

## *Repositioning academic literacy: Charting the emergence of a community of practice*

n

Elizabeth Hirst, Robyn Henderson, Margaret Allan,  
June Bode and Mehtap Kocatepe

JAMES COOK UNIVERSITY

*This paper reflects on the experiences of the authors in planning and teaching a short-course in academic literacy for students enrolled in the first year of an education degree. By conceptualising tertiary literacy as a social practice and drawing on a sociocultural approach to learning, the members of the project team were able to move beyond deficit views of individual students towards a consideration of their own teaching practices and how they could best help students expand their literate repertoires. This approach provided opportunities for the team to focus on pedagogical matters and to chart its own emergence as a community of practice working on a shared problem.*

Literacy and literacy education have been and continue to be contested terms and contested domains. Although debates in the media have identified literacy problems and crises in society in general, or in the teenagers or school children of today, little has been said about students in tertiary institutions. Indeed, it is often assumed that tertiary students can cope with any literacy demands that are made of them.

However, in recent times, tertiary literacy has been placed under scrutiny. With the 'massification' of higher education (Commonwealth Department of Education Science and Training, 2002, p. 15) and the associated increased diversity of student populations, there is no guarantee that students have been equipped by their previous life experiences to cope with the academic or tertiary literacies required of them. At the same time, teacher accreditation agencies have been putting pressure on universities to produce highly literate and well-trained teachers of literacy (e.g. see Teacher Education Working Party, 2001).

Assistance for students not coping with the academic demands of their tertiary studies has traditionally been provided by study skills units, which offer generic support in a range of academic practices across disciplines. However, current recognition that literacy practices always operate in social and cultural contexts and are embedded in social goals and cultural practices (Barton & Hamilton, 2000; Gee, 2000), gives us cause to rethink how universities can best support the academic literacy needs of commencing students. Indeed, Warwick (1999, cited in

Commonwealth Department of Education Science and Training, 2002) argues for 'rethinking the design of learning experiences and courses ... re-examining the way courses are delivered ... and recognising that systems of support for learning are as important as the delivery of subjects and courses' (p. 19). We came to the conclusion that a contextually-based approach, which 'involved the introduction of students to the conventions and genres of particular disciplines as an integral part of teaching within that discipline' (Parker, 1997, cited in Reid & Parker, 2000, p. 23), was a good place to start.

With funding from the Higher Education Equity Project of our university, we – the five authors of this paper – designed, planned and taught a short course called *Apprenticeship in Academic Literacy*. The project aimed to contribute to faculty equity objectives by increasing the success and retention rates of students from low socio-economic, rural, isolated and Indigenous backgrounds, as well as language backgrounds other than English (LBOTE), in their early encounters with the academic literacy requirements of an education degree course. Because the identification of students who fall into these equity categories is not a simple process, we used enrolment information to invite some students to join the program and provided opportunities for other students to self-select, if they believed they belonged to any of the equity groups. The students who joined the program were a diverse group, but included high proportions of low socio-economic, rural and mature-age students, and students who were the first generation of their families to attend university. Few were Indigenous or LBOTE students.

We capitalised on the opportunity to take a highly situated approach, locating the program within a core first-year education subject called *Language and Literacies in Education*. We used the readings for this subject to focus on reading strategies, and the subject requirement to submit an essay assignment provided a very real goal for the 10-hour workshop program. The authors of this paper designed the program and constituted the teaching team. Four members taught and researched in the School of Education at James Cook University and had been engaged in a wide range of teaching areas including literacy, linguistics, special needs education, TESOL and second language education. The fifth member was a Learning Adviser, who was particularly interested in helping students from a broad range of disciplines with writing skills. Our common interests in literacy and in equity matters underpinned the formation of the team, with the project providing an opportunity for us to work collaboratively with a diverse student group.

