'Ever tried. Ever failed. No matter. Try Again. Fail again. Fail better' (Samuel Beckett)[i]

'Fail Better' is an approach which supports first year students' successful transition to higher education academic writing practices. 'Fail Better' uses a broadly academic literacies model of development to address students' failure and struggle with writing. Rather than blaming students for 'poor writing', 'Fail Better' maintains that experiences of struggle and failure with academic writing are part of an inevitable and necessary process as students 'write themselves' into new disciplinary-based academic writing communities. The final part of the paper explores how subject lecturers, who are often not confident or willing writing developers, can, through the application of "Fail Better' principles, offer their students a time-efficient, proactive and supportive model of writing development. It argues, moreover, that universities must reject deficit discourses around students' struggles with academic writing and radically reconceptualise the issue of academic writing support in order to support students more effectively through their struggles and failures.

Key words: Academic writing development, student identity and transition to higher education

Introduction: (Ever tried?)

Across the world, getting to grips with unfamiliar higher education academic writing practices is crucial to first-year students' achievement, retention and progression. Yorke and Longton, in their report '*First Year Experience of Higher Education in the UK*' (2007), made the point that transition into higher education is often experienced sharply around a shift towards unfamiliar undergraduate, academic writing practices which mediate students' successful presentation of subject-specific learning and which many are unfamiliar with and feel alienated from. Consequently, many students struggle with, and even fail assignments, especially in their first year, due to 'poor writing skills, according to the feedback they receive from their lecturers. Getting to grips with unfamiliar higher education academic writing practices is, therefore, crucial to first-year students' achievement, retention and progression.

This paper argues that the problems students experience with academic writing can be explained in terms of the following pedagogic impasse. Higher education, does not traditionally value trial and error as a means by which students can begin to gain confidence around the new demands higher education makes on their writing (Lea & Stierer, 2000). Rather, the goal of producing a successful summatively assessed 'gold standard' of academic writing persists, dogged by its alter ego, the failing student who 'can't write'. In addition , the struggle and failure of some students to write effectively can be exacerbated by subject-specialist lecturers who feel they 'can't' (due to a lack of training and/or time) or 'won't' (due a belief that, as specialists in their field, that is not what they have been employed to do) teach academic writing development. 2. There is, therefore, an urgent need to address, what some commentators have called a crisis in students' academic writing in higher education (Ganobscik-Williams, 2006).

Although some students do struggle with the technical aspects of writing, this paper is more concerned with how writing effectively in higher education is often more about how students struggle to articulate 'This is what I think…and why' through their writing. One can argue that this lack of confidence reflects school examinations, in the UK and elsewhere, which increasingly emphasise knowledge-testing, and subsequently do not facilitate an ability to explore contestable, often abstract concepts and ideas through writing. Fail Better' responds to this lack of familiarity by offering an essentially metacognitive approach to higher education writing development which encourages students to consider not only *what* they should be writing about in their undergraduate assignments, but *how* and *why* they need to write in particular ways in higher education (Biggs & Tang, 2011). However, in order to produce successful higher education writing, first-year undergraduates need to feel confident enough to discard or adapt their previous writing practices and identities (even if they have been very successful) which may not be not be fit for purpose in their new higher education milieu (Clarke & Ivanic, 1992; Janks & Ivanic, 1992). Moreover, students need to understand that developing into confident academic writers is not a straightforward, linear or automatic process; rather it inevitably involves struggle, conflict and feelings of uncertainty, inauthenticity, marginalisation, exclusion and occasionally, failure.

This paper reports on an approach, 'Fail Better' that resists the obsession with standards and performativity that underpin so many contemporary higher education conceptions of academic writing success (Ball, 2008). To do so, it specifically repositions the role of struggle and productive failure as necessary components for student engagement in meaningful academic writing development. The 'Fail Better' principles discussed below have been developed, by the author, in further and higher education in UK over 20 years to tackle academic writing development within a variety of subject-based groups. They draw on the well-established 'academic literacies' approach pioneered by Lea and Street (1998), which positions academic writing as a social practice into which new undergraduates need to be sympathetically inducted in order to make a positive transition into higher education. Academic literacies encourages students and lecturers to talk explicitly about academic writing experiences, share their written work with each other, explore different ways of writing for academic purposes and challenge preconceived ideas about writing in their disciplinary field (Barton, Hamilton & Ivanic, 1994; Gee, 1996; Lea & Street, 1998). Importantly, 'Fail Better' extends the academic literacies conviction that practice should be privileged above text (Lillis & Scott, 2007) by focussing specifically on the principle that first year undergraduates, with the support of lecturers, can benefit from exploring positively the idea that their struggles, and even failures, with academic writing are an necessary part of their transition to successful graduate learning.

