

Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

Reclaiming literacies: competing textual practices in a digital higher education

Journal Item

How to cite:

Lea, Mary (2013). Reclaiming literacies: competing textual practices in a digital higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18(1) pp. 106–118.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2013 Taylor Francis

Version: Accepted Manuscript

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:

<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1080/13562517.2012.756465>

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's [data policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk



Reclaiming Literacies: Competing Textual Practices in a Digital Higher Education

Journal:	<i>Teaching in Higher Education</i>
Manuscript ID:	CTHE-2011-0311.R1
Manuscript Type:	Extended Essay
Keywords:	digital literacies, textual practice, academic literacies, university teachers, learning technology

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5 This essay examines the implications of the ubiquitous use of the term 'digital
6 literacies' in higher education and its increasing alignment with institutional and
7 organisational imperatives. It suggests that the term has been stripped of its
8 provenance and association with disciplinary knowledge production and textual
9 practice. Instead it is called into service rhetorically in order to promote competency
10 based agendas both in and outside the academy. The piece also points to a
11 tendency to position teachers in deficit with regard to their technological capabilities
12 and pay scant attention to their own disciplinary and scholarly practices in a digital
13 world. It concludes that there is a case for building on established theoretical and
14 conceptual frameworks from literacy studies if we wish to integrate advantages of the
15 digital landscape with thoughtful teaching practice.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **Discourses of the digital**

33
34
35 During the last decade, there has been increased attention to student learning in a
36 digital era. Learning technologists have been quick to point to the affordances
37 offered by technology and in so doing utilised terminology and concepts from a
38 range of research contexts (see Conole 2008; Beetham et al 2009). Against this
39 backdrop the term digital literacies has begun to take centre stage. This paper
40 examines the implications of the appropriation of the term 'literacies' in its
41 association with the digital and, in particular, the tendency for this to come to stand
42 for general capability in and beyond higher education.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 In contrast to learning technologists, literacies researchers' interest is in particular
55 enactments of textual practice in and around the digital and the possibilities for
56 meaning making that these enable and invoke for those involved. The use of the
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 term 'textual practice' in this essay signals a particular concern with the significance
4
5 of social and cultural practice in relation all kinds of texts, including those which are
6
7 created digitally. Rather than focusing on technologies and applications - VLEs,
8
9 Facebook, Google apps, Wikipedia, plagiarism detection software, smart phones,
10
11 twitter, blogs etc. - attention is on the texts that are associated with these digital
12
13 contexts. That is, the concern is not with technology per se but its interaction with
14
15 different kinds of textual practices – ranging widely from a one hundred and forty
16
17 character tweet to a substantive journal article submitted and accessed online. In the
18
19 digital HE arena, research which adopts this focus has built upon and developed an
20
21 established epistemological stance, taking as a starting point a view of literacies – in
22
23 particular academic literacies - as contextual social and cultural practice (Goodfellow
24
25 & Lea 2007; Jones & Lea 2008; Williams 2009; Lea & Jones 2011; Mc Kenna
26
27 forthcoming). Academic literacies researchers have always been interested in the
28
29 contexts of learning (Lillis & Scott 2007) but a review of publications in this field
30
31 would suggest that they have been somewhat slow to respond to the significance
32
33 and consequences of writing, reading, knowledge and meaning making in the
34
35 changing HE digital landscape. This may in part be why the plural use of the term
36
37 'literacies' has so easily been taken up elsewhere and stripped of much of its
38
39 epistemological provenance. Although it could be argued that the word 'literacy' has
40
41 become associated with many domains in the wider world and that the connotation
42
43 of reading and writing is no longer pertinent, it remains the case that these activities
44
45 are central to higher education practice and disciplinary knowledge-making,
46
47 whatever the media and textual practices involved. There is then good reason to
48
49 remain true to the association of literacy with textual practice despite the changing
50
51 nature of much of that practice in a digital world.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Goodfellow (2011) has explored the tension that emerges when the digital is
4 associated with literacy, arguing that, when used in association with the 'digital',
5 literacy has come to stand as shorthand for competency or generalised skill. He
6 suggests that rarely does the association of 'digital' with 'literacies', signal a critical
7 agenda around teaching and learning in the context of higher education. Additionally,
8 the literacies of 'digital literacies' in higher education appears to have a rather
9 tenuous connection to research on academic literacies more generally and often
10 makes little attempt to build on that body of critical literature (Lea & Stierer 2000;
11 Lillis & Scott 2007; Lea 2008; Russell et al 2009). As Goodfellow suggests, this
12 results in a mismatch between a critical and cultural view of literacy and a
13 technological focus. As a result the term 'digital literacies' in higher education has
14 become associated with a range of different agendas and approaches within
15 university settings. These include both descriptions of actual practice and
16 prescriptive approaches telling teachers how they should use digital technologies
17 with their students. Such work is frequently pragmatic, designed to provide both
18 students and academics with a set of transferable skills and competences they can
19 use in the university and in their digital worlds more generally. Theorised empirical
20 research also offers transformative but critical approaches to teaching and learning
21 in digital contexts. This essay is concerned with this clash of perspectives. A recent
22 Economic and Social Research Council seminar series - 'Literacy in the Digital
23 University' - offered spaces for learning technologists and literacies researchers to
24 speak across the kinds of competing discourses that emerge from these different
25 contexts and explore the potential for bringing together different agendas concerning
26 literacy in the digital university <http://literacyinthedigitaluniversity.blogspot.com/> (see
27 [Goodfellow & Lea, forthcoming](#)).

