What academic language and learning advisers bring to the scholarship of teaching and learning: problems and possibilities for dialogue with the disciplines

Kate Chanock*

La Trobe University, Australia

Higher education policy is seeking, in the interest of 'quality assurance', to reward teaching and the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL). Academic language and learning (ALL) advisers, who work closely with students to improve their performance in their courses of study, have much to contribute to SoTL. ALL advisers who adopt an 'academic literacies' approach share with lecturers in the disciplines an engagement with issues of '-ography' (i.e. writing in and for a discourse community) – including the relationships between epistemology, form, and language – yet, misconceptions about ALL advisers' work can prevent discipline lecturers from consulting them when thinking about questions of teaching and learning in their own field. This paper discusses ALL advisers' access to insights into students' experiences of learning and of being taught, with relevance both for particular disciplines and for academic culture across the disciplines; their contributions to SoTL; the difficulties they encounter in trying to communicate across the borders of the disciplines; and ways of improving this situation in the context of the new emphasis on encouraging improvement in the quality of teaching.

Keywords: *Academic language and learning; Quality assurance; Scholarship of teaching and learning*

Introduction

It was early summer when I sat down to begin typing this piece, and several times during the morning I was greeted by students passing my office on their way to re-enrol,

*Humanities Academic Skills Unit, Level 4, Humanities III, La Trobe University, Bundoora, Vic. 3086, Australia. Email: c.chanock@latrobe.edu.au

each of them asking what I was doing at work, now that teaching had finished for the year. I was reminded of how differently students and lecturers construct the work of the university. For the students, it is there to teach them and give them a degree; for lecturers, on the other hand, as the sun sets at the end of each semester, the lights come on and the real work of research can be given the attention it has been demanding all year. For some, teaching is a bit like vegemite, a nutritious but rather sludgy by-product of the intellectual ferment involved in research. Others would prefer not to be expected to spend a third of their time on research; but whether or not we choose it, the imperative to publish or perish has been a central fact of academic life throughout our professional lives. This has long been the case for lecturers in the disciplines, and is increasingly the case for academic language and learning (ALL) lecturers like myself.[1] ALL advisers' research draws largely upon our experience of helping students to learn and perform effectively in their disciplines, so that, in the main, our publications belong to the 'scholarship of teaching and learning' (SoTL). In this article, I would like to discuss the ways in which ALL advisers' experience with this sort of scholarship could assist other lecturers to enter into it, with benefits for ALL in the process.

However interested lecturers are in teaching, we have found that, like virtue, teaching has to be its own reward. Institutional rhetoric about a commitment to excellence in teaching cannot hope to shift the balance of lecturers' energies while performance evaluations, promotion procedures, and awarding of grants continue to value research performance more highly than teaching. As Gaither observed in 1998 (p. 90), 'changing the reward system to enhance results through professional commitment is one productive way that policy-makers can positively add to both the debate about quality and efforts to enhance it'. This is the challenge that governments have faced, in recent years, when they have sought to re-align the priorities given to teaching and research, to make universities more responsive to public expectations that they should focus on, and indeed improve, their undergraduate teaching. The Australian government Department of Education, Science, and Technology (DEST) has consulted the experience of Britain and United States, as well as the views of stakeholders in Australia, in formulating new policy discussed in *Our Universities: Backing Australia's Future* (DEST, 2003a) and elaborated in a number of subsequent documents on learning and teaching in higher education.

Shifting the balance

In its paper *Learning and Teaching Performance Fund Issues* (available at DEST, 2004), DEST observes that 'The main driver of excellence in teaching and learning is currently universities' and individual academics' desire to offer a high quality learning experience to their students' but elsewhere (DEST, 2003a) acknowledges that 'the existing funding and regulatory arrangements...do not adequately recognise the importance of quality teaching', and DEST (2004) affirms that 'internal staff promotion practices and institutional prestige tend to reinforce the importance of research performance rather than teaching performance'.

The government is therefore looking for more effective measures to encourage systemic improvements in teaching across the sector. DEST (2004) announced a Learning and Teaching Performance Fund, which will grow to '\$113.8 million in 2008 as part of this renewed focus on teaching quality in Australian universities'. To be eligible for this money, universities will have to 'demonstrate a strong strategic commitment to learning and teaching through: a current institutional learning and teaching plan or strategy; [and] evidence of systematic support for professional development in learning and teaching for sessional and full-time academic staff' (DEST, 2004).

