

In your own write; for English wherever I may find her: De-territorialising writing

Item Type	Chapter in book
Authors	Bennett, Peter;Scott, Howard
Citation	Bennett, P. & Scott, H. (2022) In your own write; for English wherever I may find her: de-territorialising writing in Bennett, P., Lambert, L., & Smith, R. (Eds.). (2022). Rethinking and Reviving Subject English: The Murder and the Murmur (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003262718
DOI	10.4324/9781003262718
Publisher	Routledge
Rights	Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International
Download date	2026-03-09 09:04:12
License	http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/
License	https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/
Link to Item	https://wlv.openrepository.com/handle/2436/625892

ABSTRACT

Chapter Twelve. In your own Write; for English wherever I may find her: de-territorialising writing

Pete Bennett (Primary, Secondary, Sixth Form College, Higher Education) and Howard Scott (Further Education, Higher Education)

This chapter offers an account of an intervention within a university-based ‘Access to Higher Education’ programme. The context is important because transitions always are and as such are also places where pauses may be made for thought. It is in this ‘hiatus’ that the authors find time and space to genuinely negotiate literacy with the University of Opportunity, an institution which was the first and only university to waive requirements for ‘passes’ in GCSE English and maths for applicants.

The chapter explores the ongoing writing project which both addresses issues around widening participation and social justice in its desire to find alternative ways to validate students as they arrive. As English teachers, working as academics in an Institute of Education and substantially focused on Teacher Education for the post-compulsory (PCE) sector, the authors found themselves experiencing and negotiating a set of issues around genuine access to a university education but also finding simple principled responses within their previous practices as teachers of the subject previously known as English. These issues had nothing to do with course content nor indeed curriculum, which can always be more responsive but are never more than, but rather concerned the creation of a community of readers and writers, where every writer could be assured of a welcome and readers.

Appropriately this process is also called ‘being included’, the ‘subject’ around which all were invited or indeed allowed to meet.

Chapter Twelve. In your own Write; for English wherever I may find her: de-territorialising writing

Pete Bennett (Primary, Secondary, Sixth Form College, Higher Education) and Howard Scott (Further Education, Higher Education)

“When I write; this is me. What I write; this is me.” (Chevelle Armstrong)

“This is us. This is who we are.” (Professor Rob Smith tweet)

This chapter explores the idea that the set of experiences, attitudes, values, opportunities and encounters which we, largely out of habit call ‘English’ can ‘take’ in any fertile ground and must do so on occasions when the traditional territories have been concreted over. It is an account of our experiences of an intervention ostensibly within an Inclusion and Inclusive Practice module which forms part of the university's Foundation programme. Formerly known as ‘LEAP’, this is essentially that adult education staple ‘Access to Higher Education’ except in our case they get across the threshold first, signing up to a degree with Foundation Studies before laying the foundation stone. The context is important because transitions always are and as such are also places where pauses may be made for thought: Rancière suggests that “the things that matter for theory turn up at crossover points where the different jurisdictions disappear...” (Rancière, 2016: 32).

The university we work in prides itself on being both the university of the Black Country and the University of Opportunity. The former manifests itself in us being the most local and working class university in the country, the latter in being the first and only university to waive requirements for ‘passes’ in GCSE English and maths for applicants. This mixture of strategy, gesture and point of principle is designed and/ or intended to address issues around

widening participation which are predicated firstly on the wonderfully diverse and often untraditional (in HE terms) character of our applicants. However, a second driver, also founded in ideas of social justice, is the desire to find alternative ways to validate students as they arrive at a moment where the academic ‘gold standard’, in this case the reformed GCSE, has never been more inappropriate or unfit for purpose.

Thus as English teachers, working as academics in an Institute of Education and substantially focused on Teacher Education for the post-compulsory (PCE) sector, we found ourselves experiencing and negotiating a set of issues around genuine access to a university education. These issues had nothing to do with course content nor indeed curriculum, which can always be more responsive but are never more than, as Jung points out, “so much necessary raw material”. Jung goes on to suggest, emotively that “warmth is the vital element for the growing plant” (Jung, 1953; 136), which might equate at least to being made welcome, coming to a place “where everybody knows your name and everybody’s glad you came” as the old song says. Appropriately this process is also called ‘being included’, the ‘subject’ around which we were all invited or indeed permitted to meet.

