

**Resistance and Production  
in the Ruins of Pedagogy  
and Student Writing**

**Juliet Henderson**

UCL Institute of Education London

PhD Thesis

December 2017

**Declaration**

I, Juliet Henderson, hereby declare that, except where explicit attribution is made, the work presented in this thesis is entirely my own.

**Word count:** 96,181

## **Abstract**

This thesis is an examination of the (im)possibility of the critical in pedagogy and student writing. More specifically, using Foucault's concept of governance, and his genealogical problematization of power/knowledge which animates and constrains the present, it interrogates normative understandings of 'the critical' as a criterion against which practice and language are evaluated in the academy.

A poststructuralist, materialist approach to understanding academic work and its subjects is developed and employed in exploring the 'ruins' of pedagogy and student writing, where the metaphor of 'ruins' refers to 'the crumbling edifice of Enlightenment values' (Maclure 2011:997). Foucault's methods and sensitivities, and Derrida's understanding of the 'event' of writing, are conjointly put to work to problematise the operations of power in the governance, administration and legitimation of hegemonic understandings of 'the critical' in higher education.

Deploying as analytical notions and tools Foucault's understanding of power as multiple forces of resistance and consent, or as an immanence in our doings which operates in minute, micro-physical heterogeneous ways, this thesis scrutinizes the ways the present of critical pedagogical practice, and undergraduate student writing in the field of intercultural communication, is produced and conditioned from within. The ineluctable oscillation between resistance and consent in such presents puts into question the post- possibility of 'the critical', here understood as 'the right to difference, variation and metamorphosis' (Derrida 2006:87) within the 'matrix of calculabilities' in the university (Ball & Olmedo 2012:103). This question is put into context in relation to the wider field of pedagogical and student writing practices.

Using close reading of student assessment texts, contingent 'micro-practices of resistance' are considered for ways they fleetingly keep openness in play, and proposed as one tentative way forward for a post-critical praxis of literacy pedagogy and writing.

## **Acknowledgements**

I have had the good fortune to have Doctor John O'Regan as my supervisor over the years it has taken to complete this thesis. My heartfelt thanks go to him for his knowledge, tact, honesty, openness to my ideas, and down-to-earth collegiate inspiration. These have given me vital support and faith in myself.

I would also like to thank all students on my module in intercultural communication, who continue to inspire me with the fresh perspectives they bring to the field of critical inquiry, and who generously gave permission for me to use their work for research purposes.

Special thanks go to my daughters, Jessica and Emma, who have tactfully and lovingly engaged with my ideas and ways of thinking, and never stopped believing in me.

Finally, I would like to thank my partner Julian for his love and support during my completing the thesis, and for his encouraging me to find ways to explain it more simply, so as to make it accessible to others than academics.

## Contents

### Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1	My intentions .....	p.11
1.2	Why the 'ruins' of pedagogy and student writing? .....	p.12
1.3	Research objectives .....	p.13
1.4	Outline of the thesis in steps .....	p.14
1.4.1	Step 2 .....	p.14
1.4.2	Step 3 .....	p.15
1.4.3	Step 4 .....	p.16
1.4.4	Step 5 .....	p.17
1.4.5	Step 6 .....	p.18
1.4.6	Step 7 .....	p.19
1.4.7	Step 8 .....	p.20
1.5	One step backwards, two steps forward .....	p.21

### Chapter 2: Theorising the discursive nature of the social worlds and materialities that constitute 'us' as subjects

2.1.	Introduction .....	p.22
2.2	Context and theoretical assumptions .....	p.22
2.3	Key concepts .....	p.23
2.4	The 'critical' in critical discourse analysis .....	p.25
2.4.1	The modernist, emancipatory paradigm of Critical Discourse Analysis .....	p.26
2.4.2	Being post-critical in critical discourse analysis .....	p.29
2.5	Discourses as archaeological .....	p.30
2.5.1	Questioning the nature of knowledge and the <i>episteme</i> .....	p.31
2.5.2	How can knowledge be an 'effect of discourse'? Rules of discursive formation .....	p.34
2.5.3	The statement, enunciative modalities , positivities of power and objects .....	p.36
2.5.4	Strengths and weaknesses of an archaeological approach to discourse .....	p.39
2.6	Discourses as genealogical .....	p.41
2.6.1	Power as relations of forces .....	p.43
2.6.2	The body as site of struggle and submission .....	p.44

2.6.3	Strengths and weaknesses of an archaeological-genealogical approach to discourse analysis .....	p.47
2.7	Conclusion .....	p.49

### **Chapter 3: The (im)Possibility of Critique and Resistance in University Knowledge**

#### **Production**

3.1	Introduction .....	p.50
3.2	Erosion of critical subjects in the polycentric neoliberal university .....	p.51
3.3	Classical Marxian perspectives .....	p.56
3.4	Gramsci: the hegemonic-state reproduction model .....	p.57
3.5	Althusser: Ideological State Apparatuses reproduction model .....	p.62
3.6	Laclau and Mouffe: hegemonic social production as plural, indeterminate discursive formation .....	p.66
3.7	Conclusion .....	p.69

### **Chapter 4: Towards Poststructural Critical Pedagogies – the Subaltern Subjects of Higher**

#### **Education**

4.1	Introduction .....	p.71
4.2	The contested field of critical pedagogy .....	p.73
4.3	Gramsci, Giroux, Ball and Freire .....	p.76
4.4	Appropriating Freire in the neoliberal contexts of the university .....	p.81
4.5	Post-critical pedagogy .....	p.82
4.6	Conclusion .....	p.90

### **Chapter 5: Towards Poststructuralist Understandings of the Critical in Student Academic**

#### **Writing**

5.1	Introduction .....	p.92
5.2	Governing and disciplining the language and behaviours of the academy .....	p.94
5.3	The observing gaze of Western, rational discourse .....	p.98
5.3.1	Anti-Rhetorical .....	p.99
5.3.2	Positivist-empirical .....	p.100
5.3.1	Deductive .....	p.100
5.4	The micro panopticon of the marksheet .....	p.101
5.5	The promise of diversity and mobility in the event of student writing .....	p.104

5.6.	Theorising the research subject of academic literacies .....	p.106
5.7	Conceptualising resistance(s) in the micropractices of student writing .....	p.109
5.8	Conclusion .....	p.112

## **Chapter 6: Methodologies, and Methodological Subjectivities**

6.1	Introduction .....	p.114
6.2	Peering 1 .....	p.120
6.2.1	Intention of first unpacking of student texts .....	p.120
6.2.2	Blindspots in my researcher vision and vehicle .....	p.121
6.2.3	Succumbing to the (false) security of modernist ways .....	p.124
6.2.4	The 'where' of student assessment text production .....	p.125
6.2.5	Falling back into modernist ways .....	p.128
6.3	Revalidating and regrounding critical textual analysis on non-foundational subjectivities .....	p.137
6.4	Peering 2 .....	p.138
6.5	Conclusion .....	p.139

## **Chapter 7: The Multiple and Dispersed Subjectivities of the Undergraduate Author –**

### **Peering 1**

7.1	Introduction .....	p.140
7.2.	Brief reminder of the research context .....	p.141
7.3.	Formalising assumptions and goals for second use of initial data analysis	p.142
7.4	Argumentative Analysis of research paper of Student A .....	p.147
7.4.1	Referential strategies – the effects of globalisation and new quests for belonging .....	p.148
7.4.2	Predicational strategies and perspectivisation – it's an institutional world	p.150
7.4.3	Intensification, mitigation strategies and metaphor – a runaway world .....	p.151
7.4.4	Interdiscursivity – the subtle radicalism of one word .....	p.151
7.4.5	The Unsaid – It's a western-centric academic world .....	p.153
7.4.6	Ventriloquation and addressivity – business as usual .....	p.153
7.4.7	Referential strategies - Personalising engagement with the discovery of new knowledge .....	p.154
7.4.8	Predicational strategies and perspectivisation – academic values of the 'natural' .....	p.155

7.4.9	Intensification and mitigation strategies – keeping the subjective an outsider (almost) .....	p.158
7.4.10	Interdiscursivity - a very expert imaginary .....	p.159
7.4.11	The Unsaid – fully controlled spontaneity .....	p.160
7.4.12	Ventriloquation and addressivity – speaking the talk .....	p.161
7.4.13	Referential strategies - Showing sensitivity to the rich data of cultural difference .....	p.162
7.4.14	Predicational strategies and perspectivisation – honouring subjectivity .....	p.163
7.4.15	Intensification and mitigation strategies – substantive difference and an ethics of equality .....	p.165
7.4.16	Interdiscursivity – a certain intercultural performativity .....	p.166
7.4.17	The Unsaid – a small elephant in the room .....	p.164
7.4.18	Ventriloquation and Addressivity – consenting to the field .....	p.168
7.5	Argumentative analysis of research paper of Student D .....	p.172
7.5.1	Referential strategies - The global is part of English-speaking UK society .....	p.172
7.5.2	Predicational strategies and perspectivisation - Keeping the subjective voice at bay .....	p.173
7.5.3	Intensification and mitigation strategies - Breaking down the cultural barriers of generalisations .....	p.175
7.5.4	Interdiscursivity – managerial speak .....	p.175
7.5.5	The Unsaid – Higher education is the only intercultural way .....	p.176
7.5.6	Ventriloquation and addressivity – not quite speaking the speak .....	p.177
7.5.7	Referential strategies – efficiencies of the bureaucratic register .....	p.178
7.5.8	Predicational strategies and perspectivisation – the violence of ethnographic interview constraints .....	p.179
7.5.9	Intensification and mitigation strategies – legitimising objective research tools and knowledge .....	p.180
7.5.10	Interdiscursivity – echoes of Enlightenment epistemologies .....	p.181
7.5.11	The Unsaid – remixing instructions .....	p.182
7.5.12	Ventriloquation and addressivity – a partial mimicry .....	p.183
7.5.13	Referential strategies – tensions between national and global .....	p.185
7.5.14	Predicational strategies & perspectivisation – if I’m British I like baked beans .....	p.186
7.5.15	Intensification and mitigation strategies – essentialisms prevail .....	p.188
7.5.16	Interdiscursivity – borderline hesitations .....	p.189

7.5.17	The Unsaid – selective selection .....	p.190
7.5.18	Ventriloquation and addressivity – (not) sticking to the rules of the game ....	p.190
7.6	Comparing argumentative and rhetorical discursive strategies of students A and D .....	p.191
7.6.1	A brief summary comparison of the knowledge performances of students A and D .....	p.202
7.7	The multiple and dispersed subjectivities of the undergraduate author – lessons for critical education .....	p.204
7.7.1	Re-inventing the critical – linking analysis back to theory .....	p.205
7.7.2	De-authorizing critical pedagogy for new learning in-comes .....	p.207
7.8	Conclusion .....	p.209

## **Chapter 8: Students and Pedagogues as Co-producing Subjects in Shared Histories –**

### **Peering 2**

8.1	Introduction .....	p.211
8.2	Trouvailles: student writing as ‘lively conceptual mutation’ .....	p.212
8.3	Findings gaps in the contractual spaces of our shared histories .....	p.221
8.4	Conclusion .....	p.223

## **Chapter 9: Conclusion**

9.1	Introduction .....	p.225
9.2	How the key research problem was theorised and examined .....	p.225
9.3	Brief summary of the whole .....	p.227
9.4	Ways the whole exceeds its parts – a brief holistic judgement .....	p.230
9.5	Limitations .....	p.230
9.6	Applications and implications of the research: one more time with feeling .....	p.231
9.7	Recommendations for (my) future research and practice .....	p.232

<b>References</b> .....	<b>p.234</b>
-------------------------	--------------

### **List of tables**

Table 1 Post-critical-archaeological and CDA approaches to critical discourse analysis (p.40)

Table 2 Post-critical-archaeological- genealogical continuum approach to critical discourse analysis (p.47)

Table 3 Gramscian perspectives on hegemony and the agency of the subject (p.61)

Table 4 Althusserian perspectives on hegemony and the agency of the subject (p.66)

Table 5 Laclau and Mouffe perspectives on hegemony and the agency of the subject (p.69)

Table 6 A glossary of post-critical pedagogical terms (p.89)

Table 7 Comparing argumentative and rhetorical discursive strategies of student A and D (p.191)

Table 8 Student *poietics* (p.213)

### Appendix A.

Intercultural communication research paper task brief (p.260)

### Appendix B.

Intercultural Communication gradesheet (p.258)

### Appendix C.

Course weekly outline (p.260)

## Chapter 1 Introduction

### 1.1 My intentions

At first glance, the terms ‘critical pedagogy’ or ‘critical writing’ appear to denote fairly straightforwardly delineated practices. Since Freire’s germinal book, *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1972), the principles and practices of ‘critical pedagogy, premised on left-thinking politically-engaged approaches to education, that work to contest class-based understandings of society, to make education accessible to the many, and which use dialogue as a teaching and learning method for raising critical consciousness, have inspired many educators. Whilst never a dominant discourse within education, many of its more innovative approaches to pedagogy have been picked up on and recirculated in differently categorised educational methods, as well as in related fields such as training and mentoring. Rare are the educators who have no knowledge of the emancipatory trajectories of Freire’s transformative approaches. Similarly, in UK higher education, ‘critical writing’ is typically taken across different disciplines to designate forms of engagement with the literature, and/or reasoning and argumentation on writing that go beyond the descriptive (e.g. University of Leicester, Oxford Brookes University, and Nottingham University). In this sense, ‘critical writing’ is the assumed outward manifestation of ‘critical thinking’, generally presented to students as ‘the ability not to take things at face value’, and to question the reasoning and validity of your own and other’s arguments and evidence (e.g. University of Sussex, University of Manchester, University of Edinburgh). Implicit in this construal of the relation between ‘critical writing’ and ‘critical thinking’ is a tacit assumption that the language used to write ‘critically’ is a neutral medium that can be controlled and guided by the writer’s thinking. Thus, whilst both fields of practice are presented as ‘critical’, the use of the term in such contexts is problematic from a poststructuralist perspective since, ultimately, it is premised on (a) a *telos* of emancipation in the case of ‘critical pedagogy’, or (b) on the Cartesian subject in the case of ‘critical writing’.

A theoretical intention of this thesis is to explore how such transformative and Enlightenment understandings of ‘the critical’, and poststructuralist understandings of the same, might be mutually enlightening in revealing to each other their respective (im)possibilities as practices for bringing about social change. A related empirical intention is to examine the way undergraduate authors are located in multiple, conflicting discourses, of which they are both vehicles and points of resistance, as they (re)produce themselves as

subjectivities. These multiple, fractured subjectivities are obscured in normative readings of student assessment writing, since they exceed the grids of intelligibility and legitimacy used to construe and evaluate the knowledge capital, or 'grade' of the good/okay/less good academic subject in the current academy-in-ruins, even if that normative grid is framed to be 'emancipatory'. The concept of subjectivity used here is that of matrix transformation. Through a poststructuralist discourse analysis which sees power as a generalizable model of the way society functions (Foucault 1997), rather than a coercive or exclusionary force, student research papers produced in the disciplinary knowledge field of intercultural communication, are examined for the unacknowledged ways that undergraduate subjects critically and creatively contribute to the social order they are fabricated in (Foucault 1997). These marginalised, creative contributions to the wider commons of academic knowledge are considered (a) for what they suggest about the limits of 'the critical' in higher education, and (b) for the ways they keep openness in play and offer singular examples of micro-localised events of resistance to centralised strategies for constituting the student subject as a unitary, sanitary output of corporate higher education. These creative contributions are offered as a small shared knowledge resource for those interested in post-critical literacy praxis.

Overall, there is currently little work exploring these particular conceptions of 'the critical' in the academy, and it is my hope the arguments and analysis developed in this thesis, whilst necessarily imbricated in the ubiquitous contingencies of the productive power and play of hegemonic discourses, can make new contributions in the fields of post-critical pedagogy and critical literacy, particularly in relation to a field such as intercultural communication, that is broadly located in the disciplinary hubs of the social sciences and arts and humanities.

## **1.2 Why the 'ruins' of pedagogy and student writing?**

Since the beginning of the twentieth century, the grand narratives and keystone assumptions of Enlightenment and Modernity about knowledge and the subject have been dismantled bit by bit, on the basis of philosophical arguments and detailed research. But amidst the resulting wreckage and 'ruins', old assumptions about the universality of truth, knowledge as clear and definite, being and knowing as separate, writing as a neutral medium of communication, history as continuous and progressive, and methods as straightforward tools for understanding identifiable objects and practices, have endured and prevailed. To indicate that the approach in this thesis remains attentive to the lasting

regulative ideals of the Enlightenment and Modernity that shape practice, and their incommensurability with theory, the metaphor of 'ruins' is made salient in the title and used as a critical thematic throughout.

Correspondingly, but to less moral ends, the dogma of the market economy has ensured that the social mission of the university is now so wholly demolished, that the most admirable aspirations for knowledge and its subjects have been co-opted by the ubiquitous mechanisms and practices of neoliberal governance. Though neither unitary nor coherent these rationalities work to remake the social world 'in the image of a market, narrowly construed' (Whelan 2015:138) and to generate as much wealth as possible from knowledge production. As well as explicitly evoking this destruction of previous iterations of the inherently hegemonic role of the university, which can hardly be said to have universally held human progress and emancipation as its priorities, the metaphor of 'ruins' is once again intended to ensure a vigilant alertness towards the subject's necessary entanglement with its goals, practices and certainties.

In sum, in this thesis, the symbolic thematic of 'ruins' is used as a leitmotiv in relation to pedagogy and student writing to undermine regulative certainties, and to evoke the fractured, fragmented, broken discontinuities that form the emergent nature of knowledge and its knowers.

### **1.3 Research objectives**

The main research objective addressed in this thesis is how to construe a plausible characterisation of 'the critical' and resistance in pedagogy, and student writing in the critical disciplines, in the light of (a) poststructuralist understandings of discourse and the subject as respectively the raw material and subjugated agency of knowledge, that simultaneously produce constant change, dispersal and proliferation of knowledge, and (b) a view of the ideologies and central concepts of modernity as 'in ruins', despite relations of power and hegemony which continue to regulate such criticism. This critique uses archaeological method (Foucault 1984c), in that it does not conceptualise knowledge and moral action as universal structures but instead considers 'the instances of discourse that articulate what we think, say and do as so many historical events' (Foucault 1984c:46).

Two further objectives, which echo the critical intention of the first, are: (a) what might contingent, asymmetrical and uneven articulations of resistance and consent in student writing look like and suggest about the unitary subject of student governance?; and (b) what might heterogeneous micro-practices of resistance in the present of student writing look like and suggest about resisting tradition and preventing closure of knowledge. These questions are genealogical in their intention to 'separate out from the contingency that has made us what we are, the possibility of no longer being, doing, what we are, do or think' (Foucault 1984c:46).

#### **1.4 Outline of the thesis in steps**

Despite poststructural construals of the text as a porous site of constantly shifting meaning, according to context, this thesis has a beginning, middle and end. As a prologue to what follows, I now expand upon the details of the different chapters which are the steps that form this whole.

##### **1.4.1 Step 2**

Following step 1 of the introduction, the aim of Chapter 2, *Theorising the discursive nature of the social worlds and materialities that constitute 'us' as subjects*, is to justify and rationalise my choice of Foucaultian and Derridean theoretical perspectives as 'methods' for troubling the modernist, emancipatory paradigm of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), used to analyse two student texts in Chapter 7, *The Multiple and Dispersed Subjectivities of the Undergraduate Author – Peering 1*, and as 'methods' that constitute the epistemology and ontology realised in this thesis. Heeding Foucault's example, it is not consistent to separate methodological considerations from the philosophical or empirical issues under consideration, nor from the art of thinking or writing techniques, and hence, as much as this chapter provides a theoretical framework for this thesis, it also affords a methodological framework and points to a form of knowledge praxis. I address these considerations more specifically in Chapter 6, *Methodologies and methodological subjectivities*.

The chapter commences by defining key concepts used in this chapter and beyond, then moves on to critique inconsistencies in the prevalent paradigm of CDA before proposing an alternative paradigm, termed post-critical discourse analysis. Using Foucault's archaeology and genealogy, that unravel traditional accounts of truth by highlighting the centrality of language to all social and cultural activity, and more particularly its materiality and endemic

ideological nature, in conjunction with the Derridean concept of openness to Other (2003), in contrast to traditional understandings I conceptualise 'the critical' in terms of pre-conceptual rules structuring arbitrary, contingent decisions about meaning in an infinite set of possibilities. Hence its meaning is highly divergent, and different discourses, sponsors, institutions will construe divergent meanings along ideological lines, guided by normative policies and practices that guide meaning to normative readings in certain ways. This conceptualisation of 'the critical' facilitates the critiques that follow of higher education and its subjects, 'critical pedagogy', and my own pedagogical praxis.

### **1.4.2 Step 3**

The aim of Chapter 3, *The (im)possibility of critique and resistance in university knowledge production*, is to interrogate more closely the agency of the post-critical pedagogue and/or student author subject of hegemonic university relations of cultural production via the political and philosophical approaches of Gramsci, Althusser, and Laclau and Mouffe. The pragmatic consequence of the genealogically embedded neoliberal ideology and discursive formations which constitute what is the most valued work in what the title of Readings book title (1996) describes as 'The University in Ruins', is that these tend to marginalise interpretive, theoretical research and thinking on topics of pedagogy and student literacy, particularly that which strays too far from the Cartesian model of the natural sciences and its subjects, and the quantitative logics of socioeconomic impacts and returns. With a concern for the critical praxis of momentarily demolishing these politically and commercially valenced rankings of dominant disciplinary knowledge, this chapter aims to provide an adequate ontology of the agency of the productive and resistant subject/worker that takes into account the indivisibility of knowledge production and sociocultural organisation, and the always already interpellations of power.

Firstly, there is a brief consideration of classical Marxian perspectives. These posit the discursive, discontinuous webs of ideology as a central force in social formation that serves to alienate or distract the worker from the ideas that drive and shape her existence, and direct her energies to working in a world frequently at odds with her own class interests (Hiddleston 2009:10). However, within such perspectives, there is the assumption of universal, deterministic connections between 'positions in relations of production and the mentality of the producers' (Laclau & Mouffe 2001:85) that belie the shifting, contingent agency of the subject of hegemonic reproduction, whatever their hierarchical position. To

overcome this incommensurability between Marxian conceptions of the worker subject, and new and post Marxian conceptions of the worker, aka the pedagogical or student worker in the university site, at this point in the thesis the specificity and positionality of class subjects is replaced with the specificity and positionality of subaltern academic subjects: all subjugated by academic grids of intelligibility.

In what follows in the chapter, I elaborate aspects of the conceptualisations of social and cultural production in the work of Gramsci, Althusser, and Laclau and Mouffe pertinent to the question of the agency of the subject of resistance and production in everyday practices that forms one of the primary foci of this inquiry. Having built an argument as to which aspects are useful, the chapter concludes by using the relevant 'tools' provided to sketch out a framework for analysing power relations, and the subjugation and agency of the academic subject of pedagogy and writing.

#### **1.4.3 Step 4**

The aim of Chapter 4, *Towards Poststructural Critical Pedagogies – the subaltern subjects of higher education*, is to engage with post-qualitative and feminist critiques of critical pedagogy. Namely, that on the one hand, its genealogy sustains a conventional position that accentuates submission to the authority of the masculine voice of reason and texts, which does not make transparent more localised contexts of pedagogy, and on the other hand that it develops unduly universal, heroic assumptions about the event and outcomes of 'critical pedagogy', which do not make transparent the subaltern subjectivities of such events. It uses these critiques as stances for disambiguating familiar readings of the 'critical' and 'pedagogy' as counter-hegemonic praxis, and as a starting point for thinking through more historical approaches to critical pedagogy's events.

This focus requires first some examination of the traces of modernist, binary assumptions of oppression and empowerment ever-present in the texts of critical pedagogy, that enable it to be seen to constitute an economy of knowledge in which history and the feminine have little currency. Having named the presences and absences in these traditions, I then proceed reflexively to a brief narrative about my own imbrication with such ahistorical traditions at the outset of work on this doctoral thesis. This is necessary in order to recognize the appeal of such sources of knowledge, whilst holding them at a distance dedicated to theory's

Others, that are rooted in the moment critical pedagogy praxis departs from what sustains it.

Finally, having excavated some of the 'ruins of critical pedagogy' (Lather 1996:488) and its subjects, it becomes possible to think the future to come of critical pedagogy, as it continues its reproduction in the systems of power/knowledge whilst remaining attentive to the relationship between theory and method. More specifically, pursuing trajectories advanced by other thinkers including Lather, Rancière and Bowman, the chapter concludes by advancing ways of wording and conceptualising new worlds of critical pedagogy, where un-learning rather than learning (Dunne 2016), learning in-comes rather than outcomes (Dunne 2016), and not-knowing rather than knowing are the places that allow us to move away from the truth and certainties of the old world.

#### **1.4.4 Step 5**

The aim of Chapter 5, *Towards poststructuralist understandings of the critical in student academic writing*, is to return to the critical subject, this time in its/their agentive function as the author of student writing, whose texts are postulated upon a pre-existing reader who legitimates and ranks its authoritative claims.

Attentive to Foucault's viewpoint, that in order to interpret the history of a text we need to look at the technologies of governance of the institution that produces and sanctions it, this chapter begins with an examination of the operations of higher education audit culture whose constraints serve to prioritise homogeneity and standardisation, and inhibit difference, spontaneity and uncertainty, in all higher education practices, including pedagogy and student writing. The discourses of audit culture, which accords such practices validity in the name of the real priorities they are purported to represent, are examined as one of the key techniques of the university's mechanisms for disguising the tactics that organise knowledge.

Next elucidated as another key technology of governance is the officiating gaze of Western, rational discourse, that circulates Enlightenment imperatives of the objective subject of knowledge. These multiple constraints work to correct and discipline any effects of the author's subjectivity, and as a part of the ahistorical infrastructures of university governance simultaneously make invisible to academic writers, including students, the subjective

practices from which they assume they are detached. Conceptualising the undergraduate feedback sheet as an endpoint, user-interface micro panopticon of this officiating gaze, that works as a discreetly totalising technique for preserving written knowledge products from their dynamic contradictions and tensions, it is argued that whilst this serves a vital, practical role in explaining to students the pre-existing knowledge norms that constitute disciplinary outputs, it also denies the praxis that generates these.

To conclude, in conjunction with the existing field of critical literacy, Foucault's characterisation of 'care of the self' (1982; 2008), and the 'virtue of critique' (1997:45) are used, along with Derrida's understanding of *poiesis* (Derrida 1988), as the ungrounded space between past and present conditions for the possibility of knowledge, to theorise diversity and mobility at the level of the text as a way of thinking and conceptualising micro-practices of resistance in the ruins of student writing.

#### **1.4.5 Step 6**

The aim of chapter 6, *Methodologies, and methodological subjectivities* is to problematise how, if assuming multiplicity and absence of foundation are the givens of poststructuralist epistemology, a 'valid' account can be given of method or object of analysis. Whilst this epistemology recognises an origination which organises a surface coherence, it does so precisely at the expense of visibility of the Other of student writing, that is the micro-mechanisms of cultural reproduction scrutinized in this thesis. Furthermore, though the twists and turns of the research process of defining an analytical framework called 'a method', and an object of analysis which is the dynamic, arbitrary historicities of undergraduate assessment writing in the field of intercultural communication are unfolded in the chapter, this is carried out within the disciplinary domains of the social sciences whose objectivity and positivism it simultaneously deciphers. This means its coherences of method and object of analysis are never really anchored.

What is presented at the beginning of the chapter is a questioning and probing of modernist structures and coherences which largely determine the ways we speak, or can speak of 'valid' methods, data and interpretation or analysis. Having given method the chance to be theoretically exacting by interfering in modernist structures, there is then a section in which I elaborate upon how the influence of these structures, and their illusions and oversights, or as Foucault puts it (1998:19) 'a badly exorcised complicity between the body's mechanics

and the mind's complacency', led me to an unsustainable starting point for my object of analysis, and the critical discourse analytical approach of Discourse Historical Analysis (Wodak & Meyer 2009) deployed in interpreting two student texts, that I next explain and critique. Put briefly, I had paid insufficient attention to my own normalising role as pedagogue, and producer of course content and assignment briefs, in generating 'the critical' approaches to intercultural communication in student writing that I was keen to identify, and also failed to see the modernist leanings of Discourse Historical Analysis. This section can be summed up as 'learning from my mistakes'.

Not wishing to discard the illuminating findings retrieved from this first 'peering' into the underside of reason, where my non-unitary, interpretations bring to light the hidden performances of the present in two student texts, I re-validate the analysis from an alternative reading perspective towards the end of the chapter. The starting point for this approach to truth is one which makes more explicit my own positivity as part of the technologies of governance that spell out and predefine 'the critical' in student writing preferred on the particular course in intercultural communication for which the research papers analysed were written. Additionally, having put into question my governing role in the local history of my courses to ensure a rightful beginning for my object(s) of analysis, I propose a second strategy for 'peering'. This moves from a broad focus on the multiple, dynamic subjectivities of student writing to one explicitly concentrated on snippets of what I conceptualise as emergent diversity and mobility in the materiality of student texts, unearthed in eight further assignments. The *trouvailles* of this peering are presented and discussed in Chapter 8, *Students and Pedagogues as Co-producing Subjects in Shared Histories – Peering 2*.

#### **1.4.6 Step 7**

Bearing in mind the in-between nature of any textual interpretation, chapter 7, *The Multiple and Dispersed Subjectivities of the Undergraduate Author – Peering 1*, uses an in-depth argumentative analysis of two student research papers, produced for the undergraduate course I teach in intercultural communication, to interrogate the productive, heterogeneous subjectivities of power which introduce a tacit, effective disorder in the surface coherences of academic discourse and student writing. The main aims of this analysis are (a) to interrogate the merit of transformative approaches to the 'critical' in pedagogy given the immediate death of the event of resistance in truth and always already present

interpellation, (b) to provide thick, rich data on production and resistance in the ruins of student writing, and (c) to attempt tacitly to give an account of the infinitude of the event of writing.

To grant theoretical legitimacy to the analysis, the chapter begins by acknowledging the historically authoritative role I assumed as pedagogue/assessor inviting the 'critical' in student writing, which potentially compromised the legitimacy of my analysis of the findings, and the misguided use of Discourse Historical Analysis which infiltrates its frameworks and objects of analysis in the place of the historical subject of knowledge. Having opened up my entanglements with these logics of governance and reason to the reader, I then instate a different epistemology from which to apprehend the discussion of findings which introduces history and the present into the different directions taken by the student texts and analysis.

Using the discourse analytical categories of *referential strategies*, *predicational strategies* and *perspectivisation*, *intensification* and *mitigation strategies*, *interdiscursivity*, *ventriloquation* and *addressivity*, and *the unsaid*, the chapter then proceeds to a comparative analysis of two research papers, one an A grade, the other a B+, in which multiple examples of intricate combinations of subalternity to mainstream and alternative modes of representing knowledge are discussed. Whilst there is no lengthy elaboration of the differences between the two, the description of the differences suggests the A grade paper demonstrates a greater capacity for resistance in the way it uses as well as serves power.

The chapter concludes by taking up the relation of the findings to the perspectives on hegemony and critical pedagogy problematised in earlier chapters, and reflecting upon the fleeting promises of change enacted in the performances of consent and resistance in the two papers.

#### **1.4.7 Step 8**

Whilst not claiming they represent coherent possibilities for action, Chapter 8, *Students and pedagogues as co-producing subjects in shared histories*, addresses the question of the 'what' and 'how' of the critical in the praxis of student writing in the dynamic processes of power and time. Pursuing the ever-present intention of challenging the givens of understandings of 'the critical' in the university, and accepting the paradoxical nature of

criticality, given the ruses of modernity, a hesitant answer to the question is presented via what are termed 'micro practices of resistance' in writing. Such an answer is premised on the incommensurability between the performative theoretical praxis of resistance and its ability to reverse the system.

More specifically, having presented snippets of such written micro practices identified in eight student research papers, I argue these are the fruit of students 'care of the self' (Foucault 1984), that produces *poiesis* (Derrida 1998), where, by a complex interplay with the self-evident coding of the sentence, subaltern practices that incorporate the other into the same are achieved. Taking these spontaneous examples of *poiesis* as small p practices of political and ethical freedom in the governmentality of the university system, I then reflect upon what they can teach us as post-critical pedagogues in our shared histories with students. Not wishing to deny the tensions inherent in such efforts, I conclude by proposing the snippets as heuristic starting points for post-critical literacy teaching where the critical is not simply forms of argumentation built from the neutral medium of language, but also a kind of insistent, internal reinvention of given ways such that the answer to the possibility of resistance in the ruins of student writing is 'Yes'. In order to retrieve such infractions of the norm from silence, and to challenge the given that language is a neutral medium, it is suggested that innovative knowledge production at the level of the text be included in the gradesheet descriptor of language, by which student writing is judged.

### **1.5 One step backwards, two steps forward**

I do not assume that the hope of bringing about a different post-critical future to come within the contingencies and antagonisms of power relations is straightforward. Nor that there is much hope of this within the micro-practices of resistance in the event of writing that are our only hope in the web of neoliberal governance the forms our current episteme. Yet this thesis is written in order to renew our awareness of false hopes that might distract us from the overlapping productivity of resistance and consent.

## **Chapter 2**

### **Theorising the discursive nature of the social worlds and materialities that constitute 'us' as subjects**

#### **2.1 Introduction**

The prime objective of this chapter is to outline and justify the Foucaultian theoretical approaches to discourse I use to critically analyse how resistance in pedagogy and student writing emerges and is produced in the social institution of the university. It thus supports my main research objective stated in Chapter 1, of providing an adequately theorised problematisation of critique in relation to governance. More specifically in this chapter, my aim is to provide myself, the researcher, with a well-defined and theoretically-adequate approach to critical discourse analysis, and also to trace for others the descriptive and interpretive paths this thesis intends to follow. Firstly, a brief outline of context and theoretical assumptions is given. Secondly, key concepts developed as elements of my research paradigm are glossed. In the ensuing section my use of the concept of criticality is clarified via a critical appraisal of the modernist emancipatory paradigm of Critical Discourse Analysis enabled by Derrida (1982, 1986) and O'Regan (2006). The third section looks at Foucault's archaeological approach to discourses (2002a), which aims to elucidate the relations between knowledge, power and discourse. In the final section, genealogical understandings of the way discourses exercise power through regulation of institutional ways of talking, thinking and acting, are considered as a necessary addition to a theoretical framework apt to explain how discourses play out conditions of emergence and submergence to ensure the course of 'the critical' in pedagogy and writing over time.

#### **2.2 Context and theoretical assumptions**

This investigation is contextualised and construed using my own experience as an applied linguist in an English-speaking university institutional structure, and by drawing on an interdisciplinary range of texts and theories which includes critical applied linguistics, anthropology, education, critical literacy, cultural studies and sociology. In this sense, it is an endeavour that operationalises a number of theoretical assumptions which I broadly categorise as 'post-critical' (Pennycook 2001) since they assume the necessity of problematising the given in our ways of approaching knowledge and reality (Foucault 1972). The research also adheres to the principle that the knowledge of the academy and its disciplines needs to be 'reality aware' both in relation to the embodied and desiring human

subject and the material conditions in which most human subjects live. The theoretical assumptions operationalised in this research include: poststructuralist insights that discourses and genres need to be theorised in relation to institutional contexts which organise knowledge in accordance with institutional structures and systems of governance (Foucault 1972, 1974; Chouliakari & Fairclough 1999; Threadgold 2003); cultural studies understandings that subjectivities and realities are largely mediated and construed through language (Threadgold 2003; Hall & Du Gay 1996); philosophical appreciations that the relationship between structure and agency needs to be theorised not as a binary, but rather as heteroglossic, dialogic, fluid and multiple (Bakhtin 1986; de Certeau 1984; Bauman 2000; Block 2007); critical epistemologies which situate the knower in selective relations to what is known and other knowers (Anderson 2010; Bhabha 1994, Bourdieu 1991); social theory perceptions which reject the assumption that social objects such as ‘the world’ or ‘the subject’ have a straightforward independent existence outside our discursively shaped understanding and texts (Chia 2000:513; Foucault 1972; Derrida 1988; Laclau & Mouffe 1985); a rejection of the notion that epistemology is a form of ‘elite’ discourse which can be differentiated from the discourses which constitute our social worlds, and hence a rejection of the differentiation between theory and practice (Chouliakari & Fairclough 1999; Rogers 2004:2) leading to a preference for the notion of ‘praxis’ which understands the relationship between theory and practice as a ‘continuous reflexive integration of thought, desire and action’ (Pennycook 2001:3). Finally, it is important to state that this inquiry is grounded in a political and ethical understanding that ‘a certain way of using language is identified with a certain way of seeing society’ (Eco 1976:46) and hence is already political, as well as an ethical vision of a moral obligation towards Others despite differences (Appiah 2006).

### **2.3 Key concepts**

My theoretical framework for describing how discourses work and exercise power in society incorporates both synchronic and diachronic dimensions. This allows me to describe and analyse both the formal, immanent level at which discourses around critical pedagogy and the critical in writing are construed and circulated, and the historical, material level at which orders of discourse become naturalised over time in non-discursive practices and contexts. In Foucault’s archaeological analysis of the workings of knowledge, discourse is conceived of as an abstract notion operating at the level of statements (*énoncés*), and also as a less abstract notion operating at the level of concrete utterances (*énonciations*). Jäger and Maier argue the latter level of operation can be conceptualised as ‘performances located at the

surface of texts' (2007:46). At this level, discourses are to be examined synchronically, as limited cuts of what can be said and is sayable at a given point in time, and diachronically as cuts of different discursive events occurring at various points in time (Jäger and Maier 2007 *ibid.*). In this thesis, I conceptualise cross-sectional analysis of discourse as 'the glance' and genealogical analysis of discourse over time as 'the gaze'. The former is important for synchronic discourse analysis of texts, and the latter is important for diachronic discourse analysis of the historical conditions of emergence of discourse, serving to identify the genesis of the discursive topic. It is important to point out that whilst I draw on my reading of Foucault to coherently conceptualise the discursively construed nature of the social world I do not do so slavishly, but as an applied linguist and educational practitioner who recognises that it is necessary to 'put Foucault to work' (Fairclough 1992:3), albeit within a poststructuralist framework of research.

As a final step in framing what follows, I briefly gloss my definition of four of the key concepts elaborated on in this chapter.

**i. Discourse**

Discourse is not synonymous with or reducible to language. Whilst both discourse and language play a part in constructing our social lives, discourse is premised on power and actively enables and moulds social reality. It is the production material of our social worlds that serves particular ends, including that of the exercise of power. Discourses are systems of representation which define and produce the objects of our knowledge. Discourses are singular, multiple and tangled. They determine social reality via active subjects, who draw on the different forms of knowledge and practice that constitute their social reality to co-produce discourse.

**ii. Orders of discourse (referred to as 'discursive formations' by Foucault)**

Orders of discourse are the rules, actions and functions which control discourse. Orders of discourse are constituted by discursive and non-discursive practices and contexts necessary for the production of 'truth'. They create regularities which link together different manifestations of a discourse. Orders of discourse use the productive forces of the power/knowledge complex to support different 'regimes of truth' that constrain and define what is understood as acceptable and effective.

**iii. Non-discursive contexts and practices**

Foucault considered discourse as inclusive of non-verbal elements such as gesture, sound and space. Discourses are also related to the way social life is organised around the authority of 'institutions', which are central places of discourse visibility. In this sense, non-discursive contexts and practices embrace modalities other than those of language and associate knowledge with physical action and performativity.

**iv. *Episteme***

For Foucault, history is composed of successive *epistemes*. These constitute the fundamental truth basis for successive epochs and are formed from the complex network of all discourses and orders of discourse. Though not knowable at an individual level, the *episteme* forms a positive and productive set of relations within which knowledge is defined.

**2.4 The 'critical' in critical discourse analysis**

In this section I explain what I understand 'critical' to mean both in relation to this chapter, and the chapters which follow. According to Schiffrin (1994:20) 'discourse' as an object of research and study may broadly be defined in two ways. One definition emerging from the formalist paradigm of linguistics is that of a non-social unit of language above the sentence. The second, located in the functionalist paradigm of linguistics, is that of language as a societal phenomenon. Whilst the latter approach includes a discussion of the relationship between society and language, it does not include tools for challenging existing ways of knowing, which are imperative to the interdisciplinary coverage of this project. It is important, therefore, to determine what is meant by the term 'critical' in this thesis.

Firstly, in line with Pennycook (2001:1), since my writing is a forging of knowledge spaces through the performances of a socially, politically and historically-situated self, I believe that critical work should be self-reflexive. By asking the question, 'what is the critical?', I am adhering to a principle of reflexivity which recognises that knowledge is perspectival not value free and hence there is no perspective from which I can claim objectivity. Such is the first step in the critical practice of critical discourse analysis, recognising that the given and the taken-for-granted need constantly to be problematized (see also the explication of my assumptions above).

Next, in order to move closer to the ways *critical* will be theorised and practised in this research, I shall now evaluate the different ways that the notion of *critical* and *power* are understood in relation to the modernist, emancipatory paradigm of critical discourse analysis (CDA) and then critique this using a Foucaultian approach to the conceptualisation of power, discourse and subjectivities.

#### **2.4.1 The modernist, emancipatory paradigm of Critical Discourse Analysis**

In the production process of emerging, embedding and becoming institutionalised as a recognisable set of discursive practices, diverse interpretations of what Critical Discourse Analysis means both as theory and method, have gained varying positions of dominance and disseminated different understandings. There is no simple, centralised unity in this field, since it incorporates structuralists, poststructuralists, Althusserian Marxists, semioticians and Foucaultians (Harland 1987:1), but I would contend that as a recognisable discipline within the qualitative social sciences it represents a fairly integrated paradigm (Kuhn 1996), at least within mainstream Anglo-Saxon approaches. Harland argues that the commonality amongst these distinct theoretical approaches qualify them as superstructuralist, since they invert the base-superstructure models so that ‘what we used to think of as superstructural actually takes precedence over what we used to think of as basic’ (Harland 1987:2). This leads to a shift from understanding language as referential and denotational to understanding language as non-referential, non-denotational and the material basis of our social worlds. It follows from this that language plays a primary role in the social existence of humankind and that meaning needs to be understood as emergent, multiple and contextually located rather than universal and fixed. Furthermore, since the relation between signifiers and signifieds is both arbitrary and empty of matter rather than universal and stable, and since everyday commonsense understandings of meaning are stabilised in the relations between subject and discourse, the interrelation between power and language needs to be explicated. How do discourses determine the naturalised meaning of language given the arbitrary nature of the relationship between signifiers and signifieds, and how does power operate to produce discourses?

Within what I characterise as the Anglo-Saxon paradigm of Critical Discourse Analysis, whilst a range of distinct techniques and approaches are used, researchers generally construe written and spoken texts as a form of ‘social practice’, and assume a mutually constitutive and dialectical relationship between discourse and institutional and social contexts (Wodak

& Krzyzanowski 2008; Fairclough 1992; Van Leeuwen 2008). Data collection in this paradigm centres on 'everyday communication in institutional, media, political or other locations' (Wodak *et al.* 2009:8).

The *critical* aim of such approaches is to bring to light the hidden ways in which social institutions and disciplines call us to order. Premised on Althusserian notions of interpellation (1977), whereby the human subject is constituted by 'always-already' pre-given language structures, according to this view dominant discourses represent the world in such a way that the particular human subject, as reader or viewer, is interpellated by the text. Implicit in such a model is a Marxist structuralist stance that the 'reader' or viewer' is oppressed by the ideological nature of the texts which serve to constitute the human subject's everyday understanding of reality. Thus, to be *critical* is to challenge this position and to seek progressive social change. Fairclough (1992;2003), whose approach to critical discourse analysis is distinguished from others by its designation as CDA (Gee 2004), argues that the Critical Discourse Analysis notion of the *critical* builds across three compatible theoretical inclinations. Firstly, from the poststructuralist view that discourses function transversally across local institutional sites, and that texts do not just reflect but construct social practices and human identities. Secondly, it employs Bourdieu's sociological assumption that concrete forms of textual practices and interaction with texts become embodied as configurations of cultural capital with varying exchange values in different social fields. Thirdly, it derives from neo-Marxist cultural theory (Hall & Du Gay, 1996), the assumption that discourses are produced and circulated within political economies, and hence reproduce and articulate wider ideological interests and social formations. The tendency in all such theorisations is to conceptualise power as an oppressive force which needs to be resisted, and to map language onto a rather static and dichotomous view of society (Laclau 1996). As Scollon (2003:77) argues, this leads to a crucial postmodernist dilemma: if the modernist subject is 'a discursive construct of his/her own narrative histories, where is the oppressed person and the oppressing one?'. This raises questions about the nature of the theoretical foundation underpinning the taking of social action if 'actions as well as agents are dissolved into confluences of historical developments' (Scollon 2003:77). Hence, CDA has a flawed theoretical understanding of 'how social relations came to be the way they are' (Pennycook 2001:6) which is not 'reality aware' in its approach to research. How then can reality be conceived in such a way that the 'ontological fallacy', which assumes our idea of the world is the same as our description of it, and the

'epistemological fallacy' which assumes the world is determined by our descriptions of it (Bhaskar 1989 in Scollon 2003:78) are resolved. In his philosophical approach to such questions, Bhaskar argues that we need to accept reality as a first principle that exists prior to our descriptions of it and causes us to act. Likewise, the ontology of our biological entity precedes the language and cognition mechanisms we use to produce knowledge. However, he also argues 'that our knowledge of this world is inevitably discursively produced' (Scollon 2003:78). In order to signal my adherence to such a critical realist principle, which I understand to also include the reality and agency of the subjects whose texts I will analyse for my research, I choose to use the term 'construe' rather than 'construct' since the former includes the possibility of a world outside the territory of discourse.

For a final consideration of the limitations of the use *critical* in the paradigm of Critical Discourse Analysis I turn to its external and internal critics. A range of such perspectives are succinctly summarised by Rogers (2004:14):

- A first critique of CDA argues that rather than the data being used to reveal socially situated perspectives legitimised by the data, political and social ideologies are projected onto the data; in this sense the analyst 'knows' what they are going to find before research is undertaken
- A second critique targets the unequal balance between theory and linguistic method
- Other critiques condemn: a lack of rigour in the method; insufficient attention to aspects of discourse such as activity and emotion; insufficient application of critical discourse analysis to matters of learning and education

However, in this thesis, I shall argue following Rogers (2004) that such apparent flaws in the theory and method of critical discourse analysis can be overcome if *critical* is taken to mean 'a set of choices within a linguistic system that has vast meaning-making potential' (*ibid.*: 2004:15). But I would replace the term 'linguistic system' with 'discourse system' since the former is not premised on power. As Pennycook (2001:93) writes when discussing the social scientific goal of critical discourse analysis: 'If ... we are prepared to see power as that which is to be explained, then our analyses of discourse aim to explore how power may operate', rather than only to demonstrate how it might oppress (see also O'Regan & MacDonald 2009). Such an approach ensures an analysis of the relationship between linguistic structures and social theory that is evolving and reflexive. But how then can the relationship between

language and power be theorised? Such a question leads me to a final critique of the mainstream paradigm of CDA which remains to be addressed.

#### **2.4.2 Being post-critical in critical discourse analysis**

The main focus of this critique is that CDA is now epistemologically adrift since it was uprooted from its anchoring in French philosophical positions. O'Regan (2006) argues that many criticisms generated by the agonistic relation of the understandings of the potential meaning of critical discourse analysis, centre on what is the potentially self-contradictory nature of the discipline of critical discourse analysis. O'Regan frames this contradiction in terms of a disparity between the normative, foundational agenda of critical discourse studies, constructed by Fairclough from the perspectives of a range of thinkers, and the relativist 'non-normative parameters and purposes of Foucault's thought' (O'Regan 2006:231) which rejects both a universal, transcendental philosophy of the subject and philosophical reasoning which simply legitimises what is already known (Foucault 1987). For O'Regan, this translates into a central conundrum linked to the meaning of critical practice within the discipline of critical discourse analysis, that is, the incommensurability between a CDA which appears to have an emancipatory agenda, and so relies on foundational presuppositions for the moral and political stands which it takes, and a Foucault-style archaeological approach to the analysis of discourse which refuses the fallacy of binary oppositions, more particularly those of subject and object, good and bad, or true and false. This epistemological refraction embodies a breach in the theoretical underpinning of the discipline. Whilst genealogically such twists and turns are a recognised element of discursive formation, disciplinary debates highlight the need for a perspective which ensures the theoretical integrity of the discipline does not preclude the possibility of its 'disciples' taking a stand. In other words, whilst recognising that a principle of openness must be maintained if discourses are to be evaluated not in terms of some absolute truth but in terms of epistemic gain (Giddens 1991), how yet is it possible for 'critical discourse studies to theoretically locate itself in opposition to discourses [such as neo-liberalism] which are associated with the closure of knowledge' (O'Regan 2006:234)? It is such closure of knowledge in certain discourses which legitimates a non-normative critique.

In line with O'Regan (2006), in this thesis I shall turn to the Derridean concept of responsibility towards the Other (2003) to serve as an operative mechanism of openness. Since it is an inescapable truth that situated perspectives on discourse, can only be

communicated from within discourses, a critically rigorous way of not giving in to this should be found (Derrida 1986:284). For Derrida, the two ways of resisting this paradox are: (a) reflexive consideration of the relationship of the discipline to the language it employs; and (b), its critical responsibility as a discourse. Since for Derrida, the Other is conceptualised as those absences of meaning which form the backdrop against which the presences of words and language are designated and re-iterated (Gergen 1999:27), an infinite horizon of alterity becomes theoretically possible. Equally, such a horizon emerges from Derrida's view of discourse as 'a system of differences' (Derrida 1986), whose parts are in incessantly shifting relations that prevent the stabilising of meaning. Furthermore, the quality and fecundity of evaluative findings or research results are predicated on the search for Other 'meaningful and *qualitative* explanations' (Derrida in Borradori 2003:93). In this sense, the disciplinary responsibility of the researcher to reveal the processes by which hegemonic discourses become accredited in the public space becomes, by extension, a moral responsibility, since such discourses are legitimated by the prevailing system which Derrida sees as:

... a combination of public opinion, the media, the rhetoric of politicians, and the presumed authority of all those who, through various mechanisms, speak or are allowed to speak in the public space' (Derrida in Borradori 2003:93)

As I have argued thus far, in the artificial 'holding pattern of inquiry' (Fuller 2003:1) of the discipline recognised as critical discourse analysis, a distinction can be made between a modernist, emancipatory paradigm and a post-critical paradigm. It is within the latter that I shall be unfolding my research questions and arguments. When taking my work forward within this heterogeneous community, I need to be aware that such a trajectory will never be simple. Whilst I may rhetorically create a research space (CARS) (Swales & Feak 1994) in my writing, my ideas will be decoded by readers who make interpretations which do not necessarily align with those of the producer. Furthermore, the emergent knowledge I produce is inherently instable, and hence apt to obsolescence. This does not mean I am being negative, but means instead I am recognising the dynamic of non-positivist knowledge production across texts and contexts. My inquiry then should not be evaluated in terms of its claims to some 'absolute truth' but in terms of epistemic gain.

## **2.5 Discourses as archaeological**

In this section I present my reading of Foucault's *Archaeology of Knowledge* and the part this plays in theoretically underpinning my research into the discursive object of criticality and its subjectivities and praxis in university contexts. Given that one of the key starting points for

this research was a critical interest in the proliferation of global citizenship discourses within the practices of the academy, and the ways in which the complexities of the notion of global citizenship were both simplified within academic practices and subsumed into hegemonic neoliberal discourses of employability and sustainability, one of my first questions concerned the nature of the power which talks into being such a normative use of the concept of global citizenship. Whilst this focus later changed, as explained in Chapter 6, to that of the temporalities of the critical pedagogue and critical student writer, the relevance of Foucault's analytical notion of the positively productive nature of power remained equally valid. Given, as I have argued, the epistemological approaches of the modernist, emancipatory paradigm of CDA are flawed by dichotomous assumptions that social, political and cultural reality can be conceptualised in terms of binary oppositions, and furthermore, provide no adequate theorization of the preconceptual to explain the conditions necessary for the emergence of a discourse, I turned to Foucault's archaeological conceptualisation of the relationship between power, knowledge and discourse to use as 'a point of attack' on my understanding of power as sets of rules for discursive formations of knowledge (Pennycook 1998:27). As previously stated, archaeology's strength is that it provides a theoretical framework for static and synchronic description of our arbitrary, rule-governed practices whose contingencies can be understood through 'careful description of appearances' (Kendall & Wickham 1999:11). In this sense it can provide microscopic slide units of discourse to examine under an 'analytic glance' (Barker 1998).

### **2.5.1 Questioning the nature of knowledge and the *episteme***

Foucault seeks to re-address the question of what constitutes disciplinary knowledge within the academy and institutions. More specifically, his target in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* which Foucault (1980a:240) qualifies as one of his 'method' books, is the human and social sciences. *Archaeology of Knowledge*, originally published in 1969 as *L'Archéologie du Savoir*, opens with the negative work of disposing of conventional 19<sup>th</sup> century categories of organisation around the unities of scientific disciplines as a strategy for revealing 'a method of analysis purged of all anthropologism' (Foucault 1972:17) and assumptions of universality. Unities are antithetical to 'the tangle of interpositivities', or positivities of power, which dynamically form the orders of discourse that constitute the horizon of archaeology (Foucault 1972:177).

Central unifying categories to be suspended for their propensity to support uncritical and anthropological acceptance of unities organised around the human subject of the author are the book and the *oeuvre*, more specifically those authors and *oeuvres* which constitute the history of ideas. A discourse is not made up of texts since books are not 'independent discursive units' (Andersen 2003:9). Foucault challenges the idea that knowledge can be explained by linking it back to creativity and influence of individuals, or that epistemology (how we can know about reality), can be conceptualised in terms of transcendent universals. Instead, he argues that the unity of the *oeuvre* 'loses its self-evidence; it indicates itself, constructs itself only on the basis of a complex field of discourse' (Foucault 1972:26) in which relationships are defined by rupture and breaks as much as by unified themes. Rather than framing the preconceptual limits of knowledge as transcendental, Foucault frames them as immanent, serving to provide a grid of regularities which constitute the conditions of possibility of the visible discursive formation (Scheurich 1997; Kendall & Wickham 1999).

Foucault's theoretical take on knowledge (1972) forms part of his redefining of prevailing notions of disciplinary knowledge. From Foucault's archaeological perspective, knowledge cannot be itemised as idealised scientific bodies of knowledge (*connaissance*) 'derived from heterogeneous experiments, traditions or discoveries' (Foucault 1972:200). Instead, knowledge is an effect of discourse, and 'that of which one can speak in a discursive practice' (Foucault 1972:201). Knowledge (*savoir*) mediates between hitherto disorganised discursive positivities and progressively coordinated orders of discourse that transform and constitute the discursive and semiotic aspect of social order and practices in different historical periods. The purpose of Foucault's archaeological methodology is to explore 'the discursive practice/knowledge (*savoir*)/science axis' (Foucault 1972: 202) which in effect constitute the positivity, or interpositivity, of the *episteme* that forms the truth basis of an entire age. In this thesis, the assumption is that it is the neoliberal *episteme* that frames the organising of economic, political and cultural contexts and subjects.

In terms of the approaches to epistemology used in my research, I see knowledge in its various disciplinary colonisations of the academy, as an effect of discourse. From a paradigmatic, archaeological perspective, knowledge, as Foucault argues, is 'really only an activity, of writing in the first case, or reading in the second and exchange in the third' (Foucault 1972:228), and these activities involve only the descriptive surfaces of signs. In this sense, my aim as a researcher is not to use my writing, reading and exchanges to support

objective claims about the totalising, empirical truths of the subject of knowledge, be they pedagogue or student, as posited by 19<sup>th</sup> century constructions of positivist, non-intersubjective knowledge. Instead, based on Foucault's characterization of knowledge as constantly active sub-dividing discursive multiplicities and formations (Deleuze 2006:17), my aim is to chronicle what can be said about 'the critical' within one or two discourse strands of the early 21<sup>st</sup> century, and to reveal the procedures whereby discourses expand or are restricted. From a post-critical perspective, framing the territory of archaeology in such terms is to recognise that discontinuities of knowledge may be mobilised towards different thresholds, of equal validity to the arguably dominant western discourse of science which, like all discourses, has an effect on regulating multiple areas of life, including the institutions 'we' live and work in. Furthermore, since in Foucault's approach to knowledge archaeology there are no assumptions of historical progress or regress, the problematisation of history never stops (Kendall & Wickham 1999:4).

Whilst all research necessarily requires some conceptualisation of the limits to what we know and how we know it, since this research calls for a theoretical, methodological and empirical approach which links the global to the local in relationship to the notion of the critical in pedagogy and student writing, I would argue that Foucault's way of conceptualising the *episteme* as the formal discursive apparatus operating as an *a priori* serving to legitimate orders of discourse (referred to by Foucault as 'discursive formations') for the whole world is apt for purpose. It links the archaeological vestiges that can be realised locally, institutionally, nationally, globally and transnationally. It is the ultimate limit to what we know and how we know it, and serves as the final legitimating device. Seen from this onion-ring perspective, I understand the *episteme* as a thread of knowledge cutting through the individual, where the access to knowledge that can be known is necessarily constrained by the individual's agency and nature.

One way to conceptualise the three epistemological axes of my research just evoked - the theoretical in which I draw on Foucault, the methodological in which I use critical discourse analysis, and the empirical which is textual analysis- is to envisage each of these axes as different tiers of a whole. This layering can be compared to O'Regan and MacDonald's three levels of orders of discourse which together constitute a 'culture'. Once all the cultures are tied together in their totality 'they represent, construct a society's, or a collection of

societies', *episteme* or regime of truth' (O'Regan & MacDonald 2009:83). These three levels of realization of highly discursive regularities are:

- *Situational* (relating to immediate social contexts e.g. a classroom);
- *Institutional* (relating to the knowledge domains of a society; medical, judicial, educational, scientific, religious, familial, political, etc.);
- *Societal* (relating to the overall configuration of situational and institutional domains together). (O'Regan & MacDonald 2009:83)

It is at the third level, that institutional orders of discourse work together to constitute a regime or 'general politics of truth' (O'Regan & MacDonald 2009:83), and this gives society its coherence and regularity. By placing the discursive object of the 'the critical' or 'resistance' within such a three-tiered epistemological framework it becomes theoretically possible to understand its importance within discourses concerning the relationship between human life and the globe, and also to break it down into an object talked about, for example, within the larger discursive formation of democracy, or a tool to promote discussions about the 'ethical' and 'responsible' nature of academic subjects.

### **2.5.2 How can knowledge be an 'effect of discourse'? Rules of discursive formation.**

In my research, I turn to Foucault's *Archaeology of Knowledge* to provide a theoretical basis and logic to explicate the construal and emergence of discourses. As previously stated, I conceptualise the analytical territory of archaeology as synchronic, whereby temporal but semantically blank relations between discursive objects across and within orders of discourse, are of paradigmatic pair-wise substitutability. Such relations allow different objects to be substituted for each other in context without changing the complex nature of the object before it emerges as visible in non-discursive contexts and practices. As Foucault argues:

A discursive formation, then, does not play the role of a figure that arrests time and freezes it for decades or centuries; it determines a regularity proper to temporal processes; it presents the principle of articulation between a series of discursive events and other series of events, transformations, mutations, and processes. It is not an atemporal form, but a schema of correspondence between several temporal series. (Foucault 1972:83)

The anonymous contingencies of knowledge manifested in these orders of discourse are what constitute the preconditions of knowing, and hence serve as plural, immanent resources for representations in non-discursive contexts.

Why use the metaphor of archaeology to conceptualise *a description of discursive events*? As stated above, for Foucault, what is at stake is freeing analysis from the hold of the Enlightenment project of history as a series of unities premised on the pre-existing unity of the human subject and the document, in order to find a method apt to identify the historical strategies which make possible one form of the document as opposed to another. As his definition of archaeology emphasises, archive elements of orders of discourse are not synthetic operators but ever-changing enunciations constituting the singularity of the event at its moment of emergence within a discursive field:

The term does not imply the search for a beginning; it does not relate analysis to geological excavation. It designates the general theme of a description that questions the already-said at the level of its existence: of the enunciative function that operates within it, of the discursive formation, and the general archive system to which it belongs. Archaeology describes discourses as practices specified in elements of the archive. (Foucault 1972:148)

Archaeology is an appropriate metaphor then not because it leads to discovery of origins but because it is a largely descriptive study of history through broad-reaching material artefacts and cultural objects which become visible when a discourse is examined. Through dispassionate description and study of the different objects of the discourse, the statements made about those objects, the authorities legitimising those statements, and the transformative interplay and penetration of those statements and objects with other discourses 'contemporary with or related to it' (Foucault 1972:74) archaeology makes it possible 'to reveal the limitations and necessities of a practice' (Foucault 1972:231) that is 'governed by analysable rules and transformations' (Foucault 1972: 232). As such, this model provides scholars with a framework for investigating social phenomena which surmounts disciplinary boundaries of knowledge, a schema which rejects cohesive and homogenised understandings of the object under study, and legitimates thinking beyond the already known. More specifically, in this thesis in which I consider 'the critical' within modernist and 'post' discourses deployed in higher education contexts, and also explore how pedagogues and students come to be considered as 'critical', this model allows me take an 'antihegemonic stance' (Pennycook 2001:14) towards the theoretical beginnings and heteroglossic and diverse wordings of the signifier 'critical'.

### 2.5.3 The statement, enunciative modalities , positivities of power and objects

The elementary unit that regulates difference in orders of discourse is the statement (Andersen 2003), which is a non-linguistic mechanism central to the dynamic of non-positivist knowledge. As previously stated, in the original text of *L'Archéologie du Savoir* Foucault differentiates between two levels of operation of statements, at one of which it is conceptualised as an abstract notion (*énoncés*) and at the other which it is conceptualised as operating as a concrete utterance (*énonciations*) located on the surface of texts. Hence, sets of statements define the conditions of production of discourse and enunciations which are the theoretical producers of social order (Íñiguez 1993:4). The rules of relations between heterogeneous sets of statements are positivities of power which in 'the play of substitutions to which they give rise' (Foucault 1972:193) are what temporarily fix the complex and dispersed orderings of discourse into different *epistemes* which give specificity to the structure of differentiated regimes of truth. In this sense, immanent positivities of power are 'always-already there', a form of restless energy producing ever-changing temporary fixings of meaning in non-discursive contexts and regimes of knowledge. Into the statement are coded subject positions, including factors of authority and knowledge that become visible within the field of non-discursive practices, as characterised by daily practices and institutions existing at a moment in time (Foucault 1972:74). If statements do not accept the rules of orders of discourse, they do not become visible in the social field. As (Jäger and Maier 2007:47) state, 'each discourse delineates a range of statements that are sayable and thereby inhibits a range of other statements'. The boundaries of the sayable and not sayable are discursive limits. Different rhetorical strategies deployed within institutional practices, for example, make it possible to expand or narrow discursive limits. Hence, statements operate both as a formal rule of meaning, and as 'events' since they emerge in different times and contexts.

Essentially then, the rules of orders of discourse are to be found in the arbitrary and dispersed relations between statements. It is from the primitive function of the statement that derives the 'simple inscription of what is said, the positivity of the dictum' (Deleuze 1988:15) whose transversal trace provides 'a set of possible subject positions for a subject' (Foucault 1972:122). Statements, though, are 'neither a syntagma, nor a rule of construction' (Foucault 1972:99), the statement is non-linguistic so it cannot be linked to the intentionality of individuals. Instead, it functions as a sort of anonymous software programme that enables the manifest forms and multiplication dynamic of signs, phrases,

arguments etc. Statements are produced in an ongoing stream in which preceding statements build the non-material context of the enacted statements (Diaz-Bone *et al.* 2007) and hence the statement has a certain memory (Deleuze 1988:12). Since 'a statement always defines itself by establishing a specific link with something else that lies on the same level as itself' (Deleuze 1988:11), systems of statements spread across corpuses of knowledge and provide the immanent operational field for the enunciative function of discourses. It is through the enunciative function or modality that the statement can be confirmed as a statement through the reactualising and extending of other statements (Andersen 2003:12).

