# The Pedagogic Potential of the Appraisal Framework in teaching Dissertation Writing

Karin Whiteside





**"Discourses are tools – they do things.** That is why they have evolved and thus **their functionality determines their character"** (Martin, 1993, p221)

e.g. in the Methods section:

- a precise, replicable account of tools, participants, processes & sequences
- justification of methodological choices

language

purpose

e.g.

- " "A questionnaire was developed ..."
- "The survey sample was composed of three groups …"
- "When ..., During ..., After ..., In the second stage ..."
- "In order to obtain ..."
- "Since .... It was important to ..."
- "Despite the fact that two projects were added some years later, the ... situation in Sweden was similar during these years."



Figure 1.18 An overview of appraisal resources

Martin & White (2005, p38)



**N.B.** "It is important to note that, in the genre examined, the identification of a span of text as one of the three options (**Distance**, **Acknowledge**, and **Endorse**) was not as easy and explicit as one can identify in Martin & White's (2005) examples which seem to function mainly by reference to the reporting verbs." (Geng, 2015, p120)

#### How procurement options influence risk management in construction projects

#### EKATERINA OSIPOVA1\* and PER ERIK ERIKSSON2

<sup>1</sup>Department of Civil, Environmental and Natural Resources Engineering, Luleå University of Technology, Luleå, Sweden

<sup>2</sup>Department of Business Administration and Social Sciences, Lulea University of Technology, Lulea, Sweden

Received 7 April 2011; accepted 6 November 2011

Before proceeding with a project, a client has to choose an appropriate procurement option that facilitates an effective project organization in general and a thorough risk management process in particular. By identifying three procurement variables that have a major influence on risk management: project delivery method, form of payment, and use of collaboration or partnering arrangements, the effect of each variable is studied. An exploratory study and a series of interviews with clients, contractors and consultants involved in 11 Swedish construction projects, were performed in order to examine how risk management was carried out in each project. Irrespective of the procurement option, many projects suffered from variations in cost affecting one or more actors. Risk management was not carried out systematically throughout project phases. However, in the projects with early involvement of the actors, their participation throughout the project, and opportunities for open dialogue and collaboration, a more thorough risk management process was found. While project delivery methods define formal risk allocation, the use of incentives and collaboration or partnering arrangements help to establish a collaborative approach to risk management.

Keywords: Contract conditions, partnering, payment, procurement, risk management.

The production phase was where most interest and activity related to RM were found. **RM** activity highest in These results confirm the findings of <u>two surveys (Uher and Toakley, 1999; Lyons and</u> production Skitmore, 2004), which show a higher degree of RM in the production phase than in the phase early phase. Unfortunately, this can easily prove to be too late to manage some risks, Finding including those design risks that might have been avoided in an earlier phase. The supports outcomes of majority of respondents feel that RM should be more important in the early phases for previous several reasons. First, early risk identification makes the client aware of project risks and research

of the actors can therefore contribute to more thorough RM.

Most of the respondents see risk as a negative event that can affect the project and cause problems. Only a few people mentioned opportunity as the converse of risk. This confirms the results of a study by Akintoye and MacLeod (1997), which show negative perception of risk among practitioners. Furthermore, when describing their work on project risks, the actors often say 'contractor's risk management' and 'client's risk management'. 'Joint risk management' where all actors participate and perform identification, assessment and response together is a weakness in the current practice. This is probably a result of

Generally, negative perception of risk Finding supports outcomes of previous research Competent clients may favour general contracts partly because the cost may be lower and partly because they want to have a higher degree of influence on the project. However, general contracts often result in a sequential construction process where many actors are involved in some project phases and focus on their own part of the work rather than on the whole project. In particular, a general contract without any collaboration arrangement gives no space for discussion about technical solutions between the client's design team and the contractor. Moreover, non-participation of the architect in the production phase brings additional design risks that the contractor must deal with. When a general contract with fixed price form of payment is used, a strong focus on financial aspects prevents actors from seeking collaboration. In the case where neither partnering or collaboration arrangements nor incentive schemes exist, the actors concentrate on formal risk allocation through the contract and shift risks to each other in an attempt to optimize their own profits. In order to strengthen contractors' contributions to technical solutions and RM in early project phases in GC, key contractors can become involved at that early stage. This study also supports previous research that highlights the benefits of coupling early involvement with partnering arrangements and incentive-based payments (Bayliss et al., 2004; Alderman and Ivory, 2007) in order to further enhance a project environment based on trust and joint commitment on which a thorough RM can rely.



