

## Liminal Space: Postgraduate Creative Writing in Australian Universities

Vahri McKenzie

Edith Cowan University

*Creative writing as a postgraduate discourse occupies a liminal space in Australian universities. A poor relation of a poor relation, it is marginal in the university environment as a whole and there are internal tensions regarding creative writing's disciplinary place within humanities/English departments. Further, there is no consensus on what constitutes a postgraduate creative writing exegesis, which comprises up to half the award. In the absence of adequate definition a space opens up that can be used to probe the grey areas of our discipline. Postgraduate writers are uniquely placed to influence the terms of future discussions on creative writing pedagogy by using the space of the creative writing exegesis to question its necessity and function, and to explore more general questions of creativity and assessment. But at the same time as postgraduates have this opportunity, it is important to realise that the terms of higher degree assessment influence the nature of the writing produced within them. The two assessable parts are in dialogue not just with each other but also with our interpretation of our obligations as postgraduates. Therefore, there is the need for a co-operative, imaginative approach to postgraduate discourse, where the possibilities and potentials of the exegesis are encouraged to unfold, particularly using the in-between status that defines the discipline's liminality.*

Three years ago I was in the fortunate position of having three PhD courses to choose from at three different universities in my city. I had only a little information on the courses and very little time to make my choice. A friend advised me, 'in the end it doesn't matter. It's your work and you'll do it wherever you are.' But looking at my research process with the advantage of hindsight, it seems to me that in this field at least, one's course has a substantial impact on the nature of the work produced. For example, my understanding that creative writing courses require a lengthy exegesis in a critical style alongside a novel led me to write about an aspect of my recent family history, because it was already situated in a readily accessible textual array including published and unpublished autobiographies and family histories. Well educated in the reading theories of an undergraduate English degree, I took it for granted that a critical exegesis regarding one's own work would turn neatly upon a tightly bound series of self-and-family texts.

Little did I know. I know a little more now, enough to realise there is a significant body of work relating to *writing theories*: the theory and practice of teaching and learning creative writing. In Australia and overseas, conferences and journals are devoted to these topics of research. However, the discipline is a relatively new one and a situation has developed where postgraduate writers have rarely learned writing theory for much, if any, of their undergraduate degree. So why don't we stick to what we know, what we've been trained in? For many, undergraduate writing courses weren't available at the time they were undertaking their first degrees. As well as that, for me there was something untenable about pursuing postgraduate qualifications in a specific field of cultural studies or English literature criticism, something dishonest, or cowardly, about retreating into criticism without attempting to *do* where I had been taught to so assiduously *undo*. My research has convinced me of the need to teach both sides of the binary: reading/writing, theory/practice,

critical/creative, and to encourage writing close to the divide; that each side of the binary enriches the experience of the other side.

Our theme here is liminality, so I will argue that creative writing as a postgraduate discourse occupies a liminal space in Australian universities. Being a postgraduate creative writer can be thought of as *liminal*, where that term refers to situations that don't fit easily into dominant systems of categorisation, perhaps carrying a burden of irrelevancy or unimportance, on several levels. In the university environment taken as a whole, industrial and corporate funding favours research with a profitable outcome and the arts come out poorly. Within the humanities, creative writing is generally structured as a subset of a dominating discipline, usually English. And to be a postgraduate creative writer is to be neither teacher nor student; a writer of a rather new kind of work combining a novel with a critical exegesis.

Although there are studies which reflect the value of reading theories on writing courses (Dawson, Freiman) and studies that argue the value of creative writing exercises in literary criticism (Howarth, Austen), most research is focussed on undergraduate courses, as if it is all too late by postgraduate level. It is at the postgraduate level that the most intractable and problematic of award structures exist, in the shape of the novel with an accompanying critical exegesis. This clearly implies a need to comment upon the creative work, a compulsive, one-way process that refuses the creative work a place on its own. Creative writers alone of research higher degree students have to submit a second, separate piece of research because the first is insufficient. So what is the exegesis? That's a good question and like all good questions there is no consensus on the answer.

