

offers three very useful ways of understanding teaching and learning or pedagogies in higher education: pedagogies of consequence (the current dominant approach); pedagogies of construction (linked to struggles for equity and justice) and pedagogies of connection (engagement). Saleem Badat, the Vice-Chancellor of Rhodes University in South Africa tackles the issues of 'League Tables'. Bluntly he says, 'No value can be attached to the SJTIHE and the THE-QS rankings. They are incapable of capturing either the meaning or the diverse qualities of a university' (136). Vincent Carpentier's chapter is a well-crafted political economic treatment of the interaction of the market, the state and higher education in the context of international student mobility. Diana Leonard and Maryam Rab share a study the use made by Pakistani women of their UK postgraduate degrees upon return home. They conclude that unless changes are made, HEIs will continue to reinforce dominant patriarchal patterns rather than do much for women and their roles in their society. Juan Carlos Barron-Pastor's chapter persuasively demonstrates the way that higher education in Mexico excludes the rich culture of the indigenous peoples. His piece illuminates and builds on what Allan Luke says earlier in the book. So what is to be done?

Melanie Walker posits a pedagogy for becoming and being richly human drawing in part on the work of Amartya Sen's lens of 'capability' and the thoughts of Paulo Freire. She underscores the emergence of a new range of global networks such as the Global University Networks for Innovation. She might well have added the Talloires Network and the Global Alliance for Community Engaged Research. Andrea Abbas and Monica McLean share a study of UK sociologists teaching approaches and make an argument that, 'It should be possible to explore the extent to which in different settings higher education is contributing to transformation in society, rather than to benefitting the already rich and comfortable' (262). Douglas Bourn and Alun Morgan make the links between the worlds of citizen's education and development education and Higher Education. Harry Brighouse in the final chapter speaks to the need of those of us who work in HEIs that continue to confer unequal benefits to the already privileged to intentionally take up an ethic of individual and collective responsibility. He feels that the liberal conception of higher education is a good starting point for this ethic.

The strengths of this book are substantial and the book fills a most useful space in the higher education literature. It should be an essential text in today's HE classrooms. The promise of the editors has been wonderfully fulfilled in the contextualising and describing of the challenge. In terms of the proverbial 'What is to be done' question, I would suggest that readers might well delve into the very rapidly expanding literature on higher education and community engagement as well as to take a look at the web sites of some of the emerging global networks such as GUNI (<http://www.guni-rmies.net>), Talloires Network (<http://www.tufts.edu/talloiresnetwork>) or the Global Alliance for Community Engaged Research ([www.communityresearchcanada.ca](http://www.communityresearchcanada.ca)).

Budd L. Hall

*University of Victoria, British Columbia, Canada*

*bhall@uvic.ca*

© 2010, Budd L. Hall

**Argumentation in higher education: improving practice through theory and research**, by Richard Andrews, New York, Routledge, 2010, 238 pp., £24.99 (paperback), ISBN 978-0-415-99501-6

*Argumentation in higher education* takes a much-needed critical approach to how argument operates in disciplines within colleges and universities. The book's main thesis is that argumentation in higher education is often neglected, marginalised, left implicit, or taken for granted. Richard

Andrews succeeds admirably in redressing this balance by placing argumentation in the centre of higher education practice and giving it the explicit and detailed attention it deserves. The book can be described as a research-based enterprise aimed at lecturers/professors in higher education, primarily in the United Kingdom and the United States. Specifically, it aims:

... to support such teachers by raising awareness of argumentation in the processes of teaching and learning, to provide theoretical and research foundations for the improvement of practice, and to supply some practical suggestions and guidance as to how this might be done. (3)

In my opinion, the book achieves these objectives, assisted by some excellent scholarship, a constructive self-reflexive approach, and a genuine engagement with the practice dimension of the topic.

New as well as previously completed/presented research in this area is discussed, with data from past research projects being revised and updated (for example, by adding new analytical perspectives) for the purposes of this book. There is an impressive range and variety of case studies/ examples from many disciplines, which will make this book invaluable to teachers within almost any university discipline. There are also useful proposed activities at the end of each chapter. These aim to raise awareness about argumentation, to be used by lecturers for academic development and can also be adapted to be used with students.