In my own university, a Learning and Teaching Plan has been drafted with plans to reform the rewards system and to encourage projects for enhancing teaching at the faculty level. With regard to professional development, the Plan requires 'Schools to incorporate, at least once annually, presentations on "scholarship of teaching" into colloquia' (La Trobe University, 2004, p. 1.1.2). This seems likely to be a very good way to build a bridge from valuing research to valuing teaching; that is, to make teaching an object of research, so that people can give it (re)focused attention without neglecting their obligation to publish.

I am conscious that I am giving more emphasis to this signal of encouragement for SoTL than is given either in the Government's announcement or in my university's Plan. However, I think it is worth highlighting because it may offer a middle way between the expectation that academics must be active researchers and the alternative possibility, perceived by many academics as a threat, that Australian institutions or Australian academic jobs may be divided into 'research' or 'teaching-only'. Although the announcement of the Teaching and Learning Fund says explicitly that 'there is no intention for any Australian university to become "teaching-only"' (DEST, 2004), this assurance must be seen in the context of discussion around the idea of creating some such distinction, which has been floated in the past few years (DEST, 2002). Academics may be understandably nervous about devoting themselves further to teaching if this could mean that they lose the option of research, which gives them a zest both for their subject and an international community to which to belong. Encouragement of SoTL, which combines research and teaching, may be a way of developing the 'ownership' of change that is always crucial to its success (but only if DEST cooperates by valuing SoTL as highly as conventional research in the disciplines). The outcome, it is hoped, should be to 'greatly encourage a stronger focus on research and evidence-based teaching practice', as HERDSA's response to DEST's (2004) Issues Paper expresses it, in support of HERDSA's suggestion that 'the scholarship of teaching would be a major indicator worthy of consideration' in decisions about dispersing the Fund (Dearn, 2004).

In a Discussion Paper published in September 2003 by DEST and the Australian Universities Teaching Committee, the next step of translating reflection into action is, rightly, envisaged as more difficult:

> While an understanding of what constitutes effective teaching and student learning is important, the biggest challenge is to apply this knowledge in the many different learning contexts and disciplines of higher education for the benefit of the diverse student population...The relationship between learning and teaching cannot be separated from

understandings of the disciplinary, inter-disciplinary and professional fields in which teaching and learning are enacted. The harnessing of understandings about learning to enable more effective 'teaching' will depend on building bridges between the two processes (DEST, 2003b).

Opportunities for ALL advisers and lecturers in the disciplines

The official encouragement of SoTL is likely to be welcomed warmly by ALL advisers in the region, who work with students, individually or in groups, to improve the work they are doing in their disciplines. Until now, a good deal of the SoTL in Australia and New Zealand has been carried out by ALL advisers. Not only can ALL advisers benefit from the 'growing recognition of the scholarship of "teaching and learning"' (DEST, 2003b), but we are also well-placed to help our colleagues in the disciplines to take up this kind of scholarship. They will face the usual challenges of moving into any unfamiliar 'field':

- Situating their own thinking in the context of the considerable literature that exists already;
- Identifying needs and opportunities for changes in their practice that would make a valuable contribution to the field;
- Forming a picture of the venues for sharing SoTL: the conferences, journals, and collections through which this kind of work is disseminated and discussed.

In addition to the literature referred to in this article, readers will find a number of journals on writing, language, communication and rhetoric 'across the curriculum' at the very useful 'WAC Clearinghouse' at http://wac.colostate.edu, and a bibliography of SoTL at the website of the Carnegie Academic for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (Hutchings *et al.*, 2002).

ALL advisers can help with all of the aforementioned challenges, as well as with the larger challenge of applying understandings of learning to the activity of teaching, and we would welcome the chance of 'building bridges between the two processes'. This would require, in addition, building bridges between ALL and the disciplines. Mostly, ALL advisers meet with and write for one another, but this is not because we do not wish to communicate with lecturers in the disciplines. On the contrary, we are chronically frustrated by the difficulty of sharing what we learn from our students with the people who are teaching and marking them. In order for such sharing to take place, however, some obstacles both structural and cultural would need to be overcome.

