

The Discursive Construction of Authorial Voice and
Disciplinarity through Citation:
When Educational Research and Applied Language Research
Articles Intersect with Decoloniality

By

Lalia Duke



*Thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of MA
in General Linguistics in the Department of General Linguistics
Stellenbosch University*

Supervisor: Dr Marcelyn Oostendorp

December 2020

DECLARATION

By submitting this thesis electronically, I declare that the entirety of the work contained therein is my own, original work, that I am the owner of the copyright thereof (unless to the extent explicitly otherwise stated) and that I have not previously, in its entirety or in part, submitted it for obtaining any qualification.

Lalia Duke

July 2020

Copyright © 2020 Stellenbosch University

All rights reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the Andrew Mellon foundation for their contribution to this research topic as it forms part of a bigger project funded by this foundation: Unsettling Paradigms. I would like to thank them also for other opportunities they have afforded me, including the opportunity to attend a conference, and assist in the administration of the post graduate course 'Re-Imagining Multilingualisms' jointly hosted by Stellenbosch University and the University of the Western Cape.

I would like to thank Carol-Ann Pope and Dr Marcelyn Oostendorp for their assistance with the translation of the abstract into Afrikaans.

I would like to say thank you to my friend and colleague, Carla, for her continued and much appreciated administrative, academic, and moral support.

I would also like to thank my family for their unwavering support. I would especially like to thank my father, Anthony Duke, for his valuable energy, time, insight, and numerous other contributions to this thesis.

Most importantly, I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr Marcelyn Oostendorp for her encouragement, patient guidance, and thoughtful advice. This thesis would truly not have been possible without her valuable input and kindness. Thank you.

ABSTRACT

This thesis aims to investigate the ways in which disciplinary knowledge, convention, canonisation, and authorial voice are constructed in Educational Research (ER) and Applied Linguistics and Language Studies (ALS) Research Articles (RA). This will be done in the context of when ALS and ER RAs intersect with Decolonial theory and praxis in response to recent and ongoing ‘#Fallist’ student movements in South Africa. Citation practices have frequently been discussed in the broader context of academic writing and has now become the focus of research in and of itself (For examples see Thompson and Ye 1991; Thomas and Hawes 1994a; Thomas and Hawes 1994b; Buckingham & Neville 1997: 52; Hyland 1999; Hyland 2008; Hyland & Jiang 2019; Peng 2019). Three different types of citation analyses were used to analyse the data. The first two focused on in-text citation practice and the third was a bibliographical quantification. These three methods allowed for a close analysis of citation practice across the data set. Citation presentation type and citation language form patterns across the data mirror those found in other studies for the ‘soft sciences’. High rates of direct quotation and relatively high rates of integral citation suggest an acknowledgement of the role of human agency in the production of knowledge. While both disciplines show high levels of reference to university and governmental policy, and the prominence of language and education literature, ER incorporates more literature often considered seminal in the ‘Decolonial canon’. Conversely, ALS seems to rely heavily on theories of multilingualism, specifically translanguaging, when they explicitly address Decoloniality in education. Ultimately, the data shows the importance of recognising both authorial agency and the constraints in which writers operate when constructing authorial voice and navigating disciplinary boundaries. In terms of voice, to discursively construct an authorial voice, a writer must create explicit and rhetorically significant intertextual linkages by negotiating self-representation through the constraints and conventions of their context. In terms of disciplinary construction, writers must make choices about which communities to align with and the degree to which they conform or resist these conventions (Hyland 2008). Writers working in academic contact zones, such as those created when many disciplinary traditions meet and sometimes clash, need to create and implement innovative and novel ways to negotiate rhetorical boundaries.

OPSOMMING

Hierdie tesis het ten doel om die maniere waarop dissiplinêre kennis, konvensie, kanonisering en outoritiese stem gekonstrueer word, te ondersoek in Opvoedkundige Navorsing (ER) en Toegepaste Linguistiek en Taalstudie (ALS) Navorsingsartikels (RA). Dit sal gedoen word in die konteks van wanneer ALS en ER RAs met dekoloniale teorie en praktyk oorvleuel in reaksie op onlangse en deurlopende '#Fallist' studentebewegings in Suid-Afrika. Verwysingspraktyke word gereeld bespreek in die breër konteks van akademiese skryfwerk en het nou die spesifieke fokuspunt van navorsing op sigself geword (Vir voorbeelde kyk Thompson and Ye 1991; Thomas and Hawes 1994a; Thomas and Hawes 1994b; Buckingham & Neville 1997: 52; Hyland 1999; Hyland 2008; Hyland & Jiang 2019; Peng 2019). Drie verskillende tipes aanhalingsanalises is gebruik om die data te ontleed. Die eerste twee het op die aanhalingspraktyk in die teks gefokus, en die derde was 'n bibliografiese kwantifisering. Hierdie drie metodes het 'n noue ontleding van die aanhalingspraktyk oor die datastel moontlik gemaak. Aanhalingsprestasietipe en aanhalingstaal vorm patrone oor die dataspieël wat in ander studies vir die 'sagte wetenskappe' gevind word. Hoë koerse van direkte aanhalings en relatief hoë koerse van integrale aanhaling dui op die erkenning van die rol van menslike agentskap in die produksie van kennis. Alhoewel beide vakgebiede hoë vlakke van verwysing na universiteits- en regeringsbeleid toon, en die prominensie van literatuur op die grensvlak van taal en onderwys duidelik toon, bevat ER meer literatuur wat dikwels as seminaal in die 'dekoloniale kanon' beskou word. Omgekeerd, lyk dit asof ALS baie steun op teorieë oor meertaligheid, spesifiek transtaling (*translanguaging*) wanneer hulle dekolonialiteit in die onderwys eksplisiet aanspreek. Uiteindelik is die belangrikheid daarvan om erkenning te gee aan sowel die outoriteitsagentskap as die beperkinge waarin skrywers werk wanneer hulle outoriale stem konstrueer en dissiplinêre grense navigeer. Wat stem betref, om 'n outoritiese stem diskursief te konstrueer, moet 'n skrywer eksplisiete en retoriese beduidende intertekstuele skakels skep deur selfverteenwoordiging te onderhandel deur die beperkinge en konvensies van hul konteks. Wat dissiplinêre konstruksie betref, moet skrywers keuses maak oor watter gemeenskappe hul hulself mee belyn, en die mate waarin hulle ooreenstem met hierdie konvensies (Hyland 2008). Skrywers wat in akademiese kontakgebiede werk, soos dié wat geskep word wanneer baie dissiplinêre tradisies ontmoet en soms bots, moet innoverende en nuwe maniere skep om retoriese grense te onderhandel.

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 Citation and Academic Writing | 1 |
| 1.2 Research Aims | 6 |
| 1.3 Research Questions | 6 |
| 1.4 Methodological Orientation | 7 |
| 1.5 Thesis Layout..... | 7 |
| 1.6 Findings and Significance..... | 8 |
| CHAPTER 2 THEORETICAL FRAME..... | 9 |
| 2.1 Citation and Academic Writing | 9 |
| 2.2 Intertextuality | 14 |
| 2.3 Constructing Authorial Voice | 16 |
| 2.4 Academic Disciplinarity | 20 |
| 2.4.1 Educational Research..... | 23 |
| 2.4.2 Applied Linguistics and Language Studies..... | 25 |
| 2.5 Conclusion | 27 |
| CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY | 29 |
| 3.1 Data Selection and Description..... | 29 |
| 3.2 Data Analysis | 31 |
| CHAPTER 4 ANALYSIS AND RESULTS | 36 |
| 4.1 Introduction..... | 36 |
| 4.2 Presentation of Cited Work: Expanding Dialogic Space and Balancing Voices..... | 36 |
| 4.2.1 Introduction..... | 36 |
| 4.2.2 Constructing Authorial Voice and Disciplinarity Through the Presentation of Citation..... | 37 |
| 4.2.3 Conclusion | 45 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 4.3 Citation Language Form: | 46 |
| 4.3.1 Introduction..... | 46 |
| 4.3.2 Constructing Authorial Voice and Disciplinarity Through Citation Language Form | 47 |
| 4.3.3 Conclusion | 51 |
| 4.4 Reference Analysis: Dominant Authors and Ideas | 51 |
| 4.4.1 Introduction..... | 51 |
| 4.4.2 Analysis..... | 53 |
| 4.4.3 Conclusion | 69 |
| 4.5 Analysis: Conclusion | 71 |
| CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION..... | 72 |
| 5.1 Citation and Constructing Authorial Voice | 72 |
| 5.1.1 Authorial Agency: Constructing <i>Individual Voice</i> | 72 |
| 5.1.2 ...And Now Deconstructing It..... | 74 |
| 5.2 Citation and Constructing Disciplines: Contact Zones and Border Rhetoric | 76 |
| 5.3 Influential Sources and Voices: Disciplinary Boundaries and the Transformative Limits of Agency..... | 78 |
| 5.4 Authorial Agency AND Contextual Constraints | 81 |
| 5.5 Limitations and Recommendations..... | 82 |
| REFERENCES..... | 84 |
| Appendices..... | 100 |
| Appendix A..... | 100 |

List of Tables

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 1: Presentation of Citation Type Across Data Set (%) | 37 |
| Table 2: Presentation of Citation Type in AL Journals (%) | 42 |
| Table 3: Presentation of Citation Type in ER Journals (%)..... | 42 |
| Table 4: Presentation of Citation Type SALALS (%)..... | 44 |
| Table 5: Presentation of Citation Type JLT (%)..... | 44 |
| Table 6: Presentation of Citation Type ERSC (%) | 44 |
| Table 7: Presentation of Citation Type PiE (%) | 45 |
| Table 8: Presentation of Citation Type PiE (%) (2)..... | 45 |
| Table 9: Citation Language Form Across Disciplines (%)..... | 48 |
| Table 10: Citation Language Form in AL (%)..... | 48 |
| Table 11: Citation Language Form in ER (%)..... | 48 |
| Table 12: Citation Language Form SALALS (%)..... | 49 |
| Table 13: Citation Language Form JLT (%)..... | 49 |
| Table 14: Citation Language Form ERSC (%)..... | 50 |
| Table 15: Citation Language Form PiE (%) | 50 |
| Table 16: Citation Language Form PiE (%) (2)..... | 50 |
| Table 17: Most Frequently Referenced Institutions and Authors Across the Data Set | 53 |
| Table 18: Most Frequently Referenced Sources Across Data Set | 55 |
| Table 19: Most Frequently Referenced Institutions and Authors: ALS | 57 |
| Table 20: Most Frequently Referenced Sources: ALS Journals | 58 |
| Table 21: Most Frequently Referenced Institutions and Authors: ER Journals | 58 |
| Table 22: Most Frequently Referenced Sources: ER Journals | 60 |
| Table 23: Most Frequently Referenced Institutions and Authors: JLT | 61 |
| Table 24: Most Frequently Referenced Sources: JLT | 64 |
| Table 25: Most Frequently Referenced Institutions and Authors: SALALS..... | 64 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 26: Most Frequently Referenced Sources: SALALS..... | 65 |
| Table 27: Most Frequently Referenced Institutions and Authors: PiE..... | 66 |
| Table 28: Most Frequently Referenced Sources: PiE..... | 67 |
| Table 29: Most Frequently Referenced Institutions and Authors: ERSC..... | 67 |
| Table 30: Most Frequently Referenced Sources: ERSC..... | 69 |

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This thesis aims to investigate the ways in which disciplinary knowledge, convention, canonisation, and authorial voice are constructed in Educational Research (ER) and Applied Linguistics and Language Studies (ALS) Research Articles (RA). This will be done in the context of when ALS and ER RAs intersect with Decolonial theory and praxis in response to recent and ongoing ‘#Fallist’ student movements in South Africa. Disciplinary knowledge in the context of this study refers to knowledge that is produced within, and disseminated from, academic discipline discourse communities. This includes the “structures of knowledge and intellectual inquiry” characteristic of a particular academic disciplinary community (Hyland 1999: 344). The epistemological, ontological, and historical foundations of an academic discipline dictate how disciplinary discourse communities negotiate the construction of new ‘knowledge’ and which knowledge is ‘canonised’ or accepted as seminal, typical, and characteristic of the discipline. They also bear on the ways that writers construct their authorial voice.

The degree to which objectivity, or subjectivity, is valued and emphasised within a discipline modifies the ways that authors represent themselves within their writing and demonstrates the necessary amount of distance between themselves and the research object. In order to generate new disciplinary knowledge, researchers must abide by the conventionalised methodological, theoretical, and rhetorical practices of their disciplinary community. These conventionalised ways of recognising and producing knowledge are reflected and concretised in the discursive practices of disciplinary discourse communities. One way of observing these practices is through an examination of the way’s citation is used within these communities.

1.1 Citation and Academic Writing

Identity, power relations, and knowledge are all constructed through written and spoken texts, and this is especially true in academic contexts. Academic knowledge is culturally and socially situated and is shaped by ideology and convention (Hyland 1999: 341). Discourses of the academy are not transparent or neutral in its ways of reporting on or describing the ‘outside world’ (Canagarajah 2002; Hyland & Partridge 2013: 178). Instead, they work to regulate and control knowledge. Epistemic authority is often afforded to the current ideologically dominant literacy practices and the ways that they are conventionalised (Hyland & Partridge 2013: 170).

Academic writing in the specialised domain of RAs is central to academic practices of knowledge production and plays a significant role in the construction, dissemination, and legitimisation of knowledge (Canagarajah 2002: 6). RAs are a common academic genre through which researchers are able to report their findings (Farnia, Bagheri, & Saeedi, 2018: 27). Often considered the central means through which scientific and scholarly information is communicated, the structure of the RA has received more attention than any other academic genre (Holmes 1997: 322). Moreover, numerous studies are now available which analyse the rhetorical and linguistic structure of one or more parts of the RA (on ‘abstracts’ see Hyland 2000; Samraj 2005; on ‘introductions’ see Farnia et.al. 2018; on ‘theoretical frameworks’ see Tseng 2018; on ‘results’ see Brett 1994; William 1999; on ‘discussions/conclusions’ see Holmes 1997; Yang & Allison, 2003).

Many of these studies have highlighted the fact that RAs are rhetorically sophisticated, and like other forms of academic writing and knowledge production, rely on striking a balance between factual information and socially negotiated writing conventions and publishing practices. As such, RAs not only have to report the results of research but report them in such a way that the audiences will perceive them as persuasive (Hyland 1999: 341). One way of bolstering the credibility of research findings is through referring to previous literature, or citation (Hyland 1999: 341).

Referencing or reporting prior research can be used to provide justification for one’s research or demonstrate its originality by allowing writers to create rhetorical gaps in which to position themselves and their research (Hyland 1999: 342). Citations allow for the positioning of research as original, distinct, and contributory within disciplinary discourses. This discursive construction through citation requires a writer to negotiate their own authorial voice and the voices of other authors simultaneously. Bakhtin (1978 quoted in Peng 2018: 11) explains that the intertextual embeddedness of citation requires “...double-voicing whereby the writer injects his or her intention and position into the representation of others’ work...”. The degree and manner in which citations are integrated into a text embody the writer’s¹ voice (Peng 2018: 12) and are a means through which writers can establish a credible writer ethos and demonstrate knowledgeability and proficiency in their disciplines.

The language form a citation takes, carries fine distinctions in intertextual meaning. Writers (sometimes unconsciously) choose one form or another to encode these complex and layered meanings (Buckingham & Neville 1997: 52). While the form of a citation embeds and embodies

¹ I will adopt Thompson and Ye’s (1991) convention of referring to the person cited as ‘author’ and the person citing as ‘writer’.

the writer's voice, it also works to negotiate the 'truth value' of knowledge claims and position a text in relation to other texts and writers. Citations can invite engagement and present knowledge as challengeable, or they can erase contestation and represent knowledge as settled and agreed upon, thereby fixing its meaning and naturalising its claims (Buckingham & Neville 1997: 54).

Through structural and rhetorical reporting choices, writers are able to increase or diminish their distance from reported findings (Hyland 1999: 344). In this way, social and epistemological conventions of academic disciplines are embedded in and reflected by routine writing choices, such as the how and when of integrating source material into a text (Hyland 1999: 363).

Discursive practices are central to the construction of disciplinary knowledge (Foucault 1972 cited in Chandrasoma: 6). For instance, greater emphasis is placed on the reported message in the 'hard sciences' by favouring citation structures which make reference to a source by superscript numbers or parenthesis. Conversely, writers in the social sciences, particularly philosophy, may prioritise the cited author by using citation which is incorporated into the sentence structure of a text. The relative importance placed on either the author or the message demonstrates the larger epistemological and ontological differences between disciplines, and the degree to which individuals within them agree on an established base on which 'knowledge' is built (Hyland 1999).

Citation can also be used to demonstrate an allegiance to a specific community, school of thought, or academic tradition (Hyland 1999: 342). Referencing those authors and works which are most often cited can indicate the most dominant discourses and voices in a discipline, and in turn reveal the prevailing ideologies and paradigms in these respective disciplines. This is a feature of citation analysis which might be especially useful and productive in emergent fields of research. This is also true of interdisciplinary research, where it can show in which ways new disciplinary knowledge is constructed and merged through intertextual practices across domains. Analysing whose knowledge is considered authoritative and is centralised within a disciplinary community can work to uncover the hidden or erased links between the subject and the production of knowledge. It also highlights the social values embedded in knowledge production and the partiality of these social norms (Grosfoguel 2007: 213).

Many studies have analysed the discursive and rhetorical construction of RAs in and across disciplinary fields. This study is focused on the fields of ALS and ER. A number of studies have analysed the rhetorical structure of RAs in these fields respectively (Ozturk 2007; Tseng 2018), and have comparatively analysed RAs in these disciplines (Pho 2008; Golebiowski 2009; Lim

2011), or across a broader range of disciplines (see Hyland 1999). What makes the data compiled for this study of RAs unique, is the fact that they were all a part of special issue publications, published in response to the increasingly loud calls for the Decolonisation of education in South Africa. As such, they bring the disciplines of ALS and ER into conversation with Decoloniality and Decolonial theory.

As Decoloniality is not only a political and epistemological movement, but a way of thinking, knowing and doing (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2015: 485), this intersection of Decolonial theory with ALS and ER respectively might have interesting consequences for the ways in which authors discursively construct their authorial voice and their disciplinary conventions. Decolonial thinking and doing is pluri-versal (Mignolo 2011: 63). It does not have a singular point of origin or linear progression. Mignolo (2011: 47) emphasises that Decolonial thought and practice arose ‘naturally’ in response to colonial matrices of power. The genealogy of Decolonial thinking can be imagined as a web of interconnected ruptures, with each knot on the web a point of delinking and opening (Mignolo 2011: 63). It follows that there are a multitude of iterations and manifestations of Decoloniality which are generated through and in specific contexts. The Decolonial turn does not refer to a single school of thought or theoretical frame, but rather to diverse philosophical and practical positions which identify coloniality as a fundamental problem, and which must be dismantled through processes of Decolonisation (Maldonado-Torres 2011: 2).

In the context of South African education, Decolonisation is a contested notion, with discordant voices advocating different meanings, and pathways of knowing and doing (Fomunyan 2017). The increasingly urgent calls for Decolonisation in South Africa have been driven by recent student ‘protest’ movements. The attention attracted by the movements has driven a proliferation in both mainstream and academic discourses wrestling with what *Decoloniality* in South Africa could look like and attempting to understand the movements and how their demands and aspirations might become manifest in the educational, social, economic, and political landscapes of South Africa.

Student protests have been a feature of South African higher education for many years, and the call to Decolonise African institutions, and specifically universities, is not new. The late twentieth century brought a wave of calls for Decolonisation across Africa for which Franz Fanon’s (1965) work entitled *The Wretched of the Earth* served, amongst others, as a prominent point of reference for Decolonial scholars (Chaka, Lephahala, Ngesi 2017: 209). 2015 saw the beginning of a new kind of student protest rise across South Africa. It is widely agreed that the recent movements to

Decolonise education in South Africa represent a radical discursive rupture not seen before (Fataar 2018: iv; Mwaniki, van Reenen & Makalela 2018: iii; Webstock 2017: 1).

The first of many movements to permeate the education sector in South Africa began at the University of Cape Town under the name #RhodesMustFall (RMF). The movement demanded the removal of a statue of Cecil John Rhodes from the campus as it was perceived as a sign of colonial oppression and white imperialism (Costandius, Blackie, Nell, Malgas, Alexander, Setati, Mckay 2018: 65). These protests should be understood not only as an articulation of dissatisfaction with the material vestiges of colonial rule, but in response to its long and contentious impact on knowledge production in South Africa.

South African history has been profoundly affected first by British and Dutch colonisation and then by the Apartheid regime. A key element of colonial domination was the introduction and expansion of Eurocentric education, which spread colonial language, epistemologies, and traditions across the colonised world. In South Africa, the colonial British education system was set up as a means of social control. Missionary schools were established in an effort to Anglicanise and Christianise Africans and used to further the political goals of the British Empire (Msila 2007: 147-148). In 1948 the Nationalist Government came into power and the cornerstone of its philosophy and politics was apartheid - social and political forced segregation of people based on their race (Christie and Collins 1982: 59). Separate education was fundamental to retaining and furthering White supremacy in South Africa. Despite the abolishment of Apartheid between 1990 and 1994, a white hegemony on social, political, and economic capital persists in South Africa. The #Fallist movements which began in 2015 criticized South African universities for perpetuating colonial oppression and failing to transform themselves in the post-Apartheid era.

The #RhodesMustFall movement eventually led to the larger protest movement, #FeesMustFall (FMF) at the University of the Witwatersrand in Johannesburg, which eventually spread all over South Africa. This movement demanded the abolishment of tuition fees and student debt at South African universities (Costandius et.al. 2018: 65; Francis & Hardman 2018: 66). The movement also aimed to give a platform to those who felt marginalised, underrepresented, and alienated by the colonial culture at South African universities, and those physically and epistemologically excluded by these universities' historically and culturally colonial practices (Francis & Hardman 2018: 66). Mobilising on the basis of demands for free education, students articulated the need for transformation at South African institutions of higher education (Fattar 2018: vi) and called for both physical and epistemic access for students (Mwaniki, van Reenen, & Makalela 2018: iii).

While some of the articles selected for the data set utilised in this study deal explicitly and exclusively with one or more aspect of the student protest movements, most address ways in which the education sector might respond to these calls in practical ways and accelerate the push towards a Decolonised curriculum. They draw on a vast array of theoretical frames and ideological positions, but they all address the transformation and Decolonisation of education in South Africa. In so doing universities will position themselves within the wider debates around what realisations of transformation and Decolonisation might look like, and in which ways curriculum Decolonisation should be approached and achieved. Through the research aims set out below, this thesis aims to explore how academic knowledge which addresses the recent calls for the Decolonisation of the South African education sector is discursively constructed through academic practices of referencing and citation.

1.2 Research Aims

1. To investigate writers' construction of authorial voice through their discursive choices in citation language form and citation presentation type in the disciplines of ALS, and ER when they intersect with Decolonial theory in South African Research Journals.
2. To establish similarities and difference between the ALS and ER RA's in terms of the construction of disciplinarity and disciplinary convention through citation language form and citation presentation type.
3. To explore the ways that disciplinary knowledge is discursively constructed and canonised through the intertextual links created through reference to source materials in ALS, and ER RAs when they intersect with Decolonial theory in South African Research Journals.

In order to achieve the aims, set out above, the research questions set out below were formulated.

1.3 Research Questions

1. How do writers construct authorial voice and disciplinarity through their discursive choices in citation language form within AL and ER RAs when they incorporate and intersect with Decolonial theory in South African research journals?

2. How do writers construct authorial voice and disciplinarity through their discursive choices in citation presentation type within AL and ER RAs when they incorporate and intersect with Decolonial theory in South African Research Journals?
3. How is disciplinary knowledge discursively constructed and canonised by the intertextual links created through reference to source materials within AL and ER RAs when they incorporate and intersect with Decolonial theory in South African Research Journals?

1.4 Methodological Orientation

To investigate the discursive construction of authorial voice and disciplinary knowledge through citation, this study used a synthesis of existing citation analysis frameworks. This consisted of investigating the citation language form and citation presentation type of in-text citations through the data set of 34 RA's. It also involved the cross referencing of the bibliographies of these articles to determine the most influential authors and sources within and across the disciplinary boundaries. While the methods of analysis adapted for use in this study make use of quantification as a means to organise and interpret the data, they are not quantitative by nature and have been adopted from previously established precedents set by numerous studies on intertextual citation practices (see Dubois 1988; Swales 1990; Hyland 1999; Hyland & Jiang 2019; and Peng 2019). The qualitative characteristics of these methods are particularly appropriate in the case of this study as the findings are not intended for extrapolation, and the sample is intentionally specific and not regarded as representative of any literary or generic category.

1.5 Thesis Layout

This thesis consists of 5 chapters – the first and current chapter is the introduction which provides the context for the current study and lays out the research aims, and research questions formulated to address them. Chapter 2 describes the theoretical frameworks in which this study was conducted, including the use of citation in academic writing, the construction of authorial voice, and of academic disciplinarity.

Chapter 3 describes the methodology of the study, outlining both the data collection process and a description of the data analysis methods employed. Data was collected from four special issue journal publications in the disciplines of ALS and ER, and the unit of analysis for this study consisted of all RAs in those special issues. Three different citation analysis tools were used which established the degree to which citation was integrated into texts, the dominant ways in which

these citations were presented, and the dominant authors, institutions, and source materials referenced in the articles.

Chapter 4 reports the findings of these analyses and provides an interpretation of these findings with regards to the construction of authorial voice and disciplinarity in the ALS and ER journals. Chapter 5 provides a discussion of the findings by exploring authorial agency in the construction of voice and disciplinarity. It also includes the limitations of the current study and recommendations for future research.

1.6 Findings and Significance

Citation presentation type and citation language form patterns across the data which mirror those found in other studies for the ‘soft sciences’. High rates of direct quotation and relatively high rates of integral citation suggest an acknowledgement of the role of human agency in the production of knowledge. While both disciplines show high levels of the reference to university and governmental policy, and clearly show the prominence of literature at the interface of language and education, ER incorporates more literature often considered seminal in the ‘Decolonial canon’. Conversely, ALS seems to rely heavily on theories of multilingualism, specifically translanguaging, when engaging with Decoloniality in education.

