CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS IN ACADEMIC WRITING PEDAGOGY: MORE REFLEXIVE CONSIDERATIONS[*]

David McInnes, University of Western Sydney
Bronwyn James, University of Wollongong

1. INTRODUCTION

In many Australian universities, textual commentary is used extensively as a way of teaching students *valued* academic writing genres and practices. This pedagogical practice, a process of direct and indirect instruction about *how to write*, involves one way of *doing* discourse analysis: textual commentary or analysis of this kind links clause level analyses to analyses of how texts work in social settings. Another key aspect of the pedagogy of academic writing in Australian universities involves the embedding of discipline-specific instruction regarding writing into units of study, rather than conducting these processes in separate instructional contexts. This is done with a view of language as social practice (Lea & Stierer, 2000) rather than from a *skills–based* perspective. This work is done through disciplines, within the mainstream curricula of the university. Imagine an engineering degree program and a student cohort of 200, taught in lecture tutorial/laboratory format and online. This is the kind of context in which many who teach academic writing execute their pedagogy. The way a growing proportion of the academic writing teachers in Australia work is through disciplines, within mainstream curricula. Writing classes which explicitly engage students in a meta-language about writing do exist and experimental writing classes also exist but dollar-driven (and dollar-starved) universities are using these other often more expensive modes less and less.

It is important to keep in mind that while this pedagogy sits within a discourse of enabling student educational access and progression at the same time it sits within the discourses of a broader economic transition. Many would argue that the dominant approach to teaching writing as social practice in Australian universities "is embedded in the values relationships and

institutional discourses constituting the culture of academic disciplines in higher education" (Lea & Stierer, 2000: 2). Given that Australian universities are now contexts in which the goals of business, government and education are increasingly converging giving rise to what Gallagher (2000) has called the emergence of the *entrepreneurial university*, we are propelled to more fully consider the operation of institutionalised regimes of power within a pedagogy driven by and framed within the working of a corporate university sector.

Within the embedded academic writing pedagogies, many writing teachers work with texts to explain to and instruct students about how they might produce a text which gives a particular impression of who they are and what they know. If text exemplars or models are used as the centre piece of pedagogy, even if augmented by commentary and other kinds of writing exercises, then those who choose texts for inclusion in such pedagogy are playing a curatorial role, a curatorial role in which selecting, analysing and evaluating academic texts plays a significant role in authenticating and valuing certain kinds of writing and devaluing others. The written text as object is also fetishised in this endeavour, obscuring from pedagogical view the negotiation made by students in the process of learning how to write and the impact such negotiations might have on what is arguably a more complicated experience of learning than can be represented on a page. In these two (and many other) ways, writing pedagogy involves operations of power within the institutional discourses of the academy.

This discursive and institutional motivation and location of writing pedagogy raise questions that "are fundamentally questions of power –of who it is that produce which account of the social world. They are also questions of desire and pleasure– of which texts persuade and convince, of whom they persuade and convince, and to what desired ends" (Lee, 2000: 189).

Hodge and McHoul's (1992) analysis of the possible political relations embodied in the practices of textual commentary and the later work of Lee (2000) initiate and frame our exploration in this paper. We seek to contribute to a reflexive engagement with the pedagogical process of Australian university writing pedagogy and the teacher practitioners in this field, particularly for this paper's purpose, focusing on their role in the institutional negotiation of power in an emerging/ent corporate university sector. To adequately critically and reflexively engage and to take seriously the critical heritage provided by Foucault in a Critical Discourse Analysis, it is necessary to be able to consider multiple dimensions of academic writing pedagogy: the pedagogical processes and practice, methodology, ontology and epistemology. Whilst we will not address the later two issues directly, it will be clear that we move between all these dimensions, sometimes somewhat and, necessarily, uncomfortably.