The module, once it passed into the hands of the PCE team, was conceived in terms of what Rendón calls an ‘emancipatory pedagogy’, consciously exploiting the opportunity to address issues of inclusion through the medium of the processes of inclusion in real time with a real group of educators and real students. Thus the Reader that we compile with the students as we move through the weeks is a record not only of our discussions but also our principles, such as a desire for education, as the philosopher Alfred North Whitehead suggested, “to represent Life, as it is known in the midst of living it?” (Whitehead, 1929). In simple terms we wished the education we were making to meet Biesta’s requirement to “provide opportunity for individuals to come into presence, that is, to show who they are and where they stand” (Biesta, 2005 :62). Also to realise Rendón’s need “to validate students’ capacities for

intellectual development at the beginning, not at the end, of their academic careers” since “many students feel that who they are and what they represent are not valued” (Rendón, 1992: 63). And finally to honour Rancière’s argument that “Equality is a presupposition, an initial axiom or it is nothing” (Rancière, 2003: 223).

The module from the beginning was successful on these terms: it promoted student confidence and an open written assignment allowed for students to respond personally, individually and creatively to the issues of inclusion by developing a ‘learning episode’ for a particular group of students from any feasible context. This was central to our notions of what ‘LEAP’ might entail and though the metaphor is hardly unproblematic we still refer to the project in this version, metaphorical old money. We also always supported students with their writing and never merely in terms of installing technical writing skills or instructing in the dialects of academic writing, rather we addressed them in a real sense as writers.

Dealing with writing as only end product emanating from a substantial range of contexts from writers whose academic literacy was in most cases endorsed by a school leaver qualification, offers little real room to develop writing let alone writers. Writing is an element of any preparation for HE, however this is qualified in every sense and clearly GCSE English is no proxy for being literate, however this is qualified. The approach we have found meets a gut feeling we have for something that holds itself unaccountable to anything that has passed for English/Literacy in ‘the other place’ (which in this case is school) and is an explicit rejection of what Peim calls Subject English, newly embodied in the reformed GCSE. What we were wanting was something active and captivating and exploratory and messy: using language to both create and collect meaning. These are students disenfranchised and for too long encumbered by another’s expectation that they were not permitted to engage with, transcend from or shred the curtain of literacy they were held behind. They embody Wittgenstein’s statement of disempowerment: ‘That whereof we cannot speak, thereof we must remain

silent' (Wittgenstein, 2007: 108). We aimed to subvert the manufactured consent of their own supposed ignorance by inducing their sense of self.

Subject English, the lurching, teetering succubus of schools qualification 'English', seeks to regulate, control and cleanse and by doing so prevents rather than allows. Working as Barthes suggests myth does as "a language which does not want to die: it wrests from the meanings which give it its sustenance an insidious, degraded survival, it provokes in them an artificial reprieve in which it settles comfortably, it turns them into speaking corpses" (Barthes, 1972: 132).

Working with students preparing for university study is understandably partly about students who one way or another probably will need to be 'better' (no blueprint) writers so the task is finding a much better place than Subject English to develop a culture of literacy (as opposed to a cult or club or gesture). This was provided in our case very simply by our insistence that writing should and would be a natural and valuable part of every session and this mainly means writing with pen or pencil though occasionally students will use laptops. This writing most usually forms the final act of a two or three hour session and might follow a coffee break or a more substantial break for lunch, meaning they are replenished both physiologically and cognitively. The writing is prompted by the experience of the session and directions are always options but this making a mark and having a say is also potentially open, self-determined as a part of a course that is partly user-generated and always emanating from this course, understood both as this collection of travellers and this particular manifestation of their progress through time and experience.