Literacies research in higher education

Literacies researchers in higher education generally locate their work within the field of academic literacies which, in conceptualising literacies as social and cultural contextual practice, signals its theoretical and methodological roots in applied linguistics, critical language studies and social anthropology. For many years the field has been concerned to foreground explicitly the significance of paying attention to language in higher education and the implications of this for understanding and supporting teaching and learning (Ivanic 1998; Lea & Street 1998; Jones et al 2000; Lea & Stierer 2000; Lillis 2001; Thesen & van Pletzen 2006; Turner 2011). This includes interest in semiotic practice and multimodality across the different contexts of post-compulsory education (Ivanic et al 2009; English 2011) and aligns with a turn to semiosis in new and critical literacy studies more broadly (Kress 2003; Williams, 2009). Common to this work is attention to the contested nature of text production, whatever the nature of the texts and the contexts within which a wide range of practices are instantiated. Work in this field is noted for its empirical orientation and in-depth exploration of participants' understandings and interpretations of their own textual practices. It is not concerned with making judgments about what participants should do but with the practices of teaching and learning and how these might be articulated in a range of ways. This approach has been shown to enhance knowledge about different understandings of practice, which result in disjunctions and misalliances between the different participants involved in learning encounters—most commonly teachers and students.

1
2
3 Literacies researchers have generally avoided associating literacies with particular
4 channels of communication or specific technologies. This follows Street (1995; 2009)
5 who cautions against the alignment of particular channels with particular forms of
6 literacy, for example, computer literacy or visual literacy. He argues that this is bound
7 to be problematic since it signals a questionable causal relationship, whereas in
8 reality literacy always involves different uses and practices in different contexts.
9 From this perspective, the use of the term digital literacies could signal a one to one
10 relationship between channel and practice, and therefore be closely aligned with
11 Street's 'autonomous' model of literacy, as opposed to the more contested and
12 contextual view of literacy suggested by his 'ideological' model, which is discussed
13 below. However, this concern to foreground the importance of context - within which
14 channel is merely an aspect - may in part explain the apparent resistance by
15 researchers in academic literacies to engage fully with the new landscape and single
16 out for scrutiny practices in and around digital technologies.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **Academic literacies and learning technologies: a contested space**

39
40 As some literacies researchers have begun to turn their attention to the broader
41 digital landscape and the implications of this for student learning (Goodfellow & Lea
42 2007; Lea 2007; Mc Kenna forthcoming) there has been a convergence of interests
43 with learning technologists, who generally use the term digital literacy/literacies to
44 refer to the development of student skill and competence with the use of
45 technologies (Aviram et al. 2006). Over the last decade, a number of arguments
46 have been called into service in the learning technologies field. The first is that
47 universities need to respond urgently to the present generation of students - digital
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 natives, wiki-fledglings, the net generation - and align university practices with
4
5 students' preferences for virtual and online activity, for example, the use of social
6
7 networking, twitter, blogging. A second related argument is that there is a pressing
8
9 need to 'upskill' teachers in developing the appropriate skills and competences for
10
11 operating in a digital university. There is also a suggestion that despite their digital
12
13 expertise, students still need to be supported in operating in a digital world both in
14
15 their studies and in terms of their entry into the economy. It is in relation to these
16
17 arguments that digital literacy is increasingly coming to stand for a whole set of skills
18
19 and competences which may be only tenuously related to literacies (textual practices
20
21 around reading and writing) and learning in higher education. This is particularly
22
23 evident in in the work of JISC, a UK based - but international in scope - largely
24
25 government-funded organisation, tasked with supporting the innovative use of digital
26
27 technologies in post-compulsory education. JISC holds an important brief in
28
29 promoting the use of learning technologies across the curriculum both nationally and
30
31 internationally. This key role gives them a particularly powerful position in
32
33 determining agendas and privileging particular approaches around teaching and
34
35 learning in HE. They regularly call for commissioned work in specific areas of
36
37 technology driven activity; and it is an example of such documentation that is under
38
39 specific scrutiny here. Detailed attention to a JISC call - for projects which, " support
40
41 the development and implementation of institutional approaches to digital literacies
42
43 across the entire workforce and including students" (p.1, JISC 2011a) - illustrates the
44
45 ways in which literacy is both elided with capability and located primarily in terms of
46
47 organisational priorities.
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 **Figure 1 HERE**
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Despite the fact that the call is explicitly concerned with digital literacy, there seems
4
5 little attention to literacy as literacies researchers would understand it,
6
7 conceptualised broadly as reading (in its widest, multi-modal, multi-media sense)
8
9 and writing, or more specifically textual practice in digital contexts. Indeed the
10
11 associated briefing paper explicitly redefines literacy for its own purposes:
12
13

