What does it mean to read literary works?
The literacy practices, epistemologies, and instructional approaches of
literary scholars and high school English language arts teachers

by

Emily C. Rainey

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Educational Studies)
in the University of Michigan
2015

Doctoral Committee:

    Professor Elizabeth B. Moje, Chair
    Associate Professor Robert B. Bain
    Assistant Professor Gina N. Cervetti
    Associate Professor Megan L. Sweeney

DEDICATION

To my parents, who first taught me the importance of reading

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

time with me. I have sought to carefully represent their ideas and practices throughout this dissertation, and I am thankful to have worked with each of them.

Neither this study nor my doctoral work overall would have been possible without the financial support of Rackham Graduate School and the School of Education at the University of Michigan, and I have benefitted greatly from the funding they offered me. I am especially grateful to have received Joan S. Kessler Award, which supported my final term of writing.

In working with such wonderful educators in this study, I have had many opportunities to reflect on the teachers I've had throughout my years in school. Topping the list are: Carol Barber, my eighth grade English language arts teacher who introduced me to her love of literature; Eric Fitzgerald, my tenth grade leadership teacher who encouraged me to grow in new directions; Dee Grimm, my eleventh grade English language arts teacher and forensics coach who helped me make decisions about college; Scott London, my anthropology professor who guided me through my first social science research study, always taking my ideas seriously; Mark Parker, who exposed me to literary criticism and the academic community of literary studies; and Karen Wixson, who helped me gain my footing in the field of education research and who encouraged me to pursue doctoral studies. It is clear to me the cumulative effect of these individuals and others on my thinking and my life.

I am thankful for my friends and family, both near and far, who have built me up, made me laugh, and reminded me to enjoy the small moments. I am particularly thankful for the encouragement and humor of my brother, Joe, along with my parents, my mother- and father-in-law, and my two sisters-in-law.

And, finally, I am grateful for my husband, Justin, who has participated in this journey alongside me. Over the past twelve years, he has loved and supported me in countless ways. I truly share my achievements, including the completion of this dissertation, with him.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

ABSTRACT

Despite many calls for K-12 disciplinary literacy instruction—instruction that teaches students the specialized ways of reading, writing, and reasoning of the academic disciplines—few researchers have focused on what disciplinary literacy instruction means for the prominent school domain of English language arts (ELA).

This study investigates and compares the disciplinary literacy practices and teaching approaches of a group of ten university-based literary scholars who taught undergraduate literary studies courses and a group of twelve high school ELA teachers who taught with literary works. I conducted semi-structured interviews and think alouds using multiple short stories. Data sources included 71 audio-recorded interviews, along with multiple classroom observations. I used constant comparative analysis (Glaser, 1965) to identify patterns among and across the two groups of participants.

I found that the literary scholars and some of the high school ELA teachers in this study seemed to share some problem-based ways of making meaning with literary works and approaches to teaching students to make meaning with literary works. The remaining high school ELA teachers focused on students' comprehension and strategy use absent disciplinary purposes, and they did not demonstrate disciplinary purposes or practices in their own reading.

I also found major differences among the institutional contexts of this study. Whereas the contexts of the university seemed to support the literary scholars' disciplinary literacy instruction, the contexts of the suburban school district seemed to constrain high school teachers' disciplinary literacy instruction. This pattern of constraint was most notable for the group of

high school teachers who shared literary literacy practices and instructional approaches with the university-based scholars; the more discipline-aligned high school teachers regularly expressed dissatisfaction in their abilities to provide sufficient instruction to their students.

Together, the findings of this study suggest that holding disciplinary understandings and disciplinary literacy practices is necessary but not sufficient for instructors' abilities to provide disciplinary literacy instruction to students. This has implications for literacy education research, teacher education and professional development efforts, and education policy.

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

As a young English language arts (ELA) teacher in an under-resourced middle school in the Arkansas Delta, I worked with bright, funny, and resilient students who often did not find the work of school important. I noticed them confuse and sometimes resist the conventions of academic discourse. The same students who made meaning from all sorts of everyday texts with high proficiency and agency often struggled to read and produce the texts of school. My classroom was generally a happy place, my relationships with students were strong, and we read and wrote a lot. But it was my job to support and build my students' academic literacies, and for that responsibility I was underprepared. Which teaching practices were most effective for supporting students to do the kind of work I knew to be central for college success (i.e., academic reading, writing, and reasoning)? Which particular teaching practices would be effective for my students, in my teaching context? How would I even manage such instruction while responsible for implementing a curriculum largely focused on teaching generic reading strategies like visualizing?

It was these questions that drove me to graduate school. I applied to a master's program with a focus on literacy and culture hoping that the answers to my questions were housed in places of education research. Early in my master's program, I was introduced to disciplinary literacy scholarship and sociocultural theory. I began to develop a new lens for considering my questions, and I recognized the need for new research in the area of adolescent literacy instruction, particularly regarding the academic disciplines related to English language arts.

In this dissertation, I explore the *what* and *how* of teaching young people to make meaning with literature, a central part of the work of English language arts classrooms. I document some of the shared reading, writing, and reasoning practices of university literary studies scholars and high school literature teachers, and I investigate the role of context as a mediator of rigorous literacy instruction at the secondary level.

In the remainder of this chapter, I discuss the study's rationale, provide an overview of the research design, and unpack the constructs central to this study.

Rationale

Called the "civil right of the twenty-first century" by Carol Lee (2004), disciplinary literacy instruction involves engaging all K-12 students with intellectually rich problems and authentic texts so that they move far beyond superficial memorization and actually learn to participate in the academic disciplines (e.g., history, biology). Learning to participate involves learning to read, write, and reason in the specialized ways valued in each discipline for the purposes of learning, questioning existing knowledge, and producing new knowledge (Moje, 2007). Such a vision of K-12 teaching and learning is a giant leap from the rote instruction of the early 20th century. And yet, given the highly complex time in which we live, anything less than rigorous instruction that supports all students in making meaning within and across the disciplines is insufficient (Bain, 2005; Lee, 2007; Moje, 2007, 2008, 2010/2011; Morrell & Duncan-Andrade, 2003; Moses & Cobb, 2001). Moreover, there is mounting evidence that less experienced readers—those who tend to be labeled "struggling" in school contexts and placed in remedial courses focused on basics—thrive when they are taught discipline-specific literacy practices because such instruction stimulates curiosity and offers purpose for schoolwork, among

2

other benefits (e.g., Bain, 2000, 2005; De La Paz, 2005; Greene, 1994; Greenleaf, Schoenbach, Cziko & Mueller, 2001; Lee, 2007; Voss & Wiley, 2000).

Indeed, there is a great deal of agreement that the rigor of K-12 schooling needs to improve and that a focus on teaching all students the unique ways of reading, writing, and reasoning in each academic discipline is central to this pursuit (Lee & Spratley, 2010). Such understanding is marked by policy documents such as the *Next Generation Science Standards* and the *College, Career, and Civic Life Framework for Social Studies*, which describe the disciplinary inquiry and literacy practices that students of various grade bands ought to be learning in the social and natural sciences (NGSS Lead States, 2013; National Council for the Social Studies, 2013). It is thanks in large part to scholarship that has integrated the study of literacy learning with learning in disciplines like history, chemistry, biology, and mathematics that such learning trajectories for students have been mapped (e.g., Bain, 2005; Goldman & Bisanz, 2002; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; Wineburg, 1991a, 1991b, 1998; Yore, Bisanz & Hand, 2003) and teacher education efforts focusing on historical, scientific, and mathematical literacy instruction within inquiry frames have been developed and implemented (Bain, 2012; Bain & Moje, 2012).

The *Common Core State Standards* (*CCSS*), too, reflect a commitment to teaching students to read, write, and reason with complex texts of the natural and social sciences and mathematics (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010). Additionally, almost half of the *CCSS* focus on the learning expectations of ELA, including many standards based on the core expectation that all students will learn to make meaning of complex literary works in sophisticated ways. However, although ELA is a central academic domain in K-12 schooling, the application of disciplinary literacy theory to ELA is relatively underdeveloped, leaving policy

3

makers, teachers, and teacher educators without clear ways of understanding and applying the theory to their work for the benefit of young people (Rainey & Moje, 2012).

There are some indicators that "business as usual" ways of teaching are not working. In general, student assessment scores indicate that nowhere near all students who graduate from high school are mastering reading, writing, and reasoning skills necessary for college (e.g., Rampey, Dion, & Donahue, 2009). A great majority—74% according to one report—of college instructors believe incoming freshmen are underprepared for first-year courses in their content area (ACT, 2013).

Given the emphasis on reading, writing, and reasoning with literary fiction in secondary and post-secondary school reflected in the *CCSS* and other standards documents, the rich possibilities for academic study of literary fiction, the many studies of personal satisfaction and pleasure of adolescents and adults who regularly read literary fiction (e.g., Lee, 2007; Sweeney, 2010), and the longstanding argument that reading literary fiction may even improve empathy (e.g., Kidd & Castano, 2013), high-quality literary instruction is quite important to understand. In particular, if ELA teachers—those who design and occupy critical spaces of literacy learning for young people in schools—are to contribute meaningfully to disciplinary literacy instruction, then disciplinary literacy in ELA must be taken up in research. What are the disciplines that undergird ELA? What is the work of the disciplines that make up ELA? How does the work of ELA reflect, approximate, or contradict the work of members of its core discipline(s)? Finally, what does, or could, disciplinary literacy instruction look like in ELA?

Study Overview: Research Questions and Research Design

In this dissertation study, I seek to describe some of the shared literacy practices of members of literary studies, a discipline in the academy that remains a central part of the K-12

school domain of ELA. Defining specialized ways of reading, writing, and reasoning in literary studies is necessary for setting a vision for what rigorous and authentic learning opportunities might include in ELA and how they differ from those of other domains and disciplines. I also seek to examine the relationship between participants' own literacy practices with literature and their approaches to helping students learn some of those practices within their institutional and cultural contexts.

The research questions guiding my study are:

1. What are the shared ways of reading, writing, and reasoning among those who study literary works?

    a. What literacy practices do they employ when reading literary works, including short stories? What purposes or problems do they bring to reading literary works?

2. How do the literacy practices of those who study literary works relate to their approaches to teaching with literary works?

3. What are high school English language arts teachers' ways of reading, writing, and reasoning with literary works?

    a. What literacy practices do they employ when reading literary works, including short stories? What purposes or problems do they bring to reading literary works?

4. How do high school English language arts teachers' literacy practices relate to their approaches to teaching with literary works?

To investigate my questions I used a case study design, with university literary scholars and high school ELA teachers representing individual cases of literary studies practice and

teaching. I conducted semi-structured and verbal protocol interviews with each participant to produce multiple cases. I also observed a subset of participants while they were teaching. In total, I conducted 71 interviews with scholars and teachers. With the cases in mind, I conducted cross-case analyses to look for patterns across the set.

Key Constructs

Multiple constructs shaped the research questions and analysis of this study. In what follows, I define each construct and describe its relationship to the other key constructs.

Cognitive Reading Strategies and Content Area Literacy Instruction

By *cognitive reading strategies*, I mean the literacy processes that cognitive scientists and educational psychologists have demonstrated that readers use strategically to comprehend and produce texts of all types. In their 1991 review, Dole, Duffy, Roehler, and Pearson reported five prominent cognitive reading strategies in the existing body of work: determining importance, summarizing, drawing inferences, generating questions, and monitoring comprehension. Other lists also include visualizing and predicting (Biancarosa & Snow, 2004; National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000). Cognitive reading strategies, often resulting from laboratory studies of undergraduate students, came out of research questions about common patterns of text processing in the mind; they relate to theories of individuals' learning focused on the processes of connecting what is already known with what is new (Kintsch, 1974; Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000).

Content area literacy explores how teachers should be using what is known about cognition, motivation, and interest to guide their teaching of literacy in various content areas (Herber, 1970).   Rather than seeking to teach students to participate in the discourse communities of various academic disciplines, content area literacy approaches focus on helping

6

students "read to learn" subject content by supporting their comprehension of challenging school texts. An example of a content area literacy instructional routine is Reciprocal Teaching, which teaches students a routine for comprehending texts of all types by pausing periodically while reading to summarize a section of the text, generate questions about it, clarify their understanding, and then predict what they will read in the next section (Palincsar & Brown, 1984, 1988).

Domains, Discourse Communities, and Literacy Practices

Sociocultural theories of teaching and learning underpin disciplinary literacy instruction, which evolved out of cognitive and content area literacy research. To begin, the social and cultural contexts of all literacy and learning may be thought of as domains (Gee, 1990). The world itself consists of countless domains. In my life, for example, I regularly move through several domains, like the domain of home, the domain of education research, and the domain of cooking. Other domains include religious groups, social/friend groups, and online communities, to name a few. Each of these domains is equally situated in social and cultural contexts, and each uses language in particular ways.

Because each domain uses language in unique ways, each domain can also be said to make up its own *discourse community*. I base my stance on Gee's (1990) theorization of "Discourses," or the shared ways of speaking, reading, writing, doing and thinking that exist in everyday and academic settings. Gee describes "Discourses" as "clubs with (tacit) rules about who is a member and who is not, and (tacit) rules about how members ought to behave" (p. 143).

Rather than conceptualizing literacy as a static thing, a set of unchanging sub-skills, or a single developmental level one can achieve, sociocultural scholars understand *literacy* as complex sets of tools or practices that one learns to employ with texts in order to participate

within certain discourse communities (Lankshear & Knobel, 2007; Rumelhart, 1984; Street, 1984). Such literacy practices vary based on purposes for communicating, longstanding group norms and conventions, and text features and demands (Scribner & Cole, 1981). Literacy practices include, for example, employing methods of reading that enable the reader to notice and gather the information deemed most important by those within the discourse community or crafting an argument that those within the discourse community would recognize.

Disciplines and Disciplinary Literacy Practices

Academic *disciplines* (e.g., chemistry, mathematics, history), each with their own ways of participation, are discourse communities themselves (e.g., Gee, 1990). Like other discourse communities, they are made up of people who engage in socially and culturally meaningful practices (Moje, 2015). And, like other communities, the knowledge, practices, and values of those within the communities are relatively stable, but they can and do shift over time.

Drawing on landmark pieces like Hirst (1972), Moje and Rainey (in preparation) argue that all disciplinarians act within communities to develop new knowledge. They do this by engaging in cycles of inquiry, including iteratively posing discipline-specific questions, investigating answers to those questions using disciplinary texts and methods, communicating academic arguments, and evaluating their own arguments and the arguments of others. This iterative inquiry cycle fundamentally involves meaning making with texts, and these texts allow disciplinarians to develop and share knowledge across space and time (Kucer, 2001). However, each disciplinary community reads, writes, and reasons in specialized and unique ways, which are driven both by the questions to be answered and by each discipline's histories of participation. By *disciplinary literacy practices*, then, I mean the specialized and shared ways of

reading, writing, and reasoning that enable those within a disciplinary community to learn, question existing knowledge, and produce new knowledge with texts.

Disciplinary Literacy Instruction

By *disciplinary literacy instruction*, I mean approaches to teaching that engage students in learning the specialized and shared ways of reading, writing, and reasoning within and across the disciplines. Put another way, disciplinary literacy instruction is instruction that teaches students to use texts to participate within and across the disciplines. This sort of instruction is not for the purposes of cementing those disciplines in place, because neither the people participating in the disciplines nor their shared practices are static; rather, disciplinary literacy instruction is for the purposes of creating the next generation of thinkers who may question, challenge, and even upend established traditions and practices that are unjust, outdated, or generally ineffective (Moje, 2008; Moje, 2010/2011). Although scholars understand disciplinary literacy instruction in various ways, some have argued that disciplinary literacy instruction is necessarily based in "intellectual problems" or questions that scaffold students' abilities to question existing knowledge and produce new knowledge using disciplinary texts (Bain, 2005; 2012; Moje, 2015). Disciplinary literacy instruction may be understood as different from instruction that focuses on teaching students cognitive reading strategies (e.g., visualizing, summarizing), discrete facts or procedures, or literacy practices outside of an inquiry frame. However, disciplinary literacy instruction could include teaching students cognitive reading strategies, facts, and procedures when they are used in the service of inquiry (Moje, 2015).

The Discipline of Literary Studies and the School Domain of ELA

Literary studies, or literature, has a long, though complicated, history as a discipline (Graff & Warner, 1989). Some scholars have traced its beginnings to the 16th century, when

John Leland and Bishop John Bales created the first Latin catalogues and Francis Thynne issued

a critical review of Thomas Speght's edition of Chaucer (Parker, 1967). Rhetoric, involving

oration and composition, and philology, or what is now called linguistics, too have had long and

relatively separate histories of study and instruction (Parker, 1967).

Thinking of the disciplines within the larger academic domain of "English" may be

surprising to readers who have been accustomed to thinking of literature, rhetoric, and linguistics

as inextricably intertwined. Yet, the merging of these disciplines under one "English" umbrella

did not happen until the late 19th century, a time when higher education was undergoing major

structural changes (Renker, 2010). As a result of increased college enrollment and

specialization, English literature professors were "…eager to increase the prestige of their

subject and the numbers of their students and course offerings by embracing not only linguistics

(including English grammar and the history of the language and even, whenever possible,

comparative philology), but also rhetoric, which normally included, of course, oratory, elocution,

and all forms of written composition" (Parker, 1967, p. 348). This merging of disciplines under

one "English" umbrella did not make more general the distinct, specialized questions and

conventions of each discourse community within it. Today the disciplines still operate as

relatively distinct at the university level, although they are often physically located within the

same buildings and departments.

Within K-12 schools, English language arts is something of a hybrid that includes

learning expectations drawn from each of the parent disciplines. One additional tension is that K-

12 ELA is also often thought of as the place where students learn generic, "transferrable"

academic reading, writing and speaking skills. Yet, careful attention to the parent disciplines of

ELA is necessary for offering students opportunities to develop the specialized ways of participating in disciplinary practice at the post-secondary level and beyond.

Literary Literacy Practices and Instruction

By *literary literacy practices*, I mean the distinct reading, writing, and reasoning practices that participants of literary studies use to make meaning and construct knowledge with texts. And, by *literary literacy instructional practices*, I mean the ways of teaching students the literacy practices necessary for participating in the discourse community of literary studies. Although literary studies is certainly not limited to literary works in the Western canon, I focus this study on more traditional literary texts because of their prominence in school.

Even though it is a bit of a tongue twister, I use the phrase "literary literacy" throughout this dissertation in order to signal that literate practice always occurs within discourse communities and that I am focused on describing one particular discourse community. The literary literacy practices explored and described in this dissertation are not to be understood as equaling "academic literacy" writ large, and neither are they to be understood as more important for students to learn or for teachers and researchers to understand than the literacy practices of other academic disciplines.

<div align="center">Overview of Dissertation</div>

In Chapter Two, I review theoretical and empirical studies related to disciplinary literacy practices and disciplinary literacy instruction.

In Chapter Three, I present the research design and methodologies, including rationale for the use of think alouds. I share details about participant recruitment, interview protocols, and methods of data collection and analysis.

Chapters Four, Five, and Six include the findings of this study. In Chapter Four, I present the literary scholars' shared patterns of reading, writing, reasoning, and teaching with literary works. In Chapter Five, I present high school teachers' patterns of reading, writing, reasoning, and teaching with literary works. In Chapter Six, I explore the mediating role of institutional context on instruction in university and secondary schooling. I describe some of the most prominent ways that literary scholars and high school teachers felt supported and constrained as teaching professionals. In particular, the patterns of institutional constraint reported by the high school teachers help to further describe their approaches to teaching with literary works.

In Chapter Seven, I present the conclusions of this research. I review the major findings and suggest ways the findings might contribute to the teaching of literary thinking and practices in high school and introductory college courses. I offer implications to (a) adolescent and disciplinary literacy researchers, (b) policymakers and school administrators, and (c) teacher educators.

CHAPTER II: THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL PERSPECTIVES

In this chapter, I review what is known about the conventions and literacy practices of predominant academic disciplines, and I argue that more research must be conducted to deeply understand what it means to participate in the discipline of literary studies. I then review what is known about teacher knowledge, beliefs, and literacies, and I argue that more research must be conducted to understand secondary teachers' disciplinary literacy practices and approaches to instruction. Let me begin by briefly situating disciplinary literacy within the field of literacy research.

Situating Disciplinary Literacy Within the Broader Field of Literacy Education

Readers should understand the disciplinary literacy movement within the broader evolution of literacy research and theory. In this section, I will trace two key lines of scholarship that have informed disciplinary literacy to this point, including contributions and limitations of each: cognitive literacy processes and content area literacy instruction.

Reading and Cognition

Beginning in the 1970s, scholars began to consider the cognitive processes that people use to make meaning from texts. Cognitive researchers examined the strategic processing of readers and found that successful readers regularly demonstrated patterns of strategy use when making meaning (Baker & Brown, 1984; Paris, Wasik, & Turner, 1991). The types of strategies employed by readers include determining importance, summarizing or retelling, drawing inferences, generating questions, visualizing, predicting, and monitoring comprehension (Dole,

Duffy, Roehler & Pearson, 1991; Biancarosa & Snow, 2004; National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000). Cognitive writing strategies include outlining, drafting, revising, and editing (Flower & Hayes, 1977; 1981).

One important part of strategic reading involves metacognitive awareness, or the ability to think about one's own thinking (Paris & Jacobs, 1984). Metacognitive readers are those who know about themselves as readers, have a toolkit of reading strategies, know how to use strategies, and know when and why to use strategies (Paris, Lipson & Wixson, 1983). Metacognitively aware readers were found to be both more strategic and better meaning-makers than students with less developed metacognitive awareness (Garner & Alexander, 1989; Pressley & Ghatala, 1990).

Over time, studies have demonstrated the benefits of teaching students to be strategic and metacognitive. The benefits of strategy-based comprehension instruction led Biancarosa & Snow (2004), in a landmark report on adolescent literacy instruction, to recommend, among other things, that students receive "[d]irect, explicit comprehension instruction, which is instruction in the strategies and processes that proficient readers use to understand what they read, including summarizing [and] keeping track of one's own understanding" (p. 4).

This cognitive line of scholarship has been very important for the field and it has been widely taken up in K-12 instruction. Strategy-based comprehension instruction, particularly for students who are not yet consistently strategic or metacognitive in their reading, has an important place in secondary school classrooms. However, a chief concern of sociocultural scholars is that many cognitive-based research studies treat texts as somewhat interchangeable and often do not offer details about the texts used in the studies at all; they also do not take up the social or cultural aspects of meaning making. Due to the highly specialized nature of disciplinary reading,

14

writing, and reasoning, approaches designed to support students' comprehension alone are unlikely to "add up" to instruction that supports students to participate in those specialized disciplinary discourse communities (Lee & Spratley, 2010; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008). Further, one team of authors recently cautioned that although comprehension strategy instruction is best understood as "intertwined" with content learning, "it seems that many scholars and teachers increasingly discuss, research, and employ reading strategies as if they were a means unto themselves" (Learned, Stockdill, & Moje, 2011, p. 160).