2. COMMON PRACTICES

"Discourse analysis is most often conceived of as what someone does to a particular site or text" (Lee, 2000: 188). The kind of academic writing pedagogy on which we are focused often involves doing a "sort of linguistic mapping of academic literacy in terms of the discipline specificity of texts" (Lee, 1996: 67) to demonstrate to students how they can improve their own writing in their discipline. Excerpt 1 is an example. The analysis in excerpt 1 demonstrates to students how they can use evidence from other writers to highlight their own skills at analysis and to support the argument they are developing in their essay. The text analysed in excerpt 1 was written by a student in a Media Studies subject in a Bachelor of Arts program. The analysis, done by one of the writer's of this paper, takes the form of a commentary directed to other Humanities students and appears to the right of the original student text. The student text and commentary form part of a teaching context. Ideally, this text and commentary would be used in a class or workshop situation where students and the writing teacher can engage in a fuller dialogue about this text and how it comes to mean what it does. In reality though, given large class sizes, this text might be used for web-based academic writing instruction offering few opportunities for dialogue.

EXCERPT 1. *Analysis of student text*

Student text	Analysis
Sobchack and Sobchack (1997: 8) *suggest* that "to be effective, montage editing must be perceived". *Certainly*, the use of highly visible montage by Eisenstein in his film October *is effective* in synthesising both emotional and intellectual responses; *however*, Perkins (1997: 8) *contends* that "cutting can be effective and meaningful even when concealed; that is, when it seems to be a product of dramatic necessity rather than of the director's will". This *is*	Look at the words used to report on other writers. The words "suggest" and "contends" have been chosen by the student to set up a comparison. This comparison demonstrates to the reader that the student has analysed the literature she is reporting on and recognised that the two sets of writers are saying different things. This difference is further emphasised by the use of the word "however". The student is not simply describing what she has found in her reading of the literature; she is analysing the literature. Now look at how the student makes use of the ideas of these other writers to

particularly evident in shots 19 to 21 when concealment rather than exposure of the editing is instrumental in synthesising a concept not physically present in the frame: the supernatural…	begin to develop her argument. She applies both sets of writer's ideas to the film October. She uses words like "Certainly", "is effective", "is particularly evident" to strongly put forward her opinion that both sets of writers' arguments are valid in relation to the film…

The textual analysis functions to teach students how to use particular linguistic resources to produce texts of their own which demonstrate a level of analysis and the development of an argument or thesis position. It is an attempt "to explain [to students who want to learn how to write this type of text] the impact that it makes; why it means what it does, and why it gives the particular impression that it does (…)" (Halliday, 1994: 366). By focusing on words like "certainly", "suggests", "contends" and so on, the commentary draws students' attention to the linguistic resources of modality (Halliday, 1994) and appraisal (Martin, 2000) without explicitly using the meta-language of either. We contend that, whilst the textual commentary operates pedagogically to show students how to use linguistic resources in their own texts, more is being done. In fact, the writing teacher is taking part in the production of absence that produces the discursive configuration of this pedagogy and thereby establishes and maintains institutional power through the curatorial valuation of texts and kinds of writing.

3. ANALYTIC AUTHORITY AND INSTITUTIONAL DISCOURSES

Our position is not a naïve liberal one in which we assume pedagogy can afford freedom from discursive mobilisations of power but one that argues *for* the consideration not only of how pedagogy is discursively/linguistically produced but, more importantly, consideration of discursive effects of pedagogy. These questions are very rarely engaged with by academic writing teachers. Our perspective provokes the following kinds of questions: Who selected the text and why? Was it a valued text in its discipline? What authenticating and valuing work is done by selecting texts in this way without explanation of how knowledge is produced and valued within the institution of the university?