14
15 We propose defining digital literacy in as neutral a way as possible, following
16
17 the lead of the European Union and the JISC-funded LLiDA1 project.
18
19

20
21 *digital literacy defines those capabilities which fit an individual for living,*
22
23 *learning and working in a digital society*
24

25
26 Defining a particular set of capabilities as a 'literacy' means that:
27

28 they are a pre-requisite or foundation for other capabilities;
29

30 they are critical to an individual's life chances;
31

32 they are essential to the making and sharing of culturally significant meanings;
33

34 as a result, there is or should be a society-wide entitlement to these capabilities
35
36

37 at some level (p.2,JISC 2011b).
38
39

40 Literacy as conceptualised here appears to be disassociated from texts and
41
42 synonymous with 'capability'. Being in 'possession' of these capabilities critically
43
44 affects people's life chances. Implicit in the position being proposed here is the
45
46 notion that one can possess a literacy, or possibly a number of literacies, since
47
48 literacies are deemed to be concerned with the acquisition of capabilities carried
49
50 through life across a range of contexts. This approach appears to contrast markedly
51
52 with academic literacies researchers' concern with the specific and contextual
53
54 processes of meaning and knowledge making practices, whatever the media
55
56 involved (Lillis & Scott, 2007; Lea & Jones 2011). Although the call does pay
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 attention to the making and sharing of meaning, associating meaning with capability
4 suggests alignment with acquisition. Nevertheless, the document does go some way
5 to acknowledging that the skills or capabilities, which are packaged up within the
6 term digital literacy, are concerned with this acquisition of skills in specific, learning,
7 teaching and research activities,” they take their meaning from the subject areas in
8 which they are practiced” (p.3, JISC 2011b). Despite this recognition of disciplinary
9 difference, the whole concept of digital literacy is aligned with an organisational
10 agenda and what is referred to as “normalising digital capability” (p.5, JISC 2011).

11
12 Digital literacy is constructed here as something that universities need more of,
13 something which goes well beyond the bounds of learning and teaching, being a
14 student or being an academic, in order to embrace engagement in society more
15 generally. Huge claims are being made for the power of digital literacy and its
16 association with digital society. In many respects this view of literacy aligns with
17 Street’s ‘autonomous’ model. Street (1995) argues that an autonomous model of
18 literacy masks the ways in which literacy functions ideologically in our society,
19 focusing on an individual’s acquisition of cognitive and technical language skills. He
20 contrasts this with an ‘ideological’ model, which is concerned with the enactment of
21 literacy as social practice in a range of different contexts, and highlights issues of
22 power, authority and identity. This offers a critical and reflexive approach towards
23 language, semiosis and the practices of knowledge making and representation.
24 Evans (2005), draws on Street in her discussion of the ‘literacy myth’ and
25 ‘technology literacy’, in which she argues that the way in which literacy has been
26 aligned with individual competences conveniently sidesteps the relationship between
27 literacy and power relations in institutional contexts.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The literacy of digital literacy, as conceptualised in the documentation examined
4 above, stands for a whole set of generalised skills. Engagement in textual practice
5 appears to be sidelined. Yet textual practice is the core work of a university, whether
6 or not these practices are enacted primarily with digital technologies. This document
7 also makes a constant slippage between literacy in the singular and literacies in the
8 plural but with no explanation as to why one is favoured over the other. In academic
9 literacies research, the plural literacies is used deliberately to signal the contested
10 nature of literacies and to suggest a diverse range of practices that are not fixed or
11 transferable but vary significantly from context to context. They often invoke different
12 meanings for the participants involved, for example, students and teachers. It would
13 be difficult to align this epistemological orientation with the transferable skills or
14 capabilities model that is inferred from equipping '*an individual for living, learning*
15 *and working in a digital society*' (p.5, JISC 2011a). The implication here seems to be
16 that what is learnt at university will transfer seamlessly to, for example, the
17 workplace. It could be argued that, an inevitable consequence of concentrating on
18 the digital is a lack of attention to the complex hybridity of multimodal textual practice
19 which is shot through any engagement in digital technologies in higher education.
20 Conversely, there is danger that a focus on literacies in context may potentially
21 sidestep the technologies and give the impression that it is business as usual, the
22 world of disciplinary knowledge making is fundamentally unchanged. In reality, it is
23 the intertwining of texts and practices in a digital world which is so central to learning
24 and the construction of knowledge practices (Lea & Jones 2011); hence, we should
25 not be valorising either the digital or textual practice. In part, this follows from the
26 work of Law, who argues that knowledge always takes on and is embodied in a
27 material form and, therefore, is part of a "patterned network" involving a process of
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 “heterogeneous engineering” in which bits and pieces from the social, the technical,
4 the textual and the conceptual are fitted together (p.2, Law 1992). Writing nearly
5 twenty years ago, Law espouses an actor-network approach which acts
6 simultaneously as a theory of agency, a theory of knowledge, and a theory of
7 machines. Perhaps most significantly for the position being rehearsed in this paper -
8 concerning the appropriation and subsequent neutralization of ‘literacies’ in standing
9 for general capability - he argues that if we want to answer questions about
10 structure, power and organization we should be exploring social effects, whatever
11 their material form. Law’s interest in questions of structure, power and organization
12 aligns well with the social practice perspective of literacies in higher education
13 research. It contrasts with the normalizing agendas and organizational priorities
14 encapsulated in the language of the JISC call, in its “digitally literate organization”
15 operating in a “digitally global education market “ (p.7, 2001a). It is clear that the use
16 of the term digital literacy sits within a whole range of complex and competing
17 discourses around teaching and learning, the global marketization of the sector,
18 professional accountability and audit and an overriding message that the functioning
19 of the whole organization (the university) is at stake without a total buy in of all staff
20 to the vision of a ‘digitally literate organisation’. A vision within which subjects and
21 disciplines appear to pay little visible role.

