CRLL International Conference 24 – 25th June 2005
"What Difference a Pedagogy Makes

Key note Paper:

"Just Do It: Literacies, Everyday Learning and the Irrelevance of Pedagogy"

Mary Hamilton

Professor of Adult Learning and Literacy
Department of Educational Research
Lancaster University
Lancaster LA1 4YL

Tel 01524 592679
Fax 01524 844788
Email: m.hamilton@lancaster.ac.uk

Introduction: In this paper I want to think about informal learning and end up with some ideas that maybe relevant to designing and facilitating formal learning opportunities for adults.

My area of study is literacy and numeracy and I want to bring to the attention of a general lifelong learning audience the important body of research on everyday literacies that has developed over the last 20 years. This is the kind of work that becomes a way of life. When I travel, in my home town or away, I take pictures of the graffiti and public signs. I notice how people stop to read maps together on city corners and how other people help them do this.

As an educator, my commitments are to the learning needs of adults who got little from their initial schooling. These commitments don't necessarily define me as a "teacher" or place me in a classroom. Most adults who express the need for support with literacy or numeracy never take part formally in lifelong learning. I keep an open mind on what the solutions to their learning needs might look like.

The Bigger Landscape of Informal Learning

What I have to say is part of a much bigger landscape of pedagogies and informal learning (Coffield 2000; Eraut, 2000; Schuller et al, 2004). I don't plan to review this literature in any detail in this paper, but simply to set down some anchor points within it for the more specific work I will be describing. As Gorard (2005) points out, by definition it is extremely hard to capture "informal learning" in a way that researchers can agree upon and operationalise. This hasn't stopped people from trying, however, and we do now have some large-scale studies of the extent of informal adult learning and how its patterns compare with participation in formal adult learning.

Karin Tusting in her review of recent literature on informal learning, identifies four features of informal learning that have commonly been used to recognise and place learning on a continuum of formal/informal: the setting where learning takes place, the degree of flexibility and planning; the approach to accreditation and external specification of outcomes; the nature of the relationship between expert and learner (Tusting, 2003 p 12). David Livingstone offers the following definition, used in his own survey work:

> "informal learning is any activity involving the pursuit of understanding, knowledge or skill which occurs outside the curricula of educational institutions, or the course or workshops offered by educational or social agencies. The basic terms of informal learning (e.g. objectives, content, means and processes of acquisition, duration, evaluation or outcomes, applications) are determined by the individual and groups that choose to engage in it. Informal learning is undertaken on one's own, either individually or collectively, without either externally imposed criteria or the presence of an institutionally authorised instructor."
>
> **(Livingstone, 2000, p 2).**

Like Eraut (2000), Livingstone distinguishes between explicit and tacit forms of learning and notes that self-report about informal learning is difficult because people often do not recognise embedded learning in the everyday flow of activity.

Canada has a long tradition of interest in adult intentional self-study starting with Tough (1970), most recently the work of David Livingstone. From his country-wide survey, Livingstone (2000) claims that adults in Canada now spend an average of 15 hours per week on intentional, informal learning, that this activity has been increasing over time and that while participation in formal adult learning courses shows the familiar patterns of increasing incidence with social class, success in initial schooling, and other indicators of social well-being and prosperity (see, for example Sargant, 2000; Ferri et al 2003) - informal learning defies these patterns and does *not* decline amongst those who are poorer, older, in less skilled employment or with fewer educational qualifications. It therefore turns the usual arguments about participation in learning on their head. Combining this with a further finding that most Canadian adults feel that their skills and expertise are not fully used in their jobs Livingstone argues that the challenge for employers, governments and educators is "to identify actual local pools of knowledge and skills, local possibilities for greater employee participation in their enterprises, new forms of work in the community and other mean of matching peoples underused skills and knowledge with local economic needs…."Canadian adults generally have unprecedented levels of education and informal knowledge but they need better jobs in which to apply their knowledge" (p15). He concludes: "Class differences in the incidence of different types of adult learning activities confirm the existence of a massive egalitarian informal learning society hidden beneath the pyramidal class structure of forms of schooling and further education."

Livingstone's finding of a radically different pattern of learning activities is confirmed in more closely focussed recent studies from the US. Reder (in press) from a carefully structured longitudinal sample of adults in Portland, Oregon finds that adults regularly engage in self-directed efforts to improve their basic reading, writing and maths skills and prepare for the GED high school equivalency certificate. As Livingstone found, the typical pattern with higher participation among groups with higher social standing or educational achievement does not hold with this kind of learning and adults with the lowest levels of literacy engaged in more self study with progressively declining proportions as skill levels increase. For many adults, the self-study activities complement their involvement with formal programmes. When Reder looked at those who successfully achieved their GED, the highest percentage of achievement was amongst those adults who engaged in both self-study and a formal programme. But if only one form of study was used, then self-study alone was more successful than simply attending a formal programme. Similar findings are reported by Comings et al (1999).