Setting the scene for failure. (Ever failed?)

Academic writing practices are important because they inform what Ruth (2008) calls, 'everyday conditions and processes' in higher education, this is because undergraduate learning is largely assessed through written summative assignments. One can argue therefore, that reproducing 'appropriate' academic writing in terms of style and form is as important a condition of graduate 'educatedness', as students' grasp of disciplinary subject matter, that is,

the content of their writing (French, 2015). The institutional weight given to summative written assessments, despite that fact that they often present lecturers with their first opportunity to read students' work, is reflected in the frequency with which generic assessment criteria valorise individualised trajectories of academic success, achievement and progression. Consequently, there is little positive attention paid to students' often complex, painful and erratic development as effective academic writers. Rather, higher education discourses around academic writing tend to treat academic writing as a decontextualised set of skills. This skills model, termed 'autonomous' by Street (1984), maintains that writing skills, such as spelling, punctuation and grammar constitute a 'neutral technology', which once acquired, can be applied by individual writers, universally, without reference to any ideological or cultural values. It also emphasises the surface features of writing, so that any writing development is primarily about:

> […] a set of atomised skills which students have to learn and which are then transferable to other contexts. The focus is on attempts to "fix" problems with student learning. (Lea & Street, 1998, pp.158-159)

Undergraduates are, therefore, firmly located within a "grammocentric" world (Hoskin, 1990), where dominant, that is, expected academic writing practices, function as a form of regulation and differentiation:

> […] centered on individual and individual difference, both normalization and pathologisation […] realised within a set of assessing, diagnostic, prognostic and normative [writing] practices. (Hoskin, 1990, p. 52)

In such a world, entrenched 'polarising discourses' which generate a crude binary between students who 'can' or 'cannot write' and largely tacit expectations by lecturers regarding 'appropriate' disciplinary writing practices, make students anxious about trying anything different or new. Fearful of producing the 'wrong' kind of writing, failing students struggle, often fruitlessly (and often alone) to unlock the secret of the 'right' kind of writing which they are convinced will improve their grades.

Supporting 'failing' students' writing outside of their discipline: acculturation, deficit, bolt-on and centralised writing development strategies in higher education (Never Mind. Try again. Fail again.)

Despite the diversity of the contemporary student body a broadly 'acculturation' model often underpins traditional higher education approaches to academic writing development. Acculturation operates on the premise that individuals come to university pre-prepared to absorb higher education academic writing practices through exposure to and immersion in the writing culture of their discipline. Lillis (2003) discusses how acculturation is assumed to happen obliquely, almost like osmosis, via students' interaction with lecturers, (their language and the teaching materials they produce) as well as contact with academic texts (such as journals, and textbooks), rather than through exposure to any overt pedagogy about learning to write academically for their particular discipline. In practice however, the acculturation model often encourages subject lecturers to assume that their 'able' students will just 'work out' how to write appropriately in higher education (Starfield, 2004. This is because it:

> […] tends to treat writing as a transparent medium of representation and so fails to address the deep language, literacy and discourse issues involved in the institutional production and representation of meaning. (Lea & Street, 1998, p. 159)

By encouraging a tacit 'discourse of transparency' (Lillis & Turner, 2001) around academic writing performance, acculturation models often create situations where students' difficulties in meeting disciplinary-based writing standards are construed as their personal failure to pick up on the cues that acculturation offers, rather than an institutional failure to meet the increasingly diverse writing development needs that many students, especially in their first year, might present.

Subject-specific lecturers are often encouraged to offer students struggling with academic writing a limited range of broadly autonomous, non-subject-specific writing support/development models. The first to consider is the centralised 'Writing Centre', a model imported from United States, where they have been popular since the 1970s. Writing centres have become increasingly popular in the UK and Europe (Björk, Bräuer, Rienecker & Jorgensen, 2003; Ganobcsik-Williams, 2011). However, a key weakness of cross-institutional centres is the extent to which they inevitably decontextualise academic writing; this because they fail to overtly address the symbiotic relationship between academic writing and its role as the primary vehicle for evidencing disciplinary or subject-specific learning. Within writing centres, support is usually offered by generic writing developers who cannot share the disciplinary background or associated writing practices of all the students they support; nor do they have any input into the kinds of assessments, and by implication the particular kinds of writing required by those assessments, that students are expected to produce.