22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46 **(Figure 2 HERE)**

47
48
49 From this perspective the traditional academic work of the university, the articulation
50 of disciplinary knowledge and particular forms of engagement in texts and practices
51 in the advancement of knowledge, appears to have been discarded. This is
52 potentially troubling for those academic teachers and educational developers who
53 wish to maintain a critical and transformative approach to teaching and learning in
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 disciplinary contexts. In aligning every aspect of what happens in a university with
4 digital technologies, the term literacy in association with digital both comes to stand
5 for anything and everything - for all forms of activity. It offers a strongly normative
6 perspective on academic practice. As both teachers and educational developers we
7 need to be cautious and critical of this valorisation and supposed authentication of
8 digital literacy to promote and perform institutional agendas. In addition, there is a
9 real cause for concern that this appropriation of both the terms 'literacy' and
10 'literations' removes their provenance in terms of their association with the use and
11 construction of language and texts in higher education (English 2010;Turner 2011).
12 Further, it is enabling a shift to a skills based agenda which has the propensity to
13 construct not just students but teachers in deficit. This is discussed further below.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Representations of theory and practice**

29
30
31 A common approach in the field of learning technologies is to use schemas for
32 representing underlying conceptual approaches. For example, Conole (2008) offers
33 a short inventory of learning theories mapping them to the affordances of different
34 media:
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 For example 'behaviourist theories' (such as instructivism) where the focus is
42 on stimulus-response and observable learning outcomes maps well to
43 technologies which enable trial and error and adaptive responses – such as e-
44 assessment tools. In contrast, a range of asynchronous and synchronous
45 communication tools provide ample opportunities for dialogue, a key element
46 to pedagogies based on socio-constructivist principles
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54 (<http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue56/conole/>).

1
2
3 Beetham et al (2009) offer a four page table of “key concepts and theorists of
4 learning and digital literacies” p.9. Such schematic representations are useful in that
5 they can simplify theoretical approaches but the danger is that they fall far short of
6 representing adequately the complexity of conceptual and theoretical work or how
7 particular sets of ideas might relate to one another. Consequently, they can fail to
8 engage with the critical nature of debates and represent rigorous, well researched
9 work in schematic ways which separates it off from its intellectual roots. Different
10 ‘approaches’ can then be called into service, resulting in something akin to a
11 commodification of learning theories. For example, although Beetham et al.(2009)
12 signal a broad swathe of both theoretical and empirical work underpinning their
13 report on learning literacies in a digital age, they explicitly avoid engaging with
14 ongoing debates in the literacies field more generally:
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 We use the term (underpinning) *practices* □ in the hope of side-stepping some
33 of the debates about definition and philosophy that beset literacies research,
34 and in particular the 'paradigm contest' between cognitive and socially situated
35 accounts of learning. Our focus in the study is on the pragmatic challenges that
36 face learners and the institutions and educators that seek to support their
37 development *in practice* as more capable human beings. (p.8, Beetham et al
38 2009)
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 They suggest that the debates they invoke are of little pragmatic relevance.
52 Literacies researchers would argue that critical engagement in a field, juxtaposing
53 different perspectives and debates is exactly how the implications of teaching and
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 supporting learning do and will continue to emerge (Lea & Stierer 2000; Lea 2004;
4
5 Ivanič et al 2009).
6
7