I will begin broadly with a few comments on the development of creative writing as a discipline in universities, to provide some context for this paper. In part, the lack of status attendant upon the discipline is due to creative writing's relatively recent professionalisation. In Australia the discipline is only a decade old, if we mark its birth from the date of establishment of the Australian Association of Writing Programs, as does Paul Dawson, although several Australian tertiary institutions established writing courses well before this. In a useful 2001 paper on the development of creative writing in Australian universities, Dawson shows that creative writing was taught in primary and secondary schools as a pedagogical tool for individual development before it reached tertiary education, seeping into the culture via teacher training colleges, public creative writing workshops and technical schools. Despite the fact that it frequently grew out of what used to be known as English departments, Dawson claims that '[i]t is obvious that Creative Writing developed in Australia out of educational agendas opposed to traditional English studies'.<sup>1</sup> This sets up a tension I will return to.

Economic concerns are a great motivator, both troubling and contributing to perceptions of the discipline's liminality. Typically literary fiction holds limited potential for financial profit but this strains against a writer's hopes of being published. According to Dawson, the crucial factor in the push towards the professionalisation of creative writing 'is not only a desire for individual self-expression which was cultivated in schools, but a cultural environment in which it seems possible and attractive to become a published author.'<sup>2</sup> Throughout the 70s and 80s, teaching of the writing arts developed differently from institution to institution due to local factors, but this occurred in the context of an international shift away from traditional literary studies towards what Dawson calls 'Theory' (with a capital T), but which I'd prefer to call contemporary critical practice, with all its myriad theories. The capitalisation of Theory implies cohesion, a monolithic entity that may be got around, or got over. In fact, one of the key understandings of 'Theory' is the realisation that one cannot be free of it: declared or not, one always speaks from a set of ideological principles.

Paul Dawson ends his Australian history of the development of the discipline in the late 1980s. He resumes his discussion of the tension between creative writing and traditional English studies in his 2003 paper, 'Towards a New Poetics in Creative Writing Pedagogy'. Dawson's bold opening claims there are two challenges influencing the humanities now: the need to move beyond 'Theory' and the need to adapt to the corporate university. In Dawson's construction, it seems that 'Theory' is to be resisted while the corporate university is to be got used to. Even though I disagree with him here, the two influences are worth looking at further.

I will begin with the former, which appears to me a paper tiger in its capitalised form, a distraction from the real tragedy of corporatising universities. In Australian universities, there has been an international shift towards a broader understanding of theories of culture, but for some, contemporary critical practice has gone too far and marooned itself in an archipelago of irrelevancy, with limited engagement in the public sphere. Dawson claims his New Poetics responds to this challenge because it 'encourages the view of literature as a public intellectual practice, rather than a means for the empowerment of individual identities and subjectivities'.<sup>3</sup> There is no explanation of how this public is to be defined, if not through examples of individual identities.

Dawson articulates a New Poetics where the study of creative writing, with its development at odds with traditional literary education, is well placed to contribute to the work of the humanities in overcoming perceptions of irrelevancy. Unlike his New Poetics, traditional creative writing pedagogy is just as formal in its structure as traditional literary studies, which separates the functions of reading and writing, creative and critical. For example, Dawson illustrates how students are frequently taught to 'read as a writer', examining how a work is crafted in terms of its plot, structure, point of view, etc., which is constructed as somehow different to reading as a critic. Dawson demonstrates that 'reading as a writer' is a critical posture, formalist in persuasion, naturalised as the writer's perspective.

Presumably, traditional creative writing pedagogy's inability to see itself in a broader context of reading theories is as a result of its insulation from contemporary critical practice. Indeed, Dawson points to the increasing numbers of scholarly articles on creative writing and claims,

[r]ather than maintaining a division between writers and critics, this new industry strives to provide academic legitimacy to the discipline by theorising the teaching of writing in relation to contemporary critical practices.<sup>4</sup>

Traditional creative writing pedagogy is set against Dawson's New Poetics and found wanting, not overcoming the challenges of irrelevancy. But his opening challenge suggests irrelevancy was a risk run by being too embedded in 'Theory'. Where the humanities in general must overcome devotions to theoretical methodologies, creative writing must embrace them. Where exactly does traditional creative writing turn away from the humanities? In Dawson's argument, 'traditional' teaching of the writing arts are the practices common to the creative writing workshop in mainly North American universities. This mode of 'traditional' is not as relevant to the Australian context and sits somewhat at odds with his Australian history, where the same arguments opposing 'traditional teaching' to creative writing are raised.