Content Area Literacy

Alongside this cognitive work, other scholars developed content area literacy, which explores how teachers should be using what is known about cognition, motivation, and interest to guide their teaching of literacy in various content areas. Content area literacy instruction foregrounds generalizable literacy processes and study skills that are used across secondary content area classrooms (Moore, Readence, & Rickelman, 1983). At the center of content area literacy is a commitment to helping students "read to learn" subject content by supporting their comprehension of challenging school texts. Literacy educators working from a content area literacy approach have advocated instructional methods like using graphic organizers, anticipation guides, vocabulary games, and summary writing to help students develop knowledge, interest, and comprehension strategies (Alvermann & Moore, 1991). Specific routines like Reciprocal Teaching (Palincsar & Brown, 1984), Questioning the Author (Beck & McKeown, 2006), and K-W-L charts (What I know, what I want to know, what I learned…) (Ogle, 1986) may also be situated within content area literacy instruction.

In his seminal book *Teaching Reading in Content Areas*, Herber (1970) first examined questions of how to teach content area literacy in secondary school classrooms. He encouraged

teachers to help their students learn from texts using approaches like those listed above. His work was based on the understanding that students in secondary school needed to continue to learn skills for reading increasingly complicated subject-area texts, which he understood to be very different in nature from the texts of elementary school.

Since the publication of Herber's (1970) book, a vast body of work has been conducted on content area literacy (for reviews of this literature, see: Phelps, 2005; Alvermann & Moore, 1991). Content area literacy has become increasingly prominent in teacher education and district professional development programs. Yet, teachers have commonly resisted content area literacy approaches (e.g., Konopak, Wilson & Readence, 1994; Bean, 1997; O'Brien, 1988; O'Brien & Stewart, 1990; Phelps, 2005), understanding them as "add-ons" to the curriculum rather than central to the work of teaching the subject areas. In a review that served to launch disciplinary literacy research and instruction, O'Brien, Stewart & Moje (1995) argued that content-area literacy approaches can actually conflict with the values and practices of some subject areas, as they tend to serve the traditional goals of secondary schooling instead of the goals of disciplinary discourse communities.

The Importance of Disciplinary Literacy Instruction

As summarized in Chapter 1, some more recent literacy scholars have argued for K-12 disciplinary literacy instruction, which has evolved out of cognitive and content area literacy instruction and sociocultural theory. Over the past 20 to 30 years, scholars have sought to both identify the discipline-specific literacy practices of various disciplines and translate them for K-12 student learning, though work on both fronts is still underway.

As such, disciplinary literacy instruction is not widespread in K-12 schools (Phelps, 2005). Commonly, students are explicitly taught "basic literacy" skills like decoding and word

knowledge when they are early readers, and then "intermediate literacy" skills like "generic comprehension strategies" (e.g., determining importance, drawing inferences) (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008, p. 45). Although the text challenges dramatically increase in secondary school, as one research team put it, "literacy instruction often has evaporated altogether or has degenerated into a reiteration of general reading strategies" that are not well matched to students' needs (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008, p. 45). Put differently, although teaching cognitive reading and writing strategies may in fact support lower-achieving students, particularly on school assessments, it is unlikely that such instruction will provide students with the opportunities they need to develop more specialized, disciplinary approaches to texts (Lee & Spratley, 2010; Snow & Moje, 2010).

Recently, Moje (2015) advanced a four-"E" heuristic that may be used to guide disciplinary literacy teaching in secondary schools. The four "Es" represent necessary components of disciplinary literacy instruction: *engaging* students in the inquiry practices of the discipline, *examining* with students words and ways with words, *evaluating* with students when, why, and how disciplinary language is useful, and *eliciting/engineering* students' necessary knowledge, skills, and practices of engaging in the inquiry. For Moje, engineering includes explicitly teaching students an action that they can deliberately use until that action becomes automatic and teaching students to engage in disciplinary inquiry. She names approaches to strategy and comprehension instruction as helpful tools that teachers might use to engage students in cycles of disciplinary inquiry.

The Importance of Understanding Disciplinarians' Literacies

Moje's (2015) heuristic for disciplinary literacy instruction, along with most other disciplinary literacy scholarship, is rooted in theoretical and empirical work on "expert"

disciplinarians' practices with texts. In order to learn more about literacy in the disciplines, researchers have carefully analyzed and documented the practices of participants with expertise in various fields. This work has largely been conducted within history, but similar studies have also been conducted in the natural sciences and mathematics. Although powerful in many ways, it is important to note that there have not been studies to document disciplinary literacy patterns over large groups of experts. Studies generally seem to range between two and eight participants each; as such, individual sets of findings are not generalizable to an entire discipline.

Other studies that inform disciplinary literacy have taken a student-centered approach, studying students' disciplinary literacy practices and disciplinary literacy development through instruction. Taken together, studies that explore expert practice and novice practice provide compelling and new ways of understanding possibilities for teaching and learning the disciplines. They underscore the argument that learning to participate in a disciplinary discourse community is more than "simply acquiring a certain body of established knowledge, skills, and abilities…[it is], more importantly, taking on a set of beliefs, norms, world views and practices characteristic of the [disciplinary] community" (Siegel & Borasi, 1994, p. 208), and they signal opportunities for better aligning K-12 instruction with ways of participating in the disciplines.

Disciplinary Participation in History and the Social Sciences

Wineburg's (1991a) seminal work with historians contributes much to our understanding of the disciplinary literacy practices of history. In his study, Wineburg documents the read aloud practices of eight historians from various areas of specialization as they review a set of texts about the American Revolution. He finds that historians are driven by historical inquiry. When historians read, they do so to answer historical questions. Regardless of the extent of their factual knowledge of the particular time period, the shared and discipline-specific nature of their

18

questions leads them to consistently employ several literacy practices when reading historical texts. Wineburg documents how the participants systematically considered a text's author and his/her biases and the context in which the text was written. They also compared multiple texts to one another in order to corroborate meaning. Although the historians generally read primary and secondary sources, they employed these same literacy practices when reading sections of a history textbook, bringing the shared assumption that all texts are laden with bias and potential misrepresentation.

In his study, Wineburg (1991a) compared the historians' practices described above to those of a group of eight high achieving high school students. In his reporting, he represents patterns in the students' literacy practices by presenting interview data of one student named Darrel. Although a good comprehender who used cognitive reading strategies flexibly and consistently, Darrel did not read historical texts in the same way as the historians in the study. When Darrel read historical texts, he did not do so in a critical way. He did not identify bias nor did he attend to the source. He assumed, in fact, that history textbooks were reliable, neutral representations of events.

By comparing experts and novices in this way, Wineburg's analysis reveals differences across the groups in both their literacy practices and their ways of thinking about the discipline of history. These differences are attributable to what Wineburg calls an "epistemology of text," or individuals' beliefs about what it means to read historical texts and conduct historical inquiry:

> … For students, reading history was not a process of puzzling about authors' intentions
> or situating texts in a social world but of gathering information, with texts serving as
> bearers of information. How could such bright students be oblivious to the subtexts that
> jumped out at historians? ... Before students can see subtexts, they must first believe they

exist. In the absence of such beliefs, students simply overlooked or did not know how to

seek out features designed to shape their perceptions or make them view events in a

particular way. Students may have processed texts, but they failed to engage with them.

(1991a, p. 510)

This excerpt—and the study as a whole—suggests the interrelationship between disciplinary

purposes, disciplinary orientations or epistemologies, and literacy practices with texts. Without

disciplinary purposes and orientations, students did not make meaning with historical texts in

ways that overlapped with the historians, although they could be said to "comprehend" or

"process" the texts generally.

Similar patterns of literacy practices and thinking have been documented in other

disciplines in the social sciences. In her dissertation study of democratic thinking, Shreiner

(2009; 2014) studied the thinking of eight political scientists and eight high school students. Her

findings suggest that learning to participate in the discipline of political science, too, requires

learning shared and specialized practices and assumptions. While reading historical documents

and news articles, political scientists engaged in the work of constructing new knowledge using

shared habits of mind, whereas students did not demonstrate this approach to reading.

In an article about the teaching of history, Bain (2000) explores some of his high school

students' ideas about the discipline. Like Darrel and his peers (Wineburg, 1991a) and the

students in Shreiner's (2009; 2014) study, Bain's students largely brought with them into his

class a "static, formulaic vision of history" whereby they assumed that memorizing facts was the

primary goal rather than conducting historical inquiry through textual analysis (p. 337).

By contrasting his students' thinking and practices with those of historians, Bain (2000)

developed an approach to offer students learning opportunities that would explicitly teach them

the ways that knowledge is created in history. This instruction included offering students a set of

heuristics and an overarching map of the ways that historical accounts are created in the

discipline, along with assigning tasks that would engage students in history-specific activities

like having students write their own historical accounts of the first day of school. He also

established a discipline-specific instructional routine—a disciplinary take on the content area

literacy instructional routine of Reciprocal Teaching (Palincsar & Brown, 1984)—for reading

primary sources that included students posing questions historians might ask, like, "Who made

the source, and when was it made?" and "What is the story line that connects all the sources?"

At the end of the school year, Bain documented students' understandings of history, finding them

more complex and more centered on thinking and interpretation rather than on memorization.

From the student voices he included, it is clear that students' interest in history was connected to

their deepened understandings of history as a discipline.

In their study of two historians, two chemists, and two mathematicians, Shanahan and

Shanahan (2008) also found that their participants' reading processes and practices seemed to be

based on the "intellectual values of a discipline and the methods by which scholarship is created

in each of the fields" (p. 50). Due to this suggested relationship, Shanahan and Shanahan argue

in favor of approaches like Bain's (2000), underscoring the importance of providing instruction

to students that teaches them specialized, discipline-specific ways with texts.

Disciplinary Participation in the Natural Sciences and Mathematics

Other disciplines have been similarly analyzed through closely looking at expert practice

and the comparisons to novice practice. As in other academic domains, the work of natural

scientists rests on specialized and shared ways of reading and writing (Norris & Phillips, 2003).

Experimental scientists, particularly, tend to seek objective explanations for natural events and

21

phenomena (Coburn & Loving, 2001). Important parts of this work often involve asking questions that may be answered using observable evidence and evaluating the quality and validity of evidence offered to support claims (Yore, Hand & Florence, 2004).

Natural scientists also tend to consider and represent information in multiple forms. The two chemists that Shanahan & Shanahan (2008) studied, for example, translated what they read into multiple representations and did so fluidly. Natural scientists also read and consider the connections between alternative forms such as graphs and charts. And, they tend to assume that, under similar conditions, the results of one study allow them to predict results in another study.

Disciplinary literacy in mathematics involves still different conventions. Mathematical proofs, by definition, must be error-free. Mathematicians, in order to produce such error-free work, tend to reread for correctness. The two mathematicians that Shanahan & Shanahan (2008) studied attended to precise meanings of words like "a" and "the," understanding them to carry important and distinct meanings. By necessity, they must know the specific definitions of technical mathematics vocabulary. Because the variables change from text to text, mathematicians also often know how to recognize variables and understand them as such (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008).

Yet, mathematicians also tend to understand mathematical knowledge as fallible and as socially constructed within a community of practice (Siegel & Borasi, 1994). Doing mathematics is not just about correct answers; instead, it involves "reasoning about situations involving quantities," which includes "bounding and solving problems involving quantities and relationships between quantities; forming, testing and proving conjectures; and communicating mathematical ideas and solutions" (Draper & Siebert, 2004, p. 930).

Need for Work on Disciplinary Participation in Literary Studies

The ability of researchers and educators to develop approaches for disciplinary literacy instruction depends on the thoroughness of the existing disciplinary literacy knowledge base. Those in the field need to know how experts of literature create meaning from domain-specific texts, what types of inquiry they engage in, what assumptions they make when they approach such texts, how they make claims and offer evidence and reasoning. In short, educators need to know how experts of literary studies think with and make meaning from texts.

Through an intensive review of the literature, I have located only two empirical studies that directly contribute to the need for knowledge about the shared literacy practices of literary studies. The first is an expert-expert-novice study (Zeitz, 1994). This study included three groups of participants: 13 doctoral students of engineering, 16 doctoral students of English, and 24 novices, who were all juniors in high school. Participants each read one unfamiliar poem, one unfamiliar short story, and one unfamiliar scientific article. Participants were asked to recall what they had read, in order to allow for cross-group comparisons. The English experts recalled verbatim lines in the poem and the gist of the poem better than any other group of readers; the engineering experts recalled verbatim lines in the science article and the gist of the science article better than any other group of readers. These results are important because they reveal that expertise in one domain does not seem to equate with expertise writ large. Although the English experts remembered more of the poem than the members of the other groups, the English experts looked very similar to the high school students when reading the science article.

Participants were also asked to respond in writing to short answer questions about the texts, such as, "Regarding the short story, 'A New England Nun,' does the narrator fundamentally approve or disapprove of Louisa? How do you know?" (p. 291). Quantifying the

responses revealed that English experts made many more interpretive statements (versus factual or other statements) regarding the short story and poem than did engineering experts or high school students. English experts also provided the most evidence to support their claims about the poem and short story. Zeitz (1994) uses these findings to conclude that the knowledge base of English experts allowed them to more deeply interpret the literary pieces, and that this knowledge base is distinct from other disciplines. She also argues that one of the hallmarks of English experts is that they make two types of meaning when reading literature: basic representation, or understanding literally what happened, and derived representation, or understanding the more abstract meaning of a text. Less advanced readers rely heavily on basic representation.

What Zeitz's (1994) methods do not reveal is a window into the complex nature of the thinking about reading that those in the discourse community of literature routinely employ. Her work does not show, for instance, how experts are using interpretation to make meaning from the pieces, how they are asking questions of the pieces or the types of questions they are considering at the outset (the only questions are the ones she provides them to respond to in writing), or how they are misunderstanding the work of reading the science article. By quantifying the number of interpretations, Zeitz shows frequency between the groups, but her work does not reveal how the engineering experts and high school students missed the mark when interpreting literature.

Perhaps most importantly, Zeitz's (1994) study does not approximate the real work of doing literature. Instead, her design more closely approximates the work of doing English class. Participants were given three texts with no context, asked to recall the events in each text, and then given a series of comprehension/analysis questions to answer. Although this approach does not discount Zeitz's findings, it also does not reveal the ways that literary disciplinarians

approach texts, the types of literary inquiry that guide their work, or the ways they produce and

evaluate knowledge. If educators are to improve literary instruction for students, Zeitz's study

does not provide all of the information needed.

In the second study of literary reading, Peskin (1998) compares the reading processes of

expert poetry readers (i.e., doctoral candidates in English literature) with novice poetry readers

(i.e., undergraduates who had taken only one college-level poetry course). Participants were

asked to think aloud as they read two unfamiliar poems. Based on these think-aloud data, Peskin

found that experts had more literary knowledge and that their knowledge was important for

reading poetry. She also found that experts were more likely to use "interpretive strategies" in

order to comprehend the poems.

Peskin's (1998) study highlights many differences between experts and novices of poetry.

The experts tended to make meaning of the structural elements of the poem, to use wordplay and

language as a cue for meaning, and to find specific images in the poem pleasing. Experts were

also likely to glean meaning and then extend their engagement with the poem, exploring the

significance, the author's craft, and the use of poetic conventions. And, they tended to make

stronger allusions to other pieces of literature. They were more likely to reread the piece

multiple times to make additional meaning. In contrast, the novices did not tend to demonstrate

these behaviors.

Peskin's (1998) study helps to answer questions about the ways that experts of literature

read and think. It also leaves questions unanswered. For instance, what does it mean to read and

think about short stories? Novels? Pieces of literature from various time periods? Texts written

by authors with various identities and backgrounds? And, how do experts employ literary theory

in their reading and thinking about text? What are the problems or big questions that drive their work? How do they understand the social, discursive aspect of the enterprise?

A final limitation of both studies is that there are only doctoral candidates in the "expert" groups. Although doctoral students certainly hold some degree of disciplinary expertise, they are not yet truly considered expert in the field. It is curious why these studies would not include individuals with doctorates, and it begs the question: Would expert practice look different among professors of literature?

Peskin (1998) does point out one important similarity regarding novice/expert epistemologies of text, which is a somewhat different finding than Wineburg's (1991a) finding; novices and experts of literature shared the expectation that the poem would say something significant, and that it would have thematic unity and metaphorical meaning. This similarity might be just an artifact of how "novice" is defined in the two studies. Whereas the "novices" of Wineburg's study were high school students, the novices of Peskin's study were undergraduates or high school students who had all had one introductory level college poetry course. The similarity between novices' and experts' epistemologies of text in Peskin's study might also be explained by the possibility that poetry is more available out of school (than historical texts) and, thus, Peskin's novices could have had more exposure to the texts under study than Wineburg's novices.

There are other conceptual, theoretical, and descriptive pieces that relate to the questions of this study. For example, Fahnestock and Secor (1991) conducted an analysis of published articles of literary criticism and concluded that five topoi were most evident in the scholarship (e.g., the paradox topos, in which the writer attempts to reconcile apparent contradictions). These topoi serve as markers of the specialized community of literary studies; they were found to

26

be largely implicit in one study of an undergraduate literature course, though students who demonstrated some awareness of these topoi were more successful in the course than students who did not (Wilder, 2002). A team of educational psychology researchers has applied Fahnestock and Secor's topoi framework to explore the effectiveness of explicitly teaching underachieving high school students both literary topoi and heuristics for developing warranted literary claims (Lewis & Ferretti, 2011; 2009), finding that the literary claims of the six student participants in their study improved with the intervention.

Recently, Tim Parks, associate professor of literature and frequent contributor to *The New York Review of Books*, posted a blog entitled "How I Read," in which he sought to respond to "scores of emails" he had received "from readers lamenting that…they felt the text was passing them by" (2014). More than simply reading with a pen in hand, Parks described his thoughts as he enters literary texts: "As I dive into the opening pages," he writes, "the first question I'm asking is, what are the qualities or values that matter most to this author, or at least in this novel?" He considers, "What is the emotional atmosphere behind this narrative?...and what is the consequent debate arising from that atmosphere?" Later in the blog, he describes that his thinking with the text changes as he continues to consider it: "Getting a sense of the values around which the story is organizing itself isn't always easy; I might change my mind two or three times. But let's say that the mere attempt to do that gives me something to look for…How is the writer trying to draw me into the mental world of his characters through his writing, through his conversation with me?" Although anecdotal, Parks's description of his own interactions with texts suggests the potential for synthesizing a set of shared literary literacy practices by conducting think aloud interviews with a group of literary scholars such as him.

Need for Work on Teaching Students Disciplinary Participation in Literary Studies

Secondary students of literature often look more like the novices in Wineburg's (1991a) and Bain's (2000) studies, initially understanding the work as static or centered on comprehension alone (Harker, 1994; Janssen, Braaksma, & Rijlaarsdam, 2006; NAEP, 1981), though their capacities for literary reasoning are evident in early grades (Lehr, 1988). At the beginning of the school year, adolescents in scholar-teacher Carol Lee's (2006; 2007) literature classroom, for instance, thought of reading canonical literature as mostly pointless and out of reach. Lee presents how she drew on lower-achieving, African American students' everyday literacy and language practices in order to develop their academic literacy and language practices in the domain of literature. Her unit goal was to teach students to interpret symbolism within literature, one type of "interpretive problem." Lee considered the alignment between the use of symbolism in African American English and symbolism in literature. She began instruction by helping students see their current processes for interpreting symbols with everyday texts like lyrics and video clips and their shared valuing of symbolism, what she calls the Cultural Modeling Framework. During class, Lee also leveraged familiar everyday modes of communication like call and response, verbal inventiveness, and the use of proverbs and Biblical verses to help students participate in discussion about academic content. Students were then able to better interpret symbolism with canonical literature.

Lee's work is quite important for the field, as it demonstrates the power of apprenticing students into sophisticated discursive disciplinary practices and methods for doing so. Moje (2007), in her review of disciplinary literacy and its relationship to social justice, remarks on Lee's important contributions to the field and also notes that there is more work to be done:

"[Lee] has begun to develop…a framework for English literature as a discipline. However, the scope of such an enterprise suggests that this is not work for one scholar alone" (p. 36).

Since Moje's review in 2007, a newer scholar has joined the effort to develop instructional approaches that allow all students access to rigorous disciplinary practices with literary works. Sarah Levine, a former student of Lee's and co-collaborator on the reasoning with literature work of Project READi, studies affective-based approaches for engaging students in literary reasoning and interpretation. In 2013, Levine, together with co-author Horton, published the student learning outcomes of an instructional intervention in which high school students were taught an "affective appraisal strategy—i.e., identifying the valence of words and phrases, and the moods and tones of whole texts, and then supporting those interpretations—…[as] an accessible first step for students in constructing thematic interpretations of poetry" (p. 106). In this study, the researchers gave two groups of students a pre- and post-test of literary interpretation that asked them to make a thematic interpretation of a poem. Between the pre- and post-tests, the treatment group received a four-week-long sequence of instruction in which they learned and practiced the affective appraisal strategy, which focused on supporting students to:

1. Appraise the valence of the text, considering whether the overall impact is positive, negative, or both.

2. Look for details in the text that led to the affective appraisals.

3. Explain why each detail seemed negative, positive, or both. (p. 114)

Students in the intervention group practiced using sentence stems like "The author condemns a world in which…" The researchers coded student responses on the pre- and post-test using a 6-point scale, which ranged from "literal descriptive unsupported" responses that include only summary without interpretation to "thematic supported" responses that include a "universal

statement about the main ideas, messages, or central meanings in the text" (p. 118). They found significant growth in the thematic interpretations of the treatment group after receiving instruction based on affective appraisal. Levine adds to the field by naming practices of literary reasoning that are important for students to learn and then providing instructional approaches that have the potential to scaffold students' move from literal to thematic meaning making with literary works.

With clearer knowledge about the markers of expert participation in the field of literature, the work of Lee, Levine, and others seeking to develop instructional approaches that support all students' uptake of literary literacy practices might be furthered. One particular area that might be informed is problem framing in literature. It is apparent to many readers that literary texts contain layers of meaning, but how do experts think about the problems of literature? How might educators then present these problems to students so as to give authentic purpose to the work and provide access to the discourse community?