In terms of voice, to discursively construct an authorial voice, a writer must create explicit and rhetorically significant intertextual linkages by negotiating self-representation through the constraints and conventions of their context. It is evident in the data that authorial agency is an important factor in the construction of an individual voice. In terms of disciplinary construction, writers must make choices about which communities to align themselves with (Hyland 2008: 6), and the degree to which they conform or resist the conventions of these communities. Writers working in academic contact zones, such as those created when many disciplinary traditions meet and sometimes clash, need, to create and implement innovative and novel ways to negotiate rhetorical boundaries. The data shows that, while working in an academic writing contact zone requires authorial agency and creative rhetorical negotiations, disciplinary boundaries and a writers’ disciplinary context still significantly shape their knowledge production and referential choices. Ultimately, what the data shows is the importance of recognising both authorial agency and the constraints in which writers operate when constructing authorial voice and navigating disciplinary boundaries.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAME

2.1 Citation and Academic Writing

Citation, also called ‘referencing’ or ‘reporting’, is the explicit referral of one text to another (Buckingham & Neville 1997: 51). Citation has become an integral and requisite part of academic writing. It has come to play a central role in the construction of academic knowledge, and the social and cultural negotiation of academic fact (Hyland 1999: 342). Hyland (1999: 362) notes that referencing previous work within academic writing is “...virtually mandatory...as a means of meeting priority obligations and as a strategy for supporting current claims”. The rhetorical functions of citation have expanded as it has become an increasingly naturalised way for writers to construct knowledge, their voice, and their disciplines. Through citation, writers are able to embed a number of nuanced intertextual meanings and perform many rhetorical acts (Buckingham & Neville 1997). Citation has become an important means of persuasion in academic and scientific text production. Citation can be used to provide definitions for important concepts used in research and to aid a writer in building their position and perspective. It can also be used to endorse their positions based on previously established precedent and justify theoretical and methodological choices (Canagarajah 2002: 125; Hyland 1999: 342).

Citation can be used to establish credible writer ethos, to indicate intellectual links within and across disciplinary communities, and to signal allegiance to a community or orientation (Hyland 1999: 342). Citation is also a means through which writers can engage previous work by raising questions, signalling opposition, or indicating ‘gaps’ in research (Canagarajah 2002: 125). Using citation in this manner allows writers to articulate the novelty of their approach and carve out a rhetorical ‘gap’ in which to position their research (Hyland 1999: 142). Citations can also come to function as markers for extended practices or orientations. Citing certain seminal literature can function as specific concept indicators and over time, these types of citations can work to fix the meaning of cited works. The initial impetus of a text may be lost as it is recontextualised across time, and the citation of specific texts may carry new meanings distinct from the original author’s intention (Bazerman 1988: 236).

Despite its vast array of rhetorical functions and indispensable status in the global academic community, citation was not always as formalised and essential as it is now. In the early development of RAs, references were fairly common but often general, non-specific, and concentrated in the introduction sections of a paper (Swales 1990: 114). Informal and irregular

acknowledgement of previous work occurred throughout the eighteenth century but served only to signal “recognition of debt” (Bazerman 1988:139). Citation has since come to play a prominent role in the construction of “facts” and the legitimisation of knowledge (Hyland 1999: 343).

Modern citation practice in scientific research began to develop in the nineteenth century. Around this time, changes started to occur in the ways scientific texts referred to one another. What began as rudimentary referrals to previous work gradually developed into ways of constructing linkages between current research and the ongoing development of codified theoretical literature (Bazerman 1988: 139). This development of, and reliance on, more elaborate implicit and explicit intertextual relationships between scientific texts and in scientific communication served as a precursor to modern citation practices (Bazerman 1988: 154). Between 1893 and 1910 the number of references in scientific literature declined, but became more specific, included dates, and predominantly referred to recent literature (Swales 1990: 114). From then on, the number of average references per article has only increased across academic disciplines (Hyland 1999; Swales 1990: 115). Bazerman (1988: 164) has also observed that along with increasing numbers of references in an article, references are becoming more evenly spread throughout an article instead of clustered at the beginning. He notes that the increasing frequency and spread of citations in an article are manifestations of the inclusion of increasing amounts of background knowledge through which writers contextualise their arguments and procedures. All of these patterns point to the growing embeddedness of a writer’s argument into the broader webs of literature in their field (Bazerman 1988: 164), and also the increasing rhetorical importance in academic writing of employing intertextual linking as a means of persuasion, inclusion, and voice construction.

Citation has frequently been discussed in the broader context of academic writing and has now become the specific focus of research in and of itself. Interest in citation as a discursively complex phenomenon has steadily grown, and research into citation practices from many methodological and theoretical perspectives has proliferated. There is now a relative abundance of literature on citation practices from various research traditions and with various aims and outcomes. By the early 1970s a number of studies relying on citation as a source of data had been published, and citation analysis as a means of understanding the discursive and intertextual construction of academic texts was gaining traction. At that time, studies of citation practices focused mainly on citation as a function of property rights, an institutional means of negotiating the tension between what is viewed as the free property of science and the protection of individual property rights (Kaplan 1965 cited in Gilbert 1977: 114). Gilbert (1977) extended this type of analysis by

proposing that citation functions not only as means of property protection, but as an important aspect of audience persuasion. He proposed that by incorporating previous research into academic texts, writers are able to embed a degree of persuasive support for their original findings based on what has already been accepted as “valid science” (Gilbert 1977: 115).

The linguistic study of citation as a discursive resource began moving towards a focus on language form and linguistic features. Early research on the specific features of citation language focused on particular aspects of grammatical construction such as tense (Oster 1981, Malcom 1987 cited in Buckingham & Neville 1997: 52). The analysis of citation language form has since been extended to include thematic patterns of reporting (Thomas & Hawes 1994b) and reporting verb types. Thompson and Ye’s (1991) and Thomas and Hawes’ (1994a) classifications of reporting verbs according to activity type and evaluative potential continue to make a significant impact on current research (see Hyland 1999, Farnia et.al. 2018, and Peng 2019). In the context of this study, two frameworks that have emerged and continue to be productive are important: First, a citation analysis frame originating from Dubois’ (1988) citation type classifications, and second, Swales’ (1990) distinction between integral and non-integral citation forms. For the purposes of this study, these distinctions were used as a means of examining the construction of disciplinarity and disciplinary knowledge, and authorial voice in 34 special issue RAs from the disciplines of ALS and ER.

Dubois’ (1988) used her citation type classifications to investigate the perceived and agreed upon ethics of the citation practices of biomedical scientists (Dubois 1988). She proposes four types or kinds of presentation used to represent source materials: 1) “direct quotation” defined as “...a stretch of three or more words found in both citing and source articles...”; 2) “paraphrase” defined as the restatement of an idea in different words; 3) “summary” as an abbreviated statement from a single source and; 4) “generalisation” as a “statement of similarity from the work of two or more source articles” (Dubois 1988: 183). Dubois (1988: 185) found that in the seven RAs included in her study, ‘generalisation’ and ‘summary’ were the most common types of citation with 25 and 23 instances respectively (1988: 185). Dubois (1988: 185) identified only two instances of ‘direct quotation’, a finding that she contrasts with citation practices in ‘softer’ disciplines such as sociology and linguistics where direct quotation and an extended treatment of previous literature is more customary (Hyland 1999: 153).

Since Dubois’ (1988) use of this analytic framework, it has been adjusted and successfully used in the investigation of a number of aspects of citation. For instance, Hyland’s (1999) cross-

disciplinary comparative study uses an adapted version of this framework as one method of investigation into the discursive construction of disciplinarity and disciplinary knowledge through citation practices. He found that the “summary” type of presentation of source material was the most utilised across disciplines, pointing to its allowance for greater flexibility of emphasis and interpretation according to the writers’ discursive needs (Hyland 1999: 348). He also found that while overall citation presentation types were similar across disciplines, in applied linguistics, quotation made up 10% of all citations, second only to sociology at 13% and as opposed to the “hard science” articles, in which no direct quotation appeared. Likewise, Pickard (1995: 92) found that in a sample of 11 ALS RAs included for analysis, one third of citations were direct quotes, 75% of which consisted of less than 20 words. Hyland (1999: 348) also found that only 8% of citation types in philosophy were constituted by generalisations as opposed to 18% in biology. For Hyland (1999: 348) these results point to the differences in the functions and constitution of persuasion across academic disciplines and the discursual conventions of academic disciplinary communities.

Hu and Wang (2014) used a similar framework adapted from Coffin’s (2009 cited in Hu & Wang 2014: 16) analytic framework to comparatively investigate RAs in the disciplines of ALS and medicine (Hu & Wang 2014: 18). In this framework, ‘summary’ and ‘generalisation’ correspond to what Hu and Wang (2014: 17) describe as ‘assimilation’, while their concept of ‘insertion’ is similar to that of ‘quotation’. ‘Generalisation’ and ‘summary’ presentation types of citation create freedom in terms of what and how a writer incorporates source material allowing greater flexibility in style and self-presentation. They allow the writer to foreground their own voice while contracting the dialogic space and fixing which meanings are to be read in source material presentation (Hyland & Jiang 2017 cited in Peng 2018: 13). They give the writer greater authority in terms of interpretation and emphasis. ‘Quotations’ on the other hand foreground the voice of the author but open the dialogic space for interpretation as the authors words appear directly, and not only the writer’s interpretation of them (Hu & Wang 2014: 17). Hu and Wang (2014) found that ‘assimilation’ was more prevalent in the applied linguistics articles than in the medical ones, again pointing to distinct disciplinary dialogic and discursive practices in the construction of knowledge and authorial voice.

Hyland and Jiang (2017) used an adaption of Dubois’ (1988) framework to investigate the diachronic change in citation practices across four disciplines between 1965 and 2015. They found that in ALS, the preference for direct quotation, as well as ‘generalisation’, had grown over the

time period, while in the ‘hard sciences’ direct quotation had remained an unpopular presentation type, going completely unused in the discipline of engineering over the 50 years (Hyland and Jiang 2017: 73). Peng’s (2019: 18) investigation of the construction of authorial voice through citation practices in linguistics and ALS doctoral theses produced across varying training contexts found that across all contexts, ‘summary’ was the dominant form of citation presentation type, contrasting with Hyland and Jiang’s (2017: 73) finding of an increasing and dominant preference ‘generalisation’ type presentations in their ALS data. This variance in findings may be due to differing cultural and ethnolinguistic contexts (Taylor and Chen 1991; Bloch and Chi 1995) or the differing generic conventions of RAs and doctoral theses.

Another distinction which has been productive in the study of discursive citation practices and their relationship with authorial voice and disciplinarity is Swales’ (1990: 148) distinction between integral and non-integral citation forms. In integral citation forms, the name(s) of an author(s) appear in the citing sentence as a part of the text. In non-integral citation forms, the name of the author appears outside of the structure of the sentence, represented elsewhere such as in superscript numbers or parenthesis. Integral citation emphasises the cited author and gives priority to their voice. In so doing, the voice of the writer is rendered into the background and the dialogic space is contracted as the writer locates themselves at a distance from the knowledge claim (Hyland 1999; Groom 2000; Hu & Wang 2014). Non-integral citation emphasises the idea over the author and privileges the writer’s voice over that of the author. In this way the dialogic space is expanded as the authorial presence of the cited author is diminished (Hyland 1999; Groom 2000; Hu & Wang 2014).

Using this type of analysis on ALS RAs, Pickard (1995: 93) found a preference for integral type citations as they constituted 58% of citation forms in his data. This finding contrasts with that of Hyland (1999: 347), who found a general preference for non-integral citation forms across the disciplines investigated. Hyland (1999: 347) does however note that the prevalence of integral forms is much greater in the ‘soft’ as opposed to the ‘hard’ sciences, pointing to greater disciplinary emphasis on cited authors in the ‘soft’ disciplines. Philosophy for instance is the only discipline found to have a greater number of integral citation forms with 65%, while in biology, only 9% of citation forms are integral. Similarly, Hyland and Jiang (2017: 74) found a general preference for non-integral citation forms, a preference which has only increased over the 50-year period investigated. Interestingly, Peng (2019: 16) found that doctoral theses written by Chinese students trained in mainland China contained more (52%) integral citation forms than did those of

their counterparts trained in Australia or the UK (47%). This finding may indicate the importance of (disciplinary) culture in shaping writers' choices in terms of their construction of authorial voice.

These and other studies conducted over the last six decades into the citation practices of academic discourse and disciplinary communities have continued to expand our understanding of how academic spaces and texts are discursively constructed through their linkages with previous texts and discourses. As an obligatory meaning making practice in academic writing, citation explicitly and continuously highlights the fact that texts exist in relation to other texts, and that for 'knowledge' to be accepted, it must be built through persuasive intellectual and intertextual linkages.

2.2 Intertextuality

In Russian scholar Mikhail Bakhtin's (1981[1953]; 1986) work on the history of the novel, he describes the 'dialogic' qualities of a text. 'Dialogism' refers to the multitude of voices present in any text and the ways in which all texts are mosaics made from previous discourses. It emphasises how all texts are constructed through the manifestation, absorption, and transformation of other texts (Lesic-Thomas 2005: 1). Bakhtin stressed the multiple ways of talking, multiple perspectives, and multiple points of articulation that are transformed and reused over time within and across texts (Johnson 2008:164).

Although Bakhtin began publishing as early as 1919, apparently under many names, due to a restrictive political climate and personal difficulties, his work did not reach Western audiences until the 1960s (Johnson 2008: 164; Alfaro 1996: 272). It was the French scholar Julia Kristeva that first introduced Bakhtin's work to Western audiences and coined the term 'intertextuality' as a way of denoting the ways that texts refer to and build on other texts (Johnson 2008: 164). The term 'intertextuality' first appeared in her essays *Word, Dialogue and Novel* and *The Bounded Text* which were included in her first volume of essays *Recherches pour une sémanalyse* in 1969. Intertextuality proposes that a text is not a self-contained unit of meaning, but a site of dynamic relational processes and practices (Alfaro 1996: 268). Kristeva argues for a view of texts as tracing, and traces of, otherness, existing at an intersection of multitudes (Alfaro 1996: 268). Intertextuality also requires us to understand texts as differential and historical artefacts, shaped by the transformation and repetition of other textual structures (Alfaro 1996: 268).

Since intertextuality was first coined by Kristeva, there has been a proliferation of intertextual theories. This proliferation of interpretive frameworks demonstrates a larger, more general shift in emphasis from viewing the text as coherent and self-contained, to the view of texts as primarily existing in relation to one another (Alfaro 1996: 268). The broad range of meanings that the term has acquired means that it cannot be provoked unproblematically or without qualification (Lesic-Thomas 2005: 1). For the purpose of this study, and following Hyland (1999, 2002), Fairclough's (2006: 117) distinction between 'manifest intertextuality' and 'interdiscursivity' will be used.

Interdiscursivity relates to the ways that discourses are constituted and incorporated in other discourses. This includes different discourse modes and the conventions of production that go into the creation of a text. Manifest intertextuality on the other hand entails the explicit reference of one text to another. In this case, one text overtly draws on another specific text (Fairclough 2006: 117;104). As the focus of this study is citation practices in academic writing, it is primarily concerned with manifest intertextuality. Sometimes however, the boundaries are not clear cut, and a text may contain complex linkages to other texts and contain more 'mixed' types of intertextual relation (Fairclough 1992). In this regard Fairclough (2006: 104) notes that:

Intertextuality entails an emphasis upon the heterogeneity of texts, and a mode of analysis which highlights the diverse and often contradictory elements and threads which go to make up a text. Having said that, texts vary a great deal in their degrees of heterogeneity, depending upon whether their intertextual relations are complex or simple. Texts also differ in the extent to which their heterogeneous elements are integrated, and so in the extent to which their heterogeneity is evident on the surface of the text. For example, the text of another may be clearly set off from the rest of the text by quotation marks and a reporting verb, or it can be unmarked and integrated structurally and stylistically; perhaps through a rewording of the original, in the surrounding text.

From Fairclough's (2006: 104) remarks it is apparent that academic writing encompasses both kinds of intertextual relations. The conventions of practice and production often govern the form and acceptable content of academic text (interdiscursivity). However, what are considered proper and ethical citation practices in manifest intertextuality entails the acknowledgement of debt, and the marking of borrowed text in order to avoid plagiarism. The distinction between what is accepted ethical practise or not is less simple however if you consider that a significant amount of

citations are made up of the “rewording” or paraphrasing of original texts. To this extent citation practices may encompass both kinds of intertextual relation. In fact, the balancing of these types is necessary for the construction of a text that is persuasive and fits its disciplinary boundaries and genre, but also for the negotiation of individual and dialogical authorial voice.

2.3 Constructing Authorial Voice

Definitions of authorial voice are diverse and sometimes contentious (Stapleton 2002; Helms-Park & Stapleton 2003; Matsuda & Tardy 2007; Stapleton & Helms-Park 2008). The term is often used to refer to the ways that writers express themselves – their personal views, authoritativeness, and their presence within a text. While voice is an unquestionably important aspect of all writing, academic writing has been viewed as a site where authorial voice is less welcome than in other domains of authorship (Hyland 2008: 5). As readers of academic writing look for evidence rather than opinion, there are many ways that new academics are taught to remove the author from the text and efface their personalities from their work, “...distancing interpretation from explanation” (Hyland 2008: 5). The polysemous nature of voice has added to the controversy about the role that it should (or does) play in academic writing (Tardy 2012: 34). In order to contextualise ‘voice’ for the scope of this study, the following section will follow Tardy’s (2012) classifications of notions of voice *as individualised, social, and dialogic*. Ultimately, a dialogic interpretation of voice will be adopted. However, due to the fact, no reader interpretations are included in the data, the study focuses on the individual and social aspects of dialogic voice.

The notion of voice has often been understood as a quality of the individual manifest in writing (Matsuda & Tardy 2007: 236). When viewed primarily as a property of the individual, voice is seen as personal and unique, “that which individuates a writer from all other writers, as evidenced in that writer’s texts” (Ramanathan and Atkinson 1999: 49). When viewed as a feature of written texts arising from the individual writer, authorial voice is often described as ‘...a writer’s unique and recognizable imprint...’ on a text (Tardy 2012: 37). Individualised voice is often used to refer to the authoritativeness and authorial presence expressed by the writer. Authorial presence in particular is thought to be marked by certain linguistic features present in the text such as hedges, boosters, attitude markers and self-mentions. Voice is associated with the textual traces of writer attitude, their commitment to the text, and their self-projection within it (Tardy 2012: 37).

Definitions of voice that prioritise the individual aspects of voice are often developed with a strong metaphorical connection to the literal human voice (Tardy 2012: 35). Voice in written text is

conceptualised as being like the human voice in that each is unique and recognisable, and modulated to fit the context. Our voice can reflect our feelings or perceptions and can be changed to take on characteristics which we wish to portray in the moment (Elbow 1994 cited in Tardy 2012: 35). Ivanić (1994; 1995; 1998 cited in Ivanić & Camps 2001: 3) has argued for instance that like the prosodic and phonetic qualities of speech, the lexical, syntactic, semantic, and material aspects of writing are as effective (and integral) to identity and voice construction within a text. Ivanić (1998: 25) labels this type of authorial presence as the “discoursal self”. It is a conception of authorial voice which focuses on the ways that writers want to sound rather than the ‘stance’ or ‘positioning’ of the writer within a text. In this view, a close relationship and many similarities exist between voice and style, and often voice is viewed as the consistent stylistic choices made by a writer (Elbow 2007: 177).

Ivanić (1998: 26) differentiates the “discoursal self” from the “self as author”. The concept of “self as author” refers to the “... aspect of writer identity [that] concerns the writer's 'voice' in the sense of the writer's position, opinions and beliefs...”. This conception of voice is especially significant when discussing academic writing as:

writers differ considerably in how far they claim authority as the source of the content of the text, and in how far they establish an authorial presence in their writing. Some attribute all the ideas in their writing to other authorities, effacing themselves completely; others take up a strong authorial stance. Some do this by presenting the content of their writing as objective truth, some do it by taking responsibility for their authorship (Ivanić 1998: 26).

The degree to which writers in academic contexts foreground their own voice or the voice of others is central not only to the notion of voice as the ‘self as author’, but also to the “social context of persuasion” in which academic writers must operate (Hyland 1999: 342). The discursive construction of authorial voice as ‘self as author’ is thus constrained by the demands of conventional citation and attribution practices in academic writing, and the successful negotiation of the presentation of ‘self as author’ is reliant on a writers’ competencies and familiarity with disciplinary or discoursal community conventions.

Unlike conceptualisations of voice as individual and unique, where voice is the property of the writer, ‘social voice’ is seen as arising in and from the social or disciplinary contexts to which the writing and writer are linked. In this view, voice is understood as contextually dependent and

results from the writer's rhetorical choices based on what is available within the socially constructed repertoire (Tardy 2012: 37). Although social accounts of voice view voice as related to self-representation and authorial presence, the social world from which a text is produced has a direct bearing on the linguistic and rhetorical resources available to the writer. This will therefore impact the conscious and unconscious choices made when constructing voice (Tardy 2012: 37). One implication of this is that rather than being an optional aesthetic addition to texts, authorial voice is always and necessarily present, and the way that voice is constructed and perceived are the product of the writer's social context (Hyland 2008: 6; Tardy 2012: 37).

Dialogic voice is the conceptualisation of voice as an interaction between the individual and the social. Voice is seen as being co-constructed by the writer and also the socio-cultural context from which and in which they are writing. In this way, "voice is the amalgamative effect of the use of discursive and non-discursive features that language users choose, deliberately or otherwise, from socially available yet ever-changing repertoires" (Matsuda 2001: 40). Dialogic voice not only understands voice as arising from the interactional nature of the individual and social, but also reader perspectives. The reader, and their social positioning, are implicated in the identification and construction of voice. While voice is the product of both the individual and social, it is also always subject to interpretation (Tardy 2012: 40).

When interpreted dialogically, the notion of voice can be a useful tool in illuminating the complex intertextual linkages within and between texts. For Bakhtin, dialogism is not just a dualism between the voice of 'self' and the voice of the 'other', it is the dialogue within and across persons. It is the assumption that all meaning can only be achieved through the social, through the configurations of nature and culture that we perceive as the 'world', and through struggle (Alfaro 1996: 272). If we view voice in the 'Bakhtinian' sense, voice locates us historically and socially. Thus, dialogic voice is not only multiple, but reflects and indexes certain political and social values which are (at least to some extent) the product of power differentials and societal dynamics which are never neutral (Blommaert 2008: 427). Voice is an essential and ever-present marker of the negotiation between the "indexical aspects of meaning, the conventional (i.e. social, cultural, historical etc.) links established between communication and the social context in which it takes place" (Blommaert 2008: 428). Thus, voice is not only the use, reuse, and transformation of previous discourse, it is also a means through which enunciators place themselves, and are placed within, recognisable social contexts. The concept of 'voice' allows us to perceive and recognise

the ways in which meaning is organised, operationalised, and constrained by ideological patterns of normativity (Blommaert 2008: 428).

In the construction of authorial voice, the position of the writer affects and reflects their social contexts, but this is also true of the reader. The reader brings their own tastes, social histories, and views to bear on a text. It would be expected therefore that the authorial voice present in a text will be constructed in distinct ways depending on the reader (Tardy 2012: 41). Tardy and Matsuda (2007; 2009 cited in Tardy 2012) explore ways in which the reader or 'reviewer' forms impressions of a text's author based on how they perceived authorial voice embedded in the texts. Reviewers made assumptions about the writer's race, gender, and disposition – assigning them qualities such as 'ambitious', 'earnest' or 'White' (Tardy 2012: 42). They also drew conclusions about writers' level of education, age, institutional affiliation, and disciplinary backgrounds (Tardy 2012: 43). Thus, the perspective of the reader is a critical aspect of the construction of voice as it shapes the writer's meaning and may or may not align with writer intention. As Tardy (2012: 40) notes "if a writer's predications about readers do not coincide with the discourse possibilities for selfhood that actual readers bring to a text, a writer's intended identities misalign with identities or impressions assigned by readers". The writer's ability to accurately construct and imagine their audience is essential in the construction of authorial voice. This is especially true in academic writing as the writer must navigate the "perilous" writer-reader relationship and negotiate the presentation of 'new knowledge' to a sceptical and critical audience (Hyland 1999: 341).

Our voice (and how we perceive the voice of others) indexes our 'locus of enunciation', or "...the geo-political and body-political location of the subject that speaks" (Grosfoguel 2007: 213). The voice of the writer reflects our positionality and signifies our discursual memberships. Writers do not have an infinite possibility of choices and must construct their authorial voice and textual self-representations from what is contextually and socially available and appropriate (Hyland 2008: 6).

Despite these constraints, author agency is still an important aspect of voice. Writers must make choices about which communities to align with (Hyland 2008: 6), and the degree to which they conform or resist the conventions of these communities. While we recognise the boundaries of our disciplines, personal choice is not eradicated as individualised voice is subsumed within a notion of voice as the negotiation of self-representation through the conventions and constraints of our discursual context (Hyland 2008: 6). The concept of 'voice' facilitates enquiry into the ways in which meaning is organised, operationalised, and constrained by ideological patterns of

normativity, but also the ways in which enunciators negotiate these constraints and resist linguistic regimes of imposed normativity (Blommaert 2008). The referencing and citation choices made by writers can be a significant aspect in the discursive construction of authorial voice by allowing the author to position their voice, or the voice of the author, as prominent and is a manifest way in which a writer is able to negotiate the myriad of voices present in a text.

2.4 Academic Disciplinarity

The concept of an academic discipline is not a straightforward one and disciplines are often so different from one another that a definition which is both sufficiently exclusive and inclusive, is illusive (Krishnan 2009: 7). In his exploration of academic (inter)disciplinarity, Krishnan (2009: 8) begins by unpacking the meaning and etymology of the word ‘discipline’. He highlights that in the context of the academy, ‘discipline’ has retained much of its connection to its Latin roots, the noun *discipulus* meaning ‘pupil’ and the verb *disciplina* meaning ‘to teach’. He also shows how, over time and through its use in theological and military contexts ‘discipline’ has acquired a moral dimension which implies the policing of certain behaviours.

Michel Foucault has added what are now considered canonical interpretations of discipline and knowledge. He has famously interpreted discipline as violent political force and action exerted to produce ‘docile’ bodies and minds (Krishnan 2009: 8). Discipline is here understood as being a part of processes of political subjugation and economic exploitation in which ‘discipline’ is internalised and comes to operate within the subject. For Foucault (1988), ‘discipline’ is a process through which the individual accepts external rationality as one’s own, and so external policing is no longer necessary. In this way, ‘discipline’ limits the freedom of the individual from within and works to constrain discourses (Krishnan 2009: 9). Discoursal limitations are implicated too in the construction and naturalisation of knowledge. As knowledge is theorised as discursive, with discursive practices establishing and upholding disciplines, it thus constitutes the action of disciplinary knowledge construction (Chandrasoma 2010: 5). According to Foucault (1981: 59) disciplinary knowledge is a set of objects, methods, and propositions which are accepted and naturalised as true. They consist also of the instruments, techniques, and rules which follow from and uphold the naturalised truths of the discipline. Foucault’s idea of ‘discipline’ then clearly includes academic disciplines, and their role in the naturalisation and internalisation of knowledge (Krishnan 2009: 9; Chandrasoma 2010: 5).