"Discourse analysts (of most persuasions) have been surprising unreflexive about their own language" (Lee, 2000: v). Following Lee, we would suggest that writing teachers who use text analysis and commentary

could be more reflexive about their language and the institutional and discursive impact of their pedagogy and, that a more genealogically-driven discourse analysis provides the potential for such reflexivity. Ironically, current pedagogy, often couched in terms of Critical Discourse Analysis, leaves aside critiques of institutionalised power and the dialectic of enablement and constraint therein so central to Foucauldian analyses while, in practice, assisting students to become the kind of writers deemed acceptable by academia and thereby *speaking* into these discourses in quite reproductive ways. Of course, we are not suggesting that academic writing teachers incite to revolution or naively value texts that will thwart student's ambitions, however, it seems pertinent to consider what is done in this field under the rubric of *discourse analysis* and to appreciate more fully the educational and political problematics therein. We want to challenge the uncritiqued role of academic writing teachers, looking to the language of analysis or commentary, focusing on the way in which the analyst/writing teacher is constituted through textual commentary and consider this in juxtaposition with a more dynamic and complex view of student-writer subjectivity as constituted in and in excess of academic writing pedagogy.

The commentary contains two imperatives, *look.* These and other words highlighted by italicised font direct the attention of students to particular aspects of the text. Students are required to focus their attention, for example, on the way in which the writer of the original text has made use of particular linguistic resources (the reporting verbs *suggests* and *contends)* to adopt a particular stance (that of setting up an almost oppositional framework) to represent the views of her two sets of authors. This, the commentary says, is evidence of *analysing, not simply describing*.

The commentary is based on a linguistic analysis of the original text. The commentary appears authoritative via the use of imperatives and, crucially, through the complete absence of an acknowledged author of the commentary. This account of the original text *is* what the text means, a statement of fact. Readers (students) are *not* in dialogue with the commentator because the linguistic analysis provides all that is needed for them to learn what is intended: to reproduce the kind of text that *analyses* in the way this text exemplar does.

"There is a sense in which the *stance* of the researcher in much linguistically oriented discourse analysis remains a positivist one, notwithstanding the theoretical understandings about language that might be supposed to destabilise and undermine such a stance" Lee (2000: 192). The writing teacher/commentator, positioned as curator, is in somewhat of a positivist relationship to both the text and the student writer of the text. The analyst of the text colonises the text as *other*. The writer of the text is

backgrounded by the text itself, its analysis and the nameless analyst. In this way, the writing teacher/commentator is constituted as the 'knower' of the text. The text itself is positioned as *a mystery* which cannot be fully understood without the tools of the commentator or analyst –only through the commentary can "(…) the author's unconscious intentions, a *true* knowledge of the history and circumstances of its production, and so on (…)" (Hodge & McHoul, 1994: 190) be revealed. The text is explained, *contained* within a pedagogical exchange in which the analyst/teacher/curator *knows* and in which the student/reader/intending writer *needs to know*.

The particular effects of this commentary are themselves effects of wider discourses, those surrounding the student teacher relationship, the production of knowledge within the university, and both of these are famed and driven by an economically rationalised and corporatised sector. Even small instances of discourse such as this moment of pedagogy position writing teachers as curators of institutional discourse through the differential power of students and teachers in terms of knowing, and in differentiating and determining value, in relation to what counts as knowledge and in relation to who has a voice in its production. What is omitted or absent from the text and the text-based pedagogy in which it is located is any discussion of, or provocation regarding the arbitrary and discursively determined value of the texts and others like them.

Fairclough (1995), following the shift to genealogical investigation inspired by Foucault (1972), suggests that absences from the text can be just as significant as inclusions. Exploration of these absences in this moment of writing pedagogy might challenge the curatorial role of the teacher and at the same time point to what might be gained for writing pedagogy through this challenge. In the following sections, we look at two of the absences that we identified in the analysis of our own commentary. The first of these absences, the writer of the original text, was not strictly speaking absent, but rather backgrounded by the text she produced. The second of these absences include the ungrammatical utterances, by which we mean unspeakable, unrecognisable, value-less or negatively valued texts which were not chosen as exemplars of the institutionally sanctioned positions which a student may take up as a writer within the university and within a particular disciplinary field. Both these absences work with and for a third dimension missing within this pedagogy –the mechanisms of discursive valuing which organise power and knowledge within the academy as an (economic) institution.