Questions of how to best engage students in the practices of literary studies have also been posed by humanities-based scholars, who are some of the first to acknowledge the need to make more explicit their often tacit ways of reading, writing, and reasoning with literary works when teaching (e.g., Graff, 2002). Hutchings and O'Rourke (2002), for instance, in their piece "Problem-based learning in literary studies," share a conceptual framework for teaching undergraduate students to participate in the discipline of literary studies. They begin the article by stating that literary studies involves:

- Exploratory research into the nature and constitution of texts, their presentation within the time of their creation and their reception through time, their language, style, meaning, intention and interpretation(s).

- A recognition that the interpretive context within which the act of criticism takes place may be historical, contextual, philosophical, linguistic, semiotic.

- Above all, the active, creative engagement of the reader to meet the creative power of the literature… (p. 75)

Based in the understanding that "[w]e should teach as we research," Hutchings and O'Rourke (2002) offer a matching check-list of questions for instructors to assess the alignment between their own problem-based practice and their teaching:

1. Has [the teacher] encouraged exploratory research?

2. Has [the teacher] encouraged students to explore a variety of interpretative contexts in order to allow them to develop their own sense of which is appropriate?

3. Has [the teacher] encouraged an active and creative engagement of students with the creative power of the literature? (p. 76)

Finally, Hutchings and O'Rourke (2002) offer an approach to problem-based teaching and learning in literary studies that actively involves the students themselves (with support from the teacher) in constructing literary problems and methods of inquiry, working together or independently to conduct research, and presenting their results.

The studies reviewed above point to the need for empirical work that articulates specific patterns of literary literacy practices and instructional approaches for engaging secondary and undergraduate students in constructing, pursuing, and communicating about literary problems. Such empirical work would complement ongoing efforts based in literacy education, educational psychology, and the humanities to meaningfully relate the work of literary critics to secondary and post-secondary students.

The Importance of Understanding Teachers' Own Disciplinary Literacies

As the scholarship of Bain (2000, 2005), Lee (2006, 2007), and Levine (2014; Levine & Horton, 2013) reveals, teachers are central to efforts that seek to provide students with more opportunities for rigorous learning. It is at the site of the classroom that disciplinary literacy practices are or are not taught. Indeed, as Bain (2000) writes, teachers occupy the space "between the novice and the expert, within the breach between the school and the academy" (p. 336). It is due to teachers' planning and instruction that students consistently receive or do not receive opportunities to learn to participate in the disciplines, which underscores the importance of teachers' own disciplinary understandings and ways with texts.

What are the relationships between teachers' own ways of making meaning with literary works and their approaches to teaching with literary works? The current scholarship on this topic is incomplete. In reviewing the literature, I could not locate studies examining the relationships between secondary teachers' or post-secondary teachers' own ways of making meaning with domain-specific texts and their approaches to teaching disciplinary literacy practices. There are, however, lines of research that may inform such a study.

Teacher Knowledge

There is a branching line of scholarship that has documented the types of knowledge that highly effective teachers seem to hold. Highly effective teachers, Shulman (1987) argues, need multiple types of knowledge, including content knowledge (i.e., "the knowledge, understanding, skill, and disposition that are to be learned by school children," pp. 8-9), pedagogical knowledge (e.g., classroom management, how students learn), pedagogical content knowledge (i.e., how to best teach students within particular content areas), knowledge of students (e.g., their interests, their background knowledge), knowledge of educational contexts (e.g., community resources,

32

school norms), and knowledge of "educational ends, purposes and values" (p. 9).

For Shulman, the way teachers think about their subject area is central to effective teaching. Not only are teachers "member[s] of a scholarly community," but they also must understand and be able to teach students "the principles of inquiry that help answer two kinds of questions in each field: What are the important ideas and skills in this domain? And How are new ideas added and deficient ones dropped by those who produce knowledge in this area? That is, what are the rules and procedures of good scholarship or inquiry?" (Shulman, 1987, p. 9). The teacher's responsibility, as someone who communicates what "truth" is in a field and the orientations and enthusiasm of those who seek to determine truth, cannot be underestimated.

In one empirical study, veteran history teachers demonstrated many of these types of knowledge (Wilson & Wineburg, 2001). They knew not only discrete historical facts like dates, but they also held a conceptual understanding of how the facts were related to each other within the discipline of history. Drawing upon their multiple forms of knowledge, teachers organized and enacted instruction that focused on students learning to participate in the discourse community of history.

Ms. Landy, the chemistry teacher in Moje's (1994) ethnography of literacy events and practices in one high school classroom, offers another example of the relationship between teachers' views of their disciplines and their approaches to literacy instruction. Ms. Landy held quite strong perspectives about literacy and chemistry. She thought of chemistry knowledge as authority rather than viewing it as ever-changing and based in discovery. This orientation was closely related to her instructional approaches. Ms. Landy spent a great deal of instructional time teaching students vocabulary words, organizational strategies, and chemical processes, believing that these skills and knowledge would help them to be successful in chemistry, as

opposed to focusing her instruction on the syntactic knowledge of chemistry (i.e., Shulman's (1987) questions: "How are new ideas added and deficient ones dropped by those who produce knowledge in this area? …[W]hat are the rules and procedures of good scholarship or inquiry?").

Other studies of content area teachers have revealed similar connections between teachers' views of their disciplines and their instructional decisions and priorities (e.g., Sturtevant, Duling & Hall, 2001).

Teachers and Literacy

A second set of scholars has studied teachers, their reading habits, and their beliefs about literacy. The work on teachers as readers focuses on what teachers—especially those working in elementary grades—read, how they read, and the relationship of their personal habits to their instructional decisions. The research has almost entirely focused on elementary teachers because elementary classrooms have been considered (until quite recently) the primary site of reading and literacy instruction. This work is based on the argument that in order for teachers to teach reading and writing they must be skilled readers and writers themselves (e.g. Atwell, 1991; Bridge & Hiebert, 1985; Mour, 1977). Along with mastery over their own literacy processes and practices, the awareness of what can be difficult about reading makes teachers better at the job: "Just as teachers who write are best able to act as guides for less experienced writers, teachers who see themselves as readers—who are aware of the requirements and strategies of the reader's role—are best able to guide young readers" (Andrews-Beck & Rycik, 1992, p. 121).

As might be predicted, studies of teachers' reading habits and practices have followed the larger arc of literacy research. When efforts were underway to encourage elementary teachers to use full-length literature in their classrooms instead of language-controlled text or collections of excerpted texts in basal readers, studies were designed to investigate whether teachers read

multiple literary genres out of school. One such study of 178 teachers found self-reported high levels of personal reading across genres and with varied purposes (Williamson, 1991). Another study examined whether there was a relationship between elementary teachers' self-identification as readers and their implementation of recommended literacy teaching methods (e.g., reading aloud regularly, facilitating daily sustained silent reading, facilitating small group discussions of literature), finding a strong linear relationship between teachers who considered themselves readers and their implementation of recommended literacy teaching methods in their classrooms (Morrison, Jacobs, & Swinyard, 1999). Presumably, teachers who read and value reading also believe literacy instruction is important and worthwhile.

Other studies more directly examined teacher values and beliefs related to literacy. If teachers were to incorporate literacy instruction into their classrooms, how much did their beliefs about literacy and the teaching of literacy matter? One study of this type was conducted by Richardson, Anders, Tidwell & Lloyd (1991). In this study, the team interviewed 39 fourth through sixth grade teachers and used teachers' responses to chart their beliefs about how children learn to read (e.g., sub-skills of reading must be taught first before comprehension can occur; reading a lot is how one learns to read). The team then used this grid to make predictions about elements of teacher instruction (e.g., whether the teacher would ask students to read silently or aloud; whether the teacher would teach vocabulary out of context; whether the teacher would use a basal reader during instruction), and then they observed teacher practice to test their predictions. The team found a high level of alignment between teacher beliefs about literacy and instructional approaches, so they were able to predict quite accurately how teachers would teach given their interview data.

Collectively, these studies point to new questions about the ways that literature teachers'

sets of knowledge, including deep content knowledge and knowledge of disciplinary purposes, relate to or are reflected by their disciplinary literacy practices and their approaches to teaching with literary works.   Studies examining the disciplinary literacy practices and conceptual understandings of teachers across the disciplines in relation to their instructional decisions and school contexts would be quite instructive for those seeking to train new teachers.

The Literacy Education Landscape and Directions for Future Research, In Sum

To conclude this chapter: disciplinary literacy scholarship and teaching marks a shift in conceptualizing literacy and literacy education. Disciplinary literacy scholarship focuses on shared sets of literacy practices that are used as tools for pursuing questions of interest to a broader community. These shared sets of literacy practices are specialized in nature; they do not describe the mental processes that readers use across all reading events. Disciplinary literacy instruction, although it might include explicit instruction on cognitive strategy use, ultimately seeks to introduce students to the shared ways of reading, writing, and reasoning of particular disciplinary communities. Whereas content area literacy instructional approaches could be "adapted to disciplinary needs and ways of building knowledge," (Learned, Stockdill & Moje, 2011, p. 180), and Bain's (2000) history-specific version of Reciprocal Teaching serves as an excellent example of such an innovation, initially they were largely designed to teach cognitive comprehension strategies and metacognition.

Given this landscape, Moje (2007), at the end of her review of disciplinary literacy, articulates a call to action for literacy education researchers:

The work of a number of literacy and disciplinary scholars reviewed here has paved the

way for thinking about the literacy processes and practices of the disciplines; however, we

need a more carefully detailed archaeology of the disciplinary practices, one that mines

both the cognitive processes and the cultural practices that mediate those processes…The work that needs to be done is not only theoretical; empirical studies of how members of the disciplines communicate and think about their communication…would do much to advance this field for developing work related to pre-service teacher education…[Some] questions to consider posing to members of the disciplines in such studies might include how language is used in the work of the disciplines (e.g. as a mathematician, a historian, a literary theorist or writer, a chemist), the types of texts used or produced as part of their work, and the purposes for using or producing such texts. Questions also should examine audiences for disciplinary work; standards for warrant; and taboo words, phrases, or writing styles. Finally, it would be useful to ask what disciplinarians consider critical for novices to learn about the discipline.

Another valuable direction in empirical studies would revolve around how secondary subject-matter teachers…conceive of literate processes and practices in the subject-matter areas they teach. Similar questions to those offered for members of the discipline could guide survey, interview, or observational studies of what teachers…think about when they think of literacy teaching and learning in the discipline. In particular, it would be important to probe teachers regarding the kinds of texts they turn to or produce when teaching in their content areas and regarding their purpose for turning to or producing such texts. Such interviews could raise questions about establishing purposes for disciplinary reading or writing for students and discussion of the teacher's role and responsibility, as well as challenges, in supporting student learning about disciplinary literacy and in developing students' literacy skills. (p. 36)

As is articulated in Moje's call to action above, the scholarship reviewed in this chapter points to

the need for studies such as this one: studies that investigate disciplinarians' purposes for meaning making with texts and studies that investigate secondary subject-matter teachers' own ways of meaning making and their teaching practices. The empirical scholarship on *literary* disciplinary literacy practices and disciplinary literacy instruction is especially minimal. This dissertation is designed to contribute to relatively open questions about the literacy practices and instructional approaches of those who study literary works and the secondary ELA teachers who teach with literary works. In the following chapter, I present the methodological decisions I made when designing and conducting the study.

CHAPTER III: RESEARCH METHODS AND DESIGN

This study has two goals: 1) to document some of the shared ways of thinking, knowing, and doing in the discipline of literature, and 2) to analyze the relationships between instructors' own ways of reading literary works and their approaches to teaching with literary works. To investigate my research questions, I used a case study design, with scholars of literary studies and high school ELA teachers representing individual cases of literary studies practice and teaching. I conducted semi-structured and verbal protocol interviews with each participant to produce multiple cases. I also observed a subset of participants while they were teaching. With the cases in mind, I then conducted cross-case analyses to look for patterns across the set.

Research Participants and Contexts

This study involves 22 participants total. Data collection occurred from January to June 2014. I worked in two school and community contexts: an English department of a large research university in the Midwest and a suburban high school campus containing three interconnected schools. See Table 3.1 for participant demographics by group.

University Participants and Context

Participants. In order to answer questions about expert practice in literature, the first phase of the study involved 10 literary scholars recruited from a public research university in the Midwest (D1-D10). The group consisted of 5 faculty members and 5 senior doctoral students in the English Department. Two of the doctoral candidates in the study completed their

dissertations within six months of their participation. See Table 3.2 for profiles of the literary scholars.

Although their scholarly interests and theoretical orientations varied, the literary scholars were all a part of one university-based literary studies program. At the time of data collection, the faculty members in this study each regularly taught undergraduate literary studies courses ranging from Introduction to Literary Studies, to courses focused on a particular author like Virginia Woolf or Emily Dickenson, to courses focused on bodies of poetry like African American nature poetry. They also regularly taught graduate level courses, but this study did not focus on their approaches to graduate level teaching. The doctoral candidates had each independently taught or assisted a professor in teaching one or more undergraduate courses in their time in their program, though the courses tended to relate less closely to their scholarly interests and often included the composition course called "Writing and Academic Inquiry" that most first-year students were required to take.

I intentionally recruited faculty members and senior doctoral students of literary studies so that I would have a reasonable chance of identifying the shared literacy practices of literary studies. I deliberately included advanced doctoral students in my population. My goal was to be able to name the implicit and assumed practices and ways of thinking that are shared by those in the discourse community of literary studies. I anticipated that working with doctoral students who are quite expert but newer to the discourse community of literary studies might reveal additional opportunities for identifying such practices. I expected that the doctoral students themselves might, in fact, be better able to name their own thinking and practices because they may be somewhat less automatic than they might be for senior members of the discourse community. However, given the limitations of solely representing the "expert" thinking and

40

practice of doctoral students described in Chapter 2, I also sought to include tenured professors in my study.

I based the number of literary scholars on other studies of this type. Studies of this size need to be small enough to reveal deep insight into the disciplinary literacy practices of a domain and large enough to ward against the threat of selecting outliers. Wineburg (1991a), for example, worked with six historians and two doctoral students of history in order to answer questions of historical literacy and expertise. Peskin (1998) worked with eight doctoral English candidates to investigate cognitive processes of reading poetry. Both studies produced trustworthy findings characterizing patterns of participants' literacy practices and processes. Studies of this size seem to be small enough to reveal deep insight into the disciplinary literacy practices of a domain and large enough to ward against the threat of selecting outliers. Studies like Shanahan & Shanahan (2008), which focused on two experts in each of three distinct domains, and Leinhardt & Young (1996), which focused on three historians, have also contributed to the field, however their findings are particularly limited by their sample size and can only be thought of as suggestive.

University context. In 2014 at the time of data collection, the University had an enrollment of approximately 43,000 students. Of those students, approximately 12,000 were graduate students. The approximately 90 faculty members of the English department together represent 38 areas of study, including American literature, British literature, Creative Writing, Poetry and Poetics, Romanticism, Rhetoric and Composition, and Drama and Performance. Of these faculty members, approximately 10% are assistant professors, 30% are associate professors, and 52% are full professors. Also in the Department were 49 lecturers and 120 graduate student instructors.

The University had a robust number of scholars who specialize in 19th and/or 20th century American literature, including approximately 40 faculty members and a number of lecturers and graduate students. The faculty composition, along with the prestige of the University as a whole, made this setting an ideal one for exploring my first research questions because of the certainty that the faculty and advanced doctoral students held sufficient expertise in the thinking and practices of the discipline of literary studies.

Recruitment. Inclusion criteria for literary scholars were: faculty member status or doctoral candidacy in literary studies. Preference was given to those who were teaching an undergraduate literature course at the time of study. I sought to recruit individuals who specialized in 19th and/or 20th century American literature.

To recruit, I sent out an email invitation to tenured and tenure-track professors and senior doctoral students of literary studies. The email ensured that all members of the population received the same information and opportunity to participate. The email included a description of the study and the incentive offered: a $100 Amazon gift card. I stressed that participation was voluntary. I then sent out individual invitation emails to literary studies scholars who listed a specialization in 18th, 19th, or 20th American literature on the departmental website.

High School Participants and Context

Participants. The high school English language arts teachers (T1-T12) were all veteran teachers in a suburban public school district in the Midwest. At the time of data collection, all teacher participants were teaching at least one course with a literature component. I deliberately recruited veteran English language arts teachers of the district. All high school teachers were certified to teach secondary ELA, and participants had a range of 6 to 36 years of secondary ELA teaching experience (M=15.1; Mdn=15.5). Four of the twelve high school teachers held

Master's degrees (2 in English literature, 1 in education, 1 in humanities), and many more had completed at least some graduate coursework in English or education. See Table 3.3 for profiles of the high school teachers.

High school campus context. The participants of this phase of the study were employees of one of three high schools within one Midwestern public school district. Approximately 300 high school teachers worked in the district at the time of data collection. English departments in each of the three high schools consist of between 10 and 15 ELA teachers. Along with 3 high schools, the district comprised 15 elementary schools and 5 middle schools. Approximately 19,000 students attended this district, roughly 6,000 of whom were high school students. In 2014, 72% of eleventh graders scored at or above Proficient on the state's standardized reading assessment. That year, students' average composite ACT score was 22 out of a possible 36. The high school graduation rate was approximately 85%. The median annual family income of students was $70,000, and less than 10% of students qualified for free or reduced school lunch.

The high schools were somewhat unusual in their proximity and relationship to one another. Located together on one campus, students traveled between the three high schools throughout the school day. Although the schools had their own sports teams and each student has a "home" high school, the district was able to offer more class options by using this campus model. Teachers, however, did not typically travel between the buildings. Instead, they tended to have a single classroom within one building in the way of traditional K-12 schools.

This school district has an ongoing partnership with the University's School of Education and is engaged in work to align the elementary and secondary curricula with those of the University. The school district is proximal to the University and, as such, the University is an

43

ideal choice for many students who attend the school district. The teachers in the district are commonly regarded as well-trained professionals, and there is some competition to secure a teaching position in this district. In many ways, these high school teachers may be considered to represent the norm. Relative to other teachers, they are somewhere in the middle of the spectrum in terms of their income, education level, and classroom performance. This setting was thus an ideal one for exploring my second set of research questions related to the similarities and differences between literary scholars' and teachers' literary literacy practices and approaches to instruction.

Recruitment. I recruited the high school ELA teachers in January 2014. I drafted an initial email describing the study and incentives—again a $100 gift card—and a district administrator sent the email to high school ELA teachers in the district. I then sent out follow up emails to teachers to encourage them to participate. To maintain subject privacy, those who decided to participate returned their forms to me directly, and I did not share information about participants with other teachers or administrators in the district.

Table 3.1

Participant Group Demographics

Participant Group	Race/Ethnicity		Gender		# Years of Professional Experience
	People of Color %	White %	Female %	Male %	
Literary scholars N=10	10% (1)	90% (9)	60% (6)	40% (4)	M=16.5 Range= 4 to 35
High school teachers N=12	0%	100%	83% (10)	17% (2)	M=15.2 Range= 6 to 36

Table 3.2

Profiles of Participating Literary Scholars

Name	Position	Highest Degree Held	Years Experience	Characteristics
David (D1)	Professor	PhD, Princeton	30	-Identified as "new critic" -Studied and taught modern British, Irish, and American literature, 1880-1945 -Former high school ELA teacher
Flora (D2)	Professor	PhD, University of California San Diego	35	-Trained as literary historian
Jane (D3)	Assoc. Professor	PhD, Stanford	16	-Studied race and the environment in colonial America
Elias (D4)	Senior lecturer	MFA, University of Michigan	15	-Identified as "new critic" -Studied and taught Midwestern literature, regions, regionality, and environmentalism
William (D5)	Professor	PhD, Johns Hopkins	32	-Studied and taught Whitman, Stevens, poetry
Grace (D6)	Doctoral candidate	MFA, University of Virginia	6	-Studied 18th and 19th c. British and American literature and poetry -Taught academic writing (100-level) -Led discussion sections on: Shakespeare, literature of the long eighteenth-century
Sarah (D7)	Doctoral candidate	BA	4	-Studied 20th c. American literature, readers and reading, and book history and materiality -Taught: academic writing about literature (100-level), children's literature (200-level) -Led discussion section on: Shakespeare

Millie (D8)	Doctoral candidate	BA	7	-Studied 21st century American Literature, writing and urban exploration -Taught: academic writing (100-level), academic writing about literature (100-level)
Anthony (D9)	Doctoral candidate	BA	7	-Studied 18th and 19th c. American literature and religious and literary culture -Taught: academic writing about literature (100-level), academic writing (100-level), academic argumentation (200-level) -Led discussion sections on: Shakespeare, *The Bible*
Alexa (D10)	Doctoral candidate	BA	11	-Studied 20th c. and contemporary American literature, African American literature, and visual studies -Taught: academic writing (100-level), academic writing about literature (100-level) -Former high school ELA teacher
Note. All names are pseudonyms.				

Table 3.3

Profiles of Participating High School Teachers

Name	Position	Highest Degree Held	Years Experience	Characteristics at Time of Data Collection
Lisa (T1)	Teacher	MA	18	-Identified as "formalist" -Recent courses included: AP English literature, Arts-Integrated American Literature (10), Multicultural literature
Sally (T2)	Teacher	MA (humanities)	9	-Was part-time -Recent courses included: American Literature (10), ELA (9), Multicultural literature
Amy (T3)	Teacher	MA (literature)	8	-Recent courses included: American Literature (10), Comic Book, ELA (9)
Alice (T4)	Teacher	BA	36	-Recent courses included: American Literature (10), AP English literature, ELA (9), Multicultural literature
Kate (T5)	Teacher	BA	10	-Recent courses included: ELA (9), Honors humanities (12)
Claire (T6)	Teacher	BA	10	-Was part-time -Recent courses included: American Literature (10), ELA (9)

Carl (T7)	Teacher	BA	16	-Recent courses included: Eastern Thought and Literature (10-12), Advanced Composition (11), American Literature (10); ELA (9)
Josh (T8)	Teacher	BA	6	-First year in this district -Courses included: American Literature (10), ELA (9)
Diane (T9)	Teacher	BA	18	-Recent courses included: Short Story, Writing Workshop (9), ELA (9)
Margaret (T10)	Teacher	MA	20	-Identified as "new critic" -Recent courses included: AP English literature, American literature (10)
Janet (T11)	Teacher	MA (literacy education)	16	-Reading specialist -Recent courses included: literacy intervention courses (9-10, 11-12)
Kara (T12)	Teacher	BA	15	-Was part-time -Recent courses included: Honors humanities (12), Multicultural literature
Note. All names are pseudonyms.				

Data Sources and Collection

I collected data from January to June 2014. Each participant was interviewed between one and four times (M=3.2, Mdn=3.5). I conducted a total of 27 interviews with the 10 literary scholars. These interviews tended to be between 60 and 90 minutes each. I conducted a total of

44 interviews with the 12 teachers. These interviews tended to be between 30 and 60 minutes each. See Table 3.4 for frequency and type of interview by participant.

