1688. My view is that although Louis’ pursuit of ‘La Gloire’ may have been an important reason there were other reasons that were of high importance, with them leading back to ‘La Gloire’.

One of the other important motives for Louis’ foreign policy was revenge. This is shown especially in the Dutch War – 1672-1679 – which was begun primarily for revenge on the Dutch from Louis due to his belief that they had deserted him during the previous War of Devolution – 1667-1668. Revenge can also be seen in another way from the Dutch War as it could be argued that Louis wanted revenge on the Dutch for their prosperous and productive Protestant – republic.

We can link the pursuit of ‘La Gloire’ back to revenge as it can be seen that Louis was trying to get revenge on the Dutch to help his own personal glory and that of France by ‘defending their honour’.

Another main motive for Louis’ foreign policy was Catholicism. It was Louis aim to enforce Catholicism over the whole of Europe; he named himself ‘The most Christian King’ which supports his view that he should bring Catholicism to Europe. At this time some countries in Europe were Protestant – The Dutch Provinces – and in France itself there was a large proportion of Protestant ‘Huguenots’ – described by Richelieu to be ‘a state within a state’ – who were very prosperous. Religion was another main reason behind The Dutch War as the Dutch Provinces was a Protestant Republic which was the opposite of France which was a Catholic ‘Absolutist’ state.

Again we can link this back to ‘La Gloire’ in that it can be said that Louis’ aim to enforce Catholicism across Europe was also in the pursuit of ‘La Gloire’ as in his eyes doing this would make him ‘The most Christian King’ and would also gain him considerable glory for being the one to in his view bring the true religion back to Europe.

However there are other motives of Louis foreign policy that in my opinion do not relate back to ‘La Gloire’. For example Louis use of and exploits to gain his natural frontiers. One way in which he went about this was to use the law to gain land that was ‘rightfully his’ in reunions. This does not relate back to ‘La Gloire’ as Louis would not have seen glory come from taking land from peasant that he saw as his own by law. However, due to the success of the reunions and therefore Louis gain of land through peaceful means may have given him some sense of ‘La Gloire’ due to his political mind being able to manipulate the system and getting what he wanted simply.

One example of ‘La Gloire’ as a motive was in Louis refurbishment of the hunting lodge of Versailles. This can be seen as a show of power and glory to the world outside of France. It cost millions of Livre and many years to complete enough for him to move his royal court there – renovations began in 1661 after Louis taking personal control of France and the court was officially established there in May 1682.

In conclusion ‘La Gloire’ – or the pursuit of glory – is fairly important in explaining Louis XIV’s foreign policy as it may not have always been the obvious reason or motive for the things he
How important is the pursuit of glory in explaining the motives of Louis XIV’s foreign policy in the years 1672-1688?

was doing concerning his foreign policy but most of the things that he did lead back to it in the end. Although we need to consider whether the things that ultimately lead back to ‘La Gloire’ were intended to do this by Louis or were just a coincidence. Due to examples of Louis’ political and strategic mind seen especially in the reunions I believe that at least a majority of motives were indeed intended to help Louis in his pursuit of personal and state wide glory.
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How important is the pursuit of glory in explaining the motives of Louis XIV’s foreign policy in the years 1672 – 1688?

It wasn’t the most important but other reasons all led back to it.

- Dutch war: revenge for letting him down in
  - stingy (Lindel)
  - having a more productive country (Dutch)
  - leads back to glory as it was defending its hard

natural resources (Dutch)

- Expansion:
  - Expanding law to get land
  - Dutch war
  - Protestant vs. absolutism/catholic

- Would be glory if it have
  - all over Europe

- More exploration
  - More contact abroad
  - Develop on peace more

Andrea

- You accept, you evidence, lost
  - lot of sub points

Kasun
How to write History argument effectively.
And pass your exams as well!

Diana M Hilliard

The gentle art of persuasion

Stage 1
Introduction
- Getting to know you
- Give, get, ghastlies, and ground rules

Stage 2
Making the implicit explicit
- Watch the following clip
- Is this an argument?
- What do you think are the characteristics of a good argument?

Stage 3
But what is History Argument?
- History Argument isn’t about winning or losing, it is about interpreting the past based on partial and incomplete evidence from a variety of different sources. Each interpretation attempts to explain and analyse a form of human, social and/or cultural behaviour from the past.
- We cannot know completely what actually happened in the past. We can only begin to understand the past when we analyse the evidence and other people’s interpretations.