#### Change management in practice: an ethnographic study of changes to contract requirements on a hospital project

Rout Televial

#### CLARE SHIPTON\*, WILL HUGHES and DYLAN TUTT

School of Construction Management and Engineering, University of Reading, PO Box 219, Reading, RG6 6AW, UK

Received 4 November 2013; accepted 10 April 2014

Changes to client requirements are inevitable during construction. Industry discourse is concerned with minimizing and controlling changes. However, accounts of practices involved in making changes are rare. In response to calls for more research into working practices, an ethnographic study of a live hospital project was undertaken to explore how changes are made. A vignette of a meeting exploring the investigation of changes illustrates the issues. This represents an example from the ethnographic fieldwork, which produced many observations. There was a strong emphasis on using change management procedures contained within the contract to investigate changes, even when it was known that the change was not required. For the practitioners, this was a way of demonstrating best practice, transparent and accountable decision-making regarding changes. Hence, concerns for following procedures sometimes overshadowed considerations about whether or not a change was required to improve the functionality of the building. However, the procedures acted as boundary objects between the communities of practice involved on the project by coordinating the work of managing changes. Insights suggest how contract procedures facilitate and impede the making of changes, which can inform policy guidance and contract drafting.

Keywords: Best practice, change management, ethnography, practice, project management.

#### Extract 1

... in the meeting the implications of the change in terms of potentially improving the functionality of the building are not discussed. Instead the focus of the discussions and actions to progress the potential changes is on demonstrating compliance and providing cost estimates. In the existing change literature and guidance, cost is judged as one of the key factors in decision-making about changes (e.g. Zou and Lee, 2008). By providing the client-side with the cost implications, the individuals in the contractor team are performing their role in advising the client of 'the implications' of the change. This information can then allow the client-side to reject and 'close out' the potential change and demonstrate that the decision has been informed by the cost implications and the fact that the current design is deemed to be compliant. By reproducing discourses concerned with minimizing and controlling changes, potential changes are being investigated in a way that emphasizes demonstrating best practice and accountability while the content and relevance of the potential change are often overlooked. ...

<u>Teacher's note</u>: Negative stance towards Zou & Lee (2008) – we can tell this from the arguments in the first and last sentences of the extract where the authors point out the important things being overlooked in prioritising cost (and from the generally critical stance towards the existing change literature throughout this article).

Focus on cost implications of change at expense of attention to impact of change on functionality In existing literature cost prioritised Costprioritising discourse from lit. reproduced in real-word scenario This means the content & relevance of change not given adequate attention

#### Extract 2

... The reality of projects and project management practice takes place 'within an array of social agenda, practices, stakeholder relations, politics and power' (Winter et al., 2006, p. 642). The existing change literature does not acknowledge the organizational context in which managing changes takes place as arguably no other study has looked close enough to see beneath the veneer of the everyday practices of using the contract procedures to understand the purposes that they sometimes fulfil. ...

Context is important

Existing change literature ignores context

<u>Teacher's note</u>: The authors neutrally report the argument of Winter et al. (2006) but are then negative about the body of change literature as a whole, and their particular criticism, that it 'does not acknowledge the organizational context', shows us they have a positive stance towards Winter et al.'s position.

### Your Discussion section as a dialogue ...



@ Will Hugher 2015

What you are doing in your Discussion can be thought of as joining a conversation: think of past scholarly contributions (research, theorising) as part of an ongoing, live debate about the issue in focus – you are now contributing by discussing your findings in relation to theirs.



These are some of the things you will be doing when you join this academic dialogue:

DISTANCING yourself from someone else's position.

DENYING someone else's position.

COUNTERING someone else's argument with an alternative position.

ACKNOWLEDING someone else's position (N.B. neutral - neither positive or negative)

CONCURRING: acknowledging a shared position with members of your academic community.

**ENDORSING** the arguments of others with your own findings.

**PRONOUNCING:** presenting your own position strongly (i.e. as if there is no alternative possibility).

ENTERTAINING a position (as one possibility of many).



Martin & White (2005, p134)

Adapted from Geng (2015)

The production phase <u>was</u> where most interest and activity related to RM were found. These results <u>confirm</u> the findings of two surveys (Uher and Toakley, 1999; Lyons and Skitmore, 2004), which show a higher degree of RM in the production phase than in the early phase.