Another point of view on traditional creative writing pedagogy is provided by Peter Howarth who suggests,

[i]f creative writing is taught with formalist criteria, it may be less because we are unreconstructed anti-theorists or anti-historicists, and more because we want to do some kind of justice to creativity, even as the creative-writing session in the university promptly institutionalises that freedom.<sup>5</sup>

Should the use of the words 'justice to creativity' be examined or taken on face value? Whose creativity? Is the fluidity of the term being used productively, and who is benefiting? It is worth making a brief diversion to Miriam Sved's 2005 paper, 'Fractured Writing: Creativity, the University and the Australian Culture Wars'. She discusses Dawson's work on creative writing pedagogy and notes that 'by anchoring his pedagogical discussion in the workshop, Dawson fails to take stock of creative writing's potential for engagement with a wider public sphere'.<sup>6</sup>

Sved shows that ideas about creativity and the university are strategically and variously deployed to serve the purposes of competing ideologies. In the Australian cultural context, concerns about the discipline of creative writing finding a niche in university institutions often come from writers outside the universities, who are suspicious of 'intellectualism in art'. She cites as an example the acceptance speech of Christopher Koch upon winning the 1996 Miles Franklin award. In this, as in other cases, creative writing in universities is considered too theoretical, too bound by 'postmodernism', in the pejorative sense. Sved examines various versions of the division in Australia and overseas

'against a broad territory of cultural anxiety that has found expression in the series of public battles and controversies often identified as the "culture wars"'. I think the details of the arguments are less significant than their occurrence, which is surely counter-productive in what ought to be a collaborative endeavour. But Sved suggests that this conflict may be useful, that in this environment, 'creative writing as it exists in the Australian academy becomes a nexus of anxiety and potentially of negotiation'.<sup>7</sup> It is the combination of creative and critical modes in Australian university creative writing courses that gives the discipline its strength, but how are the modes to be combined in a way that gives creative writing a space of its own?

Paul Dawson apparently wishes to draw on both the public-creative-writer-tradition and the university-critical-reading-tradition for his New Poetics, but describes by counter-example, pitting one against the other. I'm still not sure what the New Poetics is although I sense it aims to combine the best of both traditions. According to Dawson, all that remains of the old creative writing pedagogy is the argument that creative writing offers students more personal freedom than a critical theory course. This idea is also evinced by Graeme Harper, whose work will open up Dawson's second challenge to the humanities, as yet unexamined, that of corporatisation.

Graeme Harper is one of a growing number of academics who combine creative and critical study and argues that there is little doubt postgraduate awards in creative writing were established because they prove to be financially viable, but they also represent the freedom of academe to work in the arts regardless of economic worth. As Australian universities are increasingly corporatised, schools within it are under mounting pressure to use market value as a criterion for academic value. Economic concerns increasingly dictate our learning environments and as a less vocational discipline, creative writing is a marginal choice for postgraduate study. On the other hand, its choice can signal a political defiance, offering liberties not matched by other disciplines. It turns out that often creative writing courses can make a profit in a cash-strapped arts department, though that does not necessarily mean the money finds its way to those courses, nor does popularity with students mean profitability beyond the university marketplace.

Harper claims that university culture has always nurtured creative writers, even though university systematisation has not. His 2005 paper 'Creative Writers on Campus: Dead Spies, Living Lies 1593 to the Present', surveys four hundred years of student/writer – teacher/critic on-campus relationships. He outlines the learning environment of (mainly British) university culture, where creative writing learning took place well before the formalisation of courses. Harper contends that the key to the place of creative writing in institutions is the student/writer – teacher/critic relationship forged in universities since universities began, but that this is a 'dark and sometimes hidden history of our universities,' where the relationship hovers 'between nourishing and destroying'.<sup>8</sup> Many great writers did not engage fully with the university system. Nonetheless, in Harper's analysis, a sufficiency of young writers embraced their writing careers while at university for him to claim that,

we begin to see how much the notion of "teaching the writing arts" needs to extend to the heart of what the teaching has always actually involved: the creation of an environment in which these arts can flourish because they are valued.<sup>9</sup>

Harper asks, rhetorically, 'Does the relatively modern formation of named courses and degrees in both criticism and creative writing alter, in essence, a long established learning environment's intention?' Clearly, given the topic of his paper, he thinks it does not. But is the intention enough? Harper's next question is more anxious and its answer less resolved:

Why now do we find the situation in which creative writing in the company of academe is portrayed as something relatively new, something which many writers on campus feel we must somehow further define?<sup>10</sup>

He hints at Western prosperity and technological progress without elaborating on what the impact of these factors may be, but insists that it is the formal and informal writer and critic on-campus relationships that make the discipline relevant.

