

Seeing values: Axiology and affording attitude in Australia's 'invasion'

Y. J. Doran

LCT Centre for Knowledge-Building and Department of Linguistics

The University of Sydney

yaegan.doran@sydney.edu.au

To be published in:

Martin, J. R., Maton, K. and Doran, Y. J. (2019) (eds) *Academic Discourse: Systemic Functional Linguistics and Legitimation Code Theory*. London: Routledge.

Abstract

Values permeate academic discourse but until now it has not been clear how we can see these values, let alone teach them to students. This chapter offers a method for seeing the values systems underpinning disciplines. It does this by drawing on both the LCT concept of axiological constellations and the SFL toolkit of APPRAISAL to show how nuanced uses of language can reveal the intricate systems of terminology, ways of speaking and positions that indicate particular values. From a linguistic perspective, this opens a way of seeing highly implicit evaluative language known as 'affording attitude'; from an LCT perspective, this opens the way to see the distinct positions and stances organizing communities of practice. As a case study, it will focus on a controversy in Australia associated with the use of different terminology for discussing European arrival to Australia, such as *invasion* vs *settlement*, and the broader description of the continent's original inhabitants.

VALUES AND ACADEMIC DISCOURSE

Values permeate academic discourse. They underpin evaluations of what is right and what is wrong; what is good and what is bad; what is worthwhile and what is worthless. Although such evaluations are regularly contested across communities and intellectual fields, *within* communities or fields they are often remarkably consistent and stable; if one puts a foot wrong, it is obvious to all those listening. In this sense, evaluations do not just attribute meaning to that being evaluated, they also position the person doing the evaluation. For students learning a discipline, this means it is not sufficient to simply learn the ‘content’ of a field, they must also learn its values. While in some disciplines these values will be heavily emphasized and in others they may be relatively downplayed, what is common is that they are often highly implicit and assumed by those who hold them. As far as literacy programs targeting disciplinary knowledge is concerned, this poses a problem about how to ‘see’ these values systems and the language used to organize them, in order to aid programs aiming to teach them.

From the perspective of linguistics, one vantage point is through the work on evaluative language that in Systemic Functional Linguistics is captured under the system of APPRAISAL (Martin and White 2005). In recent decades, appraisal has proven remarkably effective in enabling linguists to understand both overt evaluation and the more subtle stances that permeate texts. Martin & White (2005) usefully distinguish between explicit evaluations that specify a clear stance in relation to some target, known as inscribed attitude, and those that are more implicit to a greater or lesser degree, known as invoked attitude. Inscribed attitudes occur when there is a definite token of evaluation, such as *crucial* in *one crucial area of natural language research*. In contrast, invoked attitudes arise through a range of linguistic resources that offer various degrees of implicitness. The most explicit are those that provoke evaluation through metaphors, such as in *on the football field, he flew*. Here the use of metaphor makes it clear there is an evaluation and usually leaves little room for one to read differently than what is intended. Slightly less explicit are attitudes that are flagged through the intensifying or amplifying resources of graduation, such as *he was the biggest footballer I’ve ever seen*. These mark that there is subjectivity in the text and so suggest evaluation is probably occurring, but they do not necessarily make it clear what this evaluation is (Hood and Martin 2007).

Finally, the most implicitly invoked attitude is affording attitude. In contrast to provoking and flagging attitude, affording attitude does not use any indicators that evaluation is occurring

(Martin and White 2005). Rather, as Bednarek (2009: 117) explains, affording attitude utilizes ideational meanings that ‘are neutral on the surface but can imply positive or negative meanings depending on the reader’s position’. That is, affording attitude involves language that is not inherently evaluative, but gains its evaluation only in certain fields, situations or communities. It is this type of evaluative language that often construes the values of intellectual fields. By virtue of its implicitness, this evaluative language is often difficult to see if it has not already been learnt. But this also gives it much of its power; by being only accessible to particular communities, it often invokes large networks of values relatively efficiently.

Although affording attitude is highly implicit, for people in the right community the evaluations will be abundantly clear. For example in Text 1, the use of the words *technicist*, *masculinist*, *modernist* and *conservative* all invoke very strong negative evaluation. It would be a rare person with any training in humanities at a tertiary level that would miss this evaluation, even if the ideational meanings are not so clear.

The second, more specific point developed in this paper is that the particular linguistic analyses of the language of school science (including geography) produced within the ‘genre’ project have functioned to produce and promote a very particular view of science, one which is most congenial to the theoretical premises and methodological technologies of a particular version of systemic linguistics developed with the ‘genre’ project... From the perspective of feminist and postmodernist critiques of science, this work is technicist, masculinist and modernist; as a curriculum project, it is profoundly conservative.

Text 1. Lee (1993: 132). Underlining added.

Although clearly evaluative, the four underlined words do not explicitly maintain the same evaluation across all contexts (i.e. the attitude is not inscribed). Taking *conservative* as an example, in modern politics, there is a large segment of society that would very happily take such an epithet as a positive endorsement. Similarly in literature, many scholars hold the works of *modernist* writers, such as Yeats, Eliot and Joyce in tremendously high esteem. The point here is that in this text they afford negative evaluations largely because of the field they are situated in (specified explicitly as *feminism* and *postmodernism*). Although in this particular text, the evaluative language here is flagged by the graduation shown through *profoundly* preceding *conservative* and the repetition of Epithets in succession – *technicist*, *masculinist* and *modernist* – this only flags that there is evaluation, it does not indicate what the evaluation

is (Hood & Martin 2007). Similarly, the terms *feminist* and *postmodernist* indicate alignment with a particular community or field of practice and to many in that community would indicate positive evaluation of the author. However to others who may be antagonistic to the fields, such terms could immediately raise an ire that could lead to a resistant reading, as Martin & White (2005) call it, that may disavow the arguments being made.

Although for this text it appears relatively clear what the evaluative position of these terms are, we have the issue of how we justify our analysis linguistically without resorting to intuition or insider knowledge. Compounding this, for many who have not had sufficient training in the humanities to intuitively understand this evaluation, we also have the issue of how to discover that these are evaluative. This issue is more clearly seen when we move into more specialized fields that do not mark their evaluative position as obviously. Text 2 shows an example from education.

One crucial area of natural language research which can be drawn on in an attempt to establish an active directing role for the adult in natural language learning is Bruner's concept of 'scaffolding' (e.g. Bruner, 1983, 1986). Scaffolding is a process whereby parents and children jointly construct texts that are based on shared experience. In doing this, the parents actively support children's learning attempts by providing models of the appropriate language and by structuring and regulating the input they provide so children can gradually take over the task of text production.

Text 2. Gray (1987: 6-7)

For those internal to the educational field this is targeted to – broadly known as genre-pedagogy (Rose & Martin 2012) – this text includes a number of lexical items and turns of phrase that clearly align the author with a particular community while disaligning him with others, such as *learning*, *scaffolding*, *jointly construct*, *shared experience*, *actively support*, *models*, *Bruner* and others. But for those outside the field it would be difficult to see the values invoked through the text and so much of the meaning would be missed.

A little closer to home in linguistics whether you rally around, emphasize, promote or prioritize 'social' or 'cognitive' linguistics, 'rhetoric' or 'logic', 'meaning' or 'form', 'language as a resource' or 'language as rules', 'system' or 'structure' (derived from Halliday 1977) positions you in one community or another and potentially leads to significant evaluation of what is

being said. Obviously such binaries are crude generalizations of the distinctions in the field, but they do give a small insight into how these terms function.