Enunciative modalities are the specific subject positions coded in statements which are deployed against each other to constitute orders of discourse. Thus the discursive object is merely a function of enunciation. If the statement can be compared to a software programme, enunciative modalities can be likened to a Boolean operator, which allows statements to connect to each other and so have materiality (a physical form of expression), an associated field (a domain for co-occurrence of other statements), a referent (something to which it refers), and a subject (a vacant place within the statement allowing it to be reproduced). It is the 'repeatable materiality' (Foucault 1972:118) of the enunciation which gives the statement the power 'it is alone in possessing' (Deleuze 1988:11). It is such 'repeatable materiality' which gives the signifiers of 'critical' or 'resistance' credit within 'the economy of the discursive constellation to which it belongs' (Foucault 1972:74) and allows it to become part of the 'true'. Such rules of repeatability focus on the 'how' or procedures of governance in non-discursive, institutional sites and the deployment or visibility of certain statements over others. For example, statements concerned to model the critical as actions with emancipatory force rather than equally feasible statements about the critical as a fleeting performance with scant emancipatory force.

When looking for regularities of statements in the formation of enunciative modalities, Foucault (1972:60) argues we need to ask questions relating to:

- Who is speaking and who has the right to speak?
- Which institutional sites give legitimacy to the discourse? What types of subject position are offered and used in the localised enunciations of the discourse? What can be said by subjects in the discursive formations?

So, when theorising the strategies used in the production of 19<sup>th</sup> century power-knowledge belonging to the medical sciences Foucault shows how:

Even when they seem to operate within the same language, statements of a discursive formation move from description to observation, calculation, institution and prescription, and use several systems or languages in the process. (Deleuze 2006:6)

It is in these 'fields of initial differentiation, in the distances, the discontinuities, and the thresholds that appear within it' (Foucault 1972:46) that discourse limits its domain, demarcates what is being talked about, and establishes its status as a nameable, visible object. As Parker (1997:6), declares, the fact we give voice to statements 'out there' in our talk, writing and practices in institutional sites, allows statements to accumulate into a specific discursive object, visible in our everyday lives, as well as helping us position ourselves.

However, for Foucault, objects are things referred to by the statement which are precisely not 'objects out there'. They are 'discursive objects constructed, classified and identified by the statement itself' (Andersen 2003:11). Of particular interest here, is how the statement, through its heterogeneous discursive practices allows the object to be placed in 'a field of exteriority' (Foucault 1972:50). Deleuze conceptualises this 'exteriority' as dreams 'each with its own special object or world' (192006:8) which serve as a frame, providing regularity in the reading of particular social texts or problems. In line with Rizvi and Lingard (2010:8), I consider it useful to consider such dreams as akin to social imaginaries or ideologies which frame the collective idea people share about the nature and scope of institutional authority which in turn serve to sustain the idea of the institution.

The appearance of these objects in discursive formations is subject to rules regulated by three main archaeological coordinates (Foucault 1972:45-46) which form an interpretive framework permitting differentiation of discursive elements into categories. The first of these is 'surfaces of emergence' (specific historical discursive contexts in which objects emerge and are used as the basis of actions). These surfaces determine the regularity of the dispersed formation of objects by statements, and generate rules according to which objects are created, classified and ordered. In the case of this thesis, important surfaces of emergence include university strategies, departmental meetings, conferences and seminars mapping out the network of genres and topics which both do and do not describe the

coordinates of how the critical in pedagogy and student writing can, could and will be understood. The second, 'authorities of delimitation' (the subject positions from which individuals can legitimately delimit and define discursive objects) for my purposes concerns the initial emergence and temporalities of emergence of 'the critical', and its establishment as a feature of knowledge and educational discourses. The temporalities of emergence are discussed below. The third, 'grids of specification' (taxonomic dimensions according to which an object is located in and across discursive regimes) relates mainly in this thesis to the fashioning and re-fashioning of 'the critical' in the texts and talk of the two contrasting and intersecting specification grids of global capitalism and higher education, and modernism and post-structuralism. The question of whether, where and how to place 'the critical' on the higher educational grid, and its dispersal within different grids such as pedagogical theory and writing praxis, and post-critical theory is key to my analysis. All three coordinates influence and are influenced by the others.

#### **2.5.4 Strengths and weaknesses of an archaeological approach to discourse**

By explaining how power operates as positivities of power productive of discourse and its objects Foucault provides a 'point of attack' (Pennycook 1998:27) on power as sets of rules for the production of knowledge which moves beyond a Marxist conceptualisation of power or knowledge as 'false consciousness' or repressive ideology. Within archaeological understandings of discursive formation the 'critical' can then, in line with Rogers (2004), be understood as systematic and pre-structured rules responsible for ways of using 'concepts', of referring to 'objects', of thinking strategically and formatting ways of speaking within an infinite set of possibilities (Diaz-Bone *et al.* 2007). As such, archaeology's strength is that it provides a theoretical framework for a static and synchronic description of our arbitrary, rule-governed practices whose contingencies can be understood through 'careful description of appearances' (Kendall & Wickham 1999:11). In this sense it can provide microscopic slide units of discourse to examine under an 'analytic glance' (Barker 1998). The differences and similarities between the modernist, emancipatory paradigm of CDA and a Foucaultian discourse analysis approach relevant to the postcritical approach taken in this study are compared in the table below. It should be noted that the schematised binary nature of the table fails to include tensions and overlap between these two construals of approaches to discourse analysis and the critical.

Table 1

**Post-critical-archaeological and CDA approaches to critical discourse analysis**

<b>Post-critical-archaeological discourse analysis approach</b>	<b>CDA approach</b>
The critical conceived of in terms of preconceptual rules structuring arbitrary decisions about meaning in an infinite set of possibilities	The critical conceived of in emancipatory terms of progressive social change
A systematic rejection of the Enlightenment postulates of history. Need to look at 'rules of exclusion' determining what is left out from society's history of knowledge.	History conceptualised in terms of teleological, Enlightenment and humanist progress
Constant openness to Other, assumption something always hidden in conceptual framework that needs to be problematised	Closed binary oppressor/oppressed conceptual framework
Power operates positively as immanent set of rules producing orders of discourse which pre-format subject positions of non-discursive sites and practices. It is power that is 'always-already there'.	Power operates ideologically to call us to order, power is an oppressive force. It is oppressed subject positions that are 'always-already there'.
<i>Episteme</i> provides formal apparatus for theorizing discourses at levels from local to global, underpinned by critical realist principles to avoid ontological and epistemological fallacies.	Ontology and epistemology are frequently conceptualised as the contingent result of discursive social practices.
Anti-hegemonic conceived of in terms of restless problematising of the given beyond disciplinary boundaries	Antihegemonic conceived of in terms of emancipation from oppression produced by dominant discourses
Ideologies exist at level of discursive not non-discursive practices, akin to social imaginaries	Ideology conflated with discourse and social practices
Asks the question 'how' rather than 'why' since wary of cause-effect relations	Asks the question 'why' rather than 'how' since sees cause-effect relations between discourse and social practices

As a researcher I am aware that crucially, the archaeological, postcritical conceptual and theoretical approaches outlined above provide an ambiguous distinction between the immanent discursive formations and the material reality of the non-discursive in the present. As Hook (2005:2-4) argues, Foucault's archaeological 'method' 'does not provide codified steps of analysis for the analysis of local discursive utterances'. From this point of view, my formulation of a theoretical framework is unsatisfactory. In order to begin to address this absence of explication of the non-discursive and move towards the 'codified' steps of analysis I look at later, in the next section I turn to Foucault's conceptualisation of discourses as genealogical which includes theoretical perspectives that allow me to theoretically problematise contextual relations between the triad of power, knowledge and the subject in everyday practices at the institutional level of realization of the *episteme*, that is, the order of discourse. In this sense the vertical, ahistorical and analytical 'glance' of archaeology is completed as a methodology by the horizontal, effective history 'gaze' of genealogy which examines statements not as microscope slides revealing webs of discourse, but as an ongoing process.

## **2.6 Discourses as genealogical**

Once knowledge has been theoretically uncoupled from an essentially one-way 'harmonious relationship with "the things of the world" (Foucault 1975:10) in which human knowledge is tacit and scientific knowledge is understood through unitary theories and genealogies, a genealogical method is needed to 'emancipate historical knowledges from that subjection' (Foucault (1980b:85) and look at what kinds of 'truth' and knowledge are produced in different contexts and practices. In contrast to archaeology, intended to provide a methodology for constantly reactivating knowledges outside the remit of classical conceptualisations of knowledge, characterised by Pennycook as a 'point of attack on discourse' (1998:27), Foucault conceptualises genealogy as 'the tactics whereby, on the basis of the descriptions of these local discursivities, the subjected knowledges which were thus released would be brought into play' (1980b:85). If then, archaeology provides a coherent set of rules for conceptualising the interrelated existence of power and knowledge as motivating our conceptualisations of knowledge objects, such as criticality, what is also needed is a theory which explains how the subject is objectivised and 'how we have been trapped in our own history' (Foucault 1982:329). This is the aim of genealogy, to provide an account of the historical subject, without reference to a transcendent subject or one located in the continuities of history.

So, with genealogy, Foucault refashions his archaeological analysis to answer problems about the 'history of the present' and give an account of the workings of power more specifically related to the material (Kendall & Wickham 1999:29; Kelly 1994:1). There is a shift away from epistemic frameworks existing in ideas towards materialism (Harland 1987:155) with an ontological link to the subject through the subject's active part in producing themselves in time as those subjected to power (Kendall & Wickham 1999:55). This theoretical link to an active subject is key in an analysis of discourses of critical pedagogy and critical writing. As such, genealogical critique provides an indispensable, historically located dimension to a scholarly understanding of the relationship between subject positions and the power-knowledge nexus (Andersen 2003:17). It also provides a guerrilla tactic for bringing the struggle between subjugated forms of knowledge into play and legitimising popular, non-scientific discourses (Foucault 1980b). Genealogy is an 'effective history' of the present because 'it avoids the traditional historian's metaphysical prejudices and relocates everything previously considered eternal into the process of becoming' (Mahon 1992:8). In this sense, it is linked to the human project of producing and inventing ourselves (Kendall & Wickham 1999) as historically contingent subjects.

Seen in this light, a genealogical approach means that the two-way traffic between the academic and the imaginative (Said 1978:73), and the conscious and the unconscious can be included in an examination of the systematic regulation of the subject of knowledge, since knowledge is to be found in a dispersed network of discursive power relations including the body and its desires and non-traditional knowledges. As Foucault points out, by including the articulation of the body with history, it becomes possible to look at the part desire and the body play in the historical production of knowledge. In this sense genealogy is anti-science since its tactics are to reactivate 'local and subjected knowledges in opposition to scientific hierarchization of knowledges and effects intrinsic to power' (Foucault 1980 in Kelly 1994:24). For some key Foucault scholars, such as Dreyfus and Rabinow (1983), the aims and arguments of Foucault's different analytical methods are categorised according to distinct periods of thought. However, in line with Deleuze (2006), Pennycook (1998) and Dean (1994), in this thesis I represent his works, more particularly those on archaeology and genealogy, as a critical continuum used by Foucault to provide an account of power not as a notion associated with 'conspiracy thinking' but as a concept related to its more everyday usage as a force that makes things work (Kendall & Wickham 1999:54).

### 2.6.1 Power as relations of forces

Pursuing the archaeological idea of positive mechanisms of power used to maintain relations of production of knowledge, Foucault highlights the need to explain power beyond its Marxist conception premised on 'the role it plays in the maintenance simultaneously of production and of class domination' (1980b:88). He argues that a new conceptualisation of the 'economy' of power relations is needed 'to investigate specific rationalities of power' (Foucault 1982:238) that subjugate us and govern our everyday practices within the institutions of today that have replaced previous forms of social control (Foucault 2001) and operate as 'a conduct of conducts' akin to governance (Dean 1999:10). Rather than investigating society and culture as a whole, Foucault investigates the process by which hostile relations of forces of power circulate and naturalise subject positions 'in a manner at once continuous, uninterrupted, adapted and 'individualised' through the whole social body' (Foucault 2001:120). In this sense, whilst in archaeology knowledge is an effect of discourse, in genealogy, 'the individual is an effect of power; it is I believe one of its prime effects' (Foucault 1980 in Kelly 1994:36). At the same time, the individual constituted by power is 'its vehicle' (Foucault *ibid.*) so that the body is understood as a force of production. This does not mean that power is directed by conscious intention, but rather that modern subjectivity presents itself as a struggle taking the form of resistance first to individualising forces of power, and second to the desire for a fixed, known identity (Deleuze 2006:87). Hence, Deleuze claims the struggle for subjectivity presents itself 'as the right to difference, variation and metamorphosis' (Deleuze 2006:87).

Through his approach to the relationship between the individual subject and institutions, Foucault challenges Marxist notions of the subject of knowledge and forms of knowledge which see these as previously determined by economic, social and political conditions of existence and forges new insights into how domains of knowledge give birth to 'new forms of subject and subjects of knowledge' (Foucault 2001:2). Within the contemporary reality of our western, neoliberal-democratic 21<sup>st</sup> century worlds, within which I see my role as an academic being one of a constant critical questioning of norms, it is important to take fresh approaches to understanding the relationship between intermeshed institutions, for example universities, the state and large corporations, and the subject. Moving beyond Althusser's framing of power in terms of state apparatuses and the ideologies that accompany them (Ideological State Apparatuses), Foucault turns our attention to 'the

material operation of power, towards forms of subjection and the inflections of utilizations of their localized systems, and towards strategic apparatuses' (Foucault 2001:40). Such strategic production apparatuses operate at the non-discursive level of the institution in which power is exercised not through relations of domination and repression, but by forms of surveillance which fasten individuals to 'an apparatus of knowledge production [and insert them] into an apparatus of normalization of people' (2001:78). Seen in the light of the archaeology-genealogy continuum, archaeological 'regimes of truth' which become visible and sayable at the institutional level through strategies of power (Kendall & Wickham 1999), establish the conditions necessary for different institutional 'regimes of practice' that produce and depend upon 'particular forms of knowledge and hence become the target of different programmes of reform and change' (Dean 1999:21). Such regimes of practice have technical or technological dimensions with different instrumentalities and mechanisms by which they seek to realise their goals (Dean 1999:21). Pertaining to my own research, it is important to consider how such power relations produce not only disciplinary knowledge practices within the academy, but also how such regimes of practice work to govern and subjugate us.

### **2.6.2. The body as site of struggle and submission**

For power to be a productive force, some form of alternating current is needed, a negative force as well as a positive force producing an interplay of forces which 'get [and gain] strength through fighting among themselves' (Foucault 1991:83). Such forces are not to be conceptualised as equivalent or sharing some sort of common ground, but rather to be seen as a necessary system of differentiation and imbalance keeping an impersonal universe of rules in motion (Foucault 1984: 84). Two concepts central to Foucault's genealogical history are those of descent and emergence drawn from Nietzsche. It is these that unsettle the surfaces of the familiar, and seek to establish the link between 'the discursive and the extra-discursive, that is, between discourses and technologies of power located within social practices' (Olssen 1999:43).

Genealogy's aim is to query 'the discourses and practices of the present by referring them back to the hegemonic conditions under which they have been established' (Andersen 2003:20). Hence, analysis of descent does not seek out generic characteristics of resemblance but instead 'the subtle, singular, and subindividual marks that might possibly intersect in them to form a network that is difficult to unravel' (Foucault 1991:81), as, for

example, in the network of Blair's 'Third Way' politics which interweave processes of competition and cooperation in such a way they are normalised as complementary features of a new global order (Fairclough 2000). Such analysis allows discovery of 'the minute deviations ... the faulty calculations ... that gave birth to those things that continue to exist and have value for us' (*ibid.*). Descent is conceived of as a form of critique since it dissolves unity and maintains the 'heterogeneity of what was previously conceived of as consistent with itself' (Foucault 1991:82). By looking down and not up, genealogy also includes in its analysis the 'articulation of the body with history' (Foucault 1991:83), and urges us to reflect upon the part the physical, unpredictable workings of the body and desire play in the historical production of knowledge. It is within the active and reactive body that 'a particular play of forces' (Foucault 1991:83) may efface or conflict with each other to produce emergence, the body's form of struggle and resistance. Such resistance is a 'technical component of power' rather than something to be celebrated or feared (Kendall & Wickham 1999:55). This understanding of resistance plays a key part in this thesis.

As Harland argues, whilst the body has its own power, primary power derives from the top rather than the bottom 'putting the body into a state of perpetual imbalance and perpetual restlessness and perpetual onward motion' (1987:161). In this sense, when for example discussing the history of sexuality, one would talk about pleasure and its bodies rather than the pleasures of the body; likewise criticality. The power of the body is a force which comes before the idea of solidity of the body. Here Foucault is materialist in a special sense:

On the one hand, the body obviously does not exist like an *idea*; but on the other hand – and no doubt less obviously – it also does not exist like a *thing*. Rather, it is always being pulled out of itself, always toppling forward in newly opening spaces, always being drawn across boundaries. (Harland 1987:137)

As well as the dimension of pleasure linked to Foucault's conception of the body, there is also the dimension of politics. The power *of* the body and *over* the body is also power in a political sense since both the body and politics appear in small-scale, local human relations. Politics in this sense is not restricted to class relations but filters down into relations such as those of lecturer-student that are addressed through the empirical research conducted for this thesis. Since there is a power of the body which is not thinking, and is not determined by the dominant episteme, there is also 'a symbolism of the body which can be used in political action and can be turned against the dominant episteme' (Harland 1987:163).

Deleuze discusses Foucault's continuum of archaeology-genealogy in terms of its logical necessity, since for a double capture between formal forms of 'Knowledge-Being' to work, a pure informal relation between forces is needed. This is 'the strategic domain of power, as opposed to the stratic domains of knowledge from epistemology to strategy' (Deleuze 2006:94). As a consequence there are three dimensions of knowledge, power and self, none of which can be reduced to the other but all of which constantly imply each other. Since these are non-positional, first principles of Being they are to be conceptualised as historical ontologies that set no universal conditions (Deleuze 2006:93) but work to produce ways in which the present explains the past:

Knowledge-Being is determined by the two forms assumed at any moment by the visible and the articulable, and light and language in turn cannot be separated from the 'unique and limited existence' which they have in a given stratum. Power-Being is determined within relations between forces which are themselves based on particular features that vary according to each age. And the self, self-Being is determined by the process of subjectivation. (Deleuze 2006:94)

I would argue that in this sense, genealogy, with its critical focus on new types of struggle that are 'transversal and immediate rather than centralized and mediated' (Deleuze 2006:94) links both to Pennycook's notion of 'praxis' discussed above, which frames the relationship between theory and practice as a 'continuous reflexive integration of thought, desire and action' (Pennycook 2001:3), and to Derrida's view of discourse as 'a system of differences' (1986), also discussed above, whose parts are in incessantly shifting relations that prevent the stabilising of meaning.

Summarising what has been said up to this point on genealogy, I observe that genealogical tactics of desubjugation of local knowledges revolve around three emergent axes of discourse: power, knowledge and the self. Genealogy enables us to explore the way in which the threads of knowledge we use to describe and understand the world 'are produced in complex power relations in which different actors, and institutions, work to establish a dominant interpretation of reality' (Diaz-Bone *et al.* 2007). By including an articulation of the body with history, it allows us to understand the part the body and desire play in the historical production of knowledge in the living present and to have a way of conceptualising individual identity as an invented and construed category rather than a natural one. In this context, 'regimes of practice', governance, technologies and the body, are important ordering criteria, since they play a structuring role in this framework of critical approaches to the present and the analysis of everyday subjectivation of knowledge to be undertaken in this thesis.

Genealogy is pertinent to the object of my research since it allows me to understand how simultaneously ‘the critical’ becomes organised around certain focal points of power, generates critical sciences and technologies and becomes integrated into an agency of ‘power-knowledge’.

### 2.6.3 Strengths and weaknesses of an archaeological-genealogical approach to discourse analysis

By problematising contextual relations between the triad of power, knowledge and the subject in everyday practices at the institutional level of orders of discourse, genealogy in tandem with archaeology provides a coherent framework for identifying the rules by which, for humans, social practices are always discursive and material. In this sense, as demonstrated below, it more provides analytical approaches of the ‘glance’ and ‘gaze’ apt for exploring different operational levels of discourse. The complementarity of these approaches is outlined in the table below:

Table 2

#### Post-critical-archaeological-genealogical continuum approach to critical discourse analysis

Post-critical-archaeological discourse analysis approach	Genealogical approach
The subject is a function derived from the statement	The subject is a derivative of forms of subjection organised by ‘regimes of truth’ and ‘regimes of practice’
History conceptualised as non-unitary formal discursive apparatuses, or <i>epistemes</i> , that are subject to the transformational rules of orders of discourse	History conceptualised in terms of an emergent history of the present which provides an account of the workings of power linked to the material
	Resistance and subjugation of body a technical component of primary power serving to make things work
Power operates positively as immanent set of rules producing orders of discourse which pre-format subject positions of non-discursive sites and practices. It is power that is ‘always-already there’.	Power operates strategically as hostile relations of force serving to circulate and naturalise subject positions. It is power that is ‘always-already there’.

<i>Episteme</i> provides formal apparatus for theorizing discourses at levels from local to global, underpinned by critical realist principles to avoid ontological and epistemological fallacies	The three ontological categories of power, knowledge and self work together to produce relationship between past and present conceptualised as praxis
Antihegemonic conceived of in terms of restless problematising of the given beyond disciplinary boundaries	Antihegemonic conceived of in terms of referring discourses and practices of present back to conditions that produced them
Statement a repetition of something else from which it is barely distinguishable	Statements related to each other by connections between forces it is difficult to differentiate
Asks the question 'how' rather than 'why' since wary of cause-effect relations	Asks the question 'how' rather than 'why' since wary of cause-effect relations

However, as Wickham and Kendell (2007) rightly suggest, the risk in using Foucault's governmentality approach, as demonstrated by the modernist, emancipatory paradigm of critical discourse analysis, is that it may be taken to imply an ultimate purpose to human endeavour and conflate 'the best traditions of description, explanation and identification of causes' with the teleological quest for ever-growing human reason 'used as the basis of moral judgements' (Wickham & Kendell 2007). By using Foucault's work in conjunction with the Derridean concept of responsibility towards the Other (Derrida 2003) to serve as an operative mechanism of openness and conceptualising the critical in terms of pre-conceptual rules structuring arbitrary decisions about meaning in an infinite set of possibilities I intend to ensure my research is underpinned by coherent epistemological justification. Whilst I argue that combining archaeology and genealogy provides me with a coherent epistemological framework for underpinning the objects of my research, from a methodological perspective, there is no operational methodology for text analysis and there is a weak determination of the process of subjectivation beyond regimes of practice. In order to address this, in Chapter 6, I examine how I used the post-critical approach problematised in this chapter in the development of a critical discourse analytical tool I initially considered apt for a detailed discursive and linguistic description of student assessment writing produced for an advanced undergraduate course in intercultural communication. Prior to

that, in Chapter 7, I theorise the process of subjectivation (assujettissement) as a low ontological level praxis of diversity and mobility at the performative surface of the text, which works to keep openness in play.

## **2.7 Conclusion**

This chapter emphasises the part power, the body and ethical responsibility to the 'other' play in unhinging modernist understandings of the critical subject of resistance from fixed, ahistorical positions outside the raw material of culture that is discourse. Poststructuralist readings of critical pedagogy which challenge these 'stuck places' (Lather 1998) have recently emerged in feminist literature and theories of 'un-knowing' (Rancière 2014;2016), both of which I examine further in Chapter 4, *Towards Poststructural Critical Pedagogies – the Subaltern Subjects of Higher Education*. However, consideration of the critical praxis of the undergraduate author commensurate with poststructuralist understandings of the unstable, vanishing nature of knowledge, and its enslaved subjects of neoliberal freedom, is noticeably missing in academic literacies and student writing discourse where a modernist ideal of the subject and its possible emancipation continues to prevail. Whilst Foucault inscribes historical understandings of theory and/as praxis that topple Western thought, which I use to confront this ideal of the undergraduate subject in my two student writing analysis chapters (Chapter 7, *The Multiple and Dispersed Subjectivities of the Undergraduate Author – Peering 1*, and Chapter 8, *Students and Pedagogues as Co-producing Subjects in Shared Histories – Peering 2*), I next engage with critical theory's Marxian legacy, and other continental philosophers' reconfiguring of the agency of the subject of cultural reproduction, in order to clarify further how the tactics of power, that require both consent and resistance, are always already alibis of the shifting grounds of hegemonic social orderings and cultural reproduction.

## **Chapter 3      The (im)possibility of critique and resistance in university knowledge production**

### **3.1      Introduction**

In the previous chapter, I argued for a Foucaultian-based conceptualisation of the relationship between power, knowledge and the subject which frames the subject as the shifting outcome of interconnected and competing discursive social forces within which s/he is subjugated and identified via institutional regimes of governance of the early 21<sup>st</sup> century. Whilst this chapter clearly outlined the poststructuralist epistemological and ontological stance underpinning my research, it did not provide a diagnostic account of the tensions played out via the agency of the subaltern university pedagogue or student subject as they alternatively resist, consent to, critique and reproduce the ideological sway of sovereign knowledge, science, and reason: all three at the service of capitalism. Such an account is needed to make more explicit the 'ruins' of traditional Marxian notions of power, class, domination and oppression as methods for analysing power, resistance and the subject, and so address the research objectives outlined in Chapter 1.

In this chapter, in order to recast the assigned transcendentalism of the critical university subject that is still presumed in many transformative projects of critical pedagogy and critical writing, I turn to the 'shifting theoretic vocabularies' (Lather 1998:487) of hegemony and cultural production of Gramsci, Althusser and Laclau and Mouffe. These have informed successive iterations of critical praxis in education and the university, albeit with a tendency for the critical subject to be construed as a centred individual incommensurate with critical social theory. In their reforming of Marxist thinking on the social reproduction of capital and privilege, they propose ideas of resistance and critique as practices generative of change, necessarily creative, experienced and performed differently in the many constituencies of the body politic, and yet also necessarily diffuse and elusive in their historical constitution of present spaces. Such thinking challenges the duality of the oppressed/oppressing subject, and provides fresh analytical perspectives for keeping the subjectivity of the pedagogue and (student) academic writer in touch with the micropolitical dimensions of their everyday practices and (re)organisation of knowledge in the hegemonic algorithms of the contemporary university. With reference to such perspectives, I advance the ontological multiplicity of critique and resistance in the materiality of everyday practice, dependent for

its signifying force upon the institutional contexts of the university, as the fluid terrain in which new orders and subjects can momentarily resist foreclosure of meaning.

### **3.2 Erosion of critical subjects in the polycentric neoliberal university**

Before reading explanations of the processes and subjects of hegemonic cultural reproduction, I briefly elucidate the constraints of the university context to which I refer in this thesis, and the dilemmas and questions these provoke for critical pedagogy and writing.

Whilst the signifier 'neoliberal' has been criticised for being too broad and slippery to have robust descriptive or analytical value, the university institution where I work is now deeply different to the one I attended in the late 70s, and I find the term neoliberal the most analytically useful for conceptualising the nature of the contemporary economic and social context. Indeed, along with most other aspects of the human and social domain, the site of the university has been organised for a while now by a neoliberal governing rationality that structures and disseminates the norm that 'all conduct is economic conduct; all spheres of existence are framed and measured by economic terms and metrics' (Brown 2017:10). On the basis of this, all 'formative or educational relationship, in the widest sense of the term' (Foucault 2008:244), for example that between parent and child, or educator and student, is now analysed not in terms of the social good, but in market terms of capital investment and returns (Foucault 2008; Harvey 2005). By extension, one of the primary images offered of the productive subject, be they student or lecturer, is that of the entrepreneurial self, 'held accountable for his or her own actions and well-being' (Harvey 2005:65) in relation to their efficiency in investing in their own human capital. Some of the salient outcomes and issues of all human capital being required to improve and maximise its competitive positioning and augment its monetary and nonmonetary value (Brown 2017:10), in relation to the (im)possibility of critique in the university context, are now briefly considered.

As a scholar-educator in today's UK higher education, in which the mutually constitutive contingent relationships of the 'humanities, the university as business, and market-driven expertise' intersect (Ong 2006:26), I am now legitimated as such in large part via discourses of marketization and commodification complicit with a wider social shift from the welfare state to the market state (Canaan & Shumar 2008:4). As part of this reconstitution of the university as a marketisable entity, and to allow it to compete 'freely' in a global market (Canaan & Shumar 2008:4) knowledge, research, and teaching and learning are index-linked

to global, neoliberal audit and league table regimes. Stronach and Clarke argue that these morph the various stages of our education system into 'a hierarchy of employability' (2011:992), in which the cultural capital of knowledge is measured against its potential economic value in a 'knowledge' economy, thus encouraging 'sterility, contradiction, and regression to the measurable' (Stronach & Clarke, *ibid.*). It is the language and everyday practices of such discourses that constitute the contemporary university's 'order of things' (Foucault 2002). Readings (1996) evokes this crumbling of the historical foundations of the modern university and its subjects, and its exposure to the forces of market capitalism, in the metaphor of 'ruins'. As Readings also noted in 1996, in this subordination of education and research to economic instrumentalism: 'the contemporary university is busily transforming itself from an ideological arm of the state into a bureaucratically-organised and relatively autonomous consumer-oriented corporation' (Readings 1996: 11). This means that central figures of the university are no longer scholars, but Vice Chancellors, management and marketing teams, and administrators (Readings 1996:8) leading to a change in culture and power balance. The scale of this shift to prioritising the corporate managerial model (and corporate salaries), with top down decision making replacing faculty governance is not always easy to measure, but one example can be seen in an estimated increase of 55% in pro-vice chancellors in post-1992 universities such as mine, between 2006 and 2015 (Shepherd 2017). Another is in the increasing percentage of support and administrative staff in the overall workforce. 2013-2014 UK university returns to HESA (Higher Education Statistics Agency) show 71% of workforce across UK universities are support staff (Jump 2015). In this context where new forms of command subsume and valorize knowledge according to market logics, dissent and critique can all too easily be assimilated into a manageable commodity.

Thus, the grand narrative of the publicly-funded university, whose educational goal was framed as the production of critical, humanist citizens who played active roles in the democratic functioning of society, has been replaced by flatter stories of the techno-bureaucratic, ahistorical 'university of excellence' (Readings 1996), whose goal is satisfied consumers – and the student is 'situated entirely as a *consumer* rather than someone who wants to think' (Readings 1996:27) - and capital excess. In this 'university of excellence' the systems of governance work to narrow the sphere of academic responsibility, from being ethical and critical to being clerical and commercial (Ayora Diaz 2010), so as to meet the demands of audit and business culture norms. In such conditions, an instrumental

accountability to accounting, cost-efficiency and economic value is normative, rather than an ethical accountability to social justice and the possibility of the openness of thought (Readings 1996: 154).

A further alteration to the university sector has been brought about by cuts in public funding that have accompanied the shift from governance by the state to governance by the market and its values. The neoliberal assumption underpinning such cuts is that the public sector is a dead weight on the economy unless subject to the rules and regulations of the private sector (Canaan & Shumar 2008:4). These have led to increased dependency on private funding and unpredictable cash flows (Courtois & O'Keefe 2015). Similarly, removing the student numbers cap and the high grade university entrance requirements in 2013 has made the university sector market more open, dynamic and volatile (McCaig 2016), which in turn has increased the need for more flexible, casualised labour and the emergence of a large academic 'precariat'. As a 2016 report by UCU (Universities and Colleges Union) demonstrates, '54% of all academic staff and 49% of all academic teaching staff are on insecure contracts' (UCU 2016) with notably those university workers beginning their career required to live in constant threat of unemployment depending on contingent student numbers and managerial priorities, and shoulder the majority of ever larger undergraduate class teaching and marking. In addition to this, working hours of the 'precariat' often exceed the nominal hourly rate, particularly if staff are to achieve reasonable student satisfaction ranking, meaning work is conducted 'on 'volunteer labour' (Whelan 2015:131). These human situations of precariousness and uncertainty, and the ever intensifying drive to make education serve capitalism (Stronach & Clarke 2011) raise fundamental questions about the status of the university as a site of critique and 'freedom of speech'. Such questions about the possibilities of the critical in university practices and subjects, particularly in relation to the redemptive and transformative claims of much 'critical' pedagogy, including my own, are central to this thesis.

Yet a further addition to this neoliberal underwriting of the site of the university in the UK, or more specifically England, was the introduction of tuition fees of £1000 in 1998, under a Labour government, raised to £3000 in 2003, also under Labour, then most recently tripled to 'up to' £9000 a year in 2012, under a Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition government. Framed as being the best way forward for the sector, for the taxpayer and for the public, rather than shifting the cost of education from the public sector to the individual,

the introduction of tuition fees has been accompanied by a new finance system of supposedly fixed low-interest student loans, only to be paid back according to working income, and purportedly intended to ensure students from all backgrounds might benefit from higher education. One result of this change which has generated controversy is spiralling amounts of student 'debt', calculated as £100 billion in 2017 by the Student Loans Company. Thus, though celebrated as giving 'freedom' to a wider market of subjects to pursue a higher education, it is really a variant on market authoritarianism (Canaan & Shumar 2008) that introduces new games of domination and power, and foregrounds the central neoliberal ideology of individualism rather than collectivism and democracy. Such changes tend to reframe the goal of attending university as a human capital investment made to increase increase earning power, and lessen the value of those disciplines not more tightly imbricated with the neoliberal agenda. However, conceptualising the university as a 'ruined' institution, does not only reference an historical shift in the ideological interests and technologies that organise it as a site of knowledge and learning. It also encapsulates the arguments put forward by post theorists that shred western culture's assumptions of universal truths and a centred subject; both central foundations of the Enlightenment vision of knowledge and the university. In a somewhat paradoxical joint enterprise, it could be argued capitalism and theory are performing a rather successful demolition of the potential of the university to be a site of critique, and for its subjects to be critical. On the one hand, the former works to reconstruct the value of knowledge according to the logics and crises of the free market economy, and simplify learning and the learning subject into a standardised product. On the other, post theorists and scholars have reconfigured humanism's account of knowledge, the subject, freedom and power away from singular cogito, agency and objective empiricism, that regresses to the quantitative, towards recognition of the complex imbrication of the scientific epistemologies and ontologies of the material of 'the scientist', with the linguistic and discursive (St. Pierre 2013: 647) such that the knowing subject is left in perpetual displacement. The new subjects construed by these two forces, both of which have credit for their part in historical change are, it should be stressed, rather radically different. Whilst the university of 'excellence' blends traditional notions of university scholar-educators as centred, impartial, disciplinary experts with those of an efficient production line manager to construe academics as figures of authority skilled at straightforward production of knowing subjects and 'well-educated' future citizens and skilled global employees, a post approach inverts this relation and sees material practices as the teeming production ground of teaching and learning subjects and subjectivities,

dispersed by the complex tensions and shiftings of the very practices which constitute them. We thus return to Pennycook's differentiation between 'the speaking subject' and the 'spoken subject' (1996: 209), and the fragmented existence of the subject of discourse, never entirely hegemonic or counter-hegemonic in his/her/ their actions.

This situation presents a dilemma to a critically oriented scholar-educator such as myself, since, though versed in the radical and critical teaching traditions in my subject domain of applied linguistics and intercultural communication, and having a DNA inheritance hardwired to want to believe in Freire's ideals of education as a subversive force capable of releasing the oppressed from oppression through a pedagogy of hope, my own historicity interferes with such critical practices. For example, when conceptualising the contingent 'emancipated' subject of critical pedagogy through a poststructuralist lens, and when attempting to imagine the possibilities of 'critical' teaching and learning practices, which work to resist reductive rationalisations of the value and responsibilities of higher education so as to 'leave space and breathing room for what does not yet have a definable face' (Derrida 2004: 163), I am immediately entangled in a contradiction. On the one hand, I feel a clear compelling desire for and need to hypothesize a common human subject capable of resisting the disciplining effect of the neoliberal onslaught on all areas of social life, including the university. On the other hand, theoretically, I recognise that there is no plenitude of presence in the unlimited variations of shifting subject positions that can constitute a collective 'we' apt to resist and break away from a dominant political regime, nor a plenitude of presence in said regime. In a nutshell my dilemma is this: if I design teaching and learning practices intended to produce such critical questioning in student writing and thinking, however innovative, imaginative or critical my course design may be, or however much I call for all students to develop as active citizens who value difference, social justice, democracy and dialogue, I am caught in an aporia: the moment my beliefs enter the social spheres as language constituting the social site of the university, they are caught up in the textual operations of power and governance. My attempts at critique are thwarted at the outset. This situation is further complicated by the fact the scene of pedagogy, now normatively referred to as teaching and learning, is riddled with foreclosed questions of authority in the teacher-knowledge-student relation linked to Socratic dialogue and canonicity (Radhakrishnan 1996; Readings 1996). As Radhakrishnan reasons (1996), there are problems concerning not only pedagogy and authority, but also pedagogy and transformation, and 'the very nature of pedagogy as a special kind of epistemic space and its topology within the

context of larger cultural and social practices' (Radhakrishnan 1996:98). By the latter he refers to pedagogy's tendency 'to constitute itself as a totally reliable and transparent vehicle of Truth' (Radhakrishnan 1996:99). All these need to be taken into account when problematising the possibility of the critical in a university context.

Thus far, this outlining of the dilemmas facing the 'critical pedagogue' working in the 'ruined' terrain of the university raises three key theoretical and practical questions. Do these mutations towards the neoliberal and marketization in dominant university discourses, as well as the theoretical constraints on resistance and the subject, then neuter the hopes of a 'critical' in pedagogy and writing that can resist the homogenising strategies of capitalist productivity in teaching and learning? Do they suggest a 'chronic complicity' (Radhakrishnan 1996:116) between the self, identity and knowledge that forestalls the possibility of space for 'the other' or 'the not yet known' in university knowledge practices, since any form of critique is recuperated and neutralised by capitalism? Or, do they help introduce new perspectives on the materiality of resistance and the critical as immanent in 'our' subjective, everyday practices of knowledge labour and production, more particularly those of pedagogy and student writing, that are apt to leave some small hope? In addressing these questions in my thesis and this chapter, I choose to dwell with the latter position on the possibility of the critical and resistance in the heterogeneous, plurality of hegemonic university practices.

### **3.3 Classical Marxian perspectives**

Before investigating parts of the terrains of new Marxist thinking that trouble ideas of the autonomous proletarian or bourgeois subject, and their part in the historical project of capitalism, and move history forward from singular and teleological time and space to multiple histories in the present, I briefly outline some of the key elements of Marxian theories of society, economics and politics which formed just some of the starting points from which discourses of left thinking mutated differently in richly, diverse directions.

In classical, materialist Marxist theory, the social is seen as 'a structural totality with its own identifiable and intelligible positivity as a society' (Shantz 2000:93) that can be understood simply by 'peering beneath [its] surface manifestations' (Shantz 2000:93). Thus, history and society are seen as essentialist totalities 'constituted around conceptually explicable laws' (Laclau & Mouffe 1995:341). Within the structural social effects of base and superstructure,

traditional discourses of the Left assert the ontological centrality of a proletariat, or working class, that operates as an historic agent 'whose self-realization will engender that imagined mastery of the social which renders possible the expulsion of social negativity' (Shantz 2000:91). As can be seen, the Marxian conception of subjectivity assumes non-contradictory, pre-given subjectivities which all necessarily have a class character. The radical character and political centrality of this class is logically deduced by their position at the base of the dominant mode of (re)production, or economic system, known as 'the base' in Marxist terminology (Clemitchaw 2013:271). What hinders worker resistance to their domination is the ideological foregrounding of certain forms of commonsense, and the marginalising of other forms of sense, via the logics of hegemony. These operate to blind subjects to their 'true identity', which is their part in the reproduction of social structures according to the ideology of the ruling classes. According to the teleological conclusions of classical Marxian thinking, it is the historical task of these 'agents of hegemony' (Laclau & Mouffe 2001:85), exclusively constituted by narrowly economic material conditions, to recognise the unity of their historical interests and liberate themselves from oppression to bring about an ideal state of socialism. Yet, as Laclau and Mouffe remind us, whilst it makes sense that the working class should try to liberate itself from a system which thrives upon inequality and oppression, it is as illogical to assume universal causal connections between 'positions in relations of production and the mentality of the producers' (Laclau & Mouffe 2001:85), as it is to assume worker subjects should be 'endowed with "historical interests" derived from their class positions' (Laclau & Mouffe 2001:85). Indeed, rather than using concrete notions of the social as an explanatory category, they argue inquiry into the contingent logics of hegemony should assume the social and class as a shifting, fractured ground (Laclau & Mouffe 2001:8). Whilst this thesis replaces the specificity and positionality of class subjects with the specificity and positionality of subaltern academic subjects, a parallel assumption of the contingent logics and grounds of hegemony is used to underpin this thesis.

### **3.4 Gramsci: the hegemonic-state reproduction model**

Gramsci was a historical materialist, a thinker who saw philosophy as 'history in action', and a politician and cultural critic committed to the cause of revolutionary socialism in early 20<sup>th</sup> century Italy. He developed his theory of cultural hegemony to explain dimensions of sociopolitical control in educational institutions. His critique of processes of state dominance via hegemonic discourse was firmly located in 'the forge of immediate struggles' (Hiddleston 2013:10) and the concrete resolution of given problems of his historical context, both a long

way from contemporary theorisations of the seminar room or doctoral thesis. Yet, despite his living and theorising in a world that precedes that of today, his concerns about the way education reproduces dominant ideologies share much in common with current critical concerns about neoliberalisation of the state and education. For example, Gramsci argued that the corporate state, generated by the 'organic' absorption of 'great specialists of private enterprise into democratic regimes of parliament' (Gramsci 1998a:27), had led to the erosion of educational aims as 'disinterested' (Gramsci 1998a:27), and the production of 'a homogenous group of intellectuals, trained to produce a regular and methodical "writing" activity' (Gramsci 1998a:28). For these reasons, and others considered below, the legacy of this already constituted domain of the critical, that emerged from his revisiting and transforming of Marxist theory, is still used to inform successive theoretical resolutions of different problems (Suarin 2013:31).

One of the key effects of Gramsci's revisiting Marx's historical-political philosophy, to consider how 'the working class develop some degree of class organisation and consciousness even under the corporate state' (Gramsci 1998a:47), was to disturb cruder, economistic, interpretations of the mechanics of class domination, and ideological superstructure and economic base. Two ways he worked to remove the rigidity of historical determinism were, first to emphasise the complexity of social formation (Ayers 2013:5), and second to problematise the non-reductive role of human agency in resisting the instrumentality of hegemonic process and producing consent (Radhakrishnan 1996:48). Regarding the first, he incorporates culture and morality into the collective 'subjugated subjects' strategy for revolt' (Hiddleston 2013:12), and also intimately ties his analysis of hegemonic production of consent and/or resistance to 'textual practices, linguistic codes, and institutional practices' (Hardin 2002:41), and embodied experiences of education. Regarding the second, though he stressed the possibility of 'man' functioning as 'an agent in relatively and historically constituted freedom' (Radhakrishnan 1996:49), he also recognised the nodal function of 'man' as pre-constituted structure (Radhakrishnan 1996:49). It is the dynamic, noncoincidental, dialectic relationship between these two categories of movement, one active, the other passive, but both culturally and morally subjugated (Hiddleston 2013:12), that for Gramsci simultaneously maintain, reproduce and yet developmentally change a given world order (Suarin 2013:32) at the local and wider scale of practices. However, differently to poststructuralist theorizing, Gramsci sees hegemony as including a strong sense of agency, and as being tightly linked to particular cultural contexts.

Importantly, Gramsci theorises the 'effort' and 'activity' that constitute this unbounded dialectic relationship as 'ontologically formative of agency' (Hill 2010:6), thus bringing theory and practice into alignment. This agency is such that in uneven and contradictory ways it brings about social evolution. So, on the one hand, 'activity' can take the form of consensual 'crying out' (Ives 2010:87) to enter into hegemonic power structures in order to 'survive and perhaps achieve a modicum of security or power or success' (Ives 2010:87). On the other, it is capable of freeing 'men' from existing capitalist mode of thought and their own fetishization of relations of production (Hill 2010:6). A fundamental characteristic of the latter figuring of agency in relation to education is that it is 'creative' (Gramsci 1998:33), and is achieved through:

a spontaneous and autonomous effort of the pupil, with the teacher only exercising a function of friendly guide – as happens or should happen in the university (Gramsci 1998a:33).

In relationship to my investigation into the possibilities of the critical in HE pedagogy today, the significance of this thinking is that resistance is prompted by spontaneous creativity and 'effort' having little direct relation to teacher directives. Though the intellectual-teacher, or scholar-educator, can offer suggestions and guidance, or engage students in debate, the critical stops being critical if it becomes didactic or overly-scaffolded. Furthermore, this 'effort' is what also ensures hegemonic procedures do not fully prevent agency from self-consciousness, nor a working out of a non-hegemonic conception of reality that resists the material forces of instrumentalism in educational institutions.

It should be pointed out that for Gramsci, agency is political, and directed towards an end goal of a socialist 'single cultural "climate"' (Gramsci 1998b:347). As clarified above, unlike most poststructuralists, Gramsci's complex theorisation of ideological reproduction was premised on a committed vision of a politics that did not fully detach the specific from the historical (though not totalised), collective bloc (Radhakrishnan 1996:53). Furthermore, his dialectic model of development was premised on the relations between two classes of subjects, intellectuals and the masses, yet this was not restricted to hierarchical socioeconomic notions of class. As 'the real, organic vanguard of the upper classes' - or bourgeoisie - to which they economically belong (Gramsci 1998c:60), the task of intellectuals is to use education to encourage the molecular political criticism and 'activity' of 'subalterns': a concept Gramsci devised that refers to a classless state of subjugation which allows analysis of oppression and insurgency within the apparatus of political, moral and

intellectual hegemony. It is the minor, day-to-day pedagogical and critical activities of the intellectuals, and the self-educating efforts of the subalterns that work in a dialectical relationship to prevent the interests of the dominant group from fully prevailing, or at least ensures that they 'stop short of narrowly corporate economic interest' (Gramsci 1998d:182). I draw on Gramsci's analytical construal of the subaltern to refer first to the agency of students when producing the (dis)orders of discourse in assessment writing, and second to the agency of critical pedagogues when working to discontinue dominant formations of the goals and practices of higher education.

Within this conception of hegemonic historical process as heterogeneous cultural battles to 'transform the popular "mentality"' (Gramsci 1998b:333), such that philosophical innovations become historically and socially concrete praxis, Gramsci construes language use and education as pivotal and deeply interrelated. He saw education/schooling as the 'embodied operation of hegemony' (Ives 2010:81), and was interested in 'the molecular operations of power within linguistic differences' (Ives 2010:81) for the ways they built division and/or unity. More specifically, Gramsci's argument proposed a national 'common language' that could be used to educate an entire population, including the divided subaltern groups in Italy (Ives 2010:89), and would ensure the collective attainment of a heterogeneous 'cultural social unity' (Gramsci 1998b:347) within a bounded geographical space. A central premise of this argument was that such a language, i.e. not one imposed from above, could prevent elite social groups from excluding the majority of the population from access to power, knowledge and elite political positions (Ives 2010:89).

To clarify the distinction between these two logics of national language, Gramsci identifies different categories of 'grammar'. On the one hand, the 'spontaneous' or 'immanent' grammars which guide speech, almost without the subject knowing it (Gramsci 1985, cited in Ives 2010:91). On the other, the 'normative grammars', or conscious structure of rules used to teach language, which constitute conformist notions of correct and incorrect via a 'whole complex of actions and reactions' (Ives 2010:91). This distinction is not a simplistic dichotomy from which it should be inferred that 'spontaneous' grammars are free from unequal power relations and that 'normative grammars' are a coercive medium for imposition of dominant cultural ideologies. Instead, the two are in a non-oppositional, dialectical relationship that hegemonically structures both coercion and consent (Ives 2010:91). Thus, 'spontaneity' is not the result of free choice, but of 'the fragmentary,

incoherent and ultimately subjugated nature of subaltern conditions’ (Ives 2010:91) that, as one of the two central dynamics of hegemony, perpetuates a worldview that embeds inequalities and oppression. Taking a bottom-up approach to analysing such ‘spontaneity’ in my close reading of normative student academic writing practices in the interpretive discipline of intercultural communication, my estimation of spontaneity is slightly more positive than that of Gramsci. Whilst recognising that by unsettling some norms, others are only produced anyway, if I read Gramsci’s spontaneity through the logics of poststructuralist agency I would argue that critical consciousness of their/our imbrication in the dynamic multiplicities of power relations in the field of knowledge can give students/academics access to ways of critically and creatively intervening in the imposed standard languages of knowledge which control and organise their subjectivities such that ‘the agent can act in an ethical way, a political way, a day-to-day way; so that the agent can be alive, in a human way, in the world’ (Spivak 1993:181).

In table 3 below, I list the Gramscian re-readings of Marx I find useful as heuristics for conceptualising the location, constraints and nature of the agency of the critical subaltern pedagogue and student subject within the local reality of hegemonic university everyday practices. I also list Gramsci’s vision of the future outcome of progressive subaltern appropriation of dominant discourses. Though it is more utopian and future oriented than a Foucaultian analysis would propose, this vision can be identified within transformative critical pedagogy discourses circulating in higher education today.

**Table 3 Gramscian perspectives on hegemony and the agency of the subject**

<i>Hegemonic specifics and processes</i>	<i>Conceptualisation of agency of subject</i>
Corporate enterprise absorbed into ‘democratic’ regimes of parliament and education	Activity/effort ontologically formative of agency to consent and/or resist
Regular ‘writing’ activity	Critical agency of student achieved through spontaneous effort of student rather than through teacher-led direction
Social formation is complex and non-reductive	Consent or resistance tied to textual practices, linguistic codes and institutional practices
Education the embodied operation of hegemony for cultural reproduction or change	Noncoincidental relation between active and passive agency of subject that maintain/change given world order
Normative/spontaneous grammars	Molecular political criticism of subaltern activity (non-class specific) that ensures interests of dominant group stop short of ‘narrowly corporate interest’

Goal to develop a utopian future

Bottom-up, heterogeneous languages counter-hegemonic

Agency partially constituted at point exterior to the context it articulates

Political, and directed to single socialist cultural climate

To summarise, if I 'plug into' Gramsci's contribution to our understanding of hegemony and its subjects to support my task of conceptualising a subaltern grasping of some agency from within dominant discourses that impose the meaning of institutional critical pedagogical and writing practices, the way forward would seem to lie in a form of double coding of the meaning of agency. On the one hand, educated/ing subjects can read and write dominant framings of the critical 'against the grain', and interrogate the binary of oppressed-liberated for their false promises of transformation, whilst recognising the project of resistance can only ever ensure the dominant group stop short of 'narrowly corporate interests'. On the other, subjects can seize the agency given to them either (a) to conform to 'regularities of writing' imposed from above, and/or (b) to resist such regularities in molecular, heterogeneous critiques of existing practice that produce them differently. Though there is no causal relation between their differing uses of agency and a given world order, such conscious 'activity' and 'effort' ensure the subject is articulating and investing in what Radhakrishnan calls 'its own hegemonic identity' (1996:167), thus circumventing strategies of neglect of the historical present (Radhakrishnan 1996:167).

### **3.5 Althusser: Ideological State Apparatuses reproduction model**

A French, Marxist philosopher, sociologist and structuralist, Althusser played a part in transforming the Marxist horizon by interpreting ideology as 'a crucial part of the politics of reading and meaning-production' (Radhakrishnan 1996:5). In his philosophical appropriation of Marx to read it within the epistemologies of structuralism (Radhakrishnan 1996:7), Althusser critiqued the 'descriptive status' of classical Marxist historical conception of the 'social whole' (Althusser 1995:298) as structured conjointly by a relatively autonomous superstructure of state and law, reciprocally acted upon by an economic base, comprised of 'productive forces and relations of production' (Althusser 1995:298). In order to give Marxist theory greater explanatory validity for explaining normative aspects of ideology, and 'the facts of oppression' (Althusser 1997:133), Althusser characterises the superstructure 'on the basis of reproduction' (Althusser 1995:299). Central to his rereading of the way the state apparatus and power subjugates/dominates its subjects, and reproduces unequal economic conditions and distributions of capital, is the concept of ISAs (Ideological State Apparatuses).

These do not exercise power and authority through coercion and repression, but through ideology. ISAs are 'a certain number of realities which present themselves to the immediate observer in the form of distinct and specialised institutions' (Althusser 1995:301) such as family, education, religion, communications and culture. The overseer of ideological reproduction in ISAs is 'a network of determinations' (Hardin 202:40), or contradictions in practice whose unstable antagonisms and non-antagonisms, or repressions and resistances, structure dominance differently, at any given moment, to reform the social whole.

Having re-conceptualised orthodox Marxist explanations of the mechanisms that structure capitalism's totality, such that its account of the coordinates of economic reproduction exceeds the descriptive, Althusser then critiques the Marxian concept of ideology, which includes the idea of 'false consciousness'. Whereas Marx saw ideology as an imaginary construction, and gave 'false consciousness' the theoretical status of a 'pure dream' (Althusser 1995:305) that made it impossible for individuals to access the real conditions of their existence, Althusser maintains that ideology has a material existence since an ideology exists in 'an apparatus and its practice, or practices' (Althusser 1995:307). It is this conjoining of ideology and practices that is used to explain the separation of the subject from 'real conditions of existence'. This differential reading of Marx's construal of ideology was premised on a contention shared with Lacan, that reliance on language and other symbolic orders prevents access to 'real conditions of existence', and ensures that individuals 'live in ideology' in a way that is deeply unconscious (Althusser 1995:308). Drawing on Lacan's retheorization of Freud's unconscious, made possible only by the 'new science' of 'linguistics' (Althusser 1997:191), Althusser's reproduction theory understands 'The Law of Culture' (Althusser 1997:193) to be constituted by a recurrent language which presents and establishes 'all human order, i.e. every human role' (Althusser 1997:193). Thus, the biological existence of the newborn, and later adult, is attuned to human existence in an ordered way.

In this material field of ideology and practices, it is the 'category of subject' which makes possible the functioning of ideology (Althusser 1995:308), and vice versa. Thus, the main function of ideology is to constitute 'concrete individuals as subjects' (Althusser 1995:308). All ideology 'hails or interpellates concrete individuals as concrete subjects' (Althusser 1995:309). It is through the subject's actions 'inserted into practices' (Althusser 1995:308) – performing which the subject takes for granted the correspondence between 'reality' and

thought - that ideology manifests itself. The incessant performance of 'rituals of ideological recognition' (Althusser 1995:309) is what instantiates individuals as subjects in relation to social institutions and others. Althusser gives a personal example of the mechanisms of the ideological practice of recognition which means we are '*always-already* subjects' (Althusser 1995:309) speaking from within ideology:

The writing I am currently executing and the reading you are currently performing are ... rituals of ideological recognition, including the 'obviousness' with which the 'truth' or 'error' of my reflections may impose itself upon you. (Althusser 1995:309)

Where does this leave the question of the agency of the reading and writing university subject, or a conceptualisation of them as progressive bodies of critical change? In the context of contemporary university life, the 'real conditions' of existence are those 'obvious' coherences through which the roles of the academy are being determined (neoliberal, managerialism, student as consumer, the demand for 'student satisfaction' rankings etc.). The relation of the scholar-educator, or student to those coherences is, for Althusser, 'imaginary'. The 'imaginary', which operates like a form of mental programming, prompts the subject to discern themselves in a state of coherence that is consistent with wider orders of social coherence. Through the symbolic order of language, the individual is able to affirm themselves in singular terms of 'I', in relation to the aggregate of society, and to see the academy as integrated orderings of academic life, both locally and globally. Through this process of abstraction, the individual finds themselves in a State of Imagination to which there is no outside, and which maintains the belief that there is a correspondence between 'their empirical self and their epistemological conception of self' (Tie 2011:368). As Althusser would have it: this is ideology at work.

The key dynamic of this ideological work of subjectification in the institution of the university is the everyday 'practices', or apparently insignificant rituals that structure the higher educational community. For example, each time the scholar-educator speaks to students as a disciplinary 'expert' and students answer. Or, each time university writing centres put together new courses on ideal-type academic writing skills and students attend these. Or, each time the scholar-educator becomes so invested in privileging disciplinary practices they are blinded to their powerlessness within webs of always-already worldly macropolitics that prevent them from having access to a primary, ordinary critical stance. For the subject to act to remain socially relevant the subject cannot avoid a constant availability for social practices, and it is on these grounds that Althusser argues there is no outside to this state,

since subjects 'work all by themselves' (Althusser 1997:169) to reclaim their subjectivation. Does this mean that the subject of the university is literally 'dead', and locked into the 'duplicate mirror structure' of ideology (Althusser 1997:168)? In his answer to this question, Althusser suggests that to 'break' with ideology, whilst speaking within it, critique and resistance need to outline 'the beginning of scientific (i.e. subjectless) discourse on ideology' (Althusser 1995:309). It is at this stage of his critique of ideology that Althusser is unwittingly interpellated by positivist ideologies of scientific knowledge as 'objective', and suggests that history is bracketed out from scientific knowledge and the process of critique. This regression to binary ideological thinking, inscribes Althusser in the position of 'the universal subject of Marxism and as the professional theorist who believes unproblematically in the right to speak for the subject' (Radhakrishnan 1996:14), and opens the door to poststructuralist thinkers such as Foucault, more sceptical of the infallibility of scientific knowledge and discourses, and the universality of Marxism.

To conclude this section, Althusser's theorisation of ideology, is useful in understanding how the university, its subjects and macropolitical and micropolitical practices operate as mediators between 'the capitalist market and the liberal state' (Tie 2011:369), and also how everyday practices of pursuit of relevance in divergent temporalities can blind us to the power dynamics of our critical practices and acts of resistance. However, it does not provide a form of theory that explicitly allows for engagement with the gaps in contesting construals of society and knowledge that are the spaces where possibilities of other futures are percolating. Nor does it show Gramsci's appreciation of subaltern 'knowledges' marginalised from official histories. Finally, to the extent that it positions the critic and academic user of 'scientific' discourse as immune to ideological formation of the hegemonic kind, it is prone to reproducing academic and pedagogical subjectivities in line with the 'coherences' that engender predominant discourses.

Table 4 below lists key lessons from Althusser's radical re-reading of orthodox Marxist macro social structures that I find useful for understanding the almost entirely unconscious way in which subjects constitute themselves in the unstable micrological, material processes of ideology at work. By critiquing the subject as the self-naturalising product and producer of ideology, he makes very clear the trap subaltern subjects are in and the consequences of this for possible forms of resistance and agency.

**Table 4 Althusserian perspectives on hegemony and the agency of the subject**

<i>Hegemonic specifics and processes</i>	<i>Conceptualisation of agency of subject</i>
Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs)	Attuning of newborn and adult to 'order of things' through individual living in ideology in deeply unconscious way
Unstable repressions and resistances structure dominance differently at any given moment	Subject makes possible functioning of ideology and vice versa
Materiality of ideology which constitutes human practices	The imaginary operates like a form of mental programming that allows them to identify as an individual 'I' in a coherent social whole
Everyday practices and rituals guarantee ideological work of <b>subjectivation</b>	Subject needs to be constantly available for rituals to remain socially relevant
Recurrent language which establishes human order	Resistance only possible through use of scientific analysis of discourse and practice

### **3.6 Laclau and Mouffe: hegemonic social production as plural, indeterminate discursive formation**

An Argentinian and a Belgian political theorist respectively, Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe collapsed the classical left discourse and imaginary in order to reconceptualise a politics of the (L)left apt for a democracy yet to come. This postulates the character of the social, the subject and resistance as 'plural and multifarious' (Laclau and Mouffe 1995:341) and understands the political in its ineradicable 'antagonistic dimension' (Mouffe 2007:1), or in its articulation with hegemony of which 'structural undecidability is the very condition' (Laclau & Mouffe 2001:xii). Thus, rather than seeking radical, universal change, the discursive fields of democracy with their various (Western) ethical, political values of liberty and equality, work to subvert 'the dominant hegemony [and contribute to] the construction of new subjectivities' (Mouffe 2007:5). The framework of such subversions includes full knowledge there is no privileged position outside ontology and the multiplicity of discursive surfaces from which to do this. In this sense, critical academic subjectivities turn away from traditional assumptions about a metaphysics of presence and a *telos* of resistance leading to emancipation from oppression, and towards resistance conceptualised as a contingent, generative, messy temporality that works in the cracks and tensions between ingrained social order to resist commodification and hegemonic governance. In this section I specifically address the usefulness of such theoretical positions in developing my thesis that the critical in university practices, including those of pedagogy and academic writing, must be understood as contingent, revocable resistance to hegemonic discourses that operate in the junction box of institutional hegemonic social spaces, that can always-already be recuperated by the positivities of power.

For Laclau and Mouffe, hegemonic formation, and hence cultural (re)production, 'coincide with the concept of discursive formation' (Laclau & Mouffe 1985:136) and so never articulate conclusive change. Against any essentialist 'utopian' conjecture of the social, or the singular anthropological subject, they see hegemonic formation as constituted by a plurality of antagonisms which continually re-define social spaces and the limits of social division. However, these multiple antagonisms of hegemonic formation are always centred in certain social relations that in capitalism are 'the relations of production' (Mouffe 1988:90). These are not to be explained 'as an effect of structure' (Mouffe 1988:*ibid.*). Rather, these relations are constant antagonistic struggle in cultural, political and economic practices that create the conditions necessary to validate capital and its accumulation (Mouffe 1988:91). Thus different hegemonic formations of capitalism are produced by radical transformation from within the social in which the institution guarantees a certain regularity of dispersion. This dispersion includes a propagation of highly diverse elements that Laclau and Mouffe (1985:142) define as the ever fragmenting, shifting and reforming relations of 'truth':

systems of differences which partially define relational identities; chains of equivalences which subvert the latter but can be transformistically recovered insofar as the place of opposition itself becomes regular and, in that way, constitutes a new difference; forms of overdetermination which constitute either power, or the different forms of resistance to it: and so forth.

Through this replacement of the concept of a constitutive dichotomy operating within a single ground that transforms the particular into the universal, and vice versa, to produce the social, by that of an understanding the social is produced by multiple antagonisms operating within a radical ground that is constitutively ambiguous and dispersed (Laclau 1996), it follows that a multitude of the referents of modernity such as democracy, the universal subject, emancipation, and freedom are empty signifiers referencing an 'absent fullness' (Laclau 1996). Given there is no fullness to these signifieds other than a temporary stability resulting from mythologising, politically driven representations in the press, government and other ISAs, the moment such terms are invoked as givens 'marks the moment that thought stops' (Strickland 2000:476). Or, more precisely, as Strickland moves on to say, it marks the moment that thought starts moving in multiple directions (Strickland 2000:*ibid.*).

From this perspective, in their function as 'empty' or 'floating' signifiers that suffer from an excess of meaning, the 'critical' and 'resistance' in pedagogy and academic writing are left

open to being articulated with bureaucratic, normative, neoliberal agendas of knowledge production. The terms of 'critical' or 'resistance' can be used just as easily within practices of marketization and the normative as in radical, progressive practices. Thus, if the concepts of the 'critical' and 'resistance' are not to be buried in the graveyard of modernist understandings of society and to be recuperated for their radical possibilities, we need to clarify how the concepts have been deployed in pedagogy and academic writing. I do the former in Chapter 5, *Towards Poststructuralist Understandings of the Critical in Student Academic Writing* and the latter in Chapter 4, *Towards Poststructural Critical Pedagogies – the Subaltern Subjects of Higher Education*. By disturbing the ways the critical and resistance have functioned, and reconceptualising how they might function, agonistic dynamics might be created that shake up knowledge and move it in a new questioning dimension. By ruffling the discursive concepts of the 'critical' and 'resistance' in this way, rather than the dynamics of democracy *per se*, I am simply relocating the radical principle of fighting for freedom and equality within the possibilities of the politics of educational praxis, rather than in the wider political context. However, since the educational community is just one of the many proliferating sites of struggle against oppression, I would argue it forms an essential site for the discourse of democracy, and the critical, to function as a source of critique of the current state of affairs. Similarly, as one of the many struggles among others working to achieve forms of democracy that can never be taken for granted or fully achieved (Mouffe 2007), there is lot to challenge in current hegemonic forms of higher education which articulate education with discourses of individual success, economic value and neutral, quantifiable technical procedures rather than ethical and political discourses of community, openness to difference, indignation at the outcomes of capitalist relations of production, and non-neutral, embodied, procedures not reducible to numbers.