Semi-Structured Interviews Without Texts

The first interview in the study was semi-structured (see Appendix). I designed it to enable investigation of how and why readers of literature employ particular practices and how they think about instruction. The questions were designed to collect data about the disciplinary purposes of reading literature (e.g., "What are the questions/problems that drive your reading of literature?"), the methods of pursuing these purposes (e.g., "How do you pursue these questions?"), and the shared, underlying conventions and assumptions of literature (e.g., "What makes a literary claim well-warranted?"). The semi-structured design allowed me to ask follow up questions or pursue ideas as they emerged (Weiss, 1994), which proved important for surfacing implicit assumptions and values that participants seemed to hold.

Remaining interviews also contained semi-structured interview questions. Interviews 2, 3, and 4 included questions like: "What is a type of claim you might make about this text? How would you need to support this claim in order to make it well-warranted?" and "What is an example of a claim you would never make about this text?" and "If you were going to use this text with your students, what would that look like?" These questions were designed to collect data about shared conventions and assumptions in the discipline of literature and ways that participants think about teaching with literature.

For longer interviews conducted with literary scholars, I often combined these protocols to make the most of our time together.

Semi-Structured Interviews With Texts

  Concurrent verbal reports. Interviews 2 and 3 primarily involved concurrent and retrospective verbal report or think-aloud methods, which, in their broadest form, ask participants to solve a problem while articulating their thoughts. I gave participants two 19th- and 20th-century American short stories that are commonly taught in upper high school ELA courses and introductory undergraduate literary studies courses. I selected the short stories based on their short length and the likely familiarity of the authors to all participants. Before participants read each text, I directed them to stop when they were aware of a question or thought. After the participants read the short story, I prompted them to reflect on the practices they brought to their reading (e.g., "How did you go about reading this text?").

  The successful use of concurrent verbal reporting can reveal the (otherwise invisible) thinking of individuals and document the contents of their working memory (Pressley & Hilden, 2004). This method is intended to reveal literacy processes and practices that proficient readers can easily take for granted and that they may not have language or awareness to name. Put simply, I used think alouds to document what readers do while reading literary works. As Martin and Wineburg (2008) put it: "Think alouds give insight into the 'intermediate processes of cognition'—the way stations that lead to discovery and the creation of warranted interpretation. It is during these stages, well before a conclusion has been reached, that we see thinking at its most raw…before it is tidied up and presented for public view" (pp. 307-308).

  Think alouds have been used productively in reading and literacy research for over a century, beginning with scholars like Titchener (1912). Newell and Simon (1972) advanced the use of the method with their book *Human Problem Solving*, in which they conducted a study of human thinking while solving problems of logic and chess. In their book, Newell and Simon

interpreted participants' verbal reports of their thinking as data, which marked a shift from considering participants' verbal reports of their thinking as somewhat unreliable and rife with inconsistencies.

In their review of over 30 think-aloud studies, Ericsson and Simon (1993) further advanced the method by finding think-aloud data quite reliable across disciplines. They, too, argued for the validity of think-aloud data when participants are asked to articulate their thinking while conducting a task. Pressley & Hilden (2004) further elaborated on the standards for quality of the think-aloud method for researchers, including the importance of avoiding asking leading questions during think alouds and the importance of prompting participants to articulate their thinking while reading. When reporting findings of a think-aloud study, Pressley and Hilden underscore the importance of sharing details about how the think alouds were conducted, including the directions given to participants and the rationales for decisions about texts and participants.

Given adherence to these standards for quality, the think-aloud method is held in high regard as an accepted way to document thinking and approaches to reading. One major contribution of the use of think-aloud protocols has been to understand the strategies and metacognition that proficient readers use to support their reading. By the 1990s, over forty think-aloud studies had been conducted to investigate strategic reading (see Pressley & Afflerbach, 1995, for a review of this literature). These studies have informed the field in many important ways, including heightened attention to supporting students' development of metacognition and "fix up" strategies with content-area texts (e.g. Carnegie, 2010).

Others in the field have used think-aloud methods to investigate the disciplinary thinking and reading of experts and novices. As reviewed above, Wineburg's (1991a) study was one of

the first in this line of scholarship. He applied the use of think alouds to questions of the

cognitive processes of historians and high school students as they read historical documents. His

study documented the patterns of thinking that historians bring to reading historical texts (e.g.,

corroborating, contextualizing) and the notable differences between historians' and students'

approaches to reading historical texts. Since the early 1990s, many other scholars have advanced

the field's understanding of disciplinary literacy by using think alouds to investigate expert and

novice approaches to domain-specific texts.

Retrospective verbal reports. Reporting thinking after having completed a task, or

retrospective reporting, includes participants' interpretations of their thinking. It is a way of

documenting how participants consider and perceive their approaches to texts. Data drawn

solely from retrospective verbal interviews have been criticized as less valid than data drawn

from concurrent reporting because of the presence of participants' interpretations and the

likelihood of their attempts to make their actions cohesive. However, retrospective reporting can

be productively used to complement concurrent reporting (Ericcson & Simon, 1993), and other

studies have applied these methods in combination (e.g., Shreiner, 2009).

The use of retrospective reporting seemed particularly useful for my research questions.

It is important to understand the extent to which university professors and secondary teachers can

articulate the literacy practices that they bring to their reading, as a first step in understanding

how they approach teaching students. To prompt retrospective reporting, I asked questions like:

"Were there aspects you found challenging? What did you do to help yourself?" and "How did

you go about reading this text? What do these practices 'buy' you?"

Texts. During interviews 2 and 3, I asked participants to read two short stories that are

commonly read in upper-high-school English languages arts courses and introductory-level

undergraduate literature survey courses: Chopin's "The Story of an Hour" and Hemingway's "A Day's Wait" (see Appendix for full texts). When I had time, I also shared with participants the original version of Chopin's story, which was published in *Vogue* and titled "The Dream of an Hour." The criteria guiding my process of selecting texts were: 1) Texts must be short stories; 2) Texts must be 19th or 20th century American literature; 3) Texts must represent two authors and two literary periods; 4) Texts must be under 1500 words each.

I elected to hold the genre constant for two reasons. First, it is possible that there are distinct literacy processes that readers bring to different genres of literature. Peskin (1998), in fact, makes this argument in order to establish a strong purpose for studying experts reading poetry. Given my number of participants and research questions, limiting the literary genres to one type was designed to strengthen my findings. Second, because short stories are so commonly included in school curricula and tests, documenting the literacy processes and practices of experts who read such texts (and teachers who teach such texts) could be particularly valuable for teaching with literary works.

I chose to focus on 19th and 20th century American literature because of its prominence in high school and college literature courses. I limited the text length to 1500 words in order to ensure that the think-aloud data I collected would be manageable.

I selected these two particular short stories in order to allow for multiple possible interpretive approaches. The stories stand alone as complete texts. As such, readers could bring a range of interpretive approaches to each story. Readers could analyze themes, bring a theoretical lens to their reading, and/or analyze a story as an example of the literary period in which it was written. I hoped that the many differences in the two texts would serve to highlight the shared literacy practices used by literary scholars and teachers across reading events.

53

The pairing of these two texts also allowed for additional interpretive approaches. If readers sought to apply their analysis of the first text to their reading of the second text, then they could demonstrate additional literacy practices (e.g., analysis of authors' craft across two stories; analysis of differences between 19th and 20th century American literature; analysis of characters across texts).

Unlike most researchers who use expert think-aloud studies, I did not insist that the texts be unfamiliar to readers. For example, Peskin (1998) purposefully selected obscure texts and then dismissed participants from the study if they were familiar with them. Many expert studies have insisted on unfamiliar texts because they were concerned with the cognitive processes that experts bring to new texts, including the ways they monitored their comprehension. Because my research questions focused on documenting the literary literacy practices of literary scholars and high school teachers, I wanted to approximate as much as possible the conditions of their reading. Literary scholars and high school teachers often read literary works again and again, sometimes over their entire career. This fact itself may even be considered a shared literacy practice. For this reason, it seemed unprofitable to limit participants' texts to solely unfamiliar ones. Further, because I sought to gain insight into the literacy practices scholars and high school teachers bring to texts that are commonly taught, I expected that at least some participants in my study would be somewhat familiar with the texts.

As a part of the interview sequence, I asked the literary scholars to bring a text of their choosing to one of our interviews. They tended to bring a text that they were using in their scholarship at the time or a text that they were using in their teaching. I included participant-selected texts to allow additional insight into the scholarship and meaning making practices of

literary scholars that could have been masked by the constraints of the verbal protocol methodology.

Interview Procedures

To ward against my influence as a researcher on what participants say, I emphasized at the start of each interview that I had no stake in how participants responded to the interview questions or reading tasks. I sought to minimize my influence on participants' talk by asking open-ended questions and striving to maintain an even tone.

Before participants read each short story, I asked them to stop when they were aware of a question or thought that they had about it. I described that I was interested in learning how s/he makes meaning from the text as a reader, not how s/he reads for the purposes of planning for student learning.

I included some prescribed stopping points in the featured texts in order to prompt readers to articulate their thinking. These stopping points were located after approximately the first paragraph of each story (a point at which I hypothesized readers were reconstructing purposes for reading and generating guiding questions for the text) and again at the end of each story (a point at which I hypothesized readers were making meaning of the resolution or lack of resolution, among other textual elements). Otherwise, I left the reader some choice in determining when to stop and what to say because I could not predict how readers would make meaning of the text. Leaving most stopping points open allowed me the opportunity to collect these data.

An added benefit of including pre-determined stopping points was that it allowed me to remain quiet while participants are reading and thinking aloud, so as to minimize my presence as

much as possible. When there were long silences, I prompted participants to continue to think

aloud by saying, "Keep talking." However, this was rarely necessary.

Table 3.4

Frequency and type of interview by participant

Name	# of Interviews	Interview: literacy practices and teaching	Think aloud with "A Day's Wait"	Think aloud with "Story of an Hour"	Think aloud with choice text
David (D1)	3	✓	✓		✓
Flora (D2)	4	✓		✓	✓
Jane (D3)	1	✓			
Elias (D4)	2	✓			✓
William (D5)	1	✓			✓
Grace (D6)	3	✓	✓		✓
Sarah (D7)	3	✓	✓		✓
Millie (D8)	3	✓	✓		✓
Anthony (D9)	4	✓	✓	✓	✓
Alexa (D10)	3	✓	✓		✓
Lisa (T1)	4	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sally (T2)	4	✓	✓	✓	
Amy (T3)	4	✓	✓	✓	
Alice (T4)	4	✓	✓	✓	
Kate (T5)	3	✓	✓	✓	
Claire (T6)	2	✓		✓	
Carl (T7)	4	✓	✓	✓	
Josh (T8)	4	✓	✓	✓	
Diane (T9)	4	✓	✓	✓	
Margaret (T10)	4	✓	✓	✓	
Janet (T11)	3	✓	✓	✓	
Kara (T12)	4	✓	✓		
Total	**71**	**22**	**17**	**13**	**10**

There is some variation in the number of interviews that I conducted with various

participants. This variation is partially explained by the general differences in the length of

interviews between scholars of literary studies and the high school teachers. Whereas the

scholars tended to prefer longer and fewer meetings, the high school teachers tended to require

more frequent and shorter meetings. A second reason for the variation is that a few of the

scholars had a limited amount of time that they were willing to offer me for interviews; even

though they could not complete the full interview sequence, I opted to include them in the study.

Classroom Observations

I wanted a way of seeing how what participants were reporting to me was occurring in

their classrooms, so I also observed the teaching of a subset of participants. I mentioned my

interest to participants to observe their instruction during the first interview; when invited, I did

everything possible to schedule times to observe, although I was somewhat limited by my own

schedule. I observed three of the ten scholars teaching and six of the twelve teachers on at least

one occasion each. When observing, I took fieldnotes to document their instructional

approaches, focusing on the alignment between their descriptions of their teaching and their

enactment. I used these observations as contextual data to support and confirm the primary,

interview-based data.

<div align="center">

Data Coding and Analysis

</div>

I began analysis immediately following the first interview in this study. My first level of

analysis was transcribing the interviews. As I transcribed, I carefully attempted to accurately

represent each line of spoken text. I began coding line-by-line as soon as I transcribed the first

interview in January 2014. Quickly, important themes began to emerge, which I represented

with umbrella codes. The process was iterative and recursive. I then analyzed the literary

scholars' interview data, paying special attention to where participants stopped to think aloud

while reading, and representing emerging themes with umbrella codes. Next, I moved to the

high school teachers' interview data, again paying attention to where participants stopped to

<div align="center">

57

</div>

think aloud while reading and representing emerging themes with umbrella codes. Finally, I compared codes across the two participant groups to look for patterns.

Coding and Analysis

I collected and analyzed data in two phases. Within each of the two phases, I used constant comparative analysis to break apart the data, code them, and discover themes (Glaser, 1965). This approach allowed me to immerse myself in the data and revise or validate initial findings with each group as necessary.

I wrote regular memos throughout the process of data coding and analysis. These memos helped me to build a record of my thinking and organize my ideas and materials. They also served as a space for me to do the work of analysis, focusing me on data-supported concepts rather than descriptions. Over time, these memos grew in complexity, and they helped to reveal, for example, when a concept was not yet fully developed or when my logic was faulty (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). I also conducted member checks as a part of the interview sequence.

Phase I: Analyzing within-group patterns of literary scholars and high school teachers. I began analyzing the literary scholars' interviews immediately after the first interview I conducted. As I conducted further interviews with the literary scholars, I transcribed and then coded the data line by line, making every attempt to remain open-minded to concepts in the data, and recognizing that at this stage, I would not know which concepts hold interpretive meaning or which are lower-level versus higher-level (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). At this stage, the coding process was "open and free, much like brainstorming" (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, p. 52). I wrote memos to capture my ideas and stimulate new insights. I then read all "before reading" sections of the think-aloud data, looking for patterns in how experts approach literary texts. I noted what

58

the literary scholars were doing and how they were doing it; I also attended to the frequency of literacy practices.

As I progressed with my interviews and analysis, I moved to axial coding. I compared moments in the data to one another, looking for places that were conceptually similar. As I noticed patterns in the data themselves or the initial codes I had assigned, I memoed about them and listed them. Then I worked to iteratively sharpen the codes, seeking to represent concepts or themes with umbrella codes and seeking to subsume minor codes underneath the umbrella codes. In order to do this iterative work, I moved back and forth between my list of initial codes and the coded data, continually asking myself, "What are the observable literacy practices?" and "What are the relationships between my drafted codes?" I paid special attention to the types of problems, purposes, and guiding questions that experts articulated before reading, because I understand all disciplinary work to be driven by discipline-specific investigations (Moje, 2008; Bain, 2006), and I planned to document these approaches to literature.

I then applied the same analytic approaches to the "during reading" and "after reading" sections of my think-aloud data, using my initial codes and the data themselves to identify patterns, and then iteratively sharpening the codes until I was satisfied that I had meaningful umbrella codes that represent literary scholars' literacy practices. When focusing on the "during reading" practices of the literary scholars, I paid close attention to how they go about investigating the question or problem they set for themselves. When I was focusing on the "after reading" practices of literary scholars, I paid special attention to when they stop interpreting and how they know that they are finished. I also paid attention to the sorts of explanations they gave for what is meaningful about the text and how they know it to be meaningful, and the sorts of discipline-specific assumptions that they carried with them throughout their interpretive work.

Finally, I analyzed the initial codes I assigned to the literary scholars' semi-structured interviews, developing consistent and representative umbrella codes to name their teaching approaches. I sorted and reorganized ideas within previous memos to help me develop these umbrella codes. Then I looked across the transcripts of individual participants for relationships between their own literacy practices and their descriptions of how they teach students.

From axial coding, I moved to selective coding. I constructed a chart of codes of observed literary literacy practices and approaches to teaching with literature. This chart included data exemplars for each umbrella code and symbols that are linked back to the transcribed and coded data. I considered how the data exemplars supported each property, and, in some cases, I decided to collapse or eliminate properties.

I then analyzed the high school teachers' interview data, going through the same process as described above. As I coded, I made every attempt to remain open-minded so that I could avoid making unwarranted generalizations about the group of teachers and jumping to conclusions about the similarities or differences in the approaches of literary scholars and high school teachers. Once I used open coding to begin analyzing these data, I then listed all possible meanings in the patterns I had seen (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). This intentional memo-ing helped me to slow down and reflect on the assumptions I may be bringing to my analysis given the set of initial findings about the literary scholars. Iteratively, I developed a sharpened set of umbrella codes that described the patterns of teachers' literacy practices before, during, and after reading, and their approaches to teaching with literature. I constructed a second chart of patterns in literacy practices of high school teachers, including data exemplars and links to coded transcripts.

Phase II: Analyzing across literary scholars and teachers. Once I developed these two independent sets of themes, then I began to compare across the two groups of participants. I examined the two charts and asked myself questions such as, "How are the literacy practices of literary scholars similar to those of high school teachers?," "How are they different?," "How do participants' own literacy practices relate to their approaches to teaching students?," and "Are there cases that complicate group-level patterns?" As I did this, I remained aware that the comparison between groups might further illuminate patterns and I continued to sharpen and refine umbrella codes to represent these patterns. See Tables 3.5—3.9 for coding categories and data exemplars.

Using these data charts, I continued to memo to construct a theoretical scheme or interpretive model that I used to answer my research questions with the data collected. I sought to sharpen the theory by first comparing it against the raw data to ensure that it explained them. I then tested my developing theory by selecting portions of data. I presented the theory to select participants for their reactions and to ensure that they could see themselves in the scheme, even if some of the details of their specific reading events were not represented (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Finally, after all coding was complete, I established interrater reliability with an experienced qualitative researcher. Initially, interrater reliability was 82%. We resolved disagreements through discussion.

Table 3.5

Coding categories and data exemplars: Shared disciplinary orientations

Code	Operational Definition	Data exemplar
SO: Problem based	The subject articulates understanding that doing literature is problem-based	• "We [literary scholars]…create puzzles for ourselves to solve so that we generate new ways of reading, new ways of seeing text" (D4, I2, 138-140)
SO: Social nature	The subject articulates understanding that doing literature is social in nature	• "[Literary criticism is] a contribution out into a community of scholars that might change the direction of the conversation" (D2, I2, 199-205)

Table 3.6

Coding categories and data exemplars: Literary literacy practices

Code	Operational Definition	Data exemplar
LLP: Seeking patterns	The subject articulates or demonstrates practice of seeking patterns to make meaning with text(s).	• "[I am] trying to find patterns" (D8, I2, 33) • "Interesting, that looking. There's a lot of looking in that sentence" (D8, I2, 197)
LLP: Identifying strangeness	The subject articulates or demonstrates practice of identifying strangeness, surprise, confusion, or disjuncture to make meaning with text(s).	• "[I] look for words that seem unique or weird" (T3, I2, 58) • "There's a kind of meandering [in this section of the story]…We're given so little that [this] seems… significant" (D8, I2, 298-299)
LLP: Articulating puzzle	The subject articulates or demonstrates the practice of articulating an interpretive puzzle with text(s).	• "I reevaluate [my annotations to ask]…what is this thing doing and how does it function…as part of a larger…ecosystem of the text?" (D4, I1, 282-286) • "What does it mean to have a word's definition involve both X and the opposite of X?" (D6, I2, 114-115)
LLP: Considering possibilities	The subject articulates or demonstrates practice of recursively considering interpretive possibilities with text(s).	• "[I try to consider] all of the possibilities that the text affords…[to] keep all those possibilities in play…[and] to get all of those possibilities on the table" (D6, I3, 434-441).
LLP: Considering contexts	The subject articulates or demonstrates practice of considering histories of use, variants, and other contexts.	• "[I'd want to do] research about the context—historical, cultural, social context in which the text was produced and circulated" (D10, I3, 408-409)
LLP: Making claim	The subject articulates or demonstrates practice of making original claim about text(s).	• "The goal is to help your reader understand the text in a new way" (T8, I1)

Table 3.7

Coding categories and data exemplars: Literary literacy instructional practices

Code	Operational Definition	Data exemplar
LLIP: Naming puzzle	The subject articulates or demonstrates instructional practice of naming features of literary puzzles or naming an example of a literary puzzle.	• "I show [students] what a question might look like…[I] say this is exactly the kind of thing that would make a great paper" (D1, I1, 375-376)
LLIP: Posing puzzle	The subject articulates or demonstrates instructional practice of posing literary puzzle for students to consider.	• "I would want my students to think about and respond to….this idea that being conscious both entraps us and frees us…" (D6, I2, 465-467)
LLIP: Constructing puzzle	The subject articulates or demonstrates instructional practice of teaching students to construct literary puzzles.	• "All these S words not only help [students] build ideas in response to the thing they're looking at, but they allow them to move from that thing to a puzzle question" (D4, I2, 96-97).
LLIP: Considering possibilities	The subject articulates or demonstrates instructional practice of teaching students to recursively consider interpretive possibilities.	• "I…tell [students] to read it again...[and] in reading it the second time you'll see new things" (D9, I1, 633-636)
LLIP: Making claims	The subject articulates or demonstrates instructional practice of teaching students to make original literary claims.	• "…a really strong thesis statement is actually making a claim of puzzlement…[with something] that might help you think about how to respond to the puzzle…since you've identified the puzzle" (D4, I1)
LLIP: Inquiry process	The subject articulates or demonstrates instructional practice of coaching students through a cycle of literary inquiry, involving both a literary puzzle and a claim.	• "I have each of them come in [to my office] and talk with me about what they want to write on. I begin with…what puzzles you?...[Then] working out to a passage and then working ot a thesis, but only later to a thesis. And it's in conversation over email and visits to office hours." (D1, I1, 362-369)

Table 3.8

Coding categories and data exemplars: Constraining contexts of high school literary literacy instruction

Code	Operational Definition	Data exemplar
K12C: Assessments not disciplinary	The subject articulates that one or more standardized assessments constrains his/her literary literacy instruction	• "…How do you measure success? What if my students don't do as well on a test, does that mean I didn't teach as well?...Did I teach them how to close read, how to write margin notes, how to highlight, how to talk to the text? Yes I did. I still don't know if that improved their test scores compared to [another type of instruction]" (T12, I2, 221-225)
K12C: Limited professional learning	The subject articulates that the lack of opportunity for professional learning constrains his/her literary literacy instruction	• "It makes me laugh when [administrators are] like, 'Well, you know you have your P[rofessional] L[earning] C[ommunity] time for 45 minutes one a month.' Yeah, that's accomplishing a lot" (T1, I1, 63-65).
K12C: Curricular constraints	The subject articulates that curriculum constrains his/her literary literacy instruction (e.g., breadth, pace)	• We are required—you can tell by my passive [language] my feeling about this—we are required to…teach that ACT-style argumentation first and fourth quarter…AP Literature, we have a lot more freedom as teachers, because we're trying to get them to dig deep…[like] what I do with literature, whereas in American Lit it's much more, we want you to teach them surgeon skills… (T1, I1, 222-230)
K12C: Strategy-focused literacy initiative	The subject articulates that the implementation of one or more strategy-focused literacy initiatives constrains his/her literary literacy instruction	• … But what I've seen [of the district-adopted model of academic writing] is [teachers] give [students] one topic, and all [students] have to write about the same topic…[T]hey might actually have the opening sentences be the same…They've had that in ninth grade. So then my struggle is how to break them from that. [Students] don't like this idea and they're like, "Why don't you just give us a topic?" "No. Part of it is you thinking deeply and coming up with something unique"… That's the starting point for me -- to get them to generate their own ideas. (T7, I1, 294-302)
K12C: Limited material resources	The subject articulates that his/her limited access to material resources constrains his/her literary literacy instruction	• There was…a story…that we could not find the whole thing of…I even paid some amount… to…access [it]…I wanted it to try to get students to consider the tone. I ended up just putting the first six paragraphs, because that's what I had access to, and just [asked students to consider], "What do you pick up from the beginning?" (T4, I2, 479-486).