4. THE SUBJECT WHO WRITES

Writers are socio-culturally constructed, constituted by the discourses that are accessible to them; they "can make (and understand) texts only out of the available discourses" (Fowler, 1996: 7). Writers, like Fowler's (1996: 7) reader who "(…) is discursively equipped prior to the encounter with the text" are engaged in dynamic and quite complex, linguistic and extra-linguistic relationships with the texts they read and produce and the audiences and authorisers of those texts. However, there is only a limited, highly circumscribed place for the writer within the current academic writing pedagogies deployed in Australian universities. In considering writer positioning or voice, significant work has emerged in Australia recently in terms of what is best described as a systemic linguistics based Appraisal framework: "The work on Appraisal focuses on the resources writers use to position themselves (…) (it is) an approach to exploring, describing and explaining the way language is used to evaluate, to adopt stances, to construct textual personas and to manage interpersonal positionings and relationships" (White, 2003: 1).

This work is positioned as having great significance for writing pedagogy. Its focus though is, given its origins in the systemic linguistic work of Halliday (1994), linguistic. Within the appraisal framework's linguistic and text-descriptive perspective, the writer is viewed as *doing* the writing but not as also *being* an aspect of the context represented in the text (Ivanic, 1998: 98) or of the context surrounding text production. The experience of the writer is conflated with or obscured by the fetishising of the text, couched in a single narration (that is, the analyst's) of what language items (words, phrases, clauses) as coded according to their appraisal value within semantic systems (White, 2003; Martin, 2000 and Eggins & Slade, 1997) construct a particular writer persona, and how language items should be/are used when one writes *like an academic* (see for example, Hood, 2004).

Becoming a subject who *writes like an academic* involves more than knowing about the available linguistic resources. The subject who writes is more than the apparently seamlessly constituted subject, a delimited subject, backgrounded by the sort of analysis we saw in excerpt 1. Students engaged in the process of becoming the sorts of writers whose texts might become exemplars used in writing pedagogy *themselves* describe a more elaborate subjectivity and a dynamic, messy, contradictory and risky relationship between themselves, their written texts and their audiences. Only *some* of some of this is acknowledged in linguistically oriented writing pedagogy. This signals a key absence in discursive production.

The experiences of students engaged in the process of becoming a subject who *writes like an academic* can tell us more about this uneasy, risky and dynamic process. Following Deleuze & Guattari (1987), we suggest that this experience cannot be communicated by a single narration and, that a focus on the single narration while it might enable aspects of current pedagogy also determines the limits to reflexivity possible within current academic writing pedagogy. Critical Discourse Analysis, harnessing the descriptive and critical potential of a Foucauldian genealogy offers the possibility of reflexivity by multiplying the versions of context and subjective intersections that might be read *off* the text and helps foreground an unstable subject who writes, as part of the social context of writing.

Work on relocating the subject in writing pedagogy has been circulating for nearly a decade (see, for example, Clark & Ivanic, 1997; Ivanic, 1998 and Kamler, 2001). Much of this work draws on Fairclough's (1992, 1995 and 2003) synthesis of linguistically and socially oriented views of discourse, a synthesis hinged on Foucault's genealogical-based critique. In this view, any instance of discourse constructs social identity through subject positions which we adopt or resist in order to make sense of a text or to construct a particular type of text (Lee, 2000 and Lemke, 1995). Discourse also simultaneously constructs social relationships between people and constructs systems of knowledge and beliefs. We want to add to this existing body of work on relocating the subject by taking an elaborate, even excessive, and dynamic view of the subject (Jagose, 1996; Butler, 1997 and Grosz, 1999). Within these views, there is resistance to the notion of a unitary subject; subjectivity is not something one is, but something one does over time. Subjectivity is not foreclosed around fixed identity categories but is fluid, contradictory, messy, elaborating and contingent. We adopt this view of the subject, making space in the text-commentary relationship for the more elaborated consideration of the student as the subject *who writes* rather than simply a *writing* subject[†].