In table 5 below I list the contingent categories of Laclau and Mouffe's unpacking of traditional Marxist understanding of hegemony I find useful in my own historicization of the heterogeneous and continually shifting practices of critique and resistance within university hegemonies. Yet, whilst their conceptualisation of the political as a form of constant deracination corresponds to Foucault's analysis of power and resistance as a diffuse element of social mechanisms, they paradoxically retain the notion of some form of transcendental collective agency operating via hegemonic practices that produces 'a global sense of community, a certain democratic common sense' (Laclau 1996:120).

Table 5 **Laclau and Mouffe perspectives on hegemony and the agency of the subject**

<i>Hegemonic specifics and processes</i>	<i>Conceptualisation of agency of subject</i>
Hegemonic formation akin to discursive formation	Identities discursively construed via agonistic spaces of institutional processes and practices
Agonistic struggles arising from multiple types of oppression constitute shifting hegemonic formation	No firm single ground from which to produce decisive resistance or change
All practices, be they radical or liberal, operate to produce hegemonic formation	If radical, has ongoing political responsibility to recuperate vocabularies of resistance from hegemonic practices
No centre, universality or teleological future to the hegemonic social – hegemonic alludes to an ‘absent fullness’	Maximised if chain of equivalences created between different levels of struggle – residual notion of ‘collective will’

### **3.7 Conclusion**

All three theoretical perspectives discussed in this chapter guide us to say farewell to fixed notions of power, class, domination and oppression as methods for analysing power, resistance and the manufacture of the subject within hegemonic relations and practices. Moving away from binary notions of class, and revolutionary assumptions of transformative collective will, they reveal how relations of power assert themselves in multiplicity, difference, and the temporal specifics of local, institutional practice. They also show how such power relations in some cases reinforce and in others resist the various mechanisms of dominant, ideological, cultural reproduction. All these hegemonic strategies form the foundation of the (higher) education system.

In looking at how each perspective reworks the duality of classical Marxist thought I find a valid framework for analysing power relations and the subjugation and agency of the subject which I now summarise:

1. Through Gramsci, I read the constantly interrupted, heterogeneous strategies of consent and resistance in the materiality of student writing regularities as a double coding of subaltern agency which authenticates a form of awareness for the subject of themselves as a form of political action within knowledge;
2. Through Gramsci, I deconstruct traditional and post- readings of critical pedagogy for their commensurability with post-Marxist theory in chapter 3, *Thinking the Normative Subject of Critical Pedagogy Differently* ;

3. Turning to Althusser, I read the workings of ideology in cultural reproduction as operations that constitute the subject in the material practices of the institution such that they are blinded to the reality of their subjugation within always-already macro-politics to which there is no outside. I analyse empirical evidence of such 'blindness' in my misplaced assumptions about the transformative nature of critical pedagogy approaches in chapter 4, *Methodologies, and Methodological Subjectivities*.
4. Through Laclau and Mouffe, I read 'critical' and 'resistance' as empty signifiers voided of fullness by the multiple antagonisms that form the ground of all relations of truth. For this reason their use in university practices such as pedagogy and academic writing needs to be critiqued to clarify their usefulness as practices for resisting the homogenising forces of capitalist productivity.

## Chapter 4      Towards Poststructural Critical Pedagogies – the subaltern subjects of higher education

### 4.1      Introduction

In the previous chapter, I sought to find answers to constantly shifting questions about the possibilities of resistance and an emancipated subject of education in the ruins of the neoliberal university, by probing the leftist-thinking theses of hegemonic economic and cultural production of Gramsci, Althusser, and Laclau and Mouffe. Here, the metaphor of *ruins* evokes a kind of ‘shorthand for the crumbling edifice of Enlightenment values’ (Maclure 2011:997). Against more traditional Marxist assumptions about a metaphysics of presence and a *telos* of resistance apt to emancipate the individual and collective subject from oppression, each of these theorists deploy arguments that posit an understanding of resistance and emancipation not as a practices standing apart from regimes of governance, but as a dynamic part of the heterogeneous, constantly interrupted, strategies that form the ‘constitutive ambiguity’ of hegemony (Laclau 1996:44), with endless micro-practices of non-binary resistance and consent in the historical present of the social text.

Having established the unstable nature of the ontological ground that re/dis/articulates empty signifiers such as ‘freedom’, ‘resistance’, ‘critical’ and ‘democracy’ whilst simultaneously decentring subjects, in this chapter, in a spirit of a poststructuralist uncertainty, where answers to questions are ‘constantly moving’ (Lather 1998:488), I shift the focus of my reading to critical pedagogy conceptions of the emancipatory, transformative power of education, now frequently imbricated with more prescriptive and utilitarian discourses of teaching and learning which frame the value of education and knowledge uniquely in capital terms.

To support the main research objective stated in Chapter 1 to challenge the illusion the subject of pedagogy has some control over the processes that shape history, this chapter is divided into three main sections which roughly correspond to: (a) a digging into the operations of the ‘games of truth’ of critical pedagogy that construe its principles and praxis for transforming oppression according to modernist narratives, premised on the understanding there is a binary alternative to hierarchies in the world of learning and education; (b) a critical reading of my relationship to these as a subject intended to help me ‘unlearn’ (Dunne 2016) and turn ‘outside in’ (Dunne 2016:14) my prior assumptions about

the nature of critical education before beginning the research for this thesis; and (c) the sketching out of heuristic starting points for helping us think the task of contravening the disciplining and volatile effects of 'the ruins of critical pedagogy' (Lather 1996:488), so as to resist the colonising powers that commodify education and its subjects and try to keep opening learning and teaching to the Derridean *event* that 'pries open what exists in the name of something unnameable, unforeseeable' (Caputo 2016:119).

In relation to the first and third sections, the aim is to pick up on the dilemmas facing the critical pedagogue within the epistemic spaces and problematic scene of pedagogy, with foreclosed questions about authority as well as about pedagogy as a transparent instrumentality of 'truth' (Radhakrishnan 1996:99), which were discussed in the previous chapter. The task is to intervene in past/current ways of construing, classifying, strategizing, and writing and talking about (critical) pedagogy and work against this dominant and powerful determinist conception of pedagogy and the pedagogical scene. Our/my responsibility is to move towards construing higher education pedagogy in terms of a metaphysics of *différance* (Derrida 1986), in which its subjects, though always-already subjected to the objectivising panopticon of global capital and neoliberal regimes of governance, as instantiated in the strategies, policies and practices of the state/corporate institutions of universities, can play with the immanent, contingent, messy, competing, temporalities of resistance and consent to blueprints. Such an *after* of critical pedagogical praxis, which prioritises 'not knowing as an ethical and political move' (Lather 2009:342), and makes explicit its inability to predict or control outcomes, could be of practical relevance to scholar-educators interested in making better sense of their attempts to construe ways of seeing knowledge, power and pedagogy. Ways that interrupt 'stultifying' (Rancière 1991), 'myopic' (Bowman 2014:1) and 'prescriptive universalizing' (Lather 1998: 488) teaching and learning approaches embedded in normative university teaching and learning strategies today, which foreclose on openness to the other, and represent pedagogy as a neutral, transparent medium of knowledge, facts and 'truth' whose outputs can be ranked and measured.

In relation to the second aim, I wish to investigate more closely the hold on the technology of my body of the 'truths' of the modernist, emancipatory discursive field of critical education that prompted my initially naïve assumptions when beginning this thesis, about the cause and effect relation between curriculum design, 'transformative' teaching content

and method, and student acquisition of ‘critical’ understandings of intercultural communication that could be read by the rational, authoritative tutor from the materiality of their assessment writing. As discussed in Chapter 6, at this stage of my thinking, my practice of the self, or self-governance (Foucault 1984) played into contemporary doxa, and projects in which I was participating, which upheld that education/educators could develop students as ‘global citizens’. This project, or ‘aesthetics of existence’ (Foucault 1983:415), became a shifting cornerstone for my own subjectivation in HE grids of intelligibility, and led to ‘the creation of new bonds between subjects, and [...] a politics of self-transformation and the transformation of others’ (Eribon 2014:80) that *inter alia* generated a research group, a centre for curriculum internationalisation, and several conferences. Indeed, it was only during the process of analysing student texts for this thesis that I encountered a turning point in my understanding of the critical subject, which toppled my partial belief in a fairly direct causal relation between teaching and learning, and reconfigured my apprehension of resistance and the critical as immanent in educator and student writing practices. This effort to speak from the ‘wrong’ turns of my own thinking may be of use to other poststructuralist pedagogues wishing to hinder ‘a return to the same’ (Lather 1998:492).

#### **4.2 The contested field of critical pedagogy**

A Brazilian educationalist, working within rural peasant communities in Brazil, and militant groupings in post-colonial Guinea-Bissau in West Africa in the mid twentieth century, Freire is claimed by 17 self-identified critical pedagogues to be ‘one of the founding “fathers” of critical pedagogy’ (Breuing 2011:18). Building largely on Gramsci’s neo-Marxist formulations of cultural hegemony and false consciousness, which blinds the exploited to the reality of their exploitation such that they comply with their state of oppression (Clemitshaw 2013), and on Catholic influenced liberation theology (Gerhardt 1993), Freire developed educational practices and ideals intended to overcome social injustice. Since for Freire ignorance was the main cause of the collective subject’s resistance to realising the causes of their oppression, namely bourgeois capitalism, his critical approach to framing the relationship between ‘the word and the world’ (Kincheloe *et al.* 2013:343) worked to reconceptualise the question of literacy in order to see reading not just as looking at words on the page, but at the ideologies hidden between the lines too. Defining practices and principles of Freirean pedagogy include framing dialogue between teacher and student as ‘the necessary social force enabling transformation’ (Nainby *et al.* 2004:35), conquering

oppression and achieving freedom through struggle, critical reflection and 'conscientization' (Freire 1972), and adhering to a political and ethical commitment to hope (Freire 1994).

Therefore, in general, though its reinvention in quite different local and institutional contexts globally by other critical scholars and practitioners is complex and contested, the critical pedagogue is understood to be s/he who sets out to challenge the status quo perpetuated by political systems and government education policies, which work to reproduce such injustice and inequality, and finally inaugurate democracy and justice (e.g. Freire 1972, 1998; Giroux 1992). More concretely, as construed by models of hegemonic cultural reproduction, educational sites are sites where everything from the layout of a classroom, to architecture, to disciplinary hierarchies, and student-educator relations reproduce class ideologies (Hardin 2002: 40), hence the onus is on the critical educator to resist these. Structuring the complex, indeterminate tradition of critical pedagogy, which has been practised and theorised by radical educationalists across different historical and cultural contexts since the 1970s, there is a widespread assumption of a 'natural and virtual *telos* of education' (Clemishaw 2013:269), underpinned by a parallel mythic assumption of an Enlightenment centred human subject, that is represented as oppressed by the vested interests and legitimate powers of dominant social and corporate classes that prohibit her/his/their emancipation. Common then to such conceptualisations of power as a binary battle between the oppressor and the victim are orthodox, dialectical left-wing readings of society that assume the possibility of resisting and overturning 'sovereign regimes of truth' (Kincheloe 2004:46) that exert 'a symbolic violence through [their] containment of choice in the present' (Jenks 1993:5). This reading of pedagogy thus multiplies the construals of power and the subject that constitute historic Marxist coherences whose discontinuities were examined in the previous chapter.

More interrogative approaches to critical pedagogy, begin to engage with different ways of doing 'critical', and construe it as an accumulation of contesting, heterogeneous claims about practice, normativity, the subject and resistance, that are all intended to be counter-hegemonic and challenge authoritarian 'dominant forms of curricula, teaching, evaluation and policy' (Apple 2011:3). Such perspectives also consider education as a political site of conflict and struggle, full of contradictions. However, though often informed by postcolonial positions which undermine essentialist readings of language, power and identity in the West/Other relationship (e.g. Spivak 1993; Bhabha 1994), or movements such as New

Literacy Studies which refuse to over-simplify the relationship between context and practice (Street 1995) by integrating an ethnographic focus on the complexities of local take-up of hegemonic and counter-hegemonic practices into its epistemologies, the activist tradition of critical educational scholarship rarely extends its understanding of the 'subaltern' to the neoliberal subjects of higher education, as I do in this thesis.

Whilst there are indeed highly valid political and ethical reasons for not blurring the boundaries between the subaltern subjects of colonialism and the subaltern subjects of contemporary higher education, whose uneven circumstances I approximately differentiate as those of oppression and wellbeing (Phipps & Guilherme 2004:6), in this thesis I argue for the validity of construing all subjects as subalterns of similarly productive and repressive agency of power that cannot be aggregated into a singular object-subject, measurable by the mechanisms of reason and knowledge. This is proposed as one possible way to free our notions of educational resistance from utopian and reformist projects of individual rights, equality, democracy and global citizenship, hegemonically modelled on 'the straight, white, Judeo-Christian, heterosexual man of property as the ethical universal' (Spivak 1993:19). Such a position does not deny an unacceptable unevenness and difference in the global distribution of capital, security, health and literacy, but cautiously re-locates Spivak's question 'Can the Subaltern speak?' to include all subjects of knowledge and power. Such re-situating of the subaltern subject is intended to resist heroic understandings of solidarity as 'us' fighting for the rights of, or donating money to 'them', that have so far done little to resist the ongoing onslaught of neoliberal practices on all public spheres, and also to suggest the best we can hope for are small refigurings from within the productive positivities of power and networks of difference that produce 'us' and 'them'.

To repoliticise the assumptions of critical pedagogy that reiterate and reproduce neat dichotomies of traditional history, we need to decolonise its productive forcefields from within. As de Certeau (2010) points out when interrogating Foucault's analyses in *Discipline and Punish*, such humanitarian projects inherited from the bourgeois Enlightenment have long since 'been 'colonized' or 'vampirized' by those disciplinary procedures that have since increasingly ordered the social realm itself' (de Certeau 2010a:185). In this sense, the dichotomy is no longer between the bourgeois and the workers, or the colonialist and the subaltern, but between the play and intersections of the two heterogeneous systems of 'ideologies and technical procedures' (de Certeau 2010a:185) via the 'political technology of

the body' (de Certeau 2010a:186). Indeed, as Spivak (1993) argues, in the light of hegemonic logics of cultural reproduction and the operational tactics of discursive force-fields of power which work with 'subindividual atomic systems' beyond the intending subject (Spivak 1993:37), we are always-already organised according to the ruses of the present historical. Re-iterating the caution(s) of Foucault, Spivak argues that in order to understand our near complete enslavement to power relations - where moments of free thought, and of alterity, are brief flashes in the repetitions of discourse - we need to bypass modernist, Eurocentric doxa modelled on a wider, dichotomous understanding of power relations, and retrieve the narrower "'local foci" of power/knowledge' (Spivak 1993:33) which work to norm us at all times towards wider power relations. In doing this, we can make appear 'the dissymetries, the disequilibriums, the aporias, the impossibilities, which are precisely the objects of all commitment' (Spivak 1993:40). For Spivak, the answer to the question of where this leaves us as critical pedagogues is formulated via a deconstructive reading of Foucault's ethics: 'One of the first things to do is to think through the limits of one's power. One must ruthlessly undermine the story of the ethical universal, the hero' (Spivak 1993:19). Such an injunction provides a useful lens for reading the work of other critical pedagogical theorists, and my own, so as to disclose its ideological underpinnings and complicate assumptions of commensurability with theory.

### **4.3 Gramsci, Giroux, Ball and Freire**

As has thus far been pointed out, activities coming under the label of critical pedagogy form a diverse archive, which has its conceptual and intellectual roots in Marxist thinking about ideology and power and social theory intended to reveal hidden regimes of truth and ideological structures. An alertness to heroic narratives in this archive has also been deemed useful in revealing a blindness to the workings of power. Taking this into account, this section will further explore the ongoing project of critical pedagogy as taken up by contemporary scholars and their critique of neoliberal education practices in the wider educational context of the United States and the United Kingdom, namely Giroux and Ball. Particular attention will be paid to ways the rhetorical logics of these authors ensure slippage from articulations of the ontological premises of the agonisms and aporiae of discursive power and its subjects, to articulations of traditional ontologies of language and the subject's voice as representational. Such slippages are incommensurate with poststructuralist theory, and betray its understanding of the subject as irreducibly plural and altering. As productive technologies they also represent the modernist assumptions of the

transformative subject present in my own practice when starting this thesis that I examine more closely in chapter 6. I next consider the heterogeneous field of feminist poststructuralist approaches to pedagogy.

Henry Giroux is a key figure in the field of critical pedagogy based in the United States, and acknowledges both Freire and Gramsci as motivating referents in his lifelong, idealistic commitment to the emancipatory power of education and democracy. Regarding the latter, Gramsci's account of hegemonic relationships as 'necessarily [...] educational' (Gramsci cited in Ives 2010:81), and his model of the teacher as 'organic intellectual' open the door to Giroux' definition of 'transformative intellectuals' who are 'aware of their own theoretical convictions and skilled in strategies for translating them into practice' (Giroux 1992:15). Defining the aims and practices of critical pedagogy as the development of critical citizenship through 'a vibrant culture of questioning' (Giroux 2005:76), and the work of 'those academics engaged in intellectual practices who interpret and question power rather than merely consolidate it' (Giroux 2005:71), Giroux argues we need to help students 'find their own voices' (Giroux 1992:74). Whilst I see such questioning as central to keeping questions of power open, what interests me here is how rhetorically there is the assumption of a high, transcendental moral ground where dichotomous rules of right and wrong prevail, and the not so ghostly presence of dialectical struggle fostered by the 'hero' in guise of transformative intellectual. Likewise, when formulating the central importance of critical pedagogy in a higher education overtaken by ubiquitous neoliberal influences, Giroux (2005:53) argues that educational practices of resistance is vital to foster socially engaged future citizens willing to continue the fight against neoliberalism, since pedagogy represents:

an essential dimension of justice, offering the conditions necessary for individuals to become autonomous in order to make choices, participate in and shape public life, and develop a socially committed notion of justice.

In this sense, alternative pedagogies and questioning of norms are seen as oppositional actions adequate for mobilizing democratic student and intellectual forces capable of producing political and social transformation in the neoliberal university. The problem of the success of such practices is sometimes considered, but Giroux stops short of understanding of power as a form of governance that manages all of our conducts, and makes absurd the notion the subject is autonomous in their choices. Such claims need therefore to be read with some scepticism and discomfort since they are premised on a misreading of the way power works.

Stephen Ball is a sociologist of education, based in the United Kingdom, who uses social theory to critique educational policy, reform and new state modalities, with a particular analytical interest in the types of identities 'crystallised' (Ball 2013:76) through neoliberal regimes of educational governance. His more recent research is largely and explicitly informed by the theoretical frameworks of Foucault, and his understanding of the contingency and fluidity of resistance to neoliberal governmentalities. In this context his attention is rarely directly focused on the traditions of critical pedagogy as such, but more on the politics and policy that disseminate narrowing, commodifying and standardising neoliberal disciplinary techniques. Epitomising the (im)possibility of critique and its subjects/subjectivities escaping imbrication with different regimes of truth, two brief excerpts from Ball's written work, one an academic publication, the other a policy paper, exemplify the complexity of producing resistance within the discursive dynamics of professional academic practice. They also remind us of the ever-present structures and technologies that reward us for remaking ourselves in the image of marketable commodities for different markets.

In a 2013 policy paper produced for CLASS (Centre for Labour and Social Studies) we can already identify in the title *Education, justice and democracy: the struggle over ignorance and opportunity*, tacit (albeit quasi explicit to the critical pedagogue) traces of Freirean social analyses and formulations. In its succinct wording of the world, it fairly directly recontextualises in a contemporary context the traditional emancipatory framework for resisting the forces of oppression, as represented by Freire and Marxian approaches. Following on from this, Ball builds an argument which attacks the 'blur [in education] between welfare state demarcations between state and market, public and private, government and business' (Ball 2013:10) in academy schools. His argument targets the false rationale this will build 'freedom' and a better world for all, rather than simply enable free market logics. Ball then proposes as solution 'rebuilding an education of hope and happiness' (Ball 2013:24) with clear intertextual reference to Freire's *Pedagogy of Hope*. This is framed as a gesture of resistance against neoliberal forces of 'scientism and economism' (Ball 2013:25) in schooling, that echoes the proclamations of Giroux, and is followed by four bullet points that include explicit references, *inter alia*, to Freire's writings, the principles and praxis of Freirian ambitions, and the assumptions underpinning them (Ball 2013:26). I cite the first of these:

- The education of democratic citizens requires critical and political literacies, not just functional skills' training that leads to technical literacy. Schools must be centrally concerned with literacies for active local and global citizenship, including a critical view of the world of work. Learning to read and write should be based on an understanding that literacy is a social practice and that making meaning requires "reading the world and the word"<sup>69</sup>. As such, "students learn that knowledge makes a difference in people's lives including their own"<sup>70</sup>.

By inference, the 'critical' is situated as an unproblematic given that can be straightforwardly inserted into progressive, bullet-pointed regimes of school governance and policy. It is also constellated with other markers of modernity, such as 'democracy' and 'citizenship' that obstruct our view of the historical nature of power. Though there is affirmation of the need to probe the ambiguous spaces between the sign and the signified to develop 'critical' understanding of how meaning prefigures our position as 'citizens', there seems to be a parallel rush to a performative attestation of the universally transformative power of new understandings of literacy as social practice. Whilst a bullet point may seem an invalid space in which to briefly evaluate meaning, it is in such obscure, minor techniques of the techniques of progress and governance that Foucault invites us to see our histories in their making, marking, dividing and classification (Foucault 1991a).

In contrast, in another scholarly work *Foucault, Power and Education* (2013), Ball starts his analysis with Foucault's point 'that genealogical knowledge is for 'cutting' and 'dissociating', not for understanding [since it] makes the point, 'progress needs to be disturbed' (Ball 2013:87). Thus, whilst in one work his rhetoric establishes that 'Our own knowledges and practices as sociologists, pedagogues, philosophers, policy analysts are historically implicated, and continue to be implicated, in the practices of management of the population' (Ball 2013: 88), in another, he crystallises his take on political change in the spaces of education according to a rationalist understanding of deliberative approaches to democracy (e.g. Habermas 1984), that essentialise being as presence (Derrida 1986). I suggest both positions elucidated in these two cuttings of scholarly discourse reveal how the scholar-educator is an elemental part of a system which reunites thousands of fragmented and tangled, written subjectivities within the unity of the 'specialist' produced by the institution of the academy, in this case producing an individual named Stephen Ball, who

produces work in the 'critical' tradition. It is one of the rules of science that it be produced by an objective, autonomous, named researcher, thus such differing positions are mapped as part of the author's production of work with successive themes, aims, genres, and audiences that constitute a 'body' of work. Such historical explanations of the figure of the critical scholar-educator circumscribe a modernist belief in the 'intelligibility of the things' (de Certeau 2010b:220) which Ball identifies with and rearticulates with in an interview: 'I am very much a reconstructed modernist, rather than a post-structuralist' (Ball in Mainardes & Marcondes 2009). In representing himself thus, 'Ball' is simply using the contemporary two-dimensional frames of knowledge about man, 'consciousness and representation' (Foucault 2002:395) where the primacy of representation is foundational. Yet flexibility and malleability are necessary qualities of the neoliberal subject, as Ball himself later suggests (2013:139-140): 'Productive rather than truthful subjects are the new subjects and the central resource in a reformed, entrepreneurial public sector'.

The conceptual framework formed by these 'left' assumptions of the possibility of education schooling critical citizens, is also recontextualised in curriculum strategy and practice in the academy. The characterisation of the graduate attribute of 'global citizenship' first produced by myself and a small team of fellow academics in 2012, which we believed represented a coherent attempt to resist the dominant readings of the purposes of higher education and its subjects, such as the framing of the student as a 'consumer' at the 'heart of the system' in a UK government White Paper (Willets 2011), emerges clearly from the productive narratives of progressive, transformative education:

Prepared to actively engage with both local and global communities. The ability to understand the local and global context of one's work. Awareness of diverse perspectives, cultures and values and the confidence to question one's own perspective and those of others. Informed about issues of equity, sustainability and social justice.

As a graduate attribute, it represents the skills, qualities and knowledge a university claims it produces in its graduates and, as such, encapsulates the distinctive focus of a university's curriculum and brand in the global market. When re-reading this wording of a technology for standardising a curriculum top down through the prescriptive, professional, disciplinary procedures and mechanisms of assessment, learning outcomes, quality control, administrative intricacies, teaching and learning conferences, *inter alia*, that details one of the unique selling points of an education at the university, where I work, I see how I wove myself into the rather rose-tinted rhetoric of contesting discourses of employability,

globalisation and counter-hegemonic education with little questioning of the theoretical soundness of my pedagogical assumptions. Whilst understanding my actions as constituting a radical counterpoint to the wider political and economic context, to government restructurings of higher education, and to outdated assumptions about the ascendancy of Western knowledge and its capital acquisition priorities, the output they produced was in fact made use of by dominant readings of the university as a 'business' and the graduate as 'a product'. At an intimate level, I had been an actor in educational govern-mentality that is meant to bring all actors and actions, including new 'international' actors, into a coherent organisational framework whose population is made 'predictable, productive and governable' (Clemitshaw 2013:273), and whose bodies and their output can be observed, measured and documented. Intrinsically, I had been subjectivised by the panoptic power modalities and contingencies of institutional curricular and pedagogical technologies, with built-in surveillance mechanisms intended to make the body more docile. What had seemed like resistance was, in fact, tacitly reactionary. My 'critical' efforts had misfired, but their doing so has served as an incentive to make better sense of the limits of the possibility of resistance in university spaces of thought, knowledge and pedagogy, increasingly colonised by neoliberal social logics and codings of value. I develop this point further in Chapter 6, *Methodologies and Methodological Subjectivities*.

#### **4.4. Appropriating Freire in the neoliberal contexts of the university**

It is with the reaffirmation of a need for wariness towards the fragile tenets and discursive expanses of critical pedagogy, that necessarily mutate into dominant orderings of things, and a need to understand the strategies of power in the present differently, that I now briefly examine an excerpt from Freire's *Education for Critical Consciousness* (2013), which illustrates the point that infinitesimal mechanisms of governmentality invest in, displace, colonise and use rhetoric and its social subjects so that they are annexed by dominant economic interests to become consenting (Foucault 1988: 99). More specifically the text, which describes some of Freire's methods outlined in a work first published in 1974, needs to be read through contemporary discourses of teaching and learning which inter-articulate with discourses of employability and practices of care of the self. These foreground the active role of the student in co-building knowledge with the educator, and include roles and methods such as 'facilitator', 'modules', 'dialogic learning', 'teaching and learning in small groups', 'reflective practice', 'student-centred teaching', 'peer feedback' and 'coaching'.

Here are Freire's words, written nearly four decades ago, that institute an idea of critical pedagogy as a starting point for social change.

We launched a new institution of popular culture, a "culture circle," since among us school was a traditionally passive concept. Instead of a teacher, we had a coordinator; instead of lectures, dialogue; instead of pupils, group participants; instead of alienating syllabi, compact programs that were "broken down" and "codified" into learning units.  
(Freire 2013:40)

The understanding of power in Freire's words, as a thing disseminated through 'democratic or anarchic distribution' from a sovereign centre (Foucault 1988: 99), that can hence be accessed as a public right by literate subjects, versed in the co-construction of community, is inspiring but off base. By taking new teaching techniques for educating 'all' as the founding principle for inaugurating social justice and radical social change, there is no recognition of the impossibility of this in systems of governmentality in which power operates and reproduces itself in 'the most molecular elements of society' (Foucault 1988:99). Giving a representational value to modernist and structuralist understandings of democracy, dialectics and power, Freire's work of resistance neither accepts nor takes into account the inevitable outcome that such a critical pedagogy project will be co-opted into the heterogeneous general mechanisms of social power where it will be both 'vitiating and nullified' (Foucault 1988:108). Thus, the emphatically political character of critical pedagogy, with its meaning and operation premised on democracy's constituent elements, including its subjects, can always already be transmuted into an economic one. Furthermore, it can be argued that the abstract formulations of liberty, equality and fraternity, which for Marx worked to negate the inegalitarian social conditions of most subjects lives, and which have been shown in this thesis to have legitimated the emancipatory ideal, are now used in the neoliberal university context to authorise a specific image of higher education knowledge 'acquisition' practice as a technology for the development of human capital, rather than the social and public good. I now turn to post-critical educational approaches to consider alternative historical routes.

#### **4.5 Post-critical pedagogy**

Whilst poststructuralist critiques of the 'critical' in pedagogy demolish old Left assumptions that counter-hegemonic intentions will necessarily produce the desired social change, and leave the assumptions, sites and subjects of democratic modernity in ruins, this does not necessarily mean we need abandon our commitment to resisting the systems of governance that inevitably reproduce unfairness, inequality and oppression as part of the global,

neoliberal condition. As Clemitshaw (2013) argues, whilst committing to progress, and universal emancipation and individual freedom is no longer possible through a Foucaultian lens, the praxis of resisting oppression remains possible but only via the particularities within 'the contingent *regulus*' (2013:277). Before elaborating on the indeterminacies of such praxis, with reference to feminist re-imaginings of the critical in both post-pedagogy and post qualitative research, and how such a pedagogy might work in the specific context of critical EAP, I read/un-learn the classical scene of pedagogy through the work of Rancière and Bowman in order to make explicit what is hidden in the 'master-pupil' relationship laid down in advance centuries ago. Without problematising the conventions and 'opaque materiality' (Radhakrishnan 1996:97) of a pedagogical model, dating back to Socrates, it is almost impossible to disarticulate our assumptions and praxis from the heavy hold of structural dynamics that Bowman (2014:1) argues construe teaching and learning in simplistic productive terms:

... based on an ideal of transparent, unimpeded, ideally face-to-face communicative transfers, boiling down to an idealization of the teacher-student relation (or scenario)

For Rancière, the foremost target of his theoretical activism is the Master-pupil dyad which he characterises as that of the 'schoolmaster [assigned] to abolish distance between his knowledge and the ignorance of the ignoramus' (Rancière 2009:8). This relation creates a circle of power(lessness) (Rancière 1991:15), which ties the student in a relation of inequality to 'the Old Master' and his methods (Rancière 1991:15). To attack this positivity, it is not a question of turning to a mythical *tabula rasa*, nor finding a right way of knowledge in the Cartesian manner: what is needed is to get rid of the 'opinion of inequality' (Rancière 2014). This 'opinion' is the very framework in which we get educated and acquire knowledge, the structure by which our thinking aligns with the inequality that defines the social order (Rancière 2014). So, the science (of pedagogy) that ostensibly guarantees freedom also 'endlessly generate[s] its own ignorance (Rancière 2009: 44), whilst covertly operating under a myth of progress. Progress is a term that Rancière (1991) defines as 'a new way of saying inequality' since:

At the heart of the pedagogical fiction is the representation of inequality as a *retard* in one's development: inferiority in its innocence, lets itself be taken in; neither a lie nor a violence, inferiority is only a lateness, a delay, so that one can put oneself in the position of curing it. (Rancière 1991:119)

Echoing Gramsci's understanding of all educational relations as hegemonic in their reproduction of inequality, Rancière proposes a fundamental re-examination of the concepts

of critique and progress, both of which reason the ‘infinitely reproduced mutilation’ (Rancière 1991:18) of ‘humanity pedagogized’ (Rancière 1991:120). This needs to be ordered to resist becoming intermeshed with the old logics of social emancipation which simply invert the logic of domination. Such conceptualisations of a pedagogy premised on progress, aka inequality, have powerful echoes for me in my own experience as a *Higher* education educator, where selection and progression are founding principles in which my own practice is imbricated through duplicitous forms of reason and justification that operate within humanist, and now neoliberal fields of value, which frame better job prospects as a core, utilitarian rationale for (paying for) education, since it ‘helps you up the ladder’.

Rancière’s first point of call in re-thinking and re-hypothesising intellectual emancipation, inspired by his reading of the lessons of Jacotet, an early 19<sup>th</sup> century lecturer in French literature (Rancière 1991:1), is to uncouple the intelligence of the student from the role of the teacher in order to link it to the intelligence of the book, which provides a tool for the student to exercise their will and learn on their own (1991:23). For Rancière ‘there is only one power, that of saying and speaking, of paying attention to what one sees and says [which] any man can do’ (Rancière 1991:26), so it follows that there is no privileged perspective or position from which to know either the book, or the pedagogical steps needed to reduce ignorance. The point is, that power cannot be apportioned or divided up. This uncoupling seals new relations of equality, in which learning is a practice between intelligent beings rather than a future goal (Rancière 1991:xxiii), and in which education is not given, but taken; like freedom (Rancière 1991:107). Such an approach unsettles the corollary, construed via ‘opinion’, between economic inequality and intellectual inequality, as well as the authority given to some, not others, to determine possible futures. It also proposes the role of the autodidact in contradistinction to that of the learner.

The main catalyst for disrupting the ‘way in which bodies fit their functions and destinations’ (Rancière 2009:72), and to challenge current coordinates of the social world, is through the ‘poetic virtue’ of ‘improvisation’ (Rancière 1991:64). This operates as a form of ‘dissensus’ (Rancière 2009:48), that produces sense rather than common sense by cracking open every situation from within ‘to alter the field of the possible and the distribution of capacities and incapacities’ (Rancière 2009:48). The poetic condition of the speaking and writing being disturbs the explicative logic and temporal reality of learning, premised on learning ‘such thing’ or ‘other thing’ (Rancière 2014), in which there is a certain correspondence between

the unfolding of time and unfolding of knowledge. Instead, by foregrounding learning 'something' (Rancière 2014), improvisation has a political effect since it produces a different temporal reality, in which there is a 'loss of destination' (Rancière 2009:72). Likewise, having improvisation as modus of learning reframes the collective body of Left thinking as multiple 'connections and disconnections' (Rancière 2009:72) operating in 'the interplay of borders and transgressions' of the field of discourse (Rancière 2004:227) that grasp our bodies to order and disturb them.

Such re-readings of the Master-pupil relationship and practice of teaching and learning allow us to conjecture an Other side to pedagogy, which understands not-knowing, the unexpected, improvisation and ignorance as conceivably the most important 'unlearning' experiences we can have. They put us in a place of risk, where we can no longer easily make normative judgements when saying and writing the words 'teaching' and 'learning', since 'unlearning' positions us outside of 'the realm of the known' (Dunne 2016: 15) and of canonic assumptions about knowledge (Rahakrishnan (1996). 'Unlearning' is neither antithesis to learning, nor 'simple semantic slippage' (Dunne 2016: 14), but an uncomfortable place from which to interrupt a learning whose hierarchies that reflect the hierarchies of the social world we have so long taken as a given, been partially blind to, in a culture premised on 'learnification' (Biesta 2013 cited in Dunne 2016:14). As an example of such a denaturalization of learning, Dunne proposes we think of learning *incomes* rather than *outcomes*, a Derridean inspired concept which he understands as referring to the unforeseen and to unexpected Others, and which can come from an unexpected range of catalysts other than generalised aims and outcomes of quality assurance discourse.

In his reading of Rancière through the work of Rifkin, Bowman (2014) aims to de-stultify current professional, managerialist discourse around teaching and learning, more specifically in the discipline of Cultural Studies. He proposes to do this through the analytical purchase of an archival research method, emerging from his reading of both theorists, that he characterises as 'an autodidactics of bits' (Bowman 2014:4). This method, which bears acknowledged affinities with Foucault's genealogy, prefers to avoid the subordination of complexity inherent to empirical approaches and instead dwell with it so as to displace the norm to reify, abstract, isolate out, objectify and demarcate the irreducible field of pedagogy (Bowman 2014:4). At the heart of Bowman's reading of pedagogy and empirical research is thus the wish to avoid academic discourse's trading in 'the fabrication and circulation of *satisfactory* narratives and *complete* outcomes' (Bowman 2014:7). These work to constitute

the panoptic regimes of audit culture under ‘the three orientations of aims, objectives, [and] outcomes’ (Bowman 2014:9) in which disciplines need to explain themselves by answering questions such as: ‘What is the point of this? What is the use of this? What are the profits or returns of it, and for whom?’” Bowman 2014:10). To Bowman’s account of the specifics of panoptic audit culture I would add the TEF (Teaching Excellence Framework), a new form of metrics for close monitoring of the ‘standards’ of educational provision, intended to give student consumers a clearer idea of the quality of the educational product they are purchasing.

Bowman’s interrogation of Rancière’s thinking about the Master-Pupil relationship within the specific discursive apparatuses of surveillance and regulation of higher education provides a useful synopsis of the constraints and ideological packaging that relegate ‘improvisation’ and ‘un-knowing’ in pedagogical and learning practice to the hidden margins. Whether we choose (un)knowingly to find pleasure in or speak back to such disciplining, Bowman’s account of the nature of the apparatus which generates ‘a kind of closing down of possibility of discovery and new insight’ (Bowman 2014:13) is spot on:

More and more clear expectations are set out for coursework, combined with more and more prescriptive stipulations of assessment criteria and guidelines. Terms like ‘learning aims’ and ‘learning outcomes’ have become so familiar that they are now entirely unremarkable phrases within everyday academic-bureaucratic language. Teaching has to have an aim. Learning has to have an outcome. Both must at least pretend to be knowable and known in advance. (Bowman 2014:11)

As poststructuralist ‘critical’ educators however, rather than framing our response to these macro academic stultification technologies, which equate teaching efficiency with the disciplinary ‘truth’ of what is taught, we need to work on untethering our practices from the regimes and ‘un-truths’ of the ‘explicatory institution’ (Rancière 1991:129), and resist playing the comedy of ‘inferiors superiors’ (Rancière 1991:98), enacted in the ‘Old Master’s’ principles. In the flexible, student-as-consumer-oriented regimes, that multiply rebrandings of knowledge, the question is, not whether, but to what extent, our efforts to un-know the inequalities of pedagogy’s taxonomic certitude and teacher-pupil roles will not become imbricated with the tacit, subtle logics of neoliberal pedagogics which work to train us all to be capitalists, investing in our own cultural capital. However, this does not prevent us from exercising the ‘prerogatives of intelligence [and] this is not *nothing*’ (Rancière 1991:98).

Such affirmatively deconstructive conceptions of critical pedagogy, that recognise truth, teaching and learning as always partial and provisional, and have no faith in master-

narratives that suggest we can know and redeem the 'Other' or represent reality (Maclure 2011), provide useful prompts for 'unlearning' (Dunne 2016) what we have learnt about learning, and introducing a dissymmetry into the heart of explanatory scripts. I now turn to the 'post' critiques of feminist critical pedagogies. To a great extent these perspectives are mobilised by 'post' feminist critiques of the humanist/totalising ontologies of empirical qualitative research and the knowledge it produces that inform my positions in my methodology chapter. A key figure in this field, Patti Lather, begins her 1998 paper *Critical Pedagogy and its Complicities: A Praxis of Stuck Places*, by pointing out that the rationalities of critical pedagogy have been written and rewritten largely by diverse male proponents using the authoritative 'masculinist voice of abstraction and universalization' (Lather 1998:488), still present in contemporary and purportedly poststructuralist critical education approaches. She compares this regime, which fails to sufficiently question the 'settled places ... of masterful authority' (Lather 2013:642), to the heterogeneous field of feminist poststructuralist approaches to pedagogy, which locates the problematic of critical and social justice in pedagogy in reflexive efforts to work the ruins of (one's own pedagogy) rather than in the generation of fresh orthodoxies. More specifically, Lather differentiates between these emphatically non-binary competing takes on critical pedagogy by labelling that which works to produce abstract universals and generalisations 'a boy thing' (Lather 1998:487), and that which works to go beyond 'right stories' (Ellsworth cited in Lather 1998:488), and move away from the 'heroics' of overly dogmatic universalising to locate the 'promise' of change on shifting ground, a 'girl thing' (Lather 1998:448). This perspective on critical pedagogy incites us 'to use praxis as a material force to identify and amplify what is already begun toward a practice of living on' (Lather 1998:495), from within the inside of discursive renderings.

Remaining committed to Freire's notion of hope as a theoretical construct in critical pedagogy, since it encourages refusal of resignation to the status quo, Sara Benesch (2001) investigates issues relating to critical pedagogy in the context of EAP (English for Academic Purposes). In an analysis that critiques EAP's 'discourse of neutrality' (Benesch 2001:34) and 'political quietism' (Benesch 2001:41) she raises questions about the dominance of the 'pragmatic discourse of capitalism' in the field. Arguing that historically EAP presents the English language as a neutral medium, and the history of the field 'as a consensual and inevitable chronology of pedagogical events' (Benesch 2001:35), Benesch demonstrates such governance eclipses consideration of power relations and depoliticizes the means and

methods of instruction (Benesch 2001:141). Evoking Bowman's later critique of discourses of teaching and learning (2014), Benesch also specifically targets the notion of *learner needs* on the grounds it conflates psychological, biological, private and institutional needs with institutional requirements (Benesch 2001:61) and in doing so naturalises what is actually socially constructed. As an alternative, she proposes the notion of *learner rights* which are 'contingent, depending upon the local context and histories of the participants in a particular course' (Benesch 2001:62). To theorise a critical pedagogy which is premised on hope, recognises the unpredictability of power, and is wary of the binary oppressor/oppressed and idealistic notions of the power of personal voice, Benesch combines two elements. First, Freire's concept of the limit-situation, an obstacle to personal freedom one can either succumb to or hope to overcome with no promise this will work, and second, Foucault's theory of power, compliance and resistance, which sees all practice as open to questioning by the agency of the subject. Thus, in Critical EAP teachers and students together address questions such as:

Who formulated the requirements and why? Should they be fulfilled? Should they be modified? What are the consequences of current conditions? What is gained by obeying and what is lost? (Benesch 2001:53)

Her critical work brings out issues in the field of academic socialisation and academic literacy formulated by authors such as Theresa Lillis and Roz Ivanič discussed in Chapter 5.

To render these post-critical, feminist pedagogical approaches succinctly, I turn to Maclure's strategy (2011) of listing some of the wider lexicon that can serve to keep us alive to the omnipresence of panoptical technologies that produce our subjectivities and to the need to see change as a random effect of immanence. Using the notion of *ruins*, used both by Readings (1996) to evoke the current status of the university and Lather (1998) to incite us to 'work the ruins' of critical pedagogy, which need to be worked if we are to decolonize our pedagogies and enact unlearning. Whilst Maclure's lexicon includes only single words, I build my brief glossary using phrases, or bits of language, which for me designate more clearly the embodied materiality of such praxis:

Table 6 A glossary of post-critical pedagogical terms

<p>Lather 1998  <i>a 'tentative, contextual, appropriative, interventionist, and unfinished effort to shift the terrain.'</i> (p.491)</p> <p><i>'much that must be rethought: the concepts of certainty, morality, meaning and praxis; resistance and agency; the unconscious; empowerment; rationalism and dialogue: the list goes on.'</i> (p.494)</p> <p><i>'such a praxis is about ontological stammering, concepts with a lower ontological weight, a praxis without guaranteed subjects or objects, oriented towards the as-yet-incompletely thinkable conditions and potentials of given arrangements.'</i> (p.495)</p>	<p>Lather 2013  <i>'insecurity of knowing'</i> (p.640)</p> <p><i>'issues of messy conceptual labor, difference, otherness and disparity, and incompleteness as a positive norm'</i> (p.642)</p> <p>St. Pierre (2013)  <i>'present an aesthetics of depthlessness and suggest that everything appears at the surface, at the level of human activity.'</i> (p.649 with reference to Foucault)</p> <p>Jackson &amp; Mazzei (2012)  <i>idea of knowledge production as 'emerging out of chaos' p.2</i></p> <p>Benesch (2001)  <i>'learner rights' not 'learner needs'</i></p>
--	--

Given that the dominant discourse in (higher) education today works to abbreviate the complexity and surprises of learning, puts the educator in the role of specialist and expert, and makes education 'work' to be predictable and 'risk-free' (Biesta 2013:2), the language used to signpost learning not as linear, but as detours and lightly-trodden traces, and to locate the quest for new orders of things in the historical present, provides an invaluable starting point for being alert to modernity's tenacious hold.

One can easily discern in this brief inventory of 'bits' the thrust to give value to discontinuity, to face the complications of 'doing' pedagogy a new way by reworking of old terms to make them urgent priorities, and to speak for the subalternities of ways of knowing shut out from the codes of reason. The reminder that the emancipatory intentions of poststructuralist pedagogies speak from the whole place of all subaltern subjects, and the 'impure liminality' and 'orphaned modes' of knowing (Radhakrishnan 1996:110), can be seen in adjectives that traditionally have negative connotations in relation to the articulation of knowledge, such as 'stammering', 'unfinished', and 'messy', or in the noun 'depthlessness' which contradicts the plenitude required in modernist contexts. Likewise, whilst the unsettling of a term's meaning through use of prefixes or suffixes such as 'lessness', or 're', or 'un', or punctuation such as the hyphen, may appear as weak, merely terminological, weapons for dislodging dominant regimes of practice, Biesta (2013:4) argues, weakness is what makes education, as

opposed to teaching and learning, possible. They also work to disrupt the status quo of hegemonic understandings of education which likes neat, measurable units. Similarly, I would argue they are useful coinage for acknowledging that in the heterogeneous materialities of knowledge, in which resistance and consent always-already exist simultaneously, what has most value is open-endedness.

#### **4.6 Conclusion**

In this chapter I have tried to irrupt into, from within, the past and present historical of the 'teaching machine' (Spivak 1993) of higher education, with a dynamic intent to 'unlearn' (Dunne 2016) pedagogical ways of doing the 'critical' according to either Enlightenment ideologies of knowledge and its subjects, or Left thinking understandings of emancipation. In conducting this de-authorising of myself and others as authoritative educators (Radhakrishnan 1996), I have resisted the impulse to generate a 'valid alternative' to existing projects of critical pedagogy, or managerial, instrumental teaching and learning procedures, which rely on positivist markers such a 'systematicity, linear processes, technique, clarity and transparency of language' (St Pierre 2013:654). These normalize a form of pedagogy that equates the linear process of learning with the *telos* of knowledge premised on the positivist ontologies of discourses of science and capital that reinstate 'the old order of the king, of the father, of the master, to which the "school-master" belongs' (Caputo 2016:123).

With no overarching vision of a new order of things concomitant with pedagogies of 'un-learning' (Dunne 2016), I now evoke some vital challenges facing us when working the ruins of our pedagogies. Derived from my re-readings of the tacit and explicit suppositions we bring to critical pedagogy in this chapter, I argue these offer ethical scope to inject chance, emergent emancipation with a very small 'e', and the unforeseen into the colonised event of teaching and learning. Here are my invocations:

- To deauthorize our 'selves' and 'others' as pedagogic practitioners, imbued with unproblematic power to transmit knowledge and assure measurable qualities of learning;
- To openly acknowledge to students our role as co-subalterns and 'ignoramuses' (Rancière 1991) entangled in the performatives, intelligibilities and rhetorics of knowledge and its texts – all of us 'agents without agency' (Caputo 2016:122);

- To inaugurate an education which 'stammers', is 'messy' and relocates human activity and authority in the present historical of its (un)doing, not in linear progression and standardised objectivities;
- To institute improvisation as modus of teaching and learning apt to produce unexpected learning incomes;
- To give value to 'the wrong turns' and chance in all our thinking (Lather 1998:492), so as to introduce a different politics and economy of knowing;
- To locate the promise of a different future in the poietics and micropractices of a weak, midway voice of teaching and learning, rather than the dogmatics and macro-logics of a fictional reality.

To situate my critique of the critical in pedagogy in a context less broad than the general, in the next chapter I attempt to locate the fugitive political and ethical gesture of improvisation within the event of student writing since the textual data I use to interrogate the immanent nature of resistance in student research papers written for an advanced undergraduate class I teach in intercultural communication. Using an organisation similar to that in this chapter, I begin by defining the discursive spaces of student writing authorised by dominant regimes, and in which critique has something to do. I then attempt to break away from this, using poststructuralist theoretical signposts towards an ethical and poietic writing praxis operating within the ideological forcefields of governance which constitute the institutional site of (higher) education.

## Chapter 5      Towards poststructuralist understandings of the critical in student academic writing

### 5.1      Introduction

To work more on the main research objective of this thesis stated in Chapter 1, this chapter moves on from the previous chapter's exploration of the relationship between theory and praxis, so far as the future to come of 'the critical' in pedagogy is concerned, to a probing of the same relationship with regards to 'the critical' in student assessment writing, more specifically undergraduate work in the field of intercultural communication, broadly located in the social sciences and arts and humanities. Both questionings of the given emerge from a desire to disturb the way things are in a university now historically organised according to neoliberal collective and individual modes of governance (Foucault 2008; Ball 2013), whose effects of subjectification work to produce 'individuals' whose core values and interests are those of *homo economicus* rather than *homo sapiens*. In these schemata of governance, our knowledges and everyday practices, as subaltern scholar-educators or student-learners, are always-already implicated in management of the population and the self, according to shifting institutional orderings and systems of classification that include concepts such as rationality, skills, intelligence, and criticality of which, as subjects of cultural capital, we are distinguished as possessing more or less. To conceptualise this 'incessant back-and-forth movement of forms of subjugation and schemas of knowledge' (Foucault 1998:98), Foucault uses the notion of 'matrices of transformations' (Foucault 1998:99). Linking this notion more closely to the technocratic, ranking-driven structures of accountability in the university, incited by wider economic and political vested interests, Ball (2013:103) portrays the university and all its subjects as 'captured in a matrix of calculabilities'. Respectively, these characterisations of the matrix, which imply both the normalising procedures of the disciplinary mechanisms of scientific knowledge, and the subject's praxis which re-organise these from within, represent the field in which resistance and consent are incessantly played out. It is from this space of unease, impermanence and tension, more specifically in relation to the event of writing, that I work to critique hegemonic assumptions that the student writer is a controllable, measurable subject who co-produces their rank and status within university classifications, and also to unsettle dominant understandings of 'the critical' in academic writing which have their genesis in Enlightenment rhetorics of reason.

These dominant accounts of 'the critical' generally frame it in terms of reasoned and evidenced argumentation and critical thinking, and tend to assume the student writer as an individual learning subject to whom the skill of criticality can be taught through different disciplinary technologies. Whilst these strategies of argumentation are an essential feature of Western academic rhetoric and its genres, whose uses it is vital to make visible to students as rules of the game, my interest in criticality in this thesis emerges from poststructuralist and deconstructive theoretical concepts and procedures. Hence, I find much existing practice and research in the field of student writing theoretically problematic in a number of ways: (a) little attention is paid to power-knowledge effects that produce the subaltern subjects of academic discourse; (b) the scene of writing is conceptualised in terms of an autobiographical subject and his/her still deficit cognitive and social ability to produce knowledge according to disciplinary discursive norms; (c) the genres of academic writing are considered as static, ahistorical normative products whose parts can be disassembled and taught, particularly in student writing centres and EAP (English for Academic Purposes) programmes (e.g. Benesch 2001); (d) the plurality of antagonisms that produce the constantly changing hegemonic relations of 'truth' are largely ignored; and (e) there is a tendency to conflate the political project of critical agency with the literacy project of acquiring and using hegemonic linguistic codes to transform given world orderings; thus sidestepping historicization of critical practice. Whilst the degree of this critique varies according to different contexts of research and practice, the main thrust of my concerns is to raise the question of what kind of theory of critical and ethical praxis serves best if the ultimate objective is molecular political criticism of subaltern activity (non-class specific), that ensures interests of the dominant group stop short of 'narrowly corporate interest' (Gramsci 1998d:182).

To think the critical in academic writing differently, more particularly as manifested in the assessment texts of undergraduates studying in the fields of applied linguistics and cultural and media studies that are analysed in this thesis, this chapter begins by looking at the different technologies which regulate what constitute 'good' and 'bad' academic writing in relation to wider global and local institutional systems of governance. Next, locating my thinking in critical literacy's interrogation of traditional ideologies about language as a transparent medium of reason, still widely prevalent in the authoritative texts of the university, I address the question of how to conceptualise the 'critical' in student writing from a valid theoretical position that is sensitive to complexity and the aporia produced by

power-knowledge effects. To do this, I turn to Foucault's understanding of the ethics of care of self, and Derrida's conceptualisation of the event of writing.

## **5.2 Governing and disciplining the language and behaviours of the academy**

In this section on disciplinary technologies of academic/student writing, I begin by looking at wider changes in institutional governance before considering the specific techniques of the genre(s) of academic rhetoric that constitute the materiality of authorised knowledge and maintain a certain subjection of 'individuals as correlative elements of power and knowledge' (Foucault 1991:194). These broader changes in regulatory techniques relate to increasingly diverse and complex global flows of relations of power, capital and people, that Fairclough links to the development of a global knowledge economy, to 'Europeanization and globalization' and to the marketization of the university (Fairclough 2006:81; Fairclough 1993). These and parallel changes, such as the move to increasing commodification of higher education (Swales 2012[2004]), to its McDonaldization (Hayes & Wynyard 2006), and to its bureaucratization (Glaser 2015), are contested, since they undermine and blur previous social and political boundaries between the public and private/commercial sphere, and have, as yet, very few perceivable benefits for the functioning of the university and its disciplines as independent sites of 'critical education' (Brecher 2010). Following the business and capital production principles from which they spring, these regimes of governance encourage a reductive simplification of the processes of knowledge production to ensure maximum productivity from the academy's human resources.

An example of the wider political decisions producing this restructuring of the university from within, to annex it for corporate and state economic interests, can be seen in successive re-namings of higher education ministerial departments. In 2007, the Labour Prime Minister, Gordon Brown, re-baptised the higher education part of the previous Department of Education and Skills as the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (Brecher 2010). As such, this department was then merged in 2016 with the Department of Energy and Climate Change to form the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy. This symbolic naturalisation of the university as a site servicing economic goals, through political strategies of re-naming its social purpose over time, places the university in a subaltern position to business and industry, and narrowly reconfigures its purpose to that of 'upskilling' the national workforce (Brecher 2010) to meet the needs of industry. This discursive severing of the university from its broader educational aims, is reinforced by

marginalising mention of arts and humanities disciplines, the cutting of government funding for undergraduate programmes in these fields, and side-lining the 'softer skills' of these interpretive disciplines. All in all, I suggest such top-down government initiatives, themselves imbricated in global and European standardisation of higher education practices and degree awards leading to agreements such as the Bologna Declaration in 1999, operate discursively to orchestrate all subjects and norms, so that seeing (higher) education as a standardised commodity to be paid for, since it purports to lead to 'an improved level of and quality of employment' (The Lisbon Declaration cited in Fairclough 2006:73), becomes a barely contested everyday commonplace.

Within these re-orderings of higher educational practices away from the post-war, welfare state models of good government, 'quality assurance' is now seen as key to the regulation of standards. As a technique centred upon 'self-examination' and 'self-evaluation' (Fairclough 2006:82), by both professionals and 'customers' in UK higher education, Shore and Wright (1999) identify it as one of three managerial technologies, along with 'accountability' and 'empowerment', that emerge from government attempts to promote an 'audit culture' in universities (Shore & Wright 1999:557). Shore and Wright's main argument about these auditing practices is that they are fallaciously represented as rational, democratic tools for making transparent to the taxpayer, (or the fee-paying student) the 'best practice' their money is spent on, that ensures the quality of educational provision and product in a competitive market. Instead, Shore and Wright maintain such financially-derived processes of audit signal 'a new form of authoritarian governmentality' (1999:557) premised on the assumption that the best model of accountability is that of market forces (1999:571). This is disabling and non-emancipatory, since it measures performance according to 'financial yardsticks of 'value for money' or 'economy, efficiency and effectiveness' (Shore & Wright 1999:571), and devolves disciplinary formulation of audit processes in keeping with values of the field to external agencies like the HEFCE (Higher Education Funding Council for England) or QAA (Quality Assurance Agency). They conclude by arguing that to resist the closing of alternatives operated by 'new agencies of neo-liberal power' (Shore & Wright 1999:572), disciplines need to reclaim the agenda through an 'alternative semantics of accountability and a knowledge of power' (Shore & Wright 1999:572). To a certain degree, I argue the notion of criticality in writing I problematise in this thesis operates in some small way along these lines to temporarily reclaim the agenda of 'the critical' from its capture by regulatory mechanisms.

In her slightly earlier critique of the 'audit explosion' that leads to 'proliferation of procedures for evaluating performance', Strathern (1997:305) focuses on the way such procedures seek to eliminate contradiction 'as an engine of the intellect' (Strathern 1997:313). Reminding us that in most social science and humanities disciplines, theoretical models allow for multiple possibilities of interpretation, openness and creativity in defining of purpose and diversity of directions, she challenges audit governmentality's attempts to produce the university as a coherent whole imbued with singleness of purpose, that 'throttle' (Strathern 1997:313) the complexity of disciplinary knowledge and practices. Refining the target of her critique, Strathern turns to the skills higher education is required to develop and assess. Since these are meant to be 'transferable', 'multi-site', and match up to certain standard expectations, they are necessarily pre-defined, and so build the grounds for a 'de-disciplining of university subjects'(Strathern 1997:315). Such standardisation is further enabled by contemporary office technologies whose omnipresent conventions of style and layout, and speed of response, echo the bureaucratic criteria of effectiveness and efficiency used as proof of quality performance. Yet, as Strathern points out, such discourses of productivity ignore all the wrong turns, mistakes and dead ends taken in order to produce 'genuine findings' (Strathern 1997:318), and frame the 'academic' as a machine-like subject available for continual output rather than one fluctuating between action and rest. Not only does this leave little room for talking about 'productive non-productivity' (Strathern 1997:318), it can also result in a pervasive, disabling sense of failure produced by the subject's self-appraisal, or appraisal via assessment practices or professional development review.

As can be seen, audit and quality assurance procedures, imbricated with wider changes in systems of governance, work to produce uniformity, standardisation, and conformity, and to inhibit diversity, criticality and creativity in all higher education practices. From a discourse-analytical perspective, Fairclough (e.g. 2006:83) sees such procedures as enacted through 'genre chains' which link different genres together in 'systematic and predictable ways' (Fairclough 2006:83) such that e.g. 'quality' is constituted as 'an institutionalized discursive entity' (Fairclough 2006:84) produced by different subjects via the genres, and whose individual and institutional value for rankings is thus (dis)confirmed. The genre chain used to implement such procedures for assessment of student writing typically begins with cyclically-repeated periodic review documents all of which have highly generic formats and guidelines

for completion. The interconnected set of documents produced for this generally: relate student learning to a university's teaching and learning strategy and graduate attributes under rubrics that include modular learning outcomes and assessment strategies; are intended to encourage departments to self-evaluate their strengths and challenges; aim to ensure quality of the student experience, and how it can be maintained and developed; and indicate examples of 'best practice' in relation to 'benchmarks' and audit criteria. Given that such technologies of surveillance are now a legal requirement for universities, and are frequently seen in higher education as producing little by way of substantive, locally-contextualised 'quality' Fairclough (2006:86) suggests that frequently only lip-service is paid to such mechanisms. Such a suggestion is supported by Cheng's examination of how academics at a pre-1992 university perceived audit culture and quality assurance mechanisms (Cheng 2010), which found that two-thirds of academics interviewed felt such mechanisms had little impact on their work, whilst the remaining two-thirds found the audit process useful for enhancing classroom teaching practice.

Insofar as the genres of audit culture governance posit an idealised coherence and functionality to disciplinary knowledge production practices, which belie the unpredictability, 'wrong turns', contradictions, multiplicities, complexity and unexpected that might constitute 'quality' in teaching, learning, and assessment practices, this thesis aims to restore such 'qualities' to being visible as 'critical' features of academic writing in the critical disciplines of the social sciences and arts and humanities.

However, as evoked earlier in Chapter 3, there is a potential caveat to such aims relating to my own historicity and care of self. Since these aims, intended to critique neoliberalism are articulated by an academic subject from within the institutional environment, using what Whelan (2015:135) deems the preferred academic technology of thought and representation, writing, it is inevitable that the critique will be absorbed and incorporated into the system such that it, and its subjects, including myself, can benefit from it professionally or financially. Like everything else, critique of neoliberalism can be turned into a marketable commodity or human/financial capital. Hence, in order to maintain a theorised space for critique from within the system, Whelan provides a distinction between 'weak' subjectivities producing the *content* of written critique that can be colonised by neoliberalism, and 'strong' subjectivities producing resistance and 'we-ness' in the *form* of written critique. This is intended to ensure the work of work (institutional labour and

reproduction) and the work of writing (constitutive re-iterations of the world) are not conflated (2015:135). This category of 'strong' subjectivity provides historicised grounds for enunciating a rejection of neoliberal governance.

### **5.3 The observing gaze of Western, rational discourse**

Having critiqued the observing gaze of the surveillance technologies of auditing, I now briefly consider how the observing gaze of Western, rational discourse, first codified according to Enlightenment orderings of the subject and knowledge, led to rhetorical techniques of disciplinary power. I then relate the regulatory mechanisms of academic rhetoric to student written assessment grids with descriptors for the target skills to be demonstrated.

The movement to the panoptic arrangement of the schemas of Western scientific discourse, whose rules and regularities still today structure cultural practices and academic rhetoric according to clarity, brevity and simplicity (Scollon & Scollon 2012:139) rests on the organisation of a scientific order of knowledge that took form in the seventeenth and eighteenth century, and which presumed a shift in the central premise of medieval societies that identified the truth of beings in obedience to God's will (De Certeau 2010b:199). This movement to a new order, that identified the truth of beings in obedience to the assumptions, institutions and praxis of scientific and capital production, was largely engendered by science's claims to represent a less transcendent reality than that of Christianity, claims that were premised on the assumption of a completely rational universe (Scollon and Scollon 2012; De Certeau 2010b:199). Accompanying this ideological shift from the divine subject to the subject of reason came philosophical accounts of the human being as an independent, rational, autonomous entity; an individual trained and educated to play and prioritise their part in the march of scientific and economic progress (Scollon & Scollon 2012:116).

In keeping with the procedures of scientific practices and laws, with their attendant concept of a completely rational universe (Scollon & Scollon 2012:115), was the need for a style of writing to be used by the autonomous subject of reason; one that mirrored the rigour, reliability and precision of science's framework of postulates and theorems at the same time as it inscribed the 'real' as knowable only through the objects and objectivities of science. As an example of the type of talk that produced the regulatory apparatus of the language of erudite knowledge, Scollon and Scollon cite Bishop Prat's 1667 guidance on the approach to

language taken by the Royal Society (2012:118). This stipulated it should be ‘analytic, original, move rapidly forward, have a unified thesis, avoid unnecessary digression, and, in essence, present only the most important information’ (Scollon & Scollon 2012:118). In this rhetorical disciplining of what counted as authoritative knowledge, we can see a shift from the ethical, carceral, disciplinary injunction of ‘God sees you’, written on the walls of cells (Foucault 1991:294) that encouraged prison inmates subjection to a ‘fictional’ field of visibility (Foucault 1991:202), to a tacit injunction to conceal the self and its subjectivities in relation to the field of visibility that constitute scientist writing techniques, which disguise the praxis that organise them (De Certeau 2010b:203).

Now hegemonic, and part of the set of utterances and statements which make up the ‘archive’ of society (Foucault 2002a) that governs society’s understanding of reality, the operations of this scientific discourse determine how the academy gives legitimacy to the types of subject positions offered in the discourse and its localised enunciations, and what can be said by subjects in the discursive formation (Foucault 2002a:55). When defining some of the archival strategies by which scientificity re-establishes its rule and maintains its system of ‘the real’ by hiding the history and subjectivities incorporated in its establishment and dissemination, Scollon and Scollon pinpoint three: anti-rhetorical; positivist-empirical; and deductive (2012:139). I briefly examine these here through Foucault’s analysis of the visibilising economy of scientific knowledge (Foucault 1998), which at the same time as it works to associate clarity with rationality and reliability necessarily works to marginalise or make invisible the elements of its articulation which constitute ‘the moving substrate of force relations’ (Foucault 1998:92) immanent in the engendering of ‘grids of intelligibility’ (Foucault 1998:93) of knowledge. Thus, of particular interest to me is what is silenced or marginalised by such workings of power.