Table 3.9

Coding categories and data exemplars: Supportive contexts of university literary literacy instruction

Code	Operational Definition	Data exemplar
UC: Alignment of expertise and teaching	The subject articulates that he/she experiences alignment between scholarly expertise and teaching	• "It feels to me like my pedagogy is very much in harmony with my scholarship and my writing, and I feel very fortunate" (D1, I3, 291-292)
UC: Sustainable workload	The subject articulates that he/she experiences workload as sustainable	• "[W]e have only 18 students. I think that's a good size to be able to get some personalized attention…But I only teach one class a semester" (D9, I1, 571-574)
UC: Access to material resources	The subject articulates that he/she has wide access to material resources	• "I'll link on the syllabus…if you're interested in reading a recent review of this edition, here it is" (D1, I3, 430-431)
UC: Pedagogical freedom	The subject articulates that he/she has freedom to make instructional decisions about content and/or structure of courses	• "The things I teach I love to teach" (D1, I3, 184)

Study Risks and Limitations

Managing Risks to Participants

I anticipated that the participants of this study would be minimally affected by the interactions I had with them, both because our time together was relatively brief and because the questions were designed to uncover the ways participants already think about and read literature. However, I took precautions to manage possible risks.

One possible risk was a breach of confidentiality. This was particularly of concern regarding the high school teacher participants in the study, as their employment and status in their school community could be negatively affected by being associated personally with particular results. I took steps to avoid this risk. Most audio did not include identifying information. When transcribing the audio files, I removed all identifying information in the

transcripts. All participants were assigned pseudonyms. In order to securely store the data, I kept all data in a locked file cabinet in a locked room. I created a table to link pseudonyms to participants, but this information, along with all other identifying information like classroom numbers, was kept securely in a separate filing cabinet away from the rest of the data and I did not share it with anyone.

Another risk was that participants might feel coerced to participate in the study. This risk was most foreseeable for the secondary high school teachers in my population because my recruiting initially involved school administrators. Because all potential participants were adults, I did not consider these risks likely. In order to minimize any individuals experiencing recruitment as coercive, I stated verbally and in writing that this project was completely voluntary and that it would not impact their job or standing in any way. I was also explicit throughout the process that participants could drop out of the study at any time.

Limitations

This study was exploratory in nature. The total number of participants was modest: 10 scholars and 12 high school teachers. Further, the participants were drawn from only two institutions: one program within a research university, and one suburban school district. Still further, the participants self-selected into the study, rather than being selected randomly. These design decisions, as I have argued, were appropriate for my exploratory research goals and I modeled them on other studies of this type (e.g., Wineburg, 1991a, 1991b). The results, however, given these design choices, should not be understood as necessarily representative of the broader populations of teachers or contexts of schooling.

Relatedly, the study was most certainly shaped by the participants with whom I worked. I can only guess at the ways my findings might have changed had I, for example, worked with a

different set of disciplinarians in the same department. I am also aware that I may have found

differences in teaching approaches. My findings might also have changed if I had recruited

scholars of literary studies across multiple universities. Similarly, it is likely that my findings

could be shaped by recruiting a different set of K-12 teachers; had I worked with teachers across

multiple districts, or in a non-suburban district, or across grade bands, I may have ultimately

come to a different set of findings.

Race, class, gender, sexuality, and nationality are always important considerations in

social science research. I chose participants randomly because I hypothesized that although race,

class, gender, or other qualities of difference might shape the content of individuals'

interpretations, disciplinary reading and writing practices would be shared across groups.

Historians in Wineburg's (1991a) study, for example, all engaged in seeking the source of

primary documents when reading, regardless of the historians' race, gender, and even particular

historical expertise. Thus, I predicted that literary scholars would share disciplinary practices,

even if their particular interpretations would be shaped by their personal qualities of difference.

Because I did not intentionally recruit participants to reveal variation among race, class,

gender, sexuality, or nationality, I did not likely see a full range of meanings that individuals

might have made with the two focal short stories. For instance, 21 of 22 participants of this

study were white. Their whiteness is likely to be an integral dimension of the meanings they

made with the short stories of this study. Their whiteness may also may have affected their

experiences as educators within their institutional contexts. Also, I am aware that one particular

emphasis for many literacy scholars relates to questions of race, class, nationality, and gender,

although most of the literary scholars in my sample did not explicitly focus their scholarship on

these types of questions. Even though race, class, gender, sexuality, and other qualities of

68

difference shaped the *specific meanings* that participants made with texts, I do not have reason to think that these qualities of difference would shape the *practices* that participants employed.

A final consideration regarding race, class, gender, sexuality, and nationality involves the two focal texts of this study. The two short stories were written by white authors: Kate Chopin and Ernest Hemingway. Neither short story directly engages with race, though they both engage with gender. The short story selections themselves may have also shaped participants' patterns of response, possibly limiting the range of interpretive meanings that participants made with the texts. However, again, I do not have reason to think that these texts would prevent me from seeing shared practices with literary works.

Just as I did not recruit participants to reveal variation among identities, I also did not necessarily recruit participants who represent the entire population of high school ELA teachers and university literary studies scholars. Based on my experiences in university-based literature courses and high school ELA classrooms, I assessed the participants of my study to be generally, but not completely, representative of literary scholars and high school ELA teachers the general population of scholars and teachers. In other words, I may have recruited literary scholars who were somewhat more concerned about questions of pedagogy, student learning, and the relationships between their teaching and the work of K-12 education than some of their university-based colleagues. One brief fact that supports this hypothesis is that 2 of the 10 literary scholars were former high school ELA teachers themselves. Similarly, I think I may have recruited high school ELA teachers who were more concerned about discipline-specific approaches to literary works and the relationships between their teaching and the work of university literary scholars than some of their high school-based colleagues. A different study design could potentially help to confirm this hypothesis. My point is that beyond simply the

design choices of the study, what I learned about the participants throughout the study, alongside my personal experiences in classrooms as a teacher and a teacher educator, prompt me to express caution regarding the representativeness of the findings.

Another potential limitation of the design is that although my classroom observations demonstrated alignment between what participants said they did and what they actually did, my main data source for the analysis of patterns was participants self-report about approaches to teaching with literature. I found patterns in their *talk* about teaching; their talk about teaching was my primary data source as opposed to documented observations of their actual teaching. In particular, I considered whether my findings related to the strategy-literacy teachers were a result of the discourses of literacy teaching that were available to them, rather than indicators of meaningful differences in their instruction. However, holding Josh as an exception, I found that teachers' self-reports of their instructional approaches aligned with their demonstrated literary literacy practices. Teachers who talked about bringing more disciplinary approaches to their instruction also tended to bring disciplinary approaches to their reading. I also found that despite being in the same school setting, with access to the same school and professional development discourses, teachers talked and taught differently. For these reasons, I am confident that the differences I found in the high school teachers' talk about their instructional approaches is not explained only by the privileged ways of speaking in K-12 school or professional development opportunities, but is in fact also connected to their ways of knowing, reading, and writing in their discipline.

Role of the researcher. *I*, too, necessarily shaped the findings. My interests in the study, my stances on teaching and learning, my prior experiences as a middle school ELA teacher, my work with preservice ELA teachers and local veteran ELA teachers, and my position as a white,

middle-class, female researcher contributed not only to the design but also the data collection and analysis.

Importantly, I am not a member of the discipline of literary studies, although I was an English major in college and I have focused my graduate studies on the relationships between secondary ELA teaching and learning and the disciplines of English. Borrowing from Wineburg (1991b), an educational psychologist who studied historians and was driven by his "deep affinity" for the discipline of history (p. 496), I similarly come to this study as a literacy education researcher with an ongoing commitment to literary studies.

One of the lenses that shaped this study, as I briefly referenced in Chapter 1, was my role as a former teacher in an underresourced rural middle school in the South. I taught seventh and eighth grade ELA, eighth grade honors ELA, and ELA to older students enrolled in the alternative learning program. Because the school's standardized test scores were so low relative to other schools in the state, there were monitors and consultants involved in helping the administrators make decisions about school structures, curriculum, professional development, and student and parent interactions. One decision that affected my teaching tremendously was the decision to turn many ELA courses into double-blocked "Literacy Intervention" courses and use a tightly choreographed curriculum, which focused on teaching students metacognitive reading strategies and encouraging them to develop identities as readers. Students who were placed into the double-blocked literacy intervention sections were well aware of the differences between their schedules and those of their friends, and often they believed that they were poor readers.

Teaching with the curriculum itself and participating in the intensive professional development offered by the curriculum provider—which included a coach who visited my

classroom regularly and helped me improve my practice—gave me a solid foundation in metacognitive reading instruction that I likely would not have otherwise developed. Teaching within the former school structures and then within the reformed school structures, which emphasized routines for student reading and talk, doubled the time I had with students, and reduced the number of students I was responsible for teaching, offered me many opportunities to see the benefits of such reform efforts. And, yet, I was dissatisfied with the rigor of the instruction students were receiving. Maybe it was the case that students needed to be taught to actively predict when they read a novel, for instance, but there was so much more that they needed to learn in order to really be ready for college-level literature courses. I was at once grateful for the support, uncertain about the underlying assumptions of the curriculum as it was written, and largely unable to question the required curriculum or learning goals. Although I did quietly experiment with various other approaches, I found that I simply did not know enough about literacy theory or pedagogy to meet the teaching and learning expectations inside of my school context at the level that I sought.

A second lens that shaped this study was the theoretical stance that I developed and the teaching and program-level work that I have done while in graduate school. I worked within an undergraduate teacher education program that was redesigned to align with sociocultural theories of teaching and learning, namely the interactive model of literacy, which is that literacy occurs at the intersection of the reader, the text, the activity, and the social and cultural contexts, and that literacy is best understood as the result of these interactions (RAND, 2002).

As a graduate student instructor of the program, most often I taught a cohorted literacy methods course to preservice English language arts teachers. Over time, my colleagues who taught other sections of the literacy methods course (e.g., to preservice history teachers)

72

informed the ways that I thought about K-12 teaching and the academic disciplines. My desire to develop an "ELA version" of the discipline-specific literacy methods courses and my inability to easily find or articulate the parallel versions of, say, Wineburg's (1991) literacy practices of historians, or Bain's (2012) intellectual problems of history, drove me to design this research study. I hoped that I would find patterns of problem framing and other practices with texts; I also held the stance that teaching literacy ought to involve more than metacognitive or content area literacy goals. Both likely shaped the data I collected and what I was able to see in them.

These lenses and prior experiences, along with my position as a white, middle-class, female researcher, shaped my study design and findings in ways that are knowable and unknowable to me. It is possible that I offered more positive feedback to participants' responses that focused on the role of constructing questions with literature, for example, through my body language, tone, or follow up questions because I sought to document constructing questions as a shared practice of the discipline. In order to bolster the interpretive validity of the study, I continually reflected on my own biases and subjectivities (Peshkin, 1988). I wrote an identity memo at the beginning of the study to sharpen my understandings of these subjectivities as they related to the study design, and I revisited it throughout my process of data analysis. Throughout my data collection and analysis, I regularly asked myself whether I was giving too much deference to the literary scholars of the study and whether I was fairly representing the high school teachers' patterns of reading and teaching. Also, I often shared portions of my data with a senior scholar to confirm that she also saw what I was noticing. I find confidence in the fact that this study yielded two major findings that I did not anticipate at the outset: 1) the dramatically different reading and instructional approaches of the high school teachers, and 2) the mediating role of institutional contexts in participants' literary literacy teaching.

CHAPTER IV: PATTERNS AMONG LITERARY SCHOLARS

…[T]he thing that we [literary scholars] do…all the time…is to create puzzles for ourselves to solve so that we generate new ways of reading, new ways of seeing text. (D4, I2, 138-140)

I…want to teach [students] to ask real questions about the things they're reading…Most of the students [at this university], I'm very lucky, are capable enough…and bored enough [by the formulaic ways they have learned to read and write with literature] that they're ready to not do that anymore…But, boy, it's so hard to shake that off and to get into the open-ended adventure instead. (D1, I1, 61-78)

Based on my analysis of data collected with 10 members of the discipline of literature, or literary studies, together with 12 high school teachers of literature, I assert that a set of shared disciplinary understandings and practices emerged that could be characterized as "literary" in approach. However, holding shared disciplinary understandings and literary literacy practices did not ensure that educators would provide consistent literary literacy instruction to students. Specifically, 1) University-based literary theorists and researchers (hereafter, "literary scholars") shared literary literacy practices and understandings, and their approaches to instruction generally tended to align with them; 2) Some high school English language arts teachers seemed to share many of the literary literacy practices and understandings evident in the literary scholars' data; those who shared literary literacy practices also tended to seek to provide instruction that aligned with them; and 3) The contexts of secondary schooling constrained the high school teachers' literary literacy instruction, whereas the contexts of the university afforded, and even supported, the literary scholars' literary literacy instruction. See Figure 4.1 for key linkage chart.

Figure 1. Key Linkage Chart

Holding shared disciplinary understandings and literary literary practices is necessary but not sufficient for instructors' abilities to provide literary literacy instruction to students

Disciplinarians seemed to share a set of literary literacy practices and understandings, and their approaches to instruction generally tended to align with them

Teachers who seemed to share many of the disciplinarians' literary literacy practices and understandings sought to provide instruction that aligned with them.

The contexts of secondary schooling seemed to constrain teachers' literary literacy instruction, whereas the contexts of the university seemed to afford/support disciplinarians' literary literacy instruction

Shared orientations

Shared literacy practices

Instructional priorities/ approaches aligned

problem-based nature

social nature

constructing literary puzzles

pursuing literary puzzles

communicating about literary puzzles

Shared orientations

Shared literacy practices

Attempts to align instructional priorities/ approaches

Constraining contexts of K-12

Supportive contexts of University

In the remainder of this chapter, I show that the literary scholars of this study approached their work with literature in shared ways, and that their approaches to instruction aligned with their literary literacy practices and orientations. The literary scholars demonstrated these values and practices while reading and thinking aloud, by what they said about literary studies, and by their explanations of their meaning making and teaching practices.

Pursuing Literary Problems to Construct New Knowledge

For these literary scholars, doing literary studies involved engaging in shared literacy practices including: seeking patterns within texts; identifying strangeness, surprise, or confusion within texts; articulating an interpretive puzzle; recursively considering interpretive possibilities with texts; considering histories of use and other contexts; and making original claims about texts. These practices rested on shared understandings that doing literary studies is fundamentally about constructing new knowledge through text-based inquiry and that such work is a social pursuit done within a community.

Problem-Based Nature of Literary Studies

Central to the data is the theme of constructing knowledge through identifying and pursuing literary problems. All ten of the literary scholar participants articulated and/or demonstrated the centrality of constructing literary questions or problems—or "puzzles," as three of ten participants called them without prompting—in their own scholarship.

David said that, although there is not "just one set" of puzzles, for him the puzzles usually "come out of particular engagements with the text" and "what remains puzzling for me and interesting for me…[are] the ways [texts] resist thematic summary and they often work back against themselves in some ways" or otherwise "refus[e] to mean one thing only" (D1, I1, 87-88,

91). For example, David described a literary puzzle in Woolf's *To the Lighthouse* that he found significant. The text includes the phrase "but in me, though not in her, rage alternated with love." He went on to describe how this phrase is meaningful and puzzling to him:

> So, Vanessa is purely enraged with their father, for all the emotionally tyrannical things he did once her mother died, but rage alternated with love…So the real questions about *To the Lighthouse* are going to be, where do you see rage and love in the same phrase alternating? Or in the same scene? Where does a scene pull itself apart along those lines?...It would be easy to write a paper that Mr. Ramsey was tyrannical. Absolutely. So we could start with that and say, yeah, but, the real question about this book is not simply how is he tyrannical, but where is the love also in that moment? (D1, I1, 95-111)

Like David, Elias used the language of "puzzles" unprompted and emphasized their centrality in doing literary studies. In response to a question about how he supports students in making literary arguments, he included in his reply: "I'm a lot about puzzles" (D4, I1, 391-392). As an instructor, Elias reported that he had spent a lot of time developing instructional approaches to support students in learning to "do the thing that we [literary scholars] do…all the time, which is to create puzzles for ourselves to solve so that we generate new ways of reading, new ways of seeing text" (D4, I2, 138-140). This way of constructing knowledge is based in an understanding that "…literature keeps its secrets. We as readers are in a position to figure out what to do productively in the face of those secrets not being revealed" (D4, I2, 297-318).

To illustrate his thinking about the prominence and nature of literary puzzles, Elias offered the following example from Morrison's *Beloved*:

> I think of that book as weirdly having two endings… There's one ending it feels like the book is ending on a kind of cliché, where Sethe and Paul D. are together…Then there's

this, almost like a coda, after that scene, where the narrator again takes over. The characters aren't so prominent. Through the narrator, we hear some final thoughts about storytelling…It seems like *Beloved* ends twice. Why does it end twice, and what would happen to *Beloved* if we didn't get this extra short little chapter to readjust our sense of what the book is ending with?" That's a puzzle. (D4, I2, 150-166)

Although the textures of the puzzles or problems varied, the literary scholars described seeking to contribute to the larger conversation of scholars by offering "an original slant" (D5, I1, 61-62) or unique perspective. Literary puzzles typically come either by "start[ing] from the text and mov[ing] out, or…start[ing] from the critical conversation and mov[ing] back" (D6, I2, 433-435). The work of both David and Elias, along with four other literary scholars, focused on literary problems or puzzles that originated from one or more texts. Grace, for example, echoing the comments of David above, said of her work: "for me, I always start with the poem, and I seem to be able to make the best contribution to the very capacious field of literary studies by posing questions that arise through my thinking with text" (D6, I2, 446-448).

Alexa's dissertation work represents a different example of a problem that has come out of her work with multiple texts. In her case, she sought to understand a new body of texts that had not been fully explored. She was working with a set of novellas alongside a set of paired photographs of previously enslaved black men taken both as they entered Union Army camps, often in tattered clothes, and then in their uniforms. This genre of photography, which has been used in different ways in literary works about slavery, was recently made more accessible thanks to digital archives, and it offered a new opportunity for considering how "the different iterations of photographic technology influenced how writers wrote about slavery and how readers read"

78

(D10, I1, 11-13). Although distinct from the examples of literary puzzles described above, Alexa's work was also focused on a problem that originated with texts.

For others within literary studies, as Grace put it, "the place they start is scholarly debates…The question that's really motivating them is a question about how to change a narrative that keeps getting used. So the move towards the primary text is more of…an example of something that would counter" (D6, I2, 414-419). Of the ten literary scholars, four characterized their work as beginning in some way with a desire to challenge or complicate a particular narrative in existing scholarship. William, for instance, described the problem of a recent book he authored as "emerg[ing] out of dissatisfaction with previous attempts to make sense of [one author's] poetry" and his efforts to offer a new approach to this body of work (D5, I1, 36-37).   Anthony's scholarship, similarly, originated from a realization that most of the time literary scholars have ignored characters' Methodism in American literature from the end of the Revolution to the beginning of the Civil War and instead have "categorized [them] under the general heading of Evangelicalism" (D9, I1, 17-18). His work was based in the understanding, given the "culture war going on during this time period between Calvinist and Methodist," that "there's a much more sophisticated reason why these authors are incorporating…Methodist characters… [in fact,] they are invoking this cultural war and it's got ramifications for understanding of the literature that haven't been explored yet" (D9, I1, 19-20, 29-33).

Social Nature of Literary Studies

The social nature of doing literary studies is a strong theme in these data. In addition to demonstrating the ways that their literary problems relate to and are informed by the work of other scholars, all ten literary scholars indicated that doing literary studies centers on "participating in an academic community" (D4, I1, 345). This understanding was so basic to one

senior scholar that he replied to an interview question about the social nature of his work with apparent boredom, saying "Well, I'm addressing a community of scholars, that's my audience, so I know what they said" (D5, I1, 46-47).

All of the literary scholars described their work as joining an existing conversation. For example, Millie explained recognizing "this sort of connective tissue between this individual text and a larger conversation," in which the concerns of the individual move "to some sort of collective" (D8, I1, 149-150). Flora said of her work: "…I'm working within a framework of meanings, but I am bringing that knowledge into a kind of connected scholarly conversation and contributing it back out to a community of people…Aspirationally, it's a contribution out into a community of scholars that might change the direction of the conversation" (D2, I2, 199-205).

Graduate students, perhaps because they were still somewhat in the process of becoming full participants in the community, tended to also talk about their proximity to scholars as well as other formal markers of group membership. Millie, for example, described feeling a part of a community of scholars of literary studies through her work with other graduate students and professors, her participation at conferences, interviews she had conducted with authors, and her desire to publish within literary journals (D8, I1, 109-131).

Not only did the literary scholars understand their scholarship as fundamentally about participation in an academic community, they also tended to describe the social functions and representations of the literary works. Far from static, Grace described literary works as "part of processes…and part of social relationships. [For example,] [t]here are a lot of different hands on any one Dickinson poem, both during her time period and between when she lived and now" (D6, I2, 250-252). David said, "There are whole conferences and whole books, literally, on editions of *Ulysses* and huge debates" about its history of publication (D1, I3, 407-409). And, of

80

course, each work itself is a construction developed by an author whose voice is deeply meaningful and worthy of careful listening. As David said, there is a sort of "ethics or tact of recognizing that other person or of hearing a voice that's not your own and allowing it to be fully present in your own work" (D1, I3, 280-282).