In this way, academic disciplines can be seen as a kind of rigorous and specific ‘knowledge’ training that produces practitioners “disciplined by their discipline” (Krishnan 2008: 8). In light of the linkages between ‘knowledge’ and ‘discipline’, it is easy to see why ‘academic discipline’ has become a technical term for the organisational structures which hierarchise and systematise the production and dissemination of knowledge within the sphere of academic practice (Krishnan 2008: 9). But the problem of discerning what constitutes a discipline, what separates disciplines from one another but bounds them as a single overarching category, remains unresolved. Aiming to diminish this uncertainty, Krishnan (2008: 9) suggests 6 characteristics which might be used to define and identify an academic discipline:

1. Disciplines have a particular object of research (e.g. law, society, politics), though the object of research may be shared with another discipline.
2. Disciplines have a body of accumulated specialist knowledge referring to their object of research, which is specific to them and not generally shared with another discipline.
3. Disciplines have theories and concepts that can organise the accumulated specialist knowledge effectively.
4. Disciplines use specific terminologies or a specific technical language adjusted to their research object
5. Disciplines have developed specific research methods according to their specific research requirements.
6. Disciplines must have some institutional manifestation in the form of subjects taught at universities or colleges, respective academic departments and professional associations connected to it.

While not all recognised or institutionalised academic disciplines meet these criteria, it is precisely through recognition and institutionalisation that an academic discipline is able to reproduce itself (Krishnan 2008: 10). Krishnan (2008: 10) notes that emergent disciplines often carry the classification of a field of ‘studies’ (as in ‘gender studies’). By means of these ‘studies’ disciplines may choose the path of seeking disciplinarisation through recognition and institutionalisation, or, like women’s studies in the 1970s may remain ‘undisciplined’. Women’s studies achieved this by resisting the consolidation of the theoretical and methodological scope of the *undisciplined*.

Beginning with the development of European universities, academic disciplines have been seen as discrete and autonomous. At first, only four disciplines were recognised: medicine, philosophy, theology, and law. Over time, increasingly specialised academic practice has led to the proliferation of new disciplines (Davies & Devlin 2010: 6). Academic disciplines are traditionally and colloquially divided between ‘hard’ knowledge and ‘soft’ knowledge (Hyland 2008: 29; Davies & Devlin 2010: 7). Viewed this way disciplines are seen as falling along a horizontal continuum with ‘hard’ sciences on one end and ‘soft’ sciences on the other.

‘Hard’ knowledge is typically produced by disciplines such as physics, chemistry, and electrical engineering in which empiricism is a grounding principle (Davies & Devlin 2010: 7). In these disciplines the production of knowledge is viewed as linear and objective. ‘Hard’ knowledge is often understood as codified knowledge, knowledge which is replicable, and so in some ways beyond contestation (Hall et.al. 2008: 68). Hall, Clegg, and Sillince (2008: 68) suggest that “What is defined as ‘hard’ knowledge is often made up by discourses containing pre-digested arguments and assumptions...”. On the other end of the continuum are the ‘soft’ disciplines or humanities. Some disciplines Hyland (2008) classifies in this category are applied linguistics and philosophy. In between these extremes are disciplines with varying degrees of methodological and theoretical “softness”, such as psychology, and to some degree biology (Hyland 1999; Martin & Davis 2010: 7). Disciplines producing ‘soft’ knowledge typically view knowledge as subjective, and processes of knowledge production are necessarily sites of contestation (Martin & Davis 2010: 7).

The division between ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ knowledges is not unproblematic. The use of these terms runs the risk of reducing what are complex and fluid ways of producing and disseminating knowledge to a simple dichotomic distinction (Hyland 2008: 30). Disciplines are culturally and historically situated, and their conventions and practices are not fixed. Further, disciplines are defined by many attributes, and the relative emphasis placed on any attribute may differ not only across time but across context as well (Martin & Davis 2010: 9). Hyland (2008: 30) additionally warns that packing “...a multitude of complex abstractions into a few simple opposites....” may privilege certain, and particular, ways of knowing – often a bias that leans towards disciplines associated with the methodological and structural perspectives of empiricism. Despite these caveats, the distinction may reflect actors’ own perceptions of their fields of speciality and this duality is often held up in academic institutions (Hyland 2008: 30). It is therefore a useful starting point when investigating the discursive practices within and across disciplines, and specifically how they may relate to the construction of disciplinary knowledge.

As Hyland (1999; 2008) has shown, disciplinary orientation affects and is affected by the discursive practices of a disciplinary community. Looking specifically at citation, Hyland (2008) found that the methods of academic attribution chosen by writers, and viewed as conventional within their disciplines, largely reflected the conceptual and theoretical orientations of the discipline more generally. He found for instance that writers in the ‘soft’ sciences, particularly philosophy, used more reporting verbs than those in the ‘hard’ sciences, demonstrating a greater emphasis on human agency in the processes of knowledge construction (Hyland 1999: 349). By viewing disciplines through their historical development, we are able to see the ways in which continuity exists between and across disciplines, but also their conceptual and discursive points of departure (Krishnan 2008: 31). It is therefore useful to explore the historical origins of the academic disciplines under investigation in the context of this study. The following section will outline some history and current orientations in the disciplines of ALS and ER.

2.4.1 Educational Research

Educational research, first known as ‘experimental pedagogy’ was founded around 1900 across Europe, in the Americas, and in Russia. Prior to this, progress was slow, but the 1800s saw the foundations laid for research into education related problems (de Landsheere 1985: 1588). The development of educational research in the 1900s was rapid and characterised by the development of three major movements: the child study movement, the New Education or progressive movement, and the scientific research movement. The child study movement was associated with child psychology, while the progressivist movement emphasised a philosophical orientation over an empirical one (de Landsheere 1985: 1588). Since its beginnings, educational research has been divided between positivist and imperativist orientations. Positivism is an empirically orientated philosophical school which argues that the social sciences should be modelled on the natural sciences, while imperativism is the rejection of this premise, and a push towards more qualitative approaches (Rowbottom & Aiston 2006: 138). The late 20th century saw fierce discourse between supporters of these oppositional paradigms (Taylor & Median 2013: 1). Despite this, it has been acknowledged in the field since the 1980s that neither a completely quantitative, nor completely qualitative approach could address the complex problems of educational research (de Landsheere 1985: 1595).

Overtime, the “paradigm wars” gave way to a “paradigm dialogue” in which each paradigm is seen as contributing specific modes of knowledge production and producing certain kinds of knowledge (Taylor & Median 2013: 1). While the paradigms within ER exist simultaneously and,

in some ways, the “false dualism” between quantitative and qualitative methods and the polarisation of the paradigms has persisted (Rowbottom & Aiston 2006: 138), a number of paradigm shifts have seen different perspectives dominate the field successively.

As already stated, ER has its beginnings in the positivist paradigm. Generally, positivism is focused on the objectivity of the research process and uses quantitative research methods to test hypotheses and build theory (Taylor & Median 2013: 3). Post-positivism is described as a “milder” form of positivism in which traditionally scientific methods are complemented with more qualitative methodologies. Like positivism, it seeks to establish objective and generalisable knowledge (Taylor & Median 2013: 4).

Influenced strongly by anthropology, educational research in the 1970s was dominated by the ‘humanistic’ or ‘interpretive’ paradigm (Taylor & Median 2013: 4). Interpretive knowledge is produced through prolonged interaction between researcher and participant. Ethnographic methods such as participant observation and informal interviewing allow researchers to construct authentic accounts and build rich local understandings of life-world experiences (Taylor & Median 2013: 4). The epistemological underpinnings of this paradigm rely on a view of knowledge as inter-subjective. In ER, the interpretive paradigm has focused on teacher and student experience, classroom culture, and the larger socio-political contexts of learning and learning environments (Taylor & Median 2013: 4). In this view, a deeper understanding can only be developed by broadening the focus to larger, social, cultural, economic, and political contexts (Taylor & Median 2013: 5). Recent developments in this paradigm have emphasised researcher subjectivity in the process of interpretation and thus autobiographic and auto-ethnographic methods have become important resources for reflective practitioners (Taylor & Median 2013: 5). The interpretive method thus brings to bear both the broader context and the reflective and subjective researcher interpretations on research.

The role of education in the (re)structuring of society has been relevant in academics for centuries (Nouri & Sajjadi 2014: 77). It is from this concern with societal structures that critical pedagogy has arisen alongside the interpretive paradigm. The critical paradigm in ER has its roots in critical theory and has been influenced by critical theorists such as those from the Frankfurt School. Critical theorists argue that prejudice, injustice, and oppression permeate society, including the education system. They posit therefore that the educational agenda should not only focus on helping students acquire new knowledge, but also raise awareness around power and politics (Nouri & Sajjadi 2014: 77).

The most seminal and influential scholar in the paradigm is Brazilian educational philosopher Paulo Freire (Nouri & Sajjadi 2014: 77). Although Freire did not often use the term ‘critical pedagogy’, what is now called ‘critical’, ‘emancipatory’ and ‘liberatory’ pedagogies have been heavily influenced by his work (Nouri & Sajjadi 2014: 77-78). Over the past decades, a variety of approaches to critical pedagogy have developed but all have retained an orientation towards creating educational programs that enable students and teachers to better understand the tacit values of society and schooling (Nouri & Sajjadi 2014: 78). Critical pedagogy involves evaluating the impact of transformative teaching on student learning and ideally leads to an evolving teacher-researcher praxis. Within the critical paradigm, a part of the role of researcher is identifying and transforming socially unjust policies, beliefs, and social structures (Taylor & Median 2013: 6). Academic writing in this paradigm is constructed in such a way as to elicit critical awareness and engagement from readers towards the aim of developing *pedagogical thoughtfulness* (Manen 1990 cited in Taylor & Median 2013: 7).

Currently, ER is generally seen as multi-paradigmatic in that paradigms serve as referents, and research often combines methods and theories from multiple paradigms. Recent post-modernist approaches have opened the door to arts-based approaches in ER and researcher-activism (Taylor & Median 2013: 9). The focus on empowerment of self and of other has seen the development of ‘critical voices’ in ER in which personal experiences (of oppression) are articulated and the need for social and political change is centred. Researchers are encouraged to draw from a full range of pronouns and multiple tenses in order to represent the full process and purpose of their research as it unfolds (Taylor & Median 2013: 9).

2.4.2 Applied Linguistics and Language Studies

While linguistics has a varied and ancient history, Applied Linguistics and Language Studies (ALS) is comparatively young (de Bot 2015: 1). It is generally agreed that ALS originally branched off from the discipline of Linguistics (Shuy 2015: 435), but since then, its varied nature has meant that consensus on what exactly ALS is, is difficult to reach (Davies 2007: 1). Wilkins (1999: 7) offers the following definition:

In a broad sense, applied linguistics is concerned with increasing understanding of the role of language in human affairs and thereby with providing the knowledge necessary for those who are responsible for taking language-related

decisions whether the need for these arises in the classroom, the workplace, the law court, or the laboratory.

ALS is a field primarily concerned with connecting knowledge about language to real world decision making (Simpson 2011: 1). ALS has its origins in the mid-twentieth century, and until the late 1980s was mostly concerned with language pedagogy, language teaching, and language acquisition. It was born of a need to give language pedagogy an “academic underpinning” and in this way it reconciles and negotiates linguistic theory and language practice (Simpson 2011: 1).

When ALS began, its main orientation was towards the transmission of linguistic knowledge to language practitioners (Cook 2015: 426). Henry Widdowson (1984 cited in Cook 2015: 426) suggested that ALS should “assume its own identity” and move its scope beyond an intermediary position between formal linguistics and pedagogy. This broadening would open the space for applied linguists to investigate and theorise on issues other than language and teaching and extend the scope of ALS to other problems of language usage (Cook 2015: 426).

While traditionally ALS has focused on (second) language acquisition and pedagogy, and the interface between them (Schmitt & Celce-Murcia 2010: 2), by the mid-1990s researchers in ALS had developed a wide variety of research interest such as “...literacy, speech pathology, deaf education, interpreting and translating, communication practices, lexicography and first language acquisition...language planning and bilingualism/multilingualism...authorship identification and forensic linguistics” (Schmitt & Celce-Murcia 2010: 2). By the mid-2000s ALS had incorporated fields such as conversational and multi-modal analysis. Along with a diversity of new areas, old areas of interest were expanded and renamed to reflect the more critical and integrative orientations being embraced in related fields such as ER. ‘First and second language learning and teaching’ had become ‘first and additional language learning and teaching’ and ‘language testing’ became ‘language assessment’ (Cook 2015: 428).

Currently the field encompasses more diverse fields of interest than ever. For instance, *The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (2011) covers a wide variety of areas such as ‘institutional discourse’, ‘linguistic imperialism’, ‘Sign Languages’ and ‘generative grammar’. Despite this proliferation of specialities, language learning, language teaching, and language acquisition remain the central focus of AL, and in many respects its nature continues to be one of transmitting research insights into practical application (Simpson 2011: 1; Cook 2015: 427). This could be because such a proliferation is necessarily unsustainable and ultimately untenable (Cook

2015). To Cook (2015: 428), the expansion of ALS is more divergence than diversification. He warns that unlike in other disciplines, ‘sub-disciplines’ not only differ on topic or level of analysis, but fundamentally differ in their epistemological and ontological principles. ALS, perhaps more than any other ‘discipline’, embodies the inherent problems with concepts such as ‘academic discipline’ and ‘interdisciplinarity’ and may signify a future (especially in the ‘soft’ disciplines) of ‘post-disciplinarity’ in which the need for tightly policed and clearly defined disciplinary boundaries is no longer relevant.

2.5 Conclusion

The role of discursive practices is central to the construction and maintenance of disciplinary knowledge (Chandrasoma 2010: 6). The examination of how writers refer to and embed previous research in their writing can offer considerable insights into the knowledge-constructing practices of their disciplinary communities (Hyland 29). Citation can serve a number of rhetorical functions. Of importance to this study is the role of citation in the construction of authorial voice, and disciplinarity and disciplinary knowledge.

In accordance with Chandrasoma (2010: 2), a disciplinary text is understood in the context of this study as one that is anchored in a particular knowledge domain. It should have explicit knowledge capital of that domain and that knowledge domain should be projected in appropriate linguistic markers and resources. As the RA’s used as data in this study were taken only from peer reviewed and accredited South African Applied Language (ALS) and Educational Research (ER) journals, it is assumed that they fit this criteria and conform in several ways to the linguistic and structural conventions of RAs in their respective disciplines.

Writers must embed their text within larger disciplinary discourses, and in so doing make decisions about how, when, and to what extent to claim authority for ideas within the academic conventions of attribution and citation (Ivanić 1998: 26). Thus, citation practices, especially in the conventional context of academic writing, play a key role in the construction of authorial voice and a writer’s self-representation within a text. As this study is concerned primarily with the ways and degree to which writers establish authorial presence and foreground the authority of their own voice, the voice of others, or of the ‘fact’ itself, it adheres to Ivanić’s (1998: 26) notion of voice as ‘self as author’. While voice is understood as dialogic in the sense that it is the product of both writer agency and contextual constraints, as it does not account for reviewer interpretation, this study addresses mainly the social and individual aspects of voice.

The current study aimed to investigate explicit intertextual linkages across 34 RAs in the disciplines of ALS and ER by focusing on citation practices. In line with the methodologies of previous research, this study uses a variation of Dubois' (1988) citation typology and Swales' (1990) distinction between integral and non-integral citation forms to comparatively explore writers' construction of disciplinary knowledge and authorial voice. It also quantifies bibliographical information across the data set to establish the most influential authors, institutions, and sources within and across disciplinary boundaries in the special context of these RAs. Having established some of the current study's intertextual linkages and embeddedness in disciplinary convention in this section, the next section details the data selection and analysis process, and fleshes out its theoretical implications in relation to methodological procedures.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Data Selection and Description

Only South African journals in the fields of ALS and ER were selected. Further, only those journals that had published a special issue in 2017 or 2018 which focused on student politics, transformation, or Decolonisation efforts in education were included. Two ER and two ALS journals were selected based on these criteria. All of the special issue journal publications addresses the need to Decolonize the South African education system and academic environments. The majority of the articles, 23, were ER studies while the remaining 11 were ALS studies. A total of 34 research articles were included.

The journals and special editions selected are as follows:

- *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, Volume 36 Issue 1: Advanced language politics in South African higher education post #RhodesMustFall.

Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies (SALALS) is a hybrid journal which gives authors the option to publish their articles Open Access or behind a paywall. SALALS is issued four times annually and it is the only one of the four journals to accept articles in languages other than English. Articles written in any of South Africa's 11 official languages will be considered for publication. Articles written in languages other than English are required to be submitted with an extended English summary.

The six articles included in this special issue focus on the language politics of the movement(s) for Decolonisation that have recently swept South Africa. The editorial states that the motivation for this special issue was to address the unprecedented level of complexity in the student demand for physical and epistemic access to education, and the important and multifaceted role that language (politics) played in the movement. (Mwaniki, van Reenen & Makalela 2018: iii). The book review which concludes this special issue was omitted from the study.

- *Journal for Language Teaching (JLT)*, Volume 52 Number 2.

The *Journal for Language Teaching* (JLT) is a peer-reviewed, bi-annual publication which is available through paid subscription only. The journal gives preference to quantitative and qualitative research which has an empirical base. Typically, research which includes

unconventional formats or interventions will not be considered. All articles must include an English abstract and may be accompanied by an optional abstract in one additional language.

This special issue takes as its point of departure the premise that language is what affords access to epistemologies. The 5 articles that were published as a part of this special issue focus on ways that language and language practice allow for or deny epistemological access in educational settings (Wildsmith-Cromarty & van Dyk 2018: vii).

- *Educational Research for Social Change (ERSC)*, Volume 7 Issue June 2018: Decolonising Education in South Africa: Perspectives and debates.

Educational Research for Social Change (ERSC) is an open access peer-reviewed journal established in 2012 in the Faculty of Education, Nelson Mandela University. ERSC is published bi-annually and available online. While it is not explicitly stated that all articles should be written in English, the only articles published in the journal's history have been in English. This journal foregrounds the transformative potential of research and therefore will only accept research articles that clearly demonstrate their relevance for social change. Interestingly, their website states that

We do not accept articles that merely report on issues, where researchers harvest data from participants and interpret it to develop recommendations for change - the research itself must lead to some form of change in at least one of the following areas; change in the researcher, change in the participants, change in the situation (Aims and scope, 2019 ERSC).

This special issue places Africa-centric epistemologies at the heart of an educational reframing focused on the imperative to Decolonise education. The introduction to this special issue stated that the 7 research articles in this issue deal in a number of ways with how the conceptual bases of curriculum knowledge can be grounded through the Decolonial approach (Fataar 2018: vi).

- *Perspectives in Education (PiE)*, Volume 35 Issue 2: Education for sustainable development in the area of decolonisation and transformation.

Perspectives in Education (PiE) is a peer reviewed journal published by the University of the Free State. PiE is published biannually and is a subscription only journal. PiE's website lists English as its only language. Some aims stated for the journal are to "...stimulate important dialogues and

intellectual exchange on education and democratic transition with respect to schools, colleges, non-governmental organisations, universities and technikons in South Africa and beyond.” (<https://journals.co.za/content/journal/persed>).

The editorial for this special issue states that the articles in it focus on the meaning and implications of transformation and Decolonisation in education, and the explanatory scope of sustainable development within this context (Mahlomaholo & Payi 2017: vii). The aim is to theoretically map out how transformation and Decolonisation efforts perform in conjunction or disjunction with education for sustainable development. The special issue contains 16 research articles which address these issues from a number of methodological and theoretical frames. The issue is organised into six categories from the level of individual learner to the level of curriculum practice.

Unfortunately, due to the time that data collection commenced, I did not have access to the call for papers published by the journals in anticipation of these special issues. These would have been an interesting inclusion as it would have provided insight into how the editors envisioned the issue, and further contextualised the RAs included in the issue by presenting if and which theoretical concepts authors were asked to specifically engage with.

3.2 Data Analysis

Three different types of citation analysis were used to analyse the data. The first two focused on in-text citation practice and the third was a bibliographical quantification. These three methods allowed for a close analysis of citation practice across the data set. The results for each discipline were then analysed collectively as although they represent two disciplinary traditions, they share the common goal of integrating Decolonial theory into these established disciplines, specifically in the context of the recent protest movements in South Africa. They were then analysed comparatively to identify similarities and differences in the ways in which authorial voice and disciplinary conventions are constructed in the ALS and ER RA's.

Instances of citation were identified and included based on canonical citation forms such as proper name followed by date and parenthesis. In occurrences of page numbers at the end of a paragraph following a name at the beginning of the paragraph, the first occurrence of page number was excluded, but second and further instances were counted. References to other forms of citations such as 'cit' and 'ibid' were included (Hyland 1999: 345). Instances of pronouns referring to previously cited authors and instances where "groups' or 'schools' of researchers and scholars" were cited without a date in their first occurrence (as in 'Platonists believe...') were not included

(Swales 1990: 150; see also Peng 2018: 15). All data was entered into excel spread sheets for referencing and cross-referencing. Results were then tabulated and self-citations were included provided they met all other criteria. For instance, references to a personal anecdote or diary entry were not included should they not have a date or be included in the reference list or bibliography

The debate around whether self-citation should be included in citation analysis is ongoing. As academic knowledge production is necessarily a cumulative process, and as scholars build on others and their own and previous findings, it is almost inevitable that at some point all productive scholars will self-cite (Shema 2012). While early studies tended to exclude self-citation (see for example Hyland 1999: 345; Shema 2012), today self-citation is included in the Journal Impact Factor (JIF), and more recent studies suggest that not only can self-citation effect citation by others (Fowler & Aksnes 2007: 433), but self-citation might be a hallmark of highly productive authors who cite their own novel works (Mishra et.al. 2018). While some suggest the exclusion, and even penalisation, of self-citation because of its effect on wider patterns of citation (Shema 2012; Fowler & Aksnes 2007: 434), this might negatively and disproportionately effect older and more productive or novel writers (Shema 2012).

Mishra, Fegley, Diesner, and Torvik (2018: 18) suggest that while, like other types of citation, self-citations “...reflect potentially many different authorial attitudes: to credit the source of inspiration; to aid the understanding of the reader; to assert authority in a field...”, self-citations also work to acknowledge a writer’s line of research. For this reason, and because increased self-citation may result in increased citation by other authors (Fowler & Aksnes 2007: 433) (and therefor effect what works exert the most ideological influence and are considered seminal or canonical), self-citations will be included in all methods of data analyses for this study.

The first method of analysis explored how cited sources are incorporated into a text. Based on previous literature this analysis will be referred to as ‘presentation of cited works’ or ‘presentation of citation type’ (Hyland 1999: 348; Peng 2019: 18). Citations were divided into four categories and quantified based on Hyland’s categorisation (1999: 348). Citations were categorised as a ‘summary’ if they rephrased or paraphrased a single work. ‘Generalisations’ are also rephrased or paraphrased material, but attribution is given to two or more sources. Direct quotation was divided into two categories – ‘quotes’ were counted as short, direct duplications of a source text indicated in inverted commas, usually accompanied by both a date and a page number. While extensive use of material directly taken from source material and presented in indented blocks within the text were counted as ‘block quotes’ (Hyland 1999: 348).

‘Summary’ and ‘generalisation’ correspond to what Hu and Wang (2014: 17) describe as *assimilation*. These types of citation allow a writer to reformulate and incorporate source material in a way that suits their own textual context, writing style, and disciplinary conventions (Hyland & Jiang 2017 cited in Peng 2018: 13). They give the writer greater flexibility in interpretation and emphasis. This opens space for the writer’s voice to be foregrounded and can contract the dialogic space by fixing the meaning of source material and thus excluding other interpretation (Hu & Wang 2014 cited in Peng 2018: 13). Quotation, as clear expressions of another author’s voice, can marginalise the voice of the writer. This is especially so when they are extensively relied upon in the construction of a text and are not accompanied by an evaluating author position (Borg 2000 cited in Peng 2018: 13). Hu and Wang’s (2014: 17) concept of *insertion* is similar to that of quotation, and according to them is dialogically expansive as it does not offer only a single interpretation of cited material but leaves the space for subjective interpretation open.

The ways in which a writer chooses to incorporate the work of others plays a significant role in the “...expression of social relationships in the collaborative construction...” of academic argumentation (Hyland 1999: 348). The discursive decisions made by writers in terms of how they incorporate source material plays an important role in the persuasive function of a citation and gaining acceptance for a knowledge claim. Writers must employ citation techniques which most effectively support their positions and propositions (Hyland 1999: 348), and which can be used most effectively to convey authorial voice (Peng 2018).

The second method of analysis involved quantifying the usage of integral and non-integral citations within each article, journal, discipline, and then across the data set as a whole. Swales’ (1990) distinction between integral and non-integral citation has proven useful when identifying the focus of a reported claim and recognising whether the author or meaning is centred in the citation. Non-integral citations make reference to an author in parenthesis or by superscript numbers (Hyland 1999: 344). By emphasising a cited idea through non-integral citation, a writer can privilege their own voice and render the voice of the author as a “Satellite component” (Groom 2000: 20). Integral citation on the other hand integrates the name of an author into the grammatical structure of discourse on the level of the sentence (Swales 1990: 148). By emphasising the cited author through integral citation, a writer can give priority to the voice of the author and create a rhetorical distance between himself and reported claims, contradicting the dialogic space and conveying a sense of objectivity (Hu & Wang 2014: 23).

The use of integral and non-integral citations also reflects the ways in which writers are constructing the disciplines within which they are working. Use of integral citations indicate that the writer is engaging the arguments of other authors. Hyland (1999: 353) notes that greater use of author centred citation practices is an indication of dialogic spaces that follow recursive and reiterative routes of knowledge construction. Knowledge in this context is understood as open to interpretation and subjective. A greater emphasis is therefore placed on elaborating a context for research and situating it within broader discourses. Writers may draw on a diverse literature that is not governed by a single line of development and is often historically and topically diverse (Hyland 1999: 353).

Conversely, in contexts which favour citation that emphasises a knowledge claim or idea above the author, knowledge is viewed as the result of steady and cumulative growth. Findings are generated by a linear development following previous research and is based on what is seen as a relatively stable, existent base of knowledge, and problems are "...seen as determined by the imperatives of current interest" (Hyland 1999: 352). As writers working from these premises often presuppose a considerable amount of established expertise, procedural knowledge, technical vernacular, and theoretical foundation, their routine discourse practices reflect a knowledge centred perspective (Hyland 1999: 352).

The last method of analysis involved the quantification of the bibliographies and reference lists of the articles used as data. This type of reference analysis investigates the intertextual construction of disciplinary and canonical knowledge by establishing the most frequently cited documents and authors across the data set. The bibliographies of all 34 articles were cross-referenced in order to identify the institutions, authors, and sources most widely and often referenced. In cases of articles with multiple authors, only the lead author was included. This analysis gives an indication of what theoretical and ideological orientations have the greatest influence across and within these specialised fields of study. This style of analysis is premised on the fact that widely cited articles are influential in their fields and that intellectual links can be traced and understood through the intertextual relationships between texts. In this way citation can be seen as a reliable indicator of the conceptual connectedness of texts and in turn the discourse communities which produce them (Rashid et. al: 2018: 764).