### **5.3.1. Anti-rhetorical**

Rhetoric with the appearance of ‘no rhetoric’, that reinforces knowledge making as an impersonal, rational, scientific process that produces authoritative, concrete ‘facts’, is the dominant model in academic writing. However, despite the ‘*impression* of [academic writing] being but a simple description of relatively untransmuted raw material’ (Swales 1990:125) it is subtly engineered through rhetorical accountability to mechanisms of genre (Bazerman 1988). Such crafting disappears the fact that academic writing is most often the final iteration of a complex research, editing and multiple drafting process which rhetorically

instantiates completion in a conclusion, and occludes the multiplicity of force relations and constellations of subjectivities immanent in such texts (Foucault 1998).

### **5.3.2. Positivist-empirical**

Key aspects and assumptions of the positivist representational strategy, which operates to obscure the part subjectivity plays in knowledge-producing processes and results, include: foregrounding scientific thinking as the best model for all thought; minimizing visibility of the contingent agency of human subjects in mapping universal laws of logic and the physical universe; removing the first person authority of the knowledge producer to replace it with passive forms of the verb; the objective knowledge of the text itself; and the inherent assumption there is an objective reality independent from the language we use to describe it, and that language is a neutral transparent medium for solving problems and communicating the 'truth' (Scollon & Scollon 2010:141-142). In keeping with the need to mandate one's 'discoursal self' (Ivanič 1998:25), and to succeed in an existing system, all subaltern academics are under pressure to deploy these positivist rhetorical strategies of clarity, objectivity and masking and distancing of the embodied subject of academic writing (Turner 2011:72). Some critical disciplines necessarily afford more space for making visible the messier, behind-scenes part positivities of power, affect and the body play in producing the epistemologies of fields of Western rationalism and scientism. Yet, given the current imposed modes of knowledge production organised by the 'ideological' techniques of contemporary knowledge governance, and the hierarchical divisions of knowledge valuable to a neoliberal economy, these generally get less funding budget, and are marginalised by socioeconomic political decisions and the gaze, genres and modes of mainstream media.

### **5.3.3. Deductive**

To sustain the notion that the text in academic discourse has 'primary authority' over the researching and researched subject (Scollon & Scollon 2010:144), and rationality's preference for generalisable rules and laws, deductive rhetorical strategy acts as if 'human relationships are of little or no consequence' (Scollon & Scollon 2010:144). Rather, it is the 'pure reason' of deductive logic and its doubling rhetorical structure, whereby if the premise is true, so is the conclusion, which gives coherence to the objects and experiments bound tightly together in linear arguments. To positively produce the subject of deductive logic and scientific knowledge, strategies are deployed which eliminate 'everything concerning the speaker' (De Certeau 2010b:218). Among these is the scientific subject's 'investment in

collective structures' (De Certeau 2010b:218), which bind the hypothesising subject to a group of fellow researchers who enact progress by developing established research findings through new experiments (Scollon & Scollon 2010:141;Turner 2011:73). Hook (2007) discusses this totalising strategy of deductive reasoning through Foucault's theme of 'universal mediation' in scientific knowledge which works to discount the reality of discourse. As seen by Hook, Foucault's 'universal mediation', indicates 'the presumption of an omnipresent *logos* elevating particularities to the status of concepts and allowing immediate consciousness to unfurl (...) the whole rationality of the world' (Hook 2007:115). To build this restricted horizon around its practices, western science adopts 'an immanent reality as the principle of [its] behaviour' (Hook 2007:115), thus ensuring 'discourse should occupy only the smallest possible space between thought and speech' (Foucault 1981 cited in Hook 2007:115).

#### **5.4 The micro panopticon of the marksheet**

Recast in the realm of student writing, these rhetorical surveillance techniques that generate typical 'academic' conceptualisation of the objects of knowledge as existing in an exterior, objectified space, and the ideal subject of knowledge as impartial, objective, knowledgeable in their field, and well educated, are used to structure one of the final links in the genre chain of student knowledge production: the mark-sheet. These grids embody and circulate the cultural and epistemological values (Turner 2011:67) of Western reasoning, and are meant to guide a certain manipulation of the written word to demonstrate clarity of expression, objectivity and skills of synthesis and analysis. As an institutionalised form of representation of disciplinary knowledge, they suggest its intrinsic characteristics are constituted by compartmentalized and objective parts with relatively impermeable boundaries and invoke a certain transcendence of the writing subject and knowledge. As part of the network of classifying and measuring disciplinary techniques that constitute audit culture, the task of these sheets is to produce 'bodies (...) both docile and capable' (Foucault 1991:294) whose activity and output aligns with institutional norms and broader mechanisms of social governance. To guide the subject in their alignment with the continuities of Western rationalist reasoning prioritised in knowledge-production in the academy, these are clearly mapped out in descriptors that identify the disciplinary skills and knowledges being tested and evaluated. Thus, the marksheet operates as a localised, mobile micro panopticon which works in everyday practices to produce 'homogenous effects of power' (Foucault 1991:202). As such, in line with panoptic regulatory logics, it can be used to

train, correct and classify development by the educator in their role as observer of skills and progress, and also to self-educate, self-correct and know the wrongs and rights of one's self development by the student. The marksheet then can be likened to a disciplinary software which programmes rudimentary and easily transferable skills quintessential to authoritative knowledge rhetoric that are realised in the products of student writing by its subjects. As a generalisable code, this software also functions as a light-touch form of 'subtle coercion for a society to come' (Foucault 1991:209) in which reason prevails over 'unreason'.

The disciplines as analysed by Foucault in *Discipline and Punish* are then essentially 'techniques for assuring the ordering of human multiplicities' (Foucault 1991:218). Using tactics of power, that include relative invisibility which arouses little resistance, disciplines ensure governance of the multiplicities of mass phenomena by adjusting them to 'the multiplication of the apparatuses of production' (Foucault 1991:219). To neutralize the effects of counter-power and resistance, a 'discipline fixes; it arrests or regulates movements; it clears up confusion' (Foucault 1991:219). Moreover, in opposition to the inherent, adverse power of multiplicity, and the 'infinitesimal level of individual lives' (Foucault 1991:222), the physical and human science disciplines use;

... procedures of partitioning and verticality that they introduce between the different elements at the same level, as solid separations as possible [so that] they define compact, hierarchical networks [of the] continuous, individualizing pyramid. (Foucault 1991:220)

Presented as a 'scaffolding' that provides students with 'clear and concise' descriptors of the skills and knowledge they should aim to demonstrate to achieve different levels of disciplinary achievement, this particular structuring of hierarchy is found clearly exercised in most generic undergraduate and postgraduate feedback sheets, and works as a technique for again and again tracing a line around the specific modalities of disciplinary knowledge to safeguard knowledge from its active genealogy of aporia and contradictions which permanently threaten to annul the rhetoric of Western rationality from its fixings and reveal its foundations.

Apart from plainly reasserting the rhetorical norms of clarity, concision and logical structure which 'perpetuate European Enlightenment values' (Turner 2011:78) of rational, objective, linear reasoning as the legitimate medium for knowledge-production, a generic undergraduate feedback sheet used at my own institution raises a number of points worthy of critical observation. Why, for example, do distinction level descriptors suggest it is good

on the one hand to demonstrate 'deep, extensive knowledge and understanding of ideas and theories' and to show 'considerable innovation in the selection of content/theory', whilst on the other, the recondite complexity of knowledge is to be articulated using an 'explicit and logical structure designed to maximise development of ideas', 'clarity of expression and 'fluent and effective writing'? There would seem to be an equally valid argument for complex, original use of language to convey innovative use of theoretical stances and profoundness of understanding. Similarly, though 'depth of critical analysis, perceptive judgment and independent thought' on the one hand recalls the objective Cartesian subject of empirical knowledge, it does not necessarily follow that astute discernment and individual thinking require explicit mapping out in logical argumentation. Furthermore, in the marksheet's cutting up of ideal knowledge-production approaches into purportedly clear units there are some concepts, such as 'deep knowledge', whose meaning is far from concise or clear. The point is that such tensions and contradictions do not matter. The rationale for the argument that clarity and rationality are the best rhetorical norms for representing the natural and social worlds of Western knowledge is ideological, and has a long history that has made it seem a commonsense given. Hence, any manifestation of difference or the Other of scientific discourse is either 'wrong' or used to support its claims to authoritative superiority. Therefore, those subject positions and textual constructions of 'the critical', for example, which do not speak to the processes, genres and assumptions of modern rationalism are methodically excluded as legitimate by the marksheet's descriptors of what is 'good' in academic writing and orderings of knowledge.

This is not to suggest the ordering principles of academic writing represented in a generic marksheet grid can or should be entirely dispensed with, such principles are a vital part of the critical traditions of all academic and scientific inquiry. Similarly, the marksheet genre fulfils an effective role as regulatory mechanism that aligns the multiplicities of student writer subjectivities to the pre-existing knowledge norms constitutive of the institution of higher education, and its disciplines and subject positions. It does this too for the multiplicities of university educator interpretations of student knowledge production, and as such provides regulated spaces for educators to encounter and evaluate student learning and skills in ways apt to produce metric measures of achievement to satisfy quality assurance and audit culture. However, its softly totalitarian technologies conceal and relegate to the margins of the fabric of knowledge its gaps, folds and multiplicities and thus provide a fictional account of the 'truth' of knowledge. In order to provide a less reductive

and more inclusive account of knowledge, I therefore now set out a framework for re-encountering ‘the critical’ in student writing premised on Foucault’s understanding of discontinuities as essential dynamics of knowledge production. More specifically, I theorise poststructuralist understandings of ‘the critical’ in the event of writing as diversity and mobility at the level of the materialities of the text.

### **5.5 The promise of diversity and mobility in the event of student writing**

My thinking and rhetoric in this section on ‘the critical’ in student writing is rooted in the field of academic literacies whose objects of critique are canonical, autonomous models of reading and writing (Horner 2013), which construct the knowledge and writing of students via a deficit discourse which works to marginalise diversity in writing, and views mobility solely in terms of acculturation to given conventions and expectations. Indeed, this deficit discourse of the culturally normative view of academic socialisation tends largely to call attention to ‘what students don’t or *can’t do* in academic writing rather than what they can, or would like to’ (Lillis *et al.* 2015:5). As a crucible for interrogating such traditional ideologies of academic literacy, its institutional critique emerges both from neo-Marxist interrogations of operations of power and possibilities of critical action considered in Chapter 3, and the diverse field of critical pedagogy theory and praxis analysed in Chapter 4.

To elucidate academic literacies’ characteristics as a field of inquiry, and to shake up the tendency for it to be understood uniquely in relation to narrow views of academic reading and writing encapsulated by the singular term ‘academic literacy’, Theresa Lillis and Mary Scott (2007:7) argued that academic literacies ‘constitutes a specific epistemology, that of *literacy as social practice*, and ideology, that of *transformation*’. Accompanying and following the paradigmatic assertions of Lillis and Scott, diverse analytical and practical trajectories have been pursued to denaturalise the idea of literacy as a ‘competence’ destabilise Western-centric ideologies of legitimate practices in the ‘textual universe’ (Luke 2013: 70) of the university, and more specifically under/postgraduate writing. Overall, these foreground difference, multiplicity, and ‘voice’ as core elements of knowledge production, and also therefore academic writing, and give importance to alternative approaches to assessment and writing styles within the social construction of knowledge.

To cleave into the mainstream narrative of literacy in higher education since the late 90s, the shifting field of Ac Lits (Delcambre 2015) research and praxis has covered a number of areas.

These include thick interpretations of everyday social practices of knowledge production through observations of classroom activities and ethnographic accounts of what it feels like to perform scholarly activities for students with diverse cultural resources (Lea & Street 1998; Gee 2012); producing a framework for critical literacy which recognises that meaning systems necessarily reproduce domination, so critical literacy needs to both provide access to normative languages, literacies and genres whilst 'simultaneously using diversity as a productive resource for redesigning social futures' (Janks 2000:178) corpora analyses of student writing across different disciplinary genres to distinguish genre families in student writing and produce more relevant formal writing schematization for use in academic writing teaching (Nesi 2012); the construal of academic literacies as complex, dialogic processes of knowledge production performed by students as they navigate personal readings and interpretations of materials encountered, based on biographically sourced cultural resources (Ivanič 1998; Lillis 2001); experiments in genre-switching intended to raise questions about legitimate meaning making resources available to undergraduates and foster skill at navigating different social semiotic affordances of different genres (English 2012); and investigating ways critical, qualitative research assignments can position students as producers rather than consumers of knowledge (Henderson 2013). This more recent notion of academic literacy as a transformative dialogue between personal and disciplinary materiality has been problematised as a methodological praxis apt to catalyse new texturings of legitimate literacies in genres and languagings (Lillis & Scott 2007; Lillis 2011). As such, it tends to avoid prescriptive, bounded accounts of writing but can at times ignore its own normalising role in creating normative procedures and practice around 'transformation'.

Aware of the competing and overlapping discourses and ideologies organising academic literacy research and education, Ros Ivanič (2004) uses a Critical Discourse Analysis approach to identify six categories of discourse active in producing the field: a skills discourse, a creativity discourse; a process discourse; a genre discourse; a social practices discourse; and a socio-political discourse. In a table mapping out the six discourses, and their attendant beliefs about writing, learning to write, approaches to teaching of writing, and typical assessment criteria (Ivanič 2004:225), she also incorporates a column clarifying the different processes implicated in the event of writing. Engaging explicitly with the tensions and contradictions between these socially produced approaches she proposes a writing pedagogy that integrates elements from each discourse. This work very usefully pluralises

and unsettles singular notions of academic literacy and hence provides a theorised model for research and practice, however it is premised on a model of 'human agents ... continuously recombining and transforming discursive resources as they deploy them for their own purpose' (Ivanič 2004:224). She thus proclaims the subject as somehow exterior to the workings of power, in a position that allows them to be the causal foundation of meaning, rather than constituted by subjectivation to both conformity and resistance in discursive fields. The intimation that writing and knowledge construction is directed by a purposive agent is not uncommon in the field of academic literacies, a more recent example can be seen in the suggestion of Gimenez and Thomas (2015:30) that their pedagogical framework provides students with approaches to transformative practice by which 'they can gain control over their own personal and educational experiences'. My intention in this section is not to de-legitimize these ideological perspectives and empirical research practices in literacy studies that conceptualise the student subject of academic literacies ethnographically so as to garner rich data on how situated university knowledge making practices play out, particularly for those in a marginal position, but rather to try to think this differently such that the active spaces of student writing are conceptualised in ways more congruent with theories of the productive forces of knowledge and writing. It will do so by reading the student subject, and their capacities for resistance in the 'always already contoured possibilities of who we are' (Lipscomb 2013:297), through a poststructuralist understanding of him/her/them as the emergent, temporal produc(t)er of a practical and agonistic re/dis/engagement with the normative constraints of Western, rationalist materiality during the freeplay of writing (Foucault 1997; Derrida 1986; Hamann 2009). This reading of the student subject is also textured by Derrida's understanding of the subject of writing as plural, and always dispersed, rather than stabilised and autonomous, since caught in the gap between traces of deferred meaning (Derrida 1986). Hence, critical and creative resistance to the 'Western University' (Derrida 2004:88) must always perform the role 'both of constitution and deconstitution' (Derrida 2004:119).

#### **5.6. Theorising the research subject of academic literacies**

To first clarify the concept of the subject as a constituent dynamic of the social practices of academic writing, I turn to Foucault's reformulation of ethics as internal to the enactment of discursive practices, not an external social code. Like all subjects, the student subject is produced through normalising forms of power in which they are imbricated, but yet also their own producer; this through practices of subjectivation, or care of the self, by which

they internalise particular understandings of legitimate ways of knowing (Foucault 1982; Foucault 2008; Hamann 2009) that form the matrix for their individuality. At the level of the text, the matrix for individuality operates in the form of disciplinary genres. In this conceptualisation of the practices by which the individual constitutes themselves through alignment and resistance, largely through rhetorical action, the 'subject' for Foucault has two meanings, both of which convey 'a form of power which subjugates and makes subject to' (Foucault 1982:781). The first is that of being 'subject to someone else by control and dependence' the second that of being 'tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge' (Foucault 1982:781). The point here is that the complex configurations of power/ knowledge that produce academic literacy and its subjects, power and resistance are not binaries but coterminous, constantly shifting, fragmented, multiple dynamics, and always internal to the regimes of governmentality in which they are located, and to which there is no outside (Foucault 2008). In this sense, Foucault's notion of the self collapses dualistic understandings of an objective subject exterior to cognitive, interior processes of reasoning which can be transferred into the neutral medium of reasoned argument into ever productive techniques of power. Rather, there is no subject or individual 'ontologically prior to power' (Ball & Olmedo 2012:87) since we are all caught up in contingencies of the shifting, fragmented historical present in which we are both 'a constant *beginning* and ... a constant *end*' (Ball & Olmedo 2012:87). As such never-completely achieved subjects, we write, and reinvent the literacies, disciplines and institutions that precede us, and without whose power relations there would be no subjects to glimpse in their fleeting moments of knowing in the historical present. It is recognition of our local imbrication in the dynamic multiplicities of power relations that I contend constitutes a first step towards critical academic literacy. I advance ways of doing this as student writers in Chapter 8.

Drawing on my reading of Foucault's work, and that of other poststructuralist thinkers, in the approach to researching the subject of academic literacies proposed in this thesis, I thus argue for a conceptualisation of the student which is not (against) that of a historicised, biographical subject whose diversity disrupts the normative givens of academic literacy and whose 'voice' should be productively included in university practices to ensure equality, participation and new norms of literacy. Rather, my conceptualisation of the undergraduate student subject of academic literacy is one intended to de-stabilise differently the conventions of Enlightenment originating ideologies that frame the growth of capabilities, and knowledge, in relation to a *telos* of linear progress (Foucault 2003a; Osberg 2010)

produced by autonomous subjects of reason. Genealogically, this Enlightenment *telos* is now entangled and inscribed with neoliberal agendas of training undergraduates for the global workplace, as well as continuous with deficit discourses of academic literacy premised on a traditional ideological centre to academic literacies, which works to exclude the other (Horner 2013:6). To rock the boat of this omnipresent *telos* differently, I position the academic subject of disciplinary literacies as a vitality that sustains ‘the “nonteleological” quality of power itself’ (Nealon 2008:99), akin in its productive nature to Lather’s (2013) ‘immanence of doing’, and hence whose diversity and mobility is to be explored in the indeterminable (con)text of student writing where neither the author nor meaning are ever fully present.

As already suggested, this line of critique is offered as an additional lens to add to the assemblage of contested ways of knowing and being that constitute the research field of academic literacies. My aim is to point to a complementary addition to academic literacies research goals of opening up the normative tools of the trade of academic rhetoric through recognising and valorizing forms of social practice and literacy (Horner 2013:6) whose value is not yet recognised within the university ‘teaching machine’ (Spivak 1993). More concretely, I am interested here in theorising the student subject of academic literacies as an analytical notion for empirically glimpsing those bifurcations from and conformity with the pre-coded fields of disciplinary writing, which originates not in a dialogic process between the cultural resources of the individual and academic meaning-making tools, but instead in a multiplicity of dynamic responses to (un)certainty that include space for the responsibility of ethics and critique, and that as such can work to keep openness to other than the dogmatic in play. Academic rhetoric, and the possibility of micropractices of resistance in writing are theorised in poststructuralist thought as the only ground of ethical and political resistance available -located beyond the inside-outside binary - for intervening in universalist, oppressive spaces of thought replete with legitimate identity regimes and ideological interpellations (Radhakrishan 1996), and that work, to differing degrees, towards closure.

Whilst the local, micro-scale of rhetorical intervention and decision making may appear quite inadequate as a form of resistance, rather than succumb to the ‘despair’ contingent upon the radical constraints the workings of discourse place upon the autonomy of our students (and our-selves) (Street 1984; Porter *et al.*2000), I argue that such small, miniature acts of change work can be subversive precisely in their focus on the microscopic detail, that

includes an acknowledgement of its temporary location in the historical present and the contingency of any representation. As such, these acts can serve as an active locus of 'hope' and 'empowerment' for all of us getting a handle on power as we are interpellated by its social norms. Indeed any rhetorical act, however small, which consciously resists the tenacious hold of power as it tacitly inscribes itself upon certain utterances as a legitimate mode of social discourse (Eagleton 2007:223), works in some way to loosen the 'lethal grip' of dominant ideologies (Eagleton 2007:223), and as such gives the individual a fleeting, unstable opportunity to bring about material change. It is research into this emergent resource of academic literacy practices I advance as a way of thinking differently. A resource that in addition I conceptualise as an alternative, or double reading of mobility since, rather than only indicating a trajectory intended to put students on a mimetically equal footing to disciplinary experts, and by extension as fit for the graduate workplace, or the path traced by students towards success and a legitimate role in the graduate workplace, it also indicates the vigour and micro potency of the individual to (dis)obey institutionally founded rhetorical norms, such as to fleetingly enact 'modest local forms of resistance' (Eagleton 2007:224), should they so wish, or decide. Paradoxically, to act rhetorically in this way corresponds to qualities of thought that are highly valued in many undergraduate written assessment descriptors of *knowledge and understanding*, criticality, originality and creativity, though few are the university writing centre online pages that explicitly engage with this rhetorical dimension of the performance of academic literacy. Indeed, a half hour google search reveals most stipulate that figurative language and metaphor are not appropriate in academic writing.

### **5.7 Conceptualising resistance(s) in the micropractices of student writing**

Having located the student subject of academic literacies within the constant mutations and contingencies of the totalizing bodies of Western reason's 'endless interpretation and cross-referencing' (De Certeau 2010c:130), and neoliberalism's mechanisms that work within almost every aspect of everyday university everyday practices to construe the subject and knowledge according to narrow, market-based values (Hannam 2009:38), I now conceptualise the operations of critique and ethical subjectivation at the borders of disciplinary rhetorical practices, that constitute resistance to the closure of such totalizing regimes, or asymmetry with their normative regimes, and as such are largely screened out by mainstream practices of the academy and academic literacy. My aim is to use such practices of resistance, already present in student writing rather than put forward by

legitimized authorities, to open up new spaces for practices of 'care of the self' as a subject of knowledge, and so enlarge the spaces of the possible in the project of being a legitimate university student and writer.

I begin this brief account of resistance as an empirical research focus of academic literacies by way of Nealon's (2008) reading of Foucault's portrayal of resistance as pivotal to the workings of power. In his interpretation, Nealon points out that in earlier Foucault works, such as *Archaeology of Knowledge*, rather than building a conventional argument to represent power's strategies, Foucault quite literally exemplifies them in 'the *enactment*' (2008:97) of his analyses. In this sense, resistance is 'lively conceptual mutation rather than the dry thematical representation of transformative modes' (Nealon 2008:98). Since for Foucault, as with domination, resistance is an unstable and uncertain 'programmed product of power' (Nealon 2008:105), not a binary opposite, it is always already there as part of power's antagonistic strategies of knowledge production. As such, resistance(s) can/should be enacted in the everyday, local capillary workings of power if 'some sort of autonomous and noncentralized ... production' (Foucault 2003b:6) is to be achieved. Hence, in order to empirically examine these antagonistic strategies, one begins by probing 'those sites at which resistance is or should be at its most intense' (Nealon 2008:104). So, following Foucault, if you wish to understand the realm of reason, look at madness, or, if you want to understand the domain of objectivity, look at subjectivity, or the 'subjugated knowledges ... present in the functional and systematic ensembles' (Foucault 2003b:7) of academic knowledge but whose marginal presence has been 'masked' (Foucault: *ibid.*). Such surfacing of 'historical contents' (Foucault 2003b:7), or 'the "local foci" of power/knowledge' (Spivak 1993:33), for Foucault constitutes critique. Put differently, resistance-critique is an 'irreducible experimental struggle' (Nealon 2008:104) that can be used to hack into the panoptic systems present in the mechanisms that monitor and 'normalize' student writing and reveal the thousand inventions and forgings that assent to the dominant differently, and in doing so disrupt the 'cold, machinic, calculative techniques' (Ball & Olmedo 2012:91) of the neoliberal system.

As empirical findings barely visible in the folds of academic discourse, these 'local foci' are the flashes of what Foucault later calls the 'virtue of critique', more specifically defined as 'the art of not being governed quite so much' (Foucault 1997:45). In this perspective, the strategics of power determining a field of knowledge necessarily involve the subject's 'types

of behaviour, decisions and choices' (Foucault 1997:64), thus ensuring there are always variable margins of non-certainty, which keep openness in play. As objects of investigation within the field of critical academic literacies, I conceptualise these resources of knowledge via a double reading of university diversity. Rather than only celebrating diversity as difference in fixed categories of ethnicity, gender, physical ability, sexual orientation, age, nationality, faith or religion, or other demographics, I (also) conjugate diversity with the unfixed, fluid, myriad configurations of critical and creative resistance always already present in student textual knowledge making practices, and that represent the struggle for subjectivity itself, which Deleuze characterizes as 'the right to difference, variation and metamorphosis' (2006:87). Enactment of such local diversity is the place where the student is the agent of their production rather than the victim, where they de-subalternize themselves away from the way the matrix plays them, only next to be drawn back into knowledge's 'mechanism of centredness' to which there is no outside (Spivak 1993:10).

To now see differently Foucault's rethinking of resistance as, a 'care of the self', comprising jujitsu like moves to carve out spaces of freedom in an ongoing struggle with – and/or taking pleasure in – the dominant, I briefly consider Derrida's inquiry into the relationship between the dogmatic and the critical, from which he derives 'an ethics inaccessible to liberalism' (Spivak 1993:37), since the singular subject is always deferred, or differed from themselves haphazardly via the movement of freeplay in language, and so eludes the grooming technologies of 'care of the self'. Freeplay is 'a field of infinite substitutions in the closure of a finite ensemble' (Derrida 1986:490), whereby the surplus of signification always disrupts the presence of intention in writing: intention that has traditionally held 'teleological jurisdiction [over]an entire field' (Derrida 1988:15). This does not mean that Derrida is denying the specificity of effects of speech, consciousness, presence and discursive event, which he equates to the speech act. Nor is he suggesting the category of intention disappears or is entirely abstracted from human reasoning and activity (Derrida 1988:19). Rather, with the concept of *différance*, Derrida disrupts teleological premises of knowledge production by contending stabilised, singular meaning is, from the outset, 'breached and breached' by iterability, or the condition of writing, whereby each iteration, which necessarily includes some conformity to code, also modifies or alters the same (Derrida 1988:61), and so is 'incommensurate with the adequate understanding of intended meaning' (Derrida 1988:61). For Derrida, this ungrounded space between old and new conditions for the possibility of knowledge is a space of *poesis*, a making or bringing into being, that in

some small way allows subjects to realise themselves autonomously, despite the ‘formative conditions of their inception’ (Whitehead 2003). Thus, such opening up of new territory by the subject, for her/himself and their readers, is an intrinsic element of knowledge ‘production’ (Whitehead 2003).

When more specifically considering university educators responsibility to strive for ways to ensure students learn how ‘to mediate critically between democratic values and the demands of corporate power’ (Giroux 2005:72), fundamentals of critical academic literacy, Derrida argues it is vital educators ‘rethink the concepts of the possible and impossible’ (2002:31). Such new approaches to these concepts need to acknowledge the dominant assumption there are no alternatives to the existing social order, while concurrently stressing the dynamic capacity of the performative of ‘as if’ (Derrida 2002:53), which makes it possible to intervene in the highly determined contexts of university knowledge making conventions using the incomplete power of the performative ‘I can’ (Derrida 2002:54). This ungrounded space of *poietics* is where the responsibility of ethics connects to the practices and politics of the institution of the university via two approaches to the *value* of language. Trifonas (2005:211) interprets these complementary modes of thought that Derrida articulates in his inquiry into ways ‘to organize an effective resistance’ (Derrida 2002:56) in the university, as ‘the instrumental (informative) and the “poietic” (creative)’, with their semiological effect being respectively ‘representation’ and ‘undecidability’. In making the language of the informative ‘our own’, and resisting it effectively and robustly in a mode of creativity, this resistance functions in a manner akin to freedom of speech. To protect and maintain this freedom, Derrida argues for alliance with ‘extra-academic forces’ (Derrida 2002:55) of language use, poached from beyond the sovereignty of the historically-sedimented, and often formulaic, objective knowledge constructions of the disciplines. Indeed, such micropractices of poietics ‘can’ or ‘may’ reinvigorate the hope of an unfinished democracy yet to come (Derrida 2002).

## **5.8 Conclusion**

To sum up, the value of such practices, that play a non-recognised part in the tangled networks of the multiple organisations of knowledge, is that they en-code a critical, ethical alternative to the universals of canonical writing as well as the economic value universals of neoliberalism. Though there is no outside to the arena of social production, they bring a priceless openness to Other into the inside of the matrix, and so keep in play the possibility

of a different future to come. Making visible the plurality of antagonisms that includes poietics, offers a way of thinking forward diversity and mobility as the effect of productive tension between centralized and non-centralised knowledge strategies, and between the informative mode of representation and the creative undecidability made material by the vitality of the subjects of academic literacy. Reading student writing disobediently offers an effective way to retrieve the 'determinate indeterminacy' (Radhakrishnan 1996:115) of the past and to reveal its tactical impurity, complexity and originality at the same time. In the next chapter, *Methodologies, and Methodological Subjectivities*, I present the epistemologies and 'methods' deployed in this thesis to analyse traces of (in) determinate subjectivation in student assessment writing.

## Chapter 6 Methodologies, and methodological subjectivities

### 6.1 Introduction

In previous chapters I have explored the discursively governed nature of our social worlds and subjectivities as subaltern pedagogues and (student) writers, and what the productive play of power in the historical materiality of our knowledge praxis suggests about the (im)possibility of criticality in pedagogy and writing. In this chapter, I deploy what Lather (2013:638) defines as a 'post-qualitative' sensitivity to the shifting, emergent quality of social meaning to describe the epistemologies and 'methods' assembled in the 'structured social process' of this thesis (Schiellerup 2008:164). Using the term *post-qualitative*, is done to explicitly call out 'the unthought in how research-based knowledge is conceptualised and produced' (Lather 2013:636) and to lessen the risk of 'the reduction of qualitative to an instrumentalism that meets the demands of audit culture' (Lather 2013:636). These sensitivities are useful when trying to imagine methods which 'no longer seek the definite, the repeatable, the more or less stable' (Law 2004:6), opting instead to critically 'peer' into and analyse the tangled and shifting discursive networks of knowledge production techniques and power strategies that co-produce student writing with active subjects. Whilst these constitute the material practice of student writing, they are made invisible when read or observed through disciplinary mechanisms of university assessment procedures. These normatively place little value on complex practices not premised on understandings of a unitary, measurable human subject, and/or which exceed the regulatory codes of rationalist, objectivist reason, and/or the strategic professional gaze of tutors dealing the challenge of marking large amounts of undergraduate assessment texts. By exploring the dispersed and competing multiple subjectivities of knowledge production this investigation offers an alternative to understanding student knowledge production as static, homogenous, outcomes of disciplinary teaching and learning that can be straightforwardly ranked. It furnishes insights into student written knowledge production as a dynamic and changing process that constitutes heterogeneity both at the material surface of the text, and during the process of reading and interpretation.

In the interpretive approach I qualify as 'peering', epistemological questions are seen as an open-ended process present in rhetorical moves. This process sometimes deploys fixed, discrete snatches of knowledge to incorporate more static, instrumental formulations of knowledge in a written text, and at other times resists convention to perform dynamic,

critical meaning makings that produce knowledge Other-wise. Neither mode is mutually exclusive. Rather, as Foucault (2003c:139) elucidates, the complex interplay between the two are the agonism of a productive relationship between ‘the recalcitrance of the will and the intransigence of freedom’ (Foucault, *ibid.*) that are the dynamic of power. Power operates strategically through these hostile relations of force which serve to circulate and naturalise subject positions and normative notions of knowledge. This post-critical inquiry sees it as important to recognise analyses of the construal of both in their constitution of the deferred knowing subject, but primarily concentrates on the latter. This is in order to broaden existing boundaries of the study and the teaching of undergraduate academic writing, more particularly in the humanities and social sciences, in a manner that validates unseen critical and creative writing practices of student subjects. When distinguishing between the two agonistic forces that produce knowledge, one is seen as co-producing the ‘spoken subject’ and the other the ‘speaking subject’ (Henderson 2013b).

More specifically, these ‘peerings’ are operationalised to two distinct yet interrelated intentions that emerged during a process of critical, post-qualitative inquiry which rejects modernist theory and methodological practices as a guiding schema (Lather 2013). These are: (1) to interrogate student writing to reveal the multiple subjectivities and competing discourses that constitute student writing, which confound bureaucratic, and rationalist assumptions of a singular writing subject simply amenable to forms of governance, be those via discourses of regulation or emancipation; and (2), to use purposive sampling and interpretation of student writing to evidence possibilities of the critical and creative that elude production of the same, and instead disturb such production. Both these intentions are made explicit within one of the central preoccupations of this thesis: What, within the reality of the ‘always already contoured possibilities of who we are’ (Lipscomb 2013:297), and the normative constraints and disciplinary-disciplining technologies of rationalist, Western academic writing, is the ethical capacity for criticality and creativity of the student subject?

As the opening to this methodology section and this preoccupation reflect, the primary research interest in this inquiry is identifying and recognising other ways of thinking about social science student writing and student writers than those which currently dominate in the academy. Thus, if the pursuit of creating equal and enabling conditions for students to participate in the customary culture and norms of social science and humanities academic

writing at undergraduate level is considered legitimate and pertinent, and the structuring activities and texts at hand produce general assumptions of fundamental 'wrongs' and 'rights', such as indirect or direct construal of 'creative' or 'figurative' language as inappropriate or 'wrong', such practices need to come under critical scrutiny, all the more so by educational researchers such as myself, interested in transformation and change, and also critical of neoliberal governmentality and instrumentality.

Both these intentions and the focus for the interpretive 'peerings' evolved during my step-by-step exploration of the messiness, and twists and turns of the development process of qualitative (doctoral) research (Chung 2009:72; Lather 2009); often in stark contrast to the layout and rhetoric of the finished research product. Since the mid to late 20<sup>th</sup> century, debates about the reflexive, situated nature of social science research, and the various 'turns' in major theoretical frameworks have critiqued the rhetorical neatness of stock representations of qualitative inquiry which background the struggles and issues involved for researching subjects (Schiellerup 2008), and are premised on a Cartesian, objectivist understanding of knowledge production, dominant in the natural and hard sciences, which tends to conceal in its rhetoric the 'marks of the epistemic subject', or researcher, and the contingent subjective nature of knowledge (Breuer & Roth 2003:3). Yet such 'twists and turns' need to be explicitly broached since the concept and technology of writing is a central component of the epistemological and practical challenges of knowledge production. In this way, I would argue that theory can be used to illuminate writing, and writing to illuminate theory. By including in the textual organisation of this inquiry a fuller range of the challenges involved in conceptualising it, and in producing a final rhetorical product, I also remain true to a political commitment to 'thinking differently', or Other-wise. Through a productive dialogue with the other of 'messiness', my aim is to destabilise oppositions currently deployed in the discursive field of academic writing, such as that between objective and subjective, and the object of knowledge and those who would know. In chipping away at the rhetorical fortifications and assumptions of modernist inquiry, my aim is to honour the spirit of 'theory' that confirms the instability and mutation of even the 'worthiest of questions' (Faubion 2009:162) as they move forward in the 'empirical course of their resolution' (Faubion 2009:162). Effecting such shifts in given templates of truth and knowledge also aligns with my understanding that we can only imagine a different political future in the academy today by thinking it with and through writing, and therefore with and through theory.

Illumination of the constantly shifting grids of intelligibility raises further questions about what counts as 'data', how the subject lives within diverse, conflicting subject positions, and what determines the validity and ethical soundness of knowledge (St. Pierre and Roulston 2006:677). As St. Pierre and Roulston (2006:677) indicate, when examined through the deconstructive lens of theory:

the very categories of qualitative inquiry and science itself—e.g. data, evidence, the field, method, analysis, knowledge, truth, power, freedom, discourse, language, representation, the subject [and] descriptions of data or evidence [and] the description of the human being itself cannot be taken for granted.

In this context, they hint at the need for a new research rhetoric whose language neither completely ignores the unstable referents of concepts such as validity, despite the hegemonic will to stabilise them produced by 'gold standard' scientific models of validity, nor denies the elusive and clashing subject positions present in the event of academic writing and research. In this methodology chapter of my thesis, whilst recognising I am not free as an academic subject of disciplinary knowledge which pre-exists me, nor in relation to the power system which constitutes it and by which I am (re)constituting it, I remain alert to (de)constructive possibilities for critiquing these extremely useful conditions of knowledge production and being which ensnare me and other academic subjects precisely through their usefulness for our 'running self-identikit' (Spivak 1993:4) within the academy. Likewise, in an analytical vein, as further evidence of the complex and fractured nature of knowledge domains, I intend to make explicit some of the 'messiness' of my temporal trajectory from research questions to 'findings'.

Concretely, the empirical research carried out in this inquiry addresses issues of the critical and creative in student writing using notions of method and analysis derived from poststructuralist theory, critical discourse analysis and post-qualitative approaches to research located in feminist theory. Namely, it uses the particularities of 8 student assessment research papers, produced to assess student learning on a course I teach in intercultural communication as mini case studies – 2 in the first peering, 6 in the second - by which to critically probe normative readings of student writing practices for the presence of the asymmetries, aporiae and alterities that, since they constitute the historical subject(ivities) of student writing, are the starting point for understanding the ethics of a care of the self (Foucault 1984) or a responsibility to the trace of the other (Derrida 1988); understood in this thesis as possible dynamics of 'the critical' in (student) academic writing.

It thus conjoins with the general guidelines of poststructuralist understandings of textual practices, power and the subject, and post-qualitative guidelines and commitments. In doing so, it aims at a qualitative analysis of student knowledge production that will yield insights into critical and creative subjectivities of the student writer that can suggest new ways to theorise student writing and its teaching and evaluation without prescribing specific practices. As a qualitative study, it does not aim to align with positivist, quantitative understandings of the social world interested in determining the frequency of an attitude in a given population, or to prove the causal relation between a certain set of variables, which 'stand above and outside the constraints of everyday life' (Denzin & Lincoln 2013: 19). Nor, as a post-qualitative study does it assume an 'originary voice' in its subjects, or an unproblematical, methodological certainty (Lather 2013: 635) that can be neatly described in advance. Rather, (post)qualitative analysis sees all social practice and subjects as 'embedded in immanence of doing' (Lather 2013: 635) that can be temporarily glimpsed in 'rich descriptions of the social world [and texts]' (Denzin & Lincoln 2013:19). However, whilst post-qualitative research draws largely on Deleuze and Guattari (e.g. 1988) to re-imagine historical materiality, in this inquiry I honour the spirit of a theory and methodology that is immanent, and in perpetual uncertainty, by drawing mainly on the perspectives of Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida.

Yet do poststructuralist approaches constitute methods? Surely 'methods' connote, and serve to constitute, a modernist agenda of knowledge production that constitutes finite answers to finite problems, As Peters and Burbules (2004) remind us, to construe poststructural approaches to education, such as archaeology, genealogy or deconstruction as akin to 'methods', risks producing the idea they are 'a handy set of methods or tools' (Peters & Burbules 2004: 55) rather than irreducible forms of criticism developed as a philosophical response to 'scientistic pretensions of structuralism' (*ibid.*). Understanding this risk, allows us to ensure we do not conflate critique with the range of methods that are conducted under the heading of critical discourse analysis, and which tend to deny the obdurate messiness of any particular fragments of knowledge. Instead, it is intended that by 'plugging into' (Jackson & Mazzei 2012) these theoretical perspectives discussion will be opened around the productive forces of power and its regulatory practices as a constituent element of student writing. Furthermore, poststructural approaches provoke self-consciousness about our own 'always-already' contoured and contouring subjectivities, and imbrication in dominant discourses and institutional structures of scientific rationality to

which there is no outside. As Luke's (1995) analysis of the usefulness of poststructural approaches in educational research details, not only does a Foucaultian approach to discourse analysis challenge naïve assumptions about the 'self' and the 'individual' as existing independently from the discourses that constitute us and our methodologies, and show how pedagogy is implicated in systems of governance and power/knowledge positioning of the subject, it is constantly sceptical towards 'transparency of talk [and] interview data' and also 'potentially reductionist and determinist models of ideological interpellation' (Luke 1995:9). Such an analysis serves as a constant reminder to deconstruct our own leanings towards explicitly transformative or emancipatory aims in our critiques/critical practices.

Though empirical, the qualitative textual analysis/reading of student assessment writing and subjectivities finally arrived at and accomplished in this inquiry undertakes to maintain such scepticism in its reflexive, interpretive enterprise and avoid all suggestion that the discourse analysis 'findings' are indicative of the plenitude of a human subject or unproblematic truth independent from the workings of power/knowledge. Rather, in its reconstrual of meaning to produce new meaning, it recognises the historical conditions of knowledge production, and employs an approach similar to that used by Hertzberg (2015), one that is 'both sympathetic and suspicious in character' (Hertzberg 2015:1210) towards the non-essential subjects whose output it interrogates and towards the non-essential subject conducting the interrogation. So, though I foreground the productive part always-already dominant discourses and ideologies play in influencing the production of academic meaning and its subjects, or what Gee would call Big D discourses, or 'thinking devices' (2005:70), that guide us to understand the purpose and nature of university learning and pedagogy in a certain way, as well as the productive critical and creative capacity of the subject and its dynamic part in the production of meaning and practices, I do not project a stability onto the textual matter analysed. Nor, in this non-humanist ontology I unroll here of an existence pre-shaped by positivities of power that are not objectively observable except at the ontic level of the statement (Foucault 1972, Spivak 1993), do I assume such capacities to correspond to a 'bounded rationality' that can be mapped back onto the individual writer (Hertzberg 2015:1211). I prefer to construe such productive capacities of the status quo and the new, as imbricated in 'agentic assemblage(s) of diverse elements that are constantly intra-acting, never stable, never the same' (Lather & St. Pierre 2013:630) which circulate and naturalise the subject position of the non-individuated student writer in relation to diverse audiences

and contexts. Thus, in the 'agentic assemblage' of this inquiry, I set out to give an alternative reading of the academic (student) writer that resonates with the irreducible nature of critique.

Having clarified the post-qualitative epistemological and ontological assumptions determining the ways my research will be conducted, I next unpack the reflexive process of the two 'peerings' into the tangled networks of student knowledge production that led, recursively, to the production of final interpretive frameworks and two sets of findings. When doing so, I make explicit some of the implicit or tacit messier aspects of practices of theorising or 'doing' research as a way of unsettling rationalist, humanist logics of knowledge production which use structural dichotomies such as subject-objective, rational-irrational, and valid-invalid to constitute the core of scientific tradition.

## **6.2 Peering 1**

### **6.2.1 Intention of first unpacking of student texts**

The first intention is to empirically unearth examples of the micropractices, or 'local foci' (Spivak 1993:33) of knowledge production techniques and shifting power strategies that constitute the everyday practices of student assessment writing, normatively read and evaluated by university lecturers for the institutional purposes of: assessing learning outcomes; providing guidance from disciplinary 'expert' to novitiate on areas of strength and weakness; and awarding grades in line with common national and European frameworks. Student writing provides strategic, linguistic actualization of dynamic responses to this 'normal'/modern/bureaucratic institutional reading and production, here conceptualised as catalysts of knowledge production that repeatedly fragment and refashion the codes of dominant discourses of academic reasoning and objectivity. For this first peering, these micropractices of production of the historical present are unearthed and read drawing on a Discourse Historical Approach (Wodak *et al.* 2009; Wodak & Meyer 2009), one of a number of different Critical Discourse Analysis frameworks that have a common interest in demystifying the working of ideologies and power through systematic investigation of semiotic data (Wodak & Meyer 2004). I provide a more in-depth analysis and critique of the epistemology of DHA below. The analyses of these 'findings' are used in the next chapter, *The multiple and dispersed subjectivities of the undergraduate writer- Peering 1*, to:

- a) unsettle and question the ‘normalising’, ‘regulating’ ‘surveillance’ of university procedures and ‘critical’ pedagogical practices (Foucault 1998), which are productive of Enlightenment and bureaucratic discourses of a singular, knowing human subject that obscure a franker account of the dynamic materiality of student writing;
- b) empirically interpret and analyse the multiple, competing, conflicting subjectivities of the social arena of student writing, where meaning ‘happens’ in the productive events of writing and reading. This analysis is used to critique the possibility of the historical, emancipated subject of Critical Pedagogy (Freire 1998, Giroux 1992), still strongly present as a ghost in the system of much pedagogical practice, including my own, despite its incommensurability with ‘post’ understandings of the historical subject.

As stated previously, in neither my interpretation, nor the student texts, do I assume there to be an inherent truth within them, or an autobiographical subject that deterministically precedes them. Nor do I assert such reading of practices at the micro level can be deterministically related to meso practices of the institution, or more abstract, macro-social theory. In his seminal study of critical views of language use in society (1989), Fairclough uses the expression ‘conditioned by’ to define the intertwining between the linguistic phenomena of texts and social processes, conditions, and non-linguistic parts of society. Responding to his top-down questioning of language and power with an expression I prefer for its evocation of change and action as ceaseless, I choose the phrase ‘dynamic responses to’ to describe the productive nature of the ceaseless (de)construction of these different dimensions and trajectories of panoptical systems. Overall, I suggest these findings of the first ‘peering’, and my account of the process of finding them, are informative for thinking about and understanding the relationship between theory, method and praxis, the possibilities of the critical in (western) university practices, including student writing, and the part subjectivity and rhetoric play in doing and writing research. However, the central purpose of these critiques will be as valuable resources for making explicit the (im)possibilities of autonomy in student writing, as read through a poststructuralist understanding of textual operations.

### **6.2.2 Blindspots in my researcher vision and vehicle**

In this section, I outline some of the problems, challenges and blind spots in my thinking, shaped by my subjective entanglement in both Enlightenment and poststructuralist

epistemologies and ontologies, that I encountered as I shifted my labour from conceptualising and producing a poststructuralist theoretical framework, in which to locate my researcher subject's knowing, doing, and being (Spivak 1993:10), to the task of developing a qualitative, textual analysis approach congruent with this theoretical commitment. To repeat myself, I do so for two reasons. First, to illustrate the blinding, magnetic pull of modernist methods, which eliminate the messiness of the research process from the final commodified knowledge product (Jackson & Mazzei 2012:2). Second, from a commitment to 'resisting an easy story' (Jackson & Mazzei 2012:3) and troubling 'the notion of [rational,objective] 'voice' in conventional and critical qualitative research' (Jackson & Mazzei: 2012:3).

The image that springs to mind to describe the 'peering 1' stage of my thinking, at which I moved from conceptualising a theoretical framework to developing a methodological approach congruent with its understandings, of power, knowledge and the self, is that of being ousted from a heady intellectual debate, only to find myself alone feeling rather lost. Though not entirely sure how to make the next step to building a bridge between theory and methodology that ensured the one was commensurate with the other, what I did know was that I needed to more clearly specify the empirical object of my study. This had initially been global citizenship discourses, subjects and practices in university prospectuses and policies, however, this had begun to seem an overly obvious object of investigation in relation to increasing neoliberal organisation of UK universities. Other questions that also remained unanswered were: *which* CDA framework I would adapt to conduct my analysis of texts; the *ethical issues* involved in analysing the indeterminate subjectivities of student texts produced on a course I taught; and *how to acknowledge* the productive presence of my *researcher-reader gaze* when exploring questions about power/knowledge dynamics in strategic assemblages of student writing. Whilst I had included a brief, detailed methods plan in my doctoral research proposal, and concluded my theoretical framework chapter with the need to develop a methodology for textual analysis apt for 'a detailed discursive and linguistic description of textual data' produced at different institutional levels of realization of orders of discourse, it became apparent that these were printed paper arrows thrown towards an unknown future that had been swept away in the historical contingencies and present of my human (ir)rationality and writing practices. Caught between the shifts of meaning and intelligibility that constitute poststructuralist epistemology, these were fraught moments in my 'contingent self-fashioning' (Koopman

2014:94) as a doctoral researcher. Ones in which I started to doubt my own ability to articulate the (at least) four-way relationship between theory, the methodological tools of empirical, critical qualitative research, the object of my research, student writing, and myself, its subject. How could I distinguish between the four in a manner that recognised them as both heterogeneous and discontinuous the one with the other (Radhakrishnam 1996:9), and as forms of power which transform the subject into an object and instrument of a knowledge sphere (Foucault 1977:205) as ‘researched’ and ‘researcher’?

A tenet of qualitative research – critical and post – is a conscious openness to adapting research plans and directions when exploring the complex threads and ambiguities of shifting social meaning (e.g. Cressman 2013; Janesick 2004). Ideologically grounded, this openness can be seen as a process of bricolage (Kincheloe *et al.* 2013: 349-350) that makes explicit the ways the researcher dynamically responds to structuring narratives of dominant research practice in order to produce an assemblage of their own making, that also works as a form of micro-political action against the status quo of knowledge production. Despite such valorization of room to manoeuvre beyond the norm I nevertheless struggled to work out how to dovetail the poststructuralist theoretical and conceptual terrain mapped out with a fecund methodological apparatus that could investigate a still fuzzy object of study. I needed to find a way forward. This came in the decision to analyse student research papers produced for assessment of learning outcomes in an advanced undergraduate course in intercultural communication I teach: a course whose content and values resonated with the ethos of the university graduate attribute of global citizen. In the case of my university, this ethos was characterised by a reflexive, ethical engagement with social, environmental and cultural issues in local communities, the world of work, and personal practices. Thus, instead, as initially intended, of investigating global citizenship discourses as a top-down genre of governance (Fairclough 2003:32), present in multi-modal semiotic and linguistic representations of the local and global recontextualised into the world of academic practices and language, more particularly in university prospectuses and policy documents, that systematically form the objects of which they speak (Foucault 1998), and are taken up by different individuals as resources for making sense of themselves and their place in the world (Foucault 1984a), I articulated the question of governance and subjection from the more local perspective of student intercultural communication assignment texts and the subjectivities materialised therein. The motivation for this twist towards pedagogy and its products as the domain of inquiry selected for my investigation was twofold. First, a default

interest in practical research findings of use to colleagues, such as myself, complicit in the labour of embedding the abstract notion of 'global citizenship' in disciplinary and disciplining pedagogies. Second, a preference for a field of knowledge production inquiry in which I, the researching subject, was already implicated and entwined: the 'teaching machine' of disciplinary pedagogy (Spivak 1993).

### **6.2.3 Succumbing to the (false) security of modernist ways**

At this leg of my complex journey to finding a methodological research practice and rhetoric congruent with Foucault and Derrida's systemic notion of power/knowledge I took a 'wrong' turn that set up a conflict between my theoretical framework and research methodology approaches and goals. Put otherwise, I lived through my own variations on apprentice doctoral researcher experiences of the recursive, twisting procedures of producing social science knowledge on the way to finding the 'right' turn and a final research narrative. I shall now describe some of the 'whats', 'wheres', 'hows' and 'whys' of my first iteration of exegetic procedures for unpacking student assessment texts whose flaws I posit can partly be ascribed to the 'normative character of [the] institutions and of the disciplines in and by which we live' (Spivak 1993:99). I shall then briefly explain the lesson learned from the 'wrong' routes taken via a critique of the analytical frameworks applied, and finally elucidate how I made 'unusable data' analysis usable (Hamilton 2009).

As I have already insisted, this inquiry aims to make explicit the messiness of the self-reflexive process by which I recursively (re)shaped and (re)oriented research questions through the work of thought, defined by Foucault (Foucault 1984b, cited in Rabinow 2003:23) thus:

Thought is not what inhabits a certain conduct and gives it meaning; rather, it is what allows one to step back from this way of acting or reacting, to present it to oneself as an object of thought and to question it as to its meaning, its conditions, and its goals.

Hence 'thought' may allow us to see the blind spots or issues in our previous ways of understanding or acting. In this sense, it was 'thought' that produced reflexive awareness of those moments of faulty reasoning or uncertainty that are part of the dynamic process of conceptualising an empirical approach congruent with the object of my study, and my entanglement within pre-existent discourses. What I am suggesting here is that articulating the particular impasses navigated as step by step I homed in on the particular object of my research allows me to move beyond what Hamilton (2009:80) calls a 'specious objectivism'

which buries the evolving nature of inquiry and ‘the multiple dimensions’ (Kincheloe *et al.* 2013:353) of research acts. As such, I consider this element of my thesis a small contribution to scholarship on postgraduate research writing processes and practices.

#### **6.2.4 The ‘where’ of student assessment text production**

In order to contextualise the normative, local environment for production of the student texts analysed, in this section I briefly outline course design, aims, theoretical approaches, and the assessment rationale and form.

The course which is the object of this study is taught by myself; a specialist both in intercultural communication and academic literacies. As a module it is part of a joint applied linguistics and culture and media studies programme where critique of praxis and discourse is fundamental. The method for course design involves four main steps (Henderson 2013a:8), namely:

1. Break down the assessment criteria to include knowledge and skills apt to foster critical (global) citizens using, for example, Byram’s five *saviors* (1997);
2. Open up the assessment design to include the student voice (student as producer not consumer);
3. Clearly scaffold the different parts of the written assignment
4. Map out the research process for gaining new knowledge about self and other

During the course, students consider two main theoretical approaches to conceptualising cultural identity as a social construct constituted in global and local everyday practices. The first approach draws on Holliday *et al.* (2004), who represent cultural identity as a repertoire of inherited resources which we draw on creatively and dynamically in order to communicate and establish belonging in different contexts. The main thrust of this conceptualisation is to elude hegemonic and essentialist construals of events, people and behaviours which is considered to lack validity as explanatory modules of cultural behaviour and social structure, be these emancipatory or traditionalist. The second approach provides a lens for analysing language as a cultural identity resource deployed in small acts of intercultural communication in everyday life. Spencer-Oatey’s (2000) framework for investigating how rapport is managed in spoken interaction provides a tool for students to probe and reflect upon culturally indexed norms of demonstrating respect, or not, in their

own interpersonal relations with other students. Together, these two approaches provide analytical frameworks for exploring the productive connections between micro relations of language used in context and macro relations of power (Pennycook 2001:5). In this sense, they are intended to provide students with theorised methodologies for understanding how their everyday talk meshes with and perpetuates normative discourses and the wider social context, but can also produce change (Henderson 2013b). As can be seen, there is a tension in the course design between more modernist approaches of authors such as Spencer-Oatey (2000) and Byram (1997), and more poststructuralist approaches of authors such as Holliday (2004) and Pennycook (2001). There is also a clear imbrication with audit culture discourses and neoliberal governance mechanisms present in the articulation of its aims with those of the graduate attribute of global citizenship. The 'subjective' processes and events leading to this being so are interrogated later in this chapter.

The main assessment, examples of which are analysed in this inquiry, asks students to conduct ethnographic style interviews with colleagues about their cultural identity. The interviews are qualified as ethnographic in the sense that the cultural identity researched is conceptualised as an emergent feature of dynamic response to local practices, that always produce 'a uniquely situated reality: a complex of events which occurs in a totally unique context' (Blommaert and Jie 2010: 17). As such, this ethnographic approach operates inductively to bring fresh perspectives to the nature of knowledge and its construction (Blommaert and Jie 2010). Also in accordance with ethnographic research practices, students are considered *de facto* as participants already immersed in undergraduate culture and, as such, possessing initiate ethnographer cognisance of the tacit and explicit 'rules' that govern the behaviours and local practices of such a culture. Using the transcribed data from this interview, students analyse and code it for themes and patterns in the qualitative data to produce individual responses to the research paper title: 'Seeing me, seeing you: an investigation into students' cultural identity and intercultural engagement in a 21<sup>st</sup> century higher education context'. Particularly in the wording of the themes derived from their close reading of interview transcripts, students are invited to use qualitative research practices of figurative and creative wordings to capture the fleeting specifics of intercultural meaning-making practices, examples of which abound in course readings and are considered in small seminar groups devoted to preparing for the assignment. Both task brief and assessment criteria (see appendices A and B) are explicitly conceptualised as a pedagogical technology for producing the critical intercultural knowledges and skills of the global citizen – a key

graduate attribute at the university concerned. Here it must be remembered that global citizenship is not a one-size-fits-all western originating identity marker, but fragmented, multiple and heterogeneous practices that incorporate contesting neoliberal and cosmopolitan subjectivities and ideologies.

At the outset of this stage of my analysis, I construed the undergraduate assessment texts, and their arguments and language, as social objects productive of competing, shifting, unstable, ideologically invested representations of intercultural knowledge and practice: and hence also productive of global citizen subjectivities (Henderson 2013a; Clifford & Montgomery 2011). The question that interested me about the texts, was the ways individual students, whom I conceptualised as 'carriers of discourse' (Gee 2005), (re)contextualised competing discourses and ideologies of culture, that tend to represent culture, and knowledge about intercultural communication processes in line with essentialist or non-essentialist readings of culture: categories that Holliday (2011) categorises as 'imagined certainty vs acknowledged complexity' (Holliday 2011:13). The course was explicitly ideologically aligned with the fostering of non-essentialist readings of culture as providing a moral-critical angle on openness to and curiosity about Other, and hence intersubjectively encouraging a broadening of the horizons of the Self. I had partly drawn my inspiration in designing the course thus from the intercultural communication competence educationalist, Mike Byram. As part of his involvement in developing the Common European Framework for teaching and assessing intercultural communication Byram (1997) categorises five epistemological stances towards the knowledge needed to be an ideal type 'intercultural speaker' (2009). The five stances are categorised under the common category of knowledge, or knowing, using the French equivalent of the English verb 'to know': *savoir*. The meaning of this French version of 'knowing' specifically indexes the notion of knowledge as a form of social practice. All five *savoirs* seek to produce valuing of and openness to the other, as a dynamic for acquiring new knowledge. As discussed in a paper in which I outline the course design, aims and its relationship to a trend for universities to commit to producing graduates with the attributes of 'a global citizen' (Henderson 2013b:736), my assumption as a (critical) pedagogue had been that 'the thinking device' (Gee 2005) of course content and activities, and the lived experience of students' ethnographic-style interview research into their cultural identity followed by analysis of key themes, would work to develop a more or less critical and ethical openness to cultural difference, that

resisted normalizing forces of wider society and the education system, that would be revealed via my close reading of the texts they produced using critical discourse analysis.

#### **6.2.4 Falling back into modernist ways**

More specifically, at this iteration of problematising my research object, the specifics of an analytical approach had not yet been pinned down. As explained above, I broadly constructed my object of inquiry as student (re)contextualisation and entextualisation of competing discourses and ideologies of cultural identity in ethnographic-style research into self and other. Having chosen to draw on critical discourse analysis approaches to explore such discourses in student writing, but never having conducted critical discourse analysis before, I turned to well-established authorities in this heterogeneous field to inform the shaping of my own method of inquiry. Subjecting myself to the logics of Western traditions of reasoning and critique I did not passively accept these approaches but worked as a bricoleur to assemble and validate a variation on the theme of pre-established critical discourse analysis practices to analyse the social fabric of student texts. However, retrospectively, I suggest at this stage insecurity led me to become entangled in these forms of a 'technology of justification' (Kincheloe *et al.* 2013:352) and hinder me from taking sufficient 'steps back' to remove myself from the control of existing pre-specified procedures such that I could: (a) notice the aporiae in my position as 'objective' knowing subject in relation to the object of my study - assessment texts produced on a course in intercultural communication written and taught by myself; and (b) recognise the points of contradiction between the ethico-moral stance of the critical discourse analysis approach used to construe my toolkit for empirical analysis at this stage, and my own ethico-moral stance outlined in my theoretical framework. I suggest that one of the main reasons for the latter misapprehension is the ways in which the 'critical' in CDA has itself been naturalised as a given in certain methods, with the procedural moves of their methods and analysis substituting for necessary theoretical justification of the procedural steps. Since not yet critically aware of these two aporia, at this point of my inquiry, for what I considered epistemological closeness to the 'what' and 'how' of my critical textual analysis, I drew on a discourse-historical analytical framework (Reisigl and Wodak 2009; Wodak & Meyer 2009) to develop analytical tools and methodological steps for my small-scale, close reading of student texts. I shall now present a description of key features of their model that I drew on when analysing two assessment texts produced by students in 2012, and how I adapted its highly detailed and explicit approaches for gathering and analysing data to work for my own

research strategy. I shall then make explicit: (a) the confines in my own thinking that emerged having analysed the two texts which potentially made the analysis 'unusable'; (b) the ways I retrospectively critique certain of DHA's principles and practices in relation to their adequacy as a dynamic response to the norms of the modernist paradigm; and (c) how I devised a way to make the data 'usable'.

The DHA framework expands upon Fairclough's top-down model of critical discourse analysis (e.g. Fairclough 1989, 2003 & 2012) which is designed principally to analyse public, scripted texts such as political speeches, brochures, policy documents and similar, and which I critique for its modernist assumptions of a telos of emancipation of the subject in my theoretical framework chapter. Overlap between CDA (critical discourse analysis) and DHA (discourse-historical analysis) includes viewing the text as a final instantiation and temporary stabilisation of the historical conditions of production, consumption and distribution that shape texts, namely those of neoliberal capitalism in the second decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, and also the texts, genres and discourses the text draws upon (Reisigl & Wodak 2009:93). Also, both approaches share critical theory's aim of revealing ideology and power at work. DHA identifies the three related dimensions of its critique thus (Reisigl & Wodak 2009:88):

1. *Text or discourse-immanent critique* aims at discovering inconsistencies, self-contradictions, paradoxes and dilemmas in the text-internal or discourse-internal structures.
2. *Socio-diagnostic critique* is concerned with demystifying the – manifest or latent – persuasive or 'manipulative' character of discursive practices. Here, we make use of our contextual knowledge and draw on social theories as well as other theoretical models from various disciplines to interpret the discursive events.
3. Future-related *prospective critique* seeks to contribute to the improvement of communication (for example, by elaborating guidelines against sexist language use or by reducing 'language barriers' in hospitals, schools and so forth).

As a method DHA was first devised to study the discursive strategies used to construct national identity (Wodak & Meyer 2009), and for my inquiry at this point it was my contention that there were similarities between this and other categories of collective identity and imaginary, more specifically intercultural identity. Given the nature of its originating research object, DHA takes a more flexible, inter-disciplinary problem-based

approach, and also adds an understanding of the historical dimension of discourses. DHA models the historical as the relation between different social fields of action e.g. political advertising, or law-making procedure, genres of text and texts, and investigates how these change synchronically and in relation to socio-political change (Reisigl & Wodak 2009:90-91). Furthermore, DHA includes the investigation of resistance to the power that constitutes discourses, as well as the discursive production of regimes of representation that work to determine 'reality' and subject positions in institutional sites that are the target of Fairclough's CDA approaches. As such, it stresses the heuristic advantages of openness to other theories, methods, and empirical observations that go beyond the purely linguistic dimension of analysis of power relations (Reisigl & Wodak 2009:89), and whose categories and tools can be fleshed out according to the specific issue under investigation (Reisigl & Wodak 2009:95). To this extent, DHA provides theorised principles of investigation (if not methods) premised on inclusion of analysis of modalities of social practice other than the materialities of the text, for example through ethnographic fieldwork and interviews (Reisigl & Wodak 2009:95). It does so on the grounds that combined investigation of the part non-elites play in co-producing knowledge and dominant discourses – in this case of global warming – in their 'reception and recontextualisation in other domains of society', Wodak & Meyer 2009:3) guarantees analytical 'completeness', albeit one that refuses the notion of conclusive and definitive findings given the interpretive dimensions of meanings in context (Wodak *et al.* 2009:2). When theorising this holistic approach to investigation, DHA draws on Habermasian notions of the lifeworld. Simply put here, in his critique of late stage capitalism Habermas seeks to restore a democratic praxis of collective agreement, or lifeworld, that resists the colonization of social systems and people by economic and political instrumental rationality which value only money and power (Krey 2002).