This paper does not aim to provide extensive details of the program that we developed, nor does it set out to formally analyse a data set as such. Although a brief schedule of the strategies and tasks that we used with students is presented in the appendix, we particularly want to focus, in this paper, on the way that our group of five developed into a

community of practice. We met for two-hour periods over seven weeks: two weeks prior to the teaching of the program, then every week during the program. Initially, we developed the program's overarching design, but our later meetings became more specific in developing the focus for each workshop. We each taught one group of students, and, once the workshops had started, the structure of our meetings changed. Bringing anecdotal notes gathered from our teaching episodes, we shared our experiences, reflected on each other's experiences, and modified our workshop design to incorporate our insights and the needs of our students.

We came together as a group with a specific purpose, each bringing our own toolkit of experiences, knowledges, skills and strategies. In sharing those tools and collaboratively planning the project, we realised that we were working as a community of practice, developing our own repertoires of pedagogical practices. This outcome was an unexpected spin-off of the program. Our learning was paralleling the types of academic practices we were trying to develop in our students and highlighted the importance of human relations, of community, in the learning process. We argue that it is this outcome that is often mitigated against in the current neo-liberal climate that commodifies university education (Connell, 2002).

### *Our perspective on literacy*

The project was framed by an understanding that literacy is a social practice and is always embedded in social and cultural contexts (Barton & Hamilton, 2000; Luke, 1992; Teacher Education Working Party, 2001). This view identifies literacy practices as specific social practices of particular groups, thus highlighting the contextual and situated nature of those practices. Literacy, therefore, is not viewed as a unitary set of neutral and transportable skills, but can mean different things to different people at different times (Baynham, 1995; Luke & Freebody, 1997).

In taking this view of literacy, we conceptualised tertiary literacy as one of the many or multiple literacies that exist (Gee, 1996; The New London Group, 1996). Instead of identifying competence in tertiary literacy as a set of 'basics' that students can acquire, this view considers the social nature of literacy in terms of ideologies, power relations, values and identities (Luke, 1994; Street, 2002). In other words, tertiary literacy is 'an active, dynamic and interactive practice' (Teacher Education Working Party, 2001, p. 4) that occurs within the social and cultural contexts of tertiary institutions.

Freebody and Luke's framework, that identifies the four roles of the literacy learner (see Freebody, 1993; Freebody & Luke, 1990; Luke & Freebody, 1999, 2000), provides a useful model for this conceptualisation. In considering literacy in terms of the sustainability and mastery of repertoires of literacy practices, Luke and Freebody argue that readers

and writers need to engage in four types of literacy practices or 'roles': breaking the code of texts; participating in the meanings of texts; using texts functionally; and critically analysing and transforming texts, to develop coding, semantic, pragmatic and critical competences (Luke & Freebody, 2000). They emphasise that each role is necessary, but none is sufficient by itself, to ensure that students can transform what they know about literacy to new situations and to deal with new forms of communication (Luke & Freebody, 1999; Queensland Department of Education, 2000). Successful literacy learners, therefore, need to engage in all four roles and be

- code breakers – How do I crack this text? How does it work?
- text participants or meaning makers – How do the ideas represented in the text string together? What are the cultural meanings and possible readings that can be constructed from this text?
- text users – How do the users of this text shape its composition? What do I do with this text, here and now?
- text analysts – What is this text trying to do to me? In whose interests?

(from Ludwig, 2000, pp. 1–2)

This broader view of literacy, which recognises that literacy learning has social as well as cognitive and linguistic dimensions, allowed us to move beyond deficit views of individual students who struggled with tertiary literacy, towards a consideration of our own teaching practices and how we could best help students to expand their literate repertoires. In planning the academic literacy program, we made sure that we considered all four roles in whatever reading and writing tasks we decided to include. Luke and Freebody's model, therefore, played a double role. We used it as a tool to design and organise a literacy program and to inform our pedagogical practices in trying to develop students' tertiary literacy, but we also taught students about the model and how to use it to frame their understandings about literacy in general.

### *Our perspective on learning*

Consistent with our conceptualisation of literacy, our sociocultural approach to learning constructed students as being apprenticed to a set of specific social practices, which will enable them to participate effectively in tertiary communities. In this view of learning and development, based on the work of Vygotsky, there is an inherent relationship between external and internal activity. The major issue is how the external social plane of activity creates and transforms the mental plane. The process of internalisation is a key concept and Vygotsky (1981) provides an account concerned with social processes, primarily language, which mediate social and individual functioning. Within this conceptual framework, learning is not conceived in terms of an individual's construction of

mental representations of an objective reality, but is conceptualised as the appropriation of available cultural resources or voices.