Importantly for this paper, discussion of each of the instances of evaluation mentioned above have relied entirely on an intuition developed through prolonged enculturation in the field of linguistics and education. There have been minimal linguistic arguments to articulate why each are evaluative, and if pushed, there are few methods for justification. This is a significant issue for a linguistics that aims to understand evaluative language, highly charged discourse and the values systems that they invoke. To this end, this paper works toward a means for seeing the highly implicit evaluative meanings of affording attitude and justifying its analysis so that we can move away from the current reliance on intuition and make more visible these meanings that organize much of our social life.

AXIOLOGICAL CONSTELLATIONS

To develop a linguistic account of affording attitude and the values systems they invoke, we will first take a step away from linguistics and into sociology, specifically the framework of Legitimation Code Theory (LCT). LCT is a framework that focuses on the underlying principles organizing social practices and knowledge, and with them, variations in discourse (Maton 2014). In recent years, LCT has been productively used in conjunction with SFL in exploring knowledge practices and discourse, by offering a complementary set of analytical tools to the Systemic Functional Linguistic gaze (Maton and Doran 2017a; Maton et al. 2016; Martin 2011). In this paper, conceptualizations in LCT will be used to guide a number of analytical choices made in understanding the language used in texts.

LCT argues that each community involves a particular set of values that cluster into tighter or looser alignments, known as axiological constellations (Maton 2014; Martin et al. 2010). Depending on how tightly integrated the values in the constellations are, if one set of values is accepted, it may be presumed that others are necessarily entailed. Using an example from Maton (2014: 155), in educational circles an opposition is often maintained between approaches that valorize ‘student-centred learning’, ‘learning-oriented’ approaches or simply ‘learning’, and those that are ‘teacher-centred’, ‘instruction-oriented’ or ‘teaching’ based approaches. Each polarized position generally involves a range of terms. Maton illustrates this by presenting a list of terms originally developed by Jonassen & Land (2000: viii) gathered

from a synthesis of literature associated with both ‘student-centred’ and ‘teacher-centred’ approaches (only a small proportion of this list is given here):

<u>Teacher-centred constellation</u>	<u>Student-centred constellation</u>
abstract, symbolic	contextualized, authentic, experiential
idealist, rational	pragmatist
symbolic reasoning	situated learning
laboratory	in situ
theoretical	everyday
objective, modelable	experiential, interpretive
disembodied	experiential
conceptual, memorial	perceptual
decontextualized	embedded in experience

LCT argues that by choosing, valorizing or emphasizing any particular word or concept involved in a constellation such as this, other meanings in that constellation will likely also be invoked. That is to say, depending on how tight the constellation, if you indicate that you hold one set of values, it will often be assumed that you also hold a range of others. Just as the use of highly technical terms in science implicate large technical taxonomies, sequences of implication and properties (Halliday & Martin 1993; Martin and Doran forthcoming, Maton and Doran 2017b), terms with highly charged evaluative meanings in particular fields will resonate out to a range of other meanings.

In Systemic Functional Linguistics, these constellations can be interpreted as networks of bonds that constitute the value systems of a community (Knight 2010, 2013; Martin & Stenglin 2006; Szenes 2017). These bonds involve shared couplings of ideational meaning and interpersonal meaning. Through these networks of shared content/evaluation bonds, communities are able to distinguish between insiders and outsiders. To use a simple example, for those aligning with the ‘student-centred’ approach in Table 1, the ideational meaning associated with *situated learning* is bonded with a positive evaluation as it is part of the constellation that they align with. In contrast, the ideational meaning associated with being *abstract* may be bonded with a negative evaluation as it is in a constellation that is in opposition

to it. Thus in particular communities that align with *situated learning*, the promotion of *abstract* knowledge may afford a negative evaluation.

In SFL's conceptualization, these bond networks organize the values of a community and so are likely to be significant candidates for instances of affording attitude. Thus, to develop a method by which we can see these implicit evaluations and the values systems associated with them, a useful path is to first develop a map of the bonding networks (in SFL terms) or axiological constellations (in LCT terms) in which they sit. This paper will offer a method for developing such a map by utilizing the appraisal framework of SFL (Martin & White 2005).

SEEING AXIOLOGICAL CONSTELLATIONS THROUGH APPRAISAL

As axiological meanings are built over time through innumerable instances of text, the method developed in this paper focuses on how ideational meanings are charged with interpersonal evaluations. Depending on the need of any particular study, it may be applied across multiple texts to build a comprehensive map. But for the purposes of illustration, this paper will focus on a text that is relatively explicit in many of its axiological meanings. The text, given as Text 3, is a news article from a prominent Australian newspaper based in Sydney, *The Daily Telegraph*. It concerns a controversy surrounding a set of guidelines published by The University of New South Wales (UNSW), known as The Cultural Diversity and Inclusive Practice toolkit. Among other things, this document makes suggestions about appropriate language use in relation to Indigenous Australian people.

University of NSW students told to refer to Australia as having been 'invaded'

STUDENTS at a leading NSW university are being told to refer to Australia as having been "invaded" instead of settled in a highly controversial rewriting of official Australian history.

They are also told it is offensive to suggest James Cook "discovered" Australia and inappropriate to say that indigenous people have lived here for 40,000 years.

Instead, they should say "since the beginning of the Dreamings".

A so-called Diversity Toolkit on indigenous terminology for University of NSW undergraduates argues that Australian history should be broken up into categories, including “pre-invasion” and “post-invasion”.

It also claims the word settlement ignores the reality of indigenous lands “being stolen”.

“Australia was not settled peacefully, it was invaded, occupied and colonized,” according to the guidelines, which are prescribed reading for some undergraduate students.

“Describing the arrival of the Europeans as a ‘settlement’ attempts to view Australian history from the shores of England rather than the shores of Australia,” the document says. “Most aboriginal people find the use of the word ‘discovery’ offensive.”

Students are also being taught the terms “Aborigines” and “aboriginal people” are inappropriate, and they should use the term “indigenous Australian people”.

The phrase “The Dreamings” is apparently more appropriate than “Dreamtime”, because the latter tended to indicate a time period that has finished.

The accepted historical period of 40,000 years is also rejected because it “puts a limit on the occupation of Australia and tends to lend support to migration theories and anthropological assumptions”.

But historian Keith Windschuttle said the term “invasion” was wrong. “Under international law, Australia has always been regarded as a settled country according to the leading judgements in international law, both here and around the world,” he said.

“Until the law changes, there is no sound basis on which to say invaded. That is wrong.”

Institute of Public Affairs research fellow Matthew Lesh criticized the guidelines, saying they suffocate “the free flow of ideas”.

Federal Education Minister Simon Birmingham said universities “enjoy autonomy when it comes to academic concepts”, however he stressed they should be a place where “ideas are contested and open to debate”.

A UNSW spokeswoman said the guides were “commonplace” across universities.