Of particular interest to me at this stage of the recursive process of my qualitative research was the strong emphasis in DHA approaches on analysis of argumentation *topoi* which, since they operate to validate normative and truth claims leading to conclusions, provide insights into the inner contradictions and fallacies that constitute discourses and their subjects (Reisigl & Wodak 2009:89). Such analysis operates at the first dimension of DHA's three-dimensional model and so takes the form of immanent critique of text-internal contradictions, which Forchtner (2011:10) argues are 'more or less independent of the investigator's point of view'. My intention was to use an in-depth argument analysis of the *topoi* and lines of reasoning, by which students mediate and articulate their intercultural

*savoirs*, to explore the ways different discourses of intercultural communication were incorporated and distributed in student research papers, and thus trace the meaning-making processes of student writing in relation to discourses of the graduate attribute of global citizenship and their power and normativity. Having committed to the DHA approach to isolate features of student writing invisibilised by normative institutional readings of assessment work and so obtain empirical 'objects' with which to enlighten theory and social science practices, I grounded my procedure in the rhetorical part of its apparatus which outlines the eight steps that can be executed in its holistic research approach. As detailed in (Reisigl & Wodak 2009:96) these are:

1. Activation and consultation of previous theoretical knowledge
2. Systematic collection of data and context information
3. Selection and preparation of data for specific analyses
4. Specification of the research question and formulation of assumptions
5. Qualitative pilot analysis
6. Detailed case studies
7. Formulation of critique
8. Application of the detailed analytical results

As Reisigl and Wodak stress (2009:96), this ideal-type list is intended for large-scale interdisciplinary projects with significant funding and resources. However, it can also serve as a point of reference when conducting smaller scale projects such as a PhD thesis. I shall now briefly elucidate upon the specifics of my making sense of some of these steps, each of which conditions the other, as I strove to make the machinery of my adopted/adapted methodology for critique work, through the interrelated acts of reading, thinking and writing in the contested spaces of knowledge's historical present.

The narrowing down of my domain of inquiry and the establishment of theoretical and conceptual points of reference considered commensurable with the object of my investigation was already fairly well resolved. However, the slow clarification of the aspects of the problem of interculturality in student writing that I wished to foreground, and the procedures by which I intended to bring to light their productive tactics as empirical 'units' had yet to be determined through trialling and testing in a 'qualitative pilot analysis'. Here, though Reisigl and Wodak (2009:100) restrict themselves to one single text when testing

first assumptions, as an initiate to this approach, I was wary of testing my assumptions, as well as perhaps further specifying them, on the basis of one student assignment only. I therefore analysed two texts to provide a point of comparison between the complex ways the structuring forces of power constrain ways of knowing the intercultural in student assessment texts. One text had a distinction grade, the other an upper second. Though my research intention was to include texts from all levels in my final analysis, my assumption for the pilot study was that higher quality student work, and hence work closer to the normative ideal, might give a clearer first indication of the discursive fields of operation that produce the intercultural in student arguments, via the productive tensions between the intercultural *spoken* subject and Intercultural *speaking* subject.

In argumentation theory (Reisigl & Wodak 2011:74-75), the overview function of the main premise is developed and underpinned by *topoi*, those parts of argumentation that explicitly or implicitly establish a relationship between evidence and the claim, and as such work as signposts guiding the reader to the conclusion. In western traditions, such procedures of linear logic are what legitimate claims to valid knowledge in most academic genres and contexts (e.g. Turner 2011; Andrews 2010). Reisigl and Wodak (2001:45) stipulate four strategies that need to be identified in argumentation schemes to reveal ideological systems and representations. Since they are argument internal these strategies are distinct but not discrete. These are:

1. *Referential/nomination strategies* used to construe and represent wider social contexts;
2. *Predicational strategies* used to give more or less positive characteristics to social actors;
3. *Perspectivation* the way speakers express their involvement in, for example, the discursive field of interculturality, and position their point of view in its reporting
4. *Intensification and mitigation strategies* that work to intensify or mitigate the epistemic status of propositions.

In addition to analysing argumentation strategies to trace emergent ethico-political horizons of the intercultural in student assessment writing, I also identified features of interdiscursivity and considered what was backgrounded, silenced and left out of the argument, as well as what was included.

At this leg of my complex journey to finding a methodological research practice and rhetoric congruent with Foucault and Derrida's systemic notion of power/knowledge, and helped by the comments of my supervisor, I identified an underlying problem with the validity of my data analysis. The problem was that I had failed to see, despite my contingent analyses of the strategic field of power relations (Foucault 1998) and the intelligibility of the trace of writing within this grid (Derrida 1998), actively used to problematise the productive nature of student writing and the absence of the presence of the author in such writing, as well as my subjectivity as a critical reader of such writing, that I had produced contradictions in my forging of a theoretical-methodological framework. To all extents and purposes, this initially appeared to make the data analysis 'unusable'. However, in this articulation of a framework for teaching students to think other-wise whose reproduction was to be analysed in student writing output produced for the course, I was undermining my own conjectures about the nature of the knowing subject, outlined in my theoretical framework, through insufficient critique of my pedagogical and research methods.

In addition, I identified three main ways in which I had insufficiently theorised my own teaching and learning practices, and hence been blind to aspects of my own positionality. First, the course and teaching sought to approve and normalise a particular 'critical' reading of cultural identity, global citizenship and intercultural communication, and in doing so to privilege my world view deemed 'authoritative' by the institution. Second, my implicit assumption was that the course content and teaching could promote actual change in academic intercultural communication practices and also empower students in their efforts to 'resist and rewrite' (Giroux 2005:72) dominant ideologies of self and other. Third, to some extent, I had tacitly construed the students as credulous consumers of dominant perspectives whom I could 'emancipate' through my critical teaching. As these three missing elements of critique revealed, as a critical pedagogue, I had not yet amalgamated a critical awareness of my own historical and institutional subject position within what Radhakrishnam (1996:114) calls its 'affirmative agenda' and hence had authorised my position as a commonsense given, outside the cut and thrust of discursive subjectivity.

Before explaining how I deployed my analysis of the historical and material reality of student writing towards an alternative research aim to the initial one of identifying more or less essentialist discourses of cultural identity and intercultural communication intended to

elucidate the effectiveness of global citizenship teaching and learning practices, I first briefly elaborate upon the triggers for this dead end in my data analysis. I then critique the field of CDA/DHA for construing the divide between epistemology and political action as a given, and for its partial disaggregation of theory from methods and researcher subjectivity. Both these CDA/DHA practices work to perpetuate the modernist myth of nonsubjugated realities and knowledges, and hence the notion of possible emancipation of the individual, and tend to function at 'a "panoptic" remove from [their] object of criticism' (Radhakrishnam 1996:33).

When tracing the triggers that led me to produce this disjunct between theory and methodology, I rehearse once again arguments about the profound pull of official discourses of knowledge, with their strong investment in the certain and stable, which hold so much of 'the power of the script' in their hands (Spivak 1993:53), and as such underpin university practices and identities. As omnipresent, tacit codes of conduct, these prompt the producer/reader of knowledge to revert to implicit assumptions of an ontologically firm ground under their feet, and so separate out theory from methodology and subject, whereas both are always explicitly entangled (Spivak 1993:53) in the historical present. As an emergent poststructuralist researcher, relatively unfamiliar with the methodological consequences of a poststructuralist epistemology, and absorbed in externally and internally imposed pressures of 'getting the thesis written', I had faltered in my critique and opted for the authoritative orderly, step-by-step reassurance of Wodak and Reisigl's Discourse-Historical Approach (2009) for analysing social discursive processes and ideology in texts, in which the *telos* of procedural steps stands in for steps which are epistemologically defined and specified. From now on, I needed to remain vigilant that I did not 'reconcile ruptures and discontinuities ... in the name of a theoretical and systematic unity' (Radhakrishnam 1996:32). There were also other forces muddling my theory-practice trajectory (not *telos*) in this inquiry, produced by a number of enabling constraints including: my embodied disciplinary entanglement in the productive tactics of CDA; forces and antagonisms of everyday wider world and university discourses producing naturalised assumptions about the singular identities of staff and students by which I and they become intelligible; a subjectivity deeply anchored in pragmatic, humanist, universalist traditions producing a centredness only partially unsettled by a novice's incomplete/closed reading of Foucault-Derrida; and a personal and professional investment in what Spivak defines as 'the aggregative apparatus of Euro-American university education' (1993:53). These 'detained

[me] from taking full measure' (Foucault 1977:119) of the shifting ground under my knowledge-producing feet, and also of my active imbrication in the flexible, hierarchical power lines of institutional distribution of knowledge which determine a tidier production of 'the critical' than the dynamically-dissolving complexity of its parts.

Having quickly delineated the commonsensical views of knowledge that co-opted my poststructuralist reasoning processes, even as I believed I was resisting them, I now highlight some of the contradictions in DHA's conceptualisation of power and language that tend to align with modernist perspectives on language. Thus, whilst like other CDA frameworks (of which there are many) that emerge largely from the work of 'post' authors such as Foucault and Derrida, as can be seen in their emphasis on the concept of power whose workings in language and discourse they aim to reveal (Ramirez 2013), their critique of text is ultimately steered by a political subjectivity (O'Halloran 2014:781) and critical, methodological practices which separate out epistemology and political action. Furthermore, DHA and CDA approaches to textual analysis broadly assume the givenness of the discourses and ideologies expressed in language and map it on to a real world 'out there' (St. Pierre 2013:651), whose workings as normalising regimes of truth it presupposes can be brought to light through empirical analysis. Such an ontology which 'maintains a representational logic' (St. Pierre 2013:*ibid*) and assumes a givenness tends to insert the centred humanist subject into the position of 'researcher', thus leaving the work of critical interrogation of representation incomplete. A few citations from Reisigl and Wodak (1998) flesh out such assumptions of a position outside ideology, where the individual has agency to resist the asymmetric relationship between social actors who have different social positions:

- (1) Ideology is seen as an '(often) one-sided perspective or world view ... used to maintain unequal power relations through discourse', *and* 'Texts are often sites of social struggle in that they manifest traces of differing ideological fights for dominance and hegemony' (Reisigl & Wodak 2009:89);
- (2) By deciphering the hegemonic practices of different discourses we can 'fight dominance' (Reisigl & Wodak 2009:88);
- (3) 'as an analytical construct, a 'discourse' always depends on the discourse analyst's perspective' (Reisigl & Wodak 2009:89)

Thus, whilst the critical discourse theories and methodologies deployed in my initial analysis of student texts draw on Foucaultian notions of orders of discourse to develop analytical frameworks that problematise normative ways of talking and acting associated with institutional sites and hegemonic uses of power that operate (e.g. Fairclough 2003; Fairclough & Fairclough 2012; Wodak *et al.* 2009), there is a tendency to briefly acknowledge their own positionality, and then carry on with business as usual. Thus, the prevalent rhetorical staging of researcher subjectivity in critical discourse analysis writing tends either explicitly or tacitly to bracket out his/her/their central part in the process of meaning construction. Explicit bracketing out takes various forms in current literature. For example: (a) a brief, ritualistic, autobiographical identity account in the opening to the methodology that is acknowledged as influencing the 'lenses' through which knowledge is evaluated and produced e.g. *'I am a white woman in her late 30s who is a teacher, who formerly identified as heterosexual and now identifies as lesbian'* (Evans 2013:8); or (b) a retrospective reflection upon positionality e.g. *'By acknowledging positionality researchers substantiate that knowledge is rigorous and the research becomes more rigorous (Longhurst 2009). I conclude that I upheld a 'closeted' positionality throughout the research'* (Keppel 2014:372); or (c), as an acknowledgement not then integrated in the rhetoric of research process and analysis e.g. as referenced earlier, *'as an analytical construct, a 'discourse' always depends on the discourse analyst's perspective'* (Reisigl & Wodak 2009:89).

Through such forms and structures, these approaches articulate partial productions of discourses of empirical transparency in which the writing subject has 'control over what is observed and explained' (Turner 2011:84) rather than being 'as much written as writing' (Spivak 1993:34). Tacit bracketing out of the researcher entanglement within discourses operating with the same strategics to those that constitute the object of their analyses is normative within the discipline, even more so in new sub-disciplines of CDA such as corpora analysis. Following O'Regan (2006), I argue such takes on the 'critical' are premised on a selective theorisation of resources of analysis and resources of 'hope' that limit the objects of knowledge to which CDA can be applied. Also relevant to my critique of CDA/DHA claims to the adjective 'critical' are Spivak's deconstruction of 'Marxist' presuppositions which read Foucault-Derridean power/knowledge productivity through 'notions of political activism [that] are deeply rooted in the bourgeois revolution' (Spivak 1993:45), and in doing so splice liberal humanist notions of the agency of the subject, and his/her/their power to bring about social justice and 'freedom' into epistemological and ontological inscriptions of 'a

*pouvoir/savoir* deeply marked by the strategy techniques of management (small m)' (Spivak 1993:*ibid*). There is thus a radical contradiction in reading Foucault-Derrida as 'an adequate blueprint for social justice' (Spivak 1993:25), since it presupposes an agency and autonomy of the researching subject who achieves and stabilises regularities in their critique over and above the procedures by which the subjectivities of the subject are constituted, and furthermore assumes an 'outside' to the discourses that produce 'us'.

### **6.3 Revalidating and regrounding critical textual analysis on non-foundational subjectivities**

Having insufficiently challenged the traditions and normative operations of authority present in the specifics of my application of DHA approaches in a pilot study analysis of two student intercultural communication assessment texts, such that I had in part reproduced the hegemonic structures of authority within the usual projects of learning outcomes, university strategies, and historically and politically interested 'truths', I needed to find a new position to speak from when re-reading my interpretation and analysis of the positivities of subjugated knowledges present in the two texts. My aim was to find a position that made visible the mobility and elusiveness of the teaching and learning subject of critical pedagogy within the systematising traditions and practices of both institutionalised higher education and critical discourse analysis. A position for reading that saw empirical findings as fleeting glances of subjugated knowledges at the moment of their insurgence in the constitutive 'event' of writing, which organises the waxing and waning ground of 'the present' and the decentred subject of critical pedagogy, who seems condemned to 'pure heteronomy' (Foucault 1997:42) within the mechanisms of subjugation which simultaneously produce and ruin the notion of emancipation at the heart of critical pedagogy. Essential to this position was an understanding that in disinterring these local subjugated knowledges from the historical present of their setting, I was performing an act of epistemological attack by positioning myself as the one who could 'speak on behalf of the authentic location of these knowledges' (Radhakrishnam 1996:32). Moreover, like the never completely achieved student subjects whose texts were the object of my criticism, I had no position outside the main scripts of knowledge from which to avoid complicity with dominant structures. I therefore positioned myself as subject alongside the coterminous local conformities and criticisms of student subjects that constitute the materiality of their writing, as I sought to identify the tactics of power that make almost unthinkable possibilities for resistance to these structures other than in our multiplicity of dynamic responses to (un)certainty. These

responses include space for the responsibility of ethics and critique and, as such, can work to keep openness to Other than the dogmatic in play.

The rich diversity and mobility of these dynamic responses to the normative canon, and the insights they provide into the subjugated knowledges made obscure by Western grids of rational intelligibility and coherence are explored in the next chapter of this thesis, *The multiple and dispersed subjectivities of the undergraduate author*. They provide a clear denaturalisation of the notion of the singular, centred subject, and in their actualisation as dynamic contingent historicities that constitute the social practices of academic rhetoric reveal examples of the student as simultaneously 'speaking' and 'spoken' subject.

#### **6.4 Peering 2**

The intention of the second 'peering' emerged from the *trouvailles* of the first critical reading of two student research papers conducted for *Peering 1*. NB I use the French term *trouvailles* here in order both to circumvent the Modernist connotations of 'findings' that imply practices of scientific methodological 'rigor' and validity, and to convey a picture of the nature of interpretation and analysis more faithful to poststructuralist epistemology and ontology. Commonly attributed to Roland Barthes, the term highlights the 'lucky find' nature and value of such discoveries within the contradictory, backward and forward de(con)structions and (dis)placements of knowledge productions.

These *trouvailles*, which are unearthed from the always already present in the rhetorical cadences of student knowledge production, include micropractices of figurative figurings out of abstract concepts, or *poetics*, a making or bringing into being of something new (Derrida 1988). As such, they provide examples of uncertain moments in the event of writing that work as operative mechanisms of ethics of openness to Other (Derrida 1988). I argue that these constitute vital, minor possibilities for being critical in institutional practices of teaching, evaluating, and reading student writing, which are generally today far from congruent with contemporary problematisations of the intersection between the social and language, and theoretical understandings of the ephemeral and unstable nature of the manufactured meaning of all social science knowledge objects. The more dominant discourse of 'the critical' in student writing is one premised on Cartesian assumptions of a rhetorical subject, with the potential to function as a clear, autonomous, rational thinker, who has 'epistemic control over what is observed and explained' (Turner 2011:84). Indeed, it

was the effect of the selfsame, in-built, invisible power wielded by this ‘deeply cognitively and culturally embedded’ notion (Turner 2011:84) that produced the initial ‘wrong’ turns in my own doctoral thesis process and rhetoricity.

Thus, these *trouvailles* produced an additional research object to the first one of the deconstructed student subject. I qualify and theorise this object as ‘the ethical capacity for criticality and creativity in the student subject of academic writing’. To extend the range of examples of this capacity, which I suggest can serve as heuristics in legitimating new authoritative practices in student writing, I conducted close reading of further student research papers, from across grade levels. In this reading however, in contrast to the first, my reader/re-searcher gaze was directed specifically towards use of metaphor, word choices, and figurative turns of phrase that form part of the production of the heterogenous, shifting complexity of academic disciplinary knowledges. A first practical and principled driver in my re-reading of other student research papers to identify examples of poietics was the understanding that they correspond to those two adjectives almost universally found in descriptors of ‘excellence’ in UK undergraduate feedback sheets, namely ‘creative’ and ‘innovative’, and yet which are so rarely deconstructed in the ‘how to’ articulations of university student writing ‘support’ materials and resources. Such lack of deconstruction, or awareness of this limitation to our own systems of thought, leaves this ethical force of university knowledge production systems a silenced tacit assumption, engraved on marksheets like a hollow marker of what was, is, or could be, drowned out by the super wattage of rationalist rhetoric and neoliberal background noise and instrumentalism of production. Yet, in today’s university world of hegemonic rationalism, if made explicit, these signs might function as an ‘open sesame’ ticket to travel, that could inspire and impel ‘autonomy’ and inventiveness in student readings and writings of academic knowledge. Discussion and analysis of these, particularly in relation to their usefulness for (a) our understandings of the possibilities of the ‘critical’ in relation to pedagogy, and (b) the teaching and assessing of student academic writing more generally, are given in Chapter 8.

## **6.5 Conclusion**

One of the central issues of a research methodology is clarification of the alignment between theory and data and data analysis. In the case of post-qualitative approaches we need to be alert to anomalies between the theoretical preferences which actively define us and what we hold to be the criticality of our praxis from the outset. As shown in this chapter,

this is not always a clear-cut procedure, and we can fall into the trap of letting normativity predefine us and our object of research, rather than us predefining normativity and our research object. However, with reflexivity as a post data analysis perceptual tool, we can re-inscribe our work within our chosen epistemological sensitivity at any point in the context of research. Indeed, with post-qualitative approaches that see theorising our activities as a constant throughout the research process, we can make such 'error' a constitutive part of the project of knowledge that interrogates and keeps in check theoretical universality as well as prompting more valid ways of knowing, and also generating more adequately defined objects of analysis. Thus, to avoid methodological limitations which leave no space for describing the how research subjects become individualised in particular local and extra-local contexts, some deliberate archaeological and genealogical awareness of the forces and texts that shape us and our research objects can perform a vital role.

Having theorised the iterative praxis leading to (re)identification of the object of analysis in my reading of data, in the next chapter I present my analysis of the ways the singular subject of student writing is dissolved, dispersed and variegated in the force fields of local, assessment text knowledge production.

## Chapter 7      The multiple and dispersed subjectivities of the undergraduate author – Peering 1

### 7.1      Introduction

In this chapter, I move from theorising the (im)possibility of critical pedagogical and student writing practices in the hegemonic institutional spaces of higher education, and conceptualising the student subject of academic literacies as a productive vitality that produces diversity and mobility through an ‘immanence of doing’ (Lather 2013), to empirical examination of micropractices of noncoincidental resistance and conformity in two student research paper assessment texts, produced for my undergraduate course in intercultural communication. These elucidate the heterogeneous dynamic responses of the always-already historically contingent subject to the constraints, aporiae and discontinuities of disciplinary knowledge and power, and as such provide bottom-up instances of ways discourses are kept in play. As indicated in the previous chapter, *Methodologies, and Methodological Subjectivities*, the understanding of the critical and critique that informed my initial interpretation of these texts ignored discontinuities between theory, methodology and pedagogical praxis which rendered it invalid. However, having now re-theorised this understanding in preceding chapters, this chapter re-uses the rich, thick descriptions of dynamic responses to the workings of power in everyday student writing practices yielded from a Discourse Historical Analysis (DHA) analysis (Reisigl & Wodak 2009). Before validating this fresh use of the findings, by formalising of different assumptions and goals, I provide a brief reminder of the research context.

### 7.2.      Brief reminder of the research context

The first findings for this research inquiry into the nature of the critical in the always already present literacy resources of student authors were unearthed in research papers written for an undergraduate course in intercultural communication in a UK university, with the task brief specifying the title: ‘Seeing me, seeing you: an investigation into students’ cultural identity and intercultural engagement in a twenty-first century higher education context’. The course was taught by myself; both a discipline specialist and an academic literacy specialist. The module is embedded within a joint applied linguistics and media and cultural studies programme where critique of praxis and discourse is axiomatic. It aims to provide students with an experiential and theoretical understanding of the social, cultural, historical and linguistic forces that inflect our dialogic and interpretive understanding of self and

other. Students come from diverse backgrounds and hence have varying levels of familiarity with ethnography as a tool of knowledge production, ways of writing up ethnographic style research, and the genre of a research paper that incorporates findings from an interview transcript. To address such learning challenges the course content is explicitly linked to the assignment task at every session, a clear framework for the research paper is provided, and weekly classroom discussions invite questions about what further information is needed to be able to actively construct their response to the assessment brief, and via this personal insights into the everyday practices of intercultural communication that may help them to realize the Freirean vision of writing/righting the wor(l)d. Moreover, particularly in their wording of the themes derived from a close reading of interview transcripts, it is suggested students use qualitative research literacy practices of figurative and creative wordings to capture the elusive specifics of intercultural meaning-making practices, examples of which are present both in course readings and considered in small seminar groups. Whilst many resist this, the suggestion is there. To some extent then, the praxis of *poietics* and figurative (re)configuring in the variable margins of knowledge, that I have argued is a critical and ethical force in university writing practices, is explicitly normative in such disciplinary literacy practices.

### **7.3. Formalising assumptions and goals for this second use of an initial data analysis**

Given that the content, pedagogy and assessment of the course for which the work was written actively seeks to normalise and authorise critical and creative approaches to knowledge in the fields of intercultural communication and ethnography, notions of culture and cultural identity as fluid, dynamic phenomena, and ethical stances of openness to Other, form a central part of the immediate context from which the content of the text arises. Indeed, they are explicitly and implicitly validated in the marksheet (see appendix B.), discussed with students in class, which I conceptualised as a ‘localised, mobile, micro panopticon’ in Chapter 5. For example, the criterion ‘Discussion and Analysis’ includes the following distinction grade descriptor, *Comprehensive revisiting and critical discussion about the nature of intercultural identity, showing awareness of the emergent and shifting nature of such identities and of the inherent bias of the researcher*, and the criterion ‘Intercultural “savoirs” and the Ethnographic Approach’ includes the distinction grade descriptor, *Highly reflexive and reflective approach to the interview process and analysis of findings*. Hence, by making such critical ethnographic stances to cultural identity and academic ‘truth’ an explicit requirement of the assignment, spelled out in the marksheet, a double relation to critique is

enacted. On the one hand, the marksheet content is necessary to assure such a take on the critical is normatively valid within the governance structure of the university, which makes the task of speaking critically from the outside, or *hors texte*, impossible. On the other hand, such uses of language interpellate (Althusser 1995) the undergraduate subject in the material, ideological field of critical literacy, inviting them to use their freedom to self-govern (Foucault 1984) in such a way as to produce controlled disturbance of hegemonic, ahistorical genres of reason from within a discipline judged useful to the institution of the academy. Such double coding of practices of critique, where the hegemonic and counter-hegemonic mutually empower each other, is a characteristic of the discursive fields of knowledge production: a characteristic described in the analyses in this chapter.

This kind of gridding of the system that ensures a place can be found for all fringe elements in order to safeguard its boundaries, leads logically to the second redefining of the aims of my DHA. Whilst the intention of the first analysis was to identify ways students construed culture and cultural identity according to more or less essentialist and/or non-essentialist perspectives (Holliday 2011), with the understanding that use of the former constituted evidence of the 'ethos of the undergraduate global citizen', the objective of this second reading of the analysis is to make visible the liminal borderlands of knowledge production in student writing, otherwise disguised or silenced by the 'normal'/modern/bureaucratic institutional reading gaze which buries the text's historical contents. More specifically, it is suggested that these textured insights into the multiple (re)contextualisations and (en)textualisations of competing discourses and ideologies (re)produced in the social practices and products of student writing, evidence the dispersed, multiple subjectivities of the subject of academic literacy that ceaselessly produce displacement, and hence belie the usefulness of transformative projects of the 'critical' in pedagogy and student writing, which still widely assume the duality of both freedom and constraint and the subject and power. Moreover, these subjugated knowledges recovered from bureaucratic grids of coherence (Foucault 1980b:81-82), and the expert reader's gaze, provide provisional examples of diverse, mobile micro-responses to (un)certainty that include spaces for an ethical critique of the present. In this thesis, I argue such responses represent previously 'unknown' critical practices in student writing that are commensurate with theory.

Given the initial insufficient theorisation of my first critical reading of two student research papers, which I reflexively identify in the previous chapter, *Methodologies, and*

*Methodological Subjectivities*, I precede the analysis section that follows by briefly identifying the main assumptions that made my approach incommensurate with my poststructuralist theoretical framework. Then, to subvert and correct their entextualisation in the analysis, I provide a number of deconstructive guidelines to serve as reading lenses.

The main modernist axioms of 'truth' that structured my thinking and writing at the outset of my research and put at stake the poststructural theoretical stance which now underpins this thesis, I identify as assumptions of:

- i. singular, centred subject positions extraneous to the text, both with regards to the students as assignment producers, and myself as objective analyst in invisible 'sovereign' position as a knowledge producer;
- ii. binary counter-hegemonic and hegemonic stances towards interculturality, the former of which I inferred constituted discrete, empirical 'evidence' of the ethos of 'critical global citizenship';
- iii. a causal pathway between a critically-oriented pedagogy and student learning, whose effects could be objectively traced and analysed in student written assessment.

To read adversarially the rhetoricization of these logics, I ask the reader to bear in mind the following deconstructive guidelines:

- Since the course content, and teaching and learning operate as a prescriptive, local set of disciplinary procedures intended to ensure normative, measurable outcomes of individual production, the 'counter' in the analytical category of 'counter-hegemonic' does not suggest the articulation of a position outside the hegemonic from which to produce radical change, but a variant on the hegemonic inscribed within normative institutional spheres of knowledge production. Of interest in my analysis of the two students' discursive renderings of knowledge are the ways the tension between the two logics of academic knowledge production, the 'hegemonic' and the 'counter-hegemonic', is resolved, and which logic tends to play a dominant role in shaping content and rhetoric.

- The points at which I refer to one of the student authors as 'she', 'student A or D', or other, need to be understood not as references to a biographical individual, but to an agency that produces the fragments, discontinuities and aporiae whose productive tensions and surplus of meanings constitute institutional orders of knowledge.
- All organisations of discursive space that suggest an omnipresent, transcendent voice of interpretive authority, should not be understood as a desire to avoid or deny the epistemological and ontological disjunctions that organise knowledge. Rather, they represent a required conformity to the imperatives of scientific rhetoric, which refer little to the historical present in discourses whilst purporting to represent an 'objective' reality.
- Whilst the initial analysis described in the previous chapter was conducted using some of the analytical categories of argumentation theory deployed within DHA, namely referential/nomination strategies, predicational strategies/ perspectivation, and intensification and mitigation strategies, the categories are not used, as initially intended, with the sole aim of isolating out or objectifying different discursive and argumentation strategies for construing cultural identity and interculturality. Instead, they are used retrospectively as analytical approaches that reveal the multiple and dispersed subjectivities of the student author. However, the qualitative themes attached to these analytical categories, as well as the analytical concepts I added during the initial DHA analysis (namely interdiscursivity, the unsaid, and ventriloquation and addressivity), which seek to encapsulate the ways tensions are resolved between the different hegemonic interpellations of the objective, rationalist voice, and the subjective interpretive voice, elude the presupposed certainty embodied in most of the DHA analytical categories, and hence constitute a valid part of this second engagement with the data.

With these caveats in mind, and with an awareness of the power relations present in my own writing too, the theoretical and methodological task of this chapter is not to develop generalizable findings that subordinate complexity (Bowman 2014), but to make visible some of the mobilisations of subjugated knowledges in disciplinary discourse at the moment of their emergence in student writing. As such, this Take II rereading of knowledge from within its governance by institutional and historical norms and practices, that work to frame

knowledge in stable, measurable units, is deconstructively interpretive and descriptive. By identifying how student subjectivities simultaneously resist and conform to wider discursive norms of academic writing, as well as the more local, (counter) hegemonic norms stipulated by the assignment brief, an implicit and explicit interrogation and shattering of normative readings of student writing is produced, that reveals the student subject of academic rhetoric as simultaneously a 'speaking' and 'spoken' subject (Pennycook 1996).

In my account of choices taken as to which student texts to include in my first critical analysis discussed in the preceding chapter, I rationalised opting for two higher graded texts as being more analytically useful for my first purposes of identifying the competing ways students produced the intercultural, given the likelihood they were closer to the normative ideal prescribed in the assignment brief and marksheet (see appendices A. and B.). Thus, this chapter begins with an analysis of the student with an A grade, then moves to the analysis of the student with a B+ grade. Furthermore, having two texts rather than one ensures further validity for the substance of my critique that questions the dissociation of relations of power from the conditioned performances of student knowledge production and assessment. Though systematic comparison of the two discrete examples of power's productivity is not the formal focus of this alternative analysis to the first, which reads the same analysis differently, the reader will note the tendency for Student A to be more critical and resistant in the writing, and Student B to be more conventional. Given the original length of the two analyses, only one of the sections in the findings and discussion section of each paper is considered. It then (a) summarises and compares the multiple and dispersed subjectivities manifested in the two research papers in a table listing the main argumentative and rhetorical discursive strategies of both authors, and (b) briefly compares the knowledge performances of the two making reference to their respective grades. In keeping with the focus of this second use of the analysis, my attention will not be on pulling the parts together into a whole according to precepts of Discourse Historical Analysis. Rather, my concluding attention will be on explaining the non-unitary findings in relation to theories of hegemonic production discussed in Chapter 3, and poststructuralist understandings of critical pedagogy examined in Chapter 4. I then use the encounters of theory and examples of textual praxis to propose suggestive avenues for teaching the critical in writing as improvised, spontaneous creativity from within the system.

Prior to the analysis I provide a brief glossary of the analytical categories used.

- a) *Referential/nomination strategies* used to construe and represent wider social contexts.
- b) *Predicational strategies* used to give more or less positive characteristics to social actors.
- c) *Perspectivation* the way speakers express their involvement in, for example, the discursive field of interculturality, and position their point of view in its reporting.
- d) *Intensification and mitigation strategies* that work to intensify or mitigate the epistemic status of propositions.
- e) *Interdiscursivity* that serves to connect discourse fragments, styles, and voices in words in text to other texts and others' words.
- f) *The Unsaid*. The overall meaning, coherence and discourse position of a text/discourse is defined as much by what is excluded as what is included. Absences can serve as cues to the reader (Gee 2012:116) of what the author considers the context they are communicating in to be.
- g) *Ventriloquation and Addressivity* is language use that takes into account the 'Other' for whose response the text is created.

There are two final provisos to this analysis. First, I should point out that in the year these texts were produced the assignment brief still qualified the writing task as an 'essay', not 'a research paper'. This explains the students' use of the former term in their work. Second, I should warn the reader that in its concern to closely analyse the multiple, heterogeneous subjectivities that constitute the respective stagings of resistance and production in two research papers, this chapter has taken a form akin to that of a long symphony. As a gesture towards traditional practice at the performance of a symphony, there is an intermezzo of a few blank, silent pages to provide the reader with a brief break.

#### 7.4 Argumentative Analysis of research paper of Student A

<b>Title</b>	<b>Seeing me, seeing you. The search for self and a sense of belonging.</b>
--------------	---

##### **STUDENT A'S INTRODUCTION TO HER RESEARCH PAPER**

1	The world is increasingly becoming more globalized, the relationship between cultures, economies and
2	technologies are rapidly intertwining (Doyle & Smith, 2002). The effects of globalization are not only
3	experienced in a worldly perspective, even on a local level the consequences are noticeable. Universities
4	see an influx of international students, the UK experienced an increase of 49% in international students
5	between 2000 and 2006 (BBC, 2009) of which a rising number came from outside the European Union.
6	This essay is focused on the way culture influences one's personality and the quest for belonging within a
7	culture. To get a clear perspective on this specific topic, this essay will look into different theories,

8	amongst these theories are Schwartz's cultural value types, Pliney's acculturation theory and finally
9	Spencer-Oatey's rapport management. Firstly the method of research is explained to get a better
10	understanding of the limitations within the research and the manner the information was gathered and
11	analyzed. Furthermore, the essay will look into the conducted interviews and the theories that can be
12	linked to the findings. Finally the essay will conclude with a recap and a definite statement.

#### 7.4.1 Referential strategies – the effects of globalisation and new quests for belonging

In student A's research paper introduction which, according to the assignment brief scaffolding of the different sections of the research paper, should 'frame the issues arising from the everyday diversity and plurality in HE, in today's globalized world', the following *topoi* are identified: *topos of globalisation as an engine of change, topos of the university as site of globalisation, topos of culture as a place of belonging and personality development.*

In relation to the *topos of globalisation as an engine of change*, of interest in the first sentence is the effect produced by sentence level differentiation between (a) 'the world' and (b) globalization as a process. Rather than subsuming 'the world' into the irresistible and hegemonic processes of the nominalised form of 'globalisation', the student places 'the world' in the main topic position at the beginning of the sentence. This aspect of sentence-level patterning of meaning serves four functions. First, it uses the syntactic resources of the sentence to represent 'the world' as a social actor that is changing in certain ways. Second, it figures the world as the wider context in which changing relations between cultures, economies and technologies are occurring. Third, by representing the world as positioned in a two-way relationship with the processes of globalisation, it ties representation of the world to a logic consistent with the openness to change and difference that is fundamental to the epistemological tenets of interculturality. Lastly, it validates the student's identity as an intercultural speaker through use of content and function words (Gee 2005) which articulate certain ways of thinking and knowing, and through reference to authoritative others within the field of academic knowledge.

The sentence (lines 3/4) recontextualising the *topos of the university as site of globalisation* has the pluralised '*Universities*' in theme position. As a plural subject in opening position it connotes a general or universal truth about the information that follows, though this is more concretely contextualised in the subject of the clause forming the second half of this sentence which is '*the UK*'. In rheme position the use of the liquid metaphor 'an influx' to describe the object of the main clause of this sentence, '*international students*', portrays the experience of the shores of one culture being no longer impenetrable to infiltration by unfamiliar meanings and 'international student' identities. Here the metaphor serves to

legitimate the opening of borders to new and different identities. The dynamic force of the metaphor 'influx' is built upon in a two-step move in the latter half of the sentence which first adds the information that '*the UK experienced an increase of 49% in international students*' and then specifies '*a rising number came from outside the European Union*'. This crescendo of different modalities of the influx of the international in the UK links textually with anti-immigration nationalist and racist discourses which headline outrage at 'the tides of immigrants flooding 'our' land'. However, there is no indication of authorial intent to rearticulate such discourses, instead there is a perhaps unwitting use of the rhetorical rule of three to draw reader attention to the statement being made. Of semantic interest in the final dependent clause is the clarification that some of the influx of international students are from '*outside the European Union*'. This suggests a graduation schema of degrees of otherness within the schema of 'international students'. The use of metaphor here indicates a small shift between different styles of meaning making; from the purely objective to the creative.

The *topos of culture as a place of belonging and personality development* is rearticulated from a wider context of knowledge in the sentence (lines 6/7) summarising the research paper focus. This focus has two interrelated strands. The first strand is worded '*the way culture influences one's personality*' (line 6). This statement indexes both popular and academic conceptualisations of culture as an agentive force and set of contexts that shape individual '*personality*'. Semantically and logically, there is a tension implicit in the idea that the distinctive aspects of the self that qualify as '*personality*' can be shaped by a normative force and set of contexts such as culture. However, at the surface level of the text this reads as a fairly commonsense causality. Linked to the first strand by the conjunction 'and', the second strand is worded '*the quest for belonging within a culture*' (lines 6/7). The use of the word '*quest*', rather than its more neutral everyday equivalent 'search', introduces into the *topos* an imaginary of noble struggle originating in texts of medieval romance, as well as connoting a struggle to uncover the truth. This use of the term 'quest' elaborates what Barthes terms 'a second-order semiological system' (1972:129) which includes values and emotions relating to the denotative function of the word. Its location in a research paper on the higher education context serves to insert a cultural meaning that differs from the dominant register of neutral objectivity and balanced reasoning traditionally inscribed in the genre. The object of the '*quest*' is '*belonging*'. One way of deciphering the connotation the word 'belonging' brings into the text is as the feeling of 'home' and 'recognition within a

group'. Furthermore, this writing of more domestic and felt meanings into predominantly objective systems of academic meaning making constitutes an example of resistance to macro-levels of academic writing governance at the level of a very local textual micro-practice.

Referential strategies in Student A's introduction construe an imaginary of globalisation as a dynamic force causing relocation of people from closer or more distant other countries in new local UK contexts, such as that of higher education. Depending on the ways the culture in which these people originate shapes their 'personality' they differently resolve a '*quest for belonging*'. When formulating her *topoi* within the genre conventions of an academic essay introduction that is very professionally structured, Student A introduces textual elements which 'speak back' to academic norms of language use as a neutral, objective medium of reasoning and makes them legible in a different way: a way that incorporates the desires, emotions and struggles of the university's subjects.

#### **7.4.2 Predicational strategies and perspectivisation – it's an institutional world**

Apart from two references to the social actor of '*international students*', all other social actors are institutions (*Universities, the UK, the European Union*) and abstract nouns (*globalization* and its cognate *globalization*) or more material and concrete nouns (*The world* and its cognate *worldly* perspectives) given the agency and responsiveness of the social actors whose presence they obscure in nominalisations which encode traditional, objective values of the academic community. Together, these establish a stage setting and list of players conventional to storylines of globalization and new mobilities in higher education. Of particular note among the nominalisations are the four uses of 'essay': '*this essay is focused on*', '*this essay will look into*' x2, and '*the essay will conclude with*'. Here the passive voice masks the actual author putting words on a page in preference for the persona of '*the essay*'. No positive or negative characteristics as such are given to the social actors engaged in the reconfiguring of society as a global and local society via the processes of globalisation. Instead, a neutral and technical register is privileged when portraying shifts in relationships between the three pillars of today's social world: cultures, economies, and technology. Such objectivity as a way of wording the world is conventional within the domain of academic knowledge inquiry and representation. Student A's preference for this register here imbues her language with the status of an authoritative representation of the wider context which disavows subjective figuring of the world. In this way, she presents herself as a detached

observer of the globalising world. She defines it as a process. She knows how globalization processes impact on a local context. Yet she does not represent herself in the language used.

The predicational strategies and perspectivisation in Student A's introduction give an overall picture of specific world geographies in which the social actors of '*international students*' are bringing different cultural personalities to the UK higher education context where they actively engage in a quest for belonging.

#### **7.4.3 Intensification, mitigation strategies and metaphor – a runaway world**

Modality in the introduction is exclusively high affinity epistemic used to intensify the dynamic attributes supporting the claims about the effects of globalisation as *an engine of change*: 'The world is **increasingly** becoming **more** globalized'; The effects of globalization are **not only** experienced in a worldly perspective, **even on** a local level the consequences are **noticeable**'; a **rising number** came from outside the European Union. In addition, the adverb 'rapidly' and the present participle form 'intertwining' that follows it, together form a metaphor portraying the speed at which new relationships between cultures, technologies and economies are being made, and hence nation-state boundaries being blurred.

All of the above serve to sharpen the illocutionary force of the assertion that the effects of globalisation are producing significant change across contexts. The use of metaphor as an intensification strategy also allows the student to present herself as a creative observer of the globalising world. She can categorise it according to a taxonomy different to the anti-rhetorical objective categories of academic argument. She can use metaphor to define its effects. She can interpret globalisation subjectively using her imagination. In doing so she also punctuates the objective spaces of the academic register with a creative voice coming from within the conventions of the critical, interpretive disciplines.

Modality in Student A's introduction performs the rhetorical function of *pathos*, in that it makes main arguments about the force of worldwide and local effects of globalisation more vivid and compelling to the reader.

#### **7.4.4 Interdiscursivity – the subtle radicalism of one word**

The introduction has four intertextual references to academic theorists which bring the presence of legitimate knowledge authorities into the research paper overview, and one to

BBC statistics concerning the numbers and origins of international students entering the UK. The mainstream hegemonic academic discourse of globalisation actualised in this section derives from traces of a number of discourses from more or less related domains. In the account of globalization producing change in local contexts, and the research paper's main focus of international students initiating new projects of belonging, a discourse of normative cosmopolitanism is evoked, in which '*international students*' (line 4) develop new allegiances with others, new frames of reference and new forms of human capital as a result of mobility (Pieterse 2009; Killick 2012). Other discourse strands intertwined in this storyline are a liberal discourse of internationalisation which construes encounters with cultural difference as leading to transformation of the subject, and a discourse of student global mobility situated at the intersection of a world market of university study, a need to acquire new intercultural skills to be employable and journeys of self-discovery. Through the use of percentages to quantify the number of international students on the move, the latter discourse strand incorporates into the text a discourse of Enlightenment rationalism and scientificity. The idea that this mobility and the concomitant requirement to adapt and change are 'natural' is supported by lexis and metaphors from the domain of natural forces. The most salient example of a genre from a non-mainstream discourse of globalisation incorporated into the text, yet not unusual in texts about identity, or intercultural studies, is that of the romantic genre and the noble ideal of a 'quest' with its connotation of flesh and blood heroes and heroines. This flouts the established academic system which grants higher values to the objective and social practices that can be economically indexed. However, given the authoritative mainstream academic rhetoric seen in the signpost language, the conventional layout of the introduction, and the register of factual certainty and writer authority embodied in the declarative statements and absence of low epistemic modality this counter-hegemonic language element extends rather than inverts established norms.

As an example of a mainstream hegemonic academic discourse of globalisation Student A's introduction recontextualises a number of related discourses that legitimise movements of individual bodies in global spaces, and also geographies of the world, in which the West is seen as central, or indeed a synecdoche of the whole. It also reproduces a restraint of the human subject and body in writing technologies of the disciplines (Foucault 1991) that leads to production of modalities of knowledge, in this case, about globalisation. Finally, it appropriates conventionalised understandings that see the individual subject as being unilaterally determined by forces of globalisation and internationalisation.

#### **7.4.5 The Unsaid – It's a western-centric academic world**

There are a number of potentially counter-hegemonic linguistic and semiotic elements that are not represented in the introduction's conceptualisation of the effect of globalisation on a local university context. There is no doubt or uncertainty articulated about the reality of globalisation; it is taken as a commonsense 'given'. There is no explicit embodiment of the personal voice of the author; rather there is a naturalised invisibility of the author position as objective and outside the text. However, through the ventriloquist's dummies of 'the essay' and passive voice there is evidence of the writer adapting the sedimented and rigidified academic language of globalisation to her own expressive intent and making it 'her own' (Bakhtin 1981: 293). This is done through including an aestheticized dimension to her writing. There is no communication of visions of alternative globalisations, nor reference to non-western academic authorities, though there is reference to a new presence of people in UK contexts from '*outside the EU*'.

By excluding these elements from this part of the text Student A is conforming to historical and socio-political conditions of the time which tend not to make legible and visible marginal discourses and subject positions.

#### **7.4.6 Ventriloquation and addressivity – business as usual**

In this section, Student A deploys indirect speech and the passive voice to speak through cited and immanent voices located in the genres of academic authority. In doing so, she situates her own voice in a particular time and place in relation to the history of academic literacy. Relative to the reader her writing positions her as located in multiple perspectives that resolve into the language of the literate academic community. Hence she is actualizing and reproducing her take on the normative reader-writer relationship in western academic genres. For example, in her overview of the research paper that frames and contextualises for the reader what is to follow she uses prescribed structures of addressivity (Noy 2009: 426) in the ritual of academic essayist literacy. In doing so she construes her authorial subjectivity within the domain of rationalist, Western norms of argumentation and so establishes an interaction between herself and the reader/addressee that characterises them as fellow members of a discourse community who 'speak the same talk'.

Overall, what this section suggests about being a socially situated and historical student subject in 21<sup>st</sup> century academic discourse is that you co-produce a dominance of scientific discourse of objectivity since this is understood as elite and superior to the subjective voice. Hence this section of the text works to uphold current social structures.

## RESEARCH METHOD

13	The ethnographic interview was conducted between two students. An ethnography is a complex research
14	method for collecting valuable data which provides perspective on a certain topic, in this case cultural
15	differences in a higher education context (Blommaert & Jie, 2010). The students in this ethnographic
16	interview have an entirely different background. Amalia* is a British student and Tasha* was born in India
17	and grew up in Nigeria. The specified setting was the Harcourt Hill library as it was most in line with the
18	natural environment of the students. The interview was based on four questions regarding student
19	life in England. There were no restrictions regarding time or subtopic, in this way, the dynamics between
20	different cultures could be explored without imposing or limiting topics. This resulted in a more natural
21	state of conversing. To get the maximum outcome, suggestions from Illes (2010) were adopted. For
22	example, prior to the interview, Amalia and Tasha were able to talk to each other, which broke the ice
23	before the interview began. Furthermore, notes were directly taken so none of the valuable data would be
24	lost. The notes were connected to the transcript which was kept in the own words of the interviewees.
25	With these precautions the interview was conducted as planned. Nonetheless, there are a few restrictions
26	to the research as currently stated. The contextual assessment norms can be skewed to the different
27	nationality of the viewer (Spencer-Oatey, 2000). This means that the coding will be conducted from
28	someone with a viewpoint that is specific to a certain culture. For instance, different forms of behaviour
29	could come across as polite in one culture but might be rude in another culture. Concluding the
30	restrictions of this essay, there is always a level of socially accepted answers to a certain question, which
31	can influence the possible outcome. Nonetheless the insights were fascinating, recognizable and were
32	easily linked to specific theories.
33	f The results will undergo a thorough analysis through the method of triangulation. According to Cohen
34	and Manion (n.d.) triangulation can be described as followed:
35	<i>“Triangulation is an attempt to map out, or explain more fully, the richness and complexity of human behaviour by</i>
36	<i>studying</i>
36	<i>It from more than one standpoint”</i>
37	The account of the interview will be looked at through Phinney’s acculturation theory, Schwartz value type
38	and Spencer-Oatey’s theory of rapport management.
38	(footnote) *The names are changed in order to maintain a level of privacy

### 7.4.7 Referential strategies - Personalising engagement with the discovery of new knowledge

In the second section in student A’s research paper which, according to the assignment brief scaffolding of the different sections of the paper, should be a brief research method section, in which the use of an ethnographic interview approach is justified whilst recognizing its limitations, the *topos of cultural differences in a higher education context*, the *topos of dynamics between different cultures*, and the *topos of usefulness of ethnography as a research method* are identified. The latter *topos*, not prevalent in dominant research paradigms and discourses, is encoded in the text using a strengths and limitations schema fairly common in a research methods section of a student paper. For example, in terms of causal powers ‘an ethnography’ (line 13) is presented as the subject of a declarative clause with high epistemic status. Though negative attributions can be used to denote ethnographic methods e.g. ‘contextual assessment norms can be skewed’ (line 26), by articulating such limitations in the text, the author does the academic rhetoric equivalent of

a *volte-face*, since to acknowledge negative traits of a research project within the text usually serves to eliminate critique from the outside and so strengthen an argument concerning its validity as a knowledge collecting and interpreting instrument. Of note, following accounts of the usefulness of the method premised on authoritative voices of authors in the field is the inclusion of the reflexive voice of the invisible researcher used to validate the usefulness of an ethnographic approach from a personal subjective viewpoint '*the insights were fascinating, recognizable and were easily linked to specific theories*' (lines 31/32).

A more familiar theme in mainstream narratives around globalisation and higher education than that of the validity of ethnographic research is found in the *topos of cultural differences in a higher education context*. As a starting point for reasoning and thinking this frequently engenders social and institutional arguments about the need to develop skills of cross cultural communication in all students, and the need to support the adaptation needs of international students. In Student A's research methods section, this *topos* is the empirical object of the investigation she is conducting using two interview subjects. Of note here is an essentialist notion of cultural difference attributable to the '*the entirelyly different background*' (line 16) of the two subjects. At this stage of her main line of reasoning Student A rearticulates modernist notions of essentialist and categorical cultural difference linked to origin and upbringing to establish the parameters of her analysis. However, she also problematises the question of individual cultural difference in relation to the *topos of dynamics between different cultures* in the words '*the dynamics between different cultures could be explored*' (lines 19/20) and so introduces into this essentialist discourse the notion of interaction, dialogue and the unfixed.

The wider social contexts and practices recontextualised in this section include the objective academic world of social science and the complexity of research methods and the findings they yield. Of note, is the way in which student A reproduces the social languages (Bakhtin 1981) of these practices in dialogue with her own authorial voice and subjective opinion.

#### **7.4.8 Predicational strategies and perspectivisation – academic values of the 'natural'**

The social actors in this section are '*two students*' x1, who are '*Amalia*' and '*Tasha*' x2, '*the students*' x2, interviewees, '*the viewer*' and '*someone with a viewpoint that is specific to a certain culture*'. Furthermore '*the (ethnographic) interview*' x5, '*the restrictions of this essay*'

and *'the insights (of the essay)'* are given the agency and function of social actors through nominalisation that conceals the active voice of the author. The storyline in this section indicates that through an interaction between the three social actors of the method, its subjects and the *'restrictions of this essay'* (line 30) that new *'insights ...'* and knowledge about cultural difference in a UK higher education context will be generated. In conformity with the ethical norms of the interview method that protects its subjects from public recognition through not revealing names and identity, the *'two students'* (line 13) are identified by fairly neutral first name pseudonyms *'Amalia'* and *'Tasha'*. This is indicated to the reader by a footnote stating *'\*The names are changed in order to maintain a level of privacy'*. They are also identified by their *'entirely different'* backgrounds: *'Amalia ... a British student'* and *'Tasha ... born in India and grew up in Nigeria'* (lines 16/17). Noteworthy in this oppositional account of culture difference in the predicates of the two interviewees is its partial alignment with colonialist discourses of difference.

A rich mix of different wordings and notions from different fields within the discursive domain of research methodology is used to characterise and legitimate the ethnographic research method as a mixture of guidelines and rules for obtaining valid social data about cultural identity. For example, in terms of the methods legitimacy and status, the adjective *'complex'* (line 13) is used to qualify the noun ethnographic *'research method'*. In the context of the sentence, the connotation of *'complex'* is positive, since it yields *'valuable data'* x2. This value relates to an economy of difference, in which the voices of others and their perspective on a topic serve to enrich personal and public knowledge: in this case about the higher education context. The sentence implies a valuable/less valuable comparison between data that remains open to uncertainty and complexity, and data that is closed to uncertainty. By introducing ethnography in this way, the student presents herself as a researcher committed to the difficulty inherent in inferring knowledge from *thick description*. There is a clear avowal that she *'the viewer'* can only know partially and from a situated perspective through ethnographic research that is seen in phrases such as: *'provides perspective on a certain topic'* (line 14), *'skewed to the different nationality of the viewer'* (line 26) and *'someone with a viewpoint specific to a certain culture'* (28).

In addition to this characterisation of the social actor of the *'ethnographic interview'*, predicates of the ethnographic research method are used to provide a landscape of the specific contexts that ethnographic research methods require to be productive (a) for

collecting data, and (b) for interpreting data. First of these contexts is the actual place where the research was conducted. This was the *'library ... most in line with the natural environment of the students'* (lines 17/18). The next aspect of context instantiated is time. Though less explicitly, the language used here also suggests that the ethnographic research method prioritises a natural management of time that generates free and spontaneous interaction and talk between interviewees: there are *'no restrictions regarding time or subtopic, in this way, the dynamics between different cultures could be explored without imposing or limiting topics'* (lines 19/20). Thus, within the given structure and framework, interviewees are able to express themselves freely and 'naturally'. The final dimension of context that forms a setting for the event of ethnographic research evoked in this section is that of data type, collection method and mode of recording. The value and credibility of the 'natural' data of the interviewees 'own words' is once more signalled in the techniques used to ensure the rich texture of this data is all recorded: *'notes were directly taken so none of the valuable data would be lost'* (line 23) and *'... transcript which was kept in the own words of the interviewees'* (line 25). Of interest in the evocation of the ethnographic research method and the status of its 'natural' data, is the quite complex parameters needed to ensure a setting for the natural to happen and be recorded. Paradoxically, the 'natural' requires quite a method-intense *mise en scène* for it to emerge. In a university context the 'natural' is not straightforward but a construct which requires forward planning and expert monitoring. Student A articulates this in the sentence *'With these precautions the interview was conducted as planned'* (line 25).

Overall, the predicational and perspectivation strategies embodied in a range of linguistic resources give a picture of the ethnographic research method as requiring a fairly sophisticated setting up of circumstances, akin to ideal laboratory experiment conditions, in order to ensure the data collected is 'natural'. The implication is that spaces of the 'natural' need to be highly regulated using established expert procedures before they can be of value to the academic community. This particular view of the 'natural' is reinforced by the absence of the personal voice of the author in this section which sets up a distinction between the value of the 'natural' when it is an empirical object of research investigation and the value of the 'natural' within the writing practices of the academy. The connotation of the 'value' of the 'natural' data produced by the ethnographic research method evokes that of the findings of a buried treasure chest, or rare breed of animal that can only briefly and carefully

be captured in momentary conditions of emergence. There is no re-articulation of the language of the assignment brief in this section.

#### **7.4.9 Intensification and mitigation strategies – keeping the subjective an outsider (almost)**

Both high affinity epistemic modality and mixed modality are used in this section. Overall, declarative statements and the simple present, past and future tense aspects function to give high affinity epistemic modality and unmitigated transparency to the information conveyed about the interview procedure whilst simultaneously demonstrating the author-researcher is able to re-articulate dominant norms of academic discourse in her own writing (epistemic modality = ‘possibility or necessity of *the truth of propositions* [that is] involved with knowledge and belief’ - Bybee & Fleischman 1995:4). A few examples of this include: ‘An ethnography **is a** complex research method ...’ (lines 13/14), ‘the students ... **have an entirely** different background’ (line 16), ‘**To get the maximum outcome**, suggestions ... **were adopted**’ (line 21), ‘prior to the interview, Amalia and Tasha were able to talk to each other, **which broke the ice ...**’ (line 22). Such micro discursive strategies connote a no-nonsense efficiency to the procedures of the interview that conform to rational, linear ways of thinking. Of note in student A’s use of high epistemic modality is the statement ‘the insights were **fascinating, recognizable and easily linked to specific theories**’ (lines 31/32). Here, intensification is of the personal as well as academic value of conducting research into the situated nature of cultural identity which is linguistically realised through a juxtaposed series of characteristics. These begin with two adjectives which legitimate the task as a process of discovery, which are then connected to a dependent clause using the conjunction ‘and’. This latter clause serves to legitimate the interest of the task from a personal perspective through its resonance with voices of authoritative ‘others’. The mutual implication of these two parts of the statement is that the research provides findings which are intelligible from the perspective of personal and academic knowledge.

There is a shift in student A’s use of epistemic modality when she is discussing the analysis and interpretation of the data. Here, rather than implying complete control over the situation, she uses low and medium affinity epistemic modality to portray the complexities of interpretation according to the cultural values and positionality of the researcher who is herself caught up in the constraints of the research paper genre and length. In doing so, she recontextualises mainstream social science epistemological stances towards knowledge and

its limits. Examples of this perspectivisation can be seen in these three excerpts: 'library ... **most in line with** natural environment of the students' (lines 17/18) 'there are a **few restrictions to the research**' (lines 25/26), 'contextual assessment norms **can be skewed ...**' (line 26) and 'Concluding **the restrictions** of this essay ...' (lines 29/30). Having dealt with possible ambiguities and bias relating to the 'complex data' student A then signals a return to firmer epistemological ground signalling control over the process of interpretation using a mixture of high affinity epistemic/deontic modality in the beginning of the next sentence and low affinity deontic modality in second part of this sentence: 'There is **always** a level of socially accepted answers ... which **can influence** the possible outcome' (lines 30/31), contrasts with modality when discussing analysis and interpretation of data. In doing so, she acknowledges the contextual constraints of a group interview given the need to show respect for others and avoid any face-threatening acts. A final intensification of the validity of the research method used to collect and analyse the data, student A is given in the phrase 'the results will undergo a **thorough analysis** through the method of triangulation' (line 33).

Use of modality in student A's research method section serves to further evaluate the ethnographic interview, and its subjects as useful tools for discovering and producing perspectival knowledge. Though the dominant mode of expression is neutral, objective and disembodied (Lillis 2011: 412), there is one irruption of the personal in the statement 'the insights were **fascinating, recognizable and easily linked to specific theories**' (lines 31/32). This adds to the patina of layered meanings around the value of ethnographic research a trace of its individual potential as an educational/transformational tool.

#### **7.4.10 Interdiscursivity - a very expert imaginary**

The research method section has intertextual reference to two academic theorists in the field of ethnography, and repeated reference to the 3 authors mentioned in the introduction as providing lenses for analysis. As explored above, much of the language Student A uses shows traces from three different discourses. These are first, the traditional social science discourse of procedural clarity, efficiency and rigour. For example, 'precautions' are taken to ensure the 'interview was conducted as planned' (line 25), of which the desired goal is 'to get the maximum outcome' (line 21). Then, when discussing analytical approaches it is claimed 'the results will undergo a thorough analysis' (line 33). Second, a discourse of natural environment/naturally occurring data often used to constitute the disciplinary fields and knowledge objects of the social sciences and applied linguistics where naturally

occurring data is the raw and 'authentic' material the researcher observes, records and analyses. For example: 'natural environment of students' (line 18); 'no restrictions regarding time or subtopic' (line 19); 'dynamics explored without ... imposing or limiting topics' (lines 20/21); 'broke the ice before the interview began' (lines 22/23); and 'the own words of the interviewees' (line 24). Third, and less saliently, there are traces of a discourse of the expert, and a discourse of research confidentiality and ethics.

Whilst all of these discourses are somewhat inevitable, given the focus of the section and the instructions in the assignment brief, what is interesting is the final effect achieved of combining the social sphere of personal, individual practices with the public sphere of knowledge, as achieved via the researcher's 'expert' management of procedures.

Interdiscursivity in this section thus mainly serves to legitimate and reproduce the values and practices of the qualitative social sciences which maintain the break between the force effects of Western rationality and the otherness of the qualitative human subject.

#### **7.4.11 The Unsaid – fully controlled spontaneity**

There are a number of potentially (counter-hegemonic) linguistic and semiotic elements that are not represented in student A's conceptualisation of ethnographic research methods.

Whilst the importance of a 'natural environment' and 'own words' data is foregrounded, the local context configured connotes the conditions and control of a lab experiment. The uncontrolled is excluded. Hence the messiness, emotions and challenges of preparing for, conducting, transcribing and interpreting the interview are excluded. The only uncertainty articulated about the validity of the ethnographic research approach is expressed through the normative modality of academic hedging and lexical items articulating the positionality of the researcher-as-interpreter. There is no explicit embodiment of the personal voice of the author; rather, there is a naturalised invisibility of the author position as objective and outside the text.

Real names of participants are excluded in conformity with privacy norms intended to guarantee the anonymity of the interview subjects and protect them from use of the data by outside parties that might be harmful to them or misrepresent them. This is in line with the regimented nature of data collection where the nature of relationship between the researcher and interviewees is mediated by institutional discourses of ethics. The implication

is that ‘natural’ and ‘own words’ are protected species whose meaning can only be accessed by specialists.

By excluding these elements from this part of the text Student A is conforming to historical and socio-political conditions of the time which tend not to make legible and visible personalised discourses and subject positions.

#### **7.4.12 Ventriloquation and addressivity – speaking the talk**

This section is populated with voices of ideologies and intentions of others which interanimate each other to build an authoritative picture of a researcher and their research. In this section, Student A deploys indirect speech and the passive voice to speak through cited and immanent voices located in the genres of academic authority. In doing so, she situates her own voice in a particular time and place in relation to history of academic literacy. Relative to the reader her writing positions her as located in both objective and subjective perspectives that resolve into the formal language of the literate academic community. Hence she is actualizing and reproducing her take on the normative reader-writer relationship in western academic genres. For example, in account of the research method that frames and contextualises for the reader what is to follow she uses prescribed structures of addressivity (Noy 2009: 426) in the ritual of academic essayist literacy in the domain of social science research methods. In doing so she construes her authorial subjectivity within the domain of rationalist, Western norms of argumentation and so establishes an interaction between herself and the reader/addressee that characterises them as fellow members of a discourse community who ‘speak the same talk’.

Overall, what this section suggests about being a socially situated and historical person in 21<sup>st</sup> century academic discourse is that you co-produce a dominance of scientific discourse of objectivity since this is understood as elite and superior to the subjective voice. Hence this section of the text works to uphold current social structures.

### **ETHNOGRAPHIC INTERVIEW FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

#### **Sub-section 1**

39	<b>Collectivist cultures and individualist cultures</b>
40	The cultural differences between Amalia and Tasha are directly noticeable. As Tasha explained her
41	background and upbringing, it is evident that family and togetherness play a big role in her life. Indian
42	collectivism finds itself rooted in family values. Tradition, history and ideals often play a big role in the
43	Indian culture (Zhang & Thakur, n.d.) An example of Tasha’s experiences with the collectivist nature of
44	Indian culture is recognizable in the following excerpt:
45	<i>“It’s a really collectivist society, so your family is really big and close and everyone kind of looks after each other ... It is</i>

	<i>really</i>
46	<i>family oriented, there isn't much individualism going on ... You are expected to make sacrifices."</i>
47	In stark comparison to the more individualistic nature of Amalia, who talked more from a personal
48	perspective, stating repeatedly that she personally feels a certain way. The difference becomes more
49	evident in a direct conversation between Amalia and Tasha in which Tasha declares her initial surprise
50	about the way British students interact with their lecturers.
51	<i>"I'd say like the role of the nation it's to be mindful and respectful ... It's kind of dictated, drilled in to you since you were a</i>
52	<i>kid, for me to come to university and call your lecturer by the name and her is like twenty years older than you is like</i>
53	<i>'whaaaaat'."</i>
54	The level of collectivity can be linked to Schwartz's cultural value inventory (1994), as is described by an
55	Investigation conducted by Kinsky, Eguchi, Blue and Kapoor (1999) India has a high level of collectivism
56	and a relatively high level of power distance. Whereas western countries like England tend to be more
57	individualistic (Green, Deschamps & Pérez, 2005). The difference in the way cultures affect Amalia and
58	Tasha are unmistakable in the way they perceive their university experience. As Tasha is more inclined to
59	be involved in the understanding of the British culture and Amalia is more captivated in her academic
60	pursuit. As a foreigner from a western country, my experiences are comparable with those of Amalia as
61	my individualistic nature makes me focus more on personal academic ambitions.