Bakhtin's (1981) notion of voice provides a useful way to understand the central concept of a sociocultural approach and how the external social order is internalised or appropriated. Voices are tools; they are not static, they are culturally, institutionally and historically shaped and involved in a continuous process of transformation as they are appropriated and bent to serve a variety of intentions. Furthermore, these voices are associated with patterns of privilege. Power and authority are dimensions, not just of the social plane, but also of the mental plane. Recognising the heterogeneity of voices allows us to consider which voices are invoked, the social contexts that are constituted and why certain voices are privileged in particular communities. Tertiary subjects, for example, privilege specific literacy practices and genres.

### *The practices we privileged*

The brainstorming and discussion sessions we had prior to each workshop provided a dialogic space for the interanimation of these diverse voices. They were useful in making explicit the voices we habitually deploy, thus heightening awareness of our own literacy practices. This process gave us the opportunity to reflect on the repertoire of academic skills and strategies that were available to us and to consider the purposes and contexts in which we draw on these. Listening to the range of practices that each of us employed allowed us to consider similarities and differences, as well as to discover skills of which we had been unaware. In this sense, the discussion sessions were not only useful for making our own knowledges explicit, but also for constructing new knowledge by appropriating the voices of others. This highlighted our belief that a top-down fit-and-fix-all-approach cannot provide students with opportunities to effectively engage with and appropriate tertiary literacy practices.

We began with some very clear intentions. We wanted to devise a five-week program that would help students cope with the reading and writing requirements of one of their core subjects. We hoped that, by assisting students to read effectively and write clearly about their course readings, we would help them approach their first major essay assignment with increased confidence. We wanted to apprentice them in ways that would facilitate their appropriation of the voices privileged in this subject. We therefore planned to look at samples of the students' writing each week and to discuss how they could be improved. From our previous experiences, we recognised that many students often feel disempowered, lack confidence and feel completely unprepared for university study. As a result, we wanted students to recognise and acknowledge the worth of their own already-existing study strategies and to value the identities they brought to their studies as they appropriated new skills

and developed new ways of being.

During the planning process, we gradually defined a number of specific tasks – oral and print based – for students to undertake, singly, in pairs, in small groups or as a class. We became specific about both the objectives and the means we intended to use. Some tasks relied on students using their own knowledge and pre-existing skills, and in others, we modelled the exercise first, making our approach explicit. Not only did Luke and Freebody's framework underpin this approach, but reference to it and its purposes were made explicit. We asked students to explain the four roles of the literacy learner and to identify which role they were employing at any one time – in other words, to be explicit about the tools they deployed.

### *Workshop practices*

The essay topic for the subject required students to engage with Gee's (1996) concept of Discourse and his introduction to *Social Linguistics and Literacies* was included in course readings. In the first week of the program (see the appendix), we used this text to develop the strategy of identifying the sentence which functions to introduce the topic of the paragraph and identify linguistic signalling, either explicit or implicit, that is consistent with that function (Kaldor, Herriman & Rochecouste, 1998). Students were encouraged to make a margin note summarising this sentence, and to then use such notes to chart the development of the argument through a section of the writing. As the Gee reading was flagged as central to the essay assignment, a number of the students had already worked through it, as could be seen from their heavily highlighted texts.

From their comments, it seemed that this task gave the students a more selective awareness that content should be clustered, generally with one main point in the paragraph with other sentences having the functions of, for example, augmenting, expanding and exemplifying the main point. One reflection from the team about this task suggested that it helped make explicit a feature of academic writing that is not self-evident to some students. Whilst the reading task may have helped students develop practical understandings of how to cluster content in a paragraph in their own writing, we also saw it as a task that foregrounds the text user role, by raising awareness of the 'intratextual' features of academic argument (Kaldor et al., 1998).