Text 3. Article on the UNSW Diversity Toolkit. Bye (2016)

This article and the Diversity Toolkit it reports on relate to a long running division in Australian society about the most appropriate description of the arrival of English people to Australian shores and subsequent Indigenous Australian history. The controversy involves a number of highly charged terms and ways of speaking that are both positive and negative, depending on which side of the ‘debate’ you are on (see Coffin 2003 for a discussion of the role of judgement in this debate). Much of the Australian population will tacitly understand the evaluations associated with various components of the article and be able to very clearly associate different terms with different perspectives. But it is important to develop a methodology for seeing these not as insiders but as linguists and text analysts. This is so we can teach such systems that permeate academic fields to students who do not have this intuitive knowledge.

The method stepped through in this paper includes two broad stages of analysis that can be reiterated across multiple texts (see Martin & White 2005, White 2003):

1. an *attitude analysis*, to look at the relatively explicit evaluation in texts; and
2. an *engagement analysis* to see the heteroglossic positioning of voices that occur

Step 1: Attitude analysis

Evaluative meanings arise in social practice. For something to maintain stable evaluative meaning, it needs to first have this meaning built in previous texts (Coffin & O’Halloran 2005). The most obvious way for this to occur is through relatively explicit evaluation. This can be analyzed in SFL through *attitude*. The method will thus begin by considering the inscribed, provoked (through metaphor) or flagged (through graduation) attitudes that the text displays (Martin & White 2005). For this paper, we will be concerned with:

1. the polarity of the evaluation (positive or negative),
2. what is being evaluated (the trigger or appraised); and
3. what is doing the evaluating (the appraiser).

For this illustration, we will not be concerned with anything more delicate such as whether the attitude involves appreciation, judgement or affect (though subtypes of attitude would become important if we wish to develop a more nuanced picture of the values in a text). Table 1 gives the inscribed, provoked and flagged attitude in the text.

Appraising item	Appraiser	Appraised	Polarity
<i>leading</i>	The Daily Telegraph ¹	University of New South Wales	positive
<i>highly controversial</i>	The Daily Telegraph	rewriting of Australian history	negative
<i>offensive</i>	UNSW Diversity Toolkit	to suggest James Cook discovered Australia	negative
<i>inappropriate</i>	UNSW Diversity Toolkit	to say indigenous people have lived here for 40,000 years	negative
<i>stolen</i>	UNSW Diversity Toolkit	(the English acquisition of Australian lands)	negative
<i>not peacefully</i>	UNSW Diversity Toolkit	(the English remaining on Australian lands)	negative
<i>invaded, occupied, colonised</i>	UNSW Diversity Toolkit	(the English arrival, acquisition of and remaining on Australian lands)	negative (flagged)
<i>view Australian history from the shores of England rather than the shores of Australia</i>	UNSW Diversity Toolkit	Describing the arrival of the Europeans as a ‘settlement’	negative (provoked)
<i>offensive</i>	most Aboriginal people	the use of the word “discovery”	negative
<i>inappropriate</i>	UNSW Diversity Toolkit	the terms “Aborigines” and “Aboriginal people”	negative
<i>More appropriate than “Dreamtime”</i>	UNSW Diversity Toolkit	The phrase “The Dreamings”	positive
<i>rejected</i>	UNSW Diversity Toolkit	The accepted historical period of 40,000 years	negative
<i>wrong</i>	Historian Keith Windschuttle	the term “invasion”	negative
<i>leading</i>	Historian Keith Windchuttle	judgements in international law, both here and around the world	positive
<i>No sound basis</i>	Historian Keith Windschuttle	to say invaded	negative (provoked)
<i>wrong</i>	Historian Keith Windschuttle	to say invaded	negative
<i>criticised</i>	Institute of Public Affairs research fellow Matthew Lesh	the guidelines	negative
<i>suffocate</i>	Institute of Public Affairs research fellow Matthew Lesh	the guidelines	negative (provoked)

¹ When the text itself does the appraising without attributing this to someone else, this will be labelled as *The Daily Telegraph*.

<i>free flow of ideas</i>	Institute of Public Affairs research fellow Matthew Lesh	(free speech)	positive (provoked)
<i>enjoy</i>	universities	autonomy when it comes to academic concepts	positive
<i>commonplace</i>	A UNSW spokeswoman	the guides	positive (flagged)

Table 1. Evaluative attitude in the UNSW Diversity Toolkit text.

This initial analysis gives us a first look at the charging of particular items as either positive or negative. To see the patterns more clearly, we will reorder the table in terms of the appraiser, as shown in Table 2, and relabel appraiser as ‘source’ and appraised as ‘target’ (which helps incorporate other analyses below).

Source	Target	Charge
The Daily Telegraph	University of New South Wales	positive
	rewriting of Australian history	negative
UNSW Diversity Toolkit	The phrase “The Dreamings”	positive
	to suggest James Cook discovered Australia	negative
	To say indigenous people have lived here for 40,000 years	negative
	(the English acquisition of Australian lands)	negative
	(the English remaining on Australian lands)	negative
	(the English arrival, acquisition of and remaining on Australian lands)	negative
	Describing the arrival of the Europeans as a ‘settlement’	negative
	the terms “Aborigines” and “Aboriginal people”	negative
most aboriginal people	The accepted historical period of 40,000 years	negative
	the use of the word “discovery”	negative
Historian Keith Windschuttle	judgements in international law, both here and around the world	positive
	the term “invasion”	negative
	to say invaded	negative
Institute of Public Affairs research fellow Matthew Lesh	to say invaded	negative
	(freedom of speech)	positive
universities	the guidelines	negative
	the guidelines	negative
A UNSW spokeswoman	autonomy when it comes to academic concepts	positive
	the guides	positive

Table 2. Preliminary list of charged elements based on attitude.

Evaluations establish relations between the source and the target (the appraiser and the appraised). As the source becomes associated with a target's particular charging, this means that not only does the target become part of the constellation (or bond network), so does the source. For example, *Historian Keith Windschuttle* not only negatively charges the term *invasion* (as being 'wrong'), but also becomes associated with that negative evaluation. The assumption here is that if you align with a particular evaluation, it is likely you will also align with the source. In this case, if you agree that the term *invasion* (the target) is 'wrong', you are more likely to align with *Keith Windschuttle* (the source). Similarly, if you align with *Keith Windschuttle* you are also likely to align with the suggestion that the term *invasion* is 'wrong'.

Under this interpretation, Table 2 above gives a first look at the constellations established in the text. Institute of Public Affairs research fellow Matthew Lesh and Historian Keith Windschuttle are associated with negative charging of the UNSW Diversity Toolkit (*the guidelines*) and positive charging of free speech (through the metaphor *free flow of ideas*). The UNSW Diversity Toolkit on the other hand is associated with negative charging of James Cook's 'discovery' of Australia, the terms *Aborigines*, *Aboriginal people* and *settlement*, and the arrival of the English population to Australia. This analysis illustrates a division between the UNSW Diversity Toolkit and those associated with negative charging of the Diversity Kit (such as *Historian Keith Windschuttle* and *Institute of Public Affairs research fellow Matthew Lesh*). As we move to further layers of analysis, this division will become more pronounced.

Step 2. Engagement analysis

Although Table 2 gives a preliminary map of the charging associated with various targets and their sources, it by no means captures all of the axiological meaning in the text. In this text in particular, the vast majority of targets in the constellation so far are negatively charged; sources disalign from many targets, but they do not align with much. To get a fuller picture of the axiological meaning in the text, the next step involves seeing what each source promotes. As noted above, if a reader aligns with a source, they will most likely align with what the source promotes. This means that if a source advocates some information, we can place this in the constellation.ⁱ

The attitude analysis builds a preliminary list of sources that are axiologically charged. This next step focuses on what these sources promote in order to see what meanings they align with.