#### 7.4.13 Referential strategies - Showing sensitivity to the rich data of cultural difference

In the third section of student A's research paper, which the assignment brief stipulates should describe and interpret the interview findings according to 3-5 key themes identified and problematised in relation to the relevant concepts in the literature, an analysis of the findings is begun using the *topos of difference* to explore the way students from different cultural backgrounds contribute to the diversity of the local university community. The overall discursive strategy of this section is to construct a substantiated image of the diversity that produces the local university student community. The extracts from this section serve to reveal the linguistic devices and choices used by student A to describe and interpret the cultural differences between her interviewees, and to elaborate on the reasons for this difference. In both cases, her commentary on the data reveals a sensitivity to the complexity of difference and its part in the constitution of diversity. Of note throughout these excerpts are the attempts by the author to avoid simplistic dichotomisation of cultural difference that might provoke 'them' and 'us' distinctions. This accords with the perspective of those strands of public discourses of globalisation and multiculturalism which seek to integrate difference rather than exclude it. Though radical cultural difference between the social actors of the interviewees is stated at the outset, *'The cultural differences between Amalia and Tasha are directly noticeable'* (line 40), this difference is not represented as divisive. Indeed, the interviewees serve as *pars pro toto* examples of sociative relations (Reisigl & Wodak 2001:96) which make explicit the equal validity of different cultural values, perspectives and social practices. Though representations of binary division and contrast at the global level are alluded to, in indirect references to the terminological dualism which naturalises distinctions between 'The West and the Rest' (Hall 1996) *'India has a high level of collectivism... Whereas western countries like England tend to be more individualistic'* (lines 55/56) and *'As a foreigner from a western country'* (line 60), the discriminatory side of these

is played down by the student emphasising her recognition and acceptance of such different values through the contextualisation cues (Gee 2012) that none of the identities of the interview participants is hierarchically more important than any other. Once more, the author articulates her refusal of homogenising social logics that speak of similarity before difference, and which circulate fallacious generalisations that seek to neutralise the nature of cultural difference using commonsense understandings of globalisation as a process taking place in a universal space (Sassens 2007). In so doing, she makes the future formation of a 'we' possible, by temporarily formulating its existence in her text (Foucault 2000). Her writing allows her to discover this way of thinking and reveals an active construal of a context apt for an ethics of interculturality.

#### **7.4.14 Predicational strategies and perspectivisation – honouring subjectivity**

The interview genre means the anonymised interviewees are the central social actors, with direct quotes from them featuring as a conventional, constitutive part of the text. Indeed, there are 7 references to Tasha, and 2 direct quotes of her words, and 5 references to Amalia, with 2 paraphrases/summaries of direct quotes. The author integrates herself into the context of the interview via one use of author voice in the phrase 'a foreigner from a western country', and personal pronouns, as in 'my experiences' and 'me focus'. In accordance with the interview focus on personal cultural identity narratives there are references to a number of collective social actors who feature in a minor role. These include 3 instances of 'family', 1 of 'British students', 1 of 'lecturers', and 1 of 'your lecturer' x 1. Personal second person pronouns also feature 11 times, with 4 instances of 'her', 6 of 'you/your' and 1 of 'she', most of which are used to organise author description and analysis of interviewee talk.

The immediacy and 'being there-ness' of the ethnographic interview is shared with the reader through the use of the present tense in the opening sentence to express the author's experience of her interviewees as social actors. The use of first names for interviewees and interviewer, albeit anonymised, and the use of terms describing personal observation sets up the persona of the writer as someone who engages interculturally with others in certain ways, and naturalises this using personalised constructs of 'self' and 'other' that suggest the existence of subjective true selves in a world beyond the objectivity required by academic rhetoric. As a sub-argument used to develop a position of interculturality, this contributes to the overall rhetorical and social purpose of the ethnographic research paper. This is to

organise accounts of encounters between counterpart subjects in 'the field' of everyday life in such a way that knowledge of 'self' and 'other' is styled both to conform to and challenge the conventions required by hegemonic academic rhetoric, and hence cultivate understanding between such counterpart subjects (Holmes & Marcus 2008:521). There is a foregrounding of the active nature of the social actors '*a direct conversation between Amelia and Tasha*' and '*Tasha declares her initial surprise*' (line 49) which identifies and gives social value to their intentions, minds and bodies as intercultural subjects. This can be seen in a micro chain of emotive and dramatic orientation working at sentence level in the vocabulary used:

- the adjective '*direct*' which precedes the noun '*conversation*' and echoes the adverb '*directly*', used a paragraph earlier in the research paper to highlight the author's almost visceral understanding of cultural difference in her fellow interviewees;
- the present tense use of '*declares*' by Tasha, which serves simultaneously to communicate the mental perceptions and actions of the interviewee and author when creating/hearing/interpreting this part of the data and the dialogic nature of the meaning mobilised by words spoken and interpreted;
- the noun '*surprise*' which is a textual enactment of the emotional self that implicitly evokes an emotional/non-emotional comparison between a subject with unpredictable emotional responses and a subject with predictable emotional responses. Its use indicates an attempt by the student to resolve the tension between the objective rhetoric and language of the academy which works to obscure the subject and his/her subjectivity, and the disciplinary rhetoric and language of the discipline of ethnography which seeks to reveal and elucidate the subject and his/her subjectivity.

In all, these vocabulary choices are instances of the writer trying to capture the physiological and mental processes that constitute the patterns of her experience of the lived moments of an encounter between 'self' and 'other' without disavowing solidarity with the languages of the academy, and its institutional power to define social identity. This textual construction of herself as a writer able to write 'against the grain' of conventional academic lines of reasoning, is also instantiated in the direct quotes from her interview data that she incorporates elsewhere in her text (not shown in excerpt), which are distinguished from the rest of her academic prose through being italicised and indented. This gives material

distinction to the 'voices' of the interview subjects which work as intertextual 'snatches' (Fairclough 1992:83) from the social languages of conversation, and the genre conventions of the novel. The effect of this on the text is to co-ordinate the value of orality and spoken discourse with the standardized regularity of academic prose such that the latter is enriched by the former. Given the purpose of the ethnographic research paper this supports the writer's intent in producing a textual product to fit such a purpose.

#### **7.4.15 Intensification and mitigation strategies – substantive difference and an ethics of equality**

Modalities in this section are mainly epistemic ones encoding likelihood, with the different modal verbs, adjectives and expressions ranging from fairly high-affinity to lower affinity. The high-affinity epistemic modality in one of Tasha's direct quotes about her national culture, which has declarative status, '*It's a **really** collectivist society ... family is **really** big ... it is **really** family oriented ... you **are expected to** make sacrifices'* (lines 45/46), is directly echoed in the author's interpretive comments, some of which are validated by reference to authoritative sources. For example, 'cultural differences ... **are directly** noticeable' (line 40), '**it is evident that** family and togetherness play **a big** role in her life' (line 41), and 'Tradition, history and ideals **often play a big role** in the Indian culture' (lines 41/42). Together, these uses of high-affinity epistemic modality tend to reinforce essentialist understandings of cultural identity and representation of knowledge as empirically clear-cut. The stance thus outlined is bolstered further in the comparison of the two interviewee stances. So, Tasha's identification with and of the collectivist nature of Indian culture '**is recognizable** in ... **stark comparison to the more individualistic nature of Amalia ...**' (lines 44/47) and points are strengthened through '**stating repeatedly ...**' (line 48). It is indicated that discussion of data allows for stronger knowledge claims: 'The difference becomes **more evident** in a **direct conversation ...**' (lines 48/49).

However, perhaps in line with the student's intentions to reveal an engagement with the 'the ethical practices of intercultural communication' (a research paper assessment criterion), the statements of social actors tend to be attenuated through epistemic modality in such a way that no voice assumes a dominant role in the polyphony of intercultural dialogue. Valid knowledge is intercultural. Thus, both Tasha's and Amalia's accounts of their cultural identities as university community members are inflected with a degree of anti-essentialist uncertainty '*Tasha is **more inclined** to be involved ...*' (lines 58/59) in certain

ways, whilst '*Amalia is more captivated in ...*' (line 59) other pursuits. In both cases, the comparative adverb '*more*' underscores the subtle and intercultural power dynamics of the relations between the actions of different social actors of the student community, in which all are given equal voice and social validity. The discursive salience of this storyline of the student community is further developed when the author compares Tasha's way of speaking to Amalia's, who '*talked from a more personal perspective*' (lines 47/48). As well as placing her text within the world of situated perspectives – the four discursive strategies serving to constitute identity are not discrete but overlap - the adjective and noun '*personal perspective*' organise an intertextual nexus between the language of personal knowledge and experience and that of theories of individualist and collectivist cultures. The student-author knows how to contextualise her interpretations in this section within the boundaries of academic knowledge production.

Use of modality in student A's findings and discussion section serves to evaluate the ethnographic interview as a useful tool for producing clear, valid evidence of national cultural difference and also for developing the ethos of interculturality that transcends such difference.

#### **7.4.16 Interdiscursivity – a certain intercultural performativity**

The interplay between hegemonic and counter hegemonic, and essentialist and non-essentialist discourses of cultural identity can be seen throughout this section in traces of different discourses. The discourse of alterity/otherness, solicited by the research paper title given, is dealt with in 'an ideal global citizen' mode of respectful learning about cultural identity with non-erasure of difference. Interestingly, the register of declarative statement and absence of judgement (neutrality) plays a significant part in sustaining this discourse since it manages to interweave impartial judgement plus empathy and recognition. It is the authorial voice encapsulated in the final expression 'a foreigner from a western country' that, as well as hinting at a discourse of orientalism, and inverse orientalism, somehow indicates the complex plurality of cultures labelled collectivist or individualist without denying the explanatory value of such Hofstede categories. Thus, the more essentialist Hofstede macro discourses of culture, individualism, is ascribed to Amalia in language that suggests a purity of cultural origin and personality absorbed in the cultural whole, 'the more **individualist nature** of Amalia, who talked from a **more personal** perspective, stating that she **personally feels** a certain way' (lines 47/48). Yet, the resistance to declarative modality

works as a strategy to partially mitigate traces of essentialism and reorient the text to openness to other. However, whilst this same strategy operates in further contrastive statements about the two interviewees, with Tasha being more inclined to 'be involved in understanding of British culture' (line 59), and Amalia 'more captivated in her academic pursuit' (lines 59/60), there are arguably traces of a colonialist discourse that opposes 'Western' discourses of success and ambition to an Other of 'Eastern' discourses of 'family', 'tradition' and 'ideals' with the former having greater legitimacy.

In terms of direct intertextuality this section has references to three academic sources, as well as to direct speech of interviewees, with the latter normatively deemed relevant in a qualitative findings and discussion section of a research paper. By introducing informal speech register, such as contractions, into the otherwise formal academic register of the text, '*everyone **kind of** looks after each other*' (line 45), '*I'd say **like** the role of nation ...*' (line 51), '*there **isn't** much individualism **going on***' (line 46), or representations of words to convey the felt intensity of emotion relating to cultural difference, '*for me to come to university and call you lecturer by the name and her is like twenty years older than you is like 'whaaaat'*' (lines 51/53), both work together to co-produce an authoritative picture of the research and the researcher.

In the 14 lines of the data excerpt exemplifying Student A's articulation of the *topos of difference*, she uses multi-faceted language devices to: ideationally present an intercultural worldview in which close listening to the Other leads to reflexive self-knowledge; fulfil the persuasive purpose of speaking to the assessment criteria and the reader who will grade her work in relation to these; interweave a range of forms of language including interpersonal language, objective language, affective language, the language of ethnographic description and interpretation, and the language of academic referencing conventions; and to bring herself into the text as a member of the student community, possessing greater or lesser similarities to her interviewees. Her choice of words when self-evaluating her identity in relation to her interview counterparts has political implications concerning status and power in the local-global community under analysis, since it is determined by her role as an out-group member of the local HE context. She represents herself as: '*a foreigner from a western country*' (line 60). The significance of this out-group membership is backgrounded by similarity between her own and Amalia's '*individualistic nature*', both explained as a normative characteristic of western social actors linked to social ambition: '*my experiences*

*are comparable with those of Amalia as my individualistic nature makes me focus more on personal academic ambitions'* (lines 60/61). This links intertextually to wider social conversations about western individualism as a dominant neoliberal paradigm of interpersonal relations in which 'Each individual is held responsible and accountable for his or her own actions and well-being' (Harvey 2005:65). However, though she unconsciously appropriates this globalised discourse of capitalist identity, she re-semiotises it by interweaving grammatical assertions of the values of interculturality, of individualism and of collectivism. In doing so, she constitutes herself and her interviewee subjects as possessing some power to determine their identity and resist, for example, the power relations of neoliberal individualism in which competition between individuals rather than collaboration are foregrounded.

#### **7.4.17 The Unsaid – a small elephant in the room**

In student A's first section discussing findings, directly negative evaluation of interviewee comments is avoided. Likewise, whilst the fact that there are 2 'western' voices and 1 'eastern' voice in the text tends to set up an ingroup/outgroup dyad there is no explicit entextualisation of superiority or inferiority in relation to ethnicity and cultural identity of different social actors. There is also no substantive explanation of how the categories for the data themes which structure the findings section are derived, but this is carried out in the coded transcript attached as an appendix to the research paper. There is direct speech of the author or 'Amalia' included, it is Tasha's talk that takes centre stage and is foregrounded. Therefore, there is a certain exoticisation of the other that structures the discussion.

#### **7.4.18 Ventriloquation and Addressivity – consenting to the field**

In this section, student A speaks through the authoritative voices of authors in the field and embodied voices of peers who participated in her research, examples of both of which were selected for the author's purposes of representing the rich texture of cultural identity difference. By selecting sources not part of those presented in course readings, student A demonstrates some originality and innovation in her scholarship to the reader. Overall there is a professional level of grammar and punctuation which sends a message to the reader of attention to detail and competence.

## **Intermezzo**

## **Intermezzo**

## **Intermezzo**

## 7.5 Argumentative analysis of research paper of Student D

The analysis of the multiple subjectivities of this second student author provides a point of comparison with the first in that it tends to align more with academic conventions and hegemonic discourses. The contrast between the two pieces of student work provides richer ‘thick’ data concerning the object of analysis, which is the subjection and subjectivation of the student author to the games of power and truth (Foucault 1994).

### STUDENT D’S INTRODUCTION TO HER RESEARCH PAPER

1	In UK society today generalisations regarding other cultures are highly relied upon to help not only identify but
2	attempt to understand a culture as a whole. One of the many effects of the globalisation but also of other nations
3	increasingly learning English as a second language has led to an increasing cultural diversity in universities, for
4	example Oxford Brookes University – where the study was conducted – is currently 17% international students
5	stemming from 132 countries ( <a href="http://www.brookes.ac.uk/about/facts/statistics">http://www.brookes.ac.uk/about/facts/statistics</a> , 2011). A possible explanation for the
6	large number of international students is that Oxford is well known for its educational excellence and therefore
7	draws in students and lecturers from all over the world, creating a diverse and multi-cultural environment. This
8	subsequent cultural diversity means that we must now live in a much more cosmopolitan way because the boundaries
9	of culture are blurred and transient. (Holliday 2012). When students first come to university they may have very
10	essentialist views on other cultures based on their own cultural upbringing. However, it is essential in today’s
11	multicultural high education setting to avoid making stereotypes and understand the person beyond the
12	cultural stereotype, this will aid in better international relations, politics and business if one can understand the others
13	culture the cultural barriers will be reduced and more effective communication can prevail.

#### 7.5.1 Referential strategies - The global is part of English-speaking UK society

In student D’s response to the assignment brief guidelines for the introduction to ‘frame the issues arising from the everyday diversity and plurality in today’s globalized world’ she identifies the *topos of globalisation* as generative of effects in ways that are elaborated on below. Other *topoi* that student D uses to construe her argument about ‘students’ cultural identity and intercultural engagement in Higher Education’ are the *topos of advantage of developing intercultural communication skills* and the *topos of definition* for cultural diversity.

Of note, in terms of the mention of globalisation towards the beginning of the paragraph, is the fact it is not in the topic sentence position. Instead, it follows a sentence which represents the wider social context as ‘UK society today’ (line 1), in which ‘UK society today’ is figured as a place and present time where, at least in the public sphere, generalisations play a salient role in identifying and understanding ‘culture’. This sequencing of ‘UK society today’ and ‘globalisation’ (line 2) linguistically foregrounds the agentive part national social structures can play as hubs for globalisation processes (Sassens 2007). Treating globalisation as a concrete ‘truth’ (Cameron & Palan 2004:30), the student author indicates it operates in tandem with ‘other nations increasingly learning English as a second language’ to bring

about 'increasing cultural diversity in universities'. By representing globalisation as a real phenomenon existing in socially (re)productive relations with (a) UK society, (b) generalisations used to identify and understand culture, and (c) the learning of English by 'others', student D, as a 'speaking' and 'spoken' subject draws on and re-enacts antecedently established imperialist and hegemonic discourses of globalisation. In these, globalisation generates bogus processes of globalisation, since though global in scope they are premised on generalised understandings of culture, safely nation-centred, and 'writ in the English language' (Eagleton 1993:4). Such equating of globalisation with English-speaking social actors and generalised understandings of cultural difference are frequent in inner-circle English popular and political discourse.

It is also interesting to examine how student D conceptualises globalisation and increased global learning of 'English as a second language' (line 3) essentially as engines producing 'cultural diversity' (line 3). This is construed as the new norm in national and university contexts and via its frequent uses in the text, or those of its cognates and synonyms ('multi-cultural environment'), the concept of cultural diversity provides a micro-chain of orientation linking the macro context of wider society to the local context of the university and also to the text itself. Importantly, in terms of the author's argument, it is positioned in a symbiotic relation with the need to live in a cosmopolitan way. In textually establishing this relation she draws on discourses dialectically opposed to those of hegemonic discourses of globalisation previously traced, and so presents herself as using language forms that also suggest alignment with counter-hegemonic epistemological tenets of shifting, openness.

Referential strategies in Student D's introduction hence push and pull in complex and contradictory ways to construe the problematics of globalisation as a wider social context. The most diametrical opposition seen is between language use that reproduces globalisation as a form of Anglo-centric hegemony and language use that articulates the importance of cosmopolitanism in a culturally diverse world. However, the distinctions between two are not explicitly identified by the author and both are drawn on to temporarily construe a hybrid conceptualisation of globalisation as a wider social context producing local effects.

### **7.5.2 Predicational strategies and perspectivisation - Keeping the subjective voice at bay**

Social actors in this section are the collective 'we' and 'one' (understood as having universal reference in passively voiced academic writing), students, lecturers and 'the person'. Of the

four references to students, two are preceded by the adjective 'international' (lines 4 and 6) and a third is used in conjunction with 'lecturers' (line 7) to depict the wide range of social actors drawn to Oxford by its 'educational excellence' (line 6). The fourth reference to 'students' (line 9) is used to evoke first year undergraduates. Though not directly negatively construed, to chime with the main storyline about conducting research to overcome barriers of cultural difference that is developed in the research paper, new undergraduates are construed discursively as possibly having 'very negative views on other cultures based on their own cultural upbringing'. The final social actor of 'the person' (line 11) refers to a generic form of humanity that exists 'beyond the cultural stereotype' (line 12) who it is 'essential' to work to understand.

In keeping with the dominant academic register of formal, objective neutrality the student author engages with to stabilise her written meaning in this section, the statements made about these different social actors are not assigned any explicit negative or positive characteristics nor linguistically construed as ingroup or outgroup. This preference for a neutral way of wording the world is also to be found in the absence of expressions of personal involvement or positionality in her arguments used to construe the diversity of the world today. However, all the social actor subject positions considered are characterised by their involvement in the unfurling of globalisation, and their experience of the tensions generated by the cultural diversity in the local university context, which the text implies globalisation processes play a part in creating. Indeed, in this section, globalisation and the university are given the agency of social actors. The agency of concrete globalisation can be seen in its changing of the local university context and its diverse actors, and the agency of the university is discursively construed to be that of a social actor with managerialist and quasi-paternal responsibility for fostering skills of 'effective communication' among its students.

Predicational and perspectivation strategies used in student D's writing of her introduction can be seen as establishing an image of the in-group of the university that aligns with the parameters set up by the assignment brief and task using the objective 'neutral' register conventionally associated with academic writing.

### 7.5.3 Intensification and mitigation strategies - Breaking down the cultural barriers of generalisations

Modality in this section is divided between two instances of deontic modality and four of epistemic modality. The first instance of high epistemic modality 'generalisations **are highly relied upon ...**' (line 1) provides a foil for the counter-argument of seeing beyond 'generalisations' in intercultural encounters. This counter-argument is expressed in the high deontic modality, '**it is essential** in today's multicultural high education setting ...' (lines 10/11), that is used in the last paragraph of the introduction to convey an obligation to overcome cultural stereotyping in HE. The force of this counter-argument is contributed to by the *topos of advantage of developing intercultural communication skills* articulated later in the same sentence using median and low epistemic modality in the words 'this **will aid** in better international relations, politics and business if one can understand the others culture the cultural barriers **will be reduced** and more effective communication **can** prevail' (lines 12/13). Paradoxically, the use of the modal 'will' in this context can also be interpreted as the future aspect of the verb 'to be', hence implying certain outcomes if 'the person beyond the cultural stereotype' (lines 11/12) is retrieved. The second instance of deontic modality is used to powerfully reinforce the imperative message that 'cultural diversity means **we must now live** in a more cosmopolitan way ...' (line 8). The other instance of low epistemic modality is used to take the sting out of the tail of the claim first year students '**may have** very essentialist views on other cultures ...' (lines 9/10).

Modality in Student D's introduction performs the rhetorical function of evaluating generalisations about culture in largely negative terms and critiquing their presence in UK society and the local university context, and presents the disembodied author as supporting ideals of 'more effective communication' and reduction of 'cultural barriers'.

### 7.5.4 Interdiscursivity – managerial speak

The intertextuality in this section is comprised of two direct references to other texts. One to the university website, to provide quantitative evidence of the number of international students studying at the university, and another to an authority in the field of intercultural communication, whose book is one of the key readings on student D's course and whose work seeks to highlight the ideologically and discursively construed nature of both intercultural identity and the discipline of intercultural communication. Such intertextual references are typical in the genre of undergraduate writing. By these two direct textual

references the author recontextualises two discourses. The first is a discourse of factual, quantitatively measured knowledge, and the second is a discourse of cosmopolitan living and worldviews.

The Western discourse of neoliberal managerialism is also brought into the text by certain lexical items, both of which identify the ideal outcomes of better intercultural understanding and communication. These are presented first in a noun cluster which frames these ideal outcomes as being 'better international relations, politics and business' (line 12). The second grouping of lexical items reiterates essentialist culture discourses in which difference equates with identifiable cultural barriers that can be overcome, so that 'more effective communication can prevail' (line 13). As such, the notion of 'effective communication' is premised on an abstract ideal of centred subjectivities who are equal agents, and whose intentional language use has fixed meanings. This sits ill at ease with dialogic discourses of communication in which language use exists in fields of tension and power relations that maintain the openness, plurality and intertextuality of communication's meaning. Other traces of managerialist discourses are the ahistorical timeless references to 'UK society today' (line 1) and 'today's multicultural high education setting' (lines 10/11) which depicts the social context as one contained in a universal present that ignores its historical past. Such discourses legitimate agendas of constant change on the premise of improved futures and the truths of the market (Cameron & Palan 2004). Together then, these lexical items texture neoliberal philosophies, which seek to define the cultural in terms of the economic and to promote efficiency in all spheres including that of self-constitution, into student D's research paper.

Interdiscursivity in this section is mainly used to conform to the genre of academic writing and to produce an unequal balance between its dispersing of the language of hegemonic discourses and counter-hegemonic discourses in a highly localised, partial context.

#### **7.5.5 The Unsaid – higher education is the only intercultural way**

There are a number of potentially counter-hegemonic linguistic and semiotic elements that are not represented in the introduction's conceptualisation of the effect of globalisation on a local university context. There is no doubt or uncertainty articulated about the reality of globalisation, not evocation of its complexity; it is taken as a commonsense 'given'. There is problematising of administrative categories of students as 'international' or 'home'. There is

no explicit embodiment of the personal voice of the author, rather there is a naturalised invisibility of the author position as objective and outside the text. There is no acknowledgement of the possibility of ‘intercultural learning’ taking place outside the university. There is no communication of visions of alternative globalisations nor reference to non-western academic authorities. Overall, there is no aestheticized dimension to student D’s writing. It is minimally creative in form.

By excluding these elements from this part of the text Student D is conforming to historical and socio-political conditions of the time which tend not to make legible and visible marginal discourses and subject positions.

### 7.5.6 Ventriloquation and addressivity – not quite speaking the speak

In this section, Student D deploys indirect speech and the passive voice to speak through cited and immanent voices located in the genres of academic authority. In doing so, she situates her own voice in a particular time and place in relation to history of academic literacy. Relative to the reader her writing positions her as located in multiple perspectives that resolve into the language of the literate academic community. Hence she is actualizing and reproducing her take on the normative reader-writer relationship in western academic genres. However, one element of prescribed addressivity is absent from her introduction i.e. she does not provide the reader with an overview of the research paper (essay) to contextualise what follows. In doing so she communicates to the reader an authorial subjectivity only partially appropriate within the domain of rationalist, Western norms of argumentation. Overall, what this section suggests about being a socially situated and historical person in 21<sup>st</sup> century academic discourse is that you co-produce dominance of a scientific discourse of objectivity since this is understood as elite and superior to the subjective voice. Hence this section of the text works to uphold current academic conventions.

### STUDENT D’S RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

14	The ethnographic approach to research was appropriate as none of the participants had any experience of it,
15	or of directly discussing their identity critically. An ethnographic interview is a controversial way of
16	collecting data. It forces the interviewee to reflect on their own personal cultural identity and experiences which can
17	sometimes lead to greater accuracy with self-reflection. (Willig 2001) Ethnographic interviews can also be beneficial;
18	they allow participants to develop a greater understanding of themselves and in doing so allows the ethnographer
19	a way of discovering a different perspective (Blommaert & Jie, 2010) unobtainable through more quantitative research,
20	whilst admitting to being bias. In addition, it allows for both a more philosophical and psychological look at the
21	language and society behind the cultures (Blommaert & Jie, 2010). Ethnographic interviews permit us to challenge
22	any misconceptions about cultures on a personal basis. However, there are problems with the ethnographic interview
23	in that people manipulate and adapt their cultural identity depending on who they want others to perceive them to be
24	(Holliday et al, 2004). In doing this we must also be aware that these personal reflections on culture are exactly that:

25	personal and we therefore cannot apply these to all members of the culture (Holliday et al, 2004).
26	∫ In the interviews it was decided that the participants would operate a turn-taking system in being each others ethno
27	mirrors. All went around the table answering question one and then again for question two and so on. This method
28	may have been slightly detrimental to the findings in that whoever was last in interesting may have drawn on other
29	ideas mentioned in previous participants answers which they may not have otherwise mentioned. After the
30	recording and transcribing of the data all participants then swapped their data with their own comments and thoughts,
31	this was to eliminate any problems others may have encountered and allow other ethno-mirrors to offer comment on
32	others idea and works.
33	∫ The questions asked in the ethnographic interview were as follows:
34	1./ What are the major features of your cultural identity?
35	2. What role does nation play in this?
36	3. What cultural resources do you draw on in the university context?
37	4. In what ways does your cultural identity influence your social networking at university?
38	For the purpose of confidentiality all participants have been given pseudonyms. Which are as follows; Evergreen, Lily,
39	Violet and Lavender.

∫ - used to denote beginning of new paragraph

### 7.5.7 Referential strategies – efficiencies of the bureaucratic register

In the second section in student D's research paper, the two *topoi* are the *topos of definition of the interview procedure* and the *topos of advantage*. The latter is used to legitimate the use of an 'ethnographic approach to research'. In accordance with the generic norms of a research methodology, the argument is that if a certain method is more useful than another then, despite its limitations, it should be used. In parallel conformity to these norms, as well as to the few lines outlining what this section should contain in the module assignment brief, the language used in this section of the text focuses largely on convincing the reader of the validity of the research approach and process. The language used to do so is very much written from the outside, and instead of demonstrating personal engagement with the authorities in the field who map out the nature and aims of ethnographic research, student D construes ethnographic research in a quasi-bureaucratic register. This includes listing ethnography's strengths and weaknesses rather than using language to build a personal argument about its legitimacy and procedures. The register in which the *topos of definition of the interview procedure* is written picks up on the quasi-bureaucratic register used to open the section but uses language and syntax to provide evidence of responding correctly to methodological norms and assignment instructions and clarity about the procedure. For example, the actual questions that form part of the assignment brief are recontextualised in student D's research methods section (lines 33 to 37).

The wider social contexts simultaneously legitimated within this local section of the research paper are the impersonal world of bureaucracy and administration and the conventionalised world of research.

### 7.5.8 Predicational strategies and perspectivisation – the violence of ethnographic interview constraints

The social actor of 'the ethnographic interview(s)' x5, 'the ethnographic approach to research' x1 and 'interviews' x1 form the framework in which other social actors are given relative agency. Most of the social actors explicitly-referenced are those central to the specific event of the ethnographic interview as described in the assignment brief plus a few more uses of collective actor positions commonly used in tandem with the passive voice. They include 'the participants' (x 6), 'the interviewee', 'the ethnographer', 'us', 'people', 'we', and 'ethno mirrors' (x 2). Of note with the latter category of social actors, 'ethno mirrors', is the omission of clarification as to its meaning. In line with the author's preference for the neutral and objective registers of academic writing, there is little tendency to frame these actors either positively or negatively. However, there are two exceptions. First, the collective social actor of 'people' (line 23) is attributed negative characteristics in the context of ethnographic research since they 'manipulate and adapt their cultural identity ...' (line 23) in a manner that arguably lessens the legitimacy of the ethnographic research process in the wider social context. Second, in stark and playful contrast to the overall neutral evocation of social actors, are the personas given to the 'participants' for 'the purpose of confidentiality' (line 38). The pseudonyms 'Evergreen, Lily, Violet and Lavender' connote a world far removed from the constraints of academic writing, and evoke language used in genres of the pastoral and the bucolic from previous historical contexts. Whilst there must have been a certain amount of humour and logical reasoning involved in the selection by 'participants' of such pseudonyms, the choice is not explicitly rationalised and problematised in terms of the fit between pseudonym and cultural identity resources emerging from analysis of the data. This omission of explicit rationalisation serves as a 'cue' (Gee 2012:116) to the reader that student D is a fledgling academic writer.

The modes of subjugation of these social actors in discourses of ethnographic research is triggered by the social actor agency given to 'the ethnographic interview' (lines 15, 17, 21) through nominalisation. Here, in a complex layering of voices, the *topos of authority* with its modes of command is invoked. Whilst the ethnographic interview is given the authority at the surface level of the text, the real agency camouflaged behind this is that of the module tutor, whose assignment design included this methodological imperative. The complex tensions between these modes of subjugation are revealed via (a) verb choices which give salience to a representation of the interview as a rather dominatrix style mode of social

practice, and by (b) predicates which give salience to the positive qualities ethnographic interview subjects acquire through the disciplinary regimes of its research practices. For example, initially encoded as 'controversial' in the text, the ethnographic interview is given an agency that: '**forces** the interviewee to reflect ...' (line 16); '**allows** the ethnographer a way ...' (lines 18/19); '**allows** for ...' (line 20); and '**permit[s] us to** ...' (line 21). Yet, in rather paradoxical manner, the outcomes of the strongly disciplinary productive constraints of the ethnographic interview are overall encoded using language with positive connotations in the context. Thus, the social actors of the 'participants' may acquire 'greater accuracy with self reflection' (line 17), be able to take a 'more philosophical and psychological look at ...' (line 20), and 'challenge any misconceptions about culture on a personal basis' (lines 22/23).

In sum, given that the ethnographic interview is accorded more agency than the largely passively-voiced participants and author in this section, it is not surprising that their actions and qualities are seen as subordinate to the social practices of the ethnographic interview. There are two exceptions to this. The first is the agency of the individual interview subjects who may seek to 'manipulate' their real identity and hence muddy the validity of the data. The second exception, which also represents an exception to conventions of academic rhetoric is the active voice implied, though not explained and justified, through the choice of non-neutral, figurative first name pseudonyms for participants. The connotation of the 'positive' of ethnographic research is that of an imposed discipline, or necessary medicine, required to gain a new form of understanding or 'health'. There is re-articulation of the language of the assignment brief in this section.

#### **7.5.9 Intensification and mitigation strategies – legitimising objective research tools and knowledge**

In this section, student D uses a mixture of high and low affinity epistemic modality and high affinity deontic modality. The low affinity epistemic modality used conforms to a normative feature of academic writing called 'hedging', a coded way of suggesting that academic knowledge is never absolute that is used to mitigate the strength of truth claims. The following examples reveal student D's ability to participate in such writing norms in the knowledge making practices of the academy, and perform like an expert though still a novice (Lillis 2011:412): 'Ethnographic interviews **can also be** beneficial' (line 17), 'This method **may have been** slightly detrimental to the findings' (lines 27/28), and 'participants then swapped their data ... to eliminate any problems others **may have** encountered ...' (line 30).

High deontic modality is used in this section of student D's essay to encode her responsibility as a subject of academic discourse to evaluate outsider 'personal' viewpoints, produced by ethnographic research, as less valuable. Such a use of high deontic modality to encode ethnographic research is confirmed in the phrase 'we **must also be aware** that these reflections are personal ...' (line 25). In light of the passive voice that characterises her writing in the first two sections, and the modality of scientific discourse more generally, her use of high deontic modality in this section enacts a conflict between the objective and subjective as reliable fields of inquiry within the academy. As a paradigm, ethnography legitimises subjective tools of interpretation that are used to analyse culture and social life and construe knowledge. Hence as a technology of knowledge production it is situated at the other end of the essentialist certainty – non-essentialist uncertainty spectrum to that of science. Though the author mitigates the textually construed higher status of science compared to ethnography through her use of social actor predicates, the language of discourses of scientific objectivity are prominent.

#### **7.5.10 Interdiscursivity – echoes of Enlightenment epistemologies**

The intertextuality in this section includes 5 conventional academic references to 3 sources of literature apt to underpin the claims about the ethnographic interview student D makes. Whether student D is referencing the actual sources or core course materials is a moot point since none of the references contain page numbers, nor are any of the sources not to be found in weekly slideshows and readings. Though they are not directly referenced, two other texts that student D recontextualises in this section are the assignment brief and a lecture slideshow. The assignment brief contains the four questions used in the ethnographic-style interview, and the slideshow expands upon the concept of ethno-mirrors.

One of the discourses that student D clearly recontextualises in the language used to write her research methods section is a discourse of submission to authority that links to the earlier *topos of authority*. The authority in question is hybrid and shifting since it melds together that of the expert academic community on the one hand, where a belief in the possibility of totalising objectivity is encoded in the passive-voiced, nominalised grammars of scientific objectivity, and on the other, the authority of the ethnographic research method through which pluralities of the 'personal' are investigated as a legitimate research object. The reason for her decision to remain predominantly within the conventional confines of academic writing is probably again an outcome of her unconscious novice wish to 'stick to

the rules' of belonging that she sees as reinforcing the validity of her claims. The one-off mixing of genres seen in the creative choice of pseudonyms for interview participants can be interpreted as an attempt in the context of the assignment brief to embrace the idea of an openness to subjectivity in ethnographic research and a working towards its materialization.

The therapeutic discourse of self-discovery and discourse of critical cultural citizenship are also introduced into this text by various lexical items which designate the ideal results of critical self-reflection leading to relativity in perspectives and openness to other. These include 'self-reflection' (line 17), 'discussing their identity critically' (line 15), 'reflect on their own personal cultural identity' (line 16), 'to develop a greater understanding of themselves' (line 18), 'allows the ethnographer a way of discovering a different perspective' (lines 18/19), 'allows for both a more philosophical and psychological look at language at the language and society behind cultures' (lines 20/21), and 'ethnographic interviews permit us to challenge any misconceptions about culture on a personal basis' (lines 21/22). Such re-contextualisation of these discourses ensures the assignment aligns with the over-arching context of the research paper title and brief.

The slightly narrative style of this section of the paper prioritises a story of human communication and interaction. The voice articulated is that of a fellow interviewee rather than an objective outsider, all subjects mentioned are part of the in-group. This narrative register is accompanied by some informality of tone, supported by the first name pseudonyms selected for the interviewees. Also included, however, are traces of discourse of research confidentiality and ethics, which function to ground the text in the domain of authoritative research.

This section's close interweaving of the domains of objectivity and subjectivity, with almost no deviation from the register of neutral objectivity, textually embodies the cultural values of Enlightenment scientific epistemology in a research field which works to deconstruct such hegemonies. Whilst there is some hybridity in the register choices it does not exceed that typical in cultural identity texts.

#### **7.5.11 The Unsaid – remixing instructions**

There are a number of potential linguistic and semiotic elements that are not represented in student D's conceptualisation of ethnographic research methods. Real names of participants are excluded, in conformity with privacy norms intended to guarantee the anonymity of the

interview subjects and protect them from use of the data by outside parties that might be harmful to them or misrepresent them. The mention of ethical stances in the research is limited to a brief nod in the direction of institutional undergraduate ethics recommendations which is procedural and bureaucratic in tone. This stance is reinforced by lack of evidence of wider reading in the field of research ethics. There is a regimented feel to the nature of the data collection since most of the messiness, emotions and challenges of preparing for, conducting, transcribing and interpreting the interview are excluded. The only uncertainty articulated about the validity of the ethnographic research approach is expressed through the normative modality of academic hedging, and lexical items articulating the positionality of the researcher-as-interpreter. There is no explicit embodiment of the personal voice of the author; instead there is a naturalised invisibility of the author position as objective and outside the text.

In terms of theoretical perspectives considered, there are no sources mentioned outside those discussed in lectures and on the reading list. This leaves little space for new articulations of the research methods beyond the framework of the course contexts.

By excluding these various elements from this part of the text Student D is conforming to historical and socio-political conditions of the time which tend to encourage adherence to guidelines and norms, and to academic writing conventions which tend not to make legible and visible personalised discourses and subject positions. More specifically, in the wider university, there is an ambivalence surrounding the degree to which students should conform to or resist the scaffolding provided for their assessment work in task briefs and templates that may tend to perpetuate a preference for aligning with conventions.

#### **7.5.12 Ventriloquation and addressivity – a partial mimicry**

In this section, Student D ventriloquates aspects of the task brief they consider relevant, for example the role of 'ethno mirrors' and the list of interview question prompts. She positions her writing within that of the task definition and course rubric which works as a practical shortcut/strategy for giving the right patina to writing. In this sense, she subordinates her identity to the task by an almost literal appropriation of its wording, leaving her more a 'spoken' than a 'speaking' subject (Pennycook 1996). Samuelson identifies such transfer of patterns in a local assignment context as the actualizing of a 'reader-writer relationship already implicit in their composition process' (Samuelson 2009:55). This may not involve a conscious choice on the part of the writer but does evidence the way subjects are shaped by

larger institutional contexts (Samuelson 2009:53). As with Student A in the research methods section, use of indirect speech and the passive voice to speak through cited and immanent voices locates her work in the genres of academic authority.

Overall, what this section suggests about the mutable, plural meanings that come into and out of focus is that the success of a subaltern 'saying' of the truth, guided by the governance systems of the university, is never certain. If the system of governance embodied in task brief and scaffolding is at times substituted for an ethical care of the self (Foucault 1984a), truth becomes hollow mimicry rather than invention. However, given the orders of hierarchy in the university, this shallower use of the scientific discourses of objectivity in undergraduate work need not detract from its other qualities.

## ETHNOGRAPHIC INTERVIEW FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### Sub-section1 heading

#### Removing the mask: Challenging the cultural identities of self and other

40	Culture is a collection of ever fluid and changing constructs the stereotypes are language, culture, food art and
41	literature. However, each culture has many sub-cultures and as a result each person within that 'umbrella' culture finds
42	their cultural identity in different things. The Dutch psychologist and anthropologist Geert Hofstede developed five
43	dimensions into which he postulated all cultures fitted into and one could understand their cultural identity using these
44	five dimensions (power distance, collectivism v individualism, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity v femininity and
45	virtue v truth) (Hofstede, 2001) this demonstrated that Hofstede perceived culture to be static, shared across all
46	members and unique to one territorially defined group. However, as Holliday asserted culture is not fixed it is
47	reflexively located in our interaction with others (Holliday, 2004) and so we form and develop our cultural identity
48	whilst in conversation with others. Furthermore, as Samovar (et al, 2009) stated, culture is fluid and not a fixed ideal
49	for any one member of the culture. One of the main challenges faced when analysing cultural identity is the notion of
50	self and other. It has been suggested that the idea of the western 'self' and more eastern 'other' (Holliday, 2011) does
51	actually have a positive affect on our feeling of significance within a group (Perdue et al. 1990) and as this positive
52	sense becomes associated with belonging to a particular group or category we shift the positive sense to being that of the
53	whole group (Farnham et al, 1999; Otten & Wentura 199). Further social psychologists then showed that these positive
54	feelings of belonging to a certain group began to contrast them with other groups (Tajfel et al. 1971; Turner, 1978;
55	Brewer 1979) and thereby began the first stage of a six stage sequence to othering people (Holliday, 2011 p.70).
56	Whilst some of the theories were postulated by social psychologists it seems logical to apply them to slightly larger
57	groups when something like national identity is more integral to one's identity than belonging to a small group. The
58	evidence of othering was demonstrated in the ethnographic interviews as the participants very rarely spoke of other
59	cultures and if they did it was critical such as when Violet says 'I don't think the French drink tea much, there was no
60	kettle, so I had to boil the water in a pan on the oven' and goes on to be critical of their lack of baked beans and then
61	when Lily criticises the English drinking attitude 'but here in England you go out almost everyday'. On the other hand,
62	when she criticises her home nation of Spain with regard to the bull fighting 'I don't like bull fighting' she follows
63	quickly with something positive 'I'm really proud of the Scottish football team ... I love Spanish cinema' to reduce the
64	harshness of her criticism. Very rarely within the interviews do participants mention other cultures, other
65	than Evergreen who has had a somewhat nomadic upbringing who sees even elements of her own culture as
66	'otherness' 'so it's quite hard ... to say that I have one place that I ... feel like everything is part of me'. The
67	interesting use of 'a part of me' demonstrates just how important it is to feel like one belongs to a culture as it is an
68	integral part of identity. This is furthered when she talks about how she cannot communicate with either of her core
69	cultures about some of their cultural resources because of having such a nomadic upbringing. 'I find it really hard
70	when English people talk about their upbringing like when they talk about games they played ... Obviously I wasn't
71	living here so even though I speak the same language I still can't talk to them about that kind of stuff.' It appears that
72	the feeling othering is ingrained as none of the participants mentioned other cultures in a positive light except Lily she
73	said, 'I also love this culture, the English culture'. But with four participants and over an hour and fifteen minutes of
74	data for only one to mention a culture not their own demonstrated just how strong and seemingly innate the sense of
75	otherness can be.
76	There are many issues with othering, one of them being by establishing a feeling of the self as a positive 'we are
77	strong' or 'we are creative' it immediately means that one must produce a polar 'they are weak' or 'they are not

78	creative' (Agar 2007). When it becomes a matter of essentially they are not as good as us stereotypes and become
79	disinterested in discovering others cultures as we feel we already know them, they are 'others'

### 7.5.13 Referential strategies – tensions between national and global

The first of three sub-sections in this part of the research paper opens with the *topos of definition* of 'culture' that is used to compare two more or less diametrically opposed conceptualisations of culture. One frames culture as 'unique to a territorially defined group' (line 46) and 'static' (line 45), the other frames it as 'fluid' (line 48) and 'reflexively located in our interaction with others' (lines 46/47). These recontextualise mainstream Western academic debates about how culture should be read that tend either to be premised on 'the scientific neutrality of theories of culture' (Holliday 2011:2), or instead argue for a more critical and cosmopolitan approach in which 'common perceptions of culture are recognized as being ideological and constructed by political interest' (Holliday 2011:12). Student D uses a few lines describing the dialectic between these two *topoi of definition of culture* to make a rough case for the latter being a more valid conceptualisation to the former. This is not explicitly stated or argued, student D deploys a compare and contrast register when describing the two approaches, but it can be inferred from a number of discursive features. These include: one academic citation used to support theories of culture as objective compared to the three citations used to support the view that theories of culture are perspectival and fluid; the theme position of the statement 'Culture is a collection of ever fluid and changing constructs ...' (line 40) in the topic sentence of the first paragraph in this section; the rhetorically conventional positioning of the counter-argument that culture is static before the main argument that culture is a fluid construct; and the segueing of this dialectic, resolved in favour of cosmopolitan theories of culture, with the *topos of culture as cultural identity*.

The *topos of culture* is an argument scheme which affirms that if a cultural group is the way it is, specific problems will arise in specific situations. As such, 'culture' is also a collective symbol that enables and constrains our interpretations of the realities relating to this symbol. Noteworthy here are the initial tropes of cultural identity student D specifies for the *topos of culture*, which echo the antipositivist assumptions of cosmopolitan and postcolonialist interpretations of culture. These include the 'idea of the western self' and more eastern 'other' (Holliday, 2011)' (line 50). The specific problems arising from this *topos* in this context is 'othering people': a phenomenon identified as the first of three key significant explanatory categories in student D's analysis of her interview data and given a

particular revelatory connotative significance in her first sub-heading for this section of the research paper *Removing the mask: challenging cultural identities of self and other*. The selected specifics of 'othering' selected from student D's interview transcript for her research paper overall serve to give form to the idea that 'othering' is present in undergraduate perceptions of self and other in two main ways. The first category of presence of othering, briefly alluded to, in fact takes the form of a notable *absence* of the mention of other cultures, even in 'over an hour and fifteen minutes of data'. The second, constituted mainly from interview data excerpts, is 'othering' as invested with an ethnocentric and critical attitude towards cultural difference that is premised on the superiority of student perceptions of their cultural ingroup's norms and habits.

#### **7.5.14 Predicational strategies and perspectivisation – if I'm British I like baked beans**

Social actors in this section can be divided into: experts referenced when defining culture that include Hofstede (x 3) as a metonym for essentialist cultural theories and Holliday (x 3) as a metonym for non-essentialist, pluralist theories of culture and 'social psychologists' x 2; variations on the notion of culture given the agency of social actors that include 'culture(s)' x 14, 'sub-cultures' x 1, 'core cultures' x 1, 'cultural identity' x 4, 'the French' x 1, and 'the English' x 1; 'self and other' x 2; singular representations of individual interview participants, Evergreen x 1, Lily x 2, and Violet x 1; personal pronouns used either by the author to refer to interview participants, or by participants to refer to themselves in the excerpts from the interview data, 's/he' x 6, 'I' x 11, 'me' x 1; and the collective 'our', 'we' (x5), 'people', 'they' (x2), 'participants' (x4), and 'you' (x2).

As collective actors, 'our' and 'we' link to academic genre pronouns used to represent an abstract, universal humanity, and also to conceptual categories of ingroup and outgroup as articulated in the literature. As such, they are used to denote experiencing a 'feeling of significance within a group' (line 51), 'a shifting of 'the positive sense to that of the whole group' (lines 52/53), 'a feeling of the self as a positive 'we are strong' or 'we are creative ... (Agar 2007)' (lines 76 to 78), a stereotyping dynamic that means 'we stereotype' negatively, and 'become disinterested in discovering others cultures as we already feel we know them, they are 'others'' (lines 78/79). Hence here, use of 'we' and 'our' serve to strengthen the bracketing of cultural identities under an 'us' vs 'them' dyad.

The labelling of the four individuals by pseudonymic alternatives is a practice common in the genre of social science research. Ethnographic methodology approaches may also more typically favour a pseudonym which gives the reader an initial framing of the social practice specifics of the individual that has been identified. Rather like the children's story series in which the characteristics of the protagonist are identified in their name e.g. Miss Happy, Mr Bumpy etc., such pseudonyms play a key rhetorical role in signposting what is to follow. Whilst the meaning these labels are intended to invoke in the context of the research paper is not explicitly made apparent, it becomes clear that the distinction between the pseudonym 'Evergreen', that evokes the perennially fresh, and the other three pseudonyms names of flowers that are season dependent, metaphorically suggest the distinction between third culture identity and monocultural identity as construed in this section, where the former is less historical and national context dependent than the latter.

The imaginaries and discursive positions of the social actors with mononational identity are set up in relations of closeness with essentialist negative othering and essentialist positive ingroup representation that present an optimal location of belonging. In contrast, those of the unique social actor with 'third culture kid' identity are connected with plural, shifting, paradoxes of belonging and the experience of being 'otherised' by the nature of mononational culture groupings. An example of the language used to construe the former via excerpts from student voices in the interview is Violet's 'I don't think the French drink tea much, there was no kettle so I had to boil the pan on the oven' and her being 'critical of their lack of baked beans' (lines 59/60). The negative aspect of othering, as represented in this research paper, is further emphasised through the six uses of 'critical' and its cognates used by student D when discussing the phenomenon of othering. Examples of the language used to construe the latter via excerpts from Evergreen's voice in the interview are 'so it's quite hard ... to say that I have one place that I ... feel like everything is a part of me' (line 66) and 'I find it really hard when English people talk about their upbringing like when they talk about games they played ... Obviously I wasn't living here so even though I speak the same language I still can't talk to them about that kind of stuff' (lines 69 to 71).

Since it is explicitly stated in the assignment brief that students should include excerpts from the interview data, a strong presence of student subjectivities is to be expected. The binary division of these subjectivities into those who do the othering - essentialist cultural identities

- and those who feel othered - non-essentialist cultural identities – give an image of the student community as one more likely to make some feel they belong than others.

#### 7.5.15 Intensification and mitigation strategies – essentialisms prevail

In her analysis of the voices making up the local intercultural community of the interview, and the wider intercultural community of the university and its theorists, student D deploys modality in three main ways. First, to signal belonging to the academic community, and second to address the problem of innate tendencies among mono-national students to otherize.

The first group of low affinity epistemic modals serve to foster and protect student D's academic in-group identity by hedging the strength of certain claims: 'It **has been suggested** that the idea of the western 'self' ...' (line 50), '**it seems** logical ...' (line 56), '**it appears that** the feeling othering is ingrained' (lines 71/72), and 'more integral to one's identity ...' (line 57).

Examples of declarative statements are also used to signal in-group identity of the interview participants: 'I **had to** boil the water in the pan ...' (line 60), 'in England you go out **almost** everyday' (line 61), 'it's **quite hard** ... to say that I have one place' (line 66), 'I'm **really** proud' (line 63), 'I find it **really hard** ...' (line 69), '**Obviously** I wasn't ...' (line 70), and 'I **can't** talk to them ...' (line 71). Though the other is not directly mentioned, by inference, their cultural norms constrain the identity and cultural habits of the interviewees.

The second pair of high-affinity deontic modals, apart from meeting genre constraints, also in this section serve to legitimate the othering identified in the empirical data of the interviews in terms of fixity: '**it appears that** the feeling othering is **ingrained**' (lines 71/72), and 'just how **strong and seemingly innate** the sense of otherness can be' (lines 74/75). This use of modality repeats previous sections' location of the text within the normative sphere of debate about the nature of intercultural communication, in which essentialist understandings of cultural identity and the possibility of measuring it objectively and quantitatively prevail.

### 7.5.16 Interdiscursivity – borderline hesitations

The tension between the two theoretical views of culture represented by Hofstede and Holliday can be witnessed in the views of interviewees incorporated in this section of the text as a distinct genre, that of direct student speech. In line with the ideological opposition between cultural identity as static and nationally bounded which hark back to 80s models of national culture, and cultural identity as an emergent property of interaction with different contexts informed by critical, post-structuralist views that frame the cultural subject as decentred, we find some excerpts of informal conversational remarks that strongly foreground nation as a fixed location of cultural identity, of pride, and of ethnocentrism towards other national cultural practices. However, other excerpts, articulate the positionality of the decentred outsider ‘though I speak the same language I still can’t talk to them about ...’, or positive views towards different national cultures ‘*I also love this culture, the English culture*’. By embodying cultural identity through the actual voices of students, and assigning them a role of representing notions articulated in academic literature, student D is able to give agency to student voices as active shapers of the field of academic knowledge about cultural identity. However, at no time is the direct speech used to challenge ideas in the literature. Theory is used to frame discussion of excerpts rather than data analysis used as main line of reasoning to show strengths and weaknesses of literature. The excerpts are selected as demonstrations of notions in the literature much in the spirit of a mix-and-match exercise. Furthermore, since in most of the quotes selected interviewees are ascribed beliefs about cultural identity synonymous with stereotypical imaginaries of national norms in everyday social practices, traces of emotive popular discourse representations of ‘them and us’ and brought into the text. This is made more obvious by the language of feeling present in the direct speech, Lily is ‘*really proud of ..*’ (line 63) and ‘*loves*’ Spanish cinema and English culture, Evergreen ‘*finds it really hard ...*’ (line 69) and ‘*feels like everything is part of me*’ (line 66). This characterisation of Evergreen as someone who struggles to know clearly who she is and experiences her relation with those nominally close to her through their linguistic capital as that of the outsider (‘close otherness’), further separates her from the cultural identity of other interviewees, and so construes another ‘us’ and ‘them’ dyad within the text which, ironically, contradicts the message in her direct speech that she does not belong in ‘*one place*’ and operates above/separately from such dyads.

### **7.5.17 The Unsaid – selective selection**

In student D's first section discussing findings, tacit negative valuation of othering is not explicitly stated, so the text plays out the required neutral, tolerant stance of the academic researcher. Whilst the transcript in the research paper appendix makes explicit how the categories and themes for discussion were derived, this methodological elucidation is excluded from the actual research paper. This enables the author to tailor the selection of data excerpts from the different themes identified to suit their own authorial purposes in relation to the text's internal logic and narrative. Data excerpts are linked quasi-causally to theories but no argument is made concerning author choice of excerpts in relation to the research focus. More information is needed to fully understand how selection was made. Thus this section produces a partial and strategic selection of the 'other' of the data.

### **7.5.18 Ventriloquation and addressivity – (not) sticking to the rules of the game**

In this section, Student D uses explicit and implicit ventriloquation of Hofstede and Holliday. Both are used as 'dummies' for opposing valid/invalid viewpoints in consecutive sentences. She then re-ventriloquates Holliday, and also ventriloquates Samovar via her selection of quotes from the interview transcript. She ventriloquates a few other authors in the field, though all ones mentioned in course slide shows or reading list. The fairly frequent errors in punctuation, certain issues with syntax, and the presence of some typos send a message to the reader of the incomplete professional status of the author persona. Overall, the message to the reader is of an insufficiently disciplined scholarly approach.

## 7.6 Comparing argumentative and rhetorical discursive strategies of student A and D

Table 7

### Introduction

Student A	Student D	Student A + D
<p><b>Introduction</b> <b>Referential strategies</b></p> <p><i>topos of globalisation as an engine of change, topos of the university as site of globalisation, topos of culture as a place of belonging and personality development.</i></p> <p>Represents globalisation in ways aligned to logic of openness to difference synonymous with intercultural epistemology. Uses creative, subjective, poetic voice to structure imaginary of noble struggle to belong.</p>	<p><b>Introduction</b> <b>Referential strategies</b></p> <p><i>topos of globalisation as generative of effects, topos of advantage of developing intercultural communication skills, topos of definition for cultural diversity</i></p> <p>Recontextualisation of mainstream ideas about globalisation and internationalisation of university.</p> <p>Reproduction (inadvertent) of colonialist discourse.</p> <p>‘Keeps subjective voice at bay’ But: Ontological metaphor of globalisation. Structural metaphor of cultural identity as barrier to be reduced.</p>	<p><b>Introduction</b> <b>Referential strategies</b></p> <p>Different ways of speaking back to absolute hegemony of globalisation. Both validate identity of author as intercultural speaker using content words etc. Centripetal and centrifugal use of semiotic resources.</p>
<p><b>Introduction</b> <b>Predicational and perspectivisation strategies</b></p> <p>Use of the social actor ‘the essay’ Passive agency of university as social actor i.e. site of ‘influx’</p>	<p><b>Introduction</b> <b>Predicational and perspectivisation strategies</b></p> <p>No overview of the essay and main line of reasoning.</p> <p>Agency of university personified, and construed as managerialist and quasi-paternalist agency.</p>	<p><b>Introduction</b> <b>Predicational and perspectivisation strategies</b></p> <p>Globalisation and the university both given the agency of social actors.</p> <p>Both use conventional, objective, passive ways of wording the world academically, but student A voice more authoritative since has understood that function of introduction is to give an overview of the essay and main line of reasoning.</p>

<p><b>Introduction Intensification and mitigation strategies</b></p> <p>Only high affinity epistemic modality. These perform the rhetorical function of <i>pathos</i>, and serve to make arguments more vivid. Creative and poetic.</p>	<p><b>Introduction Intensification and mitigation strategies</b></p> <p>Mixture of prescriptivist deontic modality plus high epistemic modality. These perform rhetorical function of negatively evaluating generalisations about culture, and supporting ideal and goal of students becoming more effective communicators.</p>	<p><b>Introduction Intensification and mitigation strategies</b></p> <p>Different ways of rendering argument more or less vivid.</p>
<p><b>Introduction Interdiscursivity</b></p> <p>Discourses of: normative cosmopolitanism, student learning and transformative learning, mainstream hegemonic academic discourse, discourse of Enlightenment rationalism and scientificity.</p> <p>Globalisation discourses in which West framed as synecdoche of whole.</p>	<p><b>Introduction Interdiscursivity</b></p> <p>Discourses of neoliberal managerialism and essentialist cultural discourses.</p> <p>Abstract ideal of centred subjectivities.</p> <p>Unequal balance between hegemonic and counter-hegemonic discourses of globalisation and the intercultural.</p>	<p><b>Introduction Interdiscursivity</b></p> <p>Both include direct references to other texts. Academic or pseudo-academic i.e. BBC and university website. More in student A's text than student D's, and these include author's not indicated in module indicative reading list. Performance of scholarly identity. Both include and legitimate social science and scientific ways of knowing.</p>
<p><b>Introduction The Unsaid</b></p> <p>Through the ventriloquist's dummies of 'the essay' and passive voice there is evidence of the writer adapting the sedimented and rigidified academic language of globalisation to her own expressive intent and making it 'her own' (Bakhtin 1981: 293).</p>	<p><b>Introduction The Unsaid</b></p> <p>No explicit embodiment of personal voice of author. No overview of research paper content in line with academic conventions. No figurative language or use of registers from outside academic mainstream. No aestheticized or explicitly creative dimension to her writing.</p>	<p><b>Introduction The Unsaid</b></p> <p>No doubt or uncertainty articulated about reality of globalisation. No explicit embodiment of personal voice of author - there is a naturalised invisibility of the author position as objective and outside the text. No communication of alternative visions of globalisation, nor reference to non-Western authorities. Conforming to historical and socio-political conditions of the time which tend not to make</p>

<p><b>Introduction Ventriloquation and Addressivity</b></p> <p>By including an essay overview in her introduction, Student A construes her authorial subjectivity within the domain of rationalist, Western norms of argumentation and so establishes an interaction between herself and the reader/addressee that characterises them as fellow members of a discourse community.</p>	<p><b>Introduction Ventriloquation and Addressivity</b></p> <p>By not including an essay overview in her introduction, Student D demonstrates a non-conformity with the norms of academic essayist/research paper literacy. From the absence of such prescribed structures of addressivity, it is likely the expert-insider reader will infer that student D does not fully master the research paper/essay genre.</p>	<p>legible and visible marginal discourses and subject positions.</p> <p><b>Introduction Ventriloquation and Addressivity</b></p> <p>Both student A and D deploy indirect speech and the passive voice to speak through cited and immanent voices located in the genres of academic authority. In doing so, they situate their own voice in a particular time and place in relation to history of academic literacy.</p>
---	--	--

**Research Methods Section**

<b>Student A</b>	<b>Student D</b>	<b>Student A + D</b>
<p><b>Research Methods Section Referential strategies</b> <i>the topos of cultural differences in a higher education context, topos of dynamics between different cultures, topos of usefulness of ethnography as a research method</i></p> <p>Represents ethnographic research method as 'complex', partial and a necessarily subjective and biased way of producing knowledge. This is seen as a limitation.</p>	<p><b>Research Methods Section Referential strategies</b> <i>Topos of advantage used to legitimate ethnographic approach to research, Topos of interview procedure to clarify methods used to reader</i></p> <p>Represents ethnographic research methods as a 'controversial', biased and yet beneficial way of producing knowledge. The bias is seen as a limitation.</p>	<p><b>Research Methods Section Referential strategies</b> <i>topos of usefulness of ethnography as a research method Topos of advantage used to legitimate ethnographic approach to research</i></p> <p>Both Student A and D develop their <i>topoi</i> using discourse and grammatical structure that challenges subjective perspectives in the ethnographic research method whilst simultaneously arguing for the insights such subjective perspectives yield.</p>
<p><b>Research Methods Section Predicational and perspectivisation strategies</b></p>	<p><b>Research Methods Section Predicational and perspectivisation strategies</b></p>	<p><b>Research Methods Section Predicational and perspectivisation strategies</b></p>

<p>Quite neutral first name pseudonyms for interviewees.</p> <p><i>'two students'</i> x1, who are <i>'Amalia'</i> and <i>'Tasha'</i> x2, <i>'the students'</i> x2, interviewees, <i>'the viewer'</i> and <i>'someone with a viewpoint that is specific to a certain culture'</i>. Furthermore <i>'the (ethnographic) interview'</i> x5, <i>'the restrictions of this essay'</i> x1 and <i>'the insights (of the essay)'</i> x1</p> <p>Empirical object of ethnographic research method is 'natural' cultural identity data. Technical, methodological tools needed to ensure that data is 'natural'.</p> <p>The social actor of the researcher, revealed in <i>'the viewer'</i> and <i>'someone with a viewpoint that is specific to a certain culture'</i>, needs to acknowledge bias they necessarily bring to interpretation of data. Chooses not to include anonymised self-data with that of the interview participants.</p> <p>Ethnographic interview as mode of subjugation seen as clinical expertise and methods necessary to capture 'natural' data.</p> <p>Constraints of ethnographic interview method and 'restrictions of essay' produce 'complex' and 'valuable' findings useful and insightful to the researcher (and hence the wider academy).</p>	<p>Non-neutral first name pseudonyms for interviewees. Evergreen, Lily, Violet and Lavender</p> <p>'the participants' (x 6), 'the interviewee', 'the ethnographer', 'us', 'people', 'we', and 'ethno mirrors' (x 2) 'the ethnographic interview(s)' x5, 'the ethnographic approach to research' x1 and 'interviews' x1</p> <p>Empirical object of ethnographic research method is 'natural' cultural identity data. This can be muddled by agency of interview subjects who can 'manipulate ... their cultural identity'. Lessens validity and value of data.</p> <p>The social actor of the researcher is not mentioned, but by inference can be seen to be one of the participants (the assignment brief specifies that you can anonymise yourself as researcher as one of participants).</p> <p>Ethnographic interview explicitly dramatised as imposed mode of subjugation.</p> <p>Constraints of ethnographic interview method produce 'positive' outcomes and new self and other knowledge for participants.</p>	<p>Indication of conformity to ethical norms of a research interview.</p> <p>Different terms used to evoke participants in interviews. Agency of social actor given to the ethnographic interview research method.</p> <p>Passive voice and nominalisation.</p> <p>Empirical object of ethnographic research method is 'natural' cultural identity data.</p> <p>Ethnographic interview either tacitly or explicitly represented as regulated mode of subjugation leading to new, positive knowledge relevant to self and the academy.</p> <p>There is an unresolved tension between the legitimacy of the 'natural' as an empirical object of research but its non-legitimacy as an element of writing practices in the academy.</p>
---	--	--

<p>Connotation of ‘value’ of ethnographic data = unearthing buried treasure chest, rare, difficult to capture.</p> <p>No re-articulation of the language of the assignment brief.</p> <p><b>Research Methods Section Intensification and mitigation strategies</b></p> <p>Use of high affinity epistemic modality and declarative statements to represent the ethnographic research methods used as objective, rational, and controlled by the researcher/author.</p> <p>Use of low affinity epistemic modality in conformity with academic genre feature: ‘hedging’.</p>	<p>Connotation of ‘value’ of ethnographic data – leads to new form of health or way of being.</p> <p>Re-articulation of the language of the assignment brief.</p> <p><b>Research Methods Section Intensification and mitigation strategies</b></p> <p>Use of low affinity epistemic modality in conformity with academic genre feature: ‘hedging’.</p> <p>Use of some declarative statements to represent the interview as rationally and transparently conducted.</p>	<p><b>Research Methods Section Intensification and mitigation strategies</b></p> <p>Overall, modality in both student A and student D’s research methods sections serves to further positively evaluate ethnographic research as a tool of knowledge discovery and production.</p> <p>Despite minor variations, the disembodied language of discourses of scientific objectivity predominate.</p>
<p><b>Research Methods Section Interdiscursivity</b></p> <p><i>Traditional social science research methods discourse of rigour discourse of procedural clarity, efficiency and rigour, ‘precautions’ ‘interview conducted as planned’ ‘to get the maximum outcome’ ‘the results will undergo a thorough analysis’ small d discourse of natural environment/naturally occurring data, ‘natural environment of students’ ‘no restrictions regarding time or subtopic’, ‘dynamics explored without ... imposing or limiting topics’, ‘broke the ice before the interview began’</i></p>	<p><b>Research Methods Section Interdiscursivity</b></p> <p>Textually embodies the cultural values of Enlightenment scientific epistemology in a research field which works to deconstruct such hegemonies.</p> <p><i>Discourse of submission to discipline to research method/authority Therapeutic discourse of self-discovery Therapeutic discourse of self-discovery and Discourse of critical cultural citizenship.</i> Lexical items: ‘self-reflection’, ‘discussing their identity critically’, ‘reflect on</p>	<p><b>Research Methods Section Interdiscursivity</b></p> <p>Hybridity</p> <p>Variations on theme of academic discourse of social sciences research methods. Student A more traditional and avoiding loose ends, Student D more embedded in messiness of ethnographic research procedures.</p> <p><i>Discourse of research confidentiality and ethics.</i></p> <p>Discourse of social science</p>

<p>‘the own words of the interviewees’</p> <p>Intertextual references to 2 sources other than those on indicative reading list – mainly essentialist, though Spencer-Oatey troubles waters of simple reading off of meaning from word since based in discipline of cross-cultural pragmatics. Two references to ethnographers, Blommaert and Jie, counter-hegemonic, Iles, least counter-hegemonic of readings.</p> <p><i>Discourse of ‘the expert’, voice of objective expert at a remove – no participant immersion</i></p>	<p>their own personal cultural identity’, ‘to develop a greater understanding of themselves’, ‘allows the ethnographer a way of discovering a different perspective’, ‘allows for both a more philosophical and psychological look at language at the language and society behind cultures’, ‘ethnographic interviews permit us to challenge any misconceptions about culture on a personal basis’</p> <p>Intertextual reference to authors in indicative reading list, slideshows and assignment brief – mainly non-essentialist, even counter-hegemonic.</p> <p>Voice of fellow interviewee rather than objective outsider – participant immersion. Slight informality of register, particularly supported by first name pseudonyms selected</p>	<p>research methods used to re-rank individual talk as objective knowledge.</p>
<p><b>Research Methods Section The Unsaid</b></p> <p>The messiness, emotions and challenges of preparing for, conducting, transcribing and interpreting the interview are excluded.</p> <p>Whilst the importance of a ‘natural environment’ and ‘own words’ data is foregrounded, the local context configured connotes the conditions and control of a lab experiment. Uncontrolled excluded.</p> <p>Implication that ‘natural’ and ‘own words’ are protected</p>	<p><b>Research Methods Section The Unsaid</b></p> <p>Most of the messiness, emotions and challenges of preparing for, conducting, transcribing and interpreting the interview are excluded.</p> <p>No essential theorists of IC drawn on (echoes close link to task brief demonstrated in rearticulation of lexical items from task brief).</p> <p>No sources other than those suggested.</p>	<p><b>Research Methods Section The Unsaid</b></p> <p>Real names/identities of participants are excluded, in conformity with privacy norms intended to guarantee the anonymity of the interview subjects and protect them from use of the data by outside parties that might be harmful to them or misrepresent them. Regimented nature of data collection.</p> <p>There is no explicit embodiment of the personal voice of the author, rather there is a naturalised</p>

<p>species that cannot be accessed except by specialists using code of confidentiality. In stark contrast to e.g. popular discourses of celebrity and reality TV.</p> <p><b>Research Methods Section Ventriloquation + Addressivity</b></p> <p>This section is populated with voices of ideologies and intentions of others which interanimate each other to build an authoritative picture of a researcher and their research.</p> <p>Addressivity – no manifest deference shown to task brief given by lecturer in this section. Takes ownership of method from own ideological and social languages perspective.</p>	<p><b>Research Methods Section Ventriloquation + Addressivity</b></p> <p>In this section, Student D ventriloquates aspects of task brief they consider relevant e.g. ethno mirrors and list of questions. Positions her writing closely to that of task defined. Not a challenge to her identity to do so. Subordinate in a way.</p> <p>Practical shortcut/strategy for giving right patina to writing. Spoken rather than speaking subject. Transfer of patterns in local assignment context. ‘writing involves appropriating articulating a particular socio-cultural voice, learned through social interaction’ + ‘actualizing reader-writer relationship already implicit in their composition process’ (<b>Beth Lewis Samuelson 2009:55</b>) + ‘deference for teachers, and expectations for involvement in an instructional encounter, among others, will undoubtedly have a significant effect on the variety of responses students will have ... (Sperling, 1991, 1996)’</p>	<p>invisibility of the author position as objective and outside the text.</p> <p><b>Research Methods Section Ventriloquation + Addressivity</b></p> <p>Social science/lab ventriloquation vs undergraduate literacy ventriloquation</p>
---	--	---

**Findings and discussion section (sub section 1)**

Since this section concerns content of the interviews there is little overlap in this section. Data differs, as does coding and analysis for different themes. Hence, there is no valid point for comparison and no third column in the table.