It is possible of course that these findings do not apply outside of North America. Recent work on the relationship between ICT and lifelong learning by Stephen Gorard and his colleagues used a more demanding definition of informal learning (a learning interest that was sustained for at least one year) and this produced a pattern of participation that mirrors that of formal adult learning (Gorard and Selwyn 2005). Nevertheless, the pattern of findings emerging from the North American surveys provide

an intriguing backdrop to the insights emerging from ethnographies of everyday literacies on both sides of the Atlantic and in a many other countries.

Everyday Literacies and Informal learning: what have we learned from recent ethnographic studies?

Having set the scene I want to focus for the rest of this paper on the body of research that has become known as the New Literacy Studies (NLS). This has developed over the last 20 years and offers specific and detailed ethnographic evidence about the way in which people learn about and with the written word, both in and outside of formal educational settings.[1]

This work is a specialist interest within lifelong learning but it has important implications for the whole field. It leads us directly to the study of informal learning and everyday practices and part of the bigger picture it reveals is how literacy itself, as a powerful semiotic and communicative technology, has a crucial role to play in the organization and shaping of regimes of knowledge, especially in the high status academy. The NLS recognises, as Barton (2001) puts it, that we live, increasingly in a "textually mediated world". In this respect the NLS has converged with macro-level sociological and anthropological theory (see Appleby and Hamilton, in press; Barton and Hamilton, in press). For example, Dorothy Smith (1990) has identified the central role of texts in defining the "relations of ruling"; Holland and Lave (2001) show how cultural artefacts including texts help bring into being new "figured worlds". Other relevant work includes Strathern (2000) on audit cultures; La Tour (1987) and Law (1994) on "mutable mobiles" and Wenger (1998) on "reifications" and "boundary objects" in communities of practice. Bernstein's (1996) ideas about classification, framing and recontextualising knowledge within official, pedagogical domains, are also entirely relevant here.

In the following section I will run briefly through the contours of the considerable body of evidence that has been assembled by the NLS and review some of the key concepts, both analytical and methodological that have emerged from it. The roots of this work lie in the ethnography of communication and situated learning theory based in the Vygotskian tradition. Shirley Brice Heath (1983), Brian Street (1984), James Gee (1990), Sylvia Scribner and Michael Cole (1981) all have played key founding roles. There are several recent reviews and edited collections that offer an overview of the main features of this body of work: these include Barton et al, 2000; Hodge 2004; Hull and Schultz, 2002; Martin-Jones and Jones (2000) and Street 1993, 2004.

Many studies have now researched everyday/family and community groups. Shirley Brice Heath (1983) compared the effects of different cultures on children's preparation for literacy learning in school. Street (1984) examined the roles of literacy in Iranian society contrasting schooled, commercial and religious traditions. Later studies include Taylor and Dorsey-Gaines (1988); Purcell-Gates 1995); Merrifield et al (1997); Barton and Hamilton (1998); Barton and Hall (2000).

In the area of workplace learning and literacy, there are several excellent studies that have indicated the relation between literacy and the re-organisation of work under conditions of the new capitalism (see Gowen 1992; Gee, Hull and Lankshear, 1996; Iedema and Scheeres, 2003; Belfiore et al, 2004. Several of the studies in the collection from South Africa edited by Princeloo (1996) explore work-related literacies at a point of major societal change. This work relates to a much wider body of knowledge we

---

[1] Some of this work – including seminal studies by Sylvia Scribner (1984); Jean Lave and Terezina Nunes – have focused on numeracy in both everyday life and employment. These studies are reviewed in Coben, 2003: see especially the section by Dhama Colwell on "Investigating the Use of Mathematics in Everyday Life" pp. 40-46.

have about informal, incidental and apprenticeship learning in the workplace (see, for example Gherardi et al, 1998; Fuller et al, 2005).

Fishman, 1988; Tusting, 2000, Kapiske, 1995; Street (1984); and Scribner and Cole's (1981) original work in Liberia, all looked at how literacies are specifically configured in religious domains. In her book "Toxic Literacies" Taylor has looked at bureaucratic literacies and the ways in which they define and impact upon the lives of poor and marginalized people in the US (Taylor 1996). Wilson (2000) has looked at everyday literacies of prisoners.