There was also a pattern of thinking about the work of literary interpretation as so multifaceted that it demands the efforts of many people. Five participants noted that literary works are art and require multiple perspectives and collaboration. For example, David said, "I feel like with great works of art like this [short story] and I feel like this with visual art too, that I can never be adequate by myself to honor the work, and that we can only read it together" (D1, I1, 523-525). "A lot of the books I teach are ostentatiously difficult books, like *Ulysses* or *The Wasteland* or Virginia Woolf's novels or these poems…" he went on, "[so] we all need each other to make the richness of the text manifest" (D1, I1, 512-516).

Using Shared Literacy Practices to Pursue Literary Problems

Data from semi-structured interviews and verbal protocols revealed that these literary scholars not only brought similar shared understandings to their work, but they also used particular literacy practices in order to construct, pursue, and communicate about literary problems. See Table 4.1 for breakdown of use and articulation of practice by participant. Though each of the following literary literacy practices is a distinct pattern in the interview and verbal protocol data, the literary scholars talked about and used them in flexible ways. Therefore, though they are presented below separately, they should be understood as tools that are used iteratively and in combination with one another.

Seeking Patterns Within Texts

One important part of working through a text is identifying patterns within it. In fact, ten of the ten literary scholars described or demonstrated seeking patterns within and/or across texts. "[T]rying to find patterns" (D8, I2, 33), rather than being initially somehow guided by particular questions, was characterized by deliberate openness to possibilities for meaning. That is, instead of bringing a particular set of expectations to the text, the literary scholars generally described a "wait and see" approach to each text. For instance, Grace characterized her work as "participating with the text, and so I wait to decide which direction I'm going to move in until I see what the text can help me accomplish and what I can help bring out of the text" (D6, I2, 455-458). Similarly, Millie said of her reading that "there's not anything that is overtly in my mind as the compass questions as I'm [initially] launching in[to a text]" (D8, I1, 221-222).

When beginning to read "A Day's Wait," for example, Millie demonstrated the open and methodical search for patterns common among participants. In this moment of the interview, she was reading for the first time the first two sentences of the short story:

"He" -- that's significant. It opens without a name. It opens with this pronoun and [inaudible 0:04:33] that we're coming onto a situation, just kind of launching into something already in process. "He came into the room to shut the windows," so it's not a room -- it's the room. Already it's sort of an allegorical kind of situation. "He came into the room to shut the windows while we were still in bed," so there's a he versus a we. "I saw he looked ill." He looked ill. I wonder what it means to look ill. That provokes a lot of thought, so I'm wondering what the dynamic is between we and he. (D8, I2, 53-60)

Her attention to the many possibilities for meaning within these early lines is evident in her commentary. She stopped after reading the first word "he" to consider possible meaning, she

82

noted the use of "the" instead of "a" in the first sentence as potentially important, and she noted the use of "we" in relationship to the "he." As she continued to read the third and fourth sentences, she was already identifying potential patterns. For instance, after reading aloud the third sentence, Millie said, "I'm getting into the style here—the sort of calm repetition, parallel structure." A few moments later, she noted the story's "terse, short sentences" (D8, I2, 88).

Millie continued this approach to her reading throughout the whole short story. She continued to notice possible patterns at the line level. For example, when she read the phrase "It would have been natural for him to go to sleep, but when I looked up he was looking at the foot of the bed, looking very strangely," she remarked, "Interesting, that looking. There's a lot of looking in that sentence" (197). She also continued to track patterns across the story. She regularly began her comments with "again," as in, "Again, there's this sort of distance that's really intriguing and disturbing" (159) and "Again, it's very clinical" (168).

The literary scholars who participated in think alouds all demonstrated this sort of open noticing and looking for patterns within the text. When talking about their own work, some scholars also described constructing puzzles by seeking patterns across texts. For instance, rather than focusing exclusively on one short story as she did for the purposes of this study, in her dissertation work Millie was seeking to examine "what an author does across their work," which involved "looking for patterns…to recognize what's typical and what's atypical for the author for that time" (552-554). Of course, seeking patterns across texts also involves seeking patterns within texts. No matter the scope of the project, the practice of seeking patterns was one that all ten literary scholars seemed to share.

Identifying Strangeness, Surprise, and Confusion

Regularly, these literary scholars described and demonstrated the importance of noticing textual features that initially seem surprising to the reader. Sometimes the surprise was related to a break in a pattern of language use, character action, or the organization of the text. When Millie began reading a section about two thirds of the way through "A Day's Wait" that marks a change in setting and that is written as a paragraph instead of separate lines of dialogue, she remarked, "Now I see that we have a whole paragraph. I'm wondering what this is going to be. It's so different…We're kind of stepping out of the progression of dialogue just like the man is stepping away from his son…". As she read the paragraph she continued to think aloud about the meaning she was making, and then she said, "There seems to be a disconnect…These are also really long sentences for this short story. There's kind of a meandering…We're given so little that that seems so significant" (D8, I2, 293-299). For her, then, the strangeness she identified came directly out of a pattern she had identified.

Other times, the surprising features identified came in the unexpected pairing of two or more concepts, words, or character behaviors. When reading a Dickinson poem, Grace pointed out a "brilliant paradox" of the final two lines: "Captivity is Consciousness, So's Liberty." She said, "so this is a really exciting end to the poem to get a definition that being conscious is both the route to suffering and the route to freedom" (D6, I2, 114-115). For her, these sorts of "key binaries" were critical features of texts that offer the reader a point for reflection and deeper meaning making (D8, I2, 34).

Still other times, the surprising elements are "strange," "weird," "peculiar," "incoherent," "twisted," or "confusing." David offered an example that highlighted the strangeness that tends to underlie many literary puzzles: "…there's a strange passage in *To the Lighthouse* where

there's a kind of weird sex scene [between a man and a woman] that's not really sex but [a child] James is standing between Mr. Ramsey's legs and Mr. Ramsey is standing over him, a weird passage…it's a very violent passage" (D1, I1, 414-420). He asked of this scene: "…why is James there too? Why is there a kid in this scene?...Totally real question, right, and really interesting question, and one that any reader…is going to want to know also, why the hell is James there?" (D1, I1, 485-488).

Millie, in the think aloud interview introduced above, had many moments in which she registered this sort of surprise. In the single paragraph she honed in on, in fact, there were multiple moments that can serve as examples. After reading, "And fell twice, hard, once dropping my gun," she said, "What? Dropping his gun?...[The gun] is being kind of thrust on you as a surprise. So there's a shock that I feel as a reader…Why the hell does he have a gun?" (278-289). And toward the end, after reading the line in which the boy in the story says, "About what time do you think I'm going to die?", Millie exclaimed, "Holy shit! What? About what time do you think I'm going to die?!...He's ending the sentence with death" (384-388).

Articulating an Interpretive Puzzle

Nine scholars demonstrated or described moving from their early noticings to "asking [a] very rigorous question" that focused and drove their further interactions with the text (D4, I1, 286). Elias said that he regularly reevaluates his noticings and considers "What is this thing doing and how does it function…as part of a larger…ecosystem of this text?" (D4, I1, 290-292). This general question often leads him to an interpretive puzzle that serves to drive his subsequent work with the text.

David, too, after identifying the weird moment in *To the Lighthouse* where a boy James is present in a sex scene, described the process of using another surprising phrase in the same novel

85

as a way of illuminating both the phrase and the "disturbing" scene. As I noted above, the text includes the phrase, "but in me, though not in her, rage alternated with love." A productive puzzle for him, given these two surprising features within the same text, could be to compare them, because "in the [James passage], you're at exactly a point where rage and love are occurring side by side" (D1, I1, 422-423). This might involve focusing, for instance, on the "figurative language, because [Virginia Woolf] uses very bizarre metaphors" in the scene, or it might involve putting these noticings alongside other "sex passages in [Woolf's other] novels [which are also] so bizarre" (D1, I1, 427). Whatever the specific focus, this work of reexamining noticings and considering how they function within the "larger ecosystem," to use Elias's phrase, led David to construct the preceding literary puzzle worthy of further pursuit.

Grace, who noted a paradox in the final line of the Dickinson poem, articulated the following puzzle for further consideration: "…what does it mean to have a word's definition involve both X and the opposite of X? What does it mean to understand one term in terms of two opposing definitions?" And, how is it that "being conscious is both the route to suffering and the route to freedom?" (114-115). Here, she put this poem in conversation with other Dickinson poems that often involve "a lot of attempting to define words" and "slipperiness" of word meanings. She also considered together the first line of the poem "No Rack can torture me, My Soul at Liberty" as "being this binary that the poem itself deconstructs or collapses by the end" with the line "Captivity is Consciousness, So's Liberty" (115-118).

Grace, after having read "A Day's Wait," reflected on a different sort of puzzle: "Even though, of course, I'm delighted to know that the boy is not going to die, there's something about the story that seems to invite me to take seriously the boy's knowledge of his own condition that the end of the story seems to kind of turn into a bit of a joke that I resist." Given this, she offered

the following problem: "Who has access to appropriate knowledge here, and whose knowledge counts? Yeah, that's what I would be interested in as a sort of fumbling first draft question."

Recursively Considering Possibilities

After articulating a "fumbling first draft" literary puzzle ("Who has access to appropriate knowledge here, and whose knowledge counts?"), Grace shared the next set of interactions she would plan with this text if she were to pursue the puzzle. She would want to reread the story again and again, first thinking about "ways that the 'I' does and does not take seriously what the boy is doing as well as saying" (D6, I3, 349-350). Though she knew that "ultimately, I would have to make an argument about the story," she said she would deliberately seek to consider "all of the possibilities that the text affords…[to] keep all those possibilities in play…[and] to get all of those possibilities on the table" (D6, I3, 434-441). This was based in a sort of "faith that what's being withheld or hinted at is being done for some sort of effect" and a commitment to "try to see how the text is inviting certain interpretive possibilities" (D6, I3, 499-502). Such effort to "find…all these multiple possibilities" (527) enables her to pursue her initial puzzle and to revise her puzzle as needed.

Rereading with the question or puzzle in mind was a critical feature of the work that nine of the ten literary scholars described. Sometimes, when time allowed, the scholars would read and then continue to reread parts of the short stories in their verbal protocol interviews. Rereading and continuing to attend to layers of the text allowed the scholars to sharpen their questions and initial interpretive thoughts.

Considering Histories of Use and Other Contexts

Each of the literary scholars frequently explained the importance of considering various types of contexts, text variants, and secondary sources when pursuing questions or puzzles. The

sorts of contexts that literary scholars considered ranged widely and included the historical

moment in which the author lived and other biographical information about the author

him/herself, the time in which the literary work was set, the academic scholarship that had been

created and read in association with the work, the content and organization of the work within a

particular volume, and the multiple versions of the literary work itself.

The scholars commonly referred to the importance of doing "research about the

context—historical, cultural, social context in which [the text] was produced and circulated"

(D10, I3, 408-409). Even in the think aloud interviews, which did not provide contextual

materials for consideration, the literary scholars typically commented on their desire to consider

such aspects as a part of their interpretive process. Grace, for instance, described "want[ing] to

think about ["A Day's Wait"] in relation to other Hemingway stories. Are there other stories by

Hemingway where we have an adult and a child or some sort of relationship where someone

seems to have more knowledge than someone else, and how does this differ from those or fit into

that mold?" (D6, I3, 400-403). She also wanted to do research about "where [people are]

drawing their knowledge about influenza and which influenzas" at that time in France, and

looking up the meaning of "Schatz" to find out if it is a "nickname or last name" and to help

determine "the relationship between the I and the boy" (404-406). And, she mentioned the

potential importance of researching "how parents or boarding school instructors or doctors were

instructed to talk with children about influenza" (408). In each case, these possible directions

were, for her, "context[s] that I would potentially go to as a way to help me think through that

question" of whose knowledge counts in this short story (411-413).

Millie, echoing many of Grace's early considerations of context, said while talking

about Hemingway's "A Day's Wait":

I think [the contexts] definitely would…matter…Seeing how that text was fit into a larger

context would, I think, surely have made me think about it differently. If it's an

anthology, is it an anthology of Hemingway work? How does it come? Is it organized

chronologically, and this just comes in chronological order, or is this somehow selected

as a more prominent or more important piece of his work? Is it in a selection of stories

about -- is it in a post-war context? Is it in a selection of stories that deals with male

relationships and maybe relationships that are not father and son? It does certainly

influence my reading, especially of the characters' relationship to each other and of

thinking through what this boy's imminent death -- or what we think for so much of the

story could be his imminent death -- what that signifies. (D8, I2, 562-571)

Making Original Text-Based Claims

Offering readers an original way of thinking about the featured puzzle or problem, for the

literary scholars, was central to communicating about literary works. As Millie put it, "the goal

[of communicating about literature] is to help your reader understand the text in a new way" (D8,

I1, 608). Similarly, Alexa, when describing her dissertation chapter about the relationship

between Paul Laurence Dunbar's collection of poetry and the photographs of slaves that were

included alongside the written text, said, "…my reading changes the way we read Dunbar"

because "when we read pictures about slavery as mere illustrations, we miss the really rich

meanings that multi-medial text had at the time" (D10, I2, 315-316; 330-331).

Interpretive claims could be thought of as presenting a new "lens" to a puzzle or question,

as Grace put it. Claims are more than "mere…personal connection[s]" and they are more than

summary; interpretive claims seek to "construct some kind of value or meaning or productivity

89

from…that thing that will never be certain to you" (D6, I2, 328-329). They are both supportable using texts and "vision shifting" for readers (D6, I2, 404-405).

Table 4.1

Articulation or demonstration of literary literacy practice, by literary scholar

	Seeking pattern within text(s)	Identifying strangeness, surprise, or confusion within text(s)	Articulating literary puzzle	Recursively considering interpretive possibilities with text(s)	Considering histories of use, variants, or other contexts	Making original claim about text(s)
D1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
D2	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
D3	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
D4	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
D5	✓		✓		✓	✓
D6	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
D7	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
D8	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
D9	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
D10	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Employing Literary Literacy Instructional Practices

The literary literacy practices described in the section above seemed to be shared by the literary scholars in this study. They demonstrated—and explained using—literary literacy practices in combination to construct, pursue, and communicate about literary problems or puzzles worthy of consideration. When describing their approaches to teaching undergraduate students, the scholars tended to describe approaches that were generally aligned with their own disciplinary orientations and literary literacy practices. This meant that scholars tended to describe using approaches to instruction that required students to construct knowledge through identifying literary puzzles or problems, pursuing those puzzles or problems, and communicating about them to others in particular ways. They also tended to express the values or orientations they strive to teach students. As David put it, "It feels to me like my pedagogy is very much in

harmony with my scholarship and my writing, [and] I feel very fortunate" (D1, I3, 291-292). Similarly, Millie said early on in our first interview, "…my teaching work kind of maps onto my personal literary interest quite nicely and I think it's very grand" (D8, I1, 50-51).

The literary scholars all emphasized the importance of teaching students to construct literary knowledge that is "new," "surprising," "original," "risky," or otherwise "productive." Without exception, literary scholars named this as a primary instructional goal for their introductory level undergraduate literary studies courses. Anthony said, "…I take it for granted that [my students] could summarize the story. I want [them] to say something new, something unique, to make a connection or to illuminate a pattern, or a polarity or whatever, that I didn't necessarily see at work" (D9, I1, 493-495). Though participants often acknowledged differences in scale between an undergraduate's project and a literary scholar's project, "the germ of it, the idea of coming up with not just a description of what the book says but some attempt to interpret it and to come up with an original slant is…the same whether I'm working on a book or I'm reading a student's paper" (D5, I1, 60-63). "In terms of the writing," William went on, "basically they're doing a mini version of what I'm doing" (D5, I1, 112).

The literary scholars seemed to favor instruction that asked students to identify, pursue, and communicate about their own literary questions, problems, or puzzles. Such an emphasis is particularly important because often they described that undergraduate students do not come to their introductory level literary studies courses with an understanding of literary inquiry. On this point, Anthony said it "is often really hard [to construct literary knowledge] and it does take imagination…I have many students who just want me to give them the formula" (D9, I1, 448-460). Grace talked about students' tendencies to believe that there is such a thing as "right or wrong" answers when reading poetry and other literary works (D6, I1, 324-325). William talked

about this as well, saying that often "students balk at the idea that they have to come up with an original claim. They find that beyond their pen. I explain to them that nothing could be further from the truth" (D5, I1, 64-66). Elias noted this issue as well, adding that often his students come to class "confused and skeptical about interpretation" thinking that a text "means whatever we want it to [mean]" (D4, I1, 259-261); teaching students how to construct literary knowledge was a primary concern for him.

Ten of the ten literary scholars described designing assignments that required students to engage with literary works to construct new knowledge. One common assignment was an essay, typically due at the midterm or the end of the semester, in which students were directed to make a clear interpretive argument based on a question or puzzle that he/she identified and pursued. In David's undergraduate courses, students "design their own projects, it tends to be shorter essays…The ideal…is that it's always a topic of their making and that they care about" (D1, I1, 371-372). Aside from assigning formal essays, the literary scholars tended to heavily emphasize the importance of whole class discussions for teaching students to engage in literary inquiry. Within these activity structures, participants revealed a set of instructional approaches for scaffolding students' abilities to construct new literary knowledge.

In the remainder of this section, I present the patterns in shared literary literacy instructional practices. See Table 4.2 for breakdown of articulation of each literary literacy instructional practice by participant.

Table 4.2

Articulation of literary literacy instructional practice, by literary scholar

	Naming literary puzzle	Posing literary puzzle	Teaching students to construct their own literary puzzle	Teaching students to recursively consider interpretive possibilities	Teaching students to make original literary claims	Coaching students through cycles of literary inquiry
D1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
D2		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
D3		✓	✓	✓	✓	
D4		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
D5					✓	
D6	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
D7	✓	✓		✓	✓	
D8		✓		✓	✓	✓
D9		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
D10		✓	✓		✓	✓

Naming Literary Puzzles

One instructional practice that three literary scholars described using in their instruction was simply naming worthwhile literary questions or puzzles in class. Grace explained, for example, wanting to look at various questions with her students and highlight for them "Which of these questions seems most interesting?" (D6, I2, 404-405).

David, too, reported regularly making opportunities to highlight the centrality and characteristics of literary puzzles in class:

> So I do show them what a question might look like and I try in classes and discussion to say, this is exactly the kind of thing that would make a great paper, and it may come from something that one of them asks, that's the best, if they say something and I say this is awesome, this is how it's a cool paper because it's saying this but look at how it unfolds in this way, so you'd also have to take this into account. (D1, I1, 375-380)

93

It was his hope that by showing them examples of literary questions or puzzles, students would learn to recognize "when [they] stumble on a real one" in their own reading and notice that it is an important part of the work of the discipline (D1, I1, 72).

Posing Literary Puzzles

Beyond simply naming worthwhile questions or puzzles, nine literary scholars described the importance of inviting students to consider questions or puzzles that they or other scholars had already constructed. By posing what David called "real" questions to students, instructors sought to show students how to engage in literary inquiry. The literary puzzles they reported inviting students to take up were those that could be answered in multiple ways and those that the instructor him/herself does not have a clear answer to:

> I tend, I think, more than I used to, to ask more general questions to my classes, like what's going on here, or what's this about… If I were to catch myself asking a question with a single answer that I know the answer to already, I will correct myself to them and apologize to them for asking a fake question…Who wants to answer that? That's just a trick for them to do for me, and that's bullshit… I guess the questions I come to class with will be, will tend to be ones that I still have as questions myself about the book, and ones that I know the students who are assembled in the class will come up with very different answers for. (D1, I1, 144-150)

Grace, when describing how she would want to teach students with the Dickinson poem she read earlier in the interview, said:

> One thing I think I would want my students to think about and respond to in relation to the [Dickinson] poem is this idea that being conscious both entraps us and frees us. I think I'd be really interested in students' responses to that sort of paradoxical

94

proposition and to what extent that rings true to them now, in the 21st century, and to

what extent that seems odd to them or what about it seems odd. (D6, I2, 465-469)

By offering students such a question, she would not only be helping them to think analytically

about the poem, but she would also be able to engage them in a conversation about the question

she posed itself, including "the extent to which they find that to be an interesting problem to

face" as readers (D6, I2, 470-471).

Another example of a puzzle that a literary scholar explained presenting to his students

was the meaning of a symbol at the end of the penultimate chapter of *Ulysses*; the dot, which was

included in the first edition of the novel, has frequently been understood by editors to be an error

and has been removed from later editions. When reading *Ulysses*, then:

...half of the editions in a given class, to this day, will not have this weird, giant mark at

the end. There is supposed to be a giant point in the first edition, the printers devised this

square thing called a [fleur 48:36] for print...[I] say to students, "Open your book to the

end...What do you have there?" Half of them have nothing, so they all draw in a dot. I

actually had a student who had that tattooed after the Joyce class. It's a badass tattoo.

That dot is supposed to be like the world or the squared circle or a book's page. It's a

million things that dot means. (D1, I3, 501-510)

By calling students' attention to the presence/absence of this symbol, David invited them to

engage with a literary puzzle that was constructed by noticing strangeness—this time between

multiple editions of the same text—and situating that strangeness in the larger whole.

Another approach to inviting students to consider given literary puzzles was to engage

students in questions of critical scholarship. For instance, Grace described the value in sharing

how a Dickinson "quatrain has been quoted and what kinds of arguments it has been used to

make" in order to engage students in considering literary puzzles (D6, I2, 408-409). David recounted bringing in scholarship that clearly shows reviewers grappling with a particular piece, and he gave the example of sharing with students:

> …early reviews by the first reviewers of "The Waste Land." You can see [the reviewers] collectively….trying to figure out what is this thing that we've got? It's weird and it's new. One of the things about art in the period that I tend to be teaching is that a lot of it is challenging on its surface and the first response of the audience is to riot or to say it's a scam or to love it or hate it or be baffled by it. It validates students' responses when they see early reviewers who were also saying I don't know what this is about. Is T. S. Eliot pulling our leg, is "The Waste Land" a real poem, or is it just a bunch of quotations? Is it a collage? Is it just snipping and pasting with scissors? Or, is it art? That feels like something worth working on together. (D1, I1, 541-550)

Teaching Students to Construct Literary Puzzles

Seven literary scholars described their approaches for teaching students to construct literary puzzles. David shared multiple ways he seeks to support students as they learn to "make questions that are interesting to them" (D1, I1, 280-281). One approach he shared was regularly "asking [students] to bring in or propose questions" that guide the class discussion (D1, I3, 46). He asks students to post questions prior to class, and he synthesizes the questions and "singles out things that are particularly powerful about these questions" (D1, I3, 78-79).