Student A	Student D
<p><b>Findings and discussion 1</b> <b>Referential strategies</b></p> <p><i>Topos of radical cultural difference</i> Rejects fallacious generalisations that seek to neutralise the nature of cultural difference. Active construal of a context apt for an ethics of interculturality. Cultural difference as equally valid demonstrated through contextualisation cues, avoidance of othering at surface of text</p> <p><b>Findings and discussion 1</b> <b>Predicational strategies and perspectivisation</b></p> <p>'family' x 3, 'British students' x 1, 'lecturers' x 1, 'your lecturer' x 1, 'her' x 4, 'you/your' x 6, 'she' x 1, 'a foreigner from a western country' Social actors: Tasha x 7 + 2 direct quotes, Amalia x 5 plus 2 paraphrases/summaries of direct quotes, author voice x1 as 'a foreigner from a western country', 'my experiences' 'me focus' The immediacy and 'being there-ness' of the ethnographic interview is shared with the reader through the use of the present tense in the opening sentence to express the author's experience of her interviewees as social actors. The use of first names for interviewees and interviewer, albeit anonymised, and the use of terms describing personal observation sets up the persona of the writer as someone who engages interculturally with others in certain ways, and naturalises this using personalised constructs of 'self' and 'other' that suggest the existence of subjective true selves in a world beyond the objectivity required by academic rhetoric</p> <p>This textual construction of herself as a writer able to write 'against the grain' of conventional academic lines of reasoning, is</p>	<p><b>Findings and discussion 1</b> <b>Referential strategies</b></p> <p><i>Topos of definition of culture</i> used to compare 'static' vs 'fluid' conceptualisations of culture Rough case made for greater validity of latter <i>Topos of culture</i> used to lead in to phenomenon of othering as absence of mention of other cultures, and ethnocentric, negative representations of different national cultures Othering a phenomenon linked to mononational identities.</p> <p><b>Findings and discussion 1</b> <b>Predicational strategies and perspectivisation</b></p> <p>Plethora of social actors compared to other sections. Interview reported in past tense. Social actors in this section can be divided into: experts referenced when defining culture that include Hofstede (x 3) as a metonym for essentialist cultural theories and Holliday (x 3) as a metonym for non-essentialist, pluralist theories of culture and 'social psychologists' x 2; variations on the notion of culture given the agency of social actors that include 'culture(s)' x 14, 'sub-cultures' x 1, 'core cultures' x 1, 'cultural identity' x 4, 'the French' x 1, and 'the English' x 1; 'self and other' x 2; singular representations of individual interview participants, Evergreen x 1, Lily x 2, and Violet x 1; personal pronouns used either by the author to refer to interview participants, or by participants to refer to themselves in the excerpts from the interview data, 's/he' x 6, 'I' x 11, 'me' x 1; and the collective 'our', 'we' (x5), 'people', 'they' (x2), 'participants' (x4), and 'you' (x2).</p>

also instantiated in the direct quotes from her interview data that she incorporates elsewhere in her text (not shown in excerpt), which are distinguished from the rest of her academic prose through being italicised and indented. This gives material distinction to the 'voices' of the interview subjects which work as intertextual 'snatches' (Fairclough 1992:83) from the social languages of conversation, and the genre conventions of the novel. The effect of this on the text is to co-ordinate the value of orality and spoken discourse with the standardized regularity of academic prose such that the latter is enriched by the former.

**Findings and discussion 1  
Intensification and mitigation strategies**

Modality: High affinity epistemic modality 'cultural differences ... **are directly** noticeable', '**it is evident that** family and togetherness play a **big** role in her life', 'Tradition, history and ideals **often play a big role** in the Indian culture', An example of Tasha's experiences with the collectivist nature of Indian culture **is recognizable** in ...' '**In stark comparison ...**' '**stating repeatedly ...**', 'The difference becomes **more evident** in a **direct conversation ...**'  
Discussion of data allows for stronger knowledge claims – will to clear-cut knowledge

Use of collective actors 'we' and 'our' serve to strengthen the bracketing of cultural identities under an 'us' vs 'them' dyad.

Metaphor of pseudonyms suggest the distinction between third culture identity and monocultural identity as construed in this section, where the former is less historical (Evergreen) and national context dependent than the latter.

The imaginaries and discursive positions of the social actors with mononational identity are set up in relations of closeness with essentialist negative othering and essentialist positive ingroup representation that present an optimal location of belonging. In contrast, those of the unique social actor with 'third culture kid' identity are connected with plural, shifting, paradoxes of belonging and the experience of being 'otherised' by the nature of mononational culture groupings.

The binary division of these subjectivities into those who do the othering - essentialist cultural identities - and those who feel othered - non-essentialist cultural identities – give an image of the student community as one more likely to make some feel they belong than others.

**Findings and discussion 1  
Intensification and mitigation strategies**

The first group of low affinity epistemic modals serve to foster student D's academic in-group identity by hedging the strength of certain claims.

The second group of high-affinity epistemic modals, apart from meeting genre constraints, also in this section serve to legitimate the othering identified in the empirical data of the interviews in terms of fixity

This use of modality repeats previous sections' location of the text within the

High and medium affinity epistemic modality ventriloquated through authors cited 'as is described ... by Kinsky ... India has a **high level** of collectivism and a **relatively high level** of power distance'

In line with the student's intentions to reveal an engagement with the 'the ethical practices of intercultural communication' (a research paper assessment criterion), the statements of social actors tend to be attenuated through epistemic modality in such a way that no voice assumes a dominant role in the polyphony of intercultural dialogue. Valid knowledge is intercultural. Thus, both Tasha's and Amalia's accounts of their cultural identities as university community members are inflected with a degree of anti-essentialist uncertainty '*Tasha is **more inclined** to be involved ...*' in certain ways, whilst '*Amalia is **more captivated** in ...*' other pursuits. In both cases, the comparative adverb '*more*' underscores the subtle and intercultural power dynamics of the relations between the actions of different social actors of the student community, in which all are given equal voice and social validity.

### **Findings and discussion 1 Metaphor**

*'the role of nation ... it's kind of dictated, drilled into you since you were a kid',* Self as site of national inscription, nation a dictation, embodied in '*you*', no choice, nation penetrates,  
*'Amalia is more captivated in her academic pursuits'*  
Academic pursuits as magical spell

normative sphere of debate about the nature of intercultural communication, in which essentialist understandings of cultural identity and the possibility of measuring it objectively and quantitatively prevail.

Third group of High epistemic modality used by Evergreen in interview to self-otherize as TCK/outsider 'it's **quite hard** ... to say that I have one place' 'I'm **really proud**' '**Obviously** I wasn't ...' 'I **can't talk** to them ...'

### **Findings and discussion 1 Metaphor**

The most noteworthy metaphoric expression in this text is the term '*mask*', used in the first sub-heading of this section to denote cultural identity. By implication, the interview is a process apt to remove the '*mask*' of neutral or polite indifference to the cultural identity of the '*other*' and bare the reality of what lies behind (the force needed to remove the mask was previously evoked in the characterisation of the agency of the ethnographic interview). This spatial metaphor, sets up a linguistic distinction between inner and outer confirmed in the other metaphoric expression used to denote cultural identity, that of a '*core*'. Together these expressions serve to conceptualise cultural identity as simultaneously a form of artifice linked to usual social interactions between students

<p><b>Findings and discussion 1</b> <b>Interdiscursivity</b></p> <p>Direct intertextuality: 9 references to 7 different academic sources, 7 quotes from live, transcribed data.</p> <p>Discourse of hegemonic cultural essentialism and ethnocentrism</p> <p>Traces of emotive, popular discourse representations of ‘them’ and ‘us’</p> <p>Language of feeling and struggle – emotions relating to cultural identity and interaction with cultural difference present in the direct speech, Lily is ‘<i>really proud of ..</i>’ and ‘<i>loves</i>’ Spanish cinema and English culture, Evergreen ‘<i>finds it really hard ...</i>’ and ‘<i>feels like everything is part of me</i>’.</p>	<p>and a form of truth linked to inner values and beliefs of the individual Metaphor ‘<i>feel like everything is part of me</i>’ self as a container</p> <p><b>Findings and discussion 1</b> <b>Interdiscursivity</b></p> <p>Direct intertextuality: 3 academic sources, direct speech = 2 quotes from live and transcribed data.</p> <p>Discourse of orientalism, + inverse orientalism ‘a foreigner from a western country’, discourse of alterity/otherness (solicited by research paper title and dealt with in ideal global citizen mode i.e. respectful learning with non-erasure of difference) – interestingly the register of declarative statement and absence of judgement (neutrality) plays significant part in sustaining this discourse, it manages to be both impartial judgement plus empathy and recognition</p> <p>discourse of individualism – ‘the more <b>individualist nature</b> of Amalia, who talked from a <b>more personal</b> perspective, stating that she <b>personally feels</b> a certain way’, essentialist discourse of culture (individualism –collectivism) reworked as non-essentialist discourse, traces of colonialist discourse in Tasha’s being more inclined to ‘be involved in understanding of British culture’, and Amalia ‘more captivated in her academic pursuit’, Western discourse of success and ambition, ‘Eastern’ discourse of family, sacrifice, mindfulness and respect’., Everyday, informal speech register (contractions) ‘<i>everyone <b>kind of</b> looks after each other</i>’, ‘<i>I’d say <b>like</b> the role of nation ...</i>’, ‘<i>there <b>isn’t</b> much individualism <b>going on</b></i>’, used also to express intensity of emotion relating to cultural difference ‘<i>for me to come to university and call you lecturer by the name and her is like twenty years older than you is like ‘whaaaat”</i>. Collectivist discourse of sacrifice to family. Discourse of alterity self + other of ‘indigenous’ native still bound to cultural origins. Discourse of ethnicity.</p>
---	---

<p><b>Findings and discussion 1</b> <b>The Unsaid</b></p> <p>No negative evaluation, no explicit suggestion either west/east superior yet fact 2 western voices and 1 eastern voice tends to set up ingroup/outgroup dyad. No real explanation of how categories derived but this is done in transcript. No direct speech of author or 'Amalia' – Tasha centre stage and foregrounded.</p>	<p><b>Findings and discussion 1</b> <b>The Unsaid</b></p> <p>Tacit negative valuation of othering not explicitly stated = neutral, tolerant stance of researcher. Conceals how categories/themes for discussion were derived, though made more explicit in transcript. Enables author to tailor selection to suit own purposes, desires, main narrative etc. Quotes linked quasi-causally to theories but no argument made concerning author choice of quotes themselves. Need more information to fully understand how selection was made. No clarification that author is 'Evergreen'. Lecturer-reader has knowledge that this is the case.</p>
<p><b>Findings and discussion 1</b> <b>Ventriloquation and addressivity</b></p> <p>Showing reader she has found sources that correspond to her themes. These sources not part of those presented in course readings. Originality, innovation and scholarship. Also, hint of non-western perspectives in literature. Voices of cultural others selected for own purposes of representing rich texture of cultural identity difference. In fact, sources ventriloquate findings and vice versa, whilst author ventriloquates both. Overall professional level of grammar and punctuation. Message to reader of attention to detail and competence</p>	<p><b>Findings and discussion 1</b> <b>Ventriloquation and addressivity</b></p> <p>Student D explicit and implicit ventriloquation of Hofstede and Holliday. Uses him as 'dummy' for opposing valid/invalid viewpoints in consecutive sentences. Evergreen ventriloquates Holliday and Samovar through her selection of quotes from interview transcript.</p> <p>Frequent errors in punctuation, issues with syntax, typos etc send message to reader of incomplete professional status of author persona. Evergreen as camouflaged ventriloquation of author identity and stance. Becomes protagonist of discussion and findings sections. Her voice dominates.</p>

### 7.6.1 A brief summary comparison of the knowledge performances of students A and student D

What is fairly clear in student A's research paper is that active knowledge of how to perform the rules and norms of academic writing in a scholarly manner, and the ability to play with or modify them and thus create fleeting knowledge alternatives in the materiality of the text, go hand in hand. Given the ethnographic style practice of combining personal narrative data and objectified, authoritative description and argument requires a presence of the speaking and experiencing subject that tends to keep open more dogmatic and instrumental rhetorical practices, an openness to other is to some extent prescribed. Nevertheless, it

requires a certain kind of initiate knower to navigate these respective preconditions for merging the transcendent rationality of the one, with the situated positionality of the other in a manner which subordinates the latter to the former to gain legitimacy, but yet uses the positivities of the latter to perform multiple, contingent virtues of critique (Foucault 1997:45). Of note then in student A's work is use of the event of writing to transiently demonstrate the ethical capacity for criticality and creativity of the student subject. At times, one can almost feel history being used to test the limits of the given in the micropractices of knowledge production.

By contrast, what is fairly clear in student D's paper is that a weaker understanding of how to adhere to the regulative rules of academic writing practices *ipso facto* make it less likely there will be a balanced intersection between objective and subjective discursive configurations, where the positivities of the former provide multiple possibilities for the creative, critical force of the latter to keep openness of knowledge in play. As can be seen in student D's paper, a less orthodox ability to perform academic writing norms and demonstrate autonomy within scholarly debates coincides with struggles to incorporate the multiple, shifting positions of the personal narrative self into the coherencies of the text, and so enrich the whole. Whilst there are gestures towards subjectivity, as in the pseudonyms chosen for interview participants, these tend to be larger-than-life and independent from the main argument. From a genealogical perspective, there is also more contamination from bureaucratic, managerialist, and course material discourses, which contribute further to difficulties in practising the 'virtue of critique' (Foucault 1997:45).

The interpretation of both texts evidences that to cultivate resistance one must also cultivate understanding of the forces of production. The history of knowledge requires such a double motion, towards the unfolding of the regulated code on the one side, and to the reflexive ethics of care of the self on the other. Perhaps not surprisingly then, it was student A who received a higher grade to student B, since the marksheet descriptors and criteria (see appendix B.) systematically index the ideal of writing inside the discursive repertoire of academic rhetoric and that of ethnographic style writing. However, despite this difference, it is important to remember that both student authors evidence ways of keeping openness in play.

### **7.7 The multiple and dispersed subjectivities of the undergraduate author – lessons for critical education**

Normatively hidden from sight to the reader gaze under surveillance from higher education and assessment marking panopticons, this analysis of two student texts renders more transparent the otherwise obscure materiality of student writing practices, and makes visible the complexity of social materiality at the micro, hyper-local level of text production. Overall, the multiple examples of intricate combinations of subalternity to mainstream and alternative modes of representing knowledge and its lively recon-figuring and texturing, unearthed from obscurity, give us a clear perception of the specific ways subaltern subjects of critical literacy spontaneously and imaginatively speak with and back to rationalist reductionism in the micro practices of the discursive rendering of this assignment task. In this sense, they exemplify what Radhakrishnan (1999:48) calls the ‘non-reductive role of human vitality in resisting instrumentality of hegemonic processes and producing consent’. Having re-defined the spirit of the analysis, in its second iteration, as one honouring the paradoxes and quandaries of a poststructuralist understanding of critique, which sees it as an event which inevitably vanishes and/or returns back to its hegemonic source of legitimacy, it could be argued such examples of the ways subjects are doomed to use material belonging to and forming the dominant, as well as demonstrating the resourcefulness of the subject of academic literacy, also demonstrate the hope-lessness of the hope for critical education in a time of epistemological austerity and knowledge economies of big data, statistics and conformity. However, as noted throughout this thesis, I place a theorised hope for upheavals in higher education in the local micro messiness and ‘stammering’ of subaltern subjects of knowledge production in their academic writing, where it is the weak ontological weight of the concepts of diversity and mobility, not index-linked to a centred subject, that form part of the machinery of academic text-level social contestation.

In the light of such hopes, I now briefly ground and contextualise these analyses of the uneven ways two students produce micro social changes in relation to the theoretical positions considered in this thesis, paying particular attention to the arguments that see resistant and creative subjectivities as the way knowledge can be/is (re)written both from within and against its temporal boundaries.

### 7.7.1 Re-inventing the critical – linking analysis back to theory

To begin, as Althusser (1995) notes, the constantly oscillating mutuality of the interplay between the subject and ideology is what makes both of them function in their roles as co-producers of the unstable field of repressions and resistances which structure hegemonic dominance and governance differently, at any given moment. It is thus from within the shifting materiality of hegemonic ideologies that structure my practices and 'self' that 'I' interpellate student subjects to carry out the task of producing 'critical' understandings of cultural identity and intercultural communication. Even though my relation to the possibilities of a coherent 'critical' subject of pedagogy is imaginary (Althusser 1997), my everyday institutional practices prompt me to believe, at a deeply unconscious level, that teaching students to be critical is a straightforward teaching and learning process. Yet, as two student responses to such interpellation to be critical subjects indicate, though teaching and learning subjects may posit and/or perform an exteriority to the norm from which to critique, which dominant ideology makes believable, the actual materiality of writing ensures such gestures are always under pain of erasure, and returned to the drift of hegemonic discourses.

As much as Gramsci (1985) also recognises that activity and passivity are both culturally and morally subjugated to the processes of hegemonic production (Hiddleston 2013), he nevertheless configures the critical agency of the subaltern educational subject as fundamentally 'creative' (Gramsci 1998:33), such that the 'effort' and 'activity' of the student subject, acting quasi independently from university teacher directives, ensures molecular production of political criticism that stretches the horizons of more regularised writing activities to include the heterogeneous languages of the non-elite (Gramsci 1998). Closely linking his analysis of hegemonic processes to 'textual practices, linguistic codes, and institutional practices' (Hardin 2002:41), Gramsci's 'normative' and spontaneous 'grammars', that guide the subject's use of speech almost without them knowing it, are conceptualised as the result of broken, incoherent subjugated conditions (Ives 2010:91) which inevitably reproduce dominant worldviews. However, despite these constraints, the 'activity' and 'effort' of the subject can momentarily free 'men' (Hill 2010:6) from a lack of consciousness of the part their own labour plays in hegemonic, neoliberal relations of knowledge production. I therefore argue as a critical educator, without the assumption of singular solutions producing forward momentum or measurable goals, that reflexive, critical consciousness of 'our' imbrication in the dynamic multiplicities of subjugated conditions, as

evidenced by examples of this chapter's parsing of local, singular diversity and mobility in writing textures, can illuminate how subaltern authors in the humanities and critical disciplines might affirm a political and ethical intention of spontaneous heterogeneity.

Turning to Laclau and Mouffe's conceptualisation of the 'critical' as 'empty signifiers' (Laclau & Mouffe 1995; Laclau 1996) meaning there is no firm, single ground from which to produce decisive change, along with other referents of modernity such as democracy, the universal subject, emancipation and freedom, there is ample evidence in the student texts of the contingent 'activity' and agonisms that move meaning in multiple directions so that texts elude structural decidability and are left open to imbrication with normative, bureaucratic agendas of hegemonic knowledge production. Moves that irrupt into knowledge from within and that question the closed set of assessment criterion that collapse knowledge's incompleteness and openness into measurable wholes which serve as unitary products of higher education.

As a textual place to make explicit a critique of the epistemological and ontological assumptions about 'the critical' that predominate in the field of academic writing, marksheet descriptors provide a micro location for critical educators to begin to construe the critical other than as forms of argumentation or research design skills dependent upon the cognitive abilities and rhetorical know-how of the singular subject. For example, it might suffice to re-use adjectives such as 'innovative', 'original', 'critical' and 'independent', widely used to demarcate undergraduate distinction level reasoning, knowledge and understanding, or analysis, in relation to writing skills, language and presentation. Alternatively, in order to establish understanding of the critical as a primary material of knowledge, and encourage greater awareness of writing as a material field of resistance and consent in which subjects can ethically and critically intervene, the descriptor 'inventive use of language that generates fresh knowledge perspectives' might be used. In one sense, this formalising of what is already taken place in the micro-practices of student writing returns us to the double bind of scripted knowledge conventions leading to normative 'critical' outcomes that are always already articulated with more prescriptive and utilitarian discourses. This could be expressed as (a) 'Don't assess for inventive use of the language of knowledge and fail students whose lives could be enriched by critical consciousness of and intervention in the ways power works in their academic rhetoric', or (b) Do assess for inventive use of the language of knowledge and potentially fail projects of theorised critical

pedagogy which question rather than affirm prescriptive norms'. However, since this descriptor explicitly prompts the subject to keep openness in play, if it were used heuristically to sanction authors discovering such a form of critique for themselves, intentionally or unintentionally, it might serve the interests of post-critical inquiry and pedagogy in a number of ways.

As was contended in Chapter 5, by making explicit the previously barely visible dimension of the cracks and fragments that constitute the dynamic and contingent materiality of academic texts, two useful deconstructive readings of epistemology and empirical 'entities' are endorsed. First, it re-minds subjects of the part the immanent, contingent, competing temporalities of resistance and consent play in constituting authoritative knowledge in higher education (Derrida 1986), and so invites them both to re-cognise the critical in other terms than only those reaching back to Newton and Aristotle, and to de-reify rationalist scalings of the impact of critical practices on social change. Second, it relocates the concepts of diversity and mobility away from only ahistorical assumptions of a centred, individual, humanist subject, reinforced by a certain concatenation of scientific, corporate and political interests, and within the alternative possibilities of (im)possible change to knowledge that are opened up by understanding the sphere of action of 'the critical' from a historical micro perspective. In addition, the concept of inclusivity is likewise relocated in the materiality of disciplinary writing practices since no group possesses the privilege of existing outside the post-epistemologies and ontologies of knowledge power strategies – we are all subalterns. Thus, whilst knowledge must still necessarily depend for its existence on institutional centres for economic and social capital, by distinguishing between two understandings of the critical, and of diversity, mobility and inclusivity, a new understanding of the governing principles of knowledge is fostered, a new sub-stance of critique so to speak.

### **7.7.2 De-authorizing critical pedagogy for new learning in-comes**

As the analysis of two student texts reveals, student re-cognition of the critical in relation to cultural identity and practices of intercultural communication is construed in the contested, heterogeneous field of the other: inside the corpus constituted by rationalist economies of knowledge and inside the corpus constituted by the counter-essentialist economies of critical intercultural communication. Whilst the institutional reading gaze makes the historical places of the text's production disappear beneath the smooth uniform surface of the unitary whole of the measurable student subject it then ranks using institutional grids of

intelligibility, it is our task as post critical pedagogues to give value and visibility to these non-linear labours which employ, fragment and ‘stammer’ the (un)making of the present historical, and introduce different economies of knowing (Lather 1998) and sub-stances of critique.

One of the first indefinite steps to take in order to interrogate old sedimentings of the critical in pedagogy is to disrupt the idealised Master-student dyadic relationship (Rancière 1991; Radhakrishnan 1996; Lather 2013; Bowman 2014), and the comedy of inferiors/superiors it produces (Rancière 1991:98). This is premised on assumptions of inequality, with the ‘ignorant’ student’s lack of skill, effort and intelligence (Rancière 2014) tacitly posited as the main obstacle likely to hinder ideal teaching and learning productivity and outcomes. By explicitly naming our own knowledge’s imbrication in the ‘immanence of doing’ and aporicity, as well as that of students, we conceptually begin to efface the hierarchical institutional divisions that regulate higher education and to construct an inclusive, manipulable and resistant collective of student/pedagogue subalterns that work both to produce and prevent the return of knowledge to its place of production. Derrida characterised such an equality as an equality in freedom, which has nothing to do with ‘numerical equality or equality according to worth, proportion or *logos* [since] it is itself an incalculable and incommensurable equality’ (Derrida 2005b:49). For Rancière (1991:xxiii), these new relations of equality set the seal on a different type of learning as a practice between two beings rather than a future goal, and which education is not bestowed but taken; like freedom (Rancière 1991:107). By linking this gesture of effacement to the metaphor of critique as sub-stance, that serves to dissolve binaries of critical/non-critical, it can also help us to reconceptualise the student and pedagogical subjects of critique. For instance, as: ‘autodidacts – of bits’ and ‘ignoramus’ (Rancière 1991; Bowman 2014) who practice ‘living on’ (Lather 1998:495) within text and context; as ‘organic intellectuals’ whose minor, everyday practices perform the moral intention of bringing new modes of thought into being (Gramsci 1998); or as ‘ontological stammerers’ willing to forgo the dotted linear lines of certainty in order to brave the unknowns of knowledge’s word spaces. Such re-namings of the subjects of critique may be useful in ‘unlearning’ (Dunne 2016) our previous understandings of the ‘how’ and ‘where’ of the critical, and for whetting and honing the tools with which we can make epistemic change in rational, quantifiable, ‘satisfactory narratives’ (Bowman 2014) of institutional categorisations of knowledge via the particularities within ‘the contingent *regulus*’ (Clemitshaw 2013:277).

Another indefinite step needed to realign pedagogy and its written incomes and outputs with a post-critical understanding of the possibilities of resistance, as proposed by theorists discussed in previous chapters, relates to what Rancière (2014) affirms as the poetic condition of the speaking and writing being. Disavowed and outlawed by the technocratic 'matrix of calculabilities' (Ball 2013:103) of the university, this condition, which discomposes the explicative logics and temporal realities of learning (Rancière 2014), is premised on a modus of learning as improvisation. As seen in the analysis of the two student texts, traces of improvisation from within the matrix are always already present. Improvisation is a condition of possibility of knowledge; one that for Rancière (2009:72) has a political effect, since it produces a different temporal reality that has no destination. Thus, *telos* is temporarily annulled through a reframing of modes of teaching and learning that conveys and honours resistant and creative subjectivities of knowledge production that in-vent new texturings.

## **7.8 Conclusion**

This chapter has situated its re-purposed analysis of student assessment writing data in the context of a question about the (im)possibility of resistance and 'the critical' in the ruins of student writing and pedagogy. The multiple subaltern educational subjectivities analysed, albeit initially in relation to a different research focus, give testimony to the heterogeneous routes to knowledge hidden by normative, institutional, prescriptive readings of different levels of knowledge. From a micro perspective, these challenge the commonsense understandings of the macro regimes of the university, that include Enlightenment rhetorics of reason which refuse ambiguity and uncertainty in the discourses of knowledge and posit knowledge as a transcendental universal, and the singular subject of university bureaucratic subject and managerial governance. From the perspective of post-critical pedagogical praxis, I suggest the multiple subjectivities unearthed in the materiality of these intercultural communication research papers serve as useful evidence of poststructuralist understandings of the creative and critical, in a particular disciplinary area, which spontaneously resist 'being governed quite so much' (Foucault 1997:45). In this sense, they can serve as prompts for unlearning old habits. Such spontaneous efforts and activities are messier ways of knowing and learning that cannot so much guarantee change as offer cautions, equipment, possibilities and prompts for thinking critical higher education otherwise. A thinking that could be taken on by other subjects interested in such a higher education. In order to pursue

the formalisation of use of such prompts further, in the next chapter, *Students and Pedagogues as Co-producing Subjects in Shared Histories – Peering 2*, I use discrete examples of snippets of student writing produced for the same course, and specifically selected for the ways they differently exemplify ‘the ethical capacity for consent, criticality and creativity in the student subject of academic writing’, to propose ways they could be used as heuristics for unlearning student writing.

## Chapter 8      Students and pedagogues as co-producing subjects in shared histories

### 8.1 Introduction

In what precedes in this thesis, I have interrogated the (im)possibility of the ‘critical’ in the ruins of pedagogy and student writing, moving from broader fields of theory to more local institutional and writing contexts . It has been argued and demonstrated that neither the ‘critical’, nor academic rhetoric/writing, nor academic student or pedagogue subjects are stable designations. Rather, none of these categories are one thing or another, but instead something we have done to us, or do, as agencies of discourse. From within such assumptions, in this chapter I present instantiations of what I tentatively qualify as ‘the ethical capacity for criticality and creativity in the student subject of academic writing’, with the aim of considering the light they shed on small trajectories for resistance in the present, not the future. Derrida’s related designation of this capacity is *poiesis* (Derrida 1988), elaborated on in Chapter 5. Generally meaning conceiving something that did not previously exist, for Derrida *poiesis*, or (tele)poiesis (2005c:32) emphasises the dual functions of an utterance that are bringing to an end and crossing a distance (Schenner 2005:240). These functions mean that *poietic* utterances are neither an end, nor a beginning, but an overflowing of meaning which constitute the ‘desert mirage effect and the ineluctability of the event’ of writing (Derrida 2005c:33).

It is hoped the arguments around instantiations offered go some way to answering the question of the ‘how’ or ‘what’ of the critical in student syntaxes of doing, as well as the other question of the ‘why’ of this critical, both in the sense of addressing the silence surrounding the post-critical and creative in the language of ‘truth’ and knowledge, and of being alert to what it might teach us about altering the place of factory inspectors of students’ written cultural capital, that we are guided to as pedagogues by our conformist, corporate systems and discourses. If we are able to re-cognize the contested, hypothetical and complex character of the ‘critical’ in student writing, and its function of opening up the unpredictable in assigned places of academic writing, and if we are serious about passing from a hierarchy of knowledges to one of heterogeneous, plural differentiation, then as pedagogues, an openness to this other criticality in student writing, ignored by the productive apparatus of society, is surely a poststructuralist ethical imperative.

## 8.2 Trouvailles: student writing as 'lively conceptual mutation' (Nealon 2008:98)

I invite the reader to read the selective sample of micro formulations of *poietics*, excavated from student materialisations of knowledge and re-contextualised in this paper, as emergent empirical evidence of subjugated knowledge practices of diversity and mobility always already present in the contested conditions in student knowledge practices, and which as such mark the exteriority of discourses of rationalism, objectivity, and functional value that regiment academic knowledge making practices. To identify these, I conducted a close reading of eight student assignments, selected from across grade levels, specifically focusing on identifying discrete instances of felicitous instances of the poietic which deconstruct 'dry thematical representation' (Nealon 2008:98) by introducing a discontinuity that cuts through into new spaces of knowing to produce qualitative change (Osberg 2010:vi). There is no suggestion that these *trouvailles* have a cause and effect link with the content, aims and pedagogy of the course. As specified at the beginning of Chapter 7, the course structure includes a session on ethnographic methodology which includes brief mention of qualitative research practices of figurative and creative writing styles which bring those parts of knowledge of the world which are emotional, embodied and imagined into the text (see appendix C.) that may shape the writing subjectivities of some students. However, when conducting the close reading my assumption was that these *poietics* were an always-already hidden part of student workaday writing practices that my first 'peering' had made visible.

With the intent to present the findings in a manner congruent with epistemological messiness and openness, I avoid neat, tidy, finite data findings' categories imposed by the researcher. Instead, I offer these as heuristics essentially sufficient in themselves for exposing the materiality of lively 'conceptual mutation' present in student writing. Readers may consider some of these more felicitous than others in their borderline capacity as micro-praxis which irrupts into the smooth, ahistorical surface of scientificity and rhetorical techniques of reasoning, or prefer to interpret them from the epistemological terrain of 'error', located in a philosophy not open to discourses of non-mastery and improvisation (Rancière 1991). Yet I would argue that these snatches of textual enactments of resistance, which technically deploy, *inter alia*, alliteration, metaphor, intertextuality, addressivity, innovative adjective-noun combinations and verb choices, and elements of literary and subjective register are poietics that produce diversity, mobility and innovation in the regimes of governmentality in which they are located. Literally, at the micro-level of textual academic

literacies practice, they demonstrate what Pennycook (2007:77) sees as a non-foundationalist 'refashioning of futures' that adds to discourse new notions of what is possible. In this sense, such written subjectivities speak back, or perhaps 'stammer' or 'stutter back' to the supervised same. Reading them afresh, I would also argue one can almost feel the 'jouissance' students experience in these local, creative struggles and engagement with knowledge's materiality that are evidence of their agency to (re)organise thought's diversity. This is not to deny the 'plaisir' students may also find in performances of more 'instrumental' learning and writing praxis, but to spotlight the freeing sense present in bodies of student meaning making that reveal the kinesics of always already resistance, historically present in the shifting folds of (intercultural) disciplinary rhetoric.

In order to make more visible the notions of rhetorical resistance theorised in this paper, I juxtapose the actual words of students next to alternative versions I have written in a more essentialist, 'dry' referential mode, to which they are dynamically tied by the exercise of power, and yet which they exceed and cleave: the distance between consent and resistance is fragile and porous. Hence, this juxtaposition does not imply a quid pro quo relation between the one and the other. Furthermore, I also specify the parts of the research paper in which these moves of resistance are located to facilitate potential contextualised use of these examples as heuristics in the 'unlearning' of student writing. The student *poietics* are in the right hand column of tables.

Table 8 **Student poietics**

*Poietics in Sub-headings*

Challenging the binary	'Deconstructing the Dichotomy'
Subjective and objective identity	'An Identity for the Head, and identity for the heart'
Scales of individualisation in cultural identity	'My own cultural identity – degrees of individualisation of cultural identity'
Evaluating different discussion contributions	'The coins put in the discussion: value and quantity of the coins'
In-depth investigations	'Behind the mask'

*Poietics in the Introduction*

'Seeing me, seeing you' alludes to ongoing debates about the nature of intergroup experiences.	'Seeing me, seeing you' hints at the speaking and thinking around universal experiences between groups.'
Cultural difference in society today can lead to clashes.	'In today's world, multiple cultures collide around us daily.'
Evidence of political correctness is widely present in Western society.	'The Western society in particular has become one obsessed with political correctness'
Cultural difference does not exclude harmonious coexistence.	'Just because there are differences between people's upbringing, nationality, gender or anything else, does not mean they are incapable of cohabiting comfortably'
As the title of this study suggests, Seeing me, seeing you', is focused on the mutual understanding between individuals in the HE context.	The terms of reference of this investigation: 'seeing me, seeing you', implicates the notion of understanding between individuals in a Higher Education setting.
'Seeing me, seeing you' evokes the concepts and theories relating to intercultural communication	'Seeing me, seeing you' hints at the speaking and thinking around universal experiences between groups.
The main aim of this work is to draw on examples of student reflexivity so as to ...	'The main premise of this text is to critically capitalize on our reflexivity in order to ...'
Intercultural communication in higher education broadens the education of all	'Higher education systems are a place of different minds and cultures mixing and

	engaging in activities for further enrichment of their education’
The specific field of higher education will be used to frame analysis of cultural identity and intercultural engagement	‘the hyponym term, higher education, is one footing in this essay to help understand cultural identity and intercultural engagement’
... can contribute to a sense of a fluidly defined environment	‘... can contribute to a sense of a ‘border-less’ environment’

*Poietics in research methods section*

A smaller interview group allowed more personal interaction	‘it would have lacked the intimacy that approaching things as a trio provided’
Four questions were used to guide discussion	‘they were given four questions to produce discussion’
the small group interview allows for more openness between participants	‘The interview structure provides a framework of intimacy ...’
Breaking conventions was seen as challenging, and hence did not often take place	‘it emerged that breaking away from these conventions is not only rare but uncomfortable and even seen as a form of social bravery necessary for cultural development.’
It is hoped the investigation results will provide useful examples of the ways participants make sense of the ‘plurality’, ‘diversity’, and cultural engagement in Higher Education relationships	It is hoped that the investigation will yield results that are both vivid and real to help participants make sense of the ‘plurality’, ‘diversity’, and cultural engagement in Higher Education relationships.
The focus of the analysis is not on producing generalised claims about cultural identity	‘the focus is on idiosyncratic opinions and thoughts rather than a homogenised notion of what cultural identity represents’

*Poietics in findings and discussion section*

drawing on a variety of works	‘extracting from a variety of works’
different behaviours exist in different situations	‘different behaviours exert in social situations’
the aim of the interview was to identify	‘The aim of the interview was to capture the

the subjective beliefs and truths of the interviewees	truth in the words of the interviewees, therefore capturing an image of their own beliefs'
decisions taken in an institutional context are influenced by prior experience	'the decisions made in an institutional context [...] are by-products of all experience that has taken place before'
Her group members responded politely	'Her group members were gracious in their response'
The fact Zoe and I share some cultural identity features cannot be taken to mean we view other cultures similarly	'Furthermore, including Zoe into the same circle of thought is making an assumption that since we share a fraction of cultural identity we might view other cultures similarly.'
The ethnographic interview and its findings reflect the changeable nature of cultural identity	'the ethnographic interview and its findings reflect the protean nature of cultural identity.'
The influence of culturally acquired linguistic norms appears to dictate and influence identity	'the influence of <i>linguistic</i> habitus ... suggests a conversational autopilot that can blindly lead and influence identity.'

*Poietics when referring to Other of interviewee(s) and findings*

Given her outsider status, she identified with the 'other' in England	'Holding a different identity, made her emulate the identity of the 'other' in England'
They respected local politeness conventions and did not interrupt each other	'They used polite faces, and did not interrupt each other for a while'
She feels confused about her identity	'She feels a confusion of identity'
The non-consensual attitude of Blue Nougat causes some perturbation	'this non-consensual ascription of Blue Nougat sets up a perturbation'
As an international student Pizza finds herself in more varied, social circles.	'Pizza as an international student finds herself in much broader circles in terms of the provenance of her peers'
Raspberry spoke openly of her parents, seeing them as a possible starting point for her socialisation.	'Raspberry spoke candidly of her parents, feeling that perhaps they were her starting point for socialisation.'

She indicates conflict with her parents and her questioning of norms as factors that created and helped her understand her cultural identity.	'She points also to conflict between herself and her parents and her questioning of the status quo as a path to creating and understanding her cultural identity: (I didn't get along with my parents...).'
Here clear single identity with multicultural interests differentiated her from others	'She has multicultural interests by a clear single national identity which settles a certain distance with others'

*Poietics when referring to Other of authors in the field*

This quote suggests new approaches to the topic	'this quote opens up further explorations of the topic'
Holliday (2010) discusses this topic in depth.	'Holliday (2010) delves deeply into this topic'
Weirzbicka (1997) develops upon the key word, friendship	'Weirzbicka (1997) lingers on this key word, friendship ...'
There has been a rise of intercultural research into ways of speaking using the approaches of Hymes (1962), in his 'ethnography of speaking'	Evidence suggests that there has been a proliferation of cross-cultural investigations in recent decades into the ways of speaking which is constituted in terms of "ethnography of speaking' (Hymes 1962).
Using ethnography as a framework allows for structured investigation into 'ourselves as human beings' (Spencer-Oatey 2008)	... it is envisaged that ethnography offers a frame work within which the understanding of 'ourselves as human beings', (Spencer-Oatey 2008) can be meaningfully and methodically pursued.
Understands politeness in broader terms than that of Brown and Levinson.	'indicates an understanding of politeness beyond the restricted definition offered by Brown and Levinson'

*Poietics in the conclusion*

Each interviewee has world views affected by their own upbringings	'In short, it is redundant to say that each interviewee in this process has their own views of the world and is affected by their
--	---

	unique nurturing environments’
Specific analysis of student activities and social circles reveals ...	‘Specific references to what each student does at university and in their social circles gives light to ...’
HE could be a an ideal situation for students to have the experience of communicating with diverse cultures without travelling	‘HE could be the best ‘foreign road’ where students have the ability to communicate with a diversity of cultures’
The university seems to be an intermediary stage between inherited parental culture and personally chosen culture	‘In that sense, the university culture appears to be a stage between the non-chosen culture of the parents and the personal culture’

The otherness of these excerpts salvaged from the ruins of student writing for an undergraduate, ethnographic style research paper, could arguably be seen as straightforward instances of the textualisation practices of the cultural interpretation genre which ‘translates experience into text’ (Clifford 1986:115), leaving traces of the lived, oral experience of dialogue with others in what is written. Yet there is always already more and less than that, given the arbitrary nature of grammatical and discursive positing and our subjectivation to the coordinates of power. From a Derridean understanding of *différance* and deferring (1982), time is not the measure of the progress of existence, that translates experience into textual traces ‘over’ time, but the internal dynamic of continually changing existence which parses, or maintains for a moment, a different future-to-come within the utterance, which is always to be envisaged as an ‘X without X’, such as criticality without criticality, or *poiesis* without *poiesis*. Whilst this may not appear to be much of a solution to the issue of locating resistance in the ruins of student writing, this is perhaps because our interpretive perceptions are always already bracketed to commonsense understandings of time and being, that are haunted by an ontology of presence which appears ‘to be welded to an orthodoxy’ (Derrida 2006:115), where the very event of being is welded to what ‘constitutes the whole history of the world’ (Derrida 2006:116) - or at least the history of Western Enlightenment knowledge and reason. Indeed, I would argue the normative reconstitutions of student academic writing in the left-hand column evoke precisely such a convergence with such ahistorical temporalities. To construe a less temporally fixed way to reason the interaction between these snippets from student texts, my interpretation of them, and readers’ response to both that that of Clifford (1986), I propose West-Pavlov’s

concept of 'bifurcation' (2013:2). Taken from chaos theory, West-Pavlov uses this concept to define:

the unpredictable moment of decision, in which the various factors at work act upon each other in apparently only marginally varying ways, but with significantly different consequences' (West Pavlov 2013:2)

So, in such an Other thinking of the time of resistance and the time of its interpretation, there is no such thing as straightforward translation of experience into text, but rather the stammerings and mirages of an ontology of non-presence.

Pursuing this Other thinking of knowledge production and its *poietic* by-products, I suggest these constitute manifestations of Foucault's care of self (1984), that involve a reflexive process of work on the self in order to attain a certain mode of being, using the tools available to the individual at the scene of writing. In this sense, these snippets should be understood as a non-intrinsic exercise of freedom, since no writing is strictly active, strictly passive, strictly instrumental, or strictly creative, given truth's heterogeneities and fracturing of meaning. In each case, the writing is as much/more in charge of the writer than vice versa, yet the writer is not completely enslaved. However, since freedom is a conscious practice that is synonymous with ethics, since freedom is 'the ontological condition of ethics' (Foucault 1984:285), extensive work of 'the self on the self' (Foucault 1984:286) can lead freedom to take shape as ways of being that are 'good, beautiful, honourable, estimable, memorable and exemplary' (Foucault 1984:286). How then might this freedom read if we transpose these adjectives of a small ethical and political praxis of freedom into the field of higher education and its pedagogical practices?

If we appropriate two of these adjectives, 'good' and 'honourable', to first provisionally apply them to our ethos as pedagogues and readers of student writing, there is immediately a sense in which these resist characterisation as standard professional attributes in HE: the ethos of the pedagogue has been rhetorically overwritten by more bureaucratic registers of representation. This does not mean in our self-governmentality we renounce such ways of being, but rather that these ethical practices, also political practices since freedom is inherently political (Foucault:1984), fit awkwardly into hegemonic secular mobilisations of identity, and so are officially muted. However, if we 'unmute' these and read the texts on our own irreducible terms of worthiness, there might be some unexpected reformatting of the ways we are instrumentally demanded to evaluate the critical in student writing.

If we next provisionally apply the adjective 'beautiful', to the student poietics in this chapter, a provision I consider valid with quite a few of these examples, an incision is made into the conventional contours of the subject of reason and ahistorical domain of objectivity, from which leaks the spilled blood of the subjects' historicity. Yet, whilst the beauty of openness and ethical action in the process of inquiry is the alternating power in knowledge's technologies of governance, to speak of it as such is analogous to betraying the textual authorities of 'truth' and opening their territory to the wildness of uncertainty and unshared historical origins. Biesta (2013) captures the threat of the designation in his book *The Beautiful Risk of Education*. Yet perhaps, working from within the ruins of pedagogy and writing, rather than rejecting them, this knowledge category that point to the temporal, aesthetic dimensions of knowledge which marks multiplicities of new beginnings, can resist 'stultifying' and formalising norms (Rancière 1991).

Finally, if we provisionally assign the adjectives 'memorable' and 'exemplary' to these student instances of poietics, and have confidence in their specificity as heuristics for discovering the freeplay in writing, that holds in it the possibility of the impossible event of a different future to come (Derrida 2005), we might 'spook the complacency' (De Caputo 2016:121) of rule-governed institutional governance, and its totalising ambitions, and keep it and our rhetorical subjectivities in 'creative disequilibrium'. Taking heuristics to mean tools for discovery and invention, which refuse foreseeable outcomes or futures, since they can never predict in advance nor completely control what the learning 'income' (Dunne 2016) will be, these 'bits' (Bowman 2014) of poietics perhaps offer critical pedagogues and students a sense of the subtle, tilted ways they can improvise with power and conceivably spook and destabilise the economies of the institution which prioritises different types of income.

Thus, whilst an attentive praxis of care of the self, premised on foundations of constant change, necessarily proliferates hegemonic economies of knowledge, the excesses of knowledge production also open institutional windows to the poetry and aesthetics that penetrate all subjectivities and texts and imaginably incite new beginnings.

### 8.3 Findings gaps in the contractual spaces of our shared histories

Both student and pedagogic labour is premised on contractual presuppositions and pledges. These prescribe a range of responsibilities liable to lead to felicitous outcomes for both parties, all of which are hinged on the performative subject of 'I will'. An 'I' that constitutes an agency of discourse sufficient to make the ruined relations between words and things temporarily bind together the established spaces and structures of the institution of the university. Prompted by this inaugurating performative, the subject enters the empty premises of higher education, body and senses always already imbricated in its technologies of governance and production, to actualise the shared, commonsense belief in its authoritative status as conferrer of economic, social and cultural capital; the latter of which embodies one of the felicitous outcomes of our reciprocal contractual spaces. At a remove from these positions of the contracting parties is the other 'us', the many others that always mutate into new forms immune to universal vaccines to produce the present of our shared histories. Whilst the university establishment barely recognises this dynamic of knowledge production and distribution, that effects the subject's disappearance and reappearance, and ruptures the certainty of general statements, it can be seen as a form of non-contractual labour whose irreducible 'other' responsibilities are hinged on the possible performative subject of 'I can' or 'I may' (Derrida 2005:22). These subjects respond to the call of the other that is there, and might come that is not fully subjugated by authority. Together, the tensions between these performative subjects of 'I will', and 'I can' or 'I may', realise the normality of an order constituted by governance, and the gaps breached in it by subjects breaking into its other free spaces. These two performative subjects might be compared to *homo economicus* and *homo sapiens*, each of which inscribe different operations in the empty site of the university, the 'instrumental' and the 'poietic' (Trifonas 2005:211), and both of which are fundamentally necessary to its institution.

Taking this ahomogenous, paradoxical duo of performative subject positions alongside the instances of student poietics, and their respective unpredictability as (il)legitimate and subaltern forms of knowing, we have a contingent departure point for conceptualising the messy labour of reinventing critical writing praxis as micropractices of resistance. This is not to suggest we should release ourselves from the responsibility of teaching students the conventional techniques, grammars and grounds of critical operations in writing which confirm them as proper subjects of institutional disciplines. Rather, since alone these are no longer adequate grounds for confirming a responsibility to other, the path forward is to

learn more about our vulnerability to these disciplines, and to invite students to ‘unlearn’ presumptions they are autonomous subjects who simply need to learn the packaging techniques of reason in order to produce quality assured final products. Such presumptions threaten the contingent depth, distinctiveness and openness of knowledge’s co-producing subjects.

To frame these poietics as possible pedagogical heuristics links to a number of philosophised principles of ‘un-learning’ (Dunne 2016). First, it constitutes an attempt to erase the structural inequality, or dysmmetry, implicit in more traditional explicative practices of teaching and learning (Rancière 2014). By resisting fixed constructions of meaning and explanation which separate the particular from the general, and the one from many others, we can place students, pedagogues and many others alike in a community of equals, all subjugated to the same logics of production and distribution, in the events of which we construct by ‘groping along in the dark’ (Rancière 2016:41). Second, by positioning students as equal subjects in the positive practice of interpreting and producing unexpected incomes and gaps in the unstable material of intellectual operations (Rancière 2014), we advance historicised avenues of inquiry which keep procedures of normalisation open to textual diversity and mobility, that maintain procedures of inclusivity, not exclusivity. Third, by sanctioning visions of written knowledge as improvised, fragmented, speculative and makeshift, writers may feel freer to be less subsumed into conventionalities and to in-vent paragraphs and phrases with glimpses of irreducible otherness that constitute new temporary housing for thought.

Despite a thorough commitment to the historicity of the subject in this sketching of a small project of un-learning university governmentality premised on epistemologies of rationalised certainty and predictability, there is no suggestion here we can subvert the all-seeing gaze of the panopticon without also heeding to its systems of surveillance. However, if we take into account the dynamic capacity of the other Derridean performative subject of ‘as if’ (Derrida 2005), which does not deny its past and traditions but enacts a preliminary consent to these (Derrida 1993), whilst intervening in the contexts of university knowledge production to fulfil the promise of a future to come using the incomplete power of the performative ‘I can’ (Derrida 2005), we can create a distance in our attachments to these contexts. This gives us the space not to respond by saying ‘Oh dear friends, there is no possibility of the critical in the ruins of pedagogy and student writing’ (variation on Derrida’s variation of Montaigne

and Aristotle in Derrida 1993), but rather to respond by saying ‘Eureka! Here is the provisional space for taking up our present responsibility to the future and for interrogating ‘our’ knowledge’, even if the message of our interrogation has a propensity to take its own unpredictable path.

When exploring these moving distances, or silences, between our contexts and our speaking of them, my question is might we augment the spooking of our logocentric affiliations, which work to return us to the determinate, if we introduce a further rupture from the source by translating these suggestive poietics into pedagogical visuals. Visuals that usher into truth modes of teaching, learning and knowing frequently left out of the picture, which are apt to elude the smooth logics or exclusivity of academic style and serve to broaden the scene of pedagogical relations beyond university contexts. Whilst I propose the power of this approach to practice, it is not my intention in this thesis to carry out the work of this translation. Yet, in imagining what these visuals might look like, I see a great opportunity to enliven and challenge narrow pre-conceptions of academic style in using animations such as gifs, memes, folioscopes and similar to analogise the open and closed places of writing. As well as distancing knowledge from its logocentric moorings, the brevity of these retweeted and recirculated repeat-mode visuals offer a rich resource for un-explicating academic writing norms whilst also symbolising the movement between constitution and erasure inherent in our shared histories, which has no particular place to go.

#### **8.4 Conclusion**

The social categories of diversity and mobility are not merely mechanisms operating outside the materiality of knowledge making practices. They also organise the very construction of knowledge itself. Indeed, they operate as tactics and procedures that produce both resistance and theory; the latter here understood as synonymous with deconstruction. In order to clarify the relationship of theory with the procedures of diversity and mobility that produce it, this chapter has de-subjugated student performed examples of such variable procedures that are both the precondition and ending of knowledge production, and which as such decentralise and keep in play the workings of power. Such instances of critical writing practices at work are postulated as a possible additional focus for post-critical pedagogical research and teaching. As findings, they constitute heuristics for the teaching of academic literacies that encourages students to recognise that their writing is already, and

can be, not simply a medium for arguments, but also a tool for cutting into discourse via poiesis.

## **Chapter 9 Conclusion: the return of present time in pedagogy and student writing**

### **9.1 Introduction**

Conceptualising the doctoral research process as a sort of final exam in my apprenticeship as an academic, in which I put my thinking and writing to the test as tools of inquiry, and sought to mark out spaces in which I might conduct intellectual practice in ways that felt ethically, rhetorically and logically right to me, I am now at the end stages of this journey, and ready to hand over this thesis to a small audience of experts from whom I seek confirmation that my problematisation and analysis of issues of resistance and production in the ruins of pedagogy and student writing stands up to fellow scrutiny. I am acutely aware this is but a beginning, and a lot more remains to be done, but as a first step in theorising my critical praxis, it has been personally illuminating and taught me a lot about the way ideas become conceivable and are translated into practice.

In order to 'finish' this thesis, whose central preoccupations have been to stay with the uncomfortable problematisation of social givens that the thinking of Foucault, Derrida and other poststructural and deconstructive thinkers prompts, and not marginalise the messier, subjective dimensions of our epistemologies, I now present a conclusion. This begins with consideration of how the research question was addressed, moves on to a brief summary of the whole, then introduces a brief holistic assessment of the main thesis message before considering the limitations of the work and listing its main contributions to the field. It ends with a few recommendations for future research.

### **9.2 How the key research problem was theorised and examined**

The main research question addressed in this thesis has been how to construe a plausible characterisation of 'the critical' and resistance in pedagogy, and student writing in the critical disciplines, in the light of (a) poststructuralist understandings of discourse and the subject as respectively the raw material and subjugated agency of knowledge, that produce constant change, and (b) a view of the ideologies and central concepts of modernity as 'in ruins', despite relations of power and hegemony which continue to regulate such criticism. The central premise throughout this thesis has rested on the assertion that to effectively carry out critical practice commensurate with theory, we need to relinquish all notions of ahistorical epistemologies that rule out language, the text and subjectivity from the ontological domain of the material world.

Answering the main research question began with broader consideration of poststructuralist understandings of theory and praxis that critique and de-centre the fixed concepts and epistemologies of modernity (see Chapter 2). It then continued with conceptualisation of the agency and subjugation of the research, pedagogy and writing subject within the hegemonic regimes of 21<sup>st</sup> century higher education, to provide a mandate for formalising and interpreting the categories of 'the critical' and 'resistance' not in binary opposition to conformity and consent, but as empty signifiers emptied of unity by the multiple antagonisms that form the ground of all relations of truth (see Chapter 3). After theorising the praxis of knowledge production not as an individual undertaking, but a learned and instinctive performance that fabricates largely ideologically-inflected forms of cultural capital, the next task in the thesis was to reclaim 'the critical' in pedagogy from the modernity that occupies some of its assumptions (see Chapter 4), and to consider 'the critical' and 'resistance' in student writing in the critical disciplines in a manner commensurate with its imbrication with centralised technologies of governance that sustain old logics of certain and predictable outcomes linked to oppressive bureaucracy and managerialism (see Chapter 5).

Having established the link between the production of knowledge, the production of society and the production of the researcher and her methodology, the thesis next incorporated reflexivity and deconstruction into the formalising of an analytical and interpretive framework that replaces positivist ways of coding data with depth and breadth of critical reading (see Chapter 6). This is used to analyse the heterogeneous aporiae of two student research papers written for an undergraduate course in intercultural communication. The significance of this evidence is to be found in: (a) the ways it provides thick data on additional and competing notions, to those currently institutionally valued, of 'the critical' and 'resistance' in writing; (b) the manner it challenges established, quality assurance hierarchical models for evaluating the merits of student writing which assume language is a neutral medium (see Chapter 7); and (c), its usefulness in providing pointers as to possible ways to effect a change in our thinking within critical pedagogy and literacies practices, that accord with the incessantly shifting human capacity for interpretation (see Chapter 8).

Following this questioning of the open, material grounds of university reasoning and knowledge, with regard to its continual assembling and disassembling through the dynamics

of subjectivity, and also the instances of diversity and mobility that it is argued this immanence of student writing produces, further examples of ‘the critical’ and ‘resistance’ are gleaned from eight other student research papers. The significance of this additional gleaning is threefold. First, it offers analysis of student compositions that focuses specifically on snippets of *poiesis* (Derrida 1998), or the performative fashioning of a possible new in the archive, that defers the given. These constitute fresh representations of the critical in student writing and literacy. Second, it marks the stage in the thesis when I finally turn to the question of the ‘what’ and ‘how’ of the limited opportunities for freedom and resistance within the historicity of Western pedagogy and knowledge strategies. This yields novel, post-critical perspectives on historicity within the event of writing. Third, it proposes empirical examples of *poiesis* for use as heuristic tools students can use to perceive how routine forms of power can be exceeded in localized contexts of their own knowledge production. It is argued the critical value of these provisional *poietics* is highly felicitous since, on the one hand they make intelligible the lost contents, of reason and ‘truth’, and on the other they give form to fresh categorisations of knowledge that incorporate language as the raw material of invention and innovation. Ironically, these supplementary categories, that it is suggested should be used under the descriptor of ‘language’ in gradesheet grids, use the very same terms as those employed for centuries to describe Cartesian perspectives on scientific progress, indicating that they capture some of the hidden coherences of knowledge’s totality.

### **9.3 Brief summary of the whole**

Applying Foucault and Derrida to the history and governance of the university, critical pedagogy, (student) writing, and my own subjectivity, this thesis has been dedicated, in a modest sense, to gesturing towards spaces of the post-critical within the far from picturesque ‘ruins’ of the academy. Assuming a poststructuralist ethical duty to re-cognize the presence of the multiple irruptions of alterity which shatter and fragment the old foundations and pillars of knowledge, power and the subject, it has attempted to highlight the degree to which both the known and the un-known constitute the archives of ‘truth’, through the positivities of power that produce both the status quo and new performances of knowledge that reform the disciplines. With reference to Foucault’s three axes of power, knowledge/‘truth’, power, and government/subject (Foucault 2010), that respectively institute each other, and his three ‘methods’ of archaeology, genealogy and ‘care of the self’, and also to Derrida’s deferring of presence and *telos* in the subject and event of

writing, the thesis has attempted to uncover some of the material contexts and texts within which theory and praxis are/can be rebooted.

Despite nostalgic or comfort zone proclivities, the ambivalent amalgams of subjectivity explored in this thesis characterise the impossibility of an essential resistance leading to deliverance from subjugation. Reasoning thus, the use-value of 'the critical' that services traditional pedagogical projects of freedom from oppression has been demonstrated to be erroneous. As I have tried to show, given the historical contingencies of knowledge production, the outcomes and/or in-comes of all our actions are at once constraining, liberating and unpredictable. The more we try to 'control' the ethical path of the critical, and orient it towards intellectual responsibility, freedom, and openness to Other, the more we deny the heterogeneous logics that make anything thinkable, including ourselves. 'The critical' is not a discreet mark of the difference between consent and resistance, however much we have in view an equitable, sustainable, or 'higher' project of education. As soon as we factor in the play of presence and absence, of emergence and submergence, and the centralised regulation of disciplinary knowledge, we are returned to the illegitimacy of the margins, and the aporiae of our theory and praxis. This is not to suggest we are power-less to resist from within, but that given the medium of knowledge in question, which is language, this should be understood as 'a performative force [which puts to work] a certain "as if"' (Derrida 2005:19) in our pedagogy and writing, whose effects can never clearly be foreseen.

One way to get a foothold in materiality with this hypothetical, post-critical, clarion call is to deconstruct, and so put into question and destabilise the terminology and constructs that form the apparent solidity and essence of old, authoritative ways. These are the powerful givens of the modern history of man, science and knowledge, now imbricated with more recent neoliberal histories of *homo economicus*, and managed national agendas of teaching and learning (Bowman 2014). For resistance to have a chance, given its shifting ground and relations with power, such old terms and conditions of knowledge need to be subverted, to maintain unfixed places and times for alternatives. Following the strategies of others, this thesis has argued an effective way to do this is to deploy new vocabularies that disarticulate modernity's desire for control and mastery (Maclure 2011; Rancière 2014).