An increasing number of studies have focused on new electronic communications technologies and the literacies involved in these. Lankshear and Michele Knobel (2001,2,3,) have written extensively about the emerging varieties of internet use, especially among young adults; Snyder (1997) has looked at the transition of literacies from page to screen; Gee (2004) has rescued video computer games from the accusation that they are just "meaningless play" (p21). There are ethnographies from within media and cultural studies that also touch on the same areas, for example Ang (1996) on the use of videos in the home and women's attitudes toward them.

Some research has documented learning within both everyday and educational settings, for example Lutrell (1997); Fingeret and Drennan (1997); Lea and Street, 1998. A new generation of scholars and projects are now beginning to report additional data, including Uta Papen on literacy and tourism, and health literacies; the Literacies for Learning in FE project represented at this conference; the Adult Learners Lives project at Lancaster University and the Changing Faces history project that has interviewed a sample of adults with basic skills needs selected from the National Child Development Study.

Key Concepts emerging from the New Literacy Studies.

In their recent review of these research studies, Glynda Hull and Katherine Schultz (2001) remark:

> "empirical, field-based research on out-of-school literacy has led to some major theoretical advances in how we conceptualize literacy…….when researchers examined literacy in out-of-school contexts they often arrived at new constructs that proved generative for literacy studies." (p. 578)

These constructs include the performative notions of literacy as constituted in observable *events* (Heath, 1993) and *practices* (Street, 1984) as the general cultural ways of using written language which people draw on in their everyday lives. Practices include the values, attitudes, feelings and relationships associated with using written texts. Hamilton (2000) has suggested that the "building blocks" of the theory are participants, domains, settings, activities and artefacts where the idea of "artefacts" fits in with Vygotskian notions of written texts as key cultural tools mediating the construction of shared meanings in human interaction. Street (1984) disputed the claim made by an earlier generation of theorists that literacy has universal cognitive effects on the human mind. Rather he sees it as situational, taking its meaning and impact from the social context within which it is embedded. He introduced the distinction between autonomous and ideological approaches to literacy to capture this point: literacy is not only embedded in the flow of everyday activities, but is configured by the institutional life of organizations that shape such activities, the ideologies and social relations that frame them.

The idea of vernacular and dominant/institutional discourses was added by Barton and Hamilton (1998) to articulate the contrast between the moment-by-moment ways in which people take hold of literacy for themselves, to serve their own purposes and needs and officially sanctioned, standardised institutional discourses of literacy. Vernacular literacies can occur in any setting. They frequently involve informal

learning, impromptu strategies and the use of immediately available resources. They are often invisible, submerged, ignored, treated as trivial or of little value. They may be treated as illegal or undesirable. They are part of the "figured worlds" of participants (Bartlett and Holland, 2002).

Finally, the NLS emphasises that the agency for literacy is often distributed and can be collaborative: literacy acts are interactions between people, sometimes face to face but often at a distance. This leads to the notion of literacy as a community resource, an aspect of social capital. It also leads to questions such as: who facilitates literacy learning and use? Who has access and how? How do texts circulate and through whose agency? Who can produce and access them?

According to Hull and Schultz (2002), the accumulating body of evidence from the new literacy studies shows us a shifting landscape of home, community, work and schools; it demonstrates the close connection between literacy practices, identities and discourses; how literacy practices in and out of formal education are shaped by power and ideology so that literacy is configured differently in different settings. The work emphasises historical change, plurality and diversity – hence the term *literacies* is preferred over "literacy".

What this work has to say about how Literacies are learned informally.

There is a lot to say about the contributions of this work but I am going to limit my observations here to pulling out some points that are relevant to the theme of this conference – that is what they have to tell us about pedagogies and informal, everyday interactions around literacy.

1. Firstly, literacy **scribes, brokers, mediators and advocates are** ubiquitous in the data from these studies. The specific roles of these brokers vary across settings and participants (whether in the home, prison or workplace) but the role is not one of "scaffolding" in a Vygotskian sense because roles of expert and novice are fluid. The same person can be novice at one moment, expert the next, with a change of situation or topic. Expertise and support are offered within reciprocal relationships, exchanges of skills and services. Particularly useful brokers are those who can mediate between the local, everyday, informal world and the world of official institutional Literacies.