Similarly, Alexa relayed regularly presenting students with "an image…a weird picture" and supporting them as they generate puzzles from it (D10, I1, 483-485). One example she offered in her interview was a recent moment of instruction, in which she showed students an "image of Tupac…superimposed against this kind of anachronistic image, there's like a little

child in a tattered dress next to him peeking out behind him, and there's a woman in the far background, a mule and a broken cart. And he's dressed in what appears to be slave's garb, or the garb of someone in the 1870's or 80's" (D10, I1, 433-437). She asked them to consider "first, what do you see?" and then, "Do you see things that are weird?" This supported students to construct literary puzzles like, "Oh yeah, [Tupac]'s wearing tattered pants and no shoes but he's also wearing his shirt the way twenty-first century gangster rappers wear their shirts" (D10, I1, 437-440). For Alexa, offering students thinking routines that support them to pose puzzles is the first step toward helping them learn to make interpretive claims about literary texts.

Elias has developed a number of heuristics he uses for helping his students construct their own literary puzzles. The first is what he called "the four Ss":

> After a whole semester of identifying things in text that are complicated and worthy of exploration or study, like, "This moment is so weird, so why is it weird?" After so much practice identifying things to observe…I, at some point, produce the S words, which are little tools to apply to things to observe and to make puzzles out of them and to make them do more work for you…[1] Substance: what is the substance of this thing? What is it really made up of?, which is just definition. [2] System: how does the thing that you've shown, how is it working? How does it work as a system? What are its parts, and how do those parts work together?...Source, system, [3] significance: of course, why is this thing important? …[4] Safety and danger. Not only why is this thing important, but why is it so important that if you don't understand it or if you don't see it the way I see it, it's actually a little dangerous? (D4, I2, 84-105)

In this heuristic, Elias named four types of literary puzzles that can come out of initial observations like surprise and confusion: 1) puzzles that seek to reveal the substance of a

97

particular feature of the text; 2) puzzles that seek to reveal how the parts of a text work together as a system (e.g., "Here's this complicated phenomenon that I've just shown you…The way it works is a puzzle to us. We can see that it's working, but it's not as easy to see what its parts are and how they function together," 91-95); 3) puzzles that explore why a particular feature is significant; and 4) puzzles that explore the danger of not recognizing a particular feature or moment as important. For Elias, "all these S words not only help [students] build ideas in response to the thing they're looking at, but they allow them to move from that thing to a puzzle question" (96-97). The puzzle question, then, allows them to pursue worthwhile directions and construct new knowledge from their initial observations about texts.

Another way of prompting students to construct literary puzzles is to share with them original versions of literary works (e.g., reading the novel *Uncle Tom's Cabin* as it first appeared as a periodical). As Anthony said: "[Students tend to] read fiction now in this very sort of fake—almost like a museum has curated [it, with its] context taken out. My students will read something like this and be like, 'Oh well. It's beyond reproach. It's beyond criticism in some ways because it's already been collected in this volume. It's already been hung on the wall. It's behind glass'" (D9, I4, 30-33). But, when students can read the original version of a literary work, it allows them to feel more able to bring a critical lens to the work. And, it allows them opportunities to construct a wider range of literary problems.

Teaching Students to Recursively Consider Interpretive Possibilities

Along with naming puzzles and offering puzzles for students to consider, eight literary scholars also shared ways that they supported students in learning to recursively consider interpretive possibilities. In the example above, Alexa, after this lesson, assigned students the

task of returning to the image for homework to continue to notice its features and to then "pose an argument about the image."

> Similarly, Anthony mentioned deliberately assigning students the task of rereading:
> …one of the things I do is just tell them to read it again. So like I assign them a short story, they come in on Tuesday, and they read it, we talk about it. I'm like, "Alright, your homework for Thursday is to read this short story again." And they're like, "Oh awesome, I don't have to do anything"…And I'm like, "The point behind this exercise is that in reading it the second time you'll see new things and here are the kinds of things you want to look for: anomalies, patterns, dichotomies…" (D9, I1, 633-643)

Anthony sought to build the expectation of rereading into the assigned coursework to formalize what he understood to be a central part of doing literary inquiry.   In both of these examples and across the moments in which scholars described the importance of asking and requiring students to reread, the rereading tended to be in the service of pursuing deeper meaning, often from moments that were initially confusing or surprising, and generating interpretive claims.

Teaching Students to Make Original Literary Claims

All of the literary scholars with whom I worked emphasized the importance of teaching students to make original claims with literary works. One way that some scholars described supporting students' attempts to write original interpretive claims was to encourage students to use an unfolding essay structure, so that each essay ended in a different or more complicated place than it began. This structure may be contrasted with an argument that centers on a thesis and is "proven" in the way of the five-paragraph essay.

Millie explicitly reflected on the value of talking with her students about the limitations of the 5-paragraph essay model:

It's been really useful…to establish what does the 5-paragraph essay allow us to do? It's a really strong organizational form. And it's a really sturdy structure for demonstrating a point…from the AP standpoint…And so it has its use, but the downside is that it doesn't really allow for a thesis to evolve and to gain new ground. And that is the goal that as your ideas encounter evidence they change, they refine, they grow. (D8, I1, 701-709)

Millie taught her students to organize their writing so that the thesis "evolve[s] as it encounters new evidence" throughout the paper and then concludes by acknowledging "how [the] thesis has evolved and where it's come since [the] introduction" (D8, I1, 654-655).   This, she said, and "especially the feeling that they don't have to have it exactly right in the introduction…[or] in the first draft" tended to be "liberating" and "freeing" for students, and it resulted in writing that is "more exploratory" (D8, I1, 716-719).

The literary puzzle was frequently at the core of literary scholars' expectations for their students' literary essays. Elias, for example, exclaimed early on in our first interview: "I don't teach thesis statements!" Instead, he shared, "I want [students] to think about anything they write as working hard to construct the details of some engaging and important problem or puzzle or question" (D4, I1). For him:

> …a really strong thesis statement is actually making a claim of puzzlement, so the claim isn't so much "This is the theme I'm trying to prove to you," but the claim is more "This thing is very puzzling and if you didn't see it as puzzling at first, you should see that it's puzzling now… [and then,] Now that you see the puzzle that I see and you believe it is a puzzle, and you understand a little bit about why the puzzle is important and it deserves your time and attention, let me just show you one more thing that might help you think about how to respond to that puzzle, where to go next, since you've identified the puzzle.

Here Elias underscored both the importance of demonstrating a puzzle and providing a new lens or approach to the reader when communicating about literary works. In this way, he sought to support students in constructing new knowledge about literature in ways that are shared by the community of literary studies.

Another thinking routine that Elias explained using to support students to construct and communicate knowledge—to participate in the discourse community of literary studies—was writing "big but" statements:

> …"big buts"…[are] sentence[s] you let yourself write in response to a text, either broadly about the entire text or about a specific moment in the text or a character or a scene...If you write a sentence like, "It's pretty obvious in *Angels in America* that *blank blank blank*, but *blank*," there's a puzzle for you as a writer to figure out that can help you hone in on a thing that's valuable to your reader, to listen through and be walked through. (D4, I2, 107-124)

By asking students to write "big but" statements in groups and individually, Elias seeks to help students "move beyond" what they tend to do, which is "say pretty obvious things about texts...[that can feel] redundant or unfocused or patronizing," and begin to "generate new ways of reading, new ways of seeing text" (112-118; 138-139).

> He described his use of this heuristic in a recent class meeting with his students:
>
> I just did one for *Moby Dick* for them as an example… I said something about *Moby Dick* to them like, "It's pretty obvious in *Moby Dick* it's pretty easy to see how obsession can result in self-destructive behavior when it turns into monomania. But in the character of Ishmael, perhaps, we might see how obsession can affect the human mind in different ways." [Then] I gave them a group project, and the first thing they had to do was to think

about *Angels in America*, either the whole text or the part of it they've read so far -- the

first half -- or some character or some scene in it. The first thing they had to do was

generate five to six different *big but* statements, just so they had some examples in front

of them. Then as a group, they had to choose the best one, and the project went on from

there. (124-136)

Even in his "big but" heuristic, which may on the surface appear to be designed to support

students' rhetorical moves in their writing, Elias was actually supporting their abilities to

construct, pursue, and communicate about literary puzzles. It was important to him that students

not include obvious summary; partly, this was because summary is typically not particularly new

or interesting to a literary studies audience and therefore might be thought of as a discursive

convention, but partly it was because the absence of summary required students to move into

literary interpretation, which is fundamentally of concern for a literary studies audience.

Coaching Students through Cycles of Literary Inquiry

Seven literary scholars described the importance of working with students as they learn to

engage in full cycles of literary inquiry. Sometimes they described seeking to provide this

instruction at the class level. For example, Alexa reported sharing a text with her students,

prompting them to identify moments that were strange or surprising, posing a literary puzzle,

then having them consider multiple interpretive possibilities. "[A]fter they do that a couple

times," she said, "then I tell them, 'So I want you to, based on what you see and what you make

of what you see, I want you to pose an argument about the image'" (D10, I1, 440-444). In this

way, Alexa designed instruction that sought to tie multiple literary literacy practices together in

the service of considering and communicating about literary puzzles.

More frequently, scholars mentioned the one-on-one coaching they regularly did to guide

students through cycles of literary inquiry. As David put it, "there's a kind of feedback loop"

required to develop students' practices with literature (D1, I3, 80). A central component of

David's courses was one-on-one conferring with his students in order to help them construct

their own literary puzzle and then pursue it:

> I have each of them come in [to my office] and talk with me about what they want to
>
> write on. I begin with, "What do you love? What irritates you? What puzzles you? What
>
> don't you like?" So, just…moving from something that makes them have a question or a
>
> point, something emotional affective and like, "ugh, I don't like this," or "God, this is so
>
> cool…" or "Why is this here?" That's where their paper will come from. It's coming
>
> from that and working out to a passage and then working to a thesis, but only later to a
>
> thesis. And it's in conversation over email and visits to office hours. (D1, I1, 362-371)

Similarly, Anthony explained holding one-on-one meetings with students:

> So very frequently it's just getting them to get a little bit more specific, yet helping them
>
> to ask the right questions really, and just pushing them a bit more. If they come in with an
>
> argument that's fairly obvious, [I'll ask them] "Okay, what if we took that for granted?
>
> What would the next move be?" So that is the way that I like interact with my students
>
> about literature on a daily basis. (D9, I1, 504-508)

Grace, too, conveyed the importance of this sort of one on one coaching. For her, when a student

has asked any type of question at all of the text, it is something to honor and celebrate: "…I

would start [the conference] by honoring that the student has asked the question, because it's

hard to ask questions" (D6, I1, 355-356). From there, she described a series of coaching

conversations that she would have with the student to build on his/her initial idea, including first

finding out from the student answers to questions like, "What is it that you're hoping to understand by asking this question?" and "How many people do you think are confused about [this question]? Just with your classmates, can you imagine a large audience that would be invested in understanding [the answer to this question]?" (356-360). And then from there, "trying to massage the question towards something that invites the student to do more historical research or comparative work" or otherwise sets the student up for constructing new knowledge (366-367). After this first meeting with the student, which would "be more than enough for one session," she said she would "ask [the student] to come back" for additional meetings throughout the semester (369).

Conclusion

Overall, the literary scholars in this study routinely described creating opportunities for students to learn how to participate in the ongoing scholarly conversations of literary studies. In wanting students to make the shift toward constructing literary knowledge, the scholars described approaches to teaching that were aligned with their own literary literacy practices with literary fiction. Underlying the instructional approaches were beliefs on the part of the instructors that their students were capable of engaging in academic inquiry with literature and that it was a worthwhile pursuit for them to learn to do so.

CHAPTER V: PATTERNS AMONG HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS

I remember one time when I went to a high school classroom [as a guest from the university] and we just spent the entire class on maybe like three lines of poetry. And the students said to me, "Oh, we've never done this before. We've never sort of just kept asking new questions about the same words and like seeing more connections that were drawn and everything." And in the back of my mind I'm like, well, what are you doing in this class if you're not doing that? (D9, I1, 535-541)

Why do we read? There are different purposes, and that changes depending on what you're reading. And in literature it should be for the answers to the big questions...But that is not the song and dance—the curriculum dance—that we're supposed to do. (T1, I1, 218-220, 255-256)

In Chapter 4, I described the shared set of literary literacy practices and understandings of the literary scholars of this study, and I showed how their approaches to instruction seemed aligned with their shared literary literacy practices and understandings. For the literary scholars, literary studies was fundamentally about pursuing literary problems to construct new knowledge within a community. They seemed to construct, pursue, and communicate about literary problems in shared ways. And, they described instructional practices that aligned with their literary literacy practices.

In this chapter, I describe the literary literacy practices, understandings, and approaches to instruction of the twelve high school teachers in my study. I found two groups of teachers in these data: a more discipline-aligned group of six high school teachers (hereafter "literary-literacy teachers") and a less discipline-aligned group of five high school teachers (hereafter "strategy-literacy teachers"). The two groups of teachers differed in their own ways of making meaning with literary works. The literary-literacy teachers tended to demonstrate some of the

shared literary literacy practices described in Chapter 4, and they gave signals that they considered themselves participants in a broader literary community. By contrast, the strategy-literacy teachers tended to focus on their own use of metacognitive strategies for comprehending the literary works they read, and they focused their meaning making on personal connections or insights. Relatedly, the two groups differed in their instructional approaches with students, with the literary-literacy teachers striving to center their instruction around constructing and pursuing literary questions or puzzles of interest to a broader literary community and the strategy-literacy teachers centering their instruction on developing individuals' school-based skills and knowledge and metacognitive reading strategies. The findings are evidenced by what the high school teachers demonstrated by reading and thinking aloud, by what they said about literary studies and English language arts, and by their explanations of their meaning making and teaching practices.

By dividing the high school teachers of this study into two groups, I do not seek to privilege the literacy or instructional practices of the literary scholars of this study, nor do I seek to disparage any of the teachers of this study. Further, I do not intend to suggest that the teachers themselves were anything but hardworking and thoughtful professionals who sought to do their best within a challenging set of contexts. Indeed, I more fully investigate the many contextual factors that help to explain the range of high school teachers' literacy practices and instructional practices in Chapter 6. However, when seeking to answer questions about high school teachers' own use of literary literacy practices and their approaches to instruction, I noticed distinct and clear sets of patterns that were generally divided by group. Insofar as high school teachers are responsible for providing disciplinary literacy instruction to students by apprenticing them into the practices of the disciplines—so that students are better able to both engage with texts for

106

disciplinary purposes and make choices about when, why, and how to use the practices—the patterns that I noticed among teachers' literacy practices and instructional approaches with literary works are important to consider.

In this section, I characterize the patterns of literate practice and instructional approaches of the six literary-literacy teachers. In the next section, I characterize the patterns of literate practice and instructional approaches of the five strategy-literacy teachers. Finally, at the end of the chapter, I present Josh's case, which did not fit neatly into either group but instead seemed to straddle the two groups in important ways.

Literacy Practices and Understandings of the Literary-Literacy Teachers

Six high school teachers in this study named instructional approaches that closely resembled those of the literary scholars. Like the literary scholars, the six literary-literacy teachers tended to describe an understanding that doing literary studies is fundamentally about constructing new knowledge through text-based inquiry and that such work is a social pursuit done within a community, and they described attempting to include literary inquiry in their instruction. The other group of teachers, characterized later in this chapter, did not tend to demonstrate or describe work with literature in disciplinary ways, and their instruction was largely focused on teaching students metacognitive strategies and study skills for academic reading and writing. Comparing the two groups of teachers, there were not consistent differences in their levels of education (e.g., master's degree or bachelors only) or types of courses taught (e.g., AP versus non-AP), though the strategy-literacy teachers did have fewer years of teaching experience on average than the literary-literacy teachers (M=12.6; M=18.8).

In this section, I will share the similarities I saw between the literary-literacy teachers and the literary scholars described in Chapter 4. At the time of data collection, the literary-

literacy teachers had a range of 6 to more than 30 years of experience teaching literature within secondary English language arts. The literary-literacy teachers held an average of 18 years of teaching experience (M=18.8, Mdn=17 years) and two of these six teachers held Master's degrees (one in literature, and one in education).

Problem-Based and Social Nature of Literary Studies

Six high school teachers—Lisa (T1), Amy (T3), Alice (T4), Carl (T7), Margaret (T10), and Kara (T12)—explicitly named the problem-based nature of literary studies. As a "student of literature," Margaret thought of herself as a fellow "searcher" who "doesn't have the answers" but seeks to "explore things with kids [because] that's what's going to show them [how] to be a searcher" too (T10, I1, 289-292). Lisa, too, characterized the purpose of reading as exploring particular questions: "Why do we read? There are different purposes, and that changes depending on what you read" (T1, I1, 218-219).

For this group of teachers, reading and considering literary questions does not produce a single or "definitive" answer, however. Engaging in this problem space involves asking "real" or "actual" questions with and about texts and then sharing a "theory" of interpretation in response. Carl, for instance, said that "questioning…[is] a big part of my own reading experience when I'm reading" (T7, I1, 60-61).   Kara said doing literature is "really about not knowing the result, it's asking questions and seeing where it takes you" (T12, I4, 339-340). For Lisa, "if it's a good piece of literature, I don't think you're writing about a question that has an answer…It's more like, 'Here's my theory.' If it's a really complex text and a complex analysis, then there is no 'The End'" (T1, I3, 367-371).   And, as people contribute new ideas about text, it allows for others to build on those ideas.

Whereas many of the twelve teachers expressed the importance of talking with others about a particular text, they described the purposes in different ways. Commonly, teachers of both groups would indicate that complex texts are challenging and necessitate working together (e.g., "…I think actually…you enjoy a book more as a community, and I also think you get more out of it when you read it together with people and talk about it and share it," T1, I1, 434-435). Whereas the strategy-literacy teachers only mentioned ways that student talk helped promote comprehension and general engagement, the six literary-literacy teachers also talked about the broader community of literary studies.

The literary-literacy teachers also considered the "history of ideas" and "different forms of criticism" in the discipline as important (T10, I1, 236). Amy, for example, said, "I like going to JSTOR and reading what others have said about authors and works. Then I know what might be important [when I read]" (T3, I2, 41-42). She also noted using Google Scholar as a resource for literary scholarship.   Commonly, the more discipline-aligned teachers mentioned reading the *New York Times* book reviews and essays about literary works or authors in journals like *The Atlantic*. Carl reported his habit of reading the literary criticism and commentary by novelists in the *New York Review of Books* (T7, I1, 345-347). Unlike the scholars, the teachers did not describe themselves as in proximity to other scholars, and they did not tend to group themselves with scholars of literature, though two teachers, Margaret and Lisa, identified with the critical traditions of "new criticism" and "formalism," respectively. But, the literary-literacy teachers frequently mentioned trying to seek the insight of their colleagues when they read and prepared to teach literary works.

Finally, the six literary-literacy teachers also emphasized the social nature of reading literature as being in conversation with the author. For one thing, as Margaret put it,

109

"literature…has a lot of things it wants to say and you have to listen to them" (T10, I1, 244).

When participating in the "great conversation, there is [the author], a mystery, and us…one of those is an authoritative voice from a very wise person" (T10, I1, 253-257). This perspective of the text as somehow representing a wise voice came up again later in interviews with Margaret when she brought up the school district's ban of *Huck Finn* as "tak[ing] the voice away from" and "silenc[ing]" Mark Twain, and it also came up in interviews with three other teachers (T10, I3, 408, 413).

The pattern of foregrounding the author him/herself was not evident in the literary scholars' interview data that I discussed in the previous chapter. Whereas the literary scholars also mentioned the importance of "listening" very closely to literary texts, they did not foreground the author him/herself. Instead of describing the conversation between the reader and the author, they described the interaction and responsibilities of the reader with the text. The scholars tended to use careful language to "[d]e-center the author as the focus," which, as Grace explained, allows for interpretive possibilities that go beyond unknowables like "dead people's psychologies or potential pathologies" and instead allows readers to "think about a history of ideas" (D6, I1, 281-286). Yet, disciplinarians also expressed the value of including other voices through their texts, like how "women and writers of color are contributing to literature in history at the time period." And, two literary scholars indicated that focusing on the author him/herself may be a helpful teaching approach for doing literary work with middle or high school students.

Table 5.1

Articulation or demonstration of literary literacy practice, by literary-literacy teacher

	Seeking pattern within text(s)	Identifying strangeness, surprise, or confusion within text(s)	Articulating literary puzzle	Recursively considering interpretive possibilities with text(s)	Considering histories of use, variants, or other contexts	Making original claim about text(s)
T1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
T3	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
T4		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
T7	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
T10	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
T12	✓	✓		✓	✓	

Literary Literacy Practices and Instruction

Literary literacy practices. Data from semi-structured interviews and verbal protocols revealed that these six high school teachers—Lisa, Amy, Alice, Carl, Margaret, and Kara—tended to use similar literacy practices as the literary scholars in order to construct, pursue, and communicate about literary puzzles, though their use differed in scope and scale. As did the literary scholars, these literary-literacy teachers used these literacy tools iteratively and in combination with one another. See Table 5.1 for a breakdown of the articulation of each literary literacy practice by participant.

Amy articulated the literary literacy practices that she uses to construct, pursue, and communicate about literary puzzles. Her descriptions echoed those of the literary scholars. Amy said of her own reading, "I read and reread, I look for repetition, look for words that seem unique or weird…and ask myself why might this be important?" (T3, I2, 58-59). "Then," she said, "I ask so what?" (50). This description of her own reading reveals multiple literary literacy practices: *seeking patterns* by looking for repetition, *identifying strangeness* in word choice, and *articulating a literary puzzle* of the whole text. She also said that when reading, she *considers*

111

contexts like who the authors are and when they lived, along with other scholarship in online databases like JSTOR and Google Scholar. In the same interview, Amy also shared the importance of annotating her texts so that she could go back and revisit particular moments and so that she could *recursively consider possibilities* and *communicate original claims*: "My books are in awful condition. I write in all of them. I like to jot down side notes about what it might mean or why it might be important, or tag key quotes, and then I reread them and put it all together…what it might mean" (T3, I2, 45-48).

For Lisa, the sorts of puzzles she seeks to explore in her reading are ones that fundamentally assume that literary works are created. Broadly speaking, her questions are ones like "Why does the artist create it that way?" and "What's the purpose or meaning behind [a given feature]?" (T1, I3, 280-288).   In her reading, Lisa demonstrated many of the literary literacy practices that she uses to construct, pursue, and communicate about literary puzzles. When reading "A Day's Wait," she sounded much like the literary scholars tended to sound in their think alouds. She *identified strangeness* in almost every place she stopped throughout the story. For instance, she remarked on the surprising word choice of the long outdoors paragraph that the literary scholars of Chapter 4 tended to notice: "…the fact that the red dog slipped and slithered, slithered is a weird way to talk about a dog walking, that's more for snakes…and falling twice is weird, why twice? That's weird to me" (T1, I2, 198-201).