8 It is of course necessary to recognise the background and context of the type of
9
10 reports and documents being discussed here and the requirement for those who
11
12 write them to offer pragmatic solutions. It is also important to signal the critical
13
14 dimensions of some of the work funded within this specific programme, see for
15
16 example initial work by Gourlay and Oliver (2012), presentations and blog
17
18 discussions <http://diglitpga.jiscinvolve.org/wp/>. The intention of this essay is not to
19
20 disparage the work of particular individuals. The documents are being offered as
21
22 exemplars of a particular form of rhetorical practice and its implications. We need to
23
24 remain mindful of the power of discourses and texts to bring specific forms of
25
26 understanding and representation into being (Blommaert 2005). The ways in which
27
28 things “achieve the status of common sense” (Fairclough 1992, p.87) is evident as
29
30 the digital becomes increasingly associated with broad capability agendas,
31
32 consumerist models of learners and deficit models of teachers. We must pay
33
34 attention to this if we wish to maintain a critical and generative stance towards
35
36 teaching and learning in a fast changing academy and resist attempts to re-cast HE
37
38 institutions as little more than digital spaces, ultimately serving the needs of the
39
40 knowledge economy.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **University teachers in deficit**

51
52
53 The argument so far is that a framing of digital literacy as capability and individual
54
55 achievement - separated from textual practice - goes hand in hand with a
56
57 commodification of theories of literacies and learning. This perspective is being
58
59
60

1
2
3 called into service in order to reduce learning and disciplinary knowledge making to a
4 matter of organizational imperatives. One of the consequences of this is the
5 articulation of teachers in deficit. As Bayne and Ross (2007) illustrate, the commonly
6 rehearsed digital native/ digital immigrant binary creates a discourse requiring
7 teachers to adapt to their students. They argue that such discourses are highly
8 problematic. Whilst acknowledging that empirical work has raised questions about
9 the whole idea of the digital native - see recent work by Bennett and Maton (2008),
10 Brown & Czerniewicz (2010), Jones et al (2011), Lea & Jones (2011) - they suggest
11 there is little in the way of published work which “challenges the fundamental
12 assumptions implicit in this discourse from a theoretical perspective” (p.1, Bayne &
13 Ross 2007). They problematise the tendency of this dominant discourse to
14 ‘marginalise the role of the teacher’, arguing that there is a dearth of literature which
15 looks more theoretically at the ways in which these arguments, around learning
16 technologies, teachers and students, are set up discursively and what
17 presuppositions underlie them. In particular, their concern is that this discourse
18 places teachers in an impossible position. On the one hand as ‘immigrants ‘they are
19 unable to change, to become natives, on the other they must adapt to keep up with
20 their students, embracing the digital, and all it has to offer if they are to function as
21 competent professionals. This alignment of competency with engagement with
22 technology is also mirrored in the role of staff as explicated in the vision of the
23 digitally literate organisation (Table 2). Bayne and Ross believe that we should
24 interrogate a discourse which “over-determines our future understanding of the
25 complex relationships between teacher, learner technology and higher education”
26 (p.3, Bayne and Ross 2007). In short, we need to understand much more about
27 academics’ own disciplinary and scholarly practices in a digital world and the
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 implications of this in terms of their own and students' textual practices (see
4
5 Goodfellow & Lea, forthcoming).
6
7
8
9

10 11 **Reclaiming literacies in digital spaces** 12

13
14 The tendency to ignore literacies theory and method also makes it possible to
15
16 conveniently side step debates around power, authority, identity and meaning
17
18 making. Many of the discourses of the digital in today's higher education do not
19
20 appear to speak directly into debates around knowledge making practices and how
21
22 certain ways of meaning are valued, with implications for student and academic
23
24 identity. Mann's (2008) thoughtful exposition on study, power and the university
25
26 argues persuasively for paying attention to the central nature of discursive practice
27
28 reminding us that:
29
30

31
32
33 Universities do not just produce 'employees', they also produce, legitimate
34
35 and reproduce knowledge through research, scholarship, publication and the
36
37 accreditation and awarding of degrees. (p.123, Mann 2008)
38
39

40 Within this context, power differentials are played out by different actors, teachers,
41
42 students, managers and learning technologists. The right to assert what counts, what
43
44 Mann refers to as " the basis of legitimate epistemological and methodological
45
46 conventions" (p.123), is central to university practice, and to the power of disciplines
47
48 and professions to lay claim to bodies of knowledge and to make judgments and
49
50 undertake assessment on the basis of these. Academics' own pedagogic and
51
52 knowledge making practices underpin their approaches to supporting student
53
54 learning (Tuck 2012). Starting from these practices forces us to foreground issues of
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 epistemology - disciplinary and subject-based knowledge making in a digital age.
4
5 Recognition of people's actual practices gives agency back to both teachers and
6
7 students as active participants in a digital world, without either reifying technologies
8
9 or decontextualizing practice. Attention to a specific focus on meaning making puts
10
11 literacy practices centrally on the agenda. Digital technologies offer possibilities for
12
13 harnessing and working with texts that are intellectually meaningful to academic
14
15 teachers. This contrasts starkly with the requirement to 'upskill' and become digitally
16
17 or organisationally literate; it also offers potential opportunities for unifying teachers
18
19 and students in the pursuit of knowledge production.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 *A case of assessment*