So what is an argument?

Stage 2
Making the implicit explicit
- Watch the following clip
- Is this an argument?
- What do you think are the characteristics of a good argument?

An interesting definition

- Let’s remember that
- “IF HISTORY IS PRE-EMINENTLY INTERPRETATION, THEN THE PRACTICE OF HISTORY IS ARGUMENT.”
  - (McGill 1973 pg 115)
Which type of argument is closest to History argument?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Dialogue</th>
<th>Initial Situation</th>
<th>Participant’s Goal</th>
<th>Goal of Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>Conflict of opinions</td>
<td>Persuade other party</td>
<td>Resolve or clarify issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry</td>
<td>Need to have proof</td>
<td>Find and verify evidence</td>
<td>Prove (disprove) hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>Conflict of interests</td>
<td>Get what you want</td>
<td>Reasonable settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information-seeking</td>
<td>One party lacks information</td>
<td>Acquire or give information</td>
<td>Exchange information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberation</td>
<td>Dilemma or practical choice</td>
<td>Co-ordinate goals and actions</td>
<td>Decide best course of action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eristic</td>
<td>Personal conflict</td>
<td>Verbally hit out at opponent</td>
<td>Reveal deeper conflict</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arguing and thinking

- Making the move from GCSE, and AS – two sided argument – to:
  - and A2 – following the thread, supporting with evidence and acknowledging other views.

Making a Judgement

- Key question
  - University fees do not reflect the true cost of higher education therefore students should pay more not less money for their courses
  - 2 reasons for your point of view

Practising the gentle art of persuasion

**Stage 4**

- In threes discuss the statement
  - One person acts as the judge while the other 2 argue for and against the statement.
  - Try and convince the other person that your argument is more persuasive.

Let’s include the History

- Think of Stalin’s role during World War II
- Remember to consider the other factors that may have contributed to Russia’s success in WWII, economic, political, social and cultural

What do YOU think?

**Stage 5**

- A2 title about Stalin’s role in WW2
- Without saying a word make a judgment about this statement
- Think of 2 reasons why you feel this way.
Have you the strength of your convictions!!!

- Still without saying a word
- Standing on the continuum .... where would you place your self?
  - HOW FAR do you agree with the statement...
- It’s Ok to have an opinion but can you support it?

Gathering the evidence

- Compare notes with the person next to you
- Together using the handouts and books review the evidence
- In pairs work out what evidence you would use to demonstrate what you think of Stalin’s role in WW2...

Keeping the thread of the Argument Clear!!

- Write down your points of view with their supporting reasons and evidence
- Discuss together and add 2 more reasons with corresponding evidence to support your points of view.
- Together work out which are the strongest and weakest reasons which support your respective point of view
- Remember to keep the thread of your argument clear by linking your reasons correspondingly

Exploring the argument — focusing on the alternative points of view

Debating in threes or fours

- On the continuum match with the pair that corresponds to the opposite of your point of view
- I person from each pair argues the first 2 points while the other person of the pair silently watches and takes notes
- The pairs meet to discuss the progress of the debate – did No 1 put forward their case and did they respond to the other side before they made their second point.

There is no right or wrong reason just the strength of argument

- The second person of the pair follows the same procedure
  
  Four-way discussion
  - The pairs that were arguing meet – has either of them changed their mind based on the other’s reason and evidence?
  - Did they change their argument to meet the demands of the other’s point of view?
  - Has anything NEW come up?
  
  Collectively discuss whether anyone has changed their position and why

Transforming this to Written argument

- Consider your initial position – has it changed and why? What is your judgement now?
- Plan your written response using whichever written structure you feel most comfortable with
  - You have made a judgement and your introduction should reflect this so state how far you agree and disagree with the statement including reference to the points you have discussed in your 4s.
  - These naturally will be different reasons and will include reasons from the pair that were ‘opposing’ you.
  - Your plan should demonstrate a convincing argument which means that the thread of the argument should be clear throughout. Your response should also incorporate the different and sometimes opposing points of view that you are aware that there are different and sometimes opposing points of view but nevertheless this is your point of view and you are sticking to it.
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With a little help from your friends

- Show your plan to a different 3 or 4 showing your introduction, the outline of your argument and incorporating the counterargument.

- Read each other's plans and post a comments one that focuses on the argument — is the thread clear, do the points support the argument and is there a counterargument present. These posts should be blogged.