In another session, it became evident that some students were unable to engage effectively with dense and complex texts (see week 2 of the schedule provided in the appendix). They were quick to identify that unfamiliar vocabulary or complex embedded sentences make a text difficult to comprehend, and most explained that they would simply consult a general-purpose dictionary to solve the problem. We took the opportunity to model other ways of tackling this problem, demonstrat-

ing how contextual clues in the paragraph can help predict meaning and how the identification of suffixes or prefixes attached to a word can assist meaning-making. We also showed ways of analysing sentences into clauses and identifying the processes and participants. For some of the students, these were 'new' skills. For others, however, they were skills they already employed but had never explicitly thought about. They commented that our modelling had made them realise that code-breaking is a role they take up regularly. In this way, it boosted their confidence to realise that they did in fact have a repertoire of literacy practices to draw on and develop, even if it was limited. For us, the task had foregrounded the taken-for-granted nature of the skills and strategies that we employ and the necessity of making these explicit to those learning new literacy practices.

Using a dictionary to solve a code-breaking problem also provided a forum to develop text analyst roles (see weeks 1 and 2 of the schedule provided in the appendix). It is not uncommon for students to use general-purpose dictionaries to define subject-specific terms in their essays, rather than using definitions provided in the subject or finding a discipline-specific dictionary. It seems that students sometimes regard dictionaries as more 'reliable' or 'truthful', an assumption that led us to interrogate this 'normalising' practice and to disrupt the notion that knowledge is fixed. Students used various sources to find definitions of key subject words, then considered the audiences for the definitions and the discourses in which the definitions were considered valid.

### *The project team as a community of practice*

As explained in the introduction, we wanted a particular focus on our group of five who designed and implemented the workshops and, in that process, became a community of practice. Community is a concept that characterises sociocultural approaches to learning (Lave 1993, Lave & Wenger 1991, Renshaw 2001). These approaches move accounts of learning and development from a focus on the individual to social relations, communicative practices and cultural tools. Learning is about participation in and appropriation of social discourses (Gee, 1996, 1992; Hicks, 1996; Wertsch, 1991, 1998). It is the process of participating in the community by adopting its practices, cultural tools (e.g. language), values and beliefs in order to contribute to its ongoing conversations. Inherent in this view is the social nature of knowledge, a view that assumes knowledge is not fixed. As a result, community is not a static entity limited by time and space. It can be created to negotiate a particular task and recreated for other purposes. In the following, in the light of our own learning, we consider these aspects of a community.

A fundamental requirement for the development of a productive community of practice is a willingness to collaborate honestly and openly, building the ground rules of trust and mutual respect (Brown,

1994). In various configurations, we had all worked with each other before and shared a commitment to helping students negotiate and develop academic literacy. This commitment enabled us to maintain a working consensus, whilst remaining open to challenge and reconstruction. Although the social is central in sociocultural accounts of learning, relationships between participants have tended to be treated as benign, excluding relations of power and forms of identification and resistance. It is important to acknowledge that every interaction is framed by multiple and contested purposes (Renshaw, 1996) and that communities of practice are not necessarily characterised by uncontested expert/novice relationships. In this community, we did not take up 'fixed' expert/novice roles. The diversity of our backgrounds meant that we brought our own understandings and experiences and, at different times, became 'the expert' or 'the novice'. This was not just a matter of individuals contributing their knowledge to the collective and making it available to others, but rather, through dialogic engagement and the interanimation of the diverse voices we brought to these discussions, we developed new ways of thinking about our pedagogical practices. Learning in this sense is 'distributed' among the participants; it is not a one-person act.

In this way, we scaffolded each other's development and planned workshops together, which were better, we felt, than any we could have produced alone. Making ideas and activities explicit to other group members increased the reflectivity of our practice. We learned a great deal about the cultural tools and practices we employ. We identified particular literacy practices, framed up particular problems and agreed on the tools we would use to tackle them. For example, the framework of the four roles of the literate learner was a cultural tool that we agreed to deploy in the construction of our pedagogies. This model reflected our view of literacy, which is not just about basic skills or about 'fixing-up' students, and we often revisited and reconstituted our values, developing a construction of students that did not see them as deficient.