28
29
30 In a study of undergraduates' literacy practices in a digital age, Lea & Jones (2011)
31
32 highlight student engagement in complex, hybrid, textual practice. They conclude
33
34 that that any redefinition of literacy in the university needs to pay attention to the
35
36 mutability of texts, how students make sense of the range of genres they encounter
37
38 and how digital knowledge making practices are implicated in their assignments.
39
40 Their findings resonate strongly with Williams (2009) research on the role of popular
41
42 culture in students' online literacy practices. He identifies a shift in students'
43
44 perceptions of authorship, ownership and audience and suggests that changing
45
46 rhetorical practices and conceptions of literacy around meaning making have tended
47
48 to be neglected by universities and their teachers. Lea & Jones (2011) argue that
49
50 when it comes to assessment, " for the most part departments and tutors remain
51
52 largely concerned with the final text, the submitted assignment" p.391. Commonly,
53
54 assignment rubrics are designed for conventional essayist production and may fail to
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 engage fully with the complexity of the rhetorical task required in drawing on,
4
5 integrating and making sense of a range of textual resources. If we think about
6
7 assessment metaphorically as a 'sandwich', attention is concentrated on the outer
8
9 layers - the assignment rubric and the finished assignment - and less upon the most
10
11 interesting and generative part - the processes of meaning making -the 'filling'. When
12
13 academics relied entirely on hard copy, print-based texts these were encapsulated
14
15 for students in reading lists and enshrined in a references section or bibliography at
16
17 the end of the assignment. Making visible the actual processes of engagement in
18
19 meaning making during the reading of these texts was arguably more difficult. With
20
21 digital texts playing a key role for both tutors and students, a shift in focus from the
22
23 finished product towards explorations of practice and how academics themselves
24
25 engage in knowledge production in a digital world could enable teachers to exploit
26
27 the 'filling of the sandwich' as a valuable disciplinary resource. Rather than being
28
29 concerned about inadvertent plagiarism, students could pay explicit attention to the
30
31 different resources they have read and used, what choices they have made about
32
33 texts, the value of different resources and why and how they have used them in
34
35 preference to others. This might enable the processes and practices of knowledge
36
37 production to be made more visible within the assignment and offer a more authentic
38
39 representation of practice than is suggested by citation and reference lists. The
40
41 precise ways of doing this depends very much on context, discipline and subject
42
43 area. It offers the potential to align student practice with academics' own digital
44
45 knowledge making practices and represent the complex rhetorical activity which is
46
47 involved in completing an assignment or - in the case of academics - their own
48
49 published work. Such an approach provides just one brief example of how it could be
50
51 possible to take full account of the digital context in relation to assessment. It offers a
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 range of possibilities for working on the blurred digital space between reading and
4
5 writing.
6
7

8 9 **Directions**

10
11 This paper has foregrounded the value of building on and developing established
12
13 theoretical frameworks from literacy studies and their potential for providing critical
14
15 perspectives on teaching and learning in a digital higher education, rather than
16
17 descriptive or competency based agendas. It offers a space for the consideration of
18
19 both contested and competing enactments of textual practice in digital contexts, with
20
21 a focus on issues of meaning making and what both students and academics
22
23 actually do in terms of knowledge construction. This approach is a far cry from the
24
25 characterisation of the university in the digital age as meeting the needs of the
26
27 knowledge economy and calling into service a 'digitally up-skilled' academic
28
29 workforce, divorced from intellectual enquiry and epistemological concerns. Readers
30
31 of this essay are likely to be located globally across a range of very different
32
33 institutions. I hope the arguments made here will resonate in their own settings.
34
35

36
37 Whatever our teaching context, as educators in a digital world we are making sense
38
39 of and building upon the myriad ways in which disciplinary and professional textual
40
41 practices are evolving in the fluid digital environments we now inhabit. Seeking to
42
43 articulate our own changing knowledge-making practices from our own disciplinary
44
45 positions is the only way we will truly be able to contribute to understanding literacies
46
47 and supporting learners in this digital age.
48
49
50

51 52 53 54 55 **References**

1
2
3 Aviram, A Gurion, B Eshet-Alkalai, Y (2006) Towards a Theory of Digital Literacy:
4 Three Scenarios for the Next Steps, *European Journal of Open and Distance*
5 *Learning* (1) http://www.eurodl.org/materials/contrib/2006/Aharon_Aviram.htm
6
7
8
9 (accessed 23rd May 2012)
10

11
12
13
14 Bayne, S & Ross, J (2007) The 'digital native' and 'digital immigrant': a dangerous
15 opposition. *Paper presented to the Annual Conference of the Society for Research*
16 *into Higher Education (SRHE) December 2007.*
17
18
19
20
21 http://www.malts.ed.ac.uk/staff/sian/natives_final.pdf (accessed 23rd May 2012)
22
23

24
25 Beetham H, Mc Gill L, Littlejohn A (2009) *Learning Literacies in a Digital Age.*
26
27 <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/media/documents/projects/lidareportjune2009.pdf> (accessed
28
29
30
31
32
33 16th May 2012)

34 Bennett, S. Maton, K Kervin, L (2008), The 'digital natives' debate: A critical review
35 of the evidence, *British Journal of Educational Technology* 39 (5): 775–786
36
37