I'd like to push Harper's suggestions one step further and suggest a causal link between the professionalisation of the discipline and Western progress: *because* university culture is being eroded, a culture that, in the past, has supported creative writers through a personal relationship between teacher and student, creative writing *has had to* professionalise, to formalise access to a teaching and learning dynamic that cannot exist without a structure and a fee, in today's corporatised universities. Harper fails, in my view, to bring his study truly into the present because he does not examine the possibilities of erosion of the key on-campus relationship that may occur under contemporary conditions, for undergraduates at least, where the ratio of students to teachers is determined by the bottom line.

Alongside the issues of corporatisation and the role of critical theory which affect humanities courses in general, there are some fundamental questions regarding the nature of creativity influencing the direction of creative writing discourse. Universities have been quick to adapt to the demand for creative writing postgraduate courses, but how has the philosophy of the arts embraced creative writing? In 'The Value of Creative Writing Assignments in English Literature Courses', Veronica Austen asserts that the divide between creative writing and formal essays is false. She counters the assumption that creative writing does not require as much intellectual rigour as essay writing; from her experience as an educator in an English Literature department she writes, 'in addition to provoking our students to become closer readers, creative writing assignments serve to further students' understanding of literary criticism'.<sup>11</sup> In her role as an educator, she requires an analytic accompaniment to her creative writing assignments that assess how the creative work relates to the texts from which it drew inspiration. She rejects the idea that this undervalues the creative work and argues that the requirement for critical analysis alongside creative work goes some way toward dispelling the cloud of doubt hovering over creative writing in the academy:

Some people may critique such an approach that does not allow the creative writing to stand alone and show its own value, but requiring such an analytic response, beyond testing a student's ability to construct an effective paragraph or essay, ensures that the activity of creative writing has in fact accomplished its purpose of deepening one's engagement with the course material.<sup>12</sup>

While it is laudable that scholars and educators such as Austen are incorporating creative writing into their literature programs, her argument is weakened when we recognise that she works within a literature department that has colonised creative writing, to use Marcelle Freiman's metaphor of assimilation. English Literature will always be the dominant discourse with forays into creative writing, though certainly there are many creative writing departments that don't follow this pattern. After insisting on the falseness of the divide between creative writing and formal essay writing, Austen goes some way towards reinstating it in her courses. On the issue of assessment, she counters the claim that creative writing is too subjective to be measured by stating that this attitude merely perpetuates the notion that creative writing is irrational and therefore out of place in a university. Austen presents strong arguments for the incorporation of creative writing into the academy, but without really challenging the hierarchy that positions critical over creative and without suggesting solutions to the assessment problem.

The difficulty of assessment and measurement of creative writing adds to its liminal status in Australian universities. In 'Crossing the Boundaries of a Discipline: a Post-colonial Approach to Teaching Creative Writing in the University', Marcelle Freiman writes:

The perceived unstructured nature of creative writing, its potential for chaos and irrationality ... are seen as a cause for concern ... Added to this is the question of the assessment of creativity, which appears unmeasurable and unquantifiable by academic assessment standards.<sup>13</sup>

Freiman also argues for the falseness of the divide between creative and critical writing, contending,

[c]reative writing involves re-reading and rewriting which develops critical ability in an acutely practical, and experiential, context. Developing this critical-reading faculty is a vital part of the teaching of writing.<sup>14</sup>

Furthermore, Freiman proposes that while the framing of university disciplines may distance students by permitting some language styles and excluding others, creative writing encourages students to actively engage with the demands of the institution by challenging its expectations and finding alternative responses, making it more relevant to them. In this context, creative writing acts as a bridge between the critical style of the academy and experience beyond university.