2. Scribing and brokering involves shared activity around written texts, opportunities for give and take between people with different attributes, supporting different kinds of identities. In particular, there is a large amount of **intergenerational learning** especially around ICT and where new languages have to be learned. Literacy is dynamic. Changing contexts, history, cultural change and dislocation affect peoples' abilities to demonstrate their skilfulness. Adults learn from children. Children learn from grandparents and from their friends and siblings. The fluidity of relationships supports different authority relations, and hence different identities. Individuals retain autonomy and control over how far, how fast or whether at all to learn. The evidence about scribes and brokers leads to idea of **networks** and the importance of social capital is certainly borne out in this data.

3. This work gives us a wealth of information about **motivations** – why people engage with literacy. It describes when and where learning happens when the learner takes the lead. Literacy fits within the flow of everyday practices and takes its chance. Much informal learning is part of what de Certeau (1984) has called the "tactics of everyday life" – activities that people carry out to make life habitable, as much to sustain life and to survive, as to transform it. Recent data from the Adult Learners Lives project identifies "points of learning" - right and wrong moments for transformative learning to happen. These points of learning are often moments of tension and change and they support changing identities as well as technical skills (see Fingeret and Drennan, 1997). Triggers for learning are often related to external events and accidents: legal or health-related issues, for example

that demand sudden action and resolution (see as an extreme example Callan,1997, who was wrongly accused of murder and assembled his legal case from within prison).

4. Less well explored, but provocative, are findings suggesting that different **yardsticks for judging success** are relevant to performance in everyday learning contexts. Informal learning offers instant feedback on efficacy, relevant to current level of performance. There are plenty of examples of everyday assessment (dog shows, poetry slams, vegetable competitions, fell runs and talent contests) but "what counts" as success is locally defined within a specific community of practice.

5. Everyday literacy learning offers **physical immersion** in the targeted activity, opportunities for "hands on" participation and practice. It uses all the senses. Everyday learning is do-it-yourself. It scavenges available resources and expertise, appropriating these to new ends. It is "making do" "bodging" and "getting by", "just doing it". All these phrases are used repeatedly in interviews with adults. The tactics of everyday learning are relentlessly instrumental in the sense of shaping what is available to self-perceived meanings and priorities, to imaginative spaces that Barratt and Holland (2002) call "figured worlds". It resists external definitions, labels and judgements unless they are fit for purpose.

6. A final, far reaching point is that everyday literacy learning does not respect boundaries between **different communication media**. It uses oral or written language, images, equations, symbols, sound, music, gestures, graphs, artefacts. Phone, screen, print, face-to-face interaction are used in combination and interchangeably, dependent on the task, convenience of access and preferred learning styles. This has led writers such as Kress (2003) and Gee (2004) to talk about "semiotic landscapes" or domains that are used to communicate distinctive types of meanings." Everyday learning operates with activities and meanings created in a multi-modal space and resists attempts to categorise by particular types of technology.

Is it enough to "Just do it"? Pedagogues fight back

The points about the nature of informal literacies and learning discussed above have now been rehearsed in many places and are in the process of becoming new orthodoxies in arguing for the significance, pervasiveness, richness and positive diversity of everyday practice. The critique that emerges from these insights from everyday learning is that formal pedagogies can actually hinder, get in the way of learning rather than support it. That they colonise learning, standardise, reduce, reproduce inequalities, sap motivations, channel or are irrelevant to learning, stop innovations, slow things down. They lag behind the everyday, they fail to engage motivations, they emphasise a narrow range of achievements and ways of being, they hone, simplify, they ignore as they educate, don't acknowledge or artefacts as key mediators of learning. Pedagogies impose authoritarian relationships and particular methods and routines of study – book learning rather than action and application.

This critique might lead policy makers to conclude that we should leave adults to their own devices and allow then to "just do it". That formal pedagogies and learning opportunities are irrelevant to extending their learning. However, formal pedagogues can fight back. They might point out that informal learning is a poor alternative to carefully designed formal learning spaces. That such learning is frequently tacit, incidental, serendipitous and uneven distributed, unresourced, unresolved, invisible. It reproduces inequalities through limited and sometimes malicious or untrustworthy networks. It is so diverse as to be meaningless. It is unfocussed, subservient and reactive to the accidents of everyday events and needs. Beyond the reciprocal relations of everyday networks it is all "use" and no "exchange" value. They could argue that there is a great deal that formal pedagogy can offer that, by definition, is not available from informal learning and that although studies of informal literacy learning pose a valid and radical

challenge to formal education, they inevitably also reveal the limitations of such learning. They might argue for continued state funding to support adult learning – though the institutional and interactional shape of these initiatives may turn out to be very different from what we have at present.