38
39 Blommaert J (2005) *Discourse: a Critical Introduction.* Cambridge: Cambridge
40
41
42
43 University Press

44 Brown, C & Czerniewicz, L (2010) Debunking the "digital native": beyond digital
45 apartheid, towards digital democracy, *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning.* Vol.
46
47
48
49
50
51 26, Issue 5, 357–369

52 Conole G (2008) 'New schemas for mapping pedagogies and technologies'. *Ariadne*
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 issue 56 <http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue56/conole/> (accessed 15th May 2012)

1
2
3 English, F (2011) *Student Writing and Genre: Reconfiguring Academic Knowledge*
4
5 London & New York: Continuum
6
7

8
9
10 Evans, E.J (2005) Autonomous Literacy or Social Practice? Students' Constructions
11 of Technology Literacy, *Journal of Literacy and Technology* 5 (1)
12
13

14
15
16 Fairclough, N (1992) *Discourse and Social Change* Cambridge: Polity Press
17
18

19
20
21 Goodfellow, R & Lea, M. R eds.(forthcoming) *Literacy in the Digital University:*
22 London and New York Routledge
23
24

25
26 Goodfellow, R (2011). Literacy, literacies, and the digital in higher education,
27 *Teaching in Higher Education*, 16(1), pp. 131–144.
28
29

30
31 Goodfellow, R & Lea, M R (2007) *Challenging E-learning in the University: a*
32 *literacies perspective*. Maidenhead & New York: Society for Research into Higher
33 Education/Open University Press/ McGraw Hill
34
35
36

37
38
39 Gourlay, L & Oliver, M (2012) Digital Literacies as a Postgraduate Attribute: Baseline
40 Report [http://diglitpqa.jiscinvolve.org/wp/files/2012/03/IOE-DigLits-Baselining-Report-](http://diglitpqa.jiscinvolve.org/wp/files/2012/03/IOE-DigLits-Baselining-Report-1.0.pdf)
41 [1.0.pdf](http://diglitpqa.jiscinvolve.org/wp/files/2012/03/IOE-DigLits-Baselining-Report-1.0.pdf) (accessed May 15th 2012)
42
43
44
45
46
47

48
49 Ivanič, R (1998) *Writing and Identity: The Discoursal Construction of Identity in*
50 *Academic Writing* Amsterdam: John Benjamins
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Ivanič R, Edwards, R Barton, D . Martin-Jones, M Fowler, Z Hughes,B Mannion,G
4
5 Miller,K Satchwell, C Smith, J (2009) *Improving learning in college: Rethinking*
6
7 *literacies across the curriculum*. London: Routledge
8
9

10
11
12 JISC (2011a) JISC Innovation Programme: Call for Projects in Developing Digital
13
14 Literacies.

15
16 http://www.jisc.ac.uk/fundingopportunities/funding_calls/2011/04/grant411.aspx

17
18 (accessed 23rd May 2012)
19
20

21
22
23 JISC (2011b) Developing Digital Literacies: Briefing Paper in support of JISC Grant
24
25 Funding 4/11.

26
27 http://www.jisc.ac.uk/fundingopportunities/funding_calls/2011/04/grant411.aspx

28
29 (accessed 23rd May 2012)
30
31

32
33
34 Jones, C Ramanau, R Cross, S and Healing, G (2010) Net generation or Digital
35
36 Natives: Is there a distinct new generation entering university? *Computers and*
37
38 *Education*, 54(3), pp. 722–732
39
40

41
42
43 Jones, C Turner, J Street, B (1999) *Students Writing in the University: Cultural and*
44
45 *Epistemological Issues* Amsterdam: John Benjamins
46
47

48
49
50 Jones, S & Lea M R (2008) Digital Literacies in the Lives of Undergraduate Students:
51
52 Exploring Personal and Curricular Spheres of Practice, *Electronic Journal of e-*
53
54 *Learning Volume 6 Issue 3 2008 (207-216)*
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Kress (2003) *Literacy in the New Media Age* London: Routledge
4
5

6
7 Law, J. 1992. Notes on the theory of the actor network: Ordering, strategy and
8 heterogeneity. Centre for Science Studies Lancaster University.
9

10 <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fass/sociology/papers/law-notes-on-ant.pdf>
11

12
13
14 (Accessed 23rd May 2012).
15

16
17
18 Lea M,R (2004) 'Academic Literacies: a Pedagogy for Course Design', *Studies in*
19 *Higher Education* 20(6) 738-56
20

21
22
23
24
25 Lea M.R (2007) 'Emerging Literacies in Online Learning', *Journal of Applied*
26 *Linguistics* 2007 4 (1) 79-100
27

28
29
30
31
32 Lea, M. R. (2008) Academic Literacies in Theory and Practice, B. V. Street and N.
33 Hornberger eds. *Encyclopaedia of Language and Education (2nd edition)* Springer:
34 227-238
35
36

37
38
39
40
41 Lea, M.R & Jones, S (2011) Digital literacies in higher education: exploring textual
42 and technological practice, *Studies in Higher Education* 36 (4) 377-395
43
44