Freiman argues that the two challenges facing creative writing in the university context are, firstly, to become increasingly relevant, secondly, to integrate the subject into the critical tradition. We've seen these arguments before, with variously positioned ideas of what 'relevance' might entail, and Freiman reminds us that 'despite post-structuralist theory's articulation of the role of the reader ... models of pedagogical practice do not necessarily fall into line with the theoretical research done in the discipline'.<sup>15</sup> But Freiman remains hopeful; even though there are 'signs of discomfort with the position of creative writing in the discipline,' she writes, 'that conflict, while indicating "trouble", also generates transformation'.<sup>16</sup> Perhaps creative writing's ability to shift between categories – creative/critical, public/institutional – that is, to inhabit liminal space, is what gives Freiman hope for change.

A closer look at one creative writing course will illustrate some of the tensions here. At the University of Western Australia, one must have previously published a novel or poetry collection before applying for their postgraduate writing courses, which sets the bar very high. But it also excludes a section of their graduates from pursuing further studies in creative writing, which is a misleading practice for an institution of education. Sensibly, perhaps, it encourages candidates who have already learned to write in a creative style at a very high level. However, there is a subtle double standard operating here. These candidates are still required to write an exegesis alongside their creative work, despite having proved themselves professional writers, though not usually academic writers. Anecdotally, it seems many postgraduates suffer through, rather than embrace fully, the critical component of their course.

On the other hand, there are those trained in academic reading and writing with no published works, like me. As I was ineligible for the UWA course despite gaining First Class Honours with a creative writing project at that university, I was advised to apply for a scholarship anyway, but to call my project 'ficto-criticism'. This was the same project, the same proposal, for which I was accepted into two creative writing postgraduate courses. My proposal at UWA was accepted, but I had to decide whether or not I wanted to take my project, which I saw as a novel, through a 'ficto-critical' process. What would this entail, exactly? Time was short, answers were inadequate; I decided not to risk my ideas in an explicitly boundary-testing context.

It seems that UWA is aiming to recruit a different kind of writer to the other institutions I was interested in. However, all of these PhD writing courses require the same end product: a novel-length creative work and a substantial critical exegesis which engages with the creative work. There is no consensus on what constitutes a creative writing exegesis. Little wonder then that anxiety is a persistent theme in my analysis of issues surrounding creative writing in universities. A recent study on 'The Problem of the Exegesis in Creative Writing Higher Degrees' by Nike Bourke and Philip Neilsen, found

a persistent sense of anxiety being expressed by academics, examiners and Research Higher Degree students ... In particular, this sense of anxiety seems to be directed toward three main areas of concern: the validity of the exegesis, its necessity, and its usefulness.<sup>17</sup>

At the root of this anxiety, I believe, lies the value judgement intrinsic to this structure, which suggests the creative work is insufficiently worthy on its own. Frequently the tension around this issue forces the writer's feelings to appear as a question. '[A]re not creative writing RHD projects legitimate research output in their own right?'<sup>18</sup> ask Bourke and Neilsen.

The body of research points to some compelling reasons in favour of 'supplementary writings' for undergraduate creative writers: they bestow academic credibility, they are a defense against plagiarism, they are an opportunity to describe one's intentions if the creative work didn't live up to them. These reasons are no longer compelling at PhD level when the depth of the research ought

to speak for itself. A more credible reason for the exegesis at PhD level comes from Graeme Harper, who suggests that a second form of research represents the opportunities a university education offers to a developing writer.<sup>19</sup>

If I put aside the hints of judgement that suggest there is a greater obligation upon creative writers to take up those opportunities, and accept that the exegesis is a necessary part of a higher degree by research, there are still the questions around what it is and what it is for. Bourke and Neilsen's study identifies four main discourses for postgraduate creative writing exegeses: Cultural Studies and Literary Theory, First and Second Order Journal Work. The first pair come from the critical reading tradition, which requires a literary artifact to pin its critique on. The second pair come out of the creative writing tradition that reflects on the process of the work unfolding. The gap between these two styles of work in Bourke and Neilsen's research was wide enough that they called for the creation of two streams of study. The 'professional' students will write professionally in the creative mode and should not be required to write an exegesis; the 'academic' students are willing and able to write in the critical mode and should be required to write an exegesis.