We propose that the act of writing anchors the self and enables students to not only "write themselves into being" (Boyd, 2006), but to write themselves into emancipation from the school of alienation, where "all too often students labelled with dyslexia become protagonists

in socially constructed narratives of failure” (MacDonald, 2009). These writings are read and annotated by teacher responses to them as writings, their arguments, their ideas and their ‘fine words’. The annotations do not evaluate the performance of either the writer or indeed the teacher, they are in no sense a form of assessment. Rather the writing constitutes a vital part of the session, where vital is taken as a language of cerebral freedom, and in an ongoing sense to the progress of the course (reimagined as a collection/ collective of writers in transit). It demonstrates the value of all manner of things (thoughtfulness, ideas, communication, one another, the collective) and anchors pretty much everything else we do with the thoughtful opinions of others including ourselves.

Moreover, we make a commitment each week to launch the session with ‘fine words’ from the previous week’s writing, importantly occupying the same spaces as the thoughts of us as teachers and our *motley crue* of philosophers, poets, theorists and assorted visionaries. These are not just ‘sayings’, we have those too, circulating in the various discussions that typify this case study in inclusive practice. These are that staple of the university ‘survival kit’, useful and engaging quotations and when the time is right (i.e. immediately) they can be set alongside the words of the great and the good. This becomes firstly a good way to meaningfully introduce the need to reference and how it might be done. It is much more importantly a very effective way to put theory of all kinds in its place as a resource and useful only when it is contributing rather than merely appearing.

This writing never asks, ‘Do you understand’, preferring ‘What have you got to say (for yourself)?’ Even the optional technical advice is about writers thinking about writing. We hope for a pedagogy that escapes notions of mastery and embraces an equality which is method, not aspiration. This represents a commitment to Rancière’s model of an education predicated on exploration rather than instruction:

“Reason begins when discourses organized with the goal of being right cease, begins where equality is recognized: not an equality decreed by law or force, not a passively received equality, but an equality in act, verified, at each step by those marchers who, in their constant attention to themselves and in their endless revolving around the truth, find the right sentences to make themselves understood by others.” (Rancière, 1981: 44)

Rancière talks of ‘instruction’ as potentially a radical point of departure and that is hellwards as soon as “telling and interpreting” are gazumped by “explaining and understanding”. Free writing is an exalted act of inclusion, which within a couple of weeks became as comfortable as it first was awkward, meant telling and interpreting were always the focus and that writing was always evident and useful. For Rancière the problem starts with old teaching assumption where the teacher “decreed the absolute beginning: it is only now that the act of learning will begin and having thrown a veil of ignorance over everything that is to be learned, he appoints himself the task of lifting it” (Rancière, 1981, 6). Instead, we tried to inculcate the belief in “what an intelligence can do when it considers itself equal to any other and considers any other equal to itself” (Rancière, 1981: 39).

In this we realised the potency of what Rancière calls a ‘circle of power’, which actually only required this simple commitment to their writing (and our own). In this act of emancipation we realised that our role was simply to be emancipated ourselves, that is “conscious of the true power of the human mind” (Rancière, 1981: 15). Those clearly designated as lacking in knowledge will indeed learn by themselves, even what the teacher doesn’t know, but only “if the master believes he can and obliges him to realize his capacity: a circle of power homologous to the circle of powerlessness that ties the student to the explicator of the old method” (op. cit.).

It was clear from quite early on in the process and has been clear in every subsequent iteration, that this situated writing and integrating and including student writings within the module content and experience had and does re-order the relation of forces. For as Rancière points out:

“The circle of powerlessness is always already there: it is the very workings of the social world, hidden in the evident difference between ignorance and science. The circle of power, on the other hand, can only take effect by being made public. But it can only appear as a tautology or an absurdity.” (Rancière, 1981: 15)

This notion of ‘absurdity’ seems quite accurate: it’s there in the response of the students for the first week or so and in the response of colleagues when we outline our practice: they look askance and then it strikes them that such an approach should not seem absurd. This relates to some considerable degree to Barthes’ warnings about what can be oppressive in our teaching: “not finally the knowledge or culture it conveys but the discursive forms through which we propose them”. Given teaching has to acknowledge “the inevitability of power”, Barthes insists that the function of pedagogical method is principally as “the means of loosening baffling or even lightning that power”(in Sontag, 1993: 476). Barthes speaks about pedagogical renewal as “presenting a discourse without imposing it”, providing access rather than explication.