45
46
47 Lea, M.R & Stierer, B eds. (2000) *Student writing in higher education: New contexts*.
48 Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press.
49

50
51
52
53
54 Lea, M R & Street, B V (1998) Student Writing in Higher Education: an academic
55 literacies approach, *Studies in Higher Education* 23(2) 57-72
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Lillis (2001) *Student Writing: Access, Regulation, Desire*. London & New York:
6
7 Routledge
8
9

10
11 Lillis, T & M. Scott (2007). Defining Academic Literacies Research: Issues of
12 epistemology, ideology and strategy, *Journal of Applied Linguistics* 4(1): 5-32.
13
14
15

16
17
18 Mann S (2008) *Study, Power and the University*. Maidenhead & New York: SRHE/
19
20 Open University Press/ Mc Graw Hill
21
22

23
24
25 McKenna, C (forthcoming) Digital texts and the construction of writerly spaces:
26
27 Academic writing in hypertext, *Pratiques* special issue 'Academic Literacies:
28
29 International Perspectives'.
30
31

32
33
34
35 Russell, D.R Lea, M. R. Parker, J Donahue, T (2009). Exploring notions of genre in
36
37 "Academic Literacies" and "Writing Across the Curriculum": approaches across
38
39 countries and contexts, Bazerman, C. *et al.*, eds. *Genre in a Changing World*. Fort
40
41 Collins, Colorado: The WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor, Press.
42

43
44 <http://wac.colostate.edu/books/genre/>, pp.395-423.
45

46
47 Sefton-Green, J & Nixon, H (2009) Reviewing approaches and perspectives on
48
49 "Digital Literacy", *Pedagogies: an International Journal* ,4: 107-125
50
51

52
53
54 Street, B (1995) *Social Literacies: Critical Approaches to Literacy in Development,*
55
56
57 *Ethnography and Education*. London/New York: Longman
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Street, B (2009) 'Multiple Literacies and Multi-literacies' in eds. R. Beard; D Myhill; J.
8 Riley; M. Nystrand *Sage Handbook of Writing Development* London: Sage
9 Publications 137-150
10
11

12
13
14
15
16 Thesen, L & Van Pletzen E (2006) *Academic Literacy and the Languages of Change*
17
18 Continuum
19

20
21
22
23 Tuck J (2012) Feedback-giving as social practice: teachers' perspectives on
24
25 feedback as institutional requirement, work and dialogue, *Teaching in Higher*
26
27 *Education* 17 (2) 209-221
28

29
30
31
32 Turner J (2011) *Language in the Academy: Cultural Reflexivity and Intercultural*
33
34 *Dynamics* Bristol, Buffalo, Ontario: Multilingual Matters
35

36
37
38 Williams, Bronwyn T. (2009) *Shimmering Literacies: Popular Culture and Reading*
39
40 *and Writing Online*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1: JISC Call for Projects in Developing Digital Literacies

Digital literacy defines those capabilities which fit an individual for living, learning and working in a digital society'

We are particularly concerned with those capabilities that are required and/or developed in the context of further and higher education, namely:

- ICT/computer literacy – information literacy – media literacy – communication and collaboration – digital scholarship
- learning skills and life-planning (p.5)

The programme is designed specifically to support the *integration* of digital capability into the core activities of educational institutions. (p.5)

- Funded projects will work to normalise digital capability in mainstream practice, whether through specialist roles (e.g. in learning support, libraries and learning resources, careers services and e-learning teams) or through the development of mainstream academic, research and administrative staff. (p.5)
- Bidders are expected to identify their own vision for digital literacies, and how digital literacy development will contribute to current organisational challenges and priorities. (p.6)

(JISC 2011a)

Figure 2: Developing Digital Literacies: Briefing Paper in support of JISC Grant Funding 4/11

A *digitally literate organisation* is resilient in the face of rapid change in both the technology and the educational landscape. Ways in which the organisation is developing resilience include: upskilling for open content with expertise in repositories, content management, licensing for open release, and open access publication; developing preservation and sustainability strategies that encompass the whole of the organisation's own digital assets; developing expertise in managing estates in which real and virtual spaces co-exist, and in greening the campus through sustainable use of ICT; developing the skills to deliver learning in a wide range of locations including workplaces and franchise institutions around the world; rewarding and recognising staff who deliver innovation in core processes; building leadership skills to thrive in a digital global education market; having the expertise to choose, adopt, adapt, implement and make interoperable a wide variety of digital systems including open source and cloud solutions; supporting members to choose digital solutions that support their different roles and preferences, while producing coherent policies and a coherent digital infrastructure. The digitally literate organisation takes a strategic approach to staff development which encompasses all roles. It treats the digital know-how of its members, staff and students alike, as a critical resource to be routinely audited, progressed, used in a range of multi-role teams, recognised and rewarded. All staff roles and responsibilities appropriately exploit technology enhanced working practices to benefit both the organisation and the individual. (p.7 JISC 2011a)