- The comments should be constructive and if the plan isn't clear then kind words should be used to offer assistance in making it clearer.

- The other comment should focus on the use of evidence and how well chosen it might be to reflect the argument — and if it is evidence that is new to you — thank the planner and offer evidence that s/he could use in return.

The final part

- Now write the essay using your plan and the comments from your friends.

- The essay will be assessed not only using the A2 level mark scheme but also looking at how you have developed your response from the comments of your friends.
Appendix 37 – A2 Mark Scheme for Stalin essay (Chapter 9)

Question was made up by the teacher in the style of the following questions

Answer two questions.

Question 1

‘The USSR remained politically and socially stable in the years 1964 to 1982 despite the policies of the Brezhnev regime.’ Assess the validity of this view. (45 marks)

Question 2

‘Gorbachev’s reluctance to commit himself fully to radical reform caused the break-up of the USSR.’ Assess the validity of this view. (45 marks)

Question 3

‘Agriculture was always the fundamental weakness of the Soviet economy.’ Assess the validity of this view of the Soviet economy in the years between 1945 and Brezhnev’s death in 1982. (45 marks)

Copyright © 2011 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.
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The A2 History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA’s GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level candidates. Most questions address more than one objective since a good historian must be able to combine a range of skills and knowledge. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a ‘levels of
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response’ scheme and assesses candidates’ historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or low Level 2 if some comment is included. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at Level 2 or low Level 3 depending on their synoptic understanding and linkage of ideas. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(b)) and will have access to the higher mark ranges.

To obtain an award of Level 3 or higher, candidates will need to address the synoptic requirements of A Level. The open-ended essay questions set are, by nature, synoptic and encourage a range of argument. Differentiation between performance at Levels 3, 4, and 5 therefore depends on how a candidate’s knowledge and understanding are combined and used to support an argument and the how that argument is communicated.

The mark scheme emphasises features which measure the extent to which a candidate has begun to ‘think like a historian’ and show higher order skills. As indicated in the level criteria, candidates will show their historical understanding by:

The way the requirements of the question are interpreted

The quality of the arguments and the range/depth/type of material used in support

The presentation of the answer (including the level of communication skills)

The awareness and use of differing historical interpretations

The degree of independent judgement and conceptual understanding shown It is expected that A2 candidates will perform to the highest level possible for them and the requirements for Level 5, which demands the highest
level of expertise have therefore been made deliberately challenging in order to identify the most able candidates.
Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that candidates might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other candidates’ responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered in relation to the level descriptors. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.
Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- Depth and precision in the use of factual information
- Depth and originality in the development of an argument
- The extent of the synoptic links

The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)

The way the answer is brought together in the conclusion

4 June 2011 A2 Unit 3: The State and the People: Change and Continuity HIS3K: Triumph and Collapse: Russia and the USSR, 1941–1991 Question 1

01 ‘The USSR remained politically and socially stable in the years 1964 to 1982 despite the policies of the Brezhnev regime.’ Assess the validity of this view. (45 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2 Nothing written worthy of credit. 0

L1: Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. 1-6

L2: Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will either be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual
Appendix 37 – continued

support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. 7-15

L3: Answers will show an understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. 16-25

L4: Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. 26-37

L5: Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be well-structured and fluently written. 38-45
October 5, 2011 at 7:09 pm!

‘Stalin’s leadership was the most significant reason for the Soviet victory?’

Intro: Stalin, as dictator, had complete control and therefore every decision that was made linked back to him.

Para 1: Military decisions
   Slow start to an effective leader
   When he accepted other guidance everything went better

Para 2: Patriotism and religious concessions
   Propaganda
   The re-opening of churches

Para 3: Industry (relocation of factories)
   Production
   Women in labour
   Help from USA and UK

Para 4: Cruelty towards his people
   Did the end justify the means?

Log in to Reply
Appendix 39 – Blog plan + comments

October 8, 2011 at 11:36 am
intro – context – stalin was most significant reason…
mention main argument briefly
para 1 – main argument, as dictator he had complete control over Russia, and so all the other factors were influenced by him.
para 2 – his improvement as a war leader coincided with Russia's change of fortune
para 3 – however was the partisan movement out of his control? eventually used it as propaganda for the war effort
para 4 – down to others such as women and generals? though it was stalin's concessions that allowed the generals the freedom to gain success.