Obstacles to communication

Structurally, ALL advisers are often located at the margins of academic divisions, with student services or in separate units outside of the teaching faculties. In about a third of Australian universities, the ALL advisers are classified as general staff; in the other two-thirds, we are classified as academic, but our teaching loads are typically

heavier than those of academics in the disciplines, leaving little time for interaction with our colleagues (Chanock *et al.*, 2004). ALL advisers cluster at the lower levels of the academic ladder and are rarely promoted to, let alone beyond, level C (i.e. 'senior lecturer'). In terms of both space and status, therefore, we often operate at the margins of academic life.

More senior positions exist in the Academic Development units or centres concerned with improvement of teaching and professional development of teaching staff. There is the potential for bringing together ALL advisers, academic development staff, and discipline lecturers to collaborate in SoTL, and in some universities this is happening. Elsewhere, it is more difficult to bridge the gap between staff in the disciplines and staff concerned with students' learning, a gap that is related to a set of hierarchically valued pairs, which includes research and teaching, theory and practice, knowledge and skill, content and form, and thought and expression. The first member of each pair may inform the second, but does not expect to be informed by it. Indeed, as Squires (1990, pp. 42–43) suggests, higher education defines itself in terms of research, theory, and knowledge, as distinct from 'mere' practice and skill. The 'othering' involved in this sort of self-definition is an obstacle to mutuality between ALL advisers and lecturers in the disciplines.

It is founded, however, upon a serious misunderstanding of the nature of ALL advisers' work. ALL advisers commonly find—and widely lament—that students are referred to us for help with matters that lecturers seem to regard as mechanical and uninteresting. Tapper and Gruba (2000, p. 56) remark on 'a strong tendency for academics to refer students to learning support units rather than addressing students' academic learning skills themselves'; more worryingly, Boquet (1999), who works in a writing centre at an American university, has found that lecturers write on students' papers, 'Go to the Writing Center!' as if it is a punishment (p. 469). Whatever their attitude to the 'specialty' of work on writing, lecturers seem to see it as separate from the project in which they themselves are engaged. Frequently, our centres seem to be regarded as a form of crash repair shop where welding, panel-beating and polishing can be carried out on students' texts—an idea that makes sense only if you regard the text as a vehicle for the writer's thoughts, and separable from the thoughts themselves.

Common ground between ALL and the disciplines

The relation of writing to thought, however, is more complex than this, and much more interesting. As Linton and colleagues (1994) put it, 'Disciplinary styles are not just frames or shells into which content can be cast, but habits of thought and communication grounded in the objectives, values, and "world view" of each discipline' (p. 65). The forms of writing in a discipline both construct and are constructed by the culture of enquiry in the discipline; they embody its epistemology; and they carry out the social purposes of its members. The international community we call a 'field' is constituted by its discourse, for most of its members are never going to meet, and this makes the discourse an important object of study. Sometimes it is investigated by members of the discipline reflecting on themselves, as in anthropology in

recent years (e.g. Clifford & Marcus, 1986; Geertz, 1988). Sometimes it requires an outsider's perspective, as in the sociology of scientific investigation (e.g. Knorr-Cetina, 1981; Gilbert & Mulkay, 1984; Latour & Woolgar, 1986). In North America, rhetorical studies have been carried out within the disciplines (e.g. Nelson *et al.*, 1987) but also in the field of composition studies. There, the teaching of academic writing has developed, institutionally, as part of the discipline of English, and scholars have drawn on a range of other intellectual sources including rhetoric, psychology and linguistics. In Britain, academics in education have developed a 'critical literacies' or 'multiliteracies' approach (Ivanic, 1998; Lea & Street, 1998), focusing on the social uses and social consequences of language choices. Everywhere, the connections between language, literacy, knowledge and power are receiving attention, informed, for example, by Bourdieu and Passeron (1990); and, in studies of the globalisation of knowledge, the consequences of the primacy of English are critically explored (e.g. Pennycook, 1994). The particular focus and emphasis of these discussions vary from place to place, but they are connected, and they can be brought to talk to each other. And it is this eclectic conversation that informs the work of ALL advisers, and to which we contribute in publications reporting and reflecting on our students' experiences of learning at university.