We developed an understanding that when we engage students in the practices of academic literacy, we are asking them not only to appropriate and develop new ways of thinking, but also to take on new ways of being. The appropriation of voices leading to cognitive change is, as Renshaw (1997) argues, 'not simply a matter of conceptual development, but involves decisions regarding personal identity' (p. 25). Learning is always an ontological matter. Learners, whatever else they may be doing, are inevitably being constituted by and are reconstituting certain positions in the socially privileged practices of the community (Ivanic, 1998). This was, of course, also the case for us, as we participated in these meetings. We took up different stances and positions as we reconstituted our ways of being. And now, through this paper, we take up other ways. The emergence of the community of practice we are doc-

umenting continues as we take up other tools to collaborate in writing and publishing this paper, so that we may engage in conversations with other overlapping and tangential communities of practice.

### **Outcomes**

Communities of practice also emerged in the workshops. Students began to share their experiences in this first encounter with university practices and their approaches to assignments. Students' comments, collected as anecdotal records by members of the team and more formally through written feedback from students, both during and after the workshops, indicated their growing awareness of academic literacy practices and their developing repertoires of skills and strategies. They identified the skills that had been practised, such as mind mapping, skimming, scanning, and note taking, as particularly relevant in helping them to engage effectively with their readings, by identifying voices which they could then deploy in their essay writing. Students often described this in terms of 'tricks', a description which suggests that these practices are often invisible. Rather than seeing themselves as passive learners, involved in merely digesting course-related information, students started to take up identities as active members of a discourse community. This extended beyond the requirements of the immediate subject, as students acknowledged that the repertoire developed in the workshops could be transferred, and drawn on, to facilitate their participation in other subjects.

According to most students, their developing relationships – with each other, the support tutors (third-year education students who worked in each of the workshops), and us – were the major benefits of the workshops. Small class size, they commented, was conducive to learning, by facilitating class discussions and allowing them to think aloud and to formulate their ideas and understandings. This had allowed them to get to know each other, to value each other's perspectives and to learn from each other. An appreciation of opportunities to engage with and understand diversity was evident in one student's written evaluation – 'It is good to reflect on things with others and gain better (or different) insights to various aspects'.

Students saw our roles and the roles of the support tutors as contributing to their learning as well. Some commented that it was good 'to know that there was extra help when I needed it' or 'to have a support tutor to contact for input, editing, help, refocus'. In this sense, the students started to see themselves as a community of learners, and these communities continued to evolve and address new goals. Although many students commented that the workshops should have been extended beyond the five weeks of the program, some organised to continue as a study group after the workshops ended.

In light of the feedback received from the students, it can be said that the students' apprenticeship in academic literacy was successful. The

workshops created the time and space to encourage students to develop new competences and new identities, and to reconceptualise learning as a community activity. One student summed up her experience of the workshops, 'I'm glad I was regarded as disadvantaged. I learned so much'.

However, it is clearly not enough that students feel 'good' about themselves. They also need to experience success, and indeed, not only was the feedback positive, but so were the results. Of the students who attended the workshops, 88 per cent passed the essay requirements for the subject. This compared with a pass rate of 45 per cent for a similar cohort of students who were targeted but did not attend, and was significantly better than the overall pass rate for the subject of 70 per cent. In an essay assignment that was required for a concurrent introductory education subject later in the semester, 85 per cent of the students who had attended the workshops passed. This compared with a pass rate of 61 per cent of the similar cohort of students who did not attend the workshops.

### *Conclusion*

In considering our own learning and development, we have documented the emergence of a community of practice. We saw ourselves as critically engaged in a project to improve the educational outcomes for a group of students often constructed by discourses of deficit. What is crucial here is not that we all came with various areas of expertise, with 'possessions', which we shared around, but that we collectively constructed opportunities to learn from each other and benefited from the diverse resources that each one of us brought to the group. What became apparent from the collaboration of the project team is that, as Renshaw (2002) argues, 'to research learning we have to research the human relationships within which it occurs, and the social contexts within which it is appropriated and used' (p. 4).