Conclusion – his dominance let him claim all victories as his own, hard to recognise significance of generals without his overwhelming authority

Log in to Reply

October 10, 2011 at 8:09 pm
Good balanced plan however you haven't come to a clear view in your conclusion? You could add historians quotes/views. Additionally you could split up factors economically socially and politically and analyse how significant these are. However a good plan covering a vast amount of factors.

Audio & video

Log in to Reply
Appendix 39 - continued

October 10, 2011 at 7:11 pm

Intro – Context, Stalins most significant action (don’t analyse this yet). However many other factors certainly were majorly responsible for the soviets success and it was not solely stalins leadership.

Section 1 – Stalins war efforts and how significant. Social political and economic.

Section 2 – Influencing factors to soviet victory (Religious concessions, the partisan movement and role of women) and how significant exactly were they.

Section 3 – How far were the people of Russia’s war successes/other factors claimed and seen as Stalins?

Section 4 – Other factories leading to soviet victory: lend lease, failures of the Germans, stubbornness of the Russians, aid from America.

Conclusion – Although Stalins efforts could be perceived as the leading factor as to why the soviets won the war, Stalin took more credit than he was liable for and without other factors such as… the soviets would not have won the war. Is this a dominant view shared by historians?

Log in to Reply
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Appendix 40 – Part of the Pre-Intervention Scheme of work - School ES Year 12

Year 12 – Argumentation In History Project - Two Weeks Preparation time

Task:

Collect evidence for both sides of the argument:

- Wolsey was in total control of the Government
- The king always retained ultimate authority

NB – Focus on the years 1515 – 1525 only

Preparation for these lessons – starting on Friday 14 October


Examining the Evidence: Thomas Wolsey: King’s Minister or Country’s Ruler?
pp. 144-152

Complete Grid Task on pp. 150-151. Only do ‘Henry or Wolsey? The Country’s Ruler’ Column


Cardinal Wolsey section
pp. 34-35

Can you find evidence that Wolsey was more in control of government and administration than Henry?

3. J. Guy: Tudor England (1988) [Only read if you have an AS starter grade of an A]

Selected pages from Chapter 4: Wolsey’s Ascendancy.
pp. 81-89 then skip to last page – pp.114-115

Again highlighting evidence for both sides of the argument.


Analysis (1) How did Thomas Wolsey maintain his pre-eminent position in English Politics for so long?

Highlight historian’s opinions & Interpretations (‘historiography’) Pollard, Elton, Starkey, Gwyn, Guy, Scarisbrick.

Also look at contemporary commentators (people who live at the time)
Cavendish, Vergil

Overall an excellent article on Wolsey/Henry relationship.

5. Active History sheet from website

How was Wolsey able to rise to power so quickly under Henry VIII?
## Appendix 41 – Example of Lesson Plan ES Year 12 Intervention (Chapter 10)

### HISTORY LESSON PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher: DMH</th>
<th>Class/Set Year Yr 12</th>
<th>Period 2 10.00 – 12.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date: Tuesday 18 October 2011</td>
<td>Room: History ES B16</td>
<td>Risk Assessment – as standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Additional Comments on class e.g.

Second contact – into the intervention

#### Lesson Title/Key Question

Main Study - The intervention Part 2

#### Long-term planning context:

The part the lesson plays in long term progression of historical learning? What concepts, skills, knowledge, understanding does it address (include NC/GCSE/AS/A2 references).

Making the transition from spoken to written argumentation – trialling an ‘intervention’

#### Medium term planning context:

Getting used to working with the class
- Skills - Reflection - Group discussion – Interaction - Critical reflection

#### Learning objectives

By the end of this lesson pupils will be able to ....

**Aims:**
- Understand the basics of formal and informal argumentation
- Appreciate why ‘persuasion’ is a more effective way of considering argumentation
- Empathetic appreciation of persuasion

**Outcomes:**
- I will have gotten to know the group better and be able to assess how well they work
- I will be in a position to develop discussion and argumentation skills more effectively
- Lead into History argument next time

**What is the point!?**

In what ways will this lesson be meaningful for the students? How would you answer the question, ‘What’s the point of doing this’?

Improve written argumentation by making them aware of what they are actually doing

#### Resources

- Powerpoint presentation
- Tripods
- Cameras
- Leads
- Paper
- Essay handouts
- Cakes

#### Rationale for/evaluation of resources

PowerPoint provides the backbone for the lesson and includes instructions, prompts and to trigger class discussions, be the focal point for discussion, clarifies the lesson objective and aid students’ focus.