Furthermore, even the most welcoming of specialist writing centres is tainted by a deficit model of writing development. Put simply, writing centres are often places where struggling students are referred by their subject tutors, for 'help with writing'. Even when students self-refer, their struggles with academic writing can feel like a very personal failure. Consequently, when students are referred to centralised support, they can become very demoralised, as they often feel ashamed that they and their writing have been singled out for support. This is a perception that higher education settings often do very little to dispel and for this reason Northedge (2006) and Haggis (2008) suggest that the deficit model of academic writing support in higher education is least likely to be taken up by those who need it the most.

The second most common form of academic writing support in higher education is the compulsory 'bolt on', study skills module, often offered as part of first year degree programmes. (Wingate's random search of the web in 2006 revealed that of ten post-1992 and ten pre-1992 higher education institution, all but two offered bolt-on study-skills courses). These 'bolt-on' study skills or writing support modules are often very unpopular with students who either feel that they do not need the additional module and/or are resentful that they have to spend time on a module that is not directly relevant to the subject that they have come to university to study (Doloughan, 2001). Research into bolt-on forms of writing development provision have found that they are less effective than embedding academic writing development within subject-specific modules, and/or developing complementary online digital resources which support the development of information literacies (Bent & Stockdale, 2009; Beetham, McGill & Littlejohn, 2009) or a combination of both (Secker & Coonan, 2011).

Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) and Writing in Disciplines (WID) approaches offer a third way of getting academic writing development on to the curriculum. Popular in America since the 70s and in the UK since the mid-90's, they reflect the idea that writing in education is always a complex, social and process-led activity. 2. Both models reflect more ideological models of literacy and academic writing development and complement, not only each other, but Lea and Street's (1998) 'academic literacies' approach with their emphasis on the situated and interrelatedness of academic writing practices. WID is primarily concerned with how disciplinary differences are expressed through academic writing practices. It pays attention to how disciplinary-based academic writing practices emerge (and change) over time and are contingent on technological advancements and social and historical developments in education and wider society. The point of WID is not to judge different forms of writing as better as or worse than each other, but to develop an understanding of how and why they are constructed differently, and, in particular, how academic forms of writing are constructed in particular ways to reflect the disciplinary expectations of different subjects. Meanwhile, WAC is rooted in constructivist pedagogies that help appraise how effectively communities of practice encourage the social aspects of teaching and learning for development. WAC and WID have their advocates in wider Europe where, as in the UK, there has been a marked shift towards social/community based approaches for writing development (Björk et al., 2003). However, irrespective of the various national flavours acquired as they have gained popularity as practical models for writing development, neither WID nor WAC explicitly harness the importance of productive struggle and failure to writing development.

The next part of this paper seeks to explore the ways in which 'Fail Better' encourages subject specific lecturers to teach academic writing as an on-going relational process, defined and reified over time by social and communicative practices that all students engage in as part of their subject-specialist studies (Wingate, Andon & Cogo, 2011). Central to this process is the part struggle and failure play in *everyone's* development as an academic writer and the idea that academic writing in the disciplines can be more usefully seen as the product:

> […] of a domain […] framed by its culture. Their meaning and purpose are socially constructed through negotiations among present and past members. [Such] activities thus cohere in a way that is, in theory, if not always in practice, accessible to members who move within the social framework. These coherent, meaningful, and purposeful activities are….most simply defined as the ordinary practices of the culture.
> (Seely-Brown, Collins & Duguid,1989, p.32).

Practical strategies for repositioning struggle and failure positively in the writing process. (Fail again. Fail better.)

Making it personal: Mining and sharing academic writing histories

'Fail Better' encourages a very practical and dialogic approach to academic writing development that centres on the ways in which positive academic identities are forged out of individuals' past and present academic writing histories. Some of these historical experiences of academic writing may be negative and scarred by struggle and failure, all of them will be characterised by experiences of transition from one educational setting to another. Through such 'personal mining' writing development activities students can begin to explore how and why academic writing in university can be so difficult and helped to appreciate that this is not

just because the knowledge in their discipline may be unfamiliar to them, but because they are expected to present their understanding of the new knowledge through equally unfamiliar writing practices. As a way of promoting a supportive writing community through disciplinary teaching, 'Fail Better' also encourages subject-specific lecturers to discuss with their first year students how they have personally struggled and perhaps failed (on occasion) as part of their own development as academic writers.