So, in this final section of the paper I want to sketch some preliminary thoughts about what formal learning opportunities and pedagogies might add, when seen through the lens of the strengths and limitations of the everyday - what do they do well and how could they build on the positives of informal learning practices, support and enhance them through the particular strengths that formal learning environments have to offer? This might reveal the reasons why adults sometimes allow themselves to be enrolled in lifelong learning, with all the loss of control, taking on of new identities and external moderation of learning that this involves.

Firstly, formal pedagogy can, like other interactional domains, offer a community of practice, peer discussion and support. Better than relying on chance and the same old local faces, within formal education people can actively seek to explore *new* affinity groups. Within these, they can find different perspectives on a topic that can offer challenging and transformative experiences. Of course, such challenge and change is not always sought by the learner nor is it always offered in a particular learning group. Sometimes people are hoping to maintain their existing skills and identities, rather than challenge them It depends on their "point of learning". A mismatch will impede their progress.

Meeting and comparing new perspectives is an invitation to reflect and move on. The haphazard, incidental, speedy and reactive nature of informal learning can make it hard to step back and reflect. As Bernstein (1986) noted, the chance for reflective time apart and systematic attention to a particular focus is another feature that can be particularly well supported by a formal pedagogy. At its best such reflective space can open up a critical awareness of genres and power relations (see Street, 2005 p.5). Unpacking and making the requirements of an educational context explicit is empowering to learners. However, pulling a topic out of the flux of everyday activity that actually fuels the impetus for learning in the first place is a tricky business, whether this is within an educational setting or, as Jim Gee has explored, in the context of designing a good video game. Getting the balance right between transmitting overt information and guidance, and immersion in the "doing" should be seen, he suggests, as two fingers on the same hand, not as alternative hands (on the one, on the other…..) in competition with one another (Gee 2004, p. 114).

Informal learning resists the disciplinary organisation of formal pedagogy, the reference to what Bernstein (1986) has described as a "vertically" organized frame of reference that sees knowledge in terms of progressive levels. It shuns this in preference to its own "horizontally" organized logic of everyday application and relevance. It often resists the evaluation and documentation of performance by external judgement and evidence. However, the disciplinary structuring of a topic area is a virtue for learners who appreciate a map of what is known and what remains to be known; a secure structure for reflecting and developing, an external basis for curriculum and assessment. Discipline and system can be welcome short-cuts to those prepared to submit to them. In return for autonomy and control of learning on your own terms, formal pedagogies open the door to exchange value and certification. They offer external yardsticks for assessment and feedback. They lead to credibility, comparability with others. They offer externally validated status which in turn affects feelings of self-efficacy. Formal learning tracks people into the system of educational qualifications. These characteristics of formal pedagogies are both valued and feared for their very real legitimising power.

Finally, formal pedagogies can offer new resources. They can offer systematic access to acknowledged experts and to tried and tested methods and routines of study that it is hard for people to muster in informal, everyday settings. At their best, they can *extend* the range of resources that are accessed by

informal learning and build on these. They can acknowledge and – further - *increase* awareness of the possible range of learning strategies.

Concluding Notes

The work of social theorists such as Smith, Foucault and Bernstein have shown convincingly that forms of knowledge are defined, shaped and legitimated by power relations. This means that landscapes of learning can be analysed as topographies of power[2]. Research on everyday literacies and learning opens up a perspective on this terrain that is informative to all educators.

"Informal learning" may take place inside or outside of the educational domain. Where it takes place outside of education, it may still be shaped by the constraints of other social institutions, even though the focus of those institutions is not primarily education, or learning. Workplaces shape learning, so do churches and welfare agencies. Even within the family or local neighbourhood, custom and habit shape the choices and discourses that are allowed, patterning them by gender, class, culture, disability.

Thus, the "everyday world " is not a wild moor land of learning: it is colonised by powerful knowledge-making institutions and practices that jostle with one another – media, medical, legal, religious, consumer, workplace, family. Education is just one, specialised domain within this landscape.

This means, that, just like formal education, informal everyday learning has its strengths and constraints, its up sides and downsides. A metaphorical view of literacy might see in its historical development a parallel with the enclosure of common land. This process is currently going on apace with the enclosure of the intellectual commons through copyright, regulation of the internet and surveillance of on-line learning *[see http://creativecommons.org]*. We have recently seen the enclosure of adult literacies in England with the imposition of a core curriculum, fixed levels of competence and a national test.