ENDORSE

Most of the respondents <u>see</u> risk as a negative event that can affect the project and cause problems. Only a few people <u>mentioned</u> opportunity as the converse of risk. This <u>confirms</u> the results of a study by Akintoye and MacLeod (1997), which show negative perception of risk among practitioners.

ENDORSE

#### **ENTERTAIN**

... In the case where neither partnering or collaboration arrangements nor incentive schemes exist, the actors <u>concentrate</u> on formal risk allocation through the contract and shift risks to each other in an attempt to optimize their own profits. In order to strengthen contractors' contributions to technical solutions and RM in early project phases in GC, key contractors <u>can</u> become involved at that early stage. This study also supports previous research that highlights the benefits of coupling early involvement with partnering arrangements and incentive-based payments (Bayliss et al., 2004; Alderman and Ivory, 2007) in order to further enhance a project environment based on trust and joint commitment on which a thorough RM can rely.



#### PRONOUNCE

'Joint risk management' where all actors participate and perform identification, assessment and response together is a weakness in the current practice. This is **probably** a result of traditional procurement options that distinctly separate responsibilities and risks in time and space. When working jointly with RM based on early involvement, incentives and partnering arrangements it will **probably** become more natural to search for positive opportunities and not to focus on avoiding negative consequences.

ENTERTAIN



#### PRONOUNCE

PRONOUNCE

... in the meeting the implications of the change in terms of potentially improving the functionality of the building <u>are</u> not discussed. Instead the focus of the discussions and actions to progress the potential changes is on demonstrating compliance and providing cost estimates. In the existing change literature and guidance, cost is judged as one of the key factors in decision-making about changes (e.g. Zou and Lee, 2008). By providing the client-side with the cost implications, the individuals in the contractor team are performing their role in advising the client of 'the implications' of the change. This information can then allow the client-side to reject and 'close out' the potential change and demonstrate that the decision has been informed by the cost implications and the fact that the current design is deemed to be compliant. By reproducing discourses concerned with minimizing and controlling changes, potential changes are being investigated in a way that emphasizes demonstrating best practice and accountability while the content and relevance of the potential change are often overlooked.

DISTANCE

PRONOUNCE

COUNTER

#### CONCUR

... The reality of projects and project management practice takes place 'within an array of social agenda, practices. stakeholder relations, politics and power' (Winter et al., 2006, p. 642). The existing change literature does <u>not</u> acknowledge the organizational context in which managing changes takes place as <u>arguably</u> no other study has looked close enough to see beneath the veneer of the everyday practices of using the contract procedures to understand the purposes that they sometimes fulfil. ...

**DENY (??)** 



1. Have the dissertation writing workshops helped you? If so, how? If not, why?

Yes it was, I was orbite to know the structure of the dissertantion very deary.

2. What has been most useful or most enjoyable?



#### 3. Has anything <u>not been useful?</u> Do you have any suggestions regarding how to improve the course for future delivery of it?

### Pedagogic potential of Engagement resources? (notes, thoughts)

- A very useful framework for decisions about lesson content & design
- A powerful and well-developed model for much of what happens in the Discussion section (and Introduction, Lit Review, Conclusion)
- but, in this experiment ...
  - a bit too 'adjunct' introduced in Lesson 4 out of 5, just re: Discussion section
  - too many Appraisal options introduced all at once for students to fully digest
- Might be better to
  - introduce Appraisal options in an 'easy' form at the beginning of a dissertationwriting course
  - have a smaller cluster of Appraisal options as foci in any given lesson
- The metaphors of the framework (i.e. dialogue & expanding/contracting space for alternate viewpoints) could be usefully deployed across a research writing course
- Questions to explore re: how explicit or implicit to make the teaching of the various Appraisal options

## **References**

Martin, J. R., & White, P.R.R. (2005). The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Geng, Y. (2015). Appraisal in discussion sections of doctoral theses in the discipline of ELT/Applied Linguistics at Warwick University: A corpus-based analysis. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK.

Geng, Y. & Wharton, S. (2016). Evaluative Language in discussion sections of doctoral theses: Similarities and differences between L1 Chinese and L1 English writers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 22, pp80-91

Lamberti, P. (2013). EAL students' use of "appraisal" resources for engaging with authoritative disciplinary voices in multiple-source discussion essays. Paper presented at EATAW 2013 Conference, Budapest, Hungary