Further 'personal mining' writing development discussion can be scaffolded if lecturers respond to anxieties about academic writing both when they arise naturally during the course of a taught session, as well as formulating directed questions (such as those listed below) to initiate more formal group discussions around specific academic writing issues. What is the aim of writing in higher education?

- How do you feel about your writing (before coming to university, now you are at university?)
- How do you feel when you read other peoples' writing in class/online?
- Is it useful to read each other's writing?
- What do we mean by reflective/discursive writing?
- What is the role of 'I' in reflective writing?
- What is the difference between writing reflexively and reflectively?
- Why is it sometimes important to write reflectively?
- Why it is sometimes important to write discursively?
- What is the relationship between writing and learning, thinking and experiencing?
- How do you feel about using social media and digital literacies in your writing?

Both types of discussion are especially useful for students if undertaken as part of students' summative assessment preparation.

Discussing disciplinary writing practices with students in this way questions however, poses a challenge for many lecturers as they inevitably trouble the notion that academic writing is a transparent medium for the articulation of disciplinary learning. Instead they acknowledge the extent to which academic writing is an overtly social, even political practice, for example by drawing attention to how some students may be less familiar than others with traditional dominant academic writing practices such as 'essayist literacies' (Lillis, 2001; 2003; Archer, 2003). Indeed, McGivney (2003) illustrates how traditional academic writing practices, if they remain unchallenged, can easily generate 'a mystique of unfamiliarity and remoteness' which can confound and confuse those undergraduates not familiar with them. Such students include those with vocational qualifications whose learning has often been characterised by more skills and portfolio-based forms of assessment and mature students who may have never acquired formal educational qualifications or have been out of education for a long time (Davies, Swinburne & Williams, 2006).

'Fail Better' also repositions students and lecturers as collaborative, active agents in the production of unfamiliar disciplinary-congruent texts for assessment. For example, in class (or virtually) students can be encouraged to critique the forms of writing assessment they are being asked to produce (or even write their own against learning outcomes). Such activities help students to understand that written assessments are a manifestation of particular social practices

associated with their discipline, rather leaving them to produce unfamiliar forms of written summative assignments without really understanding how or why they are doing so.

Reading and writing a disciplinary field

Subject-specific lecturers play a crucial role in teaching students how to read their shared disciplinary field. This involves consciously acknowledging that disciplinary fields represent a constructed community, characterised by particular forms of writing, which new undergraduates will not always be very familiar with. As neophyte readers and writers in their disciplinary field, new undergraduates are usually encouraged by lecturers to locate themselves in what have been called 'disciplinary safe spaces' (French, 2015) which are initially established via disciplinary-congruent reading lists. In this way, reading lists shape how undergraduates construct a sense of themselves as emerging academic writers within a disciplinary field, so that they gradually become culturally and emotionally congruent with its dominant writing conventions. Accordingly, 'Fail Better' maintains that lecturers should be clear that undergraduates are not just gaining disciplinary knowledge when they engage with module reading lists; they are also being inducted into appropriate writing practices as Figure 1.1 illustrates.

Insert Figure 1 about here

Figure 1 Reading and writing in disciplinary fields. (French, 2015)

Failure to understand or engage with required reading may, in 'Fail Better' terms arise because academic texts embody unfamiliar forms of disciplinary writing, irrespective of, and in addition to, the complexity of their possibly equally unfamiliar content. Explicitly discussing the forms that published disciplinary writing takes is therefore embraced in 'Fail Better' as a heuristic of subject-specific praxis prompting discussions with students that explore the following questions:

- What is the point of wider reading in your subject?
- Why is it sometimes hard to read in your subject area?
- Why and how are you expected to use wider reading in your work?

Moreover, when it comes to producing written assignments students need to be able to 'reproduce the field as writers' (French, 2015). This is essentially another disciplinary practice which extensive reading *alone* cannot help with. Rather it involves wrestling one's academic writing into an 'acceptable' disciplinary shape; acceptable, in the sense that it begins to resemble the type of disciplinary writing that the field expects (and that the student has been reading). This of course cannot happen without the student undergoing a conscious process of change *as a writer*. Using the 'Fail Better' approach this can be initiated when lecturers model forms of expected academic writing thus providing students with opportunities to critique successful and unsuccessful assignments.