5. MAKING A SPACE-WORKING WITH ABSENCES

Within university discourses, particular utterances are *ungrammatical* in the sense that there is no space within the *syntax* of the discourses for those utterances to fit (Hodge & McHoul, 1992). We begin here to focus on some of these *ungrammatical utterances*. The first example, excerpt 2, is a Visual

---

[†] We have discussed this distinction elsewhere (McInnes & James, 2004): Using the difference between an embedded clause as qualifier and a nominalisation as classifier, we signal a more dynamic, less-stable view of who or how the subject/student/writer might be in relation to the process of text production.

Arts, Master of Arts (Honours) student's experience of her lecturers' and later, her supervisor's discursive strategy of *othering* or deeming a particular style of writing as ungrammatical, as not an appropriate academic style. Excerpt 3 is the section of a draft text written by the same student onto which the supervisor wrote the comment "writing is not a rapturous activity". In the interview from which excerpt 2 is taken, the student is referred to as A, I is the interviewer.

EXCERPT 2. *Interview with A (Visual Arts)*

A. Once again, it wasn't actually discussed- my experience was never discussed, what I was trying to communicate. We only ever worked at the level of whether it was a good painting or not and whether it fitted into the Theory of the Sublime… But for me at last I'd found a way of communicating my experience via another language and that kept, that was not embarrassing. It was not personal, it was almost analytical. And that –we did that for two years and in many ways that was good for me to be able to do that…it [my experience] was so personal –so enormous– so awesome– that I would just have no control over my emotions.
I. And yet in some ways that has obviously come across in your writing because get comments from P. [A's supervisor's written comments on a draft] "Writing a thesis is not a rapturous activity". So in some way
A. [long pause] It comes through
I. It comes through.
A. As the subconscious comes through in a writer…
I. And when I read through some of your drafts, I look at what P. said as well, there's a whole lot of things about connections. I mean two things come out in what P said. One is "its not a rapturous activity and where is the argument" and the other is "what is the connection". When I first started reading your work I thought they were just language connections but from what you are saying now it sounds like those connections are really hard to make because- it was about providing some sort of connection between the experience and the written page.
A. A YES. There aren't words to write the experience. Ah very soon I realised that very soon after the experience when I when I was in a rapturous state and tried to describe it all to my family and there just weren't the words to describe it you know. But what was very, very obvious was that for me, what I was doing in the writing was what I am doing in the painting. I chose paint because you can use glazes and you can layer the colours. So much so that different angles and different times of day you get a different interpretation of the painting, so so very

subtle. And I think I decided I would do that in my thesis, I would use images, select images. So, whenever there was a gap in language, I would choose an image –and for me that gave a more authentic kind of layering if you like. And then of course the philosophy, Kant's philosophy was yet another layer.

EXCERPT 3. *Text excerpt from A's draft no. 19 (Visual Arts)*

It is as if a gentle wind has blown over the painting Monk by the Sea and like the footprints obliterated all conventional landscape motifs even suspending light itself. The Sublime feeling is created by the threat of nothing happening but if something does we are relieved and delighted. It could be that this something is one of great simplicity, that goes unnoticed and unseen like the tiny cry of the wave on the dark ocean.

These texts foreground text and text production processes, experiences and relations which are not usually acknowledged in the discourse analysis practices deployed in academic writing pedagogy. The student, A, describes a complex relationship with the text she is producing. Writing for A is an embodied experience, a rapturous activity which at times both exceeds and resists constraint within written language and *appropriate* academic style. A's own commentary sits uneasily alongside the sort of commentary we provided in excerpt 1. In that commentary, the writer was an apparently seamlessly constituted subject knowable through and contained by the linguistic resources she employed to construct an exemplary and disciplinarily *appropriate* text. Working with this uneasiness, in the same way that McHoul & Hodge (1992) have suggested, we want to use analysis and commentary to open up the complexities of the text and the writing of the text rather than to foreclose or resolve them.

The last set of texts we have chosen we hope demonstrate more of the complexities of the writing process. Excerpt 4 and 5 are respectively an excerpt from a final PhD document straddling the disciplines of cultural studies and history, and the writer, K's commentary about this section of her writing. In the interview from which excerpt 5 is taken, the student is referred to as K, I is the interviewer.