It is perfectly true that we concern ourselves with matters of 'correctness', but we find a good deal of overlap between what is 'correct' and what is 'appropriate', which requires us to ask 'appropriate for what?' We cannot effectively operate with the assumption that, as Odell (1992) has put it, '*Writing well* means observing conventions of diction, usage, syntax, and organization, conventions that are presumed to apply to all good writing and that can be identified even if one knows little about the subject matter being discussed' (pp. 86–87). No more can we share the belief Ann Johns (1997) has found to be widespread among lecturers, that there is a single set of academic values:

> …good writing, effective reading, careful listening and note-taking, and sound critical thinking…Most faculty believe quite sincerely that literacy instructors can teach students some generalized approaches to each of these academic values, which will serve the students in every context and disciplinary culture. (p. 34)

The widely varying responses of lecturers in different disciplines to the same students' writing have shown us that this simply is not true (e.g. Baum-Brunner, 1997). Thus, ALL advisers are quickly sucked beneath the surface of their students' texts and immersed in the intellectual matrix of each different discipline, to grapple with questions of '-ography' (i.e. of writing in and for a discourse community); and these are questions that engage discipline practitioners equally, if they are reflective (Squires, 1990, pp. 52–59). It should be possible, therefore, to build bridges into the disciplines, at this level of thinking. What is lacking is regular institutional means of bringing us into the same conversations, to share what we know on a basis of mutual respect (lecturers need to shed inadequate assumptions about what ALL advisers do; but ALL advisers also need to overcome some irritation at what lecturers do). ALL representation on academic committees, learning and teaching committees, and

working groups can do much to reduce the social distance between ALL and discipline lecturers. However, it is rare for ALL and discipline lecturers to attend one another's research seminars, which is needed in order to reduce the perceived intellectual distance between them. Rare too, but not unheard of, are joint presentations by ALL and discipline lecturers at research seminars. And here, the official encouragement of SoTL should be helpful; for wherever SoTL is to be shared, ALL advisers should be able to attend and participate.

What ALL advisers can contribute

What, then, do ALL advisers bring to discussions of teaching and learning? Our work gives us a perspective across the disciplines, across the various phases of higher education, and across the cultures from which our students come. This overview is informed by extensive conversations with students on the one hand, and by the access our work gives us to the design of subjects in the disciplines, the discourse of lectures, the texts assigned by lecturers, and the comments they write on students' work. Although any lecturer sees a very limited range of some of these kinds of academic discourse—limited, usually, to his or her own discipline and, often, to his or her own subjects—we see samples across a wide range of disciplines and have a sense of where the commonalities and the contrasts lie, as well as a sense of what causes problems for students' learning.

The major challenges in improving the experience and the competence of students include managing the transition from school to university, and helping students to understand what is common and what is particular across the disciplines. The purposes of school and university are not the same, because at university there is an often new, and always more pronounced, emphasis on exploring how knowledge is constructed, and this must be examined and articulated if students' learning is to be improved. Crucial words like 'argument' and 'opinion' take on a different meaning at university (Meyer, 1988; Chanock, 2004a). At school, these words often referred to a rhetoric of persuasion about how public issues should be addressed (e.g. Should euthanasia be legalised? Should there be public heroin injecting rooms? Students are asked to take one position and argue it). At university, 'argument' and 'opinion' more often refer to a set of assumptions about the instability of knowledge and the methods of constructing it through discourse. Students' 'opinions' are meant to be opinions about what has happened, how, and why (matters that are not considered settled, at this level), rather than about what should happen; and their arguments are meant to be demonstrations of how these opinions are inferred from evidence, rather than exercises in appealing to the feelings and interests of an imagined reading public. Differences of style flow from differences of purpose (Ballard & Clanchy, 1988; Chanock, 2004a), and it is more helpful to talk to students about purpose than simply to issue prescriptions about style (Chanock, 2004b). Because lecturers are in a position to mediate the transition between school and university, this seems a fruitful area for action research.

Another focus for SoTL is the differences between disciplines; here, informed reflection on the purposes and values of each discipline is crucial, together with an