#### Personal targets:

- To work on creating and maintaining positive relationships.
- To keep an eye on the pace and timing of the lesson.
- To get as much information from them as I can about their feelings about the intervention
### Differentiation:
Strategies to include all pupils from most to least able.
Pair and group work should encourage students of all abilities to work together and put forward ideas.
Class discussion allows me to differentiate in terms of the questions I ask and who I address them to.

### Assessment:
Students’ understanding will be formatively gauged within general class feedback session and at the end of the series of lessons will be checked against written essay and structured critical incident interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Teacher activity</th>
<th>Student learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>LEARNING OBJECTIVE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff and student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessing educational research intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Essay title</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you agree with the view that in the years 1515 - 25 Henry VIII wholly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>surrendered power in government to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cardinal Wolsey?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Explain your answer, using sources 4, 5 and 6 and your own knowledge.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Feedback to each other in pairs – how could you develop it further</strong></td>
<td>Reflection on individual learning</td>
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</table>

**Episode 2**

**10 min**

**Argument phase 2**

Find other reasons – some may appear from the sources themselves – think about court life and how Wolsey might or might not have fitted in – how much control does Henry have and how to prove it

Once you have found other reasons think about different forms of evidence to illustrate your points

**Argue next phase**

Feedback to each other – did you actually stick to what you thought you would be arguing if not why not

Feed it into your planned response

**Conclusion/Plenary**

**50-55 min**

**CLASS PLENARY**

---
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How to write History argument effectively.
And pass your exams as well!

Diana M Hilliard

The gentle art of persuasion

Stage 1
Introduction
• Getting to know you
• Give, get, ghastlies, and ground rules

Stage 2
Making the implicit explicit
• Watch the following clip
• Is this an argument?
• What do you think are the characteristics of a good argument?

Stage 3
But What is History Argument?
• History Argument isn’t about winning or losing, it is about interpreting the past based on partial and incomplete evidence from a variety of different sources. Each interpretation attempts to explain and analyse a form of human, social and/or cultural behaviour from the past.
• We cannot know completely what actually happened in the past. We can only begin to understand the past when we analyse the evidence and other people’s interpretations.

So what is an argument?
STAGE 2
Making the implicit explicit
• Watch the following clip
• Is this an argument?
• What do you think are the characteristics of a good argument?

How does this relate to History argument?
• But are your definitions the type of argument we use when we talk about History argument?

An interesting definition
• Let’s remember that
• “IF HISTORY IS PRE-EMINENTLY INTERPRETATION, THE PRACTICE OF HISTORY IS ARGUMENT.”
  — McGill (1973 pg 115)
Which type of argument is closest to History argument?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Dialogue</th>
<th>Initial situation</th>
<th>Participant’s Goal</th>
<th>Goal of Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>Conflict of opinions</td>
<td>Persuade other party</td>
<td>Resolve or clarify issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry</td>
<td>Need to have proof</td>
<td>Find and verify evidence</td>
<td>Prove (disprove) hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>Conflict of Interests</td>
<td>Get what you most want</td>
<td>Reasonable settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information-seeking</td>
<td>One party lacks information</td>
<td>Argue or give information</td>
<td>Exchange information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberation</td>
<td>Dilemma or practical choice</td>
<td>Co-ordinate goals and actions</td>
<td>Decide best course of action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eristic</td>
<td>Personal conflict</td>
<td>Verbally hit out at opponent</td>
<td>Reveal deeper conflict</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arguing and Thinking
• Making the move from GCSE – two sided argument – to:

• AS and A2 – following the thread, supporting with evidence and acknowledging other views.

Making a Judgement
• Key question

University fees do not reflect the true cost of higher education therefore students should pay more not less money for their courses

• 2 reasons for your point of view

Practising the gentle art of persuasion
Stage 4
• In threes discuss the statement

• One person acts as the judge while the other 2 argue for and against the statement.

• Try and convince the other person that your argument is more persuasive.

What do YOU think?

Do you agree with the view that in the years 1515-25 Henry VIII wholly surrendered power in government to Cardinal Wolsey

• Without saying a word make a judgment about this statement

• Think of 2 reasons why you feel this way.

Have you the strength of your convictions!!!