What this chapter will try and do is to relate this experience to both broader issues about literacy and identity for the access student and almost anybody else and more explicitly to what was going on both in and through these writing ‘episodes’. Our tentative hypothesis is that in these writing contexts, which simply and without fuss address students as writers as soon as they are writing, provide a much clearer and more convincing way to foster literate behaviour than the current version of Subject English for school leavers (and increasingly

inappropriately for those arriving in FE without this medal). This was not an intention of the intervention but we became increasingly aware that what we were finding, to some extent ‘after the subject’, were opportunities to put reading and writing back into the forefront of what we do, in a way that was satisfyingly non-technical and non-academic. And the results were not necessarily to be seen in ‘better’ writing, because the character of the intervention and this account of it are not measuring or charting performance in this sense, but in a better understanding for all of us of writing and being a writer. In essence, what we cultivated, was permission to write: we refused to act as gatekeepers of literacy and instead invoked what was innate: an instinct to express themselves as they never had and to participate as much as they wished.

The best way to evidence this is to focus on the writing that came out of a single session as a kind of case study: the particular session has been chosen because it proved a threshold of sorts due mainly to the attitude of students and the kind of writing produced. We are at pains to point out that we are not interested in a debate about the quality of the writing produced in this session and presented here as judged by external criteria but by the value of the writing in every sense, as activity, product, attitude and resource. The session in question, led by Howard was ostensibly about ‘Language and Inclusion’ but started as ever with the latest resource list/ newsletter comprising ‘fine words’ and ideas from the previous week to ‘stir the pot’ and prime the context. We had a few moments on Jade Battersby’s notion that “To be included makes me feel happy and honest” before Howard kicked off with quotes from Arthur Scargill and another of our students, Khadra Ahmed. Scargill, quoted by the poet Tony Harrison as a prefix to his long poem *V*, was linking his father’s reading of the dictionary every day to the need to master words, while Khadra argued for a freedom to show your personality. Both were important for what followed which used theory (e.g. Bernstein) and poetry (e.g. Agard) to stimulate a conversation about language and identity and identity

Book chapter in *Rethinking and Reviving Subject English*, published by Routledge at <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003262718>

and inclusion and inclusion and education. Pete read a poem from Agard, *Checking out me history* and Howard shared a tweet from Rob Smith but mainly we talked as a group about language and how it defined us. The session generated two prompts for writing and for the only time in the three years of the model, everyone chose to be directed.

The prompts were as follows: ‘who are you today?’ or ‘How has language hindered or opened up learning for you?’ But also these were ‘written’ on a powerpoint and accompanied by another set of instructions/ statement of intent which was largely the gist of what we’d said every week but in this case it was written, it was writing. It looked like a rubric but felt like a further invitation:

“Write however you like today. Write the way you speak. Write it as text speak. Use phrases and words you might never use in an educational task. Pay no attention to spelling or grammar. Today, we don’t care.”

This unwitting game of double bluff has plenty to teach us about writing and teaching and particularly about the relationship between the two. It produced the most enjoyable and educative contributions but also proved a watershed in the development of both the group and many individual writers. We will focus briefly on those who wrote in a poetic form, mostly for the first time, not because of an, even subliminal, hierarchy of linguistic forms but because it marked the most obvious and explicit departure from old ways of writing but more importantly thinking about writing. Here was a reaching for verse in both a specific and ongoing context, rather as Peter Willis, in his book on adult education reaches for verse to frame his thinking on the invitation that we too were hoping to extend:

I risk inviting;

I want you here.

And when you come

I feel enriched, believe

you feel the same. (Willis, 2002;)

Willis goes on to implore teachers to “trust that while you stand unarmed and welcoming your guests will not turn;”, which reminds us not only of the Biesta’s inevitable ‘risk’ but also the importance of developing a community, a culture, a context. We revel in the playful as teachers and students and as teacher-writers and student-writers but this is a playfulness with attitude as exemplified by the auto-ethnographer Sohini Madison:

“I am playful, but I am not playing. I do not appreciate carelessness. I pay attention. I do not let go or look away, because I have learned that all the meanings, languages, and bits of pain will come into clarity and utility like a liberation song. I need this clarity for the ones I love.” (Madison, 1999:108 in Spry, 2016: 176-7).