We will do this through the SFL tool of ENGAGEMENT which is concerned with the range of voices acknowledged in a text (White 2003; Martin and White 2005). This step only considers instances where the text indicates multiple voices, known as heteroglossia. For example, in *They are also told it is offensive to suggest James Cook “discovered” Australia*, the text acknowledges it is a particular source that makes the assertion that *it is offensive to suggest James Cook “discovered” Australia*. This leaves open the possibility that others may not hold this position. This is in contrast to a monoglossic utterance, such as *Institute of Public Affairs research fellow Matthew Lesh criticised the guidelines*, that does not indicate there is any question about whether Matthew Lesh criticized the guidelines.ⁱⁱ Monoglossic instances will be left out of the analysis.ⁱⁱⁱ

Heteroglossia is often shown through four main linguistic resources (Martin & Rose 2007):

- 1) modality, such as in:

they should say “since the beginning of the Dreamings”

- 2) negation, such as in:

Australia was not settled peacefully

- 3) counterexpectancy conjunctions, such as in:

... but historian Keith Windschuttle said...

- 4) projection of speech or thought, such as in:

It claims the word settlement ignores the reality of indigenous lands “being stolen”

Heteroglossia can also indicate whether a source aligns with the information they are putting forward (positively charging it) or disaligns with it (negatively charging it). As Martin & White’s model of heteroglossia involves a diverse array of resources, we will step through three main sets of resources that indicate alignment or disalignment.

- 1) *Projections indicate alignment between the source and the information being projected (positive charging in relation to the source)*

Barring irony, sarcasm, joking etc., heteroglossic statements shown through projection of speech and thought indicate the source aligns with what they say or think,^{iv} such as in:

“Australia was not settled peacefully, it was invaded, occupied and colonised” according to the guidelines.

In this example (known as heteroglossic acknowledge), we can presume that *the guidelines* align with the statement “*Australia was not settled peacefully, it was invaded, occupied and colonised*” and the negative attitudes it includes (“not peacefully”, “invaded, occupied and colonised”). For this reason, we can take this information to be positively charged in relation to its source. In Text 3, projections such as these cover the majority of instances, however there are a few other instances that we should take into account.

- 2) *Instances of heteroglossic distance or disclaim indicate disalignment (negative charging in relation to the source)*

When texts use instances such as:

It [UNSW Diversity Toolkit] also claims the word settlement ignores the reality of indigenous lands “being stolen”

The author (*The Daily Telegraph*) indicates they wish to distance themselves from the claim being made (known as heteroglossic distance, Martin and White 2005; White 2003). This indicates disalignment from the information being put forward (that *the word settlement ignores the reality of indigenous lands “being stolen”*^v), and by extension, the original source of this information (the UNSW Diversity Toolkit). This means that both the information being positioned and its source are negative charged in relation to *The Daily Telegraph*.

In this particular instance, there are in fact two sets of charging going on. The projection means that the UNSW Diversity Toolkit is aligning with the statement that *the word settlement ignores*

the reality of indigenous lands being stolen, while the uses of distancing indicates that The Daily Telegraph is disaligning from both the information and the UNSW Diversity Toolkit.

Another resource for disaligning is when a text uses either a negation to deny a proposition, such as:

Australian was not settled peacefully

or uses a counterexpectancy conjunction to counter it, such as in:

The accepted historical period of 40,000 years is also rejected because it “puts a limit on the occupation of Australia and tends to lend support to migration theories and anthropological assumptions”.

But historian Keith Windschuttle said the term “invasion” was wrong.

In the first case, the source is explicitly denying the suggestion that Australia was settled peacefully, while the second instance makes it clear through the use of *but* that Keith Windschuttle’s assertion is opposed to the assertion in the paragraph before it.

These two resources – deny and counter – are both grouped under the more general term of heteroglossic *disclaim*. As such, for our analysis, if heteroglossic disclaim occurs, a source is disaligning with the information being disclaimed and so it will be negatively charged in relation to the source.

3) *Instances of heteroglossic proclaim indicate alignment* (positive charging in relation to the source)

Finally, where a source makes a positive assertion in favor of some information, known as heteroglossic proclaim, they indicate alignment with this information (positive charging). For example, in

they should use the term “indigenous Australian people”

the source (in this case The UNSW Diversity Toolkit) is proclaiming that the use of the term “indigenous Australian people” should occur, and so is aligning with it. For any of the above

instances, any reasonings or justifications for each position will also be included in the analysis (see White 2003: 274 for discussion of heteroglossic justifications).

The linguistic resources guiding the analysis of alignment or disalignment (positive or negative charging) are given in Table 3. Any instances that are not entirely clear in their position one-way or the other will be left out. This is primarily the case for monoglossia and for heteroglossic category of entertain, such as *it is possible that there was an invasion*.

Linguistic resources	Aligning/ Disaligning	Example	
positive attitude	aligning (positive charge)	<i>The phrase “The Dreamings” is <u>appropriate</u></i>	The source (UNSW Diversity Toolkit) aligns with the phrase “The Dreamings”
negative attitude	disaligning (negative charge)	<i>Keith Windschuttle said the term “invasion” was <u>wrong</u></i>	Keith Windschuttle disaligns with the term “invasion”
projection (including heteroglossic acknowledge)	aligning (positive charge)	<i>“Australia was not settled peacefully, it was invaded, occupied and colonised” <u>according to the guidelines</u>.</i>	Alignment between proposition (in quotes) and guidelines
distance	disaligning (negative charge)	<i>It [UNSW Diversity Toolkit] also <u>claims</u> the word settlement ignores the reality of indigenous lands “being stolen”</i>	The author (Daily Telegraph) disaligns with the proposition (that <i>the word settlement ignores...</i>) and its source (The UNSW Diversity Toolkit)
disclaim	disaligning (negative charge)	<i>Australian was <u>not</u> settled peacefully</i>	The source (the UNSW Diversity Toolkit) disaligns with the proposition that Australian was settled peacefully.
proclaim	aligning (positive charge)	<i>they <u>should</u> use the term “indigenous Australia people”</i>	The source (The UNSW Diversity Toolkit) aligns with the suggestion that they should use the term “indigenous Australian people

Table 3. Linguistic resources indicating alignment (positive charging) or disalignment (negative charging)

For our text, the sources we will focus on that arose in the attitude analysis are:

The Daily Telegraph

UNSW Diversity Kit

Most aboriginal people

Historian Keith Windschuttle

Institute of Public Affairs research fellow Matthew Lesh

Universities

A UNSW spokeswoman

Using the analytical tools stepped through above, Table 4 presents the engagement analysis of our example text, with the markers of heteroglossia underlined.