• Still without saying a word

• Standing on the continuum ... Key words to consider ‘wholly surrender’ and ‘power’ where would you place yourself?

• HOW FAR do you agree with the statement...

• It’s Ok to have an opinion but can you support it?
**Gathering the Evidence**
- Compare notes with the person next to you
- Together using the sources and your notes review the evidence
- In pairs work out what evidence you would use to demonstrate what you think of Henry’s relationship with Cardinal Wolsey...

**Keeping the thread of the argument clear!!**
- Write down your points of view with their supporting reasons and evidence
- Discuss together and add 2 more reasons with corresponding evidence to support your points of view.
- Together work out which are the strongest and weakest reasons which support your respective point of view
- Remember to keep the thread of your argument clear by linking your reasons correspondingly

**Exploring the argument — focusing on the alternative points of view**
**Debating in threes or fours**
- On the continuum match with the pair that corresponds to the opposite of your point of view
- I person from each pair argues the first 2 points while the other person of the pair silently watches and takes notes
- The pairs meet to discuss the progress of the debate – did No 1 put forward their case and did they respond to the other side before they made their second point.

**There is no right or wrong reason just the strength of argument**
- The second person of the pair follows the same procedure

**Four-way discussion**
- The pairs that were arguing meet – has either of them changed their mind based on the other’s reason and evidence?
- Did they change their argument to meet the demands of the other’s point of view?
- Has anything NEW come up?
Collectively discuss whether anyone has changed their position and why

**Transforming this to written argument**

**Stage 6**
- Consider your initial position - has it changed and why? What is your judgement now?
- Plan your written response using whichever written structure you feel most comfortable with
- You have made a judgement and your introduction should reflect this so state how far you agree and disagree with the statement including reference to the points you have discussed in your 4s.
- These naturally will be different reasons and will include reasons from the pair that were opposing you.
- Your plan should demonstrate a convincing argument which means that the thread of the argument should be clear throughout. Your response should also incorporate the different reasons which you have chosen to use to demonstrate to the examiner that you are aware that there are different and sometimes opposing points of view but nevertheless this is your point of view and you are sticking to it.

**With a little help from your friends**
- Show your plan to a different 3 or 4 showing your introduction, the outline of your argument and incorporating the counterargument
- Read each other’s plans and post 2 comments on that focuses on the argument – is the thread clear, do the points support the argument and is there a counterargument present. These posts are in the form of post-its and...
- The comments should be constructive and if the plan isn’t clear then kind words should be used to offer assistance in making it clearer
- The other comments should focus on the use of evidence and how well chosen it might be to reflect the argument – and if it is in evidence that is new to you – thank the planner and offer evidence that s/he could use in return.
THE FINAL PART

- Now write the essay using your plan and the comments from your friends.

- The essay will be assessed not only using the AS level mark scheme but also looking at how you have developed your response from the comments of your friends.
Appendix 43 – AS Mark Scheme - Henry VIII and Cardinal Wolsey

Answer to:

Do you agree with the view that in the years 1515-25 Henry VIII wholly surrendered power in government to Cardinal Wolsey?

Explain your answer, using sources 4, 5 and 6 and your knowledge (40 marks)

Part (b) (40 marks)

Target: AO1a & AO1b (10% - 24 marks)

Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>Candidates will produce mostly simple statements. These will be supported by limited factual material, which has some accuracy and relevance, although not directed analytically (i.e. at the focus of the question). The material will be mostly generalized. There will be few, if any links between the simple statements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Low Level: 1-2 marks**

The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth

**Mid Level: 3-4 marks**

As per descriptor

**High level: 5-6 marks**

The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 1

The writing may have limited coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organization. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>Candidates will produce a series of simple statements supported by some accurate and relevant, factual material. The analytical focus will be mostly implicit and there are likely to be only limited links between simply statements. Material is unlikely to be developed very far or to be explicitly linked to material taken from sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Low level 2: 7-8 marks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As per descriptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>High level 2: 11-12 marks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The writing will have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible but passages will lack both clarity and organization. Some of the skills needed to produce effective writing will be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13-18</td>
<td>Candidates answers will attempt analysis and show some understanding of the focus of the question. They may, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question’s focus, or which strays from that focus. Factual material will be mostly accurate, but it may lack depth and/or reference to the given factor. At this level candidates will begin to link contextual knowledge with points drawn from sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As per descriptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>High Level 3: 17-18 marks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The writing will be coherent in places but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. Only some of the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are likely to be present. Syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19-24</td>
<td>Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material, which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. There will be some integration of contextual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
knowledge with material drawn from sources, although this may not be sustained throughout the response. The selection of material may lack balance in places.