EXCERPT 4. *Text excerpt from K's final PhD document (Cultural Studies/History)*

(…) No cultural forms were without interest, even fascination. To understand the cultural forms was to understand the ways in which people made sense of their worlds. But bush poetry? Urban male youth gangs are ok, as are teenage

girls reading romance but old, *local* bush poetry resists the discovery of resistant subjects; they are already cliches. It refuses to exemplify the genealogies of modernist media and its postmodern effects and its readership is so unknown that it doesn't even constitute an effective discourse…

To position myself to do a critique of this work is to take up a position that isolates me from my own *localness* (assuming a fruit salad such as myself can reclaim, continue to claim *localness*). If I examine this poem using my word tools and critical practices from cultural studies, am I making unreliable theory the only home I will have? Of course… [sic]

But what does or might the critique actually do to the poem and so in part to the poet? By critiquing it, I am translating from one audience to another. I am letting this poem go into a niche market of readers who have other agendas. In taking it out of the *local* and into the critical I may be destroying the very thing that makes it *work* —that is, its location. If I am to say anything about the poem then it must be ethnographically, critically *aware*. But how can I do that when my own position is so chronically disputed? I'm afraid the author is being chewed up by being. But if I leave the poem, sitting in its own invention and don't engage in any way with what it says, I am continuing its existing peripheral (in critical terms) state, I am denying that it can effect me… So lets begin again. (what a surprise; the now other worldly, now anonymously classed author is allowed to write on!) (41-42).

EXCERPT 5. *Interview with K (Cultural Studies/History)*

K. So, so within the world of popular culture there was this, some hierarchy. In fact there was a real style amongst, you know my friends and colleagues too you know, what, what you'd be willing to undo, but it was, but I mean actually that, that sort of choice, those choices of popular culture of television shows were, you know which were meant to be about popular lives.

I. Yeah

K. I found in myself for myself they actually, they came with their own sets of class positions [I: Yeah] and urban authority and things. You know because people weren't getting ahhhh, the kind of jokes we were exchanging about those kind of phenomenon or something. And, and again, loving the Simpson's, almost sets you up to not acknowledge, you know, Col Newsome's you know bush, rollicking bush poetry at all. You know you're not going to pick up a small volume of [I: Mm] and you say "what is popular?" and yet in the context of that [time] it was very popular, and so I don't know. So when I think that this is a really badly thought out section actually (laughs). I mean like you know, it, it's -I

> don't know. It got chopped I think. (laughs) But I mean it's true, you
> know I think it's just a bit raw. You know you sort of say so "how do I?"
> -you know that kind of performing how do I approach this? Like I'm
> doing it now you know, ohhhhhh -you see my body language oh, oh, oh,
> ahhhhhh (laughing). Maybe it needs to be said or not. But obviously I
> thought it did then you know.

The commentary K employs in her written text in order to reveal difficult subjective negotiations to her readers/examiners is an effective strategy of counter mastery against possible attempts to *other* her text. On the one hand, K's act of critique separates her from her own *localness* –her home town– the subject of the poem. On the other hand, the object of her analysis, the poem, may be deemed *ungrammatical* content within the discourses surrounding cultural studies. In other words, K is consciously keeping unstable what it is that might receive or be denied a legitimating response from a reader, that is, one that easily and unproblematically (and uncritically) recognises the text as *grammatical* or *ungrammatical* within academic discourse production and the discourses surrounding cultural studies. Her text "claims authority over all legitimate forms of commentary on [it]" (McHoul & Hodge, 1992: 204).

Further, K's interview tells us something about the riskiness involved in critiquing a particular popular cultural form –the bush poem, and the experience of producing her text in relation/negotiation with others, including those in her field/discipline. Her uneasiness and riskiness signal for us the absence produced by any pedagogy that might seek to understand and instruct in regard to writing that does not take account of the subjective, affective and corporeal experiences at the heart of learning to write like an academic. K's reflection on *then* foregrounds the temporality and temporal contingencies of post-graduate research and the process of text production. This again signals a vital dimension to writing and learning to write that has not been dealt with in academic writing pedagogy. We may contribute to absences and powerfully normative discursive production if we, as writing teachers, fix in time and space, experience which is always and already contingent.