At first glance, this seems to fit with my experience of the two different types of postgraduate candidate sought by different institutions. And although Bourke and Neilsen's solution seems a sincere attempt to accommodate as many students as possible, there is a danger with this recommendation. My main concern is that to divide the styles institutionally seems too close to another version of 'culture wars'. It reinforces the division between creative and critical modes because the 'academic' students, those confident in theoretical/academic writing, are being separated from purely creative writers and left with the problem of the exegesis. Surely one of the strengths of creative writing has to be its range, and shared territory with complementary disciplines can benefit all.

As Bourke and Neilsen themselves recognise, the exegetic requirement can turn the creative writing process into a product,

[when] using Cultural Studies or Literary Theory students treat their own work as a sealed and completed object. What is always lost in this treatment of their own work as object is the writing, what replaces writing is the act of reading.<sup>20</sup>

They acknowledge that this tendency should be resisted, but labelling one stream of students 'academic' will not discourage it and may result in losing half the varieties of discourse. The claim that creative writing has a lot in common with Literary Theory or Cultural Studies is largely unexamined, as Bourke and Neilsen point out. Separating students into streams limits the opportunities to do that research.

Given my investment in the exegetical postgraduate research model, I've occasionally wondered what it would have been like to write my project as a ficto-critical work in a critical analysis course, rather than a novel plus critical exegesis in a creative writing course. What are the real differences here? It may be a matter of emphasis: in the former, critical analysis may structure creative forays while in the latter, the creative project is generally the main work. But significantly, it is ficto-criticism that integrates the two styles while they are separated in creative writing courses. How much creativity can you add to your criticism before they are forced apart? Surely it is creative writing rather than critical writing which ought to be leading the field in fostering new forms. Also, something happens to the terms of assessment when comparing postgraduate critical works with creative works. While critical research PhDs are assessed against a range of criteria that comment on quality and originality, the creative project within Australian postgraduate creative writing courses is also assessed in terms of its 'publishability'. Is the market being used as a measure of creativity? This persists despite the evidence that very few gain publication. Aside from the question of whether this is misleading to potential students who imagine that by completing the course they will produce a publishable work and therefore get published, Bourke and Neilsen ask, '[h]ow then are we to assess the usefulness of a growing body of work that seems to comment on the production of unpublished – perhaps unpublishable – works?'<sup>21</sup> How indeed?

Graeme Harper interrogates the assessment of Creative Writing PhD programs that use the words 'of publishable quality' without specifying what that means. Harper writes, 'these programs were

referencing the conditions established at the birth of the modern period in relation to the marketplace notion of creative writing and its connection with private property'.<sup>22</sup> In other words, the writing was to be judged as artifact, object and product, as it might be in a marketplace. What should be assessed, argues Harper,

is the quality of the work defined by aesthetic and other conventions whose origins were far more related to form and function, genre, type and intention, language use, style and substance.<sup>23</sup>

These criteria carry their own problematic baggage of objectivity and relevance, of course, but they avoid the weakening of integrity attendant upon universities 'buying in' to marketplace notions of value. For me, the point remains the invisibility of the assessment process. I didn't know by what criteria my postgraduate work would be assessed until I sought to investigate the exact wording in preparation for this paper.

An unexamined creative-writing-plus-exegesis model reinforces a dichotomy between creative and critical writing styles and discourages the development of newer discourses. However, if we accept that it is here to stay, that it is somehow intrinsic to the very notion of higher degree by research, a space opens up that we can use to probe the grey areas of our discipline. In the absence of adequate definition of what constitutes a postgraduate creative writing exegesis, postgraduate writers are uniquely placed to influence the terms of future discussions on creative writing pedagogy by using the space of the creative writing exegesis to question its necessity and function, and to explore more general questions of creativity and assessment. This space ought to be a broad one, encompassing a generous arc of the ficto-critical spectrum. But at the same time as postgraduates have this opportunity, it is important to realise that the terms of higher degree assessment influence the nature of the writing produced within them. The two assessable parts are in dialogue not just with each other but also with our interpretation of our obligations as postgraduates. Therefore, there is the need for a co-operative, imaginative approach to postgraduate discourse, where the possibilities and potentials of the exegesis are encouraged to unfold, particularly using the in-between status that defines the discipline's liminality. A community of postgraduate writers becomes especially important where funding factors have eroded access to staff expertise.