The book's original contribution to knowledge lies primarily in being able to demonstrate – in my view, very convincingly (see later) – the need for a balance between generic knowledge about argumentation in higher education and its application variously in different discipline-specific contexts. Related to this, although university teachers are the key audience for this book (and teachers' improvement of academic practice in this area is a main aim), I believe that university students would also find the book valuable, as it addresses many of the questions they typically grapple with in their effort to navigate the argumentation waters of their specific discipline. The interrelationships between the generic and the discipline-specific are at the core of these questions, but remain far from obvious within the higher education institutions most of us inhabit.

In terms of structure, perhaps the book could benefit from a clearer rationale about the division and order of the chapters included. For example, the reader may be left wondering why the discussion of essays and reports in different disciplines comes later in the book, or why discussion of multimodality is spread out in different chapters. The author does provide a rationale for these decisions, but this could be made clearer from the outset, to help readers identify relevant sections more easily.

It might also have been useful to have a chapter on argumentation in higher education outside the UK and US contexts. Although the author does offer examples from other cultures (including some excellent insights on the critical dimension of argumentation among East Asian students), the work is very much focused on the UK/US contexts and the research presented comes from them. I agree with the author that some of the work presented in this book will give enough of a context to teachers in different countries, and that this may help them position argumentation within their own professional practice. I would argue that the opposite (teachers from other countries offering insight about their context) is also necessary, even though I acknowledge that this perspective may fall outside the scope of this book, and might be better served in an edited collection.

I now turn to a brief review of the chapters.

Chapter 1 sets the scene for what follows. It outlines the book's focus (*argumentation* – that is, the process of arguing – and *argumentational* interactions in higher education) and its aims. It also provides a theoretical backdrop to such an enterprise, arguing for a model that puts argumentation in the centre, between the theoretical and the particular, or to use the author's words, 'between abstract thought and "critical thinking" at a more nebulous level and the

various forms it takes at a discourse level' (12). The chapter ends with brief accounts on the importance of argumentation in the work of Bakhtin, Vygotsky, and Habermas.

The second chapter provides a historical context to the teaching of rhetoric and argument in higher education, outlining some of the implications of the absence of academic argumentational texts for educators and students.

Chapter 3 focuses on the generic skills in argumentation and looks at key argumentation models (from Toulmin to more recent ones) that attempt to map such skills in different ways. In this chapter, the author usefully reiterates definitions of 'argument' and 'argumentation', to assert that it is the latter, the argumentation or 'choreography of argument', that is key in education, 'because it is about transformation, clarifying, and changing ideas, personal growth, identity formation, and other dynamic aspects of learning' (39).

In Chapter 4, Richard Andrews, Carole Torgerson and Beng-Huat See revisit previous project data from a pilot study of the argumentation skills of first year undergraduates (in the UK and the US) in history, biology, and electrical engineering. The results of this study suggested that students see argumentation as important in their disciplines; would like more explicit instruction in disciplinary argumentation; tend to rely on argumentation skills learnt earlier in their education; and are not critical in their academic reading. The study also showed significant differences in argumentational practices and assumptions among institutions, disciplines, lecturers, and students. The authors here engage in an insightful analysis of the views expressed in this study, and make suggestions for ways to put the discussion of discipline-specific skills in argumentation firmly on the agenda.

Chapter 5 proposes what I believe to be the book's most prominent and distinctive thesis: a balanced approach to generic and discipline-specific skills development in argumentation at the institutional level in higher education. Andrews asserts that this balance:

... is a hybrid set of practices that provide generic *and* discipline-specific guidance [and] is necessary because it enables teachers/ lecturers *and* students to gain an understanding that is important common ground: that the discipline's epistemological identity is partly shaped and certainly expressed by the discourses that take place within it; some aspects of these discourses, in which argumentation plays a major part, are shared with other disciplines. (90)

The chapter offers a lucid discussion of the elements addressed generically (i.e., the generation of the argument; its development; the definition of stance or position; structuring; expression; refinement; and a testing of the argument's soundness) and the models that can be most fruitful in each stage; and equally, of the elements which need discipline-specific treatment. The author makes some excellent points about the problematic assumption, prevalent in universities in the UK, that students will learn argumentation skills without explicit generic provision; and the over-concern in our provision with presentation, format and generally superficial features of the genre.