In this productive space, we constructed our students and ourselves as active participants. Whilst their literacy practices were developing, so were our own pedagogical practices. The workshops had the double effect of not only changing students' practices, but also our own. Whereas for the students the workshops had affected their literacy practices, for us it was the collaboration involved in the development of each workshop that impacted on our pedagogical practices. In repositioning academic literacy, we also repositioned ourselves as collaborators across disciplines.

We acknowledge the importance of human relationships in our learning. It is impossible to commodify these human relations. The social cannot be treated 'like a landscape from which commodities can be extracted' (Connell, 2002, p. 30), a model frequently deployed by universities as they establish cross-disciplinary committees to address prob-

lems such as student retention and academic literacy. These are significant issues in the light of the new populations of students that are enrolling in universities. However, education is inherently a social process and, according to Connell (2002), 'neo-liberalism systematically argues against collective strategies to correct ... inequalities' (p. 30). Yet it was our collaboration on a shared problem, with negotiated and shared understandings about literacy learning and literacy learners, that made our program so successful.

With the increased diversity of university students, the focus on academic literacy has become more intense, with newspaper articles claiming, for example, that 'Standards are slipping' (Illing, 2002, p. 24). However, the traditional solution to addressing these issues is to rely on small study skill units to provide generic support, in effect commodifying academic literacy. In the drive for 'new efficiencies', such homogenising practices tend to discount diversity.

Can we, then, effectively cater for increasing student diversity within the current market-driven agenda of today's universities, characterised by 'cutting class contact hours, increasing tutorial sizes, employing inexperienced and hard-to-access sessional staff, persuading students to use online education, cutting the choice of subjects and cutting hard into basic resources' (Bessant, 2002, p. 37)? Are labour-intensive practices sustainable? Do we want to compromise the benefits of pedagogical engagement and quality of student learning? The neo-liberal model of 'skill' delivery does not address the situatedness of literacy practices or the centrality of the social in education. To challenge this, we need to develop educational practices that grow from an understanding of the importance of human relationships and the importance of communities of practice in learning, and to find ways to facilitate the growth of these communities.

### References

- Barton, D., & Hamilton, M. (2000). Literacy practices. In D. Barton & M. Hamilton & R. Ivanic (Eds.), *Situated Literacies: Reading and Writing in Context*. London: Routledge.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). Discourse in the novel. (C. Emerson, Trans.). In M. Holquist (Ed.), *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Baynham, M. (1995). *Literacy Practices: Investigating Literacy in Social Contexts*. London: Longman.
- Berry, R. & Hudson, J. (1997). *Making the Jump: A Resource Book for Teachers of Aboriginal Students*. Broome, WA: Catholic Education Office, Kimberley Region.
- Bessant, J. (2002). The law cuts both ways, *The Australian*, 30 October, 37.
- Brown, A. (1994). The advancement of learning. *Educational Researcher*, 23(8), 4-12.
- Burke, E. (2000). Teaching English as a second language. In R. Campbell & D. Green (Eds.), *Literacies and Learners: Current Perspectives*. Sydney: Prentice Hall.
- Collerson, J. (1997). *Grammar in Teaching*. Newtown, NSW: Primary English Teachers' Association.