What Madison is conceiving and our students are realising in their writing both as activity and product is the importance of the personal and the gestural, even ceremonial in the progress of the process of writing. Partly they are learning the lesson Barthes teaches, that “Writing is in no way an instrument for communication, it is not an open route through which there passes only the intention to speak” and this marks a difference from spoken language. It is clear that one of the developing benefits of a writing time that comes with a guarantee of readers is an escape from what Barthes calls “a whole disorder“, which “flows through speech and gives it this devouring momentum which keeps it in a perpetually suspended state”(in Sontag, 1993; 38). Žižek writes about the contemporary ‘moment’ where everything is ‘provisional’ and it is partly this which is addressed by writing, “a hard language which is

self contained and is in no way meant to deliver to its own duration a mobile series of approximations” (op. cit.). These understandings come only through patience and practice and not rehearsal but performance. The key always is validation, not as a single act but rather as a series of steps which range from establishing the theoretical value of the writing via a value enacted by teacher feedback and approval through to the aspiration of the individual finding the value of their own work for themselves. While some are clearly enthusiastic, we routinely note the tension and anxiety that first accompanies the practise of free writing. They are pathologically inhibited, guarded and defensive - but often willing, though at some pain to disguise it. Their sense is that writing is associated with *anhedonia* through a continual assessment regime that freezes their instincts to express. What we conceive as an invitation or an opportunity to write, they can find debilitating. By the end of our short module, we feel sure enough to say that we discern a transformation and an exhilaration in the writing space, as they learn to trust in themselves as capable, plausible and real. This is borne out by the ‘Open Publishing’ (Scott, 2016) of their words adorning that space, as they encounter and surpass thresholds of confidence. There is a fervour in subsequent weeks to write, to use what we share and share what they know in a tantalising dance of risk.

The session under discussion with its various experiments with forms, all student led, provided a vital threshold moment in the community of writers reaching a self-actualisation that writing is “meant to impose, thanks to the shadow cast by its system of sides, the image of a speech which had a structure even before it came into existence” (Barthes in Sontag, 1993: 38). Observing these acts of making it is clear also that, as the opposite of speech, writing always appears “symbolical, introverted, ostensibly turned towards an occult side of language” while speech remains “epitomised in this expendability of words in this froth ceaselessly swept onward” (op. cit.). In the ur-act of poetic writing what is demonstrated is that writing “is always rooted in something beyond language, develops like a seed not like a

line, it manifests an essence and holds the threat of a secret, it is an anti-communication, it is intimidating” (Barthes in Sontag, 1993: 39). These realities of writing were played out in the session as a whole which culminated the following week in our proper appreciation of process, presence and product in the performance of Nikeva’s extraordinary first poem. In all of this work, though perhaps more clearly in those which were consciously poetic, it is possible to witness Barthes’ notion that “there exists fundamentally in writing a circumstance ‘foreign’ to language, there is, as it were, the weight of a gaze conveying an intention which is no longer linguistic” (Barthes in Sontag, 1993: 38).

Though both ‘poetry’ and ‘poet’ carry cultural connotations, they may prove easier to be put on by students than ‘writer’, which perhaps carries even more impudence/ pretension/ presumption. Writing creatively is a meaningful memory to most and for some remains as an aspiration, intention or forlorn hope, which can be feasibly rekindled, recovered or otherwise ‘tapped’. This is a clumsy way of saying that in any group of students there are always poets, though some need permission as well as opportunity. When writing starts to experiment with form, these characters can make themselves useful, typically by showing where they are and where they stand; by imposing themselves. The context for these encounters is often, paradoxically, mediated by memories and the faint odours of Subject English as tantamount to C/D/E – or as impossible as 1, 2, 3 (to follow the new and pointless reclassification of grade boundaries). There is a social imperative to schools-English that slams the door on both epistemology and civic belonging, where it labels any non-standardised ludic experimentation in writing as straying from the accepted terrain of the exams board. From there, students perceive another sense that learning just about anything is not for them. For writers with the confidence of an A/B/C (or a 7, 8, 9), the craft of writing is repetition – to edit, to check, to improve.