6. CONCLUSION

Rather than being complicit with the aims of dollar-driven university pedagogy and in order to acknowledge that student negotiations from and toward kinds of academic literacy are complex, we conclude by looking to what May (1998) has called the practical utility of the sort of analysis we

have undertaken in this paper. The practical utility of admitting a more elaborated view of the subject calls up a pedagogy focused on the *subject who writes* and challenges our understanding of what academic writing pedagogy might be and the nature of its discursive effects –a genealogical analysis and critique. We have argued that writing pedagogy sets its own limits when it draws solely on linguistically oriented textual analysis. We suggest that to disrupt the reproduction of powerful and excluding discursive relations, writing pedagogy must engage in the relational and affective aspects of teaching.

Academic writing pedagogy uses discourse analysis to do more than exemplify valued writing practices. Pedagogy, necessarily, is also an attempt to reconstitute the subjects to whom and of whom it speaks (Gore, 1993). Little of the complexity of the subject who writes, nor the complex process of becoming a writer in the university is revealed in text-driven writing pedagogy. The subject to whom this pedagogy is directed is constituted in particular ways by these practices. This pedagogy interpellates its subjects in static ways as *products* of the entrepreneurial university we descried briefly in our introduction and in other papers (see, for example, McInnes & James, 2004). But, more than this, some kinds of writing pedagogy also make it possible to ignore the more complex dimensions of cultural literacies with which students enter university and the positions from which they may come when they engage in the process of learning to write in academic ways. It also ignores the reworking of powerful knowledge positions and institutionalised power on the part of writing teachers. As Luke (1997: 345, cited in Lee, 2000: 192) suggests, "Whatever the aspirations for scientific or disciplinary legitimacy it might harbour, discourse analysis is itself a kind of public speech act with a will towards (re) constituting the very objects about which it purports to speak".

The subject who writes and who does lots of other things besides writing is a complex subject engaged in the dynamic and risky process of text production and educational negotiation. While we might develop more and more sophisticated ways to foreground text as explanation of the complex processes of writing and representation, we also need to develop more complex ways of understanding the writer of those texts. If we do not do this, we will uncritically enable the pedagogies of the new, corporatised university in which students are seen in the reductive, economic rationalist terms of institutional discourse intolerant of the affective dimensions of the experience of higher education. The subject who writes (a subject who … is and does many other things beside make lexico-grammatical choices regarding their voice in text) is part of the context of writing, not just as conduit for the reproduction of particular disciplinary writing practices. Imagining the

student/subject/writer as a seamlessly constituted self, backgrounded by particular linguistic choices constitutes a significant absence from the discourse of academic writing pedagogy. This absence is part of a broader absence within writing pedagogy –the absence of the kind of politics provoked by Foucault's theoretical interventions that have brought us to Critical Discourse Analysis. This is a politics wrought by the genealogical, that is, by the complex, reflexive description of how knowledge practices and of the production (and productivity) of power and, crucially, of our own role in speaking and being spoken by the discursive. The genealogical/discursive potential of Foucault's critique refuses a stance for the analyst as *outside* of discursive production. The critical question that begs to be asked here is: What is to be gained and by whom from the implicit stance of academic writing pedagogy *as if* it is outside of and simply has a curatorial role in academic discursive production?

7. REFERENCES

Bolton, T. & T. Hyland (2003). "Implementing Key Skills in Further Education: Perceptions and Issues", J*ournal of Further and Higher Education* 27 (1): 15-26.

Butler, J. (1997). *The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection*. Stamford, Cal.: Stamford University Press.

Caldas-Coulthard, C. R. & M. Coulthard (eds.) (1996). *Texts and practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London/New York: Routledge, 3-14.