- Commonwealth Department of Education Science and Training. (2002). *Striving for Quality: Learning, Teaching and Scholarship*. Canberra: Commonwealth Government of Australia.
- Connell, R. W. (2002). Rage against the dying of the light. *The Australian*, 23 October, 30-31.
- Education Dept. of Western Australia. (1999). *Solid English*. Mt Lawley: Centre for Applied Language and Literacy Research, Edith Cowan University.
- Emmitt, M. & Pollock, J. (1997). *Language and Learning* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Freebody, P. (1993). A socio-cultural approach: Resourcing the four roles as a literacy learner. In A. Watson & A. Badenhop (Eds). *Prevention of Reading Failure*. Sydney: Ashton Scholastic.
- Freebody, P. & Luke, A. (1990). "Literacies" programs: Debates and demands in cultural context. *Prospect*, 5(3), 7-16.
- Gee, J. P. (1992). *The Social Mind: Language, Ideology, and Social Practice*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.
- Gee, J.P. (1996). *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses* (2nd ed.). London: Falmer Press.
- Gee, J.P. (2000). The New Literacy Studies: From 'socially situated' to the work of the social. In D. Barton, M. Hamilton & R. Ivanic (Eds). *Situated Literacies: Reading and Writing in Context*. London: Routledge.
- Gibbons, P. (1991). *Learning to Learn in a Second Language*. New Rozelle: Primary English Teachers' Association.
- Hicks, D. (1996). Contextual inquiries: A discourse-oriented study of classroom learning. In D. Hicks (Ed.), *Discourse, Learning, and Schooling*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Illing, D. (2002). Standards are slipping. *The Australian*, 23 October, 24.
- Ivanic, R. (1998). *Writing and Identity: The Discoursal Construction of Identity in Academic Writing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kaldor, S., Herriman, M., & Rochecouste, J. (1998). *Tertiary Student Writing*. Nedlands, WA: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.
- Lave, J. (1993). The practice of learning. In J. Lave (Ed.), *Understanding Practice: Perspectives on Activity and Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lightbown, P. & Spada, N. (1993). *How Languages are Learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ludwig, C. (2000). *Why Wait? A Way into Teaching Critical Literacies in the Early Years*. Brisbane: Education Queensland.
- Luke, A. (1992). The body literate: Discourse and inscription in early literacy training. *Linguistics and Education*, 4, 107-129.
- Luke, A. (1994). *The Social Construction of Literacy in the Primary School*. Melbourne: Macmillan Education.
- Luke, A., & Freebody, P. (1997). The social practices of reading. In S. Muspratt & A. Luke & P. Freebody (Eds), *Constructing Critical Literacies: Teaching and Learning Textual Practice*. St Leonards, NSW: Allen & Unwin.
- Luke, A., & Freebody, P. (1999). A map of possible practices: Further notes on the four resources model. *Practically Primary*, 4(2), 5-8.
- Luke, A., & Freebody, P. (2000). *Further Notes on the Four Resources Model*. <http://www.btr.qld.edu.au/papers/Luke.htm>

- Queensland Department of Education. (2000). *Literate Futures: Report of the Literacy Review for Queensland State Schools*. Brisbane: Queensland Department of Education.
- Queensland Government. (2000). *Aboriginal English in the Court: A Handbook*. Brisbane: Queensland Government.
- Reid, I. & Parker, L. (2002). Framing institutional policies on literacies. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 19–27.
- Renshaw, P.D. (1996). Commentary adult-child interaction: Can we move beyond traditional binaries? *Learning and Instruction*, 6(4), 399–404.
- Renshaw, P. (1997). A sociocultural view of the mathematics education of young children. In N. Descampes-Bednarz (Ed.), *Mathematics for Tomorrow's Young Children: International Perspectives on Curriculum*. the Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Renshaw, P. (2001). Learning and community. Paper presented to the AARE Annual Conference, Perth, WA, 2–6 December.
- Renshaw, P. (2002). Learning and community. *Australian Educational Researcher*, 29(2), 1–13.
- Street, B. (2002). Academic literacies and the 'New Orders': Implications for research and practice. Paper presented to the NCTE Conference, New York, 22–24 February.
- Teacher Education Working Party (2001). *Literacy in Teacher Education: Standards for Preservice Programs*. Brisbane: Queensland Board of Teacher Registration.
- The New London Group (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(1), 60–92.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1981). The genesis of higher mental functions. In J. Wertsch (Ed.), *The Concept of Activity in Soviet Psychology*. New York: Sharp.
- Wertsch, J.V. (1991). *Voices of the Mind: A Sociocultural Approach to Mediated Action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wertsch, J.V. (1998). *Mind as Action*. New York: Oxford University Press.