**Low Level 4: 19-20 marks**

The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.

**Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks**

As per descriptor

**High Level 4: 23-24 marks**

The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 4.

The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes may not be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing but there may be passages which lack clarity or coherence. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.

**NB:** generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.

**AO2b (7% - 16 marks)**

Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>Comprehends the sources and selects material relevant to the representation contained in the question. Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</strong> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>High Level 1: 3-4 marks</strong> The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify points which support or differ from the representation contained in the question. When supporting the decision made in relation to the question the sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Low Level 2: 5-6 marks</strong> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>High Level 2: 7-8 marks</strong> The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>The sources are analysed and points of challenge and/or support for the representation contained in the question are developed from the provided material. In addressing the specific enquiry, there is clear awareness that a representation is under discussion and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
there is evidence of reasoning from the evidence of the sources, although there may be some lack of balance. The response reaches a judgement in relation to the claim which is supported by the evidence of the sources.

**Low Level 3: 9-10 marks**
The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.

**High Level 3: 11-12 marks**
The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.

| 4 | 13-16 | Reaches and sustains a conclusion based on the discriminating use of the evidence. Discussion of the claim in the question proceeds from the issues raised by the process of analysing the representation in the sources. There is developed reasoning and weighing of the evidence in order to create a judgement in relation to the stated claim. |

**Low Level 4: 13-14 marks**
The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.

**High Level 4: 15-16 marks**
The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.

NB: generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience

Unit 2 Assessment Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>AO1a and b Marks</th>
<th>AO2a Marks</th>
<th>AO2b Marks</th>
<th>Total marks For question.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q (a)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q(b) (i) or (ii)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total marks</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%weighting</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication**
Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (b) (i)</td>
<td>The sources contain evidence to both support and challenge the stated claim. Taken at face value source 4 shows that Wolsey controlled the reigns of power while Henry pursued his pleasures as a ‘self-indulgent’ young king. Candidates can develop this point from their own knowledge of Henry’s interests, friendships and pursuits, as well as their knowledge of Wolsey’s ambition and methods of manipulation. Sources 5 and 6, however, show some limits on Wolsey’s power, referring to the importance of factions and to the role of the ‘minions’ who had a close relationship with the King that Wolsey could not share. This can be supported by cross-referencing to source 4, as well as developed from own knowledge of the greater nobility, their relations with Henry, the importance of the Privy Chamber and Wolsey’s failure to control it despite several attempts. Source 6 shows Henry actively issuing instructions. However, interpreted in context the sources offer a more complex picture and suggest that the apparent conflicts can be reconciled. In source 4 Scarisbrick suggests that it ‘seemed’ as though Henry had surrendered power to Wolsey, allowing that appearances could be deceptive. Candidates can draw on their own knowledge to refer to occasions when Henry asserted his control, and Wolsey’s haste to obey. They can also suggest that the situation varied over time, with Henry gradually becoming more active in day to day government after the failure of the Amicable Grant, or in particular areas of personal interest such as foreign policy and war. Source 5 offers a range of factors, which can be assessed by considering Wolsey’s methods of government and his relations with the nobility. The existence of factions and the role of the Privy Chamber posed a challenge to Wolsey’s power, which was balanced by his control of patronage and his use of the courts to punish those who offended him. Taken together sources 5 and 6 emphasise the extent to which the King retained control. In source 5 he is seen as the source of all power, and of the patronage on which both Wolsey and the noble factions depended. In source 6 he is demonstrating the extent to which he could play off the</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
different elements, setting Wolsey to investigate the nobility on his behalf and demonstrating his power over both. Candidates can develop this further by reference to the Duke of Buckingham, whose execution came from these instructions. However, the source is capable of being interpreted in different ways. On the one hand it shows that in challenging these men Wolsey required instruction from the King, and that it was the King who instigated the challenge. At the same time it indicates the level of trust that Wolsey enjoyed, and may point towards a removal of the conflict to create an overall judgement – that Henry surrendered the daily exercise of power to Wolsey because he knew that he could trust to his obedience and his dependence upon the King’s favour. Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available, and the sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of Wolsey's position, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.
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