The circulation and dissemination of knowledge is not neutral. Which (and who's) knowledge receives the most attention in the public domain relies on complex relationships of power, control, and influence (Franczak 2016: 23). As the dissemination of 'expert' knowledge into the public

discourse increases (Franczak 2016: 22), the need for research investigating the intertextual links in disciplinary knowledge increases as well. The ideologies and discourses which are influential in the academy are more likely to be translated and incorporated into broader public debates and action. This is especially true for politically and socially controversial issues for which academic language is often appropriated and recontextualised in the public sphere (Franczak 2016: 20). Special attention should be paid to those issues that are assigned great social importance (Franczak 2016: 20) and may influence the course of political and social policy.

Understanding the intertextual, and intellectual, linkages in the work of writers publishing in the academic sphere on topics related to the Decolonisation of education is more relevant than ever, with movements to Decolonise (education in) South Africa gaining traction in political discourses and the public domain (See [Businessstech.co.za](https://www.businessstech.co.za) 2019; News24; Ramogale 2019; Wikipedia contributors 2019; Wingfield 2017). Understanding how Decoloniality is incorporated, manifested, and canonised in the education system, political landscapes, and mainstream media of South Africa can be greatly aided by looking at the ways in which expert knowledge on these issues is constructed.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

The following chapter reports the results and findings of the three analysis types used to address the central aim of this thesis which was to investigate the discursive construction of authorial voice and disciplinarity through citation practices in the ALS and ER RAs that incorporate Decolonial theory. Section 4.2 reports the findings of the analysis of citation presentation type in which in-text references to source material were quantified and analyzed based on how they were integrated into the texts. This was done using Hyland's (1999) distinction between 'summary', 'generalization', 'quote', and 'block quote' citation presentation types. Section 4.3 presents the analysis and findings of the citation language form analysis in which in-texts citations were quantified and analyzed based on the language form the citation took in the text. Swales' (1990) distinction between integral and non-integral citation language form was used in order to achieve this. Section 4.4 reports the findings of cross-referential reference analysis in which the bibliographies of all 34 articles included in the study were quantified in order to establish the most frequently referenced authors, institutions, and source materials.

4.2 Presentation of Cited Work: Expanding Dialogic Space and Balancing Voices

4.2.1 Introduction

The presentation of citation type has been used successfully as a means of exploring the discursive construction of authorial voice (Peng 2019) and disciplinarity (Hyland 1999). How a writer presents cited material can work to foreground the voice of the writer or the voice of the author (Peng 2019), it can also broaden or narrow the discursive space for reader engagement and interpretation (Hyland 1999). How citations are used reflects the epistemological orientations of disciplinary discourse communities, as Hyland (1999: 355) states, "...what constitutes valid claims and admissible reasoning differs between disciplines, and these values and epistemologies are instantiated in aspects of a community's genre conventions". Thus, the presentation of citation can also indicate to what extent a disciplinary community acknowledges the role of human agency in knowledge construction (Hyland 1999: 355).

This section will examine the use and distribution of citation types across the data set, and how their usage relates to the discursive construction of authorial voice and disciplinarity. First, the broad patterns are described and discussed – across the data set as a whole and within the

disciplines of AL and ER. While the distribution patterns of citation type fit with the findings of previous research and what one would expect to find in the ‘soft sciences’, some deviation from what is typical of the RA genre was found. Next, the data from each journal were analysed comparatively. Again, this analysis led to some interesting insights as the epistemological rather than disciplinary orientations of the journals seemed to impact how citation type was used within the texts. Finally, the data were analysed at the level of the individual article and a brief description is given of those articles which showed outlier citation pattern profiles.

4.2.2 Constructing Authorial Voice and Disciplinarity Through the Presentation of Citation

Table 1 shows the percentages of citation types used in ALS and ER, and across the data set as whole. The general preferences for citation type shown across the data set as whole are consistent for both ALS and ER, with only minor differences in percentages. Overall, ALS and ER show remarkably similar distributions of citation type. Within each discipline, as well as across the whole data set, ‘summary’ is the most widely used citation type making up 65% of all citations, and 55% and 69% for ALS and ER respectively. These percentages are consistent with those reported by Peng’s (2019: 18) study of ALS doctoral theses and the ALS data in Hyland’s (1999: 348) cross-disciplinary study. However, they contrast with Hyland and Jiang’s (2019: 73) findings in which they reported an increasing and dominant preference for the ‘generalization’ citation type in ALS.

Table 1: Presentation of Citation Type Across Data Set (%)

| Quote Type | ALS | ER | Total |
|-----------------------|------------|-----------|--------------|
| Quote | 23 | 18 | 19 |
| Block Quote | 6 | 3 | 4 |
| Summary | 55 | 69 | 65 |
| Generalisation | 16 | 10 | 12 |

Quotations which are integrated within a text constitute the second most used citation type, at 19% of the total citations across the data set. 23% of ALS and 18% of ER citations were made up of direct integrated quotation. These findings contrast with those of Hyland (1999: 348), and Hyland and Jiang (2019: 723) who report relatively low incidents of quotation, and a pointedly greater preference for ‘generalization’ within their data. The least used citation type, both within and across disciplines, is the ‘block quote’ type. This citation type making up only 4% of the total citations. This percentage is slightly larger for AL with 6% than for ER where only 3% of citations are constituted by block quotations. Again, these findings are consistent with previously reported

findings in the ‘soft’ sciences more generally, with Peng (2019: 18), Hyland (1999: 348), and Hyland and Jiang (2019: 73) describing extended or block quotations as the least used citation type in their data.

According to Hu and Wang (2014: 17), ‘summary and ‘generalizations’, by presenting the proposition of the author only in terms of the writer interpretation, contracts the dialogic space and narrows the possibility of dialogic negotiation and alternative interpretation. Further, ‘summary’ and ‘generalization’ type citations encourage the reader to perceive propositions as “...established fact” by integrating cited claims into the citing text (Hu & Wang 2014: 23). This may also have the effect of emphasizing reported messages and not directly acknowledging the role of human agency in the construction of knowledge. This type of citation is thus overwhelmingly favoured in the ‘hard sciences’ (Hyland 1999; Hu & Wang 2014; Hyland & Jiang 2017) where the discursive practices of researchers as a mediating link in the interpretation of data is downplayed (Hyland 1999: 355). The current data shows that ‘summary’ is the most popular citation type both across the data as a whole and within AL and ER, respectively. This finding is not surprising as this citation type allows the writer to use a cited text in a way that effectively supports their own propositions and allows the writer greater flexibility in terms of emphasis and interpretation (Hyland 1999: 348).

While the percentages of ‘summary’ type citations in the currently presented data are in line with the findings of other comparable studies, the percentages of the ‘generalization’ type citation are markedly lower. These reduced rates of ‘generalization’ contrast with the findings of both Hyland (1990: 347) and Hyland and Jiang (2019: 73) who report larger, and growing, tendencies towards ‘generalization’ in RAs across disciplines. While not typical of other reported findings in RAs, the reduced rates of ‘generalization’ found in the data are similar to those reported by Peng (2019: 18) in a study of PhD theses. Peng (2019: 17) attributes the discrepancy to generic differences, stating that the PhD thesis sub-genre requires writers to engage extensively with relevant literature, while RA generic conventions tend to favor a citation style which allows writers to acknowledge previous research as economically as possible in the limited scope available.

While the reported frequency of ‘generalization’ in the current data was comparatively low for the RA genre, percentages of direct quotation were relatively high. While Hyland (1999: 348) reports that direct quotation accounts for only 8% of citations in AL and 13% in philosophy (the highest rate reported in that study), and Highland and Jiang (2019: 73) report similarly low occurrences, in the current data, integrated quotations account for the second most frequently used citation type

in both ALS and ER. If taken with ‘block quotations’, instances of direct quotation constitute a substantial proportion of all citation across the data, accounting for 23% of total citations. This percentage is even higher in ALS where it makes up 29% of all citations, a percentage more than three times that reported by Hyland (1999: 348). Again, these percentages are closer to what Peng (2019: 18) reports finding in PhD theses, specifically those of Chinese students which have been trained in the UK or USA.

As opposed to the ‘summary’ and ‘generalization’ type citations, direct quotation functions to expand the dialogic space by presenting cited work as subjective and creating space for reader interpretation (Hu & Wang 2014: 22). Using direct quotation allows the writer to capitalise on authoritative viewpoints in the construction of arguments, and foreground human agency in the production and construction of knowledge (Hu & Wang 2014: 22). As the clear expression of the voice of others, direct quotation may marginalize the voice of the writer and center the voice of the author (Peng 2019: 13).

Lower rates of ‘generalization’ and higher rates of direct quotation in the current data than have been found in comparable research suggest a greater emphasis on tracing the contributions of singular authors when constructing the dialogic space of an article. High rates of integrated direct quotation (as opposed to extended or block quotation) imply a skillful control of double voicing in the construction of authorial voice (Peng 2019: 17). It also points to similar disciplinary conventions in ALS and ER which center human agency in the production and construction of knowledge. By directly presenting the work of others, writers leave greater space for reader interpretation of the literature and also foreground other researchers and authors over the knowledge claims themselves. Low rates of ‘generalization’ than were expected indicate a tendency away from a “parenthetical plonking” style of citation usually associated with RAs (Swales 2014: 135) in which a wide range of sources are included in one citation in order to utilize the limited space of an RA economically (Peng 2019: 17), and perhaps as means to demonstrate researcher knowledge of the literature without treating it extensively in the text.

One explanation for a style of citation which features comparatively low rates of ‘generalizations’ and high rates of direct quotation is the specificity of the context ²in which these articles were produced. The incorporation of Decolonial theory into ALS and ER RAs may require more extensive coverage of the literature than would otherwise be necessary in a RA. As these specific

² Instances of ‘summary’ are shown in italics and direct quotation is shown in bold.

disciplinary discourse and knowledge communities may not be as familiar with the literature and theoretical developments in Decolonial theory, writers may not be able to rely on the assumption of pre-existent and shared knowledge of the ‘field’. This is illustrated in (1), where ‘summary’ and direct quotation were used together in order to explain and broadly define Decolonisation. The text extract references and directly quotes two authors sequentially, laying out the context of academic dialogues around Decolonisation for the reader and uses quotation to draw on authoritative arguments and voices in the field.

- (1) Ngugi (2004: 88) argues that Decolonisation is a complicated process that focuses on **“the rejecting of the centrality of the West in Africa’s understanding of itself and its place in the world”**. *This means that decolonizing is about shifting the balance of power in relation to knowledge hegemony and knowledge economy. It is about redefining African institutions from an African perspective in the bid to construct knowledge about Africa for Africans in particular and the rest of the world at large.* Prinsloo (2016: 165) adds to this by arguing that Decolonisation **“is about recentering ourselves, intellectually and culturally, by redefining what the center is: Africa”**. (Fomunyan 2017: 168).

The text excerpt shown in (2) similarly illustrates the use of direct integrated quotation employed to define ‘Decolonisation’ in the context of the article (Decolonising universities in South Africa) and shows again how individual authors and arguments are drawn on sequentially in order to contextualise Decolonial discourses for the audience. Here, the writer has drawn on authoritative viewpoints while also tailoring cited material to their own textual context.

- (2) Murriss (2016) also contributes to the Decolonisation debates that permeated these movements from a post-humanist orientation, coming to the interesting conclusion that **‘the question (of) what it means to decolonize a university is not only epistemological, but also ontological and can remain radically open when we view meaning making as discursive and material, thereby doing justice to the agency of the non-human other’** (Murriss 2016: 274). (Mwaniki 2018: 29).

Using both ‘summary’ and ‘quotation’, the text in (3) weaves together different authors’ works to support the writer’s argument allowing the text to unfold “...effectively so that the writer’s voice is clearly expressed among heteroglossia” (Peng 2019: 17). This text shows skillful integration of cited material in such a way that enables the writer to effectively foreground their own voice while

also employing the words of another author to vividly and effectively present their message (Hyland 1999: 348). This text also demonstrates again the way that ‘summary’ and direct quotation have been used across the data set to incorporate decolonial theory and etch the relevant context for the reader.

- (3) *The task of decoloniality is to shift the geography of reason from the West to ex-colonized epistemic sites* (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2013) and advance the legitimacy of what Grosfoguel (2007, p.213) called “**subaltern epistemic perspectives.**” (Walton 2018: 34).

Excerpt (4) illustrates how ‘block quotes’ (with relevant stretches of text shown in bold italics) and integrated quotes can be used to reference authoritative authors and inform the audience of the writers paradigmatic orientations while effectively describing ‘Decoloniality’ for the purposes of the writers’ argument.

- (4) Decoloniality begins with the recognition of “**existential realities of suffering, oppression, repression, domination and exclusion**” (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2013, p.15). From this recognition, the work Decoloniality is to dismantle the

Relations of power and conceptions of knowledge that foment the reproduction of racial, gender, and geopolitical hierarchies that came into being or found new and more powerful forms of expression in the modern/colonial world. (Maldonado-Torres, 2011, p.1).

Decoloniality addresses the coloniality of knowledge, coloniality of power, and the coloniality of being (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2013) (Walton 2018: 34) (emphasis in original).

These examples demonstrate not only the effective and persuasive usage of citation to draw on authoritative voices, emphasize the human and cumulative nature of research, and tailor knowledge claims to the context of specific articles, they also demonstrate the ways in which direct quotation and ‘summary’ have been used to contextualise, explain, and mobilise Decolonial discourses in ER and ALS RAs.

While the distribution patterns of citation type across ALS and ER are for the most part comparable, preferential differences are evident. While ‘summary’ type citations make up the

largest proportion in both disciplines, 14% more citations in ER are made up by this type than in ALS. Comparatively, ALS shows a slightly greater preference for direct quotation, with 29% (as opposed to 21% in ER) of all citations being constituted by integrated and block quotations. Tables 2 and 3 show in percentages the frequency of citation type in each journal. Presenting the data in this way demonstrates that although patterns are similar within and across the disciplines examined, some differences are worth noting. For instance, in ER, articles published in PiE make noticeably greater use of ‘summary’ than in the other three journals. SALALS, JLT, and ERSC show extremely similar distribution patterns to one another despite representing different disciplinary traditions. In comparison to PiE, the other journal articles use a considerably larger amount of direct quotation, specifically quotation which is integrated into a text.

Table 2: Presentation of Citation Type in AL Journals (%)

| Quote Type | SALALS | JLT | ALS |
|-----------------------|---------------|------------|------------|
| Quote | 26 | 19 | 23 |
| Block Quote | 9 | 2 | 6 |
| Summary | 50 | 61 | 55 |
| Generalisation | 14 | 18 | 16 |

Table 3: Presentation of Citation Type in ER Journals (%)

| Quote Type | ERSC | PiE | ER |
|-----------------------|-------------|------------|-----------|
| Quote | 29 | 9 | 18 |
| Block Quote | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| Summary | 58 | 78 | 69 |
| Generalisation | 8 | 12 | 10 |

Out of the four selected journals, the articles in PiE show the largest use of ‘summary’ at 78% of all citations in the special issue. PiE also shows the lowest rates of direct quotation with block and integrated quotes making up only 11% of all citations. Interestingly, the highest rates of direct quotation are found in the other ER journal, ERSC, at 33%. While any explanation for the cause of these disparities is purely speculative, and further research into the editing and reviewing processes of each journal would be useful to such an end, it seems that it is due to the epistemological orientations of the journals. Upon reviewing the scope of each journal, it appears that PiE has orientated itself towards innovative and creative research more so than the other journals. For instance, the journal aims state it “...invites manuscripts employing *innovative* qualitative and quantitative methods...” (emphasis added) (Ajol.info. 2020) and “PiE challenges

contributors to use *innovative, provocative and creative* ways of presenting and reporting their research.” (emphasis added) (Ajol.info. 2020).

Correspondingly, the other journals appear to place more emphasis on ‘scientific’ articles and are more inclined to restrict what are considered appropriate research areas and methodologies. ERSC for instance states that they focus on publishing “...*scientific* articles which draw on participatory methodologies...” (emphasis added) (Ersc.nmmu.ac.za. 2020). They emphasize that they “...do not accept articles that merely report on issues, where researchers harvest data from participants and interpret it to develop recommendations for change - the research itself must lead to some form of change (Ersc.nmmu.ac.za. 2020). These more restrictive guidelines are also evident in the ALS journals, with JLT affirming that they give preference “...to the publication of research results with an *empirical base* (quantitative and/or qualitative)” (emphasis added) (SAALT 2020) and that “Descriptions of language classroom interventions that do not adhere to conventional research practices, for example to include pre- and post-tests, or control of confounding variables, are typically not considered for publication in the Journal.” (emphasis added) (SAALT 2020). Similarly, SALALS maintains a preference for articles that focus on “... any of the *core* areas of linguistics...” (emphasis added) (SAALT | SAVTO 2020).

The finding that the articles in PiE display the highest rates of ‘summarization’ and the lowest rates of quotation is unusual. The ‘hard sciences’ typically display higher rates of ‘summarization/generalization’ and extremely low rates of direct quotation when compared with the ‘soft sciences’ (Hyland 1999: 348; Hyland & Jiang 2009: 73; Hu & Wang 2014: 1). One would thus expect that articles published in journals which emphasize the ‘scientific’ orientations of research considered for publication would display citation type patterns which more closely mirror those of the ‘hard sciences’.

Despite PiE’s citation type pattern showing a slight deviation from the other three journals, the majority of articles examined across both ER and ALS show similar frequency and distribution patterns of citation type. However, some articles deviated from this otherwise relatively uniform data set, specifically in their use of quotation type citation. Only three articles (distributed across three of the four journals) demonstrated a percentage of direct quotation (combined integrated and block quotation) larger than that of all other citation types. Tables 4 - 8 show the percentages of quotation type for each article, with Mwaniki (2018) in SALALS, Parmegiani (2018) in JLT, and Sesanti (2018) in ERSC being the articles in which direct quotation is the most used citation type.

Presumably, the authors of these articles have used larger amounts of direct quotation for a number of reasons based on the theoretical and methodological orientations of their research.

Table 4: Presentation of Citation Type SALALS (%)

| Journals | <i>South African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies, 36(1). 2018</i> | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Writers | Makalela, L. | Mkhiza, D. | Mwaniki, M | Motinyane, M | Mayaba, N.N. | van Reenen, D |
| Quote | 32 | 24 | 29 | 13 | 23 | 32 |
| Block Quote | 7 | 1 | 21 | 6 | 14 | 10 |
| Summary | 41 | 55 | 44 | 69 | 52 | 44 |
| Generalisation | 20 | 20 | 6 | 13 | 11 | 14 |

For instance, Mwaniki (2018) examines post #RhodesMustFall language politics of higher education through auto ethnography and draws on a number of sources to describe and contextualize the #movements and their effect on language and language policy in education.

Table 5: Presentation of Citation Type JLT (%)

| Journals | <i>Journal for Language Teaching , 52(2). 2018.</i> | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|
| Writers | Parmegiani, A | Ngcobo, S. | Batyi, T.T. | Hibbert, L. | Wildsmith-Cromarty, S. |
| Quote | 41 | 15 | 8 | 13 | 18 |
| Block Quote | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| Summary | 27 | 66 | 86 | 76 | 52 |
| Generalisation | 29 | 20 | 4 | 6 | 27 |

Parmegiani (2018) draws extensively on research generated through a pedagogical initiative linking English and Spanish in the USA and argues that the success of the program may suggest that similar intervention initiatives may be suitable for the South African context.

Table 6: Presentation of Citation Type ERSC (%)

| Journals | <i>Educational Research for Social Change , 7. 2018.</i> | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--------------|------------|------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Writers | Sesanti, S. | Dauids, M.N. | Walton, E. | Calitz, T. | Waghid, Z. & Hibbert, L. | Maseko, P.B.N. | Seehawer, M. |
| Quote | 48 | 9 | 34 | 12 | 18 | 15 | 33 |
| Block Quote | 3 | 0,9 | 2 | 12 | 5 | 6 | 5 |
| Summary | 48 | 88 | 62 | 54 | 70 | 60 | 30 |
| Generalisation | 0,8 | 3 | 3 | 22 | 7 | 19 | 32 |

Sesanti's (2018) article uses an African centred theoretical framework and suggests a number of ways in which African institutions can abandon colonial scholarship. The article follows a

philosophical style and register, a genre in which Hyland (1999: 346) notes writers often give prominence to cited authors.

Table 7: Presentation of Citation Type PiE (%)

| Journals | Perspectives in Education, 35(2). 2017. | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---|----------------|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| Writers | Alex, J.K. & Juan, A. | Malebese, M.L. | Qhosola, M.R. | Salami, I.A. & Okeke, C.I.O. | Ojo, O.A. & Adu, E.O. | Cishe, E.N. | Tlali, M.F. | Buka, A.M. et.al |
| Quote | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 14 | 4 |
| Block Quote | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Summary | 99 | 79 | 87 | 88 | 68 | 98 | 71 | 86 |
| Generalisation | 0 | 18 | 9 | 9 | 21 | 2 | 14 | 10 |

Table 8: Presentation of Citation Type PiE (%) (2)

| Journals | Perspectives in Education, 35(2). 2017. | | | | | | |
|----------------|---|-------------|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------------|------------------|
| Writers | Mampane, M.R. | Mutekwe, E. | Moodly, A.L. & Toni, N.M. | Fomunyan, K.G. | Maseko, P.B.N. | Fomunyan, K.G. & Teferra, D. | Chaka, C. et.al. |
| Quote | 21 | 4 | 37 | 30 | 18 | 0 | 11 |
| Block Quote | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Summary | 67 | 96 | 43 | 70 | 65 | 92 | 51 |
| Generalisation | 13 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 18 | 8 | 33 |

PiE is the only journal which does not contain an article in which direct quotation has the highest rates of occurrence, as can be seen in Tables 7 and 8. The articles in PiE show relatively uniform citation type pattern, with clear individual preferences for the ‘summary’ type citation. Low rates of ‘quote’ type citations and extremely low rates of ‘block quotes’, as well as comparatively low rates of generalisations, contribute to the unique citation profile of this journal when compared with the other three selected journals.

4.2.3 Conclusion

In terms of broad disciplinary trends, the data is in line with the findings of other studies. With relatively high rates of quotation, the data clearly shows a pattern of citation presentation usually associated with the ‘soft sciences’. However, more quotation and less ‘generalisation’ than what would be expected in the RA genre was found. This finding may be explained by the constraints of the specific context of articles represented in the data. High rates of direct quotation in the data suggest the centering of author voice and a focus on human agency in the construction and production of new knowledge.

The data also shows that the disciplines represented by the data, ER and ALS, show similar citation presentation patterns despite individual journals and articles showing patterns which deviate from the overall trends. Articles in the PiE show patterns different from articles in the other three journals described, with PiE displaying low rates of direct quotation in relation to the other journals, and ‘soft sciences’ more generally. This may be due to differences in the epistemological and methodological orientation of the journals, as ERSC, SALALS, and JLT appear to place more emphasis on ‘scientific’ research – in the “soft science” sense, while PiE encourages creativity and innovation in the design and presentation of research. The finding that PiE shows low rates of direct quotation is therefore surprising as this quality is usually associated with the ‘hard sciences’. It is possible that the creative methodologies and presentations encouraged by PiE require more original textualisation and less reliance on established practice gained from source materials.

Individual articles which deviate from larger patterns found in the data, specifically by displaying higher rates of direct quotation than other any other presentation type, focus on specific topics or methodologies, such as auto-ethnography and philosophy, which may make certain citation presentations (direct quotation) more appropriate and necessary.

4.3 Citation Language Form:

4.3.1 Introduction

Swales (1990: 148) distinction between integral and non-integral citation has been used productively in citation research to examine both the discursive construction of academic disciplinarity (Hyland 1999; Hu & Wang 2014; Hyland and Jiang 2017) and the dialogical construction of authorial voice (Peng 2019). Integral citation refers to citations in which the name of the author(s) appears within the structure of the citing sentence, while non-integral citations place the name of the author in parenthesis or superscript numbers (Swales 1990: 148). The use of integral citation appears to emphasise the reported author, and as such highlights the human agency involved in the construction of knowledge (Hyland 1999; 344). It also foregrounds the voice of the cited author and renders the voice of the writer less visible. Integral citations can contribute to a personal tone and style of persuasion and have the effect of expanding the dialogic space within the text (Hu & Wang 2014: 23). By presenting source material in its original form, writer interpretation is less prominent and reader interpretation and negotiation is enabled.

Non-integral citations foreground the voice of the writer and emphasise the reported knowledge claim over the cited author (Peng 2019: 13). In doing this, non-integral citations convey a sense

of objectivity, and as such are typically associated with epistemological traditions which view the construction of knowledge as linear and sequential (Hyland 1990: 353). Hyland (1999: 347) for instance reports rates of non-integral citation in the ‘hard’ sciences as high as 90%. When non-integral citations are used, the voice of the writer takes prominence, and the authors voice is rendered as a “satellite component” (Groom 200: 20). This allows writers to develop authoritative voice (Thomson 2012: 125) and persuasive argumentation (Hyland 1990). Non-integral citation is an effective way of appropriating source material and successfully tailoring it to the textual needs and context of the writer. Non-integral citations can be used to avoid hindering the flow of a text (Mansourizadeh & Ahmad 2011) and enhance to textual coherence (Peng 2019: 16). Hu and Wang (2014: 23) also characterise non-integral citation as impersonal in tone and consider this form of citation dialogically contractive as it limits the interpretative possibilities and excludes dialogically alternative voices.

4.3.2 Constructing Authorial Voice and Disciplinarity Through Citation Language Form

In Hyland and Jiang’s 2017 study, *Points of Reference: Changing Patterns of Academic Citation*, they report a significant rise in the rates of non-integral citation in ALS between 1965 and 2015. During this period rates of non-integral citation grew from 29% to 73%, reflecting a discipline that is increasingly orientating itself towards a more positivist-empirical epistemology and away from acknowledging the role of human agency in the processes and procedures of knowledge production (Hyland 1999: 355). Conversely, Peng’s 2019 study of ALS doctoral theses demonstrated percentages across sub-sets of data that approached a 50:50 ratio of integral and non-integral forms. At 53%, non-integral forms were dominant in the theses of Chinese speaking students trained outside of China, but theses produced by students trained in mainland China showed a preference for integral forms as they made up 52% of total citations in the data sub-set. Despite this minor difference in Peng’s (2019) data, these numbers are starkly different from the dominance of non-integral forms reported in Hyland and Jiang (2017: 74).