If at first you don't succeed: the role of purposeful, 'low stakes' writing (that can and will fail).

Short reading and writing activities that students share and discuss with each other and their lecturer in class are very useful for building a writing community within subject-specific learning spaces. Using 'Fail Better' principles students are encouraged to share their notes and ideas about required reading (either in class or virtually) and discuss their drafts with each other for support as ways of articulating and testing how they are consciously shaping and informing their written work. These activities position drafting as an activity that recognises the essential mutability and cognitive labour of the writing process. Understanding that writing requires constant working and reworking, reclaims struggle, and failure as key requisites for any kind of significant writing development, rather than sources of fear and anxiety.

Useful reading and writing activities include using lecture and textbook materials, plus assignment briefs to model and debate different aspects of academic writing for students in class, or online with forms of patchwork writing (Hughes, Lacey, Purnell, 2009). Such low-stakes, explicitly formative writing experiences encourage students to discuss and explore with each other, the experience of trying (and sometimes failing) to write effectively for a particular assignment. Through these activities students can begin to build writing confidence gradually and collaboratively as they encourage then to treat summative written assignments as carefully crafted writing products, not just implicitly organic products of learning.

Concluding thoughts.

This paper argues that it is essential that universities begin to reconceptualise students' struggles and even failure as writers positively by recognising that these experiences are actually an essential part of a more process-led model of academic writing development. Opening up an alternative discourse of 'generative failure' (Harris, 2014) around academic writing development shifts it towards a more productive, situated (that is, subject-specific) model. Such a shift challenges the notion of 'good' academic writing, moving it away from the ideal of an individually produced, polished end-product of learning which can be unproblematically assessed. With its pedagogic emphasis on struggle and failure the 'Fail Better' approach redefines academic writing development in higher education as a socially situated, multi-layered developmental process that emerges, through trial and error, ideally out of a community of practice made up of lecturers and students.

'Fail Better' reassures first year students (and reminds lecturers) that academic writing identities are the product of disrupted processes, which involve not only 'becoming' but also 'unbecoming' different kinds of writers, at different stages of their education; such as the transition from pre-graduate to undergraduate or undergraduate to postgraduate. Ivanic's work (1998, 2006) for example, has shown how students, in different educational settings, experience many different forms of writing, which constantly evolve. Necessarily, this process

of evolving includes individuals' struggling with and sometimes failing to adapt to and adopt new writing practices, as academic writers in different settings and contexts.

 To summarise, Fail Better':

- Seeks to create an environment where the ability to succeed and progress in higher education is viewed as the outcome of struggle and even failure, which are the natural products of exploration and experimentation with academic writing practices.
- Enables students to respond to and act on feedback about their academic writing more agentically because it encourages them to regard struggle as productive and failure as generative.
- Asks lecturers to consider embedding 'low-stakes' formative and collaborative writing practices into subject-specific sessions so that struggle and failure can be experienced positively by their students.

In a 'Fail Better' learning environment lecturers never treat students' struggles and failures with academic writing as problematic; rather both are recast as productive and necessary processes of learning to write at undergraduate level. Acknowledging struggle and failure openly in this way creates a supportive environment that facilitates students' positive engagement with disciplinary-based higher education academic writing processes, ensuring better retention and progression through an increased confidence and understanding.

References

Archer, L. (2003) Social class and higher education. In Higher Education and Social Class: Issues of Exclusion and Inclusion, pp. 5-20. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Ball, S. J. (2008). *The education debate: Policy and politics in the twenty-first century*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Hamilton, M., Barton, D. & Ivanic, R. (eds.) (1994) Worlds of Literacy. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Beetham, H, McGill, L., & Littlejohn, A. (2009). T*hriving in the 21st century: Learning literacies for the digital age*. (LLiDA project report). Retrieved from http://caledonianacademy.net/spaces/LLiDA/uploads/Main/LLiDAreportJune09.pdf

Bent, M., & Stockdale, E. (2009). Integrating information literacy as a habit of learning - assessing the impact of a golden thread of IL in the curriculum. *Journal of Information Literacy*, *3*, 43-50.

Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university* (4th ed.). Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.

Björk, L., Bräuer, L. Rienecker, P., & Jörgensen, S. (Eds.) (2003). Teaching academic writing in European higher education. Dordrect/ Boston/ London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Clarke, R., & Ivanic, R. (1997). *The politics of writing*. London: Routledge.