Clark, R. & R. Ivanic (1997). *The Politics of Writing*. London/New York: Routledge.

Deleuze, G. & F. Guattari (1987). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. Trans. Brian Massumi.

Dreyfus, H. L. & P. Rabinow (1983[2]). *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Eggins, S. & D. Slade (1997). *Analysing Casual Conversation*. London: Cassell.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. New York: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London/New York: Longman.

Foucault, M. (2002 [1972]). *Archaeology of Knowledge*. New York: Routledge.

Fowler (1996). "On critical Linguistics". In: C. R. Caldas-Coulthard & M. Coulthard (eds.) (1996): 3-14.

Gallagher, M. (2000). "The Emergence of Entrepreneurial Public Universities in Australia". Paper presented at the *IMHE General Conference of the OECD*, Paris. September, 2000. Canberra: Higher Education Division, Department of Education Training and Youth Affairs (DETYA).

Gore, J. (1993). *The Struggle for Pedagogies: Critical and Feminist Discourses as Regimes of Truth*. New York: Routledge.

Grosz, E. (1999). "Think the New: Of Futures Yet Unthought". In: E. Grosz (ed.) (1999): 15-28.

Grosz, E. (ed.) (1999): *Becomings: Explorations in Time, Memory, and Futures*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Hager, P. *et alii* (2002). "Enhancing the Learning and Employability of Graduates: The Role of Generic Skills". *B-HERT Position Paper no 9* (Business/Higher Education Round Table).

Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 2nd Ed. London: Edward Arnold.

Hodge, B. & A. McHoul (1992). "The Politics of Text and Commentary", *Textual Practice* 6 (2): 189-209.

Hood, S. (2004). "Managing attitude in undergraduate academic writing: A focus on the introductions to research reports". In: L. Ravelli & R. Ellis (eds.) (2004): 24-44.

Hunston. S. & G. Thompson (eds.) (2000). *Evaluation in Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ivanic, R. (1998). *Writing and Identity: The Discoursal Construction of Identity in Academic Writing*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Jagose, A. (1996). *Queer Theory*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Kamler, B. (2001). *Relocating the Personal: A Critical Writing Pedagogy*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Lea, M. R. & B. Stierer (eds.) (2000). *Student Writing in Higher Education: New contexts*. Buckingham UK: Open University Press.

Lee, A. (1997). "Working together? Academic Literacies, Co production and Professional partnerships", *Literacy and Numeracy Studies* 7 (2): 65-82.

Lee, A. (2000). "Discourse Analysis and Cultural (Re)Writing". In: A. Lee & C. Poynton (eds.) (2000): 188-202.

Lee, A. & C. Poynton (eds.) (2000). *Culture & text: Discourse and Methodology in Social Research and Cultural Studies*. St. Leonards, N. S. W: Allen & Unwin.

Lemke, J. (1995). *Textual Politics: Discourse and Social Dynamics*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Luke, A. (2003). "After the Marketplace: Evidence, Social Science and Educational research", *The Australian Educational Researcher* 30 (2): 87-10.

Martin, J. (2000). "Beyond exchange: Appraisal Systems in English". In: S. Hunston & G. Thompson (eds.) (2000): 142-175.

Martin, J. R. M. (1992). *English Text: System and Structure*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

May, T. & M. Williams (1998). *Knowing the Social World*. Open University Press, Buckingham UK.

McInnes, D. & B. James (2004). "Engaging with the Personal: Theories of Writing Meet Theories of the Body", *International Journal of Learning* 10: 1013-1027.

Poynton, C. & A. Lee (2000). *Culture and Tex: Discourse and Methodology in Social Research and Cultural Studies*. St Leonards: Allen and Unwin.

Ravelli, L. & R. Ellis (eds.) (2004). *Analysing academic writing: Contextualised frameworks*. London: Continuum.

White, P. (2003). *Appraisal Website Homepage* last updated 21/02/03. Retrieved April 15th, 2004 from <http://www.grammatics.com/appraisal/>.