Teachers and learners have much to learn about one another. We need pedagogies that assume, as their starting point, the richness and complexity of everyday literacies, pedagogies that are informed by ethnographic, reflective stances (as in Hamilton, 1999); that keep in touch with change, that are responsive, exploratory, that ask questions……..that are prepared to constantly challenge the institutional walls we build around learning, not just inviting in but going out, barefoot into the everyday world. Teachers need to become better informed about the communication competences, discursive and rhetorical repertoires of their learners, in order to acknowledge these within formal learning and create opportunities for adults to demonstrate what they know. We need to pay careful attention to what it means for learners sense of control and identity to enter an educational setting which is also new field of social relations. Entering a new community of practice involves repositioning oneself rhetorically as well as being initiated into new practices. Both are important. As Rachel Hodge concludes " We need to draw on people's insights into how they learn, their theories about literacy and education and the vernacular and informal strategies they use to learn new literacies in order to make the crucial links between peoples literacy practices and their education" (Hodge, 2003, p. 6).

None of this is rocket science and much of it has always been recognised by good adult education. However, the enclosed spaces we now operate within make it harder and harder to keep these approaches in mind and to act on them. Their articulation through the theory and evidence offered by the new literacy studies is an important contribution to keeping them on the horizon and to supporting the

---

[2] topography is defined as: the precise mapping of the configuration of material features of a place or region, with especial attention given to relative elevation and positioning – the shape of the land, the lay of the land, the contours, the patterns.

informal tactics of learners wherever and whenever these take place – not necessarily within the enclosed spaces of formal education which are – as I have argued elsewhere (Hamilton, 2002) just one kind among many "access points" for literacy that need to be supported alongside one another.

References

Allen, D., Davies, P., McRae, D., Niks, M. & Nonesuch, K. (2003) *Dancing in the Dark. How do Adults with Little Formal Education Learn? How do Practitioners do Collaborative Research?* National Literacy Secretariat. Province of BC Ministry of Advanced Education

Ang I (1996) *LivingRoomWars: Rethinking Media Audiences for a Postmodern World* London: Routledge.

Appleby, Y. and Hamilton, M. (in press) Literacy as social practice: Travelling between the Everyday and other Forms of Learning. To appear in Peter Sutherland and Jim Crowther (eds) *Lifelong Learning: Concepts and Contexts*. Routledge.

Bartlett, L. and D. Holland, (2002) Theorizing the space of literacy practices. *Ways of Knowing 2 (1)* 10-22. Brighton, Sussex: UK.

Barton, D and Hamilton, M. (1998*) Local literacies: reading and writing in one community.* London: Routledge.

Barton, D. (2001) Directions for literacy research: analysing language and social practices in a textually mediated world. *Language and Education 15: 2 & 3* 92-104.

Barton, D. and Hall, N. (2000) (eds) *Letter writing as Social Practice*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.

Barton, D. and Hamilton, M. (in press) Literacy, reification and the dynamics of social interaction. in Barton, D. and Tusting, K. (eds) *Beyond Communities of Practice* Oxford University Press.

Barton, D., M. Hamilton and R. Ivanič (eds) (2000) *Situated Literacies: Reading and Writing in Context.* London: Routledge.

Belfiore, M. E., T. Defoe, S. Folinsbee, J. Hunter and N. S. Jackson, (2004) *Reading Work: Literacies in the New Workplace.* London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Ch 1.

Bernstein, B. (1996) *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity: Theory, Research, Critique*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Blacker, F. (1995) Knowledge, Knowledge Work and Organizations: An Overview and Interpretation *Organizational Studies* 16: 6 1021-1046.

Brandt, T. and K. Clinton (2002) Limits of the local: expanding perspectives on literacy as a social practice. *Journal of Literacy Research, 34 (3)* 337-356.

Callan K (1997), *Kevin Callan's Story, London:* Little, Brown and Co (UK).

Chaiklin, S. and Lave, J. (1993) (eds) *Understanding practice: perspectives on activity and context* Cambridge; New York, N.Y. Cambridge University Press.

Coben, D. (2003) *Adult Numeracy: Review of Research and Related Literature*. London: National Research and Development Centre for Adult literacy and Numeracy.

Coffield, F. (2000) (ed) *The Necessity of Informal Learning*. Bristol: The Policy Press.

de Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Comings, J. Parrella, A. and Soricone, L.(1999). Persistence among adult basic educaiotn students in pre-GED classes. NCSALL Reports #12. Cambridge, MA: NCSALL.

Eraut, M (2000) 'Non-formal learning and tacit knowledge in professional work,' *British Journal of Educational Psychology,* 70:1, 113-136.

Ferri, E. Bynner, J. and Wadsworth, M. (2003) *Changing Britain, Changing Lives: Three Generations at the Turn of the Century*. Institute of Education, London.