Davies, S., Swinburne, D., & Williams, G. (2006). *Writing matters*. London: The Royal Literary Fund.

Doloughan, F. (2001). *Communication skills and the knowledge economy: Language, literacy and the production of meaning*. London: Institute of Education.

French, A. (2013). 'Let the right ones in!' Widening participation, academic writing and the standards debate in higher education. *Power & Education, 5*, 236-247.

French, A. (2015). *Through a glass darkly. Lecturers' perceptions of academic writing*. Unpublished PhD dissertation.

Ganobscik-Williams, L. (Ed). (2006). *Teaching academic writing in UK higher education: Theories, practices and models*. London :Palgrave MacMillan.

Ganobcsik-Williams, L. (2011). The writing centre as a locus for WiD, WAC and whole-institution writing provision. In M. Deane & P. O'Neill (Eds.), *Writing in the disciplines* (pp.250-264).Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan

Gee, J. P. (1996) Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in Discourses. London: Taylor & Francis.

Haggis, T. (2008). Student learning research: A broader view. In M. Tight (Ed.), The *Routledge handbook of higher education.* London: Routledge.

Harris, A. (2014). *The creative turn: Toward a new aesthetic imaginary*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Hoskin, K. (1990). *Foucault under examination. The crypto-educator unmasked*. London: G. Allen & Unwin Ltd.

Hughes, J., Lacey, C., & Purnell, E. (2009,). Using blogs and e-portfolios to support reflective writing and ePDP in Foundation Degree students in a School of Education. *European First Year Experience, Conference Proceedings.* Institute for Learning Enhancement, University of Wolverhampton.

Ivanic, R. (1998) *Writing and identity: The discoursal construction of identity in academic writing.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ivanic, R. (2006). Academic writing: Theories and practices. In L. Ganobcsik-Williams (Ed.), *Teaching academic writing in UK higher education*: *Theories, practices and models* (pp.). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, p. 6-15 10 p.

Janks, H., & Ivanic, R. (1992). Critical language awareness and emancipatory discourse. In N. Fairclough (Ed.), *Critical language awareness* (pp. 305-331). Longman: London.

Lea, M. R., & Stierer, B. (2000). *Student writing in higher education*: *New contexts*. Buckingham: Open University Press/SRHE

Lea, M. R., & Street, B. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education*, *23*, 157-172.

Lillis, T. (2001). *Student writing: access, regulation, desire*. London: Routledge.

Lillis, T. (2003). An 'academic literacies' approach to student writing in higher education: drawing on Bakhtin to move from critique to design. *Language and Education, 17*, 192-207.

Lillis, T., & Turner, J. (2001). Student writing in higher education: contemporary confusion, traditional concerns. *Teaching in Higher Education, 6*, 64-73.

Lillis, T., & Scott, M. (2007). Defining academic literacies research: issues of epistemology, ideology and strategy. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *4*, 5–32

McGivney, E. (2003). *Staying or leaving the course: Non-completion and retention of mature students in further and higher education.* Leicester: NIACE Publications.

Northedge, A. (2006). *The good study guide*. Milton Keynes: Open University.

Ruth, D. (2008). Being an academic: Authorship, authenticity and authority. *London Review of Education. 6*, 99-109.

Secker, J., & Coonan, E. (2011). *A new curriculum for information literacy: Executive summary*. Cambridge, UK: Arcadia Programme, Cambridge University Library.

Seely-Brown, J. Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition & the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher*, *18*, 32-42.

Starfield, S. (2004). *Recent research into student academic writing*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers

Street, B. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Street, B. (2000). Literacy events and literacy practices. In M. Martin-Jones & K. Jones (Eds.), *Multi-lingual literacies. Comparative perspectives in research and practice* (pp. 17-92). John-Benjamin: Amsterdam.

Turner, J. (2011). *Language in the academy: Cultural reflexivity and intercultural dynamics.* London: Multilingual Matters.

Wingate, U., Andon, N., & Cogo, A. (2011). Embedding academic writing instruction into subject teaching: A case study. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, *12*, 69-81.

Wingate, U. (2006). Doing away with study skills. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *11*, 447 - 460.

Yorke, M., & Longton, B. (2007). The first-year experience in higher education in the UK: Report on Phase 1. London: Higher Education Academy.

[ii] Quoted in "Samuel Beckett Talks About Beckett" by John Gruen, in Vogue, (December 1969), p. 210