A simple way to do this is to use the prefix 'un' to reject the certainties, presence and inferred *telos* of practices such as 'learning', 'thinking', 'teaching' and 'writing'. Rather than evoking a straightforward, binary opposite, this two letter supplement deconstructs the plenitude of the previous concepts it precedes, and spooks the ghost of the sovereign subject that haunts them. With the spaces of the university thus fleetingly emptied, the stage is set for performative productions of 'the critical' in present time, which may yet 'dislocate the ground of the times' (Derrida 2006:214). Other sleights of terminology include positive ranking of messy epistemologies that 'stutter' and 'stammer', which make it possible to apprehend the social complexities that scientific logics cannot access, and to interrupt the *telos* bound coherence and modalities of Cartesian rationality, so as to let other possible futures tremble for a while as pedagogical and writing 'in-comes' (Bowman 2014). However, as I have been at pains to indicate throughout the thesis, whilst we can fabricate conceptual tools that make more visible the workings of power, and problematise reason's ontological abstractions in our projects of critique, we are ourselves conditioning a new form of governance from within truth's contingencies. It is this we need constantly to be alert to and wary of. Indeed, in this sense, one of the things that emerges vividly from this thesis is a refreshed awareness of the practices of power within which 'the critical' and 'resistance' are imbricated. Nevertheless, it is the very hybridity of authoritative practices of reason, and the present history of the event, be it of pedagogy or writing, that ensures the micro possibilities of reason's undoing, and spaces for an ethical care of the self as a subject of 'freedom' (Foucault 1984).

By tracing the multiple hybridities produced in the interpretive context of the very small site of legitimation of knowledge that is my undergraduate course in intercultural communication, and the even smaller sites that are two student research papers, it has been possible to peer into the places where 'the critical' is disqualified and put unfirmly back into an understanding of power, the present and history. Thus, the re-cognition of the rich specificity of the forms and conditions of subjectivity interrogated in these two papers, and alluded to in preceding chapters, demarcates not only the broken fences of certainty that constitute the domains of knowledge, and its essential impermanence, but is also conjugated with the forms that legitimate such uncertainty. Given history's determining the absence of a guarantor of certainty to truth, care is taken in this analysis, and during the thesis, to assume or convey as little as possible an essence or security in the arguments and claims, that might return thought too quickly to hegemony. Hence, for example, the interest

of the subheadings used to point to the local specifics of subjective agency at work in two student responses to governmentality of 'truth', is that they take seriously the empirical work of interpreting the conflicts, consents and aporiae in the data in ways that resist the stability of established categories.

It was through the in-depth interpretation of the milling multiplicity of discursive construals of consent, resistance and knowledge's silences, in the first peering of my empirical inquiry, that I was pointed to one small way out of the conundrum of critical praxis in the ruins of student writing. Neither a clear cut concrete praxis, nor easy to pin down, the fleeting glimpses of subjectivities performing spontaneous openness to Other, that in the performance of interpretation 'transform the very thing [they are] interpreting' (Derrida 2006:63) were qualified as *poietics* (Derrida 1998); ambiguous, possible answers to the question of 'How can we speak?' in the productive limits of knowledge. Whilst assuming it would be vain to suggest these *poietics* can operate as a form of critique capable of organising emancipation, it is argued that they can inform an ethos of experimentation, both in pedagogy and writing, which maintains in its performance and interpretation the trace of a resistance that cannot with certainty deliver, yet which expresses the momentary absence of conformity to governance.

#### **9.4 Ways the whole exceeds its parts – a brief holistic judgement**

By bringing present time into pedagogy and student writing it has been possible in this thesis to show how truth and history are in a constant struggle with each other that neither can completely win. Closer examination of unstable resistance movements beneath the socially ordered surfaces of knowledge has shown critique to be an uncontrollable possibility led by individual activity in university sites that ensures meaning always exceeds the grids of its texts and contexts. The implications of this for critical practitioners can be posed in terms of seeing resistance as uncertain, unpredictable effects in the cohesive webs of reason.

#### **9.5 Limitations**

It is quite hard to discuss what counts as limitations when bearing in mind all the competing definitions of this term relating to the validity or generalisability of results of empirical research, and the reflexive awareness of the contingencies of power, deployed throughout this thesis, which predefine definite versions of concepts and experiences in the institutional site of the university. Indeed, whilst the theoretical perspectives, and the arguments,

rhetoric and analysis of this thesis have shortcomings and limits, the aim of this thesis has not been to produce a definitive reading of pedagogical and writing praxis, but instead to be unequivocally reflexive about what is deemed to be 'critical', 'resistance' and 'ethical', and how these unsettled non-entities appear in the event of post-qualitative research, pedagogy and writing. What I have wanted to gently underscore is the part of false starts, wrong turns and struggle in the journey to locating an object of analysis during the research process. These perform the necessary function of standing up to transcendental theory and science, and are intended to ensure messier, less rigidly normative knowing; one which remains open to questions at all stages and enactments of the inquiry. Likewise, I see the 'findings' not as givens produced from systematic analysis and comparison, but as irreducible possibilities of meaning emerging from the complex, competing theoretical ways of containing them, and a self-consciousness about my own role in writing them up and producing them. Thus, any claims to definitive advantages and disadvantages of the approach taken, or 'originality' of the findings would be inappropriate, since this would ignore the forces at work in the collection and interpretation of the data. Most of the conceptualisations of 'the critical' described in what is considered as post-qualitative evidence are best seen as unique instances of the extra local quality of some of the powers that might 'capture us' and shape these materialisations.

#### **9.6 Applications and implications of the research: one more time with feeling**

Bearing in mind the processes of chance by which they have been generated and will be understood, I now isolate some of the theorised practices of this research I consider of particular potential use-value for practitioners interested in post-critical pedagogy and literacies, and perhaps others.

- i. Replacing the specificity and positionality of class subjects with that of subaltern academic subjects: united as a community by their subjugation to grids of academic intelligibility. This inhibits assumptions about positionality as a given imposed from the top-down, that perpetuates positivist principles and hierarchical divides, and guides us towards a reflexive concern for ways all academic subalterns can speak from within the opaque workings of power (Spivak 1988; Gramsci 1998). (Chapter 3)
- ii. Use of the terms *resistance* and *consent* as analytical notions for identifying the immanent strategies and operations that together keep in motion the

heterogeneous distributional functions of power which continuously reproduce the spaces of reason at the same time as they disguise its subjective origins.

- iii. An adequate ontology of the agency of the subaltern subject of pedagogy and writing that is commensurate with the continuity of knowledge production and sociocultural organisation, and the part the heterogeneous interpellations of governance play in this. (Chapters 3 and 4)
- iv. A re-advancing of ways of wording new worlds of post-critical pedagogy that allow theory and praxis to temporarily elude the central, scrutinising gaze of Western rationality and contemporary discourses of higher education teaching and learning, to lead us towards un-learning existing knowns. (Chapter 4)
- v. In conjunction with the existing field of critical literacy, I use Foucault's characterisation of 'care of the self' (1982; 2008), and the 'virtue of critique' (1997:45), along with Derrida's understanding of *poiesis* (Derrida 1988), as the ungrounded space between past and present conditions for the possibility of knowledge, to theorise diversity and mobility at the level of the text as a way of thinking and conceptualising micro-practices of resistance in the ruins of student writing. (Chapter 5)
- vi. A fresh example of taking seriously the post- responsibility to critique the transcendent, privileged site of knowledge, by being reflexive about the messiness and mistakes in my mobilising of theoretical frameworks to put together a valid object of analysis. This makes salient the part subjectivity plays in the (mis)construal of such objects of knowledge. (Chapter 6)
- vii. Rich interpretive data that differently exemplify 'the ethical capacity for consent, criticality and creativity in the student subject of writing' in the field of intercultural communication. (Chapter 7)
- viii. Examples of *poietics* in student writing that (a) can be used as heuristics for the teaching of post-critical literacies, and (b) validate the need for criteria such as 'innovative' or 'inventive' under the descriptor of language in undergraduate grade sheets. (Chapter 8)

### **9.7 Recommendations for (my) future research and practice**

Having now unsettled my initial views of what I considered to be critical approaches to writing and pedagogy, and theorised and illustrated post-critical alternatives which sidestep formulaic pre-definition, which I argue are of some possible value for contesting the

hegemonic assertions of the market, neoliberal economics and bureaucracy at an individuated level of activity, the next step is to put these ideas into practice. First, by using theory to remain aware of what is entailed in my enacting of the role prescribed for me, and to put this in suspension for the time of opening the university to different kinds of learning and student writing. Second, by using the examples of *poietics* to impress upon students there are opportunities everywhere to cultivate creative resistance and thinking within the sedimented fields of 'academic writing'. Such figurative, configuring of thought is largely deemed inappropriate by the omnipresent rationalist ideology that inhabits university writing and skills centres, despite the fact it can produce inventive accounts of knowledge that ensure 'the capacity to imagine the social otherwise' (Readings 1996:119) is held open. Un-doing thought and practice, whilst also doing it, is a recommendation with no end.

## References

Althusser, A. (1977) *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. 2nd edn. London: NLB

Althusser, A. (1995[1971]) Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation). In: Tallack, D. (ed.) (1995) *Critical Theory: A Reader*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf pp.298-313

Anderson, E. (2010) *Feminist Epistemology and Philosophy of Science*. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Accessed on 10.12.10 at: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/feminism-epistemology/>

Andersen, N. A. (2003) *Discursive Analytical Strategies*. Bristol: The Policy Press

Andrews, R. (2010) *Argumentation in Higher Education: improving practice through theory and research*. New York & London: Routledge

Apple, M.W. (2011) *Paulo Freire, Critical Pedagogy and the Tasks of the Critical Scholar/Activist*. Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo Programa de Pós-graduação Educação: Currículo Revista e-curriculum ISSN: 1809-3876. Accessed on 25.01.17 at: <file:///C:/Users/p0074482/Documents/7591-18572-1-SM.pdf>

Appiah, K. (2006) *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York: W.W. Norton

Ayers, A. (2013) Introduction. In: Ayers, A, (ed.) *Gramsci, political economy, and international relations theory: modern princes and naked emperors*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ayora Diaz, S.I. 'The Accountologist: An emerging form of anthropological life in Mexican universities' In: Brett de Bary (ed.) (2010) *Universities in Translation: The mental labor of globalization*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press. pp. 89-103

Bakhtin, M. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press

Bakhtin, M.M. (1986) *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Translated by Vern W. McGee ; edited by Michael Holquist and Caryl Emerson. Austin: University of Texas Press

Ball, S. (2012) The Making of a Neoliberal Academic. *Research in Secondary Teacher Education*. 2(1), pp.29-31

Ball, S. (2013) *Foucault, Power, and Education*. Abingdon: Routledge

Ball, S. (2013) *Education, justice and democracy: The struggle over ignorance and opportunity*. Policy Paper. Centre for Labour and Social Studies. Accessed on 25.01.17 at: [http://classonline.org.uk/docs/2013\\_Policy\\_Paper\\_Education,\\_justice\\_and\\_democracy\\_\(Stephen\\_Ball\).pdf](http://classonline.org.uk/docs/2013_Policy_Paper_Education,_justice_and_democracy_(Stephen_Ball).pdf)

Ball, S. & Olmedo, A. (2012) Care of the self, resistance and subjectivity under neoliberal governmentalities. *Critical Studies in Education*. 54(1), pp.85-96

Barker, P. (1998) *Michel Foucault: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Barthes, R. (1972) *Mythologies*. Translated from the French by Annette Lavers. London: Cape

Bauman, Z. (2000) *Liquid Modernity*. Oxford: Polity

Bazerman, C. (1988) *Shaping Written Knowledge*. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press

Benesch, S. (2001) *Critical English for Academic Purposes: Theory, Politics, and Practice*. Mahwah, N.J.; London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates  
Bhabha, H.K. (1994) *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge

Bhaskar, R. (1989) *Reclaiming Reality: A Critical Introduction to Contemporary Philosophy*. London: Verso

Biesta, G. (2013) *Beautiful Risk of Education*. New York; Abingdon: Paradigm Publishers

- Block, D. (2007) *Second Language Identities*. London; New York: Routledge
- Blommaert, J. & Jie, D. (2010) *Ethnographic Fieldwork: A Beginner's Guide*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters
- Borradori, G. (ed.) (2003) *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogues with Jürgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press
- Bourdieu, P. (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power*. Translated by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Cambridge: Polity
- Bowman, P. (2014) Autodidactics of Bits: Adrian Rifkin's [Rancièrian] Cultural Studies & the Partition of the Pedagogical. Chapter 7 in: Arnold, D. (ed.) (2014) *Intersubjective Encounters: Re-examining the work of Adrian Rifkin*. London; New York: IB Tauris. Downloaded on 13.08.15 from Cardiff University, academia edu at: [https://www.academia.edu/703196/Autodidactics\\_of\\_Bits\\_Adrian\\_Rifkins\\_Rancierean\\_Cultural\\_Studies\\_and\\_the\\_partition\\_of\\_the\\_pedagogical](https://www.academia.edu/703196/Autodidactics_of_Bits_Adrian_Rifkins_Rancierean_Cultural_Studies_and_the_partition_of_the_pedagogical)
- Brecher, B. (2010) 'Is Critical Education Still Possible in UK Universities?'. In: Gur-Ze'ev, I. (ed. and author) (2010) *The Possibility/Impossibility of a New Critical Language in Education*. Rotterdam; Boston; Taipei: Sense Publishers. Chapter 18, pp. 351-36
- Breuer, F. & Roth, W-M. (2003) Subjectivity and Reflexivity in the Social Sciences: Epistemic Windows and Methodological Consequences. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 4(2)
- Breuing, M. (2011) Problematizing Critical Pedagogy. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 3(3), pp.2-23
- Brown, W. (2017) *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism by Stealth*. New York: Zone Books
- Bybee, J. & Fleischman, S. (1995) Modality in Grammar and Discourse: An Introductory Essay. In: Bybee, J. & Fleischman, S. (eds.) (1995) *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company

- Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communication competence*. New York: Multilingual Matters
- Byram, M. (2009) Intercultural Competence in Foreign Language Education. In: Deardoff, D. (ed.) (2009) *The Sage Handbook of Intercultural Competence*, Thousand Okas, CA: Sage pp. 321-332
- Cameron, A. & Palan, R. (2004) *The Imagined Economies of Globalization*. London: SAGE Publications
- Canaan, J.E. & Shumar, W. (2008) Higher Education in the Era of Globalization and Neoliberalism. In: Canaan, J.E. & Shumar, W. (eds.) (2008) *Structure and Agency in the Neoliberal University*. New York; Abingdon: Routledge, Chapter 1
- Caputo, J.D. (2016) Teaching the Event: Deconstruction, Hauntology, and the Scene of Pedagogy. In: Seery, A. & Dunne, E. (eds.) (2016) *The Pedagogics of Unlearning*, Earth, Milky Way: punctum books, pp. 111-130
- Cheng, M. (2010) Audit Cultures and Quality Assurance Mechanisms in England: a Study of their Perceived Impact on the work of Academics. *Teaching in Higher Education*. 15(3), pp.259-271
- Chia, R. (2000) Discourse Analysis as Organisational Analysis. *Organization* 7(3), pp.513-518
- Chouliaraki, L. F. & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press
- Chung, J.E (2009) Ethnographic Remnants. In: Faubion, J.D. & Marcus, G.E, (eds.) (2009) *Fieldwork is Not What it Used to Be*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, Chapter 2
- Clemitshaw, G. (2013) Critical Pedagogy as Educational Resistance: A Post-Structuralist Reflection. *Power and Education*. 5(3), pp. 268-279

Clifford, J. (1986) On Ethnographic Allegory. In: Clifford, J. & Marcus G.E. (1986) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary edn. Berkeley, Calif.; London: University of California Press

Clifford, V. & Montgomery, C. (2011) Introduction: Internationalizing the curriculum for global citizenship in higher education. In: Clifford, V. & Montgomery, C. (eds.) *Moving towards Internationalisation of the Curriculum for Global Citizenship in Higher Education*. Oxford, UK: OCSLD Oxford Brookes University, Chapter 1, pp.13-24

Courtois, A. & O'Keefe, T. (2015) Precarity in the ivory cage: Neoliberalism and casualization of work in the Irish higher education sector. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 13(1), pp.43-66

Cressman, J.W. (2013) *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design*. (3<sup>rd</sup> edn.) Los Angeles, [Calif.]; London: SAGE

Dean, M. (1999) *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London; Thousand Oaks; New Delhi: SAGE Publications

De Caputo, J. (2016) Teaching the event. In: Seery, A. & Dunne, E. (eds.) (2016) *The Pedagogics of Unlearning*, Earth, Milky Way: punctum books, pp.111-130

De Certeau, M. (1984) *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Translated by Steven F. Rendall. Berkeley; London: University of California Press

De Certeau, M. (2010a) Micro-techniques and Panoptic Discourse: A Quid pro Quo. In: De Certeau, M. (2010) *Heterologies: Discourses on the Other*. 8<sup>th</sup> printing. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, Chapter 7, pp.185-192

De Certeau, M. (2010b) History: Science and Fiction. In: De Certeau, M. (2010) *Heterologies: Discourses on the Other*. 8<sup>th</sup> printing. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, Chapter 15, pp.199-224

De Certeau, M. (2010c) *The Beauty of the Dead*. In: De Certeau, M. (2010) *Heterologies: Discourses on the Other*. 8<sup>th</sup> printing. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, Chapter 15, pp.199-224

Delcambre. Isabelle in conversation with Donahue, Christiane. (2015) What's at Stake in Different Traditions? Littéracies Universitaires and Academic Literacies. In Lillis, T., Harrington, K., Lea, M. R. & Mitchell, S. (eds.) 2015 *Working with Academic Literacies: Case Studies towards Transformative Practice*. Chapter 3. Fort Collins, Colorado: The WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press.. Available at <https://wac.colostate.edu/books/lillis/>

Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1988) *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. London; New Dehli; New York; Sydney: Bloomsbury

Deleuze, G. (2006 [1988]) *Foucault*. Translated from the French by Séan Hand. London; New York: Continuum

Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (2013) Introduction. In: *The Landscape of Qualitative Research*. 4<sup>th</sup> edn. Los Angeles: SAGE publications. Chapter 1. pp. 1-42

Derrida, J. (1982) Différance. (excerpt). In: *Margins of Philosophy*. Translated from the French by Alan Bass. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Accessed on 10.08.17 at: <http://hydra.humanities.uci.edu/derrida/diff.html>

Derrida, J. (1986) 'Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences'. In Robert Con Davis (ed.) *Contemporary Literary Criticism: Modernism Through Post-Structuralism*. New York & London: Longman

Derrida, G. (1988) *Limited Inc*. Translated from the French by Samuel Weber and Jeffrey Mehlman. Evanston, IL.: Northwestern University Press

Derrida, J. (1993) *Politics of Friendship*. *American Imago*, 50(3), (1993:Fall). Extracted from *PCI full text*, published by ProQuest Information and Learning Company

Derrida, J. (2004[1990]) *Eyes of the University: Right to philosophy 2*. Translated by Jan Plug and others. Stanford: Stanford University Press

Derrida, J. (2005) The future of the profession, or the university without condition: (thanks to the "Humanities," what could take place tomorrow. In: In: Trifonas, P.P. & Peters, M.A. (eds.) (2005) *Deconstructing Derrida: Tasks for the New Humanities*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Palgrave MacMillan

Derrida, J. (2005b) *Rogues: Two Essays on Reason*. Stanford; Calif.: Stanford University Press

Derrida, J. (2005c[1994]) *The Politics of Friendship*. London; New York: Verso

Derrida, J. (2006[1993]) *Specters of Marx*. New York; Abingdon: Routledge Classics

Diaz-Bone, R., Bührmann, A., Rodríguez, E., Schneider, W., Kendall, G. & Tirado, F. (2007) 'The Field of Foucaultian Discourse Analysis: Structures, Developments and Perspectives'. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*. 8(3) Accessed on 05.02.11 at: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/234/518>

Dreyfus, H.L. & Rabinow, P. (1983) *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. (2<sup>nd</sup> edn.) Chicago: Chicago University Press

Dunne, E. (2016) Learning to Unlearn. In: Seery, A. & Dunne, E. (eds.) (2016) *The Pedagogics of Unlearning*, Earth, Milky Way: punctum books, pp.13-24

Eagleton, T. (1993) *The Crisis of Contemporary Culture*. An Inaugural Lecture delivered before the University of Oxford on 27 November 1992. Clarendon Press: Oxford

Eagleton, T. (2007) *Ideology: An Introduction*. New and updated ed. London: Verso

Eco, U. (1976) *A Theory of Semiotics*. Bloomington; London: Indiana University Press

English, F. (2012) *Student Writing and Genre: Reconfiguring Academic Knowledge*. London: Bloomsbury

Eribon, D. (2014) Towards an Ethics of Subjectivation: French Resistances to Psychoanalysis in the 1970s. Pp. 71-87. In: Faubion, J.D. (ed.) (2014) *Foucault Now: Current Perspectives in Foucault Studies*. Cambridge; Malden MA: Polity

Evans, K. (2013) *Negotiating the Self: Identity, Sexuality and Emotion in Learning to Teach*. New York, NY: Routledge Falmer

Fairclough, N. (1989) *Language and Power*. London; New York: Longman

Fairclough, N. (1992) *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Fairclough, N. (1993) Critical Discourse Analysis and the Marketisation of Public Discourses: the Universities. *Discourse and Society*, 4(2), pp.133-167

Fairclough, N. (2000) *New Labour, New Language?* New York & London: Routledge

Fairclough, N. (2003) *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London; New York: Routledge

Fairclough, N. (2006) *Language and Globalization*. London; New York: Routledge

Fairclough, I. & Fairclough, N. (2012) *Political Discourse Analysis: A Method for Advanced Students*. London: Routledge

Faubion, J. D. (2009) The Ethics of Fieldwork as an Ethics of Connectivity. In: Faubion, J.D. & Marcus, G.E, (eds.) (2009) *Fieldwork is Not What it Used to Be*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, Chapter 7, pp.145-166

Forchtner, B. (2011) Critique, the discourse-historical approach and the Frankfurt School. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 8(1), pp.1-14

Foucault, M. (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon Books

Foucault, M. (1974[1966]) *The Order of Things*. Translated from the French. London: Tavistock Publications

Foucault, M. (1975) 'Truth and Juridicial Forms'. In: Foucault, M. (1994) *Michel Foucault: Power: Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984. Vol. 3*. Faubion, J.D. (ed.), translated by Robert Hurley and others. London: Penguin Books

Foucault, M. (1977) What is an Author? In: *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*. Translated from the French by Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press

Foucault, M. & Deleuze, G. (1977[1972]) *Intellectuals and Power: A conversation between Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze*. Translated from the French by Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press

Foucault, M. (1980a) 'Interview with Michel Foucault' conducted by D. Trombador, published in *Il Contributo*. In: Foucault, M. (1994) *Michel Foucault: Power: Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984. Vol. 3*. Faubion, J.D. (ed.), translated by Robert Hurley and others. London: Penguin Books

Foucault, M. (1980b) 'Two Lectures'. In: *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. New York: Vintage Books

Foucault, M. (1982) 'The Subject and Power'. In: Foucault, M. *Michel Foucault: Power: Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984. Vol. 3*. Faubion, J.D. (ed.), translated by Robert Hurley and others. London: Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (1983) Self-Writing. In *Dits et écrits*, vol.4, pp. 415-430. Accessed from the World Wide Web on 27.01.17 at: <https://foucault.info/doc/documents/foucault-hypomnemata-en-html>

Foucault, M. (1984a) 'The Ethics of The Concern of the Self as a Practice of Freedom'. In: Rabinow, P. (ed.) (2000) *Essential Works of Michel Foucault 1954-1984 – Vol. 1 Ethics, Subjectivity and Truth*. London: Penguin

Foucault, M. (1984b) Polemics, Politics and Problematization. In: Rabinow, P. & Rose, N.S (eds.) (2003) *The essential Foucault: selections from The essential works of Foucault, 1954-1984*. New York; London: New Press. pp.18-24

Foucault, M. (1984c) What is Enlightenment?. In: Rabinow, P. (ed.) *The Foucault Reader*. London: Penguin

Foucault, M. (1987) *The Use of Pleasure: The History of Sexuality*, Vol 2. Translated from the French by Robert Hurley. London: Penguin

Foucault, M. (1988) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. New York: Random House

Foucault, M. (1991[1971]) 'Nietzsche, Genealogy, History'. In Rabinow, P. (ed.) (1991) *The Foucault Reader*. London: Penguin Books

Foucault, M. (1991a[1975]) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated from the French by Alan Sheridan. London: Penguin Books Ltd.

Foucault, M. (1994) Truth and Power. In: Foucault, M. (1994) *Michel Foucault: Power: Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984. Vol. 3*. Faubion, J.D. (ed.), translated by Robert Hurley and others. London: Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (1997) What is Critique? In: *The Politics of Truth*. English Translation. Translated from French by Lysa Hocrath & Catherine Porter. In *Dits et Ecrits* for original French. Los Angeles: Semiotexte. Accessed on 10.07.2015 at: <http://anthropos-lab.net/wp/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/Foucault-Critique.pdf>

Foucault, M. (1998[1976]) *The Will to Knowledge: The History of Sexuality: 1*. Translated from the French by Robert Hurley. London: Penguin Books Ltd.

Foucault, M. (2001) *Michel Foucault: Power: Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984. Vol. 3*. Faubion, J.D. (ed.), translated by Robert Hurley and others. London: Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (2001) *Michel Foucault: Power: Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984. Vol. 3.* Faubion, J.D. (ed.), translated by Robert Hurley and others. London: Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (2002[1966]) *The Order of Things*. London; New York: Routledge Classics

Foucault, M. (2002a[1972]) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Translated from the French by Alan Sheridan Smith. London: Routledge

Foucault M. (2003a) What is Enlightenment? In: Rabinow P. & Rose, N. (eds.) (2003) *The Essential Foucault: Selections from Essential Works of Foucault, 1954-1984*, New York; London: New Press

Foucault, M. (2003b) *Society Must Be Defended. Lectures at the Collège de France 1975-76*. Translated from French by David Macey. New York: Picador. Accessed on 14.12.2015 at: [http://rebels-library.org/files/foucault\\_society\\_must\\_be\\_defended.pdf](http://rebels-library.org/files/foucault_society_must_be_defended.pdf)

Foucault, M. (2003c) The Subject and Power. In: Rabinow, P. and Rose, N. (eds.) (2003) *The Essential Foucault: Selection from Essential Works of Foucault, 1954-1984*. New York; London: New Press

Foucault, M. (2005) *The hermeneutics of the subject: lectures at the Collège de France, 1981-82*, Lecture 19, 10 March 1982, First Hour. New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Foucault, M. (2008) *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979*, translated from French by Graham Burchell. New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Foucault, M. (2010[1983]) 5 January 1983 Second Hour. In: *The Government of Self and Others: Lectures at the Collège de France*. Ed. Frédéric Gros. Translated from the French by Graham Burchell. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan

Freire, P. (1972) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin

Freire, P. (1994) *Pedagogy of hope: reliving Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. London: Continuum  
Freire, P. (1998) *Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy and Civic Courage*. Lanham, MA: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers

Freire, P. (2013) *Education for Critical Consciousness*. London: Bloomsbury

Freire, A. M. A. & Macedo, D. (eds). (2000) *The Paulo Freire Reader*. New York; London: Continuum

Fuller, S. (2003) 'Interdisciplinarity: The Loss of a Heroic Vision in the Marketplace of Ideas'. *Interdisciplines*. Accessed on 16.11.10 at: <http://www.interdisciplines.org/interdisciplinarity/>

Gee, J.P. (2004) Discourse Analysis: What Makes it Critical?. In Rogers, R. (ed.) *Critical Discourse Analysis in Education*. Mahwah, NJ; London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Gee, J.P. (2005) *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis; Theory and Method*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. New York; London: Routledge

Gee, J.P (2012) *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses*. 4<sup>th</sup> edn. London; New York: Routledge

Gergen, K.J. (1999) *An Invitation to Social Construction*. London: Sage

Gerhardt, H-P. (1993) Paulo Freire (1921-97). *Prospects: the Quarterly Review of Comparative Education*. 23(3/4), pp.439-58, UNESCO: International Bureau of Education. Accessed on 25.01.17 at: [http://www.ibe.unesco.org/fileadmin/user\\_upload/archive/Publications/thinkerspdf/freiree.PDF](http://www.ibe.unesco.org/fileadmin/user_upload/archive/Publications/thinkerspdf/freiree.PDF)

Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*,. Cambridge: Polity Press/Basil Blackwell

Giminez, J. & Thomas, P. (2015) A Framework for Usable Pedagogy: Case Studies towards Accessibility, Criticality and Visibility. In: T., Harrington, K., Lea, M.R. & Mitchell, S. (eds.) (2015) *Working with Academic Literacies: Case Studies towards Transformative Practice*. Fort

Collins, Colorado: The WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press. Chapter 1. Available at <https://wac.colostate.edu/books/lillis/>

Giroux, H. (1992) *Border Crossings: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education*. NY; London: Routledge

Giroux, H. (2005) Higher education and democracy's promise. In: Trifonas, P.P. & Peters, M.A. (eds.) *Deconstructing Derrida: Tasks for the New Humanities*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Palgrave MacMillan

Glaser, D. (2015) Bureaucracy: Why Won't Scholars Break their Paper Chains. *Times Higher Education*, 21 May, 2015. Accessed on 28.02.17 at: <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/features/bureaucracy-why-wont-scholars-break-their-paper-chains/2020256.article>

Gramsci, A. (1998) On Education: The Organisation of Education and Culture. In: *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. London: Lawrence & Wishart. Chapter 2, pp.24-33

Gramsci, A. (1998b) The Study of Philosophy. In: *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. London: Lawrence & Wishart. pp.321-377

Gramsci, A. (1998c) Notes on Italian History. In: *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. London: Lawrence & Wishart. pp.44-120

Gramsci, A. (1998d) The Modern Prince. In: *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. London: Lawrence & Wishart. pp.123-205

Habermas, J. (1984) *The theory of communicative action. Vol.1, Reason and the rationalization of society*. Cambridge: Polity

Hall, S. & Du Gay, P. (eds. (1996) *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage

Hamilton, J. (2009) On the Ethics of Unusable Data. In: Faubion, J.D. & Marcus, G.E, (eds.) (2009) *Fieldwork is Not What it Used to Be*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, Chapter 3 pp. 73-88

Hannam, T.H. (2009) Neoliberalism, Governmentality and Ethics. *Foucault Studies*. 6, pp.37-59

Hayes, D. & Wynyard, R. (2006) *The McDonaldization of Higher Education*. Charlotte, N.C: Information Age

Hardin, J. (2002) *Opening Spaces: Critical Pedagogy and Resistance Theory in Composition*. Albany: State University of New York Press

Harland, R. (1987) *Superstructuralism: The Philosophy of Structuralism and Post-Structuralism*. London; New York: Routledge

Hartley, J. (2010) Silly Citizenship. *Critical Discourse Studies* 7(4), pp.233-248

Harvey, D. (2005) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

HEA (N.D.) *Benchmarking*. Accessed on 28.02.17 at:

<http://www.adm.heacademy.ac.uk/resources/resources-by-topic/benchmarks/>

Henderson, J. (2013)a *Teaching Global Citizenship: a case study in Applied Linguistics*. Higher Education Academy. Accessed on 14.09.15 at:

[https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/resources/detail/disciplines/english/global\\_citizenship](https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/resources/detail/disciplines/english/global_citizenship)

Henderson, J. (2013)b Strategies for critiquing global citizenry: undergraduate research as a possible vehicle. *Teaching in Higher Education*. 18(7), pp.736-757

Hertzberg, F. (2015) Double gestures of inclusion and exclusion. Notions of learning outcomes, autonomy and informed choices in Swedish educational and vocational guidance. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*. 28(10) pp.1203-1228

Hiddleston, J. (2013) *Understanding Postcolonialism*. Durham: Acumen Publishing

Hill, D.J. (2010) The Origins of Gramsci's Philosophy of Praxis. In Mayo, P. (ed.) (2010) *Gramsci and Educational Thought*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, Chapter 1.

Holliday, A., Hyde, M. & Kullman, J. (2004) *Intercultural Communication: An Advanced Resource Book*. London: Routledge

Holliday, A. (2011) *Intercultural Communication and Ideology*. Los Angeles, [Calif.]; London: SAGE

Holmes, D.R. & Marcus, G.E. (2008) 'Refunctioing Ethnography: The Challenge of an Anthropology of the Contemporary'. In: Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S (eds.) *The Landscape of Qualitative Research*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn., Los Angeles; London; New Delhi; Singapore: SAGE Publications

Hook, D. (2005) 'Genealogy, discourse, 'effective history': Foucault and the Work of Critique'. *Qualitative Work in Psychology*. 2(1) pp.3-31

Hook, D. (2007) *Foucault, Psychology and the Analytics of Power*. Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Horner, B. (2013) Ideologies of Literacy, "Academic Literacies", and Composition Studies. *Literacy in Composition Studies*. 1(1), pp.1-9

Íñiguez, L. (1993) *Discourses, Structures and Analysis: What Practices? In Which Contexts?*. Accessed on the World Wide Web on 06.09.10 at:  
<http://antalya.uab.es/liniguez/Materiales/002.pdf>

Ivanič, R. (1998) *Writing and Identity: The Discoursal Construction of Identity in Academic Writing*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company

Ives, P. (2010) Global English, Hegemony and English: Lessons from Gramsci. In: Mayo, P. (ed.) (2010) *Gramsci and Educational Thought*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. Chapter 5

- Jackson, A.Y. & Mazzei, L.A. (2012) *Thinking with Theory in Qualitative Research: Viewing Data across Multiple Perspectives*. London; New York: Routledge
- Janesick V. J. (2004) *“Stretching Exercises for Qualitative Researchers*. (2<sup>nd</sup> edn.) Thousand Oaks, Calif.; London: Sage
- Jenks, C. (1993) Introduction: The analytic bases of cultural reproduction theory. In: Jenks, C. (1993) *Cultural Reproduction*. London: Routledge. Chapter 1, pp.1-16
- Jäger, S. & Maier, F. (2009) Theoretical and methodological aspects of Foucauldian critical discourse analysis and dispositive analysis. In Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (eds.) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. (2<sup>nd</sup> edn.). Los Angeles; London; New Delhi; Singapore; Washington DC: SAGE Publications
- Janks, H. (2000) Domination, Access, Diversity and Design: A Synthesis for Critical Literacy Education. *Educational Review*, 52(2), pp.175-186
- Jump, P. (2015) Academics in the minority at more than two-thirds of UK universities. THE (Times Higher Education), 3.09.2015 Accessed on 25.05.18 at:  
<https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/academics-minority-more-two-thirds-uk-universities>
- Kelly, M. (ed.) (1994) *Critique and Power: Recasting the Foucault/Habermas Debate*. London: MIT Press
- Keppel, J.J. (2014) Masculinities and Mental Health: Geographies of Hope “Down Under”. In: Gorman-Murray, A. & Hopkins, P. (eds.) (2014) *Masculinities and Place*. Farnham, Surrey; Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Limited
- Kendall, G. & Wickham, G. (1999) *Using Foucault’s Methods*. London; Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: SAGE Publications

Killick, D. (2012) Global Citizenship and Campus Community: Lessons from Learning Theory and the Lived-Experience of Mobile Students. In: Ryan, J. (ed.) (2012) *Cross-Cultural Teaching and Learning for Home and International Students*. London; New York: Routledge

Kincheloe, J. L. (2004) *Critical Pedagogy Primer*. New York; Oxford: Peter Lang

Lather, P. (1998) Critical Pedagogy and its Complicities: A Praxis of Stuck Places. *Educational Theory*, 48(4), pp. 487-497

Kincheloe, J.L. McLaren, P. & Steinberg, S.R. (2013) Critical Pedagogy, and Qualitative Research: Moving to the Bricolage. In: Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (2013) Introduction. In: *The Landscape of Qualitative Research*. 4<sup>th</sup> edn. Los Angeles: SAGE publications. Chapter 9. pp. 339-370

Kuhn, T.S. (1996[1962]) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press

Krey, P. (2002) Jurgen Habermas: The Lifeworld and the Two Systems. *ScholarDarity*.

Accessed on 27.10.15 at: [http://www.scholarDarity.com/?page\\_id=807](http://www.scholarDarity.com/?page_id=807)

Laclau, E. (1996) *Emancipation(s)*. London; New York: Verso

Laclau, E. & Mouffe, C. (1985) *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. Translated by Winston Moore and Paul Cammack. London: Verso

Laclau, E. & Mouffe, C. (1995) From Hegemony and Socialist Strategy (From Laclau, E. and Mouffe, C., (1985) *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*, London: Verso. In: Tallack, D. (ed.) (1995) *Critical Theory: A Reader*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, pp.340-353

Laclau, E. & Mouffe, C. (2001) *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. New York; London: Verso

Lather, P. (1998) Critical Pedagogy and its Complicities: A Praxis of Stuck Places. *Educational Theory*, 48(4), pp. 487-497

Lather, P. (2009) 2007 Kneller Lecture, AESA. Getting Lost: Social Science and/as philosophy. *Educational Studies*. 45(4), pp.342-357

Lather, P. (2013) Methodology-21: what do we do in the afterward? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26(6), pp. 634-645

Law, J. (2004) *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*. Abingdon; New York: Routledge

Lea, M. & Street, B.V. (1998) Student Writing and Staff Feedback in Higher Education: An academic Literacies Approach. *Studies in Higher Education* 23(2), pp.157-172

Lillis, T.M. (2001) *Student Writing: Access, Regulation, Desire*. London: Routledge

Lillis, T. & Scott, M. (2007) Defining academic literacies research: Issues of epistemology, ideology and strategy. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4(1), pp.5-32

Lillis, T. (2011) Legitimizing Dialogue as Textual and Ideological Goal in Academic Writing for Assessment and Publication. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 10 (4), pp.401-432

Lillis, T., Harrington, K., Lea, M.R. & Mitchell, S. (eds.) (2015) *Working with Academic Literacies: Case Studies towards Transformative Practice*. Fort Collins, Colorado: The WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press. Available at

<https://wac.colostate.edu/books/lillis/>Lipscomb, M. (2013) Adorno's Historical and Temporal Consciousness: Towards a Critical Theoretical Environmental Imagination. In: Biro, A. (ed.) (2013) *Critical Ecologies: The Frankfurt School and Contemporary Environmental Crises*. Toronto; Buffalo; London: University of Toronto Press Incorporated pp.297-298

Luke, A. (1995) Text and Discourse in Education: An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis. *Review of Research in Education*. 21, pp.3-48

Luke, A. (2013) Undoing Composition. *Literacy in Composition Studies*. 1(1), pp.70-74

MacLure, M. (2011) Qualitative Inquiry: Where are the Ruins? *Qualitative Inquiry*, 17(10), pp.997-1005

Mahon, M. (1992) *Foucault's Nietzschean Genealogy*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press

Mainardes, J. & Marcondes, M.I. (2009) Interview with Stephen J. Ball: a dialogue about social justice, research and education policy. *Estudos Educação e Sociedade*, 30(106).

Accessed on 6.02.17 at: [http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?pid=S0101-73302009000100015&script=sci\\_arttext&tlng=en](http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?pid=S0101-73302009000100015&script=sci_arttext&tlng=en)

McCaig, C. (2016) Lifting (or doffing) the cap: patterns of student acceptance across the sector. Accessed on 25.05.18 at: <https://wonkhe.com/blogs/lifting-or-doffing-the-cap/>

Morey, Ann. I. (2004), Globalization and the emergence of for-profit higher education. *Higher Education*, 48. pp. 131-150

Mouffe, C. (1988) Hegemony and New Political Subjects: Towards a New Concept of Democracy. In: Nelson, C. & Grossberg, L. (eds.) (1988) *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Education, pp.89-104

Mouffe, C. (2007) Artistic Activism and Agonistic Spaces. *Art and Research: A Journal of Ideas, Contexts and Methods*. (1)2, pp.1-5. Accessed on 14.9.16 at:

<http://www.artandresearch.org.uk/v1n2/mouffe.html>

Nainby, K.E., Warren, J.T. & Bollinger, C. (2004) Articulating Contact in the Classroom: Towards a Constitutive Focus in Critical Pedagogy. In: Phipps, A. & Guilherme, M. (eds.) (2004) *Critical Pedagogy: Political Approaches to Language and Intercultural Communication*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, Chapter 3. pp. 33-47

Nealon, J.T. (2008) *Foucault beyond Foucault*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press

Nesi, H. (2012) *Genres across the Disciplines: Student Writing in Higher Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

- Noy, C. (2009) 'I was here!': addressivity structure and inscribing practices as indexical resources. *Discourse and Society*, 11(4), pp.421-420
- O'Halloran, K. (2014) Counter-discourse corpora, ethical subjectivity and critique of argument. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 13(4), pp.781-813
- Olssen, M. (1999) *Michel Foucault: Materialism and Education*. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey
- Ong, A. (2006) *Neoliberalism as exception*. Durham and London: Duke University Press
- O'Regan, J. P., & Macdonald, M. N. (2009). The antinomies of power in critical discourse analysis. In T. Le, Q. Le & M. Short (Eds.), *Critical Discourse Analysis: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*. New York: Nova, pp. 79-90
- O'Regan, J. P. (2006). This risky order of discourse: The normativity debate in critical discourse studies. 3(2) *Critical Discourse Studies*, pp. 229-235
- Osberg, D. (2010) Knowledge is not made for understanding; it is made for cutting. *Complicity: An International Journal of Complexity and Education*. 7(2) pp.iii-viii, Editorial
- Oxford Brookes University. *Be more critical*. Accessed on 3.08.17 at:  
file:///C:/Users/p0074482/Documents/Be%20more%20critical%20(1).pdf
- Parker. I. (1997) *Psychoanalytic Culture: Psychoanalytic Discourse in Western Society*. London: Sage
- Pennycook, A. (1996) Borrowing others' words: Text, ownership, memory and plagiarism. *TESOL quarterly*, 30(2), pp.201-230
- Pennycook, A. (1998) *English and the Discourses of Colonialism*. London: Routledge
- Pennycook, A. (2001) *Critical Applied Linguistics: a Critical Introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Peters, M.A. & Burbules, N.C. (2004) *Poststructuralism and Educational Research*. Lanham, MD; Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Phipps, A. & Guilherme, M. (2004) Introduction. In: Phipps, A. & Guilherme, M. (eds.) (2004) *Critical Pedagogy: Political Approaches to Language and Intercultural Communication*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp.1-6

Pieterse, J. D. (2009) *Globalization and Culture: Global Mélange*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. Lanham, Md.; Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield

Porter, J.E., Sullivan, P., Blythe, S., Grabill, J.T. & Miles, L. (2000) Institutional Critique: A Rhetorical Methodology for Change. *College Composition and Communication*. 51(4), pp.610-642

Radhakrishnan, R. (1996) *Diasporic Mediations*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Readings, B. (1996) *The University in Ruins*. Cambridge; Mass; London: Harvard University Press

Ramirez, C. (2013) *Ethos and Critical Discourse Analysis: From Power to Solidarity*. *COntEXTES*. Accessed on 20.09.15 at: <http://contextes.revues.org/5805>

Rancière, J. (1991) *The Ignorant Schoolmaster: Five Lessons in Intellectual Emancipation*. Translated with an Introduction, by Kristin Ross. Stanford: Stanford University Press

Rancière, J. (2004) *The Philosopher and his Poor*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press

Rancière, J. (2009) *The Emancipated Spectator*. New York; London: Verso

Rancière, J. (2014) *The Pedagogics of Unlearning*. Lecture given at Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland, at conference The Pedagogics of Unlearning, September 6-7, 2014. Accessed on the World Wide Web on 11.02.17 at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VL7BhalkAUI>

Reisigl, M. & Wodak, R. (2009) The Discourse-Historical Approach. In: Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (eds.) (2009) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. London: SAGE, Chapter 4, pp.87-121

Reisigl, M. & Wodak, R. (2001) *Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of Racism and Anti-Semitism*. London: Routledge

Rizvi, F. & Lingard, B. (2010) *Globalizing Education Policy*. London and New York: Routledge

Rogers, R. (2004) Critical Discourse Analysis in Education. In Rogers, R. (ed.) *Critical Discourse Analysis in Education*. Mahwah, NJ; London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Said, E. (1978) *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books

Samuelson, B.L. (2009) Ventriloquation in Discussions of Student Writing: Examples from a High School English Class. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 44(1), pp.52-88

Schenner, C. (2005) *Teliopoesis, Telepoesis*, and the practice of comparative literature. *Comparative Literature*, 57(3), pp.239-245

Scheurich, J. (1997) *Research Methods in the Postmodern*. London; Washington DC: Falmer Press

Schiellerup, P. (2008) Stop making Sense: the Trials and Tribulations of Qualitative Data Analysis. *Royal Geographic Association with the Institute of British Geographers*. 40(2) pp.163-171

Schiffrin, D. (1994) *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford; Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers

Scollon, R. (2003) 'The Dialogist in a Positivist World: Theory in the Social Sciences and the Humanities at the End of the Twentieth Century'. *Social Semiotics*. 13(1), pp.71-88

Scollon, R., Scollon, S.W. & Jones, R.H. (2012) *Intercultural Communication: A Discourse Approach*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edn. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell

- Shantz, J. (2000) A post-Sorelian Theory of Social Movement Unity: Social Myth Reconfigured in the Work of Laclau and Mouffe. *Dialectical Anthropology*. 25(1), pp. 89-108
- Shepherd, S. (2017) There's a gulf between academics and university management – and it's growing. *Guardian*. 27.07.17 Accessed on 23.05.18 at:  
<https://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/2017/jul/27/theres-a-gulf-between-academics-and-university-management-and-its-growing>
- Shore, C. & Wright, S. (1999) Audit Culture and Anthropology: Neo-Liberalism in British Higher Education. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 5(4), pp.557-575
- Spivak, G. C. (1987) *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*. New York; London: Methuen
- Spivak, G. C. (1988) *Can the Subaltern Speak?* Accessed on 20.08.17 at:  
[http://abahlali.org/files/Can\\_the\\_subaltern\\_speak.pdf](http://abahlali.org/files/Can_the_subaltern_speak.pdf)
- Spivak, G.C. (1993) *Outside in the Teaching Machine*. New York; London: Routledge
- St. Pierre, A. A. (2013) The posts continue: becoming, *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26(6), pp. 646-657
- St. Pierre, E.A. & Roulston, K. (2006) The state of qualitative inquiry: a contested science. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*. 19(6), pp.673-684
- Strathern, M. (1997) 'Improving ratings': Audit in the British University System. *European Review*, 5(3), pp.305-321
- Street, B. V. (1984) *Literacy in Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Strickland, D. (2000) Worrying Democracy: Chantal Mouffe and the Return of Politicized Rhetoric. *JAC (Journal of Rhetoric, Culture and Politics)*, 19(3), pp.476-484
- Stronach, I. & Clarke, J. (2011) Eight Contentions for an Educational Future: Timely Rules for Unruly Times, *Qualitative Inquiry*, 17(10), pp. 986-996

Suarin, J. (2013) The Formation of Neo-Gramscians in International Relations and International Political Economy - neither Gramsci nor Marx. In: Ayers, A, (ed.) (2013) *Gramsci, political economy, and international relations theory: modern princes and naked emperors*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Swales, J.M. (1990) *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Swales, J. & Feak, C.B. (1994) *Academic Writing for Graduate Students*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press

Swales, J.M. (2012[2004]) *Research Genres: Explorations and Applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Accessed on 28.02.17 at: <https://www-cambridge-org.oxfordbrookes.idm.oclc.org/core/books/research-genres/957CEE46BB758DA7EC55BBDC31010748>

Threadgold, T. (2003) Cultural Studies, Critical Theory and Critical Discourse Analysis: Histories, Remembering and Futures. *Linguistik Online*, 14(2). Accessed on 10.02.11 at: <http://www.linguistik-online.de/index.html>

Tie, W. (2011) Getting from 'Critic and Conscience' to Conscientious Criticism. *Griffith Law Review*, 20(2), pp. 362-384

Trifonas, P.P. (2005) Ourselves as Another: Cosmopolitical Humanities. In: Trifonas, P.P. & Peters, M.A. (eds.) (2005) *Deconstructing Derrida: Tasks for the New Humanities*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Palgrave MacMillan

Turner, J. (2011) *Language in the Academy*. Bristol, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters

UCU (2016) Precarious work in higher education: a snapshot of insecure contracts and institutional attitudes. April 2016. Accessed on 29.05.18 at: [https://www.ucu.org.uk/media/7995/Precarious-work-in-higher-education-a-snapshot-of-insecure-contracts-and-institutional-attitudes-Apr-16/pdf/ucu\\_precariouscontract\\_hereport\\_apr16.pdf](https://www.ucu.org.uk/media/7995/Precarious-work-in-higher-education-a-snapshot-of-insecure-contracts-and-institutional-attitudes-Apr-16/pdf/ucu_precariouscontract_hereport_apr16.pdf) University of Edinburgh. *Critical*

*Thinking*. Accessed on 3.08.17 at: <http://www.ed.ac.uk/institute-academic-development/postgraduate/taught/learning-resources/critical>

University of Leicester. *What is Critical Writing?* Accessed on 3.08.17 at: <http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/ld/resources/writing/writing-resources/critical-writing>

University of Manchester. *Critical Thinking*. Accessed on 3.08.17 at: [http://www.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/studyskills/essentials/reading/critical\\_thinking.html](http://www.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/studyskills/essentials/reading/critical_thinking.html)

University of Nottingham. *Writing Critically*. Accessed on 3.08.17 at: <https://www.nottingham.ac.uk/studentservices/support/supportforyourstudies/academic-support/studyresources/writing/writingcritically.aspx>

University of Sussex. *Critical Thinking*. Accessed on 3.08.17 at: <http://www.sussex.ac.uk/skillshub/?id=277>

Van Leeuwen, T. (2008) *Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

West-Pavlov, R. (2013) *Temporalities*. London; New York: Routledge

Whelan, A.M. (2015) Academic Critique of Neoliberal Academia, *Sites: a journal of social anthropology and cultural studies*, 12(1), pp.130-152

Whitehead, D. H. (2003) *Poiesis and Art-Making: A Way of Letting Be*. *Contemporary Aesthetics*. 1. Accessed 17.12.2105 at: <http://www.contempaesthetics.org/newvolume/pages/article.php?articleID=216>

Wickham G., & Kendall, G. (2007) 'Critical Discourse Analysis, Description, Explanation, Causes: Foucault's Inspiration versus Weber's Perspiration'. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*. 8(2). Accessed on 25.02.11 at: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/234/518>

Willetts, D. (2011) *Higher Education: Students at the Heart of the System*. Department for Business Innovation and Skills. TSO London: Stationery Office. Accessed on the World Wide Web on 7.02.17 at:  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/31384/11-944-higher-education-students-at-heart-of-system.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/31384/11-944-higher-education-students-at-heart-of-system.pdf)

Wodak, R. & Krzyzanowski, M. (2008) *Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan

Wodak, R., de Cillia, R., Reisigl, M. & Liebhart, K. (2009) *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*. (2<sup>nd</sup> edn.) Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (2009) Critical Discourse Analysis: history, agenda, theory and methodology. In: Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (eds) (2009) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. London: SAGE, Chapter 1, pp.1-33

## Appendix A.

### ASSIGNMENT BRIEFS

There are two assignments for this module, one which forms the foundations for the other. The first is a transcribed and coded ethnographic-style interview, and the second is the research paper which relates the interview findings and analysis to theoretical perspectives on cultural identity and intercultural communication. Please see further clarification as to these two assignments below.

1. **(30%) Transcribed and coded ethnographic interview data with key themes identified. Learning outcomes assessed: KU i, ii,. PDS i, ii, iv. TS i, ii.**
  - You should submit this as your Appendix of the research paper. It should include: the typed version of your final interview notes; your personal post-interview notes (for more details see ethnographic interview guidelines below; and the final coded analysis of these for key themes.

#### *The ethnographic interview*

You will be divided into groups of three on the day. Please think through the questions below before the interview – a mind map or rough notes might be useful. If you have them, bring photos or objects which mean something to you as far as your national identity is concerned. It is recommended you use your mobile phones or a tape recorder to record the interviews. These will serve as back-up for your notes.

**Ethnographic Interview 1.** (1) What are the major features of your cultural identity? (2) What role does nation play in this, if any? (3) In what ways do the habits and values of your inherited and creative cultural identity resources influence the social groupings in which you find belonging at university?

#### *Approaches to note-taking during and after the interview (capturing live data)*

During the interview you will **take rough notes** which you will then write up after class. These will not so much relate to the informational content of what is said since you will record and transcribe the actual speech and use the transcribed content of the interview as one key dimension of the data to interpret.

Instead, your **post-interview notes** will relate to your own subjective and reflective interpretation of: (a) what you inferred about cultural identity from e.g. intonation, hesitation, stress on certain words, general manner and mood, and (b) what you inferred about cultural identity from the ways rapport was managed in the interaction. This should be done as quickly as possible, as thoroughly as possible, and include as much detail as possible (you will need to take at least 3-4 hours). As Bernard, (2002, p.373) recommends: 'The faster you write up your observations, the more detail you can get down'.

Equally, all good ethnographic research makes awareness of the part your own bias and partiality plays in responding to and inter personal conditions and interests explicit, so the part your identity and worldview plays in shaping your write-up and identification of key themes should be discussed.

#### *Transcribing the interviews*

The transcription process for this assignment is fairly straightforward. All that is required for this is a typing up of the words used in the interview, with significant intonation, speed of

speaking etc. indicated by e.g. comments in brackets, bold print for louder voice, ... for pauses and silences. Please indicate the code you will use for such intonation, pace of speaking, body language etc. dimensions at the beginning of the transcription.

#### *Coding the data and finding themes (the interpretation and analysis process)*

Once you have transcribed your interviews, you should begin identifying key themes and patterns which relate to the essay topic through what is called a data coding process - "coding can be thought about as a way of relating our data to our ideas about those data" (Coffey and Atkinson, 1996, p.27) For this, you will need to 'immerse yourself in the data' by reading it carefully a first time. On the second reading, you need to go through pretty much line by line with comment boxes describing: what's happening here, what are the assumptions about self and other, the processes, consistencies, inconsistencies, the patterns etc.? Very often, the best way is to use the active verb (-ing forms of the verb), so it's the process, not a product. You are aiming to capture snapshots of the complexity of the stories of cultural identity.

Examples of such coding comments might be: e.g. *'emphasising this aspect of inherited cultural identity as of particular importance'*, *'expressing both inherited and creative cultural identity, explaining how education and parental education made her deviate from traditional cultural norm'*, *'notion of belongingness in this aspect of culture by including the word 'our'*, *'she formed a circle with her hands to show it's a small, tight community (physical embodiment'*, *'depicts her country as a place where power distance and collectivism are high'*, *'positive identity face of other group members is threatened'*, *'reference to a well-known stereotype from her inherited cultural identity'*, *'gaining knowledge about self and other'*, *'me seeing the use of fast intonation as an indication of embarrassment.*

#### *Identifying themes*

This close reading, combined with your interview notes and your ethnographer's intuition should allow you to begin to identify key themes that link to theories about inter- or intra-cultural identity, intercultural communication and rapport management studied in class. It is very important to have specific wording to themes that shows how they have emerged from bottom up, or inductive, interpretation of the data. DO NOT use broad umbrella themes relating either to questions, or to big topics like 'Culture and Education'. These will not help you in your analysis.

At this point of completing your final draft of the transcription it is useful to highlight by colour the parts of the transcription relating to the themes identified.

#### *Anonymising interviewee identity*

It is standard research practice to ensure the identity of one's informants is anonymised. However, since the aim of this ethnographic research is to bring out the rich textures of the cultural identity of participants in the interview, it is rather contradictory to use the anonymous ways of identifying different speakers used in mainstream social sciences research e.g. S1, S2, etc. Instead, you are asked to use a pseudonym that conveys the main features of each participant's individual identity identified in your analysis e.g. *mix'n'match*, *my home is my castle*, *global wanderer* etc.

#### *Final submission of transcription to include*

- i. Coded interview transcript with comments and colour coding to identify main themes

- ii. List of themes with few sentences explaining how you derived these and what aspect of theory you intend to relate these to
- iii. Your post-interview notes

**2. 'Seeing Me, Seeing you: An investigation into students' cultural identity and intercultural engagement in a 21st century Higher Education context'**

(70%) A 2200 word research paper using data from the ethnographically-styled interview. Use 1.25 line spacing.

Learning outcomes assessed: KU i, ii, iii, iv. PDS i, ii, iii, iv. TS i, ii, iii, iv. Please note that the 2200 word count does not include the appendix or the bibliography.

*Notional study time: 70 hours*

*Aim*

The aim of this research paper is to allow you to critically reflect upon self and other cultural identity ('big C' and 'small c') when operationalised during communication with other students, and what this suggests about the social worlds of a 21<sup>st</sup> century university. Your reflection will be guided by the ethnographically-styled interview which takes place in class. For this, you should record and analyse the answers to the 4 questions of each member of the interview group (including yourself). The 3-5 key themes and concepts that emerge from your findings should then be discussed and developed in relation to the literature on (inter)cultural identity. Identity here is understood as an inherited cultural resource which we play with creatively and dynamically in different contexts.

*Brief*

For submission, please use the research paper assessment criteria cover sheet from the back of the handbook.

Your research paper should include the following sub-sections, each with a heading in bold:

- A brief introduction which a) frames the issues arising from the everyday diversity and plurality in HE, in today's globalized world, b) outlines the paper's aims, and c) provides an overview of the main arguments and conclusion
- A fairly brief research methods section, in which you explain and justify the use of an ethnographic interview approach for researching intercultural identity in an HE context, taking into consideration its principles and limitations. At least 3 sources must be used to underpin this. You should also briefly specify the nationality, age, languages spoken etc. of all interviewees. Remember in this section to explain how you overcome the issue of researcher bias when coding data, through reflexivity and awareness of interpretative nature of meaning.
- An analysis and discussion of the interview findings. These should be coded and categorised according to between 3-5 key themes. The discussion should use relevant concepts from the literature to analyse and support the specific insights afforded into student intercultural identity that emerge from your first interpretation of the data. Each theme should serve as a sub-heading in the research paper, under which you list relevant data excerpts used to constitute the theme (data excerpts are not included in the final word count). The discussion and analysis should follow the list of relevant data excerpts. N.B. If English is not your first language, you are very welcome to include some words or phrases from your own language which you feel allow you to more precisely express what you mean. If you do this, please ensure you include a translation or paraphrase in English.

One of these themes should explore the actual language used for intercultural communication between participants during the interview, and how people positioned themselves in relation to self and other. It is recommended for this section you take a short dialogue or brief selection of interactions to analyse, doing so drawing on features of Spencer-Oatey's rapport management model such as positive or negative quality face, identity face, equity rights, association rights etc.

- A conclusion in which you summarise the findings and discuss the implication of these in relation to the research paper title
- A complete references section, which includes reference to at least 12 sources used to problematise and underpin the issues being discussed

## Appendix B.

### Research Paper: Marksheet

Grade Mark	<i>Intercultural 'savoirs' and the ethnographic approach</i>	<i>Discussion &amp; Analysis</i>	<i>Communication, Presentation &amp; Bibliography</i>
A+ mark of 75-100 A mark of 70-74	Highly reflexive and reflective approach to the interview process and analysis of findings.  Excellent ability to make discoveries and develop fresh perspectives through interaction and reflection.  Evidence of a full knowledge of the possibilities and limitations of the ethnographic methodology being used.	Evidence of a rigorous, high level of analysis which thoroughly explores the topic resulting in judgement based upon evidence which may lead to new insights. All parts of research paper serve to address research paper question  Comprehensive revisiting and critical discussion about the nature of intercultural identity showing awareness of emergent and shifting nature of such identities and inherent bias of researcher.  Clear evidence of use of concepts and ideas in the literature to develop and substantiate own analysis of findings.  Effective, well-articulated conclusion.	Writes fluently and effectively using a wide range of vocabulary; clarity of expression is excellent with consistently accurate use of grammar, spelling and punctuation.  Explicit and logical structure designed to maximise development of ideas. Innovative use of subheadings to identify different sections of research paper.  Referencing clear, relevant and consistently accurate using the Harvard System.
B+/B Mark of 60-69	Sound reflexive and reflective approach to the interview process and analysis of findings.  Good ability to and develop fresh perspectives through interaction and reflection  Evidence of good understanding of the possibilities and limitations of the ethnographic methodology being used.	Evidence of depth of analysis.  Critical discussion of intercultural identity themes showing some awareness of indeterminate nature of these and intrusive role of researcher.  Wide range of information from a variety of relevant sources presented as part of overall argument.  Effective conclusion.	Language fluent; thoughts and ideas clearly expressed; grammar, spelling and punctuation essentially accurate.  Clear structure that facilitates the development of ideas. Good use of subheadings to identify different sections of research paper.  Referencing relevant and mostly correct and consistent throughout using the Harvard System.
C+/C Mark of 50-59	Evidence of some understanding of reflexive and reflective approach to the interview process and analysis of findings  Some ability to make discoveries through interaction and reflection.  Evidence of the ability to apply ethnographic methodology.	Evidence of a satisfactory level of analysis which is reasonably objective.  Key areas of intercultural identity considered showing some awareness of indeterminate nature of these and intrusive role of researcher  Evidence of information from some sources, partially integrated in argument.  Some conclusions made	Language mainly fluent; work is coherent; minor spelling and/or grammar and/or punctuation errors.  Structure is fairly clear but the material could be organised more effectively. Use of subheadings to identify different sections of research paper.  Harvard Referencing errors evident but of a minor nature.
D+/D Mark of 40-49	Little understanding of intercultural practices of openness to other. Insubstantial or superficial understanding of ethnographic methodology. Limited response to interviewee comments.	Some evidence of analysis to support ideas.  Evidence of some linkages between the various aspects of intercultural identity and the literature.  Weak conclusions made.	Significant errors in grammar and/or spelling and/or punctuation. Language not always fluent or coherent but meaning is generally apparent. Some organisation of material/ structure. Harvard Referencing System present but with major inconsistencies/inaccuracies.
R Mark of 30-39 F R Mark of 0-39 Retake module	No or inadequate ability to collate information about ethical practices of intercultural communication. No or insufficient evidence of understanding of ethnographic methodology and interviewee comments.	No evidence of analysis to support ideas or no links between ideas.  Discussion of intercultural identity not related to the literature.  No conclusion .	Language far from fluent; meaning unclear; spelling and/or grammar and/or punctuation consistently poor. Difficult to identify a coherent structure. Referencing has major inconsistencies/ errors or is absent. Or Harvard System not used.

Marker' comments:

STRENGTHS	POINTS FOR DEVELOPMENT
-----------	------------------------

--	--

Marker's signature:

Moderator's signature:

Sent to external examiner: Yes No Mark:

Appendix C. Course weekly outline

<b>S1 Week 1</b>	Defining core concepts and themes: culture and communication.
<b>S1 Week 2</b>	Taking a look at Hofstede: how reliable are essentialist models of culture? Do they allow us to see or stop us seeing?
<b>S1 Week 3</b>	Conceptualising (inter)cultural identity as a resource to be drawn on in different communication contexts.
<b>S1 Week 4</b>	Identity and rapport: what part do different language norms play in building inter(intra)cultural relationships.
<b>S1 Week 5</b>	Being an ethnographer: ethnographic interviews. <b>Please note that this session will last longer than usual, in order to allow you to complete your interviews.</b>
<b>S1 Week 6</b>	Research coding week – no lectures. Time to transcribe your data from the interviews, begin identifying key themes and start selecting relevant background literature.
<b>S1 Week 7</b>	Cultural scripts as ‘universes of meaning’: how can we compare different cultures in terms of ‘cultural scripts’?
<b>S1 Week 8</b>	Intercultural communication in educational contexts: the challenges and rewards of a multicultural campus.
<b>S1 Week 9</b>	Coursework preparation: small group seminars at which you share: data coding approaches; 4-5 key themes identified that you intend to discuss in your research paper; and initial essay outlines.
<b>S1 Week 10</b>	Intercultural sensitivity in film and literature: matching theory and concept to fictional worlds.
<b>S1 Week 11</b>	Going beyond the ‘Self’ and ‘Other’ binary in intercultural human relations.
<b>S1 Week 12</b>	Pulling it all together: a synoptic overview. Module evaluation to be completed in class. Copy of research paper and transcribed and coded ethnographic interview data with key themes identified to be uploaded to Moodle.