<u>Instance</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Charge</u>
<i>University of NSW students <u>told</u> to refer to Australia as having been ‘invaded’</i>	(UNSW Diversity Toolkit)	to refer to Australia as having been ‘invaded’	aligning (positive charge)
<i>Students at a leading NSW university are being <u>told</u> to refer to Australia as having been “invaded” instead of settled</i>	(UNSW Diversity Toolkit)	to refer to Australia as having been “invaded” instead of settled	aligning (positive charge)
<i>They are also <u>told</u> it is offensive to suggest James Cook “discovered” Australia and inappropriate to say the indigenous people have lived here for 40,000 years</i>	(UNSW Diversity Toolkit)	it is offensive to suggest James Cook “discovered” Australia and inappropriate to say the indigenous people have lived here for 40,000 years	aligning (positive charge)
<i>they <u>should</u> say “since the beginning of the Dreamings”</i>	(UNSW Diversity Toolkit)	to say “since the beginning of the Dreamings”	aligning (positive charge)
<i>A <u>so-called</u> Diversity Toolkit on indigenous terminology for University of NSW undergraduates</i>	The Daily Telegraph	Diversity Toolkit on indigenous terminology for University of NSW undergraduates	disaligning (negative charge)
<i>A so-called Diversity Toolkit on indigenous terminology for University of NSW Undergraduates <u>argues</u> that Australian history <u>should</u> be broken up into categories, including “pre-invasion” and “post-invasion”.</i>	A so-called Diversity Toolkit on indigenous terminology	Australian history being broken up into categories, including “pre-invasion” and “post-invasion”.	aligning (positive charge)
<i>It also <u>claims</u> the word settlement ignores the reality of indigenous lands “being stolen”</i>	It (UNSW Diversity Toolkit)	the word settlement ignores the reality of indigenous lands “being stolen”	aligning (positive charge)
<i>It also <u>claims</u> the word settlement ignores the reality of indigenous lands “being stolen”</i>	The Daily Telegraph	the word settlement ignores the reality of indigenous lands “being stolen” & UNSW Diversity Toolkit	disaligning (negative charge)
<i>“Australia was not settled peacefully, it was invaded, occupied and colonised” <u>according to the guidelines</u></i>	UNSW Diversity Toolkit	Australia was not settled peacefully, it was invaded, occupied and colonised	aligning (positive charge)

<i>Australia was <u>not</u> settled peacefully</i>	UNSW Diversity Toolkit	Australia was settled peacefully	disaligning (negative charge)
<i>“Describing the arrival of Europeans as a ‘settlement’ attempts to view Australian history from the shores of England rather than the shores of Australia” The document <u>says</u>. “Most Aboriginal people find the use of the word ‘discovery’ offensive”</i>	UNSW Diversity Toolkit	“Describing the arrival of Europeans as a ‘settlement’ attempts to view Australian history from the shores of England rather than the shores of Australia” & “Most Aboriginal people find the use of the word ‘discovery’ offensive”	aligning (positive charge)
<i>“Most Aboriginal people <u>find</u> the use of the word ‘discovery’ offensive”</i>	Most Aboriginal people	the use of the word ‘discovery’ being offensive	aligning (positive charge)
<i>Students are also being <u>taught</u> the terms “Aborigines” and “Aboriginal people” are inappropriate and they <u>should</u> use the term “indigenous Australian people”</i>	(UNSW Diversity Toolkit)	the terms “Aborigines” and “Aboriginal people” are inappropriate and they should use the term “indigenous Australian people”	aligning (positive charge)
<i>The phrase “The Dreamings” is <u>apparently</u> more appropriate than “Dreamtime”</i>	(UNSW Diversity Toolkit)	The phrase “The Dreamings” is more appropriate than “Dreamtime”	aligning (positive charge)
<i>The phrase “The Dreamings” is <u>apparently</u> more appropriate than “Dreamtime” <u>because</u> the latter tended to indicate a time period that has finished</i>	(UNSW Diversity Toolkit)	Dreamtime as indicating a time period that has finished	disaligning (negative charge)
<i>The phrase “The Dreamings” is <u>apparently</u> more appropriate than “Dreamtime”</i>	The Daily Telegraph	The phrase “The Dreamings” is more appropriate than “Dreamtime” & UNSW Diversity Toolkit	disaligning (negative charge)
<i>The <u>accepted</u> historical period of 40,000 years</i>	The Daily Telegraph	The historical period of 40,000 years	aligning (positive charge)
<i>The accepted historical period of 40,000 years is also rejected <u>because</u> it “puts a limit on the occupation of</i>	(UNSW Diversity Toolkit)	putting a limit on the occupation of Australia	disaligning (negative charge)

<i>Australia and tends to lend support to migration theories and anthropological assumptions.</i>		& supporting migration theories and anthropological assumptions	
<i>But historian Keith Windschuttle said the term “invasion” was wrong</i>	Historian Keith Windschuttle	UNSW Diversity Toolkit	disaligning (negative charge)
<i>historian Keith Windschuttle <u>said</u> the term “invasion” was wrong</i>	Historian Keith Windschuttle	the term “invasion” was wrong	aligning (positive charge)
<i>“Under international law, Australia has always been regarded as a settled country according to the leading judgements international law, both here and around the world” he <u>said</u></i>	Historian Keith Windschuttle	Under international law, Australia has always been regarded as a settled country according to the leading judgements in international law, both here and around the world	aligning (positive charge)
<i>Under international law, Australia <u>has always been regarded as a settled country according to the leading judgements in international law, both here and around the world</u></i>	the leading judgements in international law, both here and around the world	Australia is a settled country	aligning (positive charge)
<i>“Until the law changes, there is no sound basis on which to say invaded. That is wrong”</i>	Historian Keith Windschuttle	“Until the law changes, there is no sound basis on which to say invaded. That is wrong”	aligning (positive charge)
<i>there is <u>no</u> sound basis on which to say invaded.</i>	Historian Keith Windschuttle	there is a sound basis on which to say invaded	disaligning (negative charge)
<i>Institute of Public Affairs research fellow Matthew Lesh... <u>saying they suffocate “the free flow of ideas”</u></i>	Institute of Public Affairs research fellow Matthew Lesh	The UNSW Diversity Toolkit suffocates the free flow of ideas.	aligning (positive charge)
<i>A UNSW spokeswoman <u>said</u> the guides were “commonplace” across universities.</i>	A UNSW spokeswoman	the guides were “commonplace” across universities.	aligning (positive charge)

Table 4. Heteroglossia and charging

On the basis of this analysis, we can synthesize a number of specific terms and ideas that arrange into constellations. For example although the term *invasion* invokes a negative judgement of the English arrivals (made most explicit by the repetition in *invaded, occupied, colonized*), the UNSW Diversity Toolkit emphasizes that this is their preferred term for describing the English arrival to Australia. This means that by using the term *invasion*, one can be seen to align with the constellation of values endorsed by the UNSW Diversity Toolkit, while also disaligning with the arrival of Europeans itself. As we will discuss below, this in turn may afford a positive judgement of the person using the term. In addition to terminology, certain ideas and reasons are also made more explicit: The UNSW Diversity Toolkit believes that *Australian history should be broken up into categories, including “pre-invasion” and “post-invasion”*, and that the reason for the rejection of the term *settlement* is that it *ignores the reality of indigenous lands “being stolen”* (suggesting that they disalign with the theft of indigenous lands). In contrast, Historian Keith Windschuttle comfortably aligns with using the term *settlement*, which he justifies through *leading judgements in international law, both here and around the world*. Through this engagement analysis, we can build another map of the constellations associated with each source. Table 5 focuses on elements that were not already captured by the attitude analysis.