Looking at creative writing in terms of liminality, certain themes coalesce. Funding concerns continue to shape the development of creative writing in universities. Also, there are internal tensions regarding creative writing's disciplinary place which reflect larger cultural anxieties. Significantly, alongside the anxiety, many are hopeful for the future of the creative writing discipline: Miriam Sved values its breadth and Marcelle Freiman values its ability to trouble the dichotomy between theoretical and experiential knowledge. This shiftiness, this ability to play between the lines for advantage or ingenuity, is another way of conceiving liminality, and one that may be usefully employed by creative writing postgraduates.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Paul Dawson, 'Creative Writing in Australia: The Development of a Discipline', *Text*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2001, viewed 31 July 2006, <http://www.griffith.edu.au/school/art/text/april01/dawson.htm>.

<sup>2</sup> Dawson, 'Creative Writing in Australia: The Development of a Discipline'.

<sup>3</sup> Paul Dawson, 'Towards a New Poetics in Creative Writing Pedagogy', *Text*, vol. 7, no. 1, 2003, viewed 31 July 2006, <http://www.griffith.edu.au/school/art/text/april03/dawson.htm>.

<sup>4</sup> Dawson, 'Towards a New Poetics in Creative Writing Pedagogy'.

<sup>5</sup> Peter Howarth, 'Integrating Creativity into the Curriculum', English Subject Centre Online Newsletter, Issue 9, November 2005, viewed 31 July 2006, <http://www.english.heacademy.ac.uk/explore/publications/newsletters/newissue9/howarth.htm>.

<sup>6</sup> Miriam Sved, 'Fractured Writing: Creativity, the University and the Australian Culture Wars', *Text*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2005, viewed 31 July 2006, <http://www.griffith.edu.au/school/art/text/oct05/sved.htm>.

<sup>7</sup> Dawson, 'Towards a New Poetics in Creative Writing Pedagogy'.

<sup>8</sup> Graeme Harper, 'Creative Writers on Campus: Dead Spies, Living Lies, 1593 to the Present', *Text*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2005, viewed 31 July 2006, <http://www.griffith.edu.au/school/art/text/oct05/harper.htm>.

<sup>9</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> Harper, 'Creative Writers on Campus: Dead Spies, Living Lies, 1593 to the Present'.

<sup>11</sup> Veronica J. Austen, 'The Value of Creative Writing Assignments in English Literature Courses', *International Journal for the Practice and Theory of Creative Writing*, vol. 2 no. 2, 2005, p.142.

<sup>12</sup> Austen, p.147.

<sup>13</sup> Marcelle Freiman, 'Crossing the Boundaries of the Discipline: A Post-colonial Approach to Teaching Creative Writing in the University', *Text*, vol. 5, no. 2, 2001, viewed 31 July 2006, <http://www.griffith.edu.au/school/art/text/oct01/freiman.htm>.

<sup>14</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>15</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>16</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>17</sup> Nike Bourke and Philip Neilsen, 'The Problem of the Exegesis in Creative Writing Higher Degrees', *Text*, Special Issue no. 3, 2004, viewed 31 July 2006, <http://www.griffith.edu.au/school/art/text/speciss/issue3/bourke.htm>.

<sup>18</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>19</sup> Graeme Harper, 'What is a Postgraduate Degree in Creative Writing?' in Siobhan Holland, *Creative Writing: A Good Practice Guide*, English Subject Centre Report Series No.6, February 2003, p.16, viewed 31 July 2006, [english.heacademy.ac.uk/explore/resources/creative/guide.php](http://english.heacademy.ac.uk/explore/resources/creative/guide.php).

<sup>20</sup> Bourke and Neilsen.

<sup>21</sup> Bourke and Neilsen.

<sup>22</sup> Graeme Harper, 'The Creative Writing Doctorate: Creative Trial or Academic Error?' *International Journal for the Practice and Theory of Creative Writing*, vol. 2 no. 2, 2005, pp.82-83.

<sup>23</sup> *ibid.*, p.83.