Fingeret, H., and Drennan, C. (1997) *Literacy for life: adult learners, new practices*. New York: Teachers College Press Language and Literacy Series.

Fishman, A. (1988) *Amish literacy: What and How it Means* Portsmouth, NH. Heinemann.

Fuller, A. Hodkinson, H., Hodkinson, P. and Unwin, L. (2005) "Learning as peripheral participation in communities of practice a reassessment of key concepts in workplace learning." *British Educational Research Journal.* Vol. 31:1, pp. 49-68.

Gee, J. (1990) *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses*. Lewes: The Falmer Press.

Gee, J. Hull, G. and Lankshear, C. (1996) *Literacy and the New Work Order: Behind the Language of the New Capitalism.* St Leonards: Allen and Unwin.

Gee, J. (2004) *What Video Games Have to Teach Us About Learning and Literacy* Palgrave MacMillan, 2004.

Gherardi, S. Nicolini, D. and Odella, F. (1998) Toward a Social Understanding of How People Learn in Organizations: The Notion of Situated Curriculum. *Management Learning* Vol 29:3, 273-297.

Gorard, S. (2004) Where Now for ICT and Adult Learning? in *Adults learning* November 2004 Issue, pp. 8-10.

Gorard, S. and Selwyn, N. (2005) Towards a learning society? The impact of technology on patterns of participation in lifelong learning. In *British Journal of Sociology of Education* Vol. 26, No 1. Feb 2005 pp 71-89.

Gowen, S. (1992) *The Politics of Workplace Literacy: A Case Study.* NY: Teachers College Press.

Hamilton. M. (2000) 'Ethnography for the Classroom' in Special Issue of the *Journal of Curriculum Studies* on Literacy in the Curriculum, Vol 7, No.3 pp 429-444.

Hamilton, M. (2000) Using Media Photographs to Explore Literacy as Social Practice. In Barton, D,. Hamilton,M. and Ivanic, R. *Situated Literacies*. London: Routledge.

Hamilton, M. (2001) Privileged literacies: policy, institutional process and the life of the international adult literacy survey" in *Language and Education, Special Issue on The New Literacy Studies* 15:2/3, 178-196.

Hamilton, M. (2002) "Sustainable Literacies and the Ecology of Lifelong Learning" in Harrison, R. Reeve, F. Hanson, A. and Clarke, J. (eds) *Supporting Lifelong Learning Volume 1: Perspectives on Learning*. Routledge/Open University Press pp 176-187.

Hamilton, M. (2005) Understanding the Everyday: Adult Lives, Literacies and Informal Learning. In McKeough, A., Phillips, L., Timmons, V., & Lupart, J. (Eds.). *Understanding Literacy Development: A Global View*. Newark, NJ: Erlbaum Pp. 137-150

Heath, S. B. (1983) *Ways with Words*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hodge, R. (2003) *A review of Recent Ethnographies of Literacy.* Lancaster Literacy Research Centre Working Paper No 1.

Holland, D. and Lave, J. (eds) (2001) *History in Person: enduring struggles, contentious practice* Santa Fe, NM:

School of American Research Press.

Howard, U. (2004) Learning to Write in 19th Century England. *Reflect*. Issue 1, p.18-20. London: National Research and Development Centre for Adult literacy and Numeracy.

Hull, G. (ed.) (1997) *Changing Work, Changing Workers: Critical Perspectives on Language, Literacy, and Skills.* New York: State University of New York Press.

Hull, G. and Schultz, K. (2001) Literacy and learning out of school: a review of theory and practice. In *Review of Educational Research.* l 71:4, 575-611.

Hull, G and Schultz, K (2002) *School's Out! Bridging Out-of-School Literacies with Classroom Practice,* New York, Teachers' College Press.

Iedema, R. and Scheeres, H. (2003) Doing work to talking work: renegotiating knowing, doing, and identity. *Applied Linguistics 24 (3)* 316-337.

Jones, K. (2000) Becoming just another alphanumeric code: farmers' encounters with the literacy and discourse practices of agricultural bureaucracy at the livestock auction. In D. Barton, M. Hamilton and R. Ivanič (eds) *Situated Literacies.* London: Routledge 70-90.

Kapitzke, C. (1995) Literacy and religion: The Textual Politics and Practices of Seventh-day Adventism, Amsterdam: John Benjamin.

Knobel, M. (2005)   Conference paper presented to the "Policy Options and Models for Bridging Digital Divides" Conference Global Challenges of eDevelopment Project, March 14-15, 2005.