Source	Target	Charge
UNSW Diversity Toolkit	Australia was invaded	positive
	Australia was invaded instead of settled	positive
	indigenous people have been here “since the beginning of the Dreamings”	positive
	Australian history being broken up into categories, including “pre-invasion” and “post-invasion”	positive
	the word settlement ignores the reality of indigenous lands “being stolen”	positive
	Australia was “invaded, occupied and colonised”	positive
	the term “indigenous Australian people”	positive
	Australia was settled peacefully	negative
	putting a limit on the occupation of Australia	negative
	supporting migration theories and anthropological assumptions	negative
	the historical period of 40,000 years	positive

The Daily Telegraph	The name “Diversity Toolkit on indigenous terminology	negative
	UNSW Diversity Toolkit	negative
	the word settlement ignores the reality of indigenous lands “being stolen”	negative
	The phrase “The Dreamings” is more appropriate than the “Dreamtime”	negative
Historian Keith Windschuttle	Under international law, Australia has always been regarded as a settled country	positive
	UNSW Diversity Toolkit	negative
	there is a sound basis on which to say invaded	negative
the leading judgements in international law, both here and around the world	Australia is a settled country	positive

Table 5. List of charged elements based on heteroglossic engagement

From this analysis, we can now pull together the results to present the constellations developed in this text. As we have seen, the relations center around a small set of sources that either broadly align with the UNSW Diversity Toolkit or are opposed to it. For ease of reference, we will divide the results into two constellations along these lines. Table 6 shows the constellation associated with the UNSW Diversity Toolkit and Table 7 shows the constellation opposed to the UNSW Diversity Toolkit. As we are building a more abstract map of relations than the precise instances of the text, the table synthesizes the constellations into generalized sources, terms and ideas (‘Ideas’ here are understood broadly in SFL as activities and items at the level of field, Martin & Doran forthcoming).

<i>Sources</i>	Aligning with (positively charged)		<i>Sources</i>	Disaligning with (negatively charged)	
	<i>Terms</i>	<i>Ideas</i>		<i>Terms</i>	<i>Ideas</i>
UNSW spokeswoman Most Aboriginal People	<i>invasion, occupation, colonisation, stolen</i> <i>Indigenous Australian people</i> <i>The Dreamings</i>	Indigenous people have been here since the beginning of the Dreamings Australian history being broken up into categories including “pre-invasion” and “post-invasion”		<i>discovery, settlement</i> <i>Aborigines, Aboriginal people</i> <i>Dreamtime</i>	Indigenous people have lived here for 40,000 years English people’s acquisition of Australian lands Australia was settled peacefully putting a limit on the occupation of Australia migration theories and anthropological assumptions

Table 6. Constellation associated with the UNSW Diversity Toolkit

<i>Sources</i>	Aligning with (positively charged)		<i>Sources</i>	Disaligning with (negatively charged)	
	<i>Terms</i>	<i>Ideas</i>		<i>Terms</i>	<i>Ideas</i>
The Daily Telegraph Historian Keith Windschuttle Institute of Public Affairs research fellow Matthew Lesh Judgements in international law	<i>settlement</i> <i>Dreamtime</i>	University of New South Wales free flow of ideas (freedom of speech) the historical period of 40,000 years for Indigenous occupation of Australia	The UNSW Diversity Toolkit	<i>invasion</i> <i>The Dreamings</i>	The rewriting of Australian history the word settlement ignores the reality of indigenous lands being stolen

Table 7. Constellation opposed to the UNSW Diversity Toolkit

These tables present relatively broad maps of each constellation. Following the LCT analysis of axiological values systems, this map indicates terms, ideas and sources that may resonate out to larger constellations. By using any particular term or aligning with ideas or sources from one constellation, one evokes the meanings of others in the constellation. In this case, for example, by using the term *invasion* to describe the arrival of English people to Australia, one would tacitly indicate alignment with a community that would likely also accept the terms *occupation*, *colonisation* and *stealing* to describe the arrival, the term *Indigenous Australian people* for the original inhabitants of the continent and the notion that *indigenous people have been here since the beginning of the Dreamings*, while rejecting the terms *discovery*, *settlement*, *Aboriginal people* and *Aborigines*, and the idea that *Australia was settled peacefully*. By using the term *settlement*, on the other hand, although this term would be rejected by the ‘UNSW Diversity Toolkit’ community, this analysis suggests it would indicate positive alignment with another community that included people such as *Historian Keith Windschuttle* and *Institute of Public Affairs research fellow Matthew Lesh*, as well as the newspaper *The Daily Telegraph*.

In this way, although they are not explicitly evaluative, elements from these constellations do not neutrally convey ideational meaning. Rather, they indicate bonds of ideational and interpersonal evaluative meaning associated with particular communities. This means that depending on the community reading the text, using elements in these constellations may afford particular evaluations. Using the term *invasion* to describe the arrival of English people to Australia not only invokes a negative judgement on the English arrivals, but depending on the readership also affords a judgement of the speaker/author as having the ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ values. If read by a community sympathetic to the constellation associated with the values indicated by the UNSW Diversity Toolkit, the use of *invasion* may tacitly afford a positive judgement of the author. If read by a community opposed to these values (or aligned with values associated with *Keith Windschuttle* and *The Daily Telegraph*), it may afford a negative judgement of the author.

It is crucial to keep in mind, however, that such an evaluative response is not a fait accompli. By its nature, affording attitude (and indeed all invoked attitude) may be read as non-evaluative, depending on a large range of factors. What this analysis suggests is that these terms are likely to be associated with particular communities and thus *may* invoke evaluative responses. In this way, we have a means of ‘seeing’ such affording attitude and the axiological constellations or values systems they invoke, as well as justifying this analysis without resorting to intuitions or ethnographic assertions. The broad method outlined here is summarized as follows:

1. Analyze all instances of evaluation, for the source, target and charging (positive or negative).
 [In SFL terms, analyze for attitude. Focus on the appraiser, appraised and polarity (positive or negative).]
2. Group according to the source/appraiser.
3. Analyze the alignment or disalignment of information associated with the sources identified in Steps 1 and 2. Use Table 3 to guide your analysis.
 [In SFL terms, analyze for engagement, focusing on heteroglossia from sources identified in Steps 1 and 2. Use Table 3 to interpret the heteroglossic analysis in terms of alignment/disalignment (positive/negative charging).]
4. Add to the constellation built in Step 2.
5. Repeat across multiple texts, progressively building the constellation as necessary.

The constellations in Tables 6 and 7 were built on the basis of text analysis, but the results mirror a larger political division in Australia associated with what is known as the ‘History Wars’ (Macintyre & Clark 2003). This division surrounds interpretations of British colonization and the treatment of Indigenous Australians often aligned with ‘conservative’ or ‘progressive’ political positions. Those who align with a more conservative political position are generally understood as aligning with more positive evaluations of the European arrival to Australia, while those with a more progressive view tend to be more aligned with negative evaluations of the arrival. One of the major figures of this division is the historian Keith Windschuttle, who is situated in the constellation opposed to the UNSW Diversity Toolkit. Windschuttle authored two volumes entitled *The Fabrication of Aboriginal History* (2002, 2009), which, among other things, accused a large number of Australian historians of fabricating evidence about the poor treatment and killings of Indigenous Australians. This position also tends to align with positions put forward by the conservative think-tank The Institute of Public Affairs (aligned with Windschuttle in Table 7). As the constellations suggest, one of the flashpoints of this debate surrounds whether the arrival of Europeans was an *invasion* or *settlement*. This becomes prominent each year around the time of an Australian national

holiday officially known as *Australia Day*, but which certain segments of the community term *Invasion Day* (or *Survival Day*) due to its placement on the anniversary of the arrival on Australian soil of a large fleet of British ships known as the First Fleet. Although none of this information was used in justifying the constellations built in Tables 6 and 7, we can see that it clearly reflects this division in Australian society.