For those in the school of ‘re-sits’, repetition kills them because they are dealt a deficit badge whatever the circumstances - and they are rarely inherent to the individual, but systemic – and the deficit badge of repetition is imprinted to the soul. That the ‘resit course’ for GCSE is located at the door to PCE and FE, that bastion of transformation, where many school leavers, adults and HE-access students go to seek pedagogical sanctuary, is a scandal for the many young people not captivated by the illusory spell of school. Here, far from that field we present as English teachers with a poetry that exterminates the blind flags of reality (Nuttall, 2019). For some the feeling is just too strong and this is not a bad thing: we know from both Land and Meyer (2001) and Mezirow (1997) that the negotiation of thresholds conveys apprehension and disorientation. All that we needed was to gain some distance from those demoralising schools experiences, which prohibit any time for constructive disorientation, to design and incite a creative space, built on individual freedom. This is the murmur of English, part of its lasting glory, though all too often the ‘poets’ it inspired, it also failed to maintain or develop.

Here Chevelle fits that bill as someone who does write...poems, who knows she is a writer but also what that implies in these limited contexts filled originally with the toxicity of the need to be ‘some good’, whatever that means. This is a profound moment and she does not let herself down, because she writes in a register that adds to the discussion: working in a different key, she draws attention and makes everything a little more clear and a little more useful. Chevelle’s words explicitly embrace ideas like ambiguity and paradox and as such are useful in organising work as a whole that this learning is about the tentative and provisional qualities of reflection and creation. This is a matter of confidence and address and it speaks to and for the collective: “Let my words coat your mind like a summer breeze/ Open your eyes to what blinded you before... (Chevelle). Her words transform, engage and involve us: “Not knowing and knowing may seem so different but mean the same thing/ To you it makes no

sense but to me it's open to debate... (Chevelle Armstrong). This is an irreversible and integrative act (Land and Meyer, 2003: 4), publicly situated, for both writer and audience, and pulls us all towards the solace of the summer breeze which Chevelle so gracefully evokes.

For the others who were trying this form and mode out for the first time the experiences were entirely different but equally intriguing. Freed specifically from the dynamic of encountering 'poetry' within the reservation of subject English, though much of the meaning of poetry is rooted there, this became much more of a writing exercise – though no less aesthetic. Also, there was the sense that a poem was more obviously a product than what had otherwise been emerging from fifteen minutes writing. Lianne, a mature student, appreciated this sense of completion enough to take it away and read it to her mom, whose complex but positive critique ran, "You didn't write that". But she did and it was a manifesto:

"Today I learnt I can be who I want to be.

Today I evolved" (Lianne Tetsell)

Charlene, on the other hand was engaged enough with the challenge of both experience and rhyme to try it out during the break on her mobile. The sight of her then transferring it to paper while trying to find the right sentences to make herself understood by others was a memorable one. It was the epitome of the writer at work:

This morning, I woke up as a mother,

And as the day progressed, I've turned into another.

Here the lecture has been all about language,

On all different types and how they average.

Book chapter in Rethinking and Reviving Subject English, published by Routledge at <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003262718>

Today I am a pupil, understanding different language codes,

From restricted to elaborate, my head feels like it's going to explode. (Charlene Stephens)

This is a proper first draft as our writing inevitably is: it has been made and we are all better for that. Of course in the unpredictability of creation, you get unexpected delights, handwritten first poems that just sing:

Umma proud aunty da luv to sing,

I play wit ma nieces n nephews out unda the tree.

You see, wen we outside anything is possible

We dance, we sing, we run, our imagination runs wild

'Sing for meh tantie' day would say

'Ahyah lawd try go play' wat else I mus say.

Nikeva is from Anguilla and not used to writing the way she speaks: like a lot of us she has a number of voices which she can elect to deploy!

Smile, yah beautiful people would say,

Kind words comes out of my mouth

I've grown and feel so empowered about myself

Who to think da I go University rite now: ah just laugh at maself.

I'm the rose that grew outta concrete.