Chapter 6 looks at the impact of information and communication technologies and multimodality and how their use may help teach and/or research argumentation. Readers without knowledge of multimodality will appreciate the illustration of what argumentation can look like from a modal perspective, focusing on the place (and dominance) of different modes and the tensions between modes. Readers who are looking for a substantial discussion of argumentation in the digital/ multimodal age may find it more useful to look first at some of the research projects referenced by Andrews, and then read parts of the three chapters in this book, where this topic is dealt with selectively.

In Chapter 7, Andrews synthesises past research undertaken with colleagues at the University of York, UK, to draw out some lessons from argumentation in schools (7- to 14-year age range) and implications for undergraduate education. He focuses on the increase of argumentation demands from 7 to 11 years, 11 to 14, 14 to 16, 16 to 18, pointing out that students

need to develop new strategies along these transitions. This is not an easy task, however, especially when 'the genre largely remains unspoken and unquestioned' (132).

A focus on undergraduate education follows, appropriately, in the next chapter (Chapter 8), which reports on an empirical study in which first year undergraduates' views on argumentation are elicited through interviews by other students. This work is summarised through case studies that offer a snapshot of how students see argumentation in a medical course, in mathematics, psychology, politics, literature study, nursing, and chemistry. One view emerging from these student interviews is that argumentation is typically not addressed or made explicit by lecturers.

Chapter 9 is devoted to written argumentation, looking at students' essays and reports in different disciplines, as well as lecturer feedback to student assignments. The chapter also provides a thought-provoking commentary on the essay, discussing both its advantages and alternatives to it.

In Chapter 10, Andrews turns to feedback from lecturers, and particularly how lecturers 'negotiate and establish the parameters of argumentation in their disciplines through feedback' (169). The real examples of feedback at undergraduate level (e.g., on a coursework assignment) and at postgraduate level (e.g., pre viva voce examination reports), including a brief look at alternative forms of argumentation, will all be particularly useful for encouraging lecturers to reflect on their own practice.

Methodological issues in researching argumentation (importantly, an interdisciplinary enterprise) are discussed in Chapter 11. The author first looks at what counts as evidence in education research, and offers a useful provisional list of questions to ask regarding evidence in this particular field. He then briefly examines methodological approaches to investigating argumentation; in doing this, he usefully reminds us that paradigm wars are futile and misguided.

The concluding chapter of the book draws together key issues and implications for research, policy and practice. Andrews is concerned with what areas need to be researched, but also with ways for lecturers to address cross-cultural issues in argumentation (such as, for example, common assumptions about students outside Anglophone countries and their understanding of or ability to be critical). Looking at the context of higher education in England in particular, he once again problematises the invisibility and/or marginalisation of argumentation in that tradition: not being made an explicit part of the undergraduate or postgraduate experience (i.e., without explicit instruction, and without a connection between students' oral and written forms of argument); and being undermined by an emphasis on the substance of the discipline or subject, or an assumption that argumentation will 'inhere in the very nature of the discipline' (197). In the last part of this chapter, Andrews considers examples of four dissertations (in order to discuss the critical dimension) and the dissertation in the digital age.

*Argumentation in higher education* is a thought-provoking text and it will be a valuable addition to the library of university teachers in any discipline.

Lia Litosseliti  
City University London, UK  
l.litosseliti@city.ac.uk  
© 2010, Lia Litosseliti

**Governing universities globally: organisations, regulation and rankings**, by Roger King, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar, 256 pp., £65 (hardback), ISBN 978-1-84720-739-5

I confess I embarked on this review with some scepticism: globalisation has become rather an easy concept as a change agent in higher education and the banking crisis has demonstrated