The percentages reported in this study, however, are most in line with older data reported by Hyland (1999: 347) in the discipline of ALS, and ‘soft sciences’ more generally. In terms of citation language form, Hyland’s 1999 study found large differences between the ‘soft’ and ‘hard’ sciences, with the ‘hard’ sciences showing much more frequent rates of non-integral forms. For instance, in his data, 90.2% of citations in Biology took a non-integral form as opposed to only 35.4% in Philosophy. He reported a non-integral citation rate of 65.6% in ALS, a rate comparable to that found in both ER and ALS in the current study. Correspondingly, Hu and Wang (2014: 23)

reported disciplinary differences in their examination of RAs in General Medicine (hard science) and AL (soft science), finding significantly higher rates of integral forms in ALS. The findings of the current study thus demonstrate the disciplinary orientations of the AL and ER sub-genre examined lean towards the ‘soft’ sciences, but not to the extent reported by Peng (2019: 16).

Table 9: Citation Language Form Across Disciplines (%)

| Citation Language Form | Applied Language | Educational Research | Total |
|------------------------|------------------|----------------------|-------|
| Integral | 37 | 35 | 35 |
| Non-integral | 63 | 65 | 65 |

Table 9 shows the percentages of integral and non-integral citation language forms in each discipline as well as across the data set as whole. These percentages reflect an overall preference for non-integral citation forms, with 65% of all citations in the data consisting of non-integral forms. They also demonstrate remarkably similar patterns across both disciplines with integral citation being only 2% more common in ALS. As tables 10 and 11 show, this pattern holds not only on disciplinary level, but also on the level of each journal, contributing to a pattern of citation language form which appears remarkably homogenous across the data.

Table 10: Citation Language Form in AL (%)

| Citation Language Form | SALALS | JLT | Applied Language |
|------------------------|--------|-----|------------------|
| Integral | 39 | 34 | 37 |
| Non-integral | 61 | 66 | 63 |

Table 11: Citation Language Form in ER (%)

| Citation Language Form | ERSC | PiE | Educational Research |
|------------------------|------|-----|----------------------|
| Integral | 36 | 34 | 35 |
| Non-integral | 64 | 66 | 65 |

As a resource of dialogic engagement, citation language forms also indicate the dialogic construction of authorial voice within a text (Hu and Wang 2014: 23). While the proportions of integral citations in the current data set are generally comparable to other disciplines in the ‘soft sciences’, the overall preference for non-integral forms reflect a general tendency across the data towards emphasising the writer’s voice above that of the author (Peng 2019: 16). This enables the writer to construct an authoritative and persuasive position and can enhance the textual coherence and flow of a text (Peng 2019: 16). However, according to Hu and Wang (2014: 23), this also has

the effect of contracting the dialogic space, as it restricts alternative positions and voices foregrounded in a text and obscures the human agency necessarily involved in the construction of knowledge.

The pattern of citation demonstrated favours non-integral citation forms, but less so than disciplines typically associated with the ‘hard’ sciences. This may indicate a transitional phase in South African ER and ALS. It may be that in the future, citation language form patterns found in ALS and ER research will more closely mirror that reported by Hyland and Jiang (2017). A move towards more empirical and ‘scientific’ research may be a product of (and also the producer of) journal guidelines that favour empirically orientated research and guidelines that are restrictive in terms of methodology and presentation of research, as was shown in section 4.2. If true, this transition towards non-integral forms will also mean a shift in the way that texts dialogically interact with other texts, the ways that multiple voices are negotiated by writers, and the prominence afforded to the role of human agency in the production and construction of new knowledge.

While frequencies of citation language forms appear relatively uniform across the data at the disciplinary and journal levels, frequencies in individual articles are much more variable. As can be seen in tables 12-16, rates of non-integral citation vary between 18-99% at the level of individual articles. In contrast to the broader patterns of citation, at least one article in each journal special issue shows higher rates of integral than non-integral citation forms. Six articles in total show this converse pattern, with half of these occurring in PiE.

Table 12: Citation Language Form SALALS (%)

| Journal | <i>South African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies, 36(1). 2018</i> | | | | | |
|---------------------|--|------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| Writers | Makalela, L. | Mkhiza, D. | Mwaniki, M. | Motinyane, M. | Mayaba, N.N. | van Reenen, D. |
| Integral | 12 | 23 | 79 | 24 | 33 | 40 |
| Non-integral | 88 | 77 | 21 | 76 | 67 | 60 |

Table 13: Citation Language Form JLT (%)

| Journal | <i>Journal for Language Teaching, 52(2). 2018.</i> | | | | |
|---------------------|--|------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|
| Writers | Parmegiani, A | Ngcobo, S. | Batyi, T.T. | Hibbert, L. | Wildsmith-Cromarty, S. |
| Integral | 12 | 41 | 31 | 62 | 33 |
| Non-integral | 88 | 59 | 69 | 38 | 67 |

Table 14: Citation Language Form ERSC (%)

| Journal | <i>Educational Research for Social Change</i> , 7. 2018. | | | | | | |
|---------------------|--|--------------|------------|------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Writers | Sesanti, S. | Davids, M.N. | Walton, E. | Calitz, T. | Waghid, Z. & Hibbert, L. | Maseko, P.B.N. | Seehawer, M. |
| Integral | 36 | 30 | 42 | 31 | 57 | 35 | 28 |
| Non-integral | 64 | 70 | 58 | 69 | 43 | 65 | 72 |

Table 15: Citation Language Form PiE (%)

| Journal | <i>Perspectives in Education</i> , 35(2). 2017. | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---|----------------|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| Writers | Alex, J.K. & Juan, A. | Malebese, M.L. | Qhosola, M.R. | Salami, I.A. & Okeke, C.I.O. | Ojo, O.A. & Adu, E.O. | Cishe, E.N. | Tlali, M.F. | Buka, A.M. et.al |
| Integral | 37 | 25 | 1 | 46 | 31 | 82 | 17 | 31 |
| Non-integral | 63 | 75 | 99 | 54 | 69 | 18 | 83 | 69 |

Table 16: Citation Language Form PiE (%) (2)

| Journal | <i>Perspectives in Education</i> , 35(2). 2017. | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---|---------------|-------------|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------------|------------------|
| Writers | Duku, N. & Salami, I.A. | Mampane, M.R. | Mutekwe, E. | Moodly, A.L. & Toni, N.M. | Fomunyam, K.G. | Maseko, P.B.N. | Fomunyam, K.G. & Teferra, D. | Chaka, C. et.al. |
| Integral | 43 | 27 | 41 | 34 | 61 | 30 | 68 | 17 |
| Non-integral | 57 | 73 | 59 | 66 | 39 | 70 | 32 | 83 |

Theoretical and methodological underpinnings are varied, but all six of the articles make use of qualitative research designs. Four of the articles rely on semi-structured interviews, questionnaires, and/or focus groups to collect data (Fomunyam 2017; Mwaniki 2018), while the other two make use of existing literature to build critical arguments and recommendations regarding the processes of Decolonisation and transformation in South African education (Cishe 2017; Fomunyam & Teferra 2017; Hibbert 2018; Waghid & Hibbert 2018). However, these resemblances in methodology are not sufficient to explain the outlying patterns of citation found in these articles, as the majority of articles included in the study make use of qualitative and interpretive methods. This suggest that although broader disciplinary trends are apparent, individual writer's appropriate citation forms to suite the specific contexts and topics of their articles, as well as their individual expressions of authorial voice.

Two of the writers, Liesel Hibbert and Kehdinga George Fomunyam are each responsible for authoring or co-authoring two of the articles respectively. This finding demonstrates the dialogic qualities of authorial voice, and points specifically to the importance of considering 'self as author' or individualised voice (Tardy 2012: 37) within a dialogic conception of voice. Writer choices in citation language forms thus display individual author stance, style, and presence within a text and

how they work to construct voice in negotiation with the epistemological orientations and constraints of the disciplines in which the writers are working.

4.3.3 Conclusion

Citation language form has been shown to be an important research tool on the investigation of the discursive construction of disciplinarity and authorial voice in academic texts. The findings reported in the current analysis of ER and ALS disciplines most closely resemble those found by Hyland (1999), and clearly place the disciplines more in line with citation patterns associated with the ‘soft’ sciences. Higher rates of non-integral citation may indicate a move towards increasingly scientific and quantitative orientations in the disciplines of ER and ALS. This speculation is supported by journal guidelines that emphasise the importance of empirical research and restrict the presentation of research in form and content.

Across the data set as a whole, as well as across both disciplines and all of the journals, the ratio in usage of integral and non-integral citation language forms is noticeably uniform, indicating that the epistemological orientations of both disciplines lean towards emphasising human agency and the recursive nature of knowledge construction. However, at the level of individual articles, it is clear that authorial voice, particularly *self as author*, is an important and even determining factor in writer choice when it comes to integration of source materials.

4.4 Reference Analysis: Dominant Authors and Ideas

4.4.1 Introduction

The aim of the following analysis was to explore the ways in which disciplinary knowledge is discursively constructed and canonised through the intertextual links created by referencing source material in ALS, and ER studies when they intersect with Decolonial theory in South African Research journals. This was achieved by quantifying all the references made to Decoloniality source material in the articles used as data for this study. The most frequently referenced institutions, authors, and sources were established through this cross referencing.

The aim of this analysis is to give a broad view of the most influential scholars and institutions, and by extension expertise, concepts, and theories, within and across the data set. It also seeks to examine the disciplinary differences in terms of which scholars are viewed as seminal when ER and ALS research incorporates the Decolonial agenda. Similarly, this analysis attempts to trace intertextual linkages within the data set, and in doing so highlight in more detail which texts have

been the most influential in terms of the incorporation of Decolonisation, Decoloniality, and Decolonial thinking into ALS and ER, the mandate of each of the special issues included in the study.

For the purpose of this analysis, a 'reference' is considered an instance when an author, institution, or source has appeared in the bibliography or reference list of one of the 34 articles included in the study. The most frequently referenced sources, authors, and institutions were determined by cross referencing the bibliographies of all 34 articles. For the counting of authors and institutions, all publications referred to in a bibliography were counted individually. Each reference to the same source material across the data set was also counted. In other words, an author may be referenced multiple times in one article, but a source can only be referenced once. Thus, the number of times a source is referenced is also the number of articles in which the source was referenced. Due to the limited scope and focus of the current study, only the authors and institutions with the highest and second highest frequencies are described. Only the most frequently referenced sources are described although referents with the second highest frequencies are included in the tables.

This type of reference analysis is predicated on the assumption that citation can be viewed as a reliable indicator of intellectual and intertextual connections found within texts, and by extension the discourse communities which produce them (Rashid et. al: 2018: 764). This analysis investigates the dominant theoretical and ideological trends found within and across the disciplinary boundaries of the specialised fields and sub-genres investigated. The production, dissemination, and circulation of knowledge is not a neutral process. Complex relationships of power and practice determine which and who's knowledge becomes a part of the public discourse, is used in the creation of public and governmental policy, and is canonised in its relevant fields (Franczak 2016: 22).

The dissemination of academic expert knowledge into the public and private domains of discourse has increased (Franczak 2016: 20). As a result, discourses which appear prominently in the academic production of knowledge, especially those addressing controversial or important social matters, are often incorporated and recontextualised in the public sphere (Franczak 2016: 20).

The most frequently referenced authors, and more specifically their fields of expertise, should highlight some of the most important theoretical, philosophical, and methodological trends in the data. This analysis rests on the presumption that widely cited and referenced authors are influential in their fields and that the intertextual linkages that can be traced through these citations can

indicate some of the dominant ideologies with disciplinary communities (Rashid et. al: 2018: 764). This type of analysis also highlights the situatedness of knowledge production and explores whose knowledge is accepted as authoritative. In doing this, it works to uncover the subjective nature of knowledge production which is often concealed by Western scientific and philosophical traditions (Grosfoguel 2007: 213). This analysis seeks to gain greater understanding of how Decoloniality is incorporated, manifested, and canonised through expert knowledge in the disciplines of ALS and ER.

4.4.2 Analysis

As can be seen in all of the tables showing the most cited institutions below, the South African Department of Education is consistently among the most frequently referenced institutions. The most frequently referenced institution across the data set as a whole is the Department of Education, with 24 references appearing across 50% of the data set (Table 17). In 2009 the South African National Department of Education was divided into the Department of Basic Education (DBE) and the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) (Dhet.gov.za. 2020). The DBE oversees all South African adult literacy programs and schools offering tuition for grades R to 12 (Us and DBE, 2020), while the DHE presides over the Post-School Education and Training system in South Africa. Despite their shared history, the Department of Education, the DBE, and the DHET are, in the context of this study, considered separate entities, and references to each were counted as such.

Table 17: Most Frequently Referenced Institutions and Authors Across the Data Set

| All Journals | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| Most Frequently Referenced Institution | No. of References | % of Articles Referenced in | Frequently Referenced Author | No. of References | % of Articles Referenced in |
| Department of Education | 24 | 50 | Garcia, O. | 19 | 20.5 |
| University of the Free State | 13 | 2.9 | Freire, P. | 13 | 23.5 |

One of the most frequently referenced sources in the data set, as well as being among the most frequently referenced sources at the level of the journals and articles, is the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa. It appears in the references of 10 of the 34 articles. This means it has been referenced in 33% of data set. The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (1996) is the 'supreme law of the land' in South Africa, meaning that no other laws may supersede the

provisions made in the constitution (Gov.za. 2020). In its current iteration, it was approved by the Constitutional Court (CC) on 4 December 1996 and took effect on 4 February 1997. The South African Constitution enjoys a reputation for being one of the most progressive in the world (Gov.za. 2020; Constitutionhill.org.za. 2020) and contains the Bill of Rights, which asserts that all South African citizens have the inalienable right to life, equality, human dignity, and privacy (Constitutionhill.org.za. 2020). It is the first incarnation of the South African constitution that does not bar Black South Africans from voting and from political and everyday rights (Constitutionhill.org.za. 2020). The constitution is now available in all 11 of South Africa's official languages (Gov.za. 2020). In the data set, reference to the Constitution most frequently refers to the rights of students which are enshrined within it, often with regards to access to adequate (multilingual) education, and sometimes also the failure of the education system to effectively uphold those rights. For instance, Batyi (2018: 53) asserts that

The country's Constitution spells out that “[e]veryone has the right to receive education in the official language or languages of their choice in public educational institutions *where that education is reasonably practicable*” (Constitution of South Africa, 1996, Chapter 2, Section 29 issue 2). It is the escape clause “*where that education is reasonably practicable*” that contributes to the delay of full multilingualism in higher education teaching and learning. Institutions of higher learning hide behind the clause when they justify the slow or non-implementation of multilingualism in academic contexts. It is always not “*reasonably practicable*” for them to include indigenous languages as languages of learning and teaching... (emphasis in original)

The frequent references to the Constitution, government publications, and governmental educational departments is a recurring pattern within the data and suggests that there is a focus on local policy, especially its relation to language and education as it is practiced in the South African education sector.

Table 18: Most Frequently Referenced Sources Across Data Set

| All Journals | |
|---|-----|
| Most Frequently Referenced Sources | No. |
| The Constitution of The Republic of South Africa. 1996. | 10 |
| Garcia, O. & Wei, L. 2014. <i>Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education</i> . London: Palgrave Pivot | 6 |
| Fanon, F. <i>The Wretched of the Earth</i> . | 4 |
| Freire, P. (1970). <i>Pedagogy of the oppressed</i> . New York, USA: Continuum. | 4 |
| García, O. 2009. <i>Bilingual Education in the 21st century: A global perspective</i> . Malden: Wiley/Blackwell. | 4 |
| Madiba M. 2014. Promoting concept literacy through multilingual glossaries. A translanguaging approach. In Hibbert, L. & van der Walt, C. Eds. <i>Multilingual Universities in South Africa: Reflecting society in higher education</i> . Bristol U.K.: Multilingual Matters: 88-106. | 4 |
| Mbembe, A. (n.d.). <i>Decolonising Knowledge</i> | 4 |
| Department of Education (Republic of South Africa). 1997. <i>Education white paper 3: A program for transformation of higher education</i> . Pretoria, South Africa: DoE. | 4 |
| Department of Education (Republic of South Africa). 2002. <i>The Language policy for higher education</i> . Pretoria: Government Press. | 4 |

The most frequently referenced authors across the data set are Ofelia Garcia, with 19 references across 20.5% articles and Paulo Freire with 13 referenced in 23.5% of the articles. Garcia's presence as a dominant voice in the data set, especially in the ALS data, is confirmed by the fact that she is cited repeatedly in the articles included in the study, with her co-authored book *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education* (2014) appearing as one of the top two most frequently referenced sources across the data set as whole, as well as being the most referenced source in the ALS journals (Table 17). García is an internationally leading expert in bilingual education, language policy, multilingualism, and the sociology of language (Gc.cuny.edu. 2020).

García's work has had a significant impact in both AL and ER. Her concepts have changed the way that bi- and multilingual language practices are understood. Some of her most influential work focuses on translanguaging³ and dynamic bilingualism, often in educational settings (Gc.cuny.edu. 2020). In their book *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education* (2014, Garcia and Li Wei focus on translanguaging in both its theoretical and practical manifestations. The book highlights how the concept of translanguaging can be used in the development of pedagogies, offering useful examples of translanguaging pedagogical practices (Rubinstein 2018: 86). They

³ While the term has been popularised and extended by Garcia, 'translanguaging' was originally coined in Welsh as 'trawsieithu' by Cen Williams (1994), and was meant to encourage bilingual education in English and Welsh.

also deal “...with translanguaging as social practice and its implications for our understanding of languages and language use...” (Rubinstein 2018: 86).

The second most frequently referenced author across the data set, Freire, is most well-known for his work “Pedagogy of the Oppressed” (1972) (Freire.org. 2020). Freire’s work is most commonly associated with emancipatory praxis, and critical and liberatory pedagogies. His pedagogy of literacy focuses on the development of critical consciousness and his philosophies encourage people to question their historical and social context in order to “read their world” (Bentley 1999). Freire’s work entails a view of teaching and learning as dialogic, with both teachers and students participating in meaning-making processes through reflection and questioning (Bentley 1999). His ground-breaking work in education and literacy continue to influence many spheres of academic and educational practice and his work is considered seminal across several academic disciplines including community health, community development, and education (Freire.org. 2020). Bentley (1999) acknowledges the importance of Freire’s work by affirming that

As long as the struggle for more humane educational practices, for deeper insights into constructions of power and oppression, and the impulse for people to invent their own identities and realities exists—Freirean praxis will challenge every person toward personal and social liberation, both in thought and deed. (Bentley 1999).

The second most frequently referenced author across the data for both AL journals is Leketi Makalela, with 12 references, in 54.5% of the articles. Makalela is the co-editor of the SALALS special issue included in this study as data, along with Munene Mwaniki and Dionne van Reenen. His research has contributed to multi-disciplinary specialisation fields including Applied Linguistics, English Studies, Literacy Education and Linguistics (Makalela 2020). Some of his most influential work has focused on the interface between languages and literacies, and how these can be used to promote identity affirmation and epistemic access, specifically for multilingual speakers. A particularly relevant contribution of Makalela’s has been the development of a multilingual literacies model, ‘Ubuntu Translanguaging’, which is an Africa-centred approach to transforming educational systems in sub-Saharan Africa and beyond (Makalela 2020).

Table 19: Most Frequently Referenced Institutions and Authors: ALS

| Applied Linguistics and Language Studies | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| Most Frequently Referenced Institution | % of Articles Referenced in | % of Articles Referenced in | Frequently Referenced Author | No. of References | % of Articles Referenced in |
| University of the Free State. | 13 | 9 | Garcia, O. | 18 | 54.5 |
| Department of Education | 10 | 45.4 | Makalela, L. | 12 | 54.5 |

The most frequently referenced institution across the two ALS journals is the University of the Free State, with 13 references, however these appear in only 1 of the articles, which deals specifically with the language policies and linguistic ecologies of UFS (van Reened 2018). As shown in Table 23, the most frequently referenced institution in SALALS is the University of the Free State (UFS) with 11 references. DBE and the Department of Education are the second most frequently cited institutions, each with seven references found in 33% of the SALALS articles. The Department of Education is the second most frequently referenced institution across the AL data set with 10 references across 45.4% of the articles. The most frequently referenced author is Garcia, with a total of 18 references across 54.5% of the articles. Shown in Table 20, the most cited sources across both ALS journals are Garcia, O. & Wei, L. 2014. *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. London: Palgrave Pivot, and the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, both of which are cited 6 times.

From the collective data of both ALS journals, the same patterns that appear in them individually are evident. Institutions of higher education and national departments of education, especially basic education, are frequently referenced. The data suggests a focus on theories of multilingualism, particularly translanguaging, as a means of establishing the Decolonial agenda in ALS. Literature from the 'established Decolonial canon' are less common than in the ER journals and articles, as can be seen from a comparison on data in Tables 19-22.

Table 20: Most Frequently Referenced Sources: ALS Journals

| Applied Linguistics and Language Studies | |
|--|-----|
| Most Frequently Referenced Sources | No. |
| Garcia, O. & Wei, L. 2014. <i>Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education</i> . London: Palgrave Pivot | 6 |
| <i>The Constitution of The Republic of South Africa</i> . 1996. | 6 |
| García, O. 2009. <i>Bilingual Education in the 21st century: A global perspective</i> . Malden: Wiley/Blackwell. | 4 |
| Madiba M. 2014. Promoting concept literacy through multilingual glossaries. A translanguaging approach. In Hibbert, L. & van der Walt, C. (Eds.). <i>Multilingual Universities in South Africa: Reflecting society in higher education</i> . Bristol U.K.: Multilingual Matters: 88-106. | 4 |
| Department of Education (Republic of South Africa). 2002. <i>The Language policy for higher education</i> . Pretoria: Government Press. | 4 |

Table 21: Most Frequently Referenced Institutions and Authors: ER Journals

| Educational Research | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| Most Frequently Referenced Institution | No. of References | % of Articles Referenced in | Frequently Referenced Author | No. of References | % of Articles Referenced in |
| Department of Education | 14 | 43.4 | Freire, P. | 9 | 21.7 |
| Department of Basic Education | 11 | 26 | Creswell, J. | 7 | 21.7 |
| | | | Fomunyan, K.G. | 7 | 8.9 |

Shown in Table 21, John Creswell and Kehdinga George Fomunyan are the second most frequently referenced authors in the ER data. Creswell is a professor of family medicine and specialises in mixed methods research and research design. He is codirector of the Michigan Mixed Methods Research and Scholarship Program at the University of Michigan (SAGE Publications Inc. 2020). Creswell has authored and co-authored numerous publications on qualitative and mixed method research, including the American Psychological Association “standards” on qualitative and mixed methods research and “Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design”, which won the Textbook and Academic Author’s 2018 McGuffey Longevity Award (SAGE Publications Inc. 2020). It follows that the majority of references made to Creswell’s work within the data set are related to methodological concerns and decisions. All of the articles referencing Creswell’s work made use of what they describe as ‘qualitative’ research designs.

Three of the five articles used interviews and/or focus groups to collect data, one used a qualitative case study in which a desktop review was conducted, and one used an ethnographic approach.

Unlike Creswell who is most commonly cited in relation to methodologies, Fomunyam is known for his work in the development of Decolonial approaches to curriculum and pedagogy design. He lectures and researches Higher Education in the Department of Higher Education Training. His work within the discipline of Curriculum and Education Studies (Hes.ukzn.ac.za. 2020) has focused on "...curriculum, pedagogy, quality assurance, teacher education, literature and higher education." (Hes.ukzn.ac.za. 2020). The influence of his work in Decolonising education in South Africa is highlighted by his involvement in projects such as 'Decolonising South African Higher Education' and his anticipated book "Curriculum Theorising: The African Perspective" (Hes.ukzn.ac.za. 2020). His prominence in the data is likely also influenced by the fact that he authored or co-authored two of the articles in PiE. As is suggested by Mishra et.al. (2018), in the data Fomunyam's use of self-citation functioned as reference to novel work previously done by the author and may be a hallmark of high productivity in his field.

The prominence of Creswell and Fomunyam, along with that of Freire, shows that, overall, the ER journals place emphasis on qualitative methodologies, Decolonial theory, and liberatory pedagogies. The finding that Freire is the most frequently referenced author across both journals, while not being the most frequently referenced in either journal speaks to the larger patterns of citation which work to establish and entrench certain theoretical and methodological practices.

Across both ER journals (PiE and ERSC) four sources are each cited four times, making them the most frequently cited sources in the ER data. These sources are *Fanon, F. The Wretched of the Earth*, *Heleta S. 2016. Decolonisation of higher education: Dismantling epistemic violence and Eurocentrism in South Africa. Transformation in Higher Education, 1(1)*, *Mbembe, A. n.d. Decolonising knowledge and the question of the archive*, and *The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa*.

Table 22: Most Frequently Referenced Sources: ER Journals

| Educational Research | |
|--|-----|
| Most Frequently Referenced Sources | No. |
| Fanon, F. <i>The Wretched of the Earth</i> . | 4 |
| Heleta S. 2016. <i>Decolonisation of higher education: Dismantling epistemic violence and Eurocentrism in South Africa</i> . <i>Transformation in Higher Education</i> , 1(1). | 4 |
| Mbembe, A. n.d. <i>Decolonising knowledge and the question of the archive</i> . | 4 |
| <i>The Constitution of The Republic of South Africa</i> . 1996. | 4 |
| Freire, P. (1970). <i>Pedagogy of the oppressed</i> . New York, USA: Continuum. | 3 |
| Maldonado-Torres, N. 2007. On the coloniality of being. <i>Cultural Studies</i> , 21(2-3): 240-270. | 3 |
| Tuck, E. & Yang, K. W. 2012. Decolonisation is not a metaphor. <i>Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society</i> , 1(1): 1-40. | 3 |
| Department of Education (Republic of South Africa). 1997. <i>Education white paper 3: A program for transformation of higher education</i> . Pretoria, South Africa: DoE. | 3 |

Franz Fanon's *The Wretched of the Earth*, first published in 1961, is arguably his most famous text (Cherry 2015: 151). Originally published in a time of extreme upheaval in post-war Africa, it has since reached an international audience and become a seminal work in anti-colonial and Decolonial literature, held as a passionate and brilliant exploration of Decoloniality (Burke 1976: 127). Fanon's ideas continue to have global relevance and the resonance of his writings is still visible in the political landscape in South Africa through academics, revolutionaries, and political bodies alike (Cherry 2015: 151).

Savo Heleta's (2016) *Decolonisation of higher education: Dismantling epistemic violence and Eurocentrism in South Africa*, is an award winning and widely cited (News.mandela.ac.za 2020) article which traces the roots of epistemic violence in South African universities by arguing that "South Africa must tackle and dismantle the epistemic violence and hegemony of Eurocentrism, completely rethink, reframe and reconstruct the curriculum and place South Africa, Southern Africa and Africa at the centre of teaching, learning and research." (Heleta 2016: 1). Heleta (2016) argues that Decolonising South African universities needs to not only address the Decolonisation of the curriculum, but also the fundamental restructuring of institutional cultures and staff demographics.