As a final step, we can illustrate the utility of building such a map of these constellations by applying it briefly to Text 4, a comment piece from another Australian newspaper, the *Herald Sun*. For this article, we will underline the particular terminology used in this article that arose in the constellations developed in Tables 6 and 7.

Black benefits of white settlement

Professor Paul Frijters and PhD student Tony Beaton attack the stifling political correctness among our social scientists:

Consider ethnic diversity (commonly seen as a good thing) and Aboriginal welfare (widely regarded as having grown worse). ... For example, news articles often report the claim by academics that the life expectancy of Aborigines is almost 20 years below the national average. As social science researchers, we lack a data set of all those with some Aboriginal ancestry. What we rely on is the group that self-identifies as Aboriginal, so we cannot say with certainty what Aboriginal life expectancy is. The number of people reporting their Aboriginality has risen sharply in the past 20 years – the population registered in this way has almost doubled – so the official figures captured over time may not be representative. What can be said is that self-identified Aborigines - who may not be representative - are estimated to die on average 17 years earlier than other Australians. One behavioural scientist, Nikola Balvin from the University of Melbourne, used this at best partial finding to argue last year in the Australian Journal of Peace Studies that “Australia, because it permits such inequities and poor care for its indigenous people, is not a civilised nation”. Is it really self-evident that Aboriginal peoples are worse off than their ancestors 200 years ago, or that they are poorly cared for? The best guess of anthropology is that hunter-gatherers such as the Aborigines had a life expectancy of about 30 years. Average expectancy in Aboriginal surveys now is close to 60 years. On the face of it, that’s a doubling of the length of life, related to Western medicine (vaccinations and the like) and Western-

style public services (such as pure drinking water, relatively safe transport, and basic housing). According to the federal Department of Health, average health expenditure on Aboriginals is 20 to 50 per cent higher than on other Australians... (T)he sacrifice made by public servants and taxpayers on behalf of Aborigines does not immediately jump at you as being so “poor” that it is “uncivilised”... The most fascinating thing about the ethnic diversity debate is that we as an academic community seem reluctant to push our arguments to their logical conclusion. If diversity is so great, then why don’t we argue the supposed advantages for Aborigines of the greater diversity brought in with European settlement? If living in a sea of diversity is so wonderful for other Australians, why not for Aborigines?

Text 4. Political correctness in our social scientists. Bolt (2007). Underlining added.

Like the first text we looked at, this text includes a significant degree of inscribed attitude and heteroglossic engagement that develop particular evaluations and position different constellations. However for our purposes, what is noticeable is that this text repeatedly utilizes a small number of elements from the constellations developed in Tables 6 and 7. This includes regular reference to the original inhabitants of Australia as *Aborigines*, *Aboriginal*, *Aboriginals*, as well as a description of the arrival of Europeans as *settlement* and acknowledgement of *best guesses of anthropology*^{vi}. This set of terminology is situated in the constellation that disaligns with the UNSW Diversity Kit. In this way, it positions the authors, *Professor Paul Frijters* and *PhD student Tony Beaton*, as well as the author quoting them, journalist Andrew Bolt, as disaligning with the Diversity Kit and aligning with people such as *Keith Windschuttle* and *Institute of Public Affairs Research Fellow Matthew Lesh*. The argument of this paper is that for those who align with the UNSW Diversity Kit (very broadly, those who are may be considered politically left-wing in Australia), the use of this terminology will afford a negative judgement of these authors, which will likely color many of the arguments made in the text. Though to be sure of this, a much larger range of texts would need to analyzed to see how tight the constellation is.

Nonetheless, the opposition of the terms *Aborigines*, *Aboriginals* etc. to their counterparts in the constellation aligning with the Diversity Kit is reinforced by the single use of the term *indigenous people* in this text. Rather than being directly specified by the authors of this text,

it is positioned in projected speech and attributed to *Nikola Balvin from the University of Melbourne*:

One behavioural scientist, Nikola Balvin from the University of Melbourne used this at best partial finding to argue last year in the Australian Journal of Peace Studies that “Australia, because it permits such inequities and poor care for its indigenous people, is not a civilised nation”.

The text makes clear that the authors disalign with this quote and by extension with *Nikola Balvin* and the use of the term *indigenous people*. This is most obvious in the disclaimer: denial and negative evaluation of Balvin’s characterization of Australia as not being *civilised* and of providing *poor care*, in ‘(T)he sacrifice made by public servants and taxpayers on behalf of Aborigines does not immediately jump at you as being so “poor” that it is “uncivilised”’. The different use of the terms *Aborigine*, *Aboriginal* etc. and *indigenous people* thus correlates with the different constellations set up through the previous text analysis. By developing the analysis of the different constellations of values, we have been able to get an initial handle on the different positions being put forward in this paper. Moreover, we have a linguistic method for justifying why people in certain communities might balk at this text, while others may praise it. In this sense, a method has been developed that enables us to argue that the choice of *Aborigine* as opposed to *indigenous people* is not neutral – they in fact afford evaluations – without having to resort to intuition or ethnographic methods.

If we accept that the choice of each term likely affords a judgement on whoever uses them, then the constellation analysis offers a means through which we can see highly implicit affording attitude, and potentially enables an understanding of the rich swathe of field-specific evaluative language that permeates language use. In the case of the above article, it positions the sources of each term (*Paul Frijters and Tony Beaton vs Nikolas Balvin*) in different communities, which will potentially affect how each is read by those aligning or not with these communities.

It is obvious that the map we have built by no means captures all of the potentially evaluative meanings associated with each community nor that these are the only two communities in our society. After all, the map has been derived from only a single text. To achieve a more comprehensive map, this method may be applied iteratively across multiple texts, such as that of Text 4. Nevertheless, by building this initial map from Text 3 we can glean insights into some of the evaluative meanings at stake in various communities. By progressively expanding

this map through analyses of multiple texts, we could see which elements are stable across multiple texts (and so more likely to be shared bonds across a wider community) and which appear to be only instancial tokens in a single text. From such a map, we can begin to see the values systems that organize our communities, the highly implicit affording attitude that invoke these values systems, and where appropriate, teach these to students learning new intellectual fields.