understanding that these purposes and values are not the same; that the differences have consequences at every level of discourse; that the differences cause difficulties for students; and that they can be described, explicated and mediated in ways that help students to succeed. Much of the most interesting scholarship in teaching and learning is about the differences between disciplines and the consequences of failing to recognise these. For example, MacDonald (1987), focusing on the different kinds of knowledge that different disciplines produce, argues that social sciences endeavour to reduce large amounts of data to demonstrable generalisations about the way things happen, whereas literary studies seek to expand understanding of a single text by elaborating insights from it. Linton and colleagues (1994) draw attention to the role of text structures in signalling different attitudes in disciplines' toward the discovery of knowledge. Scientists, they write, use the standard form of introduction-method-results-discussion to '[impose] a particular order on experience which is more recursive, less linear, less neat than the model [to make it] conform to the ideal of the empirical method', thus affirming, each time, 'the importance of shared, replicated methodology' (Linton et al., 1994, p. 68). In humanities, by contrast, 'presentation of the author's central insight' comes early in the piece, before the evidence from which it has been drawn (Linton et al., 1994, p. 67), with the effect that an idea, rather than a method, governs the piece. Another difference is the use of citations, which in scientific writing are listed 'without discussion', in a 'highly condensed form of communication with other members of the discourse community', whereas 'in the humanities, analysis (rather than identification) of previous work is often used strategically to anchor discussion' (Linton et al., 1994, p. 69). This echoes a similar observation made by Bazerman (1981), discussing how different disciplines establish a problem early in a piece of writing: scientists work with shared problems, so only the most recent and relevant work must be cited; social scientists, on the other hand, often devote a good deal of space to establishing that they have a problem to discuss. A large and interesting body of literature of this kind already exists (e.g. Ballard & Clanchy, 1988; Herrington & Moran, 1992; Langer, 1992; Baum-Brunner, 1997; Saunders & Clarke, 1997), but there is certainly scope for more, and ALL advisers could encourage lecturers to see their experiences as a source of ideas for publication. Baum-Brunner (1997) has rightly stressed:

> ...the need for faculty to articulate disciplinary expectations with a level of precision that is all too rarely enacted. By researching further — from a multiplicity of data sources and perspectives on our personal, disciplinary and rhetorical domains and beliefs — we can clarify our expectations and underlying intentions, and improve not only our teaching but our students' writing and the conversations that cross departmental lines. (p. 93)

With greater awareness of the varieties of disciplinary discourses, ALL advisers and discipline lecturers can devise activities and materials to focus students' attention on particular features of discourse as a regular part of learning in their subjects (for an example, see my kit for discipline lecturers in Chanock, 2004a).

As well as having to negotiate movement among disciplines, students from overseas are faced with a transition between academic cultures, in which misunderstandings unfortunately abound. Lecturers who teach a high proportion of international

students might like to undertake action research, perhaps consulting the insights of writers like Canagarajah (2002), Fox (1994), Ivanic and Camps (2001), Leki (1992), Matalene (1985), Phan (2001), Wilkinson and Olliver-Gray (2006), or the collection edited by Zamel and Spack (1998). Combining their knowledge of contrastive rhetoric with the comments and explanations of students they have taught, these scholars shed valuable light on behaviours of international students that often puzzle lecturers, demonstrating that approaches, styles, ways of using sources and text structures that violate Western readers' expectations are not signs of deficiency but of explicable, and interesting, cultural differences.

In action research, in particular, there may be opportunities for collaboration between lecturers and ALL advisers. 'Collaborative research, undertaken to answer teachers' questions about their own and their students' practices is...essential', according to McCarthy and Walvoord (1988), and 'this research is based on the assumption that knowledge is gained not only through action but also for action' (p. 86). One form that such research can take is what McCarthy and Walvoord (1988) call:

> The Focused Pair. In this model...a writing specialist pairs with a teacher from another discipline, and together they study the writing going on in the latter's classroom....Focused pairs, in many cases, produce not only professional growth and change but also publications. (p. 80)

They may also produce new approaches to teaching, when the researchers work out, together, a new understanding of the reasons why students' writing misses the mark, or try out an intervention in the students' learning that seems to be effective. For example, I have worked with a lecturer in History to introduce an explicit focus on the structure of academic argument into his regular teaching of a first-year subject (Chanock & Tyrrell, 1996). In another example, Iris Vardi (2003) worked with a lecturer teaching a subject on industrial relations, who assessed students on their production and revision of a series of drafts of a single piece of work:

> Those students who had agreed to participate in the study gave the lecturer permission to photocopy, for analysis, all their written texts for the unit, along with the teacher written feedback they had been given. This allowed Vardi to undertake in-depth analysis of the texts, the types of feedback the students had received, how the texts changed over time, and how the changes observed related to the feedback and the assessment process. (Chanock & Vardi, 2005)

The results of these collaborations, and others like them, have been disseminated in conference presentations and publications that are likely to be better known to ALL advisers than to many lecturers in the disciplines; and, as I have already suggested, ALL advisers could readily help lecturers to find venues for their work in SoTL. In Australia, some of my colleagues and I have compiled a list of conferences and journals in which ALL professionals have published (Maxwell *et al.*, 2003). Many of these are in Applied Linguistics and these journals would require authors to show a degree of technical expertise in that field; but others are well suited to SoTL by people in diverse fields.