Achille Mbembe's *Decolonizing Knowledge and the Question of the Archive* is a text which formed the basis of a series of public lectures given at the Wits Institute for Social and Economic Research (WISER), University of the Witwatersrand (Johannesburg), at conversations with the Rhodes Must Fall Movement at the University of Cape Town and the Indexing the Human Project,

Department of Sociology and Anthropology at the University of Stellenbosch (Meurer 2015). In this lecture, Mbembe elaborates on the processes and concepts of Decolonisation as it relates to higher education in post-Apartheid South Africa (Meurer 2015) and convincingly sets forth the necessity of a complete political, economic, social and intellectual change of higher education elaborating on the notions of “De-Westernization” and “Africanization” with reference to the thought of Frantz Fanon and Ngugi wa Thiong’o on promoting the idea of a non-racial “pluriversity” as a common good (Meurer 2015).

This piece addresses a number of pressing concerns for the decolonial movement in South Africa, and globally, including the demythologising of Whiteness, the redefining and reclaiming of public space, the restructuring of university management, and the philosophical and intellectual intricacies of the Decolonial and Decolonising agenda (Mbembe n.d.). The most cited sources across both ER journals confirms the orientation of the discipline towards journals towards Decolonial scholarship.

Table 23: Most Frequently Referenced Institutions and Authors: JLT

| <i>Journal for Language Teaching , 52(2)</i> | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Most Frequently Referenced Institution | No. of References | % of Articles Referenced in | Most Frequently Referenced Author | No. of References | % of Articles Referenced in |
| Department of Education | 3 | 60 | Garcia, O. | 12 | 40 |
| Council on Higher Education | 3 | 40 | Parmagiani, A. | 6 | 20 |

With three references each in 60% and 40% of the JLT articles, the most frequently referenced institutions are the Department of Education and the Council on Higher education (CHE). The CHE is an independent statutory quality council for South African higher education. Its main areas of work are to provide strategic and policy related advice to the Minister of Higher Education and Training and promote a “...system of quality assurance for all higher education institutions...” in South Africa (Nationalgovernment.co.za. 2020). As a part of its work, CHE focuses on research and monitoring trends and developments in the South African higher education system and initiating critical discourse on contemporary issues within the educational sector (Nationalgovernment.co.za. 2020).

Garcia is again the most frequently referenced author, appearing in the references of 40% of articles in JLT. Andrea Parmagiani is the second most frequently referenced author, with six references in 20% of the articles. Parmagiani is an Associate Professor in the English Department at Bronx Community College. His research has contributed to academic praxis in language and identity, specifically in multilingual educational contexts where English is the dominant language. His research in South Africa explores the notion of language ownership and identity construction (Bronx Community College. 2020). He advocates for the use and appropriation of dominant languages and codes through additive multilingualism, and the linking of “mother tongues” and dominant languages in education (Bronx Community College. 2020).

Table 24 shows the most cited sources in JLT are *Gee, J.P. 1996. Sociolinguistics and literacy: Ideologies in discourse. London: Falmer Press.*, *Madiba M. 2014. Promoting concept literacy through multilingual glossaries. A translanguaging approach. In Hibbert, L. & van der Walt, C. Eds. Multilingual Universities in South Africa: Reflecting society in higher education. Bristol U.K.: Multilingual Matters: 88-106., Department of Education (Republic of South Africa). 2002. The Language policy for higher education. Pretoria: Government Press.*, and *The Republic of South Africa. 1996. The Constitution*, each of which is cited 3 times.

James Paul Gee’s 1996 book *Sociolinguistics and literacy: Ideologies in discourse* states that it’s three aims are to

first, to give readers an overview of sociocultural approaches to language and literacy, approaches which coalesced into the New Literacy Studies; second, to introduce readers to a particular style of analysing language-in-use-in-society (see also Gee 2005); and, third, to develop a specific perspective on language and literacy centered around the notion of “Discourses” (Gee 2008: 2)

The book’s general argument is stated as being to enhance the study and appreciation of language as a part of the larger social contexts in Discourses, and not as an isolated phenomenon (Gee 2008: 2).

Mbulungeni Madiba’s chapter entitled *Promoting Concept Literacy Through Multilingual Glossaries: A Translanguaging Approach* was published as one of a collection of essays in the book *Multilingual Universities in South Africa Reflecting Society in Higher Education* edited by Liesel Hibbert and Christa van der Walt. The book focuses on strategies used in South African higher education institutions to promote multilingualism (Bagwasi 2015: 173). Madiba’s chapter

“...describes the use of multilingual glossaries at the University of Cape Town” (Bagwasi 2015:). The glossaries used were developed based on translanguaging approaches which use one language to enforce another in order to promote a deeper understanding of specific words. By encouraging students to draw on their linguistic repositories this approach seeks to provide linguistic and academic support to multilingual students (Bagwasi 2015:175).

The South African Language Policy for Higher Education was developed in 2002 by the Ministry of Education on the principals of promoting multilingualism, enhancing equity and access in higher education, and upholding the (linguistic) rights of all citizens enshrined in the Constitution. The framework developed in this policy sets out a number of ways in which these aims can be achieved. They include the development of South African languages as mediums of instruction, the promotion of the study of African languages and literature, the encouragement of multilingualism in institutional policies and practice, and the development of student proficiency in languages of instruction (Department of Higher Education 2002: 15). The policy aims to counteract the legacy of apartheid in which language policy was used as a means of oppression and control, and to develop policy and strategy which enhances epistemic access and prioritises the development and promotion of local languages (Department of Higher Education 2002).

The most frequently referenced author in the SALALS special issue is Makalela with seven references in 50% of the articles. Garcia is second most frequently referenced author, with six references in 16.6% of the articles.

Table 24: Most Frequently Referenced Sources: JLT

| <i>Journal for Language Teaching</i> , 52(2). | |
|---|-----------------|
| Most Frequently Referenced Sources | No of Citations |
| Garcia, O. & Wei, L. 2014. <i>Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education</i> . London: Palgrave Pivot | 3 |
| Gee, J.P. 1996. <i>Sociolinguistics and literacy: Ideologies in discourse</i> . London: Falmer Press. | 3 |
| Madiba M. 2014. Promoting concept literacy through multilingual glossaries. A translanguaging approach. In Hibbert, L. & van der Walt, C. Eds. <i>Multilingual Universities in South Africa: Reflecting society in higher education</i> . Bristol U.K.: Multilingual Matters: 88-106. | 3 |
| <i>The Constitution of The Republic of South Africa</i> . 1996. | 3 |
| Department of Education (Republic of South Africa). 2002. <i>The Language policy for higher education</i> . Pretoria: Government Press. | 3 |
| Baker, C. 2001. <i>Foundations of Bilingual Education and bilingualism</i> , 3rd Edition. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters. | 2 |
| García, O. 2009. <i>Bilingual Education in the 21st century: A global perspective</i> . Malden: Wiley/Blackwell. | 2 |
| Kaschula, R.H. & Maseko, P. 2014. The intellectualisation of African Languages, multilingualism and education: a research based approach. <i>Alternation Special Edition</i> , 13: 8-15. | 2 |
| Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. 2012. Translanguaging: Origins and development (EAL) students through corpus-based, multilingual glossaries. <i>Alternation</i> , 17(1): 225-248. | 2 |
| Madiba, M. 2013. Multilingual education in South African Universities: Policies, pedagogy and practicability. <i>Linguistics and Education</i> . 24(4): 385-395. | 2 |
| Ramani, E., Kekana, T., Modiba, M & Joseph, M. 2007. <i>Terminology development versus concept development through discourse: Insights from a dual medium BA Degree</i> . South African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies., 25(2): 207-223. | 2 |
| Wildsmith-Cromarty R & N. Turner. 2018. Bilingual instruction at tertiary level in SA: What are the challenges? <i>Current Issues in Language Planning</i> . | 2 |
| Council on Higher Education (CHE). 2013. <i>A proposal for undergraduate curriculum reform in South Africa: A case for a flexible curriculum structure. Report of the task team on undergraduate curriculum structure</i> . Pretoria: Council on Higher education. | 2 |

Table 25: Most Frequently Referenced Institutions and Authors: SALALS

| <i>South African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies</i> , 16(1) | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| Most Frequently Referenced Institution | No. of References | % of Articles Referenced in | Most Frequently Referenced Author | No. of References | % of Articles Referenced in |
| University of the Free State | 11 | 16.6 | Makalela, L. | 7 | 50 |
| Department of Education | 7 | 33.3 | Garcia, O. | 6 | 16.6 |
| Department of Basic Education | 7 | 33.3 | | | |

Table 26: Most Frequently Referenced Sources: SALALS

| <i>South African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies</i> , 16(1). | |
|--|-----|
| Most Frequently Referenced Sources | No. |
| Garcia, O. & Wei, L. 2014. <i>Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education</i> . London: Palgrave Pivot | 3 |
| <i>The Constitution of The Republic of South Africa</i> . 1996. | 3 |
| García, O. 2009. <i>Bilingual Education in the 21st century: A global perspective</i> . Malden: Wiley/Blackwell. | 2 |
| Mwaniki M. 2012. Language and social justice in South Africa's higher education: Insights from a South African University. <i>Language and Education</i> , 26(3): 213-232 | 2 |
| Makalela, L. 2015. <i>Translanguaging as a vehicle for epistemic access: Cases for reading comprehension and Multilingual interactions</i> . <i>Per Linguam</i> , 31(1): 15-29 | 2 |

The most cited sources in SALALS are Garcia, O. & Wei, L. 2014. *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. London: Palgrave Pivot, and the *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa*, with three citations each. Like JLT, the most frequently referenced authors in SALALS are experts in multilingualism and educational contexts. It is evident that Garcia specifically is an influential scholar in the nexus between language and Decoloniality in ALS. This again suggests that her most widely recognised and used concepts of translanguaging and dynamic bilingualism are used by scholars in ALS working within Decoloniality and related concepts.

Shown in Table 27, the most referenced authors in PiE are Creswell, who is cited a total of seven times in 31.2% of the articles, and Fomunyan, who is referenced seven times in 12.5% of the articles. Also shown in Table 27 is the most frequently referenced institution in PiE which is the South African Department of Education. It is cited eight times in 37.5% of the PiE articles. The Department of Basic Education (DBE) is referenced five times in 18.7% of the articles.

Being referenced five times in 31.2% of the articles, the second largest number of references, is Jonathan Jansen. Jansen is known for his work in education and has written a number of influential books on transformation, peaceful reconciliation and unity". He is Distinguished Professor of Education at Stellenbosch University and president of the Academy of Science of South Africa (Blogs.sun.ac.za. 2020). He is internationally renowned for his expertise in education and ER and is "...known for his strong views on transformation, peaceful reconciliation and unity..." (Uwc.ac.za. 2020). The broad focus of his research is the politics of knowledge. He has published several influential books and "...was the first black Rector and Vice-Chancellor appointed in UFS's history." (Uwc.ac.za. 2020).

Table 27: Most Frequently Referenced Institutions and Authors: PiE

| <i>Perspectives in Education</i> , 35(2) | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| Referenced Institution | No. of References | % of Articles Referenced in | Frequently Referenced | No. of References | % of Articles Referenced in |
| Department of Education | 8 | 37.5 | Creswell, J. | 7 | 31.2 |
| Department of Basic Education | 5 | 18.7 | Fomunyam, KG. | 7 | 12.5 |
| | | | Jansen, J.D. | 5 | 5 |

Table 28 shows that the most frequently referenced sources in PiE are *Heleta S. 2016. Decolonisation of higher education: Dismantling epistemic violence and Eurocentrism in South Africa. Transformation in Higher Education, 1(1)*, and *Biko, S. 1987. I write what I like*, with three citations each. Steve Biko's classic work on black political thought (Kunnie 2020), *I Write What I Like* is a collection of Biko's writings and speeches originally published in 1978. It remains one of the most widely cited and influential pieces in the global canon of black liberation writing (Kunnie 2020). *I Write What I Like* is considered one of the most foundational and poignant texts in the Black Consciousness movement (Kunnie 2020).

From the data collected from PiE regarding the most frequently, and therefore the most influential, scholars, it is possible to conclude that there is a focus on educational research which centres on a Decolonial and transformative perspective. This is in line with the stated aims and objectives of this special issue. There also seems to be an emphasis on qualitative research designs. While not all papers that used qualitative designs cited Creswell, only two of the 16 articles in this special issue of PiE used what could be described as quantitative research designs. These results along with the most frequently referenced sources reinforce the notion that this sub-genre of research in ER is strongly influenced by Decolonial scholarship.

Table 28: Most Frequently Referenced Sources: PiE

| <i>Perspectives in Education, 35(2)</i> | |
|--|-----|
| Most Frequently Referenced Sources | No. |
| Heleta S. 2016. Decolonisation of higher education: Dismantling epistemic violence and Eurocentrism in South Africa. <i>Transformation in Higher Education</i> , 1(1). | 3 |
| Biko, S. 1987. <i>I write what I like</i> . | 3 |
| Barnhardt, R. 2005. Indigenous knowledge systems and Alaska native ways of knowing. <i>Anthropology & Education Quarterly</i> , 36(1): 8-23. | 2 |
| Beetar, M. 2013. <i>UKZN is failing its students</i> . | 2 |
| Brodie K. 2016. <i>Yes, mathematics can be decolonised. Here's how to begin</i> . | 2 |
| Creswell, J. 2009. <i>Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches</i> . Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. | 2 |
| Disemelo, K. 2015. <i>South African student protests are about much more than just #feesmustfall</i> . | 2 |
| Du Preez, P. Simmonds, S, & Verhoef, A.H. 2016. Rethinking and researching transformation in higher education: A meta-study of South African trends. | 2 |
| Excell L, Linington V, & Schaik N. 2015. <i>Perspectives on early childhood education</i> . | 2 |
| Fanon, F. <i>The Wretched of the Earth</i> | 2 |
| Mamdani, M. 1998. Is African studies to be turned into a new home for Bantu education at UTC? <i>Social Dynamics</i> , 24: 63-75. | 2 |
| Mgqwashu, E. 2016. Universities can't delconise the curriculum without defining it first. <i>The Conversation</i> . | 2 |
| Moll, I. 2004. Curriculum responsiveness: The anatomy of a concept. In H. Griesel | 2 |
| Ogude, N., Nel, H. & Oosthuizen, M. 2005. <i>The challenge of curriculum responsiveness in South African higher education</i> . Pretoria: Council on Higher | 2 |
| Ramathan, L. 2016. Beyond counting the numbers: Shifting higher education transformation into curriculum spaces. <i>Transformation in Higher Education</i> , 1: 1-8. | 2 |
| Wood, G. 1992. <i>Schools that work: Americas most innovative public education programs</i> . New York, New York: Dutton. | 2 |
| Department of Education 2003. <i>National Curriculum Statement Grade 10-12</i> . South Africa: Seriti Printing. | 2 |

Table 29: Most Frequently Referenced Institutions and Authors: ERSC

| <i>Educational Research for Social Change</i> , 7. 2018. | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| Most Frequently Referenced Institution | No. of References | % of Articles Referenced in | Frequently Referenced Author | No. of References | % of Articles Referenced in |
| Department of Basic Education | 6 | 71.4 | Maldonado-Torres, N. | 6 | 42.8 |
| Department of Education | 6 | 57.1 | wa Thiong'o, N. | 5 | 57.1 |

Table 29 shows that the most frequently referenced institutions in ERSC are the DBE and the Department of Education, both of which are referenced six times in 71.4% and 57.1% of the ERSC

articles respectively. The most frequently referenced author in ERSC is Nelson Maldonado-Torres with six citations across 42.8% of the articles. Maldonado-Torres is a Professor at the Department of Latino and Caribbean Studies and the Comparative Literature Program (Martel, M., 2020). His research interests include comparative critical and Decolonial theorising, theories of race and ethnicity, Decolonial feminism, phenomenology, and social and political philosophy (Martel 2020). His most influential contributions include his work on “...the crossings of different genealogies of thinking, and their appearance in different genres of writing, discourses, artistic expressions, and social movements” (Martel 2020). He is an authority of Decolonial theory and has written extensively on the epistemologies, politics, and ethics of Decoloniality (Martel 2020).

Maldonado-Torres’s article *On the Coloniality of Being* (2007), is also the most frequently referenced source in ERSC as shown in Table 30. In it he describes the origins and premise of the concept of ‘the coloniality of being’ and explores how the concept was developed out of need to address the effects of coloniality on the lived experiences of people. While the ‘coloniality of power’ could address modern forms of exploitation and domination, and ‘the coloniality of knowledge’ could address the impact of coloniality on knowledge production, “the coloniality of being would make primary reference to the lived experience of colonization and its impact on language” (Maldonado-Torres 2007: 242).

Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o is the second most frequently referenced author in ERSC. He is referenced in 57.1% of the articles, a total of five times. wa Thiong’o is currently Distinguished Professor of English and Comparative Literature at the University of California, Irvine, (wa Thiong'o 2020). wa Thiong’o has written a number of seminal and highly acclaimed works, including novels, plays, and short stories, including the extremely influential, *Decolonising the Mind* (1986). His polemical declaration, *On the Abolition of the English Department* sparked global debates and has been instrumental in setting standards of practice now at the centre of post-colonial theories (wa Thiong'o 2020). In 1977, under the Kenyan Moi dictatorship, wa Thiong’o was arrested and imprisoned without charge at Kamiti Maximum Security Prison (wa Thiong'o 2020). While imprisoned he committed himself to writing in his “mother tongue” Gikuyu, following which he wrote the novel “Caitani Mutharabaini” (1981). It was translated into English as *Devil on the Cross* in 1982 (wa Thiong'o 2020). wa Thiong’o has

...continued to write prolifically, publishing, in 2006, what some have described as his crowning achievement, *Wizard of the Crow*, an English translation of the Gikuyu language novel, *Murogi wa Kagogo*. Ngũgĩ’s books have been translated into more

than thirty languages and they continue to be the subject of books, critical monographs, and dissertations (wa Thiong'o 2020).

wa Thiong'o's revolutionary approaches and insights into Decoloniality and language have been extremely influential to Decolonial discourses in Africa and beyond.

Table 30: Most Frequently Referenced Sources: ERSC

| <i>Educational Research for Social Change</i> , 7. 2018. | |
|--|-----|
| Most Frequently Referenced Sources | No. |
| Maldonado-Torres, N. 2007. On the coloniality of being. <i>Cultural Studies</i> , 21(2-3): 240-270. | 3 |
| <i>The Constitution of The Republic of South Africa</i> . 1996. | 3 |
| Fanon, F. <i>The Wretched of the Earth</i> . | 2 |
| Freire, P. 1970. <i>Pedagogy of the oppressed</i> . New York, USA: Continuum. | 2 |
| Grosfoguel, R. 2007. The epistemic decolonial turn. <i>Cultural Studies</i> , 21(2-3), 211-223. | 2 |
| Kincheloe J. L. 2007. <i>Teachers as researchers: Qualitative paths to empowerment</i> . London, U.K: Falmer. | 2 |
| Maldonado-Torres, N. 2011. Thinking through the declonial turn.: Post-continental interventions in theory, philosophy, and critique - An introductions. <i>Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World</i> , 1(2): 240-270. | 2 |
| Mignolo, W. D. 2007. Introduction: Coloniality of power and decolonial thinking, <i>Cultural Studies</i> , 21(2-3): 150-176. | 2 |
| Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. (2013). Why decoloniality in the 21st century? <i>The Thinker</i> , 48: 10-15. | 2 |
| Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. <i>Decolonising the mind</i> . London, Uk: Heinemann. | 2 |
| Tuck, E. & Yang, K. W. 2012. Decolonisation is not a metaphor. Decolonization: Indigeneity, <i>Education and Society</i> , 1(1): 1-40. | 2 |
| Department of Education (Republic of South Africa). 1997. <i>Education white paper 3: A program for transformation of higher education</i> . Pretoria, South Africa: DoE. | 2 |
| The Republic of South Africa. 1996. <i>South African Schools Act</i> . | 2 |

The scholars which are most frequently referenced in ERSC are seminal scholars in Decolonial theory and praxis. wa Thiong'o is considered one of the most important thinkers to contribute to Decolonisation efforts in Africa. In turn, Maldonado-Torres is also an extremely influential scholar in Decolonial thought and has worked extensively in the field, becoming one of the most recognised and most extensively published scholars in the field. According to the google scholar citation index, he has been cited nearly 1000 times in 2019 alone.

4.4.3 Conclusion

The reference analysis conducted above highlights some of the central ways in which disciplinary knowledge is discursively constructed and canonised through the intertextual links created by

writers' reference to source material in ALS and ER RAs when they intersect with Decolonial theory in South African Research Journals. Specifically, this analysis highlights which authors are considered authoritative and whose knowledge is centralised within the sub-genre. This type of analysis works to uncover the hidden or erased links between the subject and the production of knowledge and highlight the social values embedded in knowledge production and the partiality of its production (Grosfoguel 2007: 213). Through the separation of subject and knowledge production, "Western philosophy and sciences are able to produce a myth about a Truthful universal knowledge that covers up, that is, conceals who is speaking..." (Grosfoguel 2007: 213). These 'myths' of non-situated and objectively produced knowledge pervade Western academic paradigms, and work to dislocate knowledge from its point of origin, thus masking the reproduction of power and upholding the status-quo of power relations (Grosfoguel 2007: 213). By making explicit the influential voices and intertextual linkages, this type of analysis works to 'relocate' knowledge with its point of origin, and conscientise us to the importance of the "...geopolitical and body-political location of the subject that speaks." (Grosfoguel 2007: 213).

Looking at the data set as a whole, it is clear that theories and theorists of language and education are central to the production of knowledge within the sub-genre, as one would expect considering the social and academic context in which these articles were produced. The most frequently referenced institutions are universities and governmental departments of teaching and learning, and the most frequently referenced authors are considered experts and leaders in the study of the interface between language and pedagogy. There is also a clear emphasis on liberatory, transformative, and 'Decolonial' approaches to education.

The disciplinary differences between the ways that ER and ALS scholars incorporate Decolonial theories into the construction of disciplinary knowledge is evidenced by the distinct intertextual links which writers in each discipline establish. While writers in ER rely more heavily on authors from what are considered Decolonial and post-colonial focused studies, such as Maldonado-Torres and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, writers in ALS seem to draw more heavily on internally generated disciplinary knowledge and experts from within the ALS field, especially Garcia. This points to the possibility that ALS, as a discipline operates in such a way that knowledge production prioritises disciplinary convention over 'inter-disciplinary' intertextual linkages, while knowledge production practices in ER allow for more 'interdisciplinarity', meaning specifically the incorporation of Decolonial and post-colonial scholarship.

4.5 Analysis: Conclusion

Citation presentation type patterns across the data mirror those found in other studies for the ‘soft sciences’. High rates of direct quotation suggest that the voice of the writer is often featured less prominently than those of the cited authors and highlights an acknowledgement of the role of human agency in the production of knowledge. This is typical of the ‘soft sciences’ where the production of knowledge is not viewed as a linear process and thus follows more recursive and reiterative patterns of practice (Hyland 1999: 353). Lower rates of generalisation than would be expected may be due to constraints in the specific sub-genre, as writers cannot take for granted the audience’s acquaintance with the literature. Despite deviations in individual articles, overall citation patterns were similar in both ER and ALS.

The results of the citation language form analysis most closely resemble those found by Hyland (1999). Again, citation patterns in both disciplines are similar to those typically associated with the ‘soft sciences’. Higher rates of non-integral citation than have been reported in some previous literature may represent an epistemological shift towards more empirical orientations. Despite this, levels of integral citation forms still demonstrate that both disciplines currently lean towards the ‘soft sciences’. This citation pattern highlights the voice of the author and the role of human agency in knowledge production. High levels of variation were found at the level of individual articles, indicating the importance of understanding the individual agency associated with the construction of authorial voice.

The reference analysis, more than the citation analyses, show marked disciplinary differences between ALS and ER. While both disciplines show high levels of the reference to university and governmental policy, and clearly show the prominence of literature at the interface of language and education, ER incorporates more literature often considered seminal in the ‘Decolonial canon’. Conversely, ALS seems to rely heavily on theories of multilingualism, specifically translanguaging, when engaging with Decoloniality in education.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

5.1 Citation and Constructing Authorial Voice

5.1.1 Authorial Agency: Constructing *Individual Voice*...

Definitions of authorial voice are often varied and have in some instances become polemicised (Stapleton 2002; Helms-Park & Stapleton 2003; Matsuda & Tardy 2007; Stapleton & Helms-Park 2008). In the context of this study, authorial voice was understood as dialogic. This view of voice asserts that the presence of voice in a text is interactional, arising out of rhetorical negotiations between the writer and the social and disciplinary context in which the writer is working. Thus, while voice is understood as individual and unique to a writer, a product of their personal views, authoritativeness, and style, it is also recognised that manifestations of authorial voice are constrained by the knowledge production practices and rhetorical conventions of their disciplinary communities (Hyland 1999: 344). When viewed dialogically, authorial voice is always the product of a writer's situatedness, resulting in part from their historical and social contexts. The discursive construction of voice then, is always reflective and indexical of certain political and social values which are often the product of power differentials operating within the context of the writer (Blommaert 2008: 427).

In the context of academic writing, the presence of a unique authorial voice has been viewed less favourably than in other domains of authorship (Hyland 2008: 5). Writers in the academic sphere are traditionally expected to maintain an objective distance from their object of study, downplay the subjective nature of knowledge production, and to a degree, efface their personalities from their work (Hyland 2008: 5). The constraints on academic writers are thus often even more stringent than in other genres and domains of writing. It follows that when viewing voice dialogically, in this context specifically, the focus is frequently on the ways in which meaning is organised, operationalised, and constrained by contextual ideological patterns of normativity (Blommaert 2008: 428).

It is indisputable that our linguistic resources are “co-owned” and that the performance of language is intrinsically social. As such the notion of a unique, personal, and authentic authorial voice becomes almost untenable (Atkinson 2008). Despite the concession that voice is ultimately the product of both the individual disposition of the writer and the social context in which they write, some scholars have maintained that, in at least some aspects, personal voice does exist (Atkinson 2008; Hirvela & Belcher 2001). Atkinson (2008: 201) points out that there are some writers, even

in the typically ‘voice neutral’ sphere of academics, that leave a distinct textual “footprint”. More importantly, Atkinson (2008: 203) points out that, as writers, we *experience* the act of writing. Despite the fact that much of our understanding of the world and of ourselves is derived and constructed from the social, the primary way in which we know and actively exist in the world is phenomenological and emic (Atkinson 2008: 203). That is to say that the individual voice does exist, if only in our own knowing of, experiencing of, and searching for a personal self, and an individual voice through which this personal self may be expressed.