References

- Bednarek, M. (2009) 'Polyphony in APPRAISAL: Typological and topological perspectives', *Linguistics and the Human Sciences*. 3(2). 107-136.
- Bye, C. (2016) 'University of NSW students told to refer to Australia as having been 'invaded'', *The Daily Telegraph*. 30/03/16.
<http://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/news/nsw/invasion-of-the-history-rewriters/news-story/d18774ad2553314898261298cef4e17d> (accessed 13/12/2016).
- Bolt, A. (2007) 'Black benefits of white settlement', *Herald Sun*. 14/02/07.
<http://www.heraldsun.com.au/blogs/andrew-bolt/black-benefits-of-white-settlement/news-story/6a5311fd5455d513f51638b4a6e44217> (accessed 01/06/17)
- Coffin, C. (2003) 'Reconstruals of the past – settlement or invasion? The role of JUDGEMENT analysis', in J. R. Martin and R. Wodak (eds) *Re/reading the past: Critical and functional perspectives on time and value*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 219-246.
- Coffin, C. & O'Halloran, K. A. (2005) 'Finding the Global Groove: Theorizing and analyzing dynamic reader positioning using APPRAISAL, corpus, and a concordance', *Critical Discourse Studies* 2(2). 143-163.
- Gray, B. (1987) 'How natural is "natural" language teaching? Employing wholistic methodology in the classroom', *Australian Journal of Early Childhood* 12(4). 3-19.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1977) 'Ideas about language' *Occasional Papers Applied Linguistic Association of Australia*. I. 32-55.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Martin, J.R. (1993) *Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power*. London: Falmer.

- Hao, J. (2019) *Analysing Scientific Discourse from a Systemic Functional Linguistic Perspective: A Framework for Exploring Knowledge-Building in Biology*. London: Routledge.
- Hood, S. & Martin, J.R. (2007) 'Invoking attitude: the play of graduation in appraising discourse' in R. Hasan, C. M. I. M. Matthiessen & J. J. Webster (eds) *Continuing discourse on language: A functional perspective. Volume 2*. London: Equinox. 739-764.
- Hommerberg, C. and Don, A. (2015) 'Appraisal and the language of wine appreciation: A critical discussion of the potential of the Appraisal framework as a tool to analyse specialized genres', *Functions of Language*. 22(2). 161-191.
- Jonassen, D. H. & Land, S. M. (2000) 'Preface', in D. H. Jonassen & S. M. Land (eds) *Theoretical Foundations of Learning Environments*, London: Lawrence Erlbaum. iii-x.
- Knight, N. K. (2010) 'Wrinkling complexity: Concepts of identity and affiliation in humour', in M. Bednarek & J. R. Martin (eds) *New Discourse on Language: Functional Perspectives on Multimodality, Identity and Affiliation*. London: Continuum. 35-54.
- Knight, N. K. (2013) 'Evaluating experience in funny ways: How friends bond through conversational humour', *Text and Talk* 33(4-5). 553-574.
- Lee, A. (1993) 'Whose Geography? A feminist-poststructuralist critique of systemic 'genre'-based accounts of literacy and curriculum', *Social Semiotics* 3(1). 131-156.
- Macintyre, S. & Clark, A. (2003) *The History Wars*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Martin, J.R. (2011) 'Bridging troubled waters: Interdisciplinarity and what makes it stick' in F. Christie & K. Maton (eds) *Disciplinarity: Functional linguistic and sociological perspectives*. London: Continuum. 35-61.
- Martin, J. R. and Doran, Y. J. (forthcoming) 'Field Relations: Understanding scientific explanations' in K. Maton, J. R. Martin and Y. J. Doran (eds) *Studying Science: Knowledge, Language, Pedagogy*. London: Routledge.

- Martin, J.R., Maton, K. & Matruglio, E. (2010) 'Historical cosmologies: Epistemology and axiology in Australian secondary school history discourse' *Revista Signos* 43:74. 433-463.
- Martin, J.R. & Rose, D. (2007) *Working with Discourse: meaning beyond the clause*. 2nd edn. London: Continuum.
- Martin, J.R. & Stenglin, M. (2006) 'Materializing reconciliation: Negotiating difference in a transcolonial exhibition' in T. D. Royce & W. L. Bowcher (eds) *New directions in the analysis of multimodal discourse*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. 215-238.
- Martin, J.R. & White, P.R.R. (2005) *The Language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Maton, K. (2014) *Knowledge and knowers: Towards a realist sociology of education*. London: Routledge.
- Maton, K. and Doran, Y. J. (2017a) 'SFL and code theory' in T. Bartlett & G. O'Grady (eds), *The Routledge Handbook of Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Routledge. 605-618.
- Maton, K., and Doran, Y. J. (2017b) 'Semantic density: A translation device for revealing complexity of knowledge practices in discourse, part 1 – wording' *Onomázein, Special Issue on Systemic Functional Linguistics and Legitimation Code Theory*. 46-76.
- Maton, K., and Doran, Y. J. (2017c) 'Condensation: A translation device for revealing complexity of knowledge practices in discourse, part 2 – clausing and sequencing' *Onomázein, Special Issue on Systemic Functional Linguistics and Legitimation Code Theory*. 77-110.
- Maton, K., Martin, J.R. & Matruglio, E. (2016) 'LCT and systemic functional linguistics: Enacting complementary theories for explanatory power' In K. Maton, S. Hood, S. Shay (eds) *Knowledge-building: Educational studies in Legitimation Code Theory*. London: Routledge.
- Rose, D. & Martin, J.R. (2012) *Learning to Read/Reading to Learn: Genre, knowledge and pedagogy in the Sydney School*. London: Equinox.

Szenes, E. (2017) *The Linguistic Construction of Business Reasoning: Towards a Language-Based Model of Decision-Making in Undergraduate Business*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Department of Linguistics, The University of Sydney.

White, P.R.R. (2003) 'Beyond modality and hedging: A dialogic view of the language of intersubjective stance' *Text* 23:2. 259-284.

Windschuttle, K. (2002) *The fabrication of Aboriginal history. Volume 1, Van Dieman's Land 1803-1847*. Paddington: Macleay.

Windschuttle, K. (2009) *The fabrication of Aboriginal history. Volume 3, The stolen generations 1881-2008*. Paddington: Macleay.

ⁱ This does not mean everything an axiologically condensed source says will necessarily gain a significant foothold in the constellation (in LCT terms, it does not mean it will develop relatively strong axiological semantic density). If it is only mentioned a small number of times by a source, then it will likely have only a relatively weak association with this constellation and so will be somewhat peripheral to the field. However if it is repeated, explained, developed and used widely, it will develop a significantly stronger association with the constellation and become more tightly bound to the field. To see how this develops, large corpus studies of the evaluative patterns would be of use here.

ⁱⁱ Note here, the question is not whether the guidelines are worthy of criticism, rather we are concerned with whether or not Matthew Lesh did indeed criticize the guidelines. The text does not indicate that he may not have. In contrast, the previous example notes that the proposition *it is offensive to suggest James Cook "discovered" Australia*, is in some sense questionable, by giving it a source (implicitly the UNSW Diversity Toolkit).

ⁱⁱⁱ Although, authors may use monoglossic utterances to evoke various networks of values, there is no linguistic marking that enables us to see this at this stage. For this reason, monoglossic statements will not be considered.

^{iv} This is more precisely formulated in terms of positioned figures under Hao's (2019) discourse semantic framework.

^v Here I am taking the quotation marks around “*being stolen*” as genuinely quoted material, rather than as ‘scare quotes’. If read as scare quotes, this would be another heteroglossic resource used to disalign from the terms *being stolen*.

^{vi} It is arguable whether *the best guess of anthropology* should be captured here. The constellation suggests that the UNSW Diversity Kit disaligns with *anthropological assumptions*, but whether this is specifically the *assumptions* made by anthropologists, or anthropological models in general would need further text analysis to tease out.