Conclusion

In all these ways, then, the expansion of SoTL offers opportunities for sharing that may benefit both ALL advisers and lecturers in the disciplines and, hence, benefit the students whom all of us teach. ALL advisers may well be able, in the ways I have suggested, to assist with the uptake of SoTL in our institutions.

Notes

1. 'Academic language and learning', with the acronym 'ALL', has recently replaced the term 'language and academic skills' ('LAS') to refer to this professional field.

References

Ballard, B., & Clanchy, J. (1988). Literacy in the university: An 'anthropological' approach. In G. Taylor, B. Ballard, V. Beasley, H. Bock, J. Clanchy & P. Nightingale, *Literacy by degrees* (pp. 7–23). Milton Keynes: SHRE and Open University Press.

Baum-Brunner, S. (1997). Be not deceived: Looking at historians' and compositionists' views of multiculturalism in freshman composition courses. *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines*, 2(1), 85–95.

Bazerman, C. (1981). What written knowledge does: Three examples of academic discourse. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 11, 361–382.

Boquet, E. (1999). 'Our little secret': A history of writing centers, pre- to post-open admissions. *College Composition and Communication*, 50(3), 463–482.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, C.-J. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (2nd edn). (R. Nice, Trans.). London: Sage. (Original work published 1977).

Canagarajah, S. (2002). Multilingual writers and the academic community: Towards a critical relationship. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 1, 29–44.

Chanock, K. (2004a). *Introducing students to the culture of enquiry in an Arts degree*. Milperra, NSW: Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia (HERDSA).

Chanock, K. (2004b). A shared focus for WAC, writing tutors and EAP: Identifying the 'academic purposes' in writing across the curriculum. *The WAC Journal*, 15, 19–32.

Chanock, K., East, J., & Maxwell, J. (2004). Academic &/or general? How the classification of LAS advisers affects us and our institutions. In K. Dellar-Evans & P. Zeegers (Eds.), *Language and academic skills in higher education, Vol. 6*. Adelaide, SA: Flinders University.

Chanock, K., & Tyrrell, A. (1996). *An academic argument: Content and structure*. (Videorecording). Melbourne: La Trobe University.

Chanock, K., & Vardi, I. (2005). *Data: We're standing in it!* TL Forum 'The Reflective Practitioner', Perth, Western Australia. Retrieved August 11, 2005, from http://lsn.curtin.edu.au/tlf/tlf2005-contents-all.html

Clifford, J., & Marcus, G. (Eds.). (1986). *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Dearn, J. (2004). Response by HERDSA to the Learning and Teaching Performance Fund Issues Paper. Retrieved August 12, 2005, from http://www.herdsa.org.au/submissions.php

Department of Education, Science and Technology (DEST). (2002). *Higher education review process. Striving for quality: Learning, teaching and scholarship, 6. Future challenges and ways forward*. Retrieved June 18, 2006 from http://www.backingaustraliasfuture.gov.au/pubs.htm#2

DEST & Australian Universities Teaching Committee. (2003a). *Our universities: Backing Australia's future*. Policy paper 13. May 2003. Retrieved January 21, 2007, from http://www.backingaustraliasfuture.gov.au/policy_paper/1.htm

DEST and Australian Universities Teaching Committee (September 2003). (2003b). *National Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education discussion paper.* Retrieved January 2, 2005, from http://www.dest.gov.au/highered/learning_teaching/paper.htm#1

Department of Education, Science and Technology (DEST). (2004). *Learning and teaching in higher education: Learning and teaching fund.* Retrieved January 21, 2005, from http://www.dest.gov.au/highered/learning_teaching/p_fund_default.htm. (For the Learning and Teaching Fund Issues Paper, click on the link at this site.)

Fox, H. (1994). Listening to the world: Cultural issues in academic writing. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Gaither, G. (1998). The future dynamics of quality assurance: Promises and pitfalls. In G. Gaither (Ed.), *Quality assurance in higher education: An international perspective. New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 99. Vol. XXV*,no. 3 (pp. 87–91). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Geertz, C. (1998). *Works and lives: The anthropologist as author.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Gilbert, G., & Mulkay, M. (1984). *Opening Pandora's box: A sociological analysis of scientists' discourse.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Herrington, A., & Moran, C. (Eds.). (1992). *Writing, teaching, and learning in the disciplines.* New York: Modern Language Association.