(Nikeva Connor)

Peter King once wrote that, “Teachers who refuse to think about the nature of their subject will make it easy for those forces to overcome the profession” (in Peim, 1994: xiv) and this has to some extent become the place we think about Subject English: ‘wherever we may find it’ as the title emotes. King was introducing the most important intervention into this debate in the last thirty years, Nick Peim’s *Critical Theory and the English Teacher*, a book which might articulate the central experience of this intervention. For Peim (in 1993) the time had come to rip up the blueprint and start again since, “The position expressed here claims that the identity of English has been and is founded on premises and practices that are not viable” (Peim, 1993: 4). And like Peim, though it still pains us to say it our argument is “against English - against its current practices and the values they represent- proposing a newly defined field of ideas and activities” (op. cit.). In the teeth of regressive reforms of both A level and GCSE and the creation of a compulsory English GCSE retake, students become disciplined by “the normalising gaze and techniques of the social institution of the school into internalising identities as failures” (Barden, 2014: 99). Peim’s most damning indictment is even more convincing now than when it issued forth more than twenty five years ago: “Even though it may continue doggedly to make special claims for itself...English...works against the majority of its students” (Peim, 1993: 5). Peim explained then, as we do now that “To reconstruct English in this way means addressing issues of inequality and cultural identity: it also means addressing more fully and more centrally issues of race class and gender...” (Peim, 1994: 8). This reconstruction might need to happen elsewhere as we have tentatively discovered.

Michel de Certeau’s masterwork on ‘reading’ (and to a lesser extent writing) is entitled *The Practice of Everyday Life*, another possibility for naming this newly established space. It is a place where the focus is on producing work, on making meanings, on ‘doing’ reading and writing on creating not demonstrating, on excursions not exercises. In doing so we are rising

Book chapter in *Rethinking and Reviving Subject English*, published by Routledge at <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003262718>

to Deleuze's challenge that "We lack creation. Resistance to the Present" (Deleuze & Guattari, 2001: 108). And in this case that Present in Subject English is bound up with processes rather than production, forming rather than forging, even 'achieving' rather than addressing or attempting.

References

Barden, O. (2014) *Exploring dyslexia, literacies and identities on Facebook*. Available at:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/264630166_Exploring_dyslexia_literacies_and_identities_on_Facebook/citations. [Accessed 4/12/2014].

Barthes, R. (1972) *Mythologies*, New York, Jonathan Cape.

Biesta, G. (2005) Against learning. Reclaiming a language for education in an age of learning, *Nordisk Pedagogik*, (25): 54–66.

Boyd, D. (2006) Friends, friendsters, and MySpace top 8: writing community into being on social network sites, *First Monday* 11(12): 4.

Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (2001) *A Thousand Plateaus*, London: Continuum

Jung, C. (1953) *The Development of Personality*, London: Routledge.

MacDonald, S.J. (2009) Windows of Reflection: Conceptualizing Dyslexia Using the Social Model of Disability *Dyslexia*, 15(4): 347-62.

Mezirow, J. (1997) Transformative Learning: Theory to Practice, *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*. (74): 5–12.

Meyer, J.H.F. and Land, R. (2003) Threshold Concepts and Troublesome Knowledge 1 – Linkages to Ways of Thinking and Practising, in Rust, C. (Ed) *Improving Student Learning – Ten Years On*, Oxford: OCSLD.

Book chapter in *Rethinking and Reviving Subject English*, published by Routledge at <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003262718>

Peim, N. (1994) *Critical Theory and the English Teacher*. London: Routledge.

Rancière, J. (1991) *The Ignorant Schoolmaster: Five Lessons in Intellectual Emancipation*, Stanford: Stanford U.P.

Rancière, J. (2003) *The Philosopher and his Poor*, London: Duke University Press.

Rancière, J. (2016) *The Method of Equality*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Rendón, L. (1992) From the Barrio to the academy: Revelations of a Mexican American “scholarship girl”, *New Directions for Community Colleges*: (80): 55-64.

Whitehead, A.N. (1929) *The Aims of Education*. Available at:

<https://www.educationevolving.org/content/aims-of-education-whitehead-1929>. [Accessed 3/12/2020].

Willis, P. (2002) *Inviting Learning: An Exhibition of Risk and Enrichment in Adult Education*, Leicester: NIACE.

Wittgenstein, L. (2007) *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, New York: Cosimo