Knobel, M. and Lankshear, C. (2001). "Cut, paste, publish: The production and consumption of zines." Paper presented at the State of the Art Conference, Athens, Georgia January 25-28, 2001. In D. Alvermann (Ed.), *New Literacies and Digital Technologies: A Focus on Adolescent Learners*. New York: Peter Lang (2002) [http://www.geocities.com/c.lankshear/zines.html; accessed 6.1.05]

Knobel, M. and Lankshear, C. (2003). *Do-It-Yourself Broadcasting: Writing Weblogs in a Knowledge Society*. Paper presented at the AERA, Chicago, April 21st, 2003.

Kress, G. (2003) *Literacy in a New Media Age*. Routledge.

Kress, G. and T. van Leeuwen, (2001*) Multimodal Discourse: The Modes and Media of Contemporary Communication.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Lankshear, C. Knobel, M. (2002). *"Steps Toward a Pedagogy of Tactics"* Keynote Paper National Council of English Teachers' Assembly for Research Mid-Winter Conference NY, eb 22-24, 2002.

Lankshear, C. and Knobel, M. (2003) *New Literacies: Changing Knowledge and Classroom Learning.* Open University Press.

Latour, B. (1987) *Science in Action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lave, J., and Wenger, E. (1991*) Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Law, J. (1994) *Organizing Modernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lea, M. and Street, B. (1998) Student Writing in Higher Education. *Studies in Higher Education* 23 (2): 157-172.

Livingstone, D.W. (2000). *Exploring the Icebergs of Adult Learning: Findings of the first Canadian Survey of informal learning practices.* NALL Working Paper No. 10.

Livingstone, D.W. (2003). *Hidden Dimensions of Work and Learning: The Significance of Unpaid Work and Informal Learning in Global Capitalism. N*ALL Working Paper No. 3.

Luttrell, W. (1997) *School smart, motherwise: working class women's identity and schooling.* New York: Routledge.

Martin-Jones, M. and Jones, K. (2000) *Multi-lingual Literacies.* Amsterdam: John Benjamin.

Merrifield, J., Bingham,M. B., Hemphill, D., de Marrais, K. (1997) *Life at the margins: Literacy, Language and Technology in Everyday Life.* New York: Teachers College Press Language and Literacy Series.

Princeloo, M. and Breier, M. (eds) 1996 *The Social Uses of Literacy: Theory and Practice in Contemporary South Africa.* Amsterdam: John Benjamin.

Purcell-Gates,V. (1995) *Other people's words: the cycle of low literacy.* Boston: Harvard University Press.

Reder, S. (in press) "Giving Literacy Away, Again: New Concepts of Promising Practice" in A. Belzer and H. Beder (eds) T*oward defining and improving quality in adult basic education: Issues and Challenges.*N J: Erlbaum.

Sargant, N. (2000) *The Learning Divide Revisited*. Leicester: NIACE.

Schuller, T., Bynner, J., Hammond, C., Bassett-Grundy, A., Preston, J. (2004) *The Benefits of Learning*. Routledge.

Scribner, S. (1984) Studying Working Intelligence in B. Rogoff and Lave J. (eds) *Everyday Cognition: Its Development in Social Context*, Cambridge, MA. Harvard university Press.

Scribner, S. and M. Cole (1981) *The Psychology of Literacy.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Smith, D.E (1990) *Texts, facts, and femininity : exploring the relations of ruling*. London : Routledge.

Snyder, I. (1997) (ed) *Page to screen: Taking literacy into the electronic era.* Sydney: Allen & Unwin and London: Routledge.

Strathern, M. (2000) (ed) *Audit Cultures: Anthropological Studies In Accountability, Ethics And The Academy.* Routledge.

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

Street, B. (1993) *Cross-Cultural Approaches to Literacy*. Cambridge: CUP

Street, B. (2004) (ed) *Literacies across Educational contexts: Mediating Learning and Teaching.* Caslon.

Taylor, D., and Dorsey-Gaines, C. (1988) G*rowing up literate: learning from inner-city families.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Taylor, D. (1996) *Toxic Literacies: Exposing Injustices in Bureaucratic Texts.* Portsmouth, NH. Heinemann.

Tough, A. M. (1982) *Intentional changes.* Chicago: Follett.

Tusting, K. (2000) The new literacy studies and time: an exploration. In D. Barton, M. Hamilton and R. Ivanič (eds) *Situated Literacies.* London: Routledge.

Tusting, K. (2003) *A review of Theories of Informal Learning.* Lancaster Literacy Research Centre Working Paper No 2.

Wenger, E. (1998) C*ommunities of practice: learning, meaning and identities.* Cambridge Mass: Cambridge University Press.