Hutchings, P., Babb, M., & Bjork, C. (2002). *The scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education: An annotated bibliography revised and updated, Fall 2002.* Available at the website of The Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Retrieved November 19, 2006, from http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/elibrary/docs/bibliography.htm

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

Ivanic, R., & Camps, D. (2001). I am how I sound: Voice as self-representation in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(1-2), 3–33. Retrieved July 26, 2002, from http://www.sciencedirect.com

Johns, A. (1997). *Text, role and context: Developing academic literacies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Knorr-Cetina, K. (1981). The manufacture of knowledge: An essay on the constructivist and contextual nature of science. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Langer, J. (1992). Speaking of knowing: Conceptions of understanding in academic disciplines. In A. Herrington & C. Moran (Eds.), *Writing, teaching, and learning in the disciplines* (pp. 69–85). New York: Modern Languages Association.

Latour, B., & Woolgar, S. (1986). *Laboratory life: The social construction of scientific facts* (2nd edn). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

La Trobe University. (2004). *The learning and teaching operational plan 2005–2008.* Retrieved June 18, 2006, from http://www.latrobe.edu.au/teaching/assets/downloads/Operational_plan.pdf

Lea, M., & Street, B. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education, 23*(2), 157–171.

Le Ha, P. (2001). How do culturally situated notions of 'polite' forms influence the way Vietnamese postgraduate students write academic English in Australia? *Australian Journal of Education, 45*(3), 296–309.

Leki, I. (1992). *Understanding ESL writers: A guide for teachers.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton Cook.

Linton, P., Madigan, R., & Johnson, S. (1994). Introducing students to disciplinary genres: The role of the general composition course. *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines, 1*(2), 63–78. Retrieved June 18, 2006, from http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/archives.cfm

McCarthy, L., & Walvoord, B. (1988). Models for collaborative research in writing across the curriculum. In S. McLeod (Ed.), *Strengthening programs for writing across the curriculum. New Directions for teaching and learning*,no. 36 (pp. 77–89). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

MacDonald, S. (1987). Problem definition in academic writing. *College English, 49*, 315–331.

Matalene, C. (1985). Contrastive rhetoric: An American writing teacher in China. *College English*, *47*, 789–808.

Maxwell, J., Chanock, K., & East, J. (2003). *Promoting our work through publishing: A prolific and diverse bibliography of LAS publications.* Paper presented at the 2003 Biannual Language and Academic Skills in Higher Education Conference held 24–25 November 2003, at Flinders University, Adelaide, Australia.

Meyer, R. (1988). The comprehension gap: Reflections on staff–student misunderstandings in respect of language. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *7*, 79–89.

Nelson, J., Megill, A., & McCloskey, D. (Eds.). (1987). *The rhetoric of the human sciences: Language and argument in scholarship and public affairs.* Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Odell, L. (1992). Context-specific ways of knowing and the evaluation of writing. In A. Herrington. & C. Moran (Eds.), *Writing, teaching, and learning in the disciplines* (pp. 86–98). New York: Modern Language Association.

Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language.* Harlow, Essex, England; New York: Longman.

Saunders, C., & Clarke, J. (1997). Negotiating academic genres in a multi-disciplinary context. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *21*(3), 297–306.

Squires, G. (1990). *First degree: The undergraduate curriculum.* Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Tapper, J., & Gruba, P. (2000). Using a 'conference' model to teach communication skills in a communication across the curriculum program. *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines*, *4*(1), 55–65.

Vardi, I. (2003). *Tertiary student writing, change and feedback: A negotiation of form, content and contextual demands.* Unpublished PhD, The University of Western Australia, Perth, Australia.

Wilkinson, L., & Olliver-Gray, Y. (2006). The significance of silence: Differences in meaning, learning styles and teaching strategies in cross-cultural settings. *Psychologia*, *49*(2), 74–88. Retrieved November 19, 2006, from http://www.educ.kyoto-u.ac.jp/cogpsy/psychologia.

Zamel, V., & Spack, R. (Eds.). (1998). *Negotiating academic literacies.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.