## Appendix: Literacy Workshops – schedule

Week	Focus Strategies	Tasks	Resources
1	<p>Purposes for reading Awareness of strategies already used</p> <p>Skimming Scanning</p> <p>Question Text-user</p> <p>Recall</p> <p>Code-breaking (Dictionary work) Text participant Text analyst</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is this reading about? – 4/5 min individual reading.</li> <li>2. What did you find out and how? (strategies)</li> <li>3. Relate to other types of reading &amp; other strategies e.g. newspaper.</li> <li>4. Different purposes/ different strategies – What is purpose of academic reading?</li> <li>5. Reading for information – model some strategies (Gee introduction).</li> <li>6. What is Gee's main message and where would we expect to find this?</li> <li>7. Identify Gee's examples – mark these (bracket and margin note).</li> <li>8. Why does he give these examples? Identify explanations.</li> <li>9. Identify key words – How? e.g. linguistic signals, repetition, use of capitals, sentence function etc. Does the writer define these? (margin notes)</li> <li>10. Write a short account of the main message using the key words. Rewrite as a group on an OHT.</li> <li>11. Compare – main ideas (included &amp; excluded, organisation, mechanics).</li> <li>12. Making meaning – accessibility of Gee's reading. Not all readings are straightforward.</li> </ol>	<p>Gee, 1996</p> <p>OHT Gee p.1</p> <p>OHT &amp; pens</p> <p>OHT of lexically-dense text</p>
2	<p>Predicting/ Anticipating – text participant</p> <p>Recognise purpose – text user Skim/scan</p> <p>Metacognitive strategies Code breaker</p> <p>Text analyst</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reflect on previous week's strategies.</li> <li>2. Look at title of readings. Predict content of each. What information about the literacy roles can you bring to this reading?</li> <li>3. Recall information about literacy roles from lectures or tutorials. Compare notes.</li> <li>4. Recognise authors' purposes in writing these articles (Look for keywords in introduction).</li> <li>5. Identify key words – skim/scan readings</li> <li>6. Consider your purpose for reading: Define the literacy roles (your purpose is different from the authors' purpose).</li> <li>7. Ask students which literacy role they are utilising.</li> <li>8. Look for definitions of key words – identify signals e.g. headings, linguistic signals, bullet points.</li> <li>9. Identify words in Luke &amp; Freebody that make the article difficult to read.</li> <li>10. Note: Density and complexity of an introduction often cause students to give up reading – Why is text dense? Authors are often establishing their credentials and indicating their position in this area.</li> <li>11. Compare differences in use of language in the readings.</li> </ol>	<p>Ludwig, 2000; Luke &amp; Freebody 1999</p>

3	<p>Purposes of note-taking Types of note-taking (margin, summary, revision) Text participant Text user</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Relate to purposes for reading.</li> <li>2. Go to last week's lecture notes in study guide. Did you make any notes during the lecture? What of? How? Why? Why not?</li> <li>3. Make a mind map of macrostructure of Lightbown &amp; Spada.</li> <li>4. In groups read a separate section and make margin notes of key concepts. Compare notes.</li> <li>5. Read Chapter 9 of textbook (Emmitt &amp; Pollock, 1997) and discuss use of margin notes. What information is included in the notes? In what other ways could the same notes have been made?</li> <li>6. Compare your notes for Lightbown &amp; Spada with the ones in the textbook. Have the same key arguments/keywords been noted? What is the purpose of the textbook's notes? Are the textbook's notes useful?</li> </ol>	<p>Lightbown &amp; Spada, 1993; Burke, 2000; Gibbons, 1991; Emmitt &amp; Pollock, 1997</p>
4	<p>Analysing essay question Mind mapping/ outlining Text user Text analyst</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Break essay question into parts: focus, content words, instruction, audience (Who is my audience? Who am I? What is expected of me in this writing?)</li> <li>2. Do a concept map as a plan for the essay.</li> <li>3. Write an introduction. (Tutors and support tutors to give feedback).</li> <li>4. Skim/ scan through the readings to see which parts you can refer to.</li> </ol>	<p>Dept. of WA, 1999; Qld Gov, 2000; Berry &amp; Hudson, 1997</p>
5	<p>Essay macro-structure and referencing Text user</p>	<p>Essay writing</p>	<p>Collerson, 1997</p>