Having an individual and personal voice in academics is difficult. The challenges of writing for scholarly publication are numerous, for some writers even more so than for others (see Canagarajah 2002; Canagarajah 2008; Kubota 2008, and numerous others). The negotiations and concessions required to get a text to the point of publication may pose a substantial challenge to the expression of an author’s original voice (Kubota 2008: 74). The importance of personal voice in the academic context might then be most relevant when viewed in light of the possibility that authors can construct their voice with personal agency. Instead of being understood primarily as “victims” of the constraints of their writing context and disciplinary discourses, writers can be seen as active agents, choosing how best to represent themselves in their writings (Casanave 2008: 172), and possessing the ability to use the rhetorical resources available to them to subvert or resist the constraints of their contexts.

As I have already established, referencing and citation are important, and mandatory, rhetorical resources for academic writers. The findings of the current study suggest that some writers may be using citation as a means of ‘activating’ their voice, or perhaps more precisely in this case the voice of the author/other, to resist disciplinary conventions, and current theoretical orientations and momentums. When viewed at the level of academic disciplines, the level most frequently focused on in similar research, citation practices in the data used for this study appear relatively uniform. However, when viewed at the level of the individual article vast variations become apparent. For instance, despite an apparent overall preference for non-integral citation forms, rates of non-integral citation in individual articles vary between 18-99 %. Similarly, while ‘summary’ type citations were the most common across the data set, some articles displayed frequencies of quotation as high as 50%. This elevated level of quotation was in fact high enough to effect the overall patterns of citation in such a way as to reflect higher rates of quotation across the data than what would be expected based on previously reported findings (Hyland 1999; Hyland 2002; Hyland & Jiang 2019; Peng 2019).

Six articles in total displayed higher rates of integral citation forms. These were authored by Fomunyam, Fomunyam and Teferra, and Cishe in PiE; Waghid and Hibbert in ERSC; Mwaniki in SALALS; and Hibbert in JLT. Cishe's (2018) work displayed the highest rate of non-integral citation with 88% non-integral forms. It is interesting to note that the only two authors represented twice in the data also display rates of non-integral citation higher than what is otherwise expected in the data. The authors of these articles are featured in three of the four journals, two of which I have already shown to have a more 'scientific' orientation. As such, one would expect to see higher rates of non-integral citation as the journals position themselves, at least in part, towards 'hard science'. It is therefore a possibility that the citation patterns found in the work of these authors are a part of their unique authorial "footprint", and that citation is one way in which an author might construct their voice in opposition to the disciplinary trends demonstrated by the orientations of the journals themselves, but also by the larger trends found in educational and applied language research RAs (Hyland & Jiang 2019). Due to the fact that no other writers are represented more than once in the data, the small sample size, and the lack of ethnographic or similar style data, it is difficult to confirm the reasons for authorial citation choices. However, the data does suggest that despite the existent constraints and pressures of the academic publication context, these authors have utilised citation forms in the construction of their authorial voice that demonstrate not only the uniqueness of their voice, but also how author agency in the construction of voice can be used to subvert the disciplinary and contextual constraints in which writers work.

5.1.2 ...And Now Deconstructing It

Bowden (1995 cited in Ramrathan and Atkinson 1999: 49) describes the modern emergence of the notion of the individual, unique, and authentic voice in the 1960s and 1970s as a reaction to previously pervasive cultural and social emphasis on the impersonal and technological over the personal and the natural. However, the view of authorial voice as personal and authentic is ultimately and "...intimately linked to a particular ideology of the individual: Euro-American *individualism*" (Atkinson 2008: 190) (emphasis in original). The ideology of individualism is often traced to the aftermath of the European Renaissance (Atkinson 2008: 190), when human beings began to be "reconceived and reconfigured, fundamentally, as individual or autonomous subjects...by locating and disciplining bodies in physical and symbolic space..." (Atkinson 2008: 191).

Michel Foucault understood the creation of the modern "individual" as a part of the Enlightenment project of rationalising humankind, and the Enlightenment ethos of fostering the individual as not

so much a move towards the individual's inalienable rights and freedoms, but a move to towards individuated discipline and control (Atkinson 2008: 190-191). Western Enlightenment, and Eurocentrism and colonialism are intrinsically linked. As Partha Chatterjee (1986: 168) notes

ever since the Age of Enlightenment, Reason in its universalizing mission has been parasitic upon a much less lofty, much more mundane, palpably material and singularly invidious force, namely the universalist urge of capital. From at least the middle of the eighteenth century, for two hundred years, Reason has travelled the world piggyback, carried across oceans and continents by colonial powers eager to find new grounds for trade, extraction and the productive expansion of capital.

If the notion of authorial voice as individual, unique, and personal, perhaps even the notion of authorial voice itself, is a product of Western Enlightenment and colonality then perhaps our desire as writers to manifest a written identity, a “footprint”, is a means through which we reproduce the colonial ideologies and our internalised, Enlightened subjectivities. So, while the data used in this study has shown how writer agency manifested in citation practices can contribute to the construction of a unique and personal authorial voice, it also provided an insight into how it may contribute to its deconstruction. In the data for this study this is demonstrated by the comparatively high rates of direct quotation across the data, and in some articles specifically.

Direct quotation makes up a large percentage of the citation presentation types across the data, second only to ‘summary’. This high rate of direct quotation represents a deviation from what is usually associated with the RA genre in ER and ALS and also contrasts with some of the other findings of this study which suggest an increasing alignment with the ‘hard sciences’ in ER and ALS. The finding is also in contrast with other reported findings that the use of direct quotation is often the least popular citation presentation type (Hyland 1999; Hyland 2008; Hyland & Jiang 2019). One of the reasons that direct quotation is less popular is that it may obstruct the ‘flow’ of a text and downplay the authoritativeness of the writer. Direct quotation marginalises the voice of the writer and opens the interpretive space for the reader, essentially allowing the reader to negotiate the meaning of the author’s text for themselves. As such, it may increase the likelihood of interpretive reader divergence, and possibly undermine persuasiveness of a writer’s argument.

Integrated quotation requires the skilful control of double voicing in the construction of authorial voice by the writer (Peng 2019: 17) as it is the clear expression of an author’s voice which the writer must put to work for their own rhetorical needs. Despite the nuance required to effectively

use direct quotation, employed successfully, it allows a writer to utilise authoritative disciplinary voices in the construction of arguments (Peng 2019: 13; Hu & Wang 2014: 22). In fact, some studies have suggested that the effective use of direct quotation can improve the readers impression of a text and its writer (Petrić 2012).

The highest rates of direct quotation are found in Sesanti's (2018) paper *Teaching Ancient Egyptian Philosophy (Ethics) and History: Fulfilling a Quest for a Decolonised and Afrocentric Education*, which appears in ERSC. In this article, integrated and block quotation types make up 51% of all citation presentations, the only article in which more than half of all citation presentation types are made up by direct quotation (although a couple of other articles do come close). This paper demonstrates the effective use of direct quotation in the construction of an argument which resists the broader conventions of its context and genre in both its form and content.

Sesanti's (2018) article also uses a relatively high rate of integral citation forms. At 34% it is a percentage in line with what would be expected of an article in the 'soft-sciences' but is comparatively high when the other articles are considered individually. High rates of direct quotation and relatively high rates of integral citation forms clearly demonstrate rhetorical and discursive constructions which focus the voice of the author, and centre the human agency and subjectivity of knowledge production processes. As previously stated, this is often not a popular choice in the sphere of academic writing in which authoritativeness is often seen as essential and personal, or human orientated styles are regularly seen as undesirable. Sesanti's (2018) article argues for the centring of African discourses in education in South Africa, and the deconstruction of the sector's Eurocentric standards. He adopts a philosophical style which focuses on the ethics of and in education by referring to the dislocated African histories of ancient Egypt. His argument demonstrates how a writer can effectively centre the voices of others by using direct quotation, and in doing so undermine the still prevalent and Eurocentric epistemic orientations in academic research. His paper not only works to deconstruct Eurocentrism in education in its content, it does so also in its style and discursive construction of authorial voice as distinctly *collective*.

5.2 Citation and Constructing Disciplines: Contact Zones and Border Rhetoric

The recognition of agency in language practices is not a new one. ALS has, for the most part, abandoned views of language and the speech community that mirror conceptualisations of the modern nation, that is, as "...embodying values like equality, fraternity, liberty..." and presuming

“...a unified and homogeneous social world in which language exists” (Pratt 1991: 38). In this utopian view, the prototypical manifestation of language is conceptualised as the speech of native adult speakers in monolingual, and even monodialectal situations (Pratt 1991: 38). Mary Louise Pratt’s (1991) concept of the ‘contact zone’ is one of many that has offered a way of disrupting the homogenising discourses in ALS and literary studies by highlighting the conflicts and systematic social differences that govern linguistic and textual interactions in heterogenous contexts (1991: 38). Contact zones “...refer to social spaces where cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other...” (Pratt 1991: 34). Pratt (1991: 37) asserts that “[t]he idea of the contact zone is intended in part to contrast with ideas of community that underlie much of the thinking about language, communication, and culture that gets done in the academy.” In this way, the notion of the contact zone is one which recognises diversity and the individual agency of those which operate in these heterogenous zones of contact.

In the context of academic writing, specifically when it is being done at (inter)disciplinary boundaries, this means a recognition of the rhetorical work writers must do in order to successfully position themselves and their work in such a way that it connects to several different disciplinary ethos’ (Journet 1993: 524-525). The ‘contact zone’ in academic writing highlights that when working at the intersections or boundaries of academic disciplines, academics are working at the margins of their fields, and are often negotiating and straddling organisational and institutional boundaries (Norgaard 1999: 49). Where writers are operating at the rhetorical boundaries of their disciplines, they must make a number of innovative rhetorical choices in order to accommodate the (inter)disciplinary context in which they are working (Journet 1993). It follows that conflicting patterns of citation are bound to arise in such contexts. In the data for this study, these tensions and differences in citation practice patterns are evident both within and across the disciplines, and are evidence that these writers, in working at the interface of language, education, and Decoloniality, are indeed operating in disciplinary “contact zones”.

The textual evidence of the contact zone in the form of patterns of reference and citation are seen in the data at the level of the individual article, where, for instance, the same writer who uses the highest rate of non-integral citation forms also uses the highest rates of summary, and authorial voice is constructed both as individual and collective. Evidence of the contact zone is also seen at the broadest disciplinary level, where higher rates of direct quotation indicate a pull towards epistemologies of the ‘soft sciences’, while journal guidelines, international trends in the fields, and relatively low rates of integral citation seem to pulling towards the ‘hard sciences’.

The low rates of generalisation are the most obvious indicator that these writers are operating at their disciplinary borders, where writers working in the contact zone have to consider how to develop and construct their disciplinary expertise when they communicate with readers outside of their immediate specialisations (Norgaard 1999: 49). Working at rhetorical boundaries means that writers may not be able to rely on the assumption of pre-existent and shared knowledge in the ‘field’ and use “parenthetical plonking” (Swales 2014: 135) to rhetorically point towards whole canonical developments. More extensive coverage of the literature than would otherwise be necessary in a RA genre is required here as the disciplinary discourse communities for which these articles are intended may not be familiar with the literature and theoretical developments referred to by the writer.

5.3 Influential Sources and Voices: Disciplinary Boundaries and the Transformative

Limits of Agency

The recognition of agency in language practices has been growing, and a number of concepts that focus on the agentive and transformative nature of language and language practice have emerged. For instance, Oostendorp (forthcoming: 15) notes that notions like ‘linguistic repertoire’, ‘agency’, and ‘voice’ are being increasingly reconceptualised as possibilities for mobilisation, and used as a means of “...showcasing how, despite overwhelming social forces, people can carve out resistance and a new way of being through language”. One of the most dominant agentive and transformative concepts to emerge in ALS has been ‘translanguaging’. This dominance of paradigms which centre subject agency are notable in the data, specifically the concept of ‘translanguaging’. Many of the most prominent sources and authors referred to in the ALS data have been influential in the development of the concept.

While it is evident that, as a whole, theories and theorists operating at the interface between language and pedagogy are central to the production of knowledge within both ER and ALS RA genre, there are distinct intertextual patterns and linkages which were developed in the two disciplines when writers are incorporating Decolonial theory in the context of these special issue publications. Writers in ER are more likely to draw on authors and sources from what are considered Decolonial and post-colonial focused studies. Writers in ALS seem to rely more heavily on internally generated disciplinary knowledge and experts from within the ALS field. This points to the possibility that ALS, as a discipline, operates in such a way that knowledge production prioritises disciplinary convention over ‘inter-disciplinarity’. Specifically, the

concept of ‘translanguaging’ stands out as highly utilised and influential in the ALS data, and may represent more rigid disciplinary constraints within ALS.

Translanguaging has become a popular concept in socio- and applied linguistics and most often is used to refer to “the multiple discursive practices in which bi-lingual engage in order to make sense of their bi-lingual worlds” (Garcia & Wei 2014: 65). Theories developed around translanguaging demand a shift to the normalisation of multilingual language practices and seek to disrupt dominant language ideologies which are often rooted in classist, racist, and imperialist paradigms (Poza 2017: 103). They emphasise that language users select linguistic features generatively from a single repertoire, as opposed to moving between features of distinct languages (Wei 2011: 1225). As it has proliferated socio-linguistic discourses it has acquired a diverse range of meanings and applications including the “...innate instinct that includes monolinguals; to the performance of fluid language use that mostly pertains to bilinguals; to a bilingual pedagogy; to a theory or approach of language; and to a process of personal and social transformation.” (Jaspers 2018: 3).

Until this point I have framed the data in a way that highlights the agency of the writers both in the development of authorial voice, in the construction of (inter)disciplinarity, and in the dominance of agentive transformative concepts in data. However, a focus on transformative agency, even when it emphasises multiplicity and diversity, is often not enough to really resist social inequalities (Oostendorp forthcoming: 9). Several authors have raised concerns over the transformative power of translanguaging. For instance, Poza (2017: 103) worries that the proliferation of the term may lead to a situation in which it represents no more than repackaged code-switching, and is used mainly as a justification for language acquisition scaffolding. He highlights a situation in which the dilution of the concept may lead to translanguaging being “...reduced to a means for closing achievement disparities, thus losing questions about the broader historical hierarchies and neoliberal socioeconomic imperatives from which these disparities emerge.” (Poza 2017: 102). Jaspers (2017) raises similar concerns that the concept is undergoing a “discursive shift” (Cameron 1995 cited in Jaspers 2017: 1), whereby the term loses precise meaning as its uptake in the mainstream media and academic circles surges.

Jaspers (2017) also raises a number of arguably more serious concerns for the transformative power of translanguaging. He argues that while translanguaging literature emphasises its transformative power, the concept “...shares and reproduces a number of convictions with the monolingual authorities it criticizes.”, such as a shared confidence in the prominence of language

in pedagogical regimes through which student success is achieved and “...it is only the type of language they disagree over.” (Jaspers 2018: 5). A final concern voiced by Jaspers is that despite translanguaging’s power to uplift minority languages, its dominance in the field may lead to it becoming “...a moral imperative that disqualifies other concerns with language as beyond the pale.” (Jaspers 2018: 7). In a sense, Jaspers’ concerns have been borne out in the data of this study, where the concept of translanguaging shows a clear dominance, perhaps to the detriment of other more appropriate concepts, and where it becomes representative of how ALS interacts with the imperatives of Decoloniality.

In the context of this study, focusing solely on the agentic nature of academic writing, and specifically on citation choice patterns, would neglect the ways in which writer’s agency is constrained. The relative dominance of a concept such as translanguaging highlights the fact that despite the writer’s relative agency in navigating the contact zones which appear at the intersections of interdisciplinary discourses, they are still working within a specific and historically located (disciplinary) context, one which may limit the conceptual and theoretical reach of writers operating within them. Thus, it is important to recognise the constraints of disciplinary boundaries, and the rhetorical limits of crossing them. In fact, these disciplinary, or perhaps more appropriately in this case, the contextual and generic constraints of academic writing are evidence in this paper through my own interpretations of the data, which focus agency in the construction of authorial voice and disciplinarity.

My focus on individual agentic voice and the use of a lens which recognises agency (contact zones) in the data, I believe, is the product of three influences. Firstly, it is clear that based on the citational practices of the authors included in the study, to at least some extent, individual patterns and choices in citation practices, and thus in the construction of authorial voice, are evident. Secondly, the process of academic writing, and of successfully acquiring proficiency in academic discourse, requires a certain amount of socialisation (Kobayashi, Zappa-Hollman, & Duff 2017). Therefore, due to the prevalence of paradigms which emphasise individualistic and agentic perspectives in ALS, it is likely that I have been socialised to ‘see’ these patterns and trends, and have probably even been influenced by the data itself as I have fostered a certain familiarity with it over the course of writing this thesis. Third, the tendency to observe that, despite its dialogic qualities, a personal and unique voice, a self-as-author, exists, is likely driven by a personal desire to believe so.

The development of an authentic and authoritative authorial voice in student writing has been widely researched from many perspectives. A repetitive theme, however, is the seemingly inherent difficulty this poses. Inexperienced academic writers run the risk of exposing their inexperience "...or, even worse, [being labelled as] outsiders" (de Magalhães, Cotterall, Mideroscand 2018: 3). Often, students are expected to not only to develop a unique voice, but one that is infused with their personal identity (Ivanić 1998). Thus, the pressure, and resultant effort, to develop a unique and individual authorial voice as a student would predispose me to 'finding' it in the work of established authors in order to affirm that it does, in fact, exist, and that the pursuit to develop an authoritative and authentic authorial voice has not been in vein (even if it has been deeply problematic). It is thus clear, to me at least, that in the case of this thesis, the focus on authorial agency is at least in-part resultant from the constraints of my context. That is, the precariousness of being a student, and the desire to counteract that precariousness by 'conforming' to dominant paradigms, appropriating dominant (agentive) discourses, and finding the reassuring (but still personally illusive) traces of authentic voice in my data.

5.4 Authorial Agency AND Contextual Constraints

Ultimately, what the data shows is the importance of recognising both authorial agency and the constraints in which writers operate when constructing authorial voice and navigating disciplinary boundaries. Disciplinary contexts (and constraints) and intertextual linkages are crucial for the existence of authorial agency, as a writer cannot write without a context to operate in, or in some cases against. They exist in a dialectic relationship (Oostendorp forthcoming: 18). In terms of voice, to discursively construct an authorial voice, a writer must create explicit and rhetorically significant intertextual linkages by negotiating self-representation through the constraints and conventions of their context. Thus, the dialogic nature of texts is a necessary condition for the construction of a personal authorial voice and self-representation in a text, but an extreme or exclusive focus on the socially constructed nature of voice may obscure authorial agency in the construction of a text (Brown 2015: 8). It is necessary to acknowledge that, especially as it relates to authorial identity, "...voice-related experiences are multilayered and must be viewed from a variety of perspectives. That is, they are not simply stories of cultural or rhetorical imposition." (Hirvela & Belcher 2001: 86)

In terms of disciplinary construction, writers must make choices about which communities to align with (Hyland 2008: 6), and the degree to which they conform or resist the conventions of these communities. Writers working in academic contact zones, such as those created when many

disciplinary traditions meet and sometimes clash, need to create and implement innovative and novel ways to negotiate rhetorical boundaries. Authorial agency is obviously required in these contexts, where new rhetorical and intertextual pathways must be forged, and disparate research traditions must be brought into conversation in novel ways. Despite the agentive nature of the contact zone, they are also places where disciplinary constraints may be magnified. In the data, this is demonstrated by the prominence of internally generated knowledge in ALS, specifically the utilisation of translanguaging, despite concerns over its transformative limits and individually agentive nature.

5.5 Limitations and Recommendations

Due to the scope and size of this thesis, there are some methodological and theoretical limitations, the most important of which is the limited extent to which this thesis was able to explore the relationship between the dominant theoretical tenets within the data (namely translanguaging and critical pedagogy) and Decolonial theory. Understanding how these theories and practices may work with or against each other in the context of South African education will surely yield useful insights in the continuing struggle for epistemic and material access in education.

Chief among the methodological limitations is the exclusion of ethnographic data. Hyland's (1999) inclusion of interview data from participants writing within the disciplinary traditions that he examined, added rich insight into writer choice in terms of citation, and shed light on the reasons for these choices. For instance, Hyland was able to expand his understanding of the epistemological orientations of disciplines by looking at the ways that participants viewed their role as researchers (Hyland 1999: 352). Similarly, Peng (2019: 16) was able to give more detailed insights into the reasons for writers' citational choices and was thus able to better justify her conclusions in terms what citation forms indicate about the construction of authorial voice.

Ethnographic data could also contribute significantly by focusing on reader perspective. This is especially important in terms of the discursive construction of authorial voice. Viewing voice as dialogic, and thus the result of co-constructed meaning, it is important to acknowledge the role played by readers in the construction of authorial voice (Tardy 2012: 40). This is especially important as the social context of the reader and the reader's impressions are an important aspect in the identification of authorial voice within a text (Tardy 2012: 40). Burgess and Ivanič (2010 cited in Tardy 2012: 40) note the critical importance of reader perspective in the construction of voice, as they change depending on the discourses and possibilities of selfhood available to the

reader (Tardy 2012: 40). If the identities assigned by the writer to the audience do not align with those of actual readers, the writer's intentions in terms of the construction of voice may be subverted (Tardy 2012: 40).

There are also many other ways of quantifying and analysing the use of citation that would contribute to a fuller understanding of citation practices in the sub-genre focused on in the current study. For instance, analysing the reporting structures and chosen reporting verbs can tell us much about the discursive construction of both disciplinarity (Hyland 1999) and authorial voice (Peng 2019). There are many taxonomies that have been developed in order to achieve this, possibly the most influential of which is Thomson and Ye's (1991). This taxonomy has been successfully adapted and modified a number of times (see Buckingham & Neville 1997; Hyland 1999; Hyland 2002; and Peng 2019). Buckingham and Neville (1997) developed a model which divides citations into a number of options which account for both the integration of citations and the reporting verb types that accompany them.

Lastly, important insights can be gained not only by looking at what intertextual connections are emphasised in a text, but also those which are de-emphasised or absent. For instance, by de-emphasising intertextual relationships and intertextual cues, writers are able to avoid certain aspects of these intertextual relationships while highlighting others (Farrelly 2019: 16). Analyses which focus on which texts have not been brought into intertextual relations at crucial points of argumentations, or routinely as conventional practice (Farrelly 2019: 7), may provide important insights into the voices and texts which are obscured by the conventionalised practices and dominant ideologies in a field of research.

REFERENCES

- Ajol.info. 2020. *Perspectives In Education*. [online] Available at: <<https://www.ajol.info/index.php/pie>> [Accessed 23 May 2020].
- Alex, J. K. and Juan, A. 2017. Quality education for sustainable development: Are we on the right track? Evidence from the TIMSS 2015 study in South Africa. *Perspectives in Education*, 35(2): 1–15. doi: 10.18820/2519593X/pie.v35i2.1.
- Alfaro, M.J.M. 1996. Intertextuality: Origins and development of the concept. *Atlantis*, 18(1-2): 268-285.
- Atkinson, D. 2008. Writing for publication/writing for public execution: On the (personally) vexing notion of (personal) voice. In C, Casanave and S, Vandrick (eds.). *Writing for Scholarly Publication: Behind the Scenes in Language Education*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: 189-210.
- Bakhtin, M.M. 1981. *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.
- Bagwasi, M.M. 2015. Book Review: Multilingual universities in South Africa: Reflecting society in higher education. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 16(1-2): 173-180. doi: 10.1080/14664208.2014.992195.
- Batyi, T. T. 2018. Multilingual glossaries: a solution for epistemological access in higher education. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 52(2): 50–76. doi: 10.4314/jlt.v52i2.3.
- Bentley, L. 1999. A Brief Biography of Paulo Freire. *Pedagogy and Theatre of the Oppressed, Inc.* 2020. [online] Available at: <<https://ptoweb.org/aboutpto/a-brief-biography-of-paulo-freire/>> [Accessed 7 May 2020].
- Bloch, J. and Chi, L. 1995. A comparison of the use of citations in Chinese and English academic discourse. In D, Belcher & G, Braine (eds.), *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex: 231-274.
- Blogs.sun.ac.za. 2020. *Prof Jonathan Jansen | Inaugural Lectures*. [online] Available at: <<https://blogs.sun.ac.za/inaugural-lectures/event/prof-jonathan-jansen/>> [Accessed 07 May 2020].

- Blommaert, J. 2008. Bernstein and poetics revisited: voice, globalization and education. *Discourse & Society*, 19(4): 425-451.
- Brett, P. 1994. A genre analysis of the results section of sociology articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 13: 47–59.
- Bronx Community College. 2020. *Parmegiani, Andrea – Bronx Community College*. [online] Available at: <<http://www.bcc.cuny.edu/employees/parmegiani-andrea/>> [Accessed 08 May 2020].
- Brown, D. 2015. *Writing to be Heard: Authorial Voice in the Written Discourse of Chinese International Students* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation or master's thesis). University of Tasmania, Tasmania.
- Buka, A. M., Matiwane-Mcengwa, N. F. and Molepo, M. 2017. Sustaining good management practices in public schools: Decolonising principals' minds for effective schools, *Perspectives in Education*. 35(2): 99–111. doi: 10.18820/2519593X/pie.v35i2.8.
- Buckingham, J. and Neville, M. 1997. A model of citation options. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 20(2): 51-66.
- Businessstech.co.za. 2019. Minister wants to 'decolonise' education in South Africa. [online] Available at: <https://businessstech.co.za/news/lifestyle/294654/minister-wants-to-decolonise-education-in-south-africa/> [Accessed 02 December 2019].
- Calitz, T. 2018. Recognition as reparation: A participatory approach to (mis)recognition and decolonisation in South African higher education. *Educational Research for Social Change*, 7(SpecialEdition): 46–59. doi: 10.17159/2221-4070/2018/v7i0a4.
- Chaka, C., Lephahala, M. and Ngesi, N. 2017. English studies: Decolonisation, deparochialising knowledge and the null curriculum. *Perspectives in Education*, 35(2): 208–229. doi: 10.18820/2519593X/pie.v35i2.16.
- Canagarajah, S. 2002. *A Geopolitics of Academic Writing*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Canagarajah, S. 2008. A somewhat legitimate and very peripheral participation. In C, Casanave and S, Vandrick (eds.). *Writing for Scholarly Publication: Behind the Scenes in Language Education*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: 233-248.

- Canagarajah, S. 2011. Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of Translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal, Special Issue: Toward a Multilingual Approach in the Study of Multilingualism in School Contexts*, 95(3): 401-417.
- Casanave, C. 2008. Narrative braiding; Constructing a multistrand portrayal of self as writer. In C, Casanave and S, Vandrick (eds.). *Writing for Scholarly Publication: Behind the Scenes in Language Education*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: 157-174.
- Chandrasoma, R. 2010. *Academic writing and interdisciplinarity*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Christie, P. and Collins, C. 1982. Bantu Education: Apartheid ideology or labour reproduction? *Comparative Education*, 18(1): 59–75. doi: 10.1080/0305006820180107.
- Cishe, E. N. 2017. Teachers’ perspectives on transforming teacher education curriculum for relevance to basic education for sustainable development. *Perspectives in Education*, 35(2): 73–84. doi: 10.18820/2519593X/pie.v35i2.6.
- Cook, G. 2015. Birds out of dinosaurs: The death and life of applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 36(4): 425-433.
- Constitutionhill.org.za. 2020. *The Constitution of South Africa – Constitution Hill*. [online] Available at: <<https://www.constitutionhill.org.za/pages/the-constitution-of-south-africa>> [Accessed 8 May 2020].
- Costandius, E., Blackie, M., Nell, I., Malgas, R., Alexander, N., Setati, E. and Mckay, M 2018. #FeesMustFall and decolonising the curriculum: Stellenbosch University students’ and lecturers’ reactions. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 32(2): 65–85. doi: 10.20853/32-2-2435.
- Davids, M. N. 2018. Ideology critique as decolonising pedagogy: Urban forced removals as a case study. *Educational Research for Social Change*, 7(SpecialEdition): 6–30. doi: 10.17159/2221-4070/2018/v7i0a2.
- Davies, A. 2007. *An introduction to applied linguistics: From practice to theory*, 2nd Edition. Wilts, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Davies, M. and Devlin, M. 2010. Interdisciplinary Higher Education: Perspectives and Practicalities. *International Perspectives on Higher Education Research*, 5: 3–28.

- de Bot, K. 2015. *A history of applied linguistics: From 1980 to the present*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- de Landsheere, G. 1985. History of educational research. In T. Husen & T.N. Postlethwaite (eds). *International Encyclopedia of Education*, Vol 3. Oxford, United Kingdom: Pergamon Press. 1588-1596.
- de Magalhães, M. B. , Cotterall, S., Miderosc, D. 2018. Identity, voice and agency in two EAL doctoral writing contexts. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, [online] Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2018.05.001>> [Accessed 03 March 2020].
- Department of Education (Republic of South Africa). 2002. *The Language Policy for Higher Education*. Pretoria: Government Press.
- Dhet.gov.za. 2020. Department Of Higher Education And Training - Aboutusnew. [online] Available at: <<http://www.dhet.gov.za/SitePages/AboutUsNew.aspx>> [Accessed 10 May 2020].
- Duku, N. and Salami, I. A. 2017. The relevance of the school governance body to the effective decolonisation of education in South Africa. *Perspectives in Education*, 35(2):112–125. doi: 10.18820/2519593X/pie.v35i2.9.
- Elbow, P. 2007. Voice in writing again: embracing contraries. *College English*, 70: 168–88.
- Ersc.nmmu.ac.za. 2020. *Educational Research for Social Change*. [online] Available at: <<http://ersc.nmmu.ac.za/index.php?id=1>> [Accessed 23 May 2020].
- Fairclough, N. 2006. *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Farnia, M., Bagheri, Z. and Saeedi, M. 2018. Comparative citation analysis of Applied Linguistics research articles' introductions. *Brno Studies in English*, 44(1): 27-43.
- Farrelly, M. 2019. Rethinking intertextuality in CDA. *Critical Discourse Studies*. doi: 10.1080/17405904.2019.1609538
- Fataar, A. 2018. Decolonising education in South Africa: Perspectives and debates', *Educational Research for Social Change*, 7(SpecialEdition): vi–ix.
- Foucault, M. 1981. The order of discourse. In R. Young (ed.). *Untying the Text*. New York: Routledge.

- Foucault, M. 1988. Technologies of the Self. in: L.H. Martin, H. Guttman, and P. Miller (eds.), *Technologies of the Self*. Amhurst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Fowler, J. H. and Aksnes, D. W. 2007. Does self-citation pay? *Scientometrics*, 72 (3):427-437. doi: 10.1007/s11192-007-1777-2
- Fomunyam, K. G. 2017. Decolonising the future in the untransformed present in South African higher education. *Perspectives in Education*, 35(2): 168–180. doi: 10.18820/2519593X/pie.v35i2.13.
- Fomunyam, K. G. and Teferra, D. 2017. Curriculum responsiveness within the context of decolonisation in South African higher education. *Perspectives in Education*, 35(2): 196–207. doi: 10.18820/2519593X/pie.v35i2.15.
- Francis, S. and Hardman, J. 2018. #RhodesMustFall: Using social media to “decolonise” learning spaces for South African higher education institutions: A cultural historical activity theory approach. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 32(4): 66–80. doi: 10.20853/32-4-2584.
- Franczak, K. 2016. The circulation of knowledge in public discourse: Between ‘popularization’ and ‘populization’. *Polish Sociological Review*, 1(193): 19-32.
- Frantz, F. 1965. *Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Weidenfield. [online] Available at: <<http://abahlali.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/Frantz-Fanon-The-Wretched-of-the-Earth-1965.pdf>> [Accessed 03 November 2019].
- Freire.org. 2020. *Paulo Freire - Freire Institute*. [online] Available at: <<https://www.freire.org/paulo-freire/>> [Accessed 8 May 2020].
- Garcia, O. & Wei, L. 2014. *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism, and Education*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- García, O. 2020. *Ofelia García*. [online] Available at: <<https://ofeliagarcia.org/>> [Accessed 11 May 2020].
- García, O. and Wei, Li. 2014. *Translanguaging. Language, Bilingualism and Education*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Gc.cuny.edu. 2020. *Ofelia García*. [online] Available at: <<https://www.gc.cuny.edu/Faculty/Core-Bios/Ofelia-Garcia>> [Accessed 08 May 2020].

- Gee, J. 2008. *Social Linguistics and Literacies*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.
- Gilbert, N. 1977. Referencing as persuasion. *Social Studies of Science*, 7(1): 113-122.
- Golebiowski, Z. 2009. Prominent messages in education and applied linguistic abstracts: How do authors appeal to their prospective readers? *Journal of Pragmatics* 41(4): 753–769.
- Gov.za. 2020. *The Constitution Of The Republic Of South Africa | South African Government*. [online] Available at: <<https://www.gov.za/documents/constitution/constitution-republic-south-africa-1996-1>> [Accessed 06 May 2020].
- Groom, N. 2000. Attribution and averral revisited: Three perspectives on manifest intertextuality in academic writing. In P. Thompson (ed.), *Patterns and Perspectives: Insights into EAP Writing Practice*. Reading, UK: Centre for Applied Language Studies: 14-25.
- Grosfoguel, R. 2007. The epistemic decolonial turn. *Cultural Studies*, 21(2): 211-223.
- Hall, M., Clegg, S.R. and Sillince, J. 2008. The importance of learning to differentiate between ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ knowledge. *Communications of the IBIMA*, 6,: 67-74.
- Heleta, S. 2016. Decolonisation of higher education: Dismantling epistemic violence and Eurocentrism in South Africa. *Transformation in Higher Education*, 1(1): 1-8.
- Helms-Park, R. and Stapleton, P. 2003. Questioning the importance of individualized voice in undergraduate L2 argumentative writing: an empirical study with pedagogical implications. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(3): 245–265.
- Hes.ukzn.ac.za. 2020. *Dr Kehdinga George Fomunyam*. [online] Available at: <<http://hes.ukzn.ac.za/DrKehdingaGeorgeFomunyam.aspx>> [Accessed 8 May 2020].
- Hibbert, L. 2018. Critical language awareness as decolonising tool for a unifying ecology in teacher education in South Africa. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 52(2): 78–98. doi: 10.4314/jlt.v52i2.4.
- Hirvela, A. and Belcher, D. 2001. Coming back to voice: The multiple voices and identities of mature multilingual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10: 83-106.
- Hu, G. and Wang, G. 2014. Disciplinary and ethnolinguistic influences on citation in research article. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 14: 14- 28.

- Holmes, R. 1997. Genre analysis, and the social sciences: An investigation of the structure of research article discussion sections in three disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16, (4): 321-337.
- Hyland, K. 1999. Academic attribution: Citation and the construction of disciplinary knowledge. *Applied Linguistics*, 20(3): 341-367.
- Hyland, K. 2004. *Disciplinary discourses: Social Interaction in Academic Writing*. Michigan Classic Edition. Michigan, USA: Michigan University Press.
- Hyland, K. 2008. Disciplinary voices: Interactions in research writing. *English Text Construction*, 1(1): 5–22. doi 10.1075/etc.1.1.03hyl
- Hyland, K. 2013. Academic discourse. In K. Hyland, & B. Partridge, (eds.). *Bloomsbury Companion to Discourse Analysis*. New York: Bloomsbury. 171-184.
- Hyland, K. and Jiang, F. 2019. Points of Reference: Changing Patterns of Academic Citation. *Applied Linguistics*, 40(1): 64–85.
- Ivanić, R. 1998. Writing and identity: The discursal construction of identity in academic writing. In Street, B. and Verhoeven, L. (eds.). *Studies in Written Language and Literacy*, 5. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ivanić, R. and Camps, D. 2001. I am how I sound: Voice as self-representation in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10: 3-33.
- Jaspers, J. The transformative limits of translanguaging. *Language & Communication*, 58: 1–10.
- Johnstone, B. 2008. *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Journet, D. 1993. Interdisciplinary discourse and “boundary rhetoric”: The case of S. E. Jelliffe. *Written Communication*, 10(4): 510-541.
- Krishnan, A. 2009. What are academic disciplines?: Some observations on the disciplinarity vs. interdisciplinarity debate. *ESRC National Centre for Research Methods NCRM Working Paper Series*, 3(9): 1-57.
- Kobayashi, M., Zappa-Hollman, S., and Duff P.A. 2017. Academic Discourse Socialization In P.A. Duff & S. May (eds.). *Language Socialization, Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-02255-0_18

- Kubota, R. 2008. Striving for original voice in publication?: A critical reflection. In C, Casanave and S, Vandrick (eds.). *Writing for Scholarly Publication: Behind the Scenes in Language Education*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: 73-86.
- Kunnie, J. 2020. *Kunnie On Biko, 'I Write What I Like: Selected Writings'* | H-Safrica | H-Net. [online] Available at: <<https://networks.h-net.org/node/10670/reviews/11141/kunnie-biko-i-write-what-i-selected-writings>> [Accessed 7 May 2020].
- Lesic-Thomas, A. 2005. Behind Bakhtin: Russian formalism and Kristeva's Intertextuality', *Paragraph*, 28(3): 1-20.
- Lim, J. 2011. 'Paving the way for research findings': Writers' rhetorical choices in education and applied linguistics. *Discourse Studies*, 13(6): 725–749.
- Madiba, M. 2014. Promoting concept literacy through multilingual glossaries. A translanguaging approach. In Hibbert, L. & van der Walt, C. Eds. *Multilingual Universities in South Africa: Reflecting society in higher education*. Bristol U.K.: Multilingual Matters: 88-106.
- Mahlomaholo, S. and Payi, M. 2017. Education for sustainable development in the era of decolonisation and transformation. *Perspectives in Education*, 35(2): vii–xi.
- Makalela, L. 2018. "Our academics are intellectually colonised": Multi-languaging and Fees Must Fall. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 36(1): 1–11. doi: 10.2989/16073614.2018.1452877.
- Makalela, L. 2020. *Biography | Leketi Makalela*. [online] Available at: <<http://www.leketimakalela.co.za/biography.php>> [Accessed 11 May 2020].
- Maldonado-Torres, N. 2011. Thinking through the decolonial turn: Post-continental interventions in theory, philosophy and critique: An introduction. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*: 1-15.
- Malebese, M. L. 2017. A socially inclusive teaching strategy for transforming the teaching of English first additional language. *Perspectives in Education*, 35(2): 16–29. doi: 10.18820/2519593X/pie.v35i2.2.
- Mampane, M. R. 2017. Resilience of the socio-educational afterschool and community intervention drop-in centre'. *Perspectives in Education*, 35(2): 126–141. doi: 10.18820/2519593X/pie.v35i2.10.

- Mansourizadeh, K. and Ahmad, U.K. 2011. Citation practices among non-native expert and novice scientific writers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 10(3): 152-161.
- Martel, M. 2020. *Nelson Maldonado-Torres, Ph.D.* [online] Available at: <https://latcar.rutgers.edu/people/core-faculty/52-nelson-maldonado-torres> [Accessed 8 May 2020].
- Maseko, P. B. N. 2017. Codification, meritocracy and performativity: Debilitating factors for black pre-service teachers'. *Perspectives in Education*, 35(2): 181–195. doi: 10.18820/2519593X/pie.v35i2.14.
- Matsuda, P. K. 2001. Voice in Japanese written discourse: Implications for second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(1-2): 35-53.
- Matsuda, P. K. and Tardy, C. M. 2007. Voice in academic writing: The rhetorical construction of author identity in blind manuscript review. *English for Specific Purposes*, 26(2); 235-249.
- Mayaba, N. N. 2018. A reflection on language politics at Nelson Mandela University. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 36(1): 49–57. doi: 10.2989/16073614.2018.1452881.
- Mbembe, A. *Decolonizing knowledge and the question of the archive.* [online] Available at: <https://wiser.wits.ac.za/system/files/Achille%20Mbembe%20-%20Decolonizing%20Knowledge%20and%20the%20Question%20of%20the%20Archive.pdf> [Accessed 08 May 2020].
- Meurer, J. 2015. Achille Mbembe “Decolonizing Knowledge And The Question Of The Archive”. [online] *TRAFO – Blog for Transregional Research*. [online] Available at: <https://trafo.hypotheses.org/2413> [Accessed 17 May 2020].
- Mishra, S., Fegley, B.D., Diesner, J. and Torvik, V.I. 2018. Self-citation is the hallmark of productive authors, of any gender. *Plos One*. [online] Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0195773> [Accessed 02 December 2019].
- Mkhize, D. 2018. The language question at a historically Afrikaans university: Access and social justice issues. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 36(1): 13–24. doi: 10.2989/16073614.2018.1452878.

- Moodly, A. L. and Toni, N. M. 2017. Re-imagining higher education leadership – in conversation with South African female deputy vice-chancellors. *Perspectives in Education*, 35(2): 155–167. doi: 10.18820/2519593x/pie.v35i2.12.
- Motinyane, M. 2018. A textual analysis of the African language expressions used during the #RhodesMustFall campaign. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 36(1): 37–48. doi: 10.2989/16073614.2018.1457269.
- Mignolo, W. 2011. Epistemic disobedience and the decolonial option: A manifesto. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*: 44-66.
- Msila, V. 2007. From Apartheid Education to Revised National Curriculum Statement: Pedagogy for Identity Formation and Nation Building in South Africa. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 16(2): 146–160.
- Mutekwe, E. 2017. Unmasking the ramifications of the fees-must-fall-conundrum in higher education institutions in South Africa: A critical perspective. *Perspectives in Education*, 35(2): 142–154. doi: 10.18820/2519593X/pie.v35i2.11.
- Mwaniki, M. 2018. South African higher education language politics post #RhodesMustFall: The terrain of advanced language politics. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 36(1): 25–36. doi: 10.2989/16073614.2018.1452880.
- Mwaniki, M., van Reenen, D. and Makalela, L. 2018. Advanced language politics in South African higher education post #RhodesMustFall'. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 36(1): iii–v. doi: 10.2989/16073614.2018.1452876.
- Nationalgovernment.co.za. 2020. *Council On Higher Education (CHE) - Overview*. [online] Available at: <<https://nationalgovernment.co.za/units/view/90/council-on-higher-education-che>> [Accessed 07 May 2020].
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. 2015. Decoloniality as the Future of Africa. *History Compass*, 13(10): 485–496. doi: 10.1111/hic3.12264.
- Neo Maseko, P. B. 2018. Transformative praxis through critical consciousness: A conceptual exploration of a decolonial access with success agenda. *Educational Research for Social Change*, 7(SpecialEdition): 78–90. doi: 10.17159/2221-4070/2018/v7i0a6.

- News24. 2019. *Decolonisation articles on News24*. [online] Available at: <https://www.news24.com/Tags/Topics/decolonisation> [Accessed 12 November 2019].
- News.mandela.ac.za. 2020. *Award for article on decolonisation - News*. [online] Available at: <https://news.mandela.ac.za/News/Award-for-article-on-decolonisation> [Accessed 10 May 2020].
- Ngcobo, S. 2018. Translanguaging in summarizing skills: the need to develop biliterate students. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 52(2): 26–48. doi: 10.4314/jlt.v52i2.2.
- Norgaard, R. 1999. Negotiating expertise in disciplinary “contact zones”. *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines*, 3(2): 44-63/
- Ali Nouri, A. and Seyed, M.S. 2014. Emancipatory pedagogy in practice: Aims, principles and curriculum orientation. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 5(2): 76-87.
- Ojo, O. A. and Adu, E. O. 2017. Transformation of teaching quality in secondary school education: Teachers’ conception. *Perspectives in Education*, 35(2): 60–72. doi: 10.18820/2519593X/pie.v35i2.5.
- Oostendorp, M. In press. Linguistic citizenship and non-citizens: Of utopias and dystopias. In Q. Williams, A. Deumert, and M. Tommaso. (eds.). *Multilingualism and Linguistic Citizenship: Education, Narrative and Episteme*. Multilingual Matters.
- Ozturk, I. 2007. The textual organisation of research article introductions in applied linguistics: Variability within a single discipline. *English for Specific Purposes*, 26: 25–38.
- Parmegiani, A. 2018. Linking mother tongue and English academic literacy courses for epistemic access. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 52(2): 1–24. doi: 10.4314/jlt.v52i2.1.
- Peng, J. 2019. Authorial voice constructed in citation in literature reviews of doctoral theses: Variations across training contexts. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 37: 11-21.
- Petrić, B. 2012. Legitimate textual borrowing: Direct quotation in L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(2): 102-117.
- Pho, P.D. 2008. Creating a theoretical framework: On the move structure of theoretical framework sections in research articles related to language and linguistics. *Discourse Studies*, 10(2): 231–250.

- Poza, L. 2017. Translanguaging: Definitions, Implications, and Further Needs in Burgeoning Inquiry. *Berkeley Review of Education*, 6(2): 101-128. doi:10.5070/B86110060.
- Pickard, V. 1995. Citing previous writers: What can we say instead of 'Say'? *Hong Kong Papers in Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 18: 89-102.
- Pratt, L. 1991. Arts of the Contact Zone. *Profession*, 1: 33-40.
- Qhosola, M. R. 2017. Enhancing the teaching and learning of auditing: The case for descriptive feedback. *Perspectives in Education*, 35(2): 30-44. doi: 10.18820/2519593X/pie.v35i2.3.
- Ramanathan, V. and Atkinson, D. 1999. Individualism, academic writing, and ESL writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(1): 45-75.
- Ramogale, M. 2019. Decolonise the curriculum for global relevance. [online] *The M&G Online*. Available at: <<https://mg.co.za/article/2019-06-26-00-decolonise-the-curriculum-for-global-relevance>> [Accessed 12 November 2020].
- Rashid, Y., Waseem, A., Akbar, A.A. and Azam, F. 2019. Value co-creation and social media: A systematic literature review using citation and thematic analysis. *European Business Review*, 31(5): 761-784.
- Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. 2011. In J. Simpson. (ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Rowbottom, D.P. and Aitston, S.J. 2006. The myth of 'scientific method' in contemporary educational research. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 40(2): 137-156.
- Rubinsein, C.V. 2018. Book Review: *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*, by Ofelia García and Li Wei (2014). Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, U.K, 165 pages. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, 11(1): 85-95.
- Salami, I. A. and Okeke, C. I. O. 2017. Transformation and decolonisation of mathematics education for sustainable development: A case study of its learning trend in Nigeria. *Perspectives in Education*, 35(2): 45–59. doi: 10.18820/2519593X/pie.v35i2.4.
- SAALT | SAVTO. 2020. *Submit A Paper*. [online] Available at: <<http://www.saalt.org.za/submit-a-paper.html>> [Accessed 23 May 2020].

- SAALT. 2020. *Guidelines for Authors*. [online] Available at: <http://www.saalt.org.za/uploads/5/9/1/3/59135321/saalt_journal_guidelines_for_authors_version_2_.pdf> [Accessed 23 May 2020].
- Samraj, B. 2005. An exploration of genre set: Research article abstracts and introductions in two disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24: 141–156.
- Schmitt, N. and Celce-Murcia, M. 2010. An Overview of Applied Linguistics. In N. Schmitt (ed.). *An Introduction of Applied Linguistics*, 2nd Edition. London, UK: Hodder & Stoughton: 1-18.
- Seehawer, M. 2018. South African science teachers' strategies for integrating indigenous and western knowledges in their classes: Practical lessons in decolonisation. *Educational Research for Social Change*, 7(SpecialEdition): 91–110. doi: 10.17159/2221-4070/2018/v7i0a7.
- Sesanti, S. 2018. Teaching ancient Egyptian philosophy (ethics) and history: Fulfilling a quest for a decolonised and Afrocentric education. *Educational Research for Social Change*, 7(SpecialEdition): 1–15. doi: 10.17159/2221-4070/2018/v7i0a1.
- Shema, H. 2012. On Self-Citation. *Scientific American*. [online] Available at: <<https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/information-culture/on-self-citation/>> [Accessed 08 November 2019]
- Shuy, R.W., 2015. Applied linguistics past and future. *Applied Linguistics*, 36(4): 434-443.
- Simpson, J. 2011. Introduction: Applied linguistics in the contemporary world. In J. Simpson. (eds.). *Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. New York, NY: Routledge: 1-9.
- Stapleton, P. 2002. Critiquing voice as a viable pedagogical tool in L2 writing: returning the spotlight to ideas. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 11(3): 177–190.
- Stapleton, P. and Helms-Park, R. 2008. 'A response to Matsuda and Tardy's "Voice in academic writing: The rhetorical construction of author identity in blind manuscript review"'. *English for Specific Purposes*, 2794–99.
- Swales, J. M. 1990. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Tardy, C. M. 2012. Current conceptions of voice. In K. Hyland, & C. Sancho-Guinda (eds.). *Stance and Voice in Written Academic Genres*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan. 34-48.
- Tardy, C. M. and Matsuda, P. K. 2009. The construction of author voice by editorial board members. *Written Communication*, 26(1): 32-52.
- Taylor, G. and Chen, T. 1991. Linguistic, cultural and subcultural issues in contrastive discourse analysis: Anglo–American and Chinese scientific texts. *Applied Linguistics*, 12: 319–336.
- Taylor, P.C. and Medina, M.N.D. 2013. Educational research paradigms: From positivism to multiparadigmatic. *Journal for Meaning-Centered Education*, 1: 1-16.
- Thomson, P. 2012. Achieving a voice of authority in PhD theses. In K. Hyland and C. Sancho-Guinda (eds.). *Stance and Voice in Written Academic Genre*, 119-133. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Thompson, G. and Ye, Y. 1991. Evaluation in the reporting verbs used in academic papers. *Applied Linguistics*, 12(4): 365-382.
- Tlali, M. F. 2017. Creating sustainable physical sciences learning environments: A case for decolonised and transformative learning. *Perspectives in Education*, 35(2): 85–98. doi: 10.18820/2519593X/pie.v35i2.7.
- Tseng, M. 2018. Creating a theoretical framework: On the move structure of theoretical framework sections in research articles related to language and linguistics. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 33: 82-99.
- Us and DBE. 2020. *About DBE*. Education.gov.za. [online] Available at: <<https://www.education.gov.za/AboutUs/AboutDBE.aspx>> [Accessed 9 May 2020].
- Uwc.ac.za. 2020. *Professor Jonathan Jansen*. [online] Available at: <<https://www.uwc.ac.za/Chancellor%20Award/Pages/Professor-Jonathan-Jansen.aspx>> [Accessed 11 May 2020].
- van Reenen, D. 2018. Communicative rationality in conflicted language ecologies post #RhodesMustFall at the University of the Free State. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 36(1): 59–71. doi: 10.2989/16073614.2018.1452883.

- Waghid, Z. and Hibbert, L. 2018. Decolonising preservice teachers' colonialist thoughts in higher education through defamiliarisation as a pedagogy. *Educational Research for Social Change*, 7(SpecialEdition): 60–77. doi: 10.17159/2221-4070/2018/v7i0a5.
- Walton, E. 2018. Decolonising (Through) Inclusive Education ? *Educational Research for Social Change*, 7(June): 31–45. doi: 10.17159/2221-4070/2018/v7i2a3.
- wa Thiong'o. 2020. ABOUT. [online] Available at: <<https://ngugiwathiongo.com/about/>> [Accessed 08 May 2020].
- Wei, L. 2011. Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5): 1222–1235. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.035
- Webbstock, D. 2017. Decolonising the curriculum: stimulating debate: a deep re-examination of current hegemonies. *Briefly Speaking*, Council on High, 3(3): 1–12.
- Wikipedia contributors. 2019. Decolonization of higher education in South Africa. In Wikipedia, *The Free Encyclopedia*. [online] Available at: <https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Decolonization_of_higher_education_in_South_Africa&oldid=895011222> [Accessed 20 December 2019].
- Wildsmith-Cromarty, R. 2018. Building a knowledge base for language teaching through translanguaging. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 52(2): 100–120. doi: 10.4314/jlt.v52i2.5.
- Wilkins, D.A. 1999. Applied linguistics. In Spolsky, B. (ed.). *Concise Encyclopedia of Educational Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Elsevier: 6–17.
- Williams, C. 1994. *Arfarniad o Ddulliau Dysgu ac Addysgu yng Nghyd-destun Addysg Uwchradd Ddwylieithog*, [An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education]. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wales, Bangor.
- Williams, I. A. 1999. Results sections of medical research articles: analysis of rhetorical categories for pedagogical purposes. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18: 347–366.
- Wingfield, B. 2019. What "decolonised education" should and shouldn't mean. [online] *The Conversation*. [online] Available at: <<https://theconversation.com/what-decolonised-education-should-and-shouldnt-mean-72597>> [Accessed 12 December 2019].

Yang, R. and Allison, D. 2003. Research articles in applied linguistics: moving from results to conclusions. *English for Specific Purposes*, 22: 365–385.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A



PROJECT EXEMPT FROM ETHICS CLEARANCE

13 November 2019

Project number: GENL-2019-11690

Project title: Decoloniality, Transformation, and Epistemic Access in Academic Writing: South African Applied Language and Education Research Articles

Dear Ms Lalia Duke

Co-investigators:

Your application received on 25/09/2019 13:06 was reviewed by the REC: Humanities.

You have confirmed in the proposal submitted for review that your project does not involve the participation of human participants or the use of their data. You also confirmed that you will collect data that is freely accessible in the public domain only.

The project is, therefore, exempt from ethics review and clearance. You may commence with research as set out in the submission to the Research Ethics Committee: Humanities.

If the research deviates from the application submitted for REC clearance, especially if there is an intention to involve human participants and/or the collection of data not in the public domain, the researcher must notify the DESC/FESC and REC of these changes well before data collection commences. In certain circumstances, a new application may be required for the project.

Please remember to use your **project number** (GENL-2019-11690) on any documents or correspondence with the REC concerning your project.

Sincerely,

Clarissa

Graham

REC Coordinator: Research Ethics Committee: Human Research (Humanities)