Rereading this paragraph, she then said:

There's got to be something going on, because we've got "flushed" and "covey," which is a more elevated word and he doesn't use that anywhere else. This is the first time we have a word that's sort of, one that's not an average word. And we've got "flushed," "brush," "brush piles," "mounds of brush" several times, "springing brush"…

[Hemingway's] not Mr. Repetitive, so something's going on [here].

In this moment, she demonstrated *seeking patterns* in the text as she tracked the repetition of "brush" in the paragraph. She also noted the shift in language use, along with the alignment to the change in paragraph structure: "He's now spent almost the same amount of time in the text on this hunting thing as he has the dying child" (T1, I2, 230).

After reading, Lisa remained confused about the "outdoors" paragraph in the short story. She *articulated an interpretive question* that for her would be worthy of further consideration and that she would want to support students in considering: "What's the purpose [of that paragraph] and why is it there?...Because the story doesn't need that part if it was just about [the boy's] death" (T1, I2, 453-454).

In order to pursue questions and interpretive meaning, Lisa said, "You might have to reread, and you might still not get the nuances…You're not going to be like, 'Nailed it!' No one is going to. So that's the nature of this" (T1, I3, 436-440). For her, when exploring a literary question, the reader's own lack of certainty should come through in his/her way of *making an original claim* in response to the puzzle:

> [Your] conclusion [of your interpretation] doesn't have all the answers at the end…[Instead it] basically says, "Hey, I explored the answer to this question. I gave you some options, but I still don't know what the answer to the question is," and that's sort of the point…There's no wrapping up. It's not tying in a bow, and I'm not done completely. (T1, I3, 348-359)

These practices, used in the service of constructing, pursuing, and communicating about problems, were generally evident across the literary-literacy teachers' interviews.

113

Literary literacy instruction. These literary literacy practices were also reflected in the teachers' approaches to teaching students to make meaning with literary works. Broadly, the literary-literacy teachers described the importance of teaching students "How does a real reader [of literary works] think?" (T12, I4, 383-384). All six teachers emphasized that real readers of literature consider interpretive questions that do not have just one answer. See Table 5.2 for breakdown of articulation of each literary literacy instructional practice by participant.

Table 5.2

Articulation of literary literacy instructional practice, by literary-literacy teacher

	Naming problem space of literature	Naming literary puzzle	Posing literary puzzle	Teaching students to construct their own literary puzzle	Teaching students to recursively consider interpretive possibilities	Teaching students to make original literary claims	Coaching students through cycle of literary inquiry
T1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
T3	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓
T4	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
T7	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
T10	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
T12	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Naming problem space/value of literature. All six literary-literacy teachers articulated the importance of introducing their students to the problem space of literature. This problem space, as described above, includes introducing students to the "cosmic" questions of literature like "what is the nature of a human being and what is the nature of human existence?" (T10, I1, 232-233), and "…If we feel joy at someone else's pain, or if we feel pain at someone else's joy, why is this and what does that mean? Why are they so linked?" (T1, I3, 425-438). It also involves—but does not exclusively consist of—deeply personal meaning making, namely that "literature adds value to…life," "remind[ing] you of your value as a human being" when, for

114

example, "your kid…tell[s] you they hate you or…your wife…ask[s] for a divorce" (T10, I4, 239-241).

For these high school teachers, part of the urgency of these discussions came out of their students' past experiences in school. For students who have largely understood reading in ELA as answering comprehension questions, as Lisa put it, "that's where problems come up":

> If they've gone through sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth and all they've ever done is this *<points to questions in textbook>*—that's it—then you're not teaching them how to read necessarily. You're not teaching them that literature has nuances and has multiple interpretations, and you're teaching them to look for key things that they can spit back at you. If there's one answer, and everyone should get the same answer—I think that's what you lose. You lose the critical thinking. (T1, I4, 332-338)

Lisa expressed the importance of teaching students about the underlying purposes of reading literature, how it is different than reading for other purposes, and how doing literature can be meaningful for their own lives. For her, this required regularly presenting students with rich texts and also teaching them about the questions and practices of the discipline.

Naming and posing literary puzzles. The six literary-literacy teachers talked about their efforts to pose literary puzzles for students to consider. For example, Carl, at the time of interview, was preparing to read Eliot's "The Waste Land" with students over a period of days. He was designing instruction around puzzles of the text like "images that don't seem to go together so well" (T7, I2, 137).

Kara also emphasized the importance of routinely posing literary puzzles to students. Kara described sharing a set of cave paintings with her students at the beginning of each new school year. The broad problem of the cave paintings was evident to students immediately:

what do they mean? She said, "When we interpret cave paintings, what's really interesting about that is nobody really truly knows [what they mean]. It's not like there's an answer even now, which is kind of exciting" (T12, I1, 118-121). The task itself prompted students to pursue interpretive paths by asking about specific features of the paintings. "The bottom line," Kara said, "is we're trying to set them up for the interpretive act that they will be doing over and over again over the course of the year with so many other works" (T12, I1, 122-125).

Lisa described how her students tend to read literary fiction by focusing on "Okay, this [character] is a person, and this is what the person does. Why does this person do it?" instead of asking the question, "This is a creation, and why does the artist create it that way?" She gave an example of a literary text she had recently used in class in which a character was insane. In order to move them into interpretive meaning making, she reminded her students, "This isn't a real person. So his idiosyncrasies aren't because he's insane. It's created insanity. It's created idiosyncrasy" and then posed the question, "Why would the author create [a character like] that?" (T1, I3, 279-288).

Three teachers of the six also described naming for students the types of specific literary questions or puzzles that drive literary analysis or explaining the sorts of features that make up good puzzles. For Lisa, Margaret, and Shelley, interpretive puzzles or questions should be neither "a simple fact of the text" nor "completely unknowable" (Margaret, I1, 70-75), and they should be neither "too focused…[nor] too broad" (T12, I4, 886). Finally, they should be of interest to a community of readers, not simply of interest to one reader.

Prompting students to construct literary puzzles. Five of the six teachers emphasized the centrality of helping students learn to construct their own literary puzzles. Carl, early in our first

interview, characterized his teaching as fundamentally about teaching students a "process of discovery" (T7, I1, 274):

> Emily: How do you think about, just in general, teaching students with literature? How do you think about what's important for students to learn?
>
> Carl: Right. My biggest thing is I don't like telling them what to do…I try to teach them how to ask their own questions, how to come up with their own analytical comments. (T7, I1, 38-43)

Kara recounted a routine in her classroom in which students are responsible for "generat[ing] their own questions" in preparation for weekly text-based discussions. The questions were supposed to "deal with craft or theme" or promote conversation among classmates about something in the text that is "powerful or shocking" (T12, I2, 370; 382). This scaffold supported students as they learned to construct questions and pursue them in their writing. Further, holding regular fishbowl conversations that are led by students enabled students to hear and consider one another's questions, which both underscored the value of considering multiple perspectives and also enabled Kara to point out the features of particularly interesting puzzles.

Prompting students to recursively consider possibilities. In many of the excerpts above, the teachers talked about orchestrating learning opportunities that require students to recursively consider texts. For example, the class discussions in Kara's classroom encouraged students to revisit particular lines and features of texts and also consider multiple possibilities for interpretation. A typical moment of discussion in her classroom might sound like the following description she gave, in which a student began by saying:

> "Actually, that reminds me of this quote from *Native Son* on page 37" and then everybody in the room…turn[s] to page 37 and they'll read the quote. And then the

student will say, "Well, I, what I was wondering about that was do you think that

Malcolm is a really violent man or do you think that he's saying these things [for another

reason]?" (T12, I2, 390-395)

Kara explicitly taught students the practice of recursively considering possibilities at the

beginning of the year. As Kara noted about a class period when she and her students were

reading cave paintings at the beginning of the year, they spent "an entire hour just looking at a

few cave paintings and talking about what we notice…That's the foundation for the whole

course: look, keep looking, don't stop looking, don't look with just one point of view in mind.

Then be conscious of the moment that you cross into that world of interpretation" (102-117).

Kara called students' attention to the sorts of features that are important to notice, like

"comparison contrast" found within the text and "moments of juxtaposition."

Margaret intentionally showed students how to bring multiple types of critical lenses to

texts, inviting them to consider affordances and limitations of each approach: "I try to show them

what I'm doing so if they want to reject it they can and I talk to them about English discourse

and how there are a lot of different arguments over that" (T10, I1, 500-503). She tried to show

students how to move "from one lens to another lens," modeling how a reader might read *Their

Eyes Were Watching God* in a "feminist way," for example (T10, I1, 491). Her classroom

included visual representations of various literary traditions, and she often encouraged students

to consider a given text by exploring the sorts of questions and interpretations of each.

Teaching students to make original interpretive claims. Each of the six teachers in this

group emphasized the importance of supporting students as they learn to offer responses to the

literary puzzles they identify. Carl said that he strives to teach students "that there is more than

one right interpretation of a poem…[but] you can be quite wrong. Sometimes, they accidentally

go in a wrong direction, one that's kind of obviously wrong" because it is not supported by the text (T7, I2, 153-158). One routine that he used to support students in offering warranted interpretations was to work in small groups to "brainstorm…several possibilities" for interpretive claims and then discuss which ones should "get weeded out" because they are not supported by the text.

Coaching students through cycles of literary inquiry. Beyond just posing puzzles, all six teachers sought to organize lessons and units of instruction that supported students in engaging in a process of literary inquiry. Margaret, for instance, explained presenting "avant-garde, truly bizarre stuff" to students because "they do a better analysis of weird stuff than an analysis of familiar stuff…" (T10, I2, 99-103):

> One thing I like to do is I like to put avant-garde dance performances on the board and have them just write a bunch…I teach them the business of simply listing everything they observe and not making a judgment first. Then they'll skip the odd stuff. I'm like, "Come on. How could you not notice that?" I give them a prize…a prize for every kid who can fill up the page with observations. We'll watch twice, and it's like a ten-minute thing. Then I ask them to look for patterns, and they have to figure out what the thing is about. They're surprised that by focusing on the weird stuff, they can figure it out. (T10, I2, 66-76)

Within this sequence of instruction, Margaret prompted inquiry and interpretive reasoning by giving students a complex text and then scaffolding students' use of literary literacy practices like noticing strangeness, seeking patterns, and recursively considering texts.

Five of the six literary-literacy teachers recounted independent projects that they have designed that encourage students to construct their own literary puzzles. Aside from regular

119

class discussions centered on literary puzzles, Kara reported "spend[ing] a great deal of [direct instructional] time on…what kind of question do you need to ask to create a good A+ thesis?" (T12, I2, 334-338).

Alice described a year-long sequence of inquiry that she used to use—before the curriculum was changed—in which students learned to ask questions and then pursue them:

> [With each text we read in class] I'd help them ask questions that don't have a right and wrong or at least they don't have only one way of answering. [Then we explored them as a class.] They'd look at me and say, "Did I get it right?' and I'd say to them, "Well, I have a preferred reading, but there are multiple ways to look at this. Let's work through it together. At the end of it all, the point is to have gotten closer." (T4, I1)

Over the year, as students practiced asking and pursuing questions of various literary works, the teachers reported that students tended to ask more sophisticated questions and need less and less prompting to do so.

Dissatisfaction with ability to provide sufficient literary literacy instruction. Each of these six literary-literacy teachers articulated the orientation that discipline-based questions, whether teacher-constructed or student-constructed, should drive instruction with literature. Such questions promote social interaction, attention to particular ways with words within the discourse community of literary studies, and literary knowledge building. Each of the six literary-literacy teachers also reported their efforts to support students' comprehension and metacognition within a larger inquiry frame.

However, they also emphasized their general dissatisfaction with their opportunities to provide consistent and sufficient literary literacy instruction. Interviews with the six more discipline-aligned teachers were peppered with phrases like, "I try..", "I used to…", "It would be

better if…", "I'd rather…", and "I would…if…". Lisa said at one point, "I do the best I can. It's not as much as I'd like" (T1, I1, 313). Kara said, "I think it would be better to do less reading, but do it in bigger depth…so that the experience is meaningful" (T12, I2, 184-185). Each interview with these six literary-literacy teachers contained no fewer than three unprompted utterances of this nature (Range=3-14 utterances per interview).

Margaret said of her work, "I want the curriculum to be guided by [literary] questions. I think it's more about scaffolding and having everything work together so that the skills [I am required to teach are not]…isolate[ed]" (T10, I1, 130-132). Whereas AP courses generally allow Margaret the sort of freedom she needs to organize her instruction around literary questions, the tenth grade American Literature curriculum was "unworkable" for her.

At the time of data collection, Kara was helping a colleague design a ninth-grade ELA curriculum for a new charter school that was slated to open the following year. The charter school was being designed to be an "innovative small school" focused on inquiry-based learning. Kara said of the experience:

> Kara: It's been a very interesting exercise, because it's such a completely opposite kind of school from what we have here. I mean…I'm very dedicated. But I've been helping her just think through English curriculum and what that would look like if you had no rules and no limitations and finally could say no. What would you do?
>
> Emily: What are you all doing?
>
> Kara: It took like a year just to get my head around that. Because I kept thinking "Well, we can't do that. [The charter school leader] said, "Why not?" I said, "What do you mean, "Why not?"" …It's taken some time, a long time, just to get over that initial hurdle. Project based, it's very project based, that's where we're headed, and choice.

Kara offered an example of the type of project that was being designed for the social studies

curriculum, in which teachers had partnered with a university professor of history and a local

historical museum seeking to build an archive of the world's largest collection of documents

from Abraham Lincoln. As she put it:

> [The documents have] never been digitized, they've never been analyzed, nobody knows
>
> what's in [the collection]. Who knows, there could be – I mean who knows what might
>
> be in there? So they have an entire floor of the museum full of these boxes of…
>
> American history documents. And so they want to have, for instance, as a project-based
>
> thing, have kids in history class come and help a trained historian…where the kids would
>
> help…scan documents in, but what about preservation of documents and what you do
>
> with that, but also analyze the contents and do abstracts of each of them and consider the
>
> importance of each, and why it would be important and what can you learn from each…
>

Though "project-based" can mean lots of different things to those concerned with education, for

Kara it seemed to be a shorthand term for disciplinary literacy instruction that is rooted in both

student-driven inquiry and texts. When asked what she imagined for teaching literary works at

this school, she said:

> Kara: …The big thing about it would be having the big question, having a set of
>
> questions, and how do you come up with questions yourself. And not guiding, but having
>
> the students determine the direction… So I think in terms of interpretive, [literary]…
>
> reading I think that that's something that English teachers could work with Social Studies
>
> teachers on. We can learn so much from each other. I love doing things that – I don't

122

even really know. I don't even know yet. But I can see some exciting things we could do with that.

Emily: I see some of that in your practice here at [your current high school]. Can you say a little bit about what's stopping you from fully teaching in this way here?

Kara: Everything. Just everything. (T12, I4, 226-236)

Though Kara did not elaborate on what she meant by "everything" in this moment of the interview, across all four of her interviews she—like each of her five literary-literacy teacher colleagues—attributed her challenges with providing literary literacy instruction to constraints like the lack of time with her students, the sheer volume of work, the limited time for ongoing professional learning and collaboration with colleagues, the breadth of curriculum they were responsible for teaching, and the pressure to prepare students for standardized assessments (e.g., ACT) that do not seek to measure disciplinary reading, writing, and reasoning. The five other literary-literacy teachers who taught lower level ELA courses brought up the additional constraint of the district-created curricula, which is neither organized to promote disciplinary inquiry nor written to allow teachers flexibility in their enactment.

Uncertainty about providing literary literacy instruction. These literary-literacy teachers also articulated the trade-offs regarding their decisions to teach literary works through an inquiry-approach. One major trade-off was sacrificing breadth of instruction, and this lack of breadth was something that four of the six teachers indicated uncertainty about. Margaret, for instance, expressed some guilt and uncertainty about not being able to teach everything she was responsible for teaching.

Emily: Do you ever talk to [students] about the differences between reading literature and reading non-fiction texts?

123

Margaret: I have not done a lot with non-fiction for the last 15 years, and I suppose I

should …It's a whole different deal, isn't it?... It is in theory what they're doing in all

their other classes. So no, I failed at that.

Emily: There are arguments that English teachers shouldn't be in charge of all things

reading and writing and thinking.

Margaret: Yeah, the Common Core Standards have all this non-fiction. I'm freaking out

and realized, oh my gosh, how can we teach that non-fiction? …I know when I've done

it, it hasn't worked out well.

Emily: It may be better to go more deeply in literature. That's your wheelhouse.

Margaret: I don't know that I'm helping them. Well, I'm helping them when I say,

"What's the core idea of this sentence here?" I am helping them with reading skills, and

when I teach them reading strategies, that's going to help them [read nonfiction]…I'm

trying to justify this. No, I'm not doing as much teaching of reading non-fiction.

A moment later, Margaret said with some apparent sorrow, "You try to do it all, but you can't"

(T10, I2, 388). Similarly, when required to build non-fiction reading into his American literature

course because the ELA Common Core Standards include nonfiction, Carl said, "I don't know. I

could be wrong, but I'd still rather be wrong and teach the fiction that we've been teaching

instead of throwing it all away" (T7, I2, 441-443). At multiple moments in our interviews, he

made comments of doubt about his teaching choices, like, "I'm no expert" and determining what

ought to be taught to highschoolers "certainly [isn't] my expertise" (T7, I2, 73-74).

Overall, the six literary-literacy teachers in this study demonstrated and described using

similar literary literacy practices as the scholars in this study for the purposes of constructing,

124

pursuing, and communicating about literary puzzles. They also described a set of ideal teaching approaches that mirrored those of the scholars, like posing literary puzzles for students to consider with particular texts. However, the literary-literacy teachers also reported general dissatisfaction with their opportunities to provide the sort of literary literacy instruction they imagined, along with some doubt about whether their approaches were what students ought to be learning.

Literacy Practices and Understandings of the Strategy-Literacy Teachers

In this section, I characterize the literacy practices and instruction of the five strategy-literacy teachers. This group of high school teachers—Sally (T2), Kate (T5), Claire (T6), Diane (T9), and Janet (T11)—held an average of 12 years of teaching experience (M=12.6, Mdn=10, Mode=10 years). Two of the six held a Master's degree (one in literacy, and one in humanities). The teachers in this group largely focused their instruction on teaching students metacognitive strategies for academic reading and formulaic strategies for academic writing, often describing that such instruction helps to prepare students for college and standardized tests like the ACT. Unlike the literary scholars and the literary-literacy teachers described in the sections above, the strategy-literacy teachers tended not to focus on constructing, pursuing, or communicating about literary puzzles in their own reading, and they did not organize their instruction on literary inquiry. Rather than considering potential value in pursuing interpretive puzzles of literature, the strategy-literacy teachers sought to help students fix or avoid problems of comprehension. And, rather than focusing on shared ways with texts, the strategy-literacy teachers focused on individuals' interactions with texts. See Table 5.2 for breakdown by strategy-literacy teacher. See Tables 5.3 and 5.4 for comparison by participant group.

Table 5.3

Articulation or demonstration of literary literacy practice, by strategy-literacy teacher

	Seeking pattern within text(s)	Identifying strangeness, surprise, or confusion within text(s)	Articulating literary puzzle	Recursively considering interpretive possibilities with text(s)	Considering histories of use, variants, or other contexts	Making original claim about text(s)
T2	✓	✓				
T5		✓				
T6		✓				
T9		✓				
T11	✓	✓				

Table 5.4

Number of participants who articulated or demonstrated literary literacy practices, by participant group

	Literary scholars (n=10)	Literary-literacy teacher (n=6)	Strategy-literacy teacher (n=5)
Seeking pattern within text(s)	10	5	2
Identifying strangeness, surprise, or confusion within text(s)	8	6	5
Articulating literary puzzle	9	5	0
Recursively considering interpretive possibilities with text(s)	9	6	0
Considering histories of use, variants, or other contexts	10	6	0
Making original claim about text(s)	10	5	0

Table 5.5

Number of participants who articulated literary literacy instructional practices, by participant group

	Literary scholars (n=10)	Literary-literacy teacher (n=6)	Strategy-literacy teacher (n=5)
Naming literary puzzle	3	3	0
Posing literary puzzle	9	6	0
Teaching students to construct their own literary puzzle	7	5	0
Teaching students to recursively consider interpretive possibilities	8	6	0
Teaching students to make original literary claims	10	6	0
Coaching students through cycle of literary inquiry	7	6	0

Nature of Literary Studies or English

When asked about the larger purposes of reading literature, the strategy-literacy teachers

tended not to describe the social or problem-based nature of the academic discourse community

of literary studies. In fact, they tended not to talk about academic disciplines at all, even when

prompted, instead focusing on the school domain of English language arts.

The strategy-literacy teachers tended to focus on students' school success for the sake of

getting ready for upcoming tests or the next grade level. Their primary instructional goals

centered on students learning to make personal connections, understand plot, enjoy reading, be

metacognitive in their reading, and do well on standardized tests. The strategy-literacy teachers

characterized their work as broadly teaching students to read and write academic texts. And,

they tended not to distinguish between "doing school" and meaning making for disciplinary

purposes.

All five strategy-literacy teachers shared their passion for English teaching, which for them centered either on students themselves (As Janet said, there are "people who teach kids and [then there are] people who teach books," T11, I3, 545-546) or on improving students' amount of reading or quality of expository or narrative writing. Four of the five teachers in this group articulated their interest in becoming stronger teachers of literature, and one, Diane, even said that she agreed to take part in this study because she was hoping to learn more about teaching with literary works. Of her instruction in her most literature-heavy course, she said, "I hate [my most literature-centered class]. I hate it, I hate it, I hate it…I'm just not there, and I know I'm not there. I feel bad about it every single day" (T9, I4, 116-119).

Literacy Practices with Literary Works

In their think alouds, the five strategy-literacy teachers largely demonstrated their own metacognition when reading, pointing out, for instance, the connections they made, the predictions they had, and the times they intentionally reread to make sure they were fully comprehending. Though they sometimes articulated pleasure or delight when noting a particular element of craft, for example, their comments about text tended to stop at paraphrasing, summarizing, or making personal connections (e.g., linking a character's struggle to a moment in their own lives). None of the strategy-literacy teachers named the specific literary literacy practices named by the other groups in the study, nor did they demonstrate or describe the importance of constructing, pursuing, or communicating about literary puzzles when reading literary works.

Table 5.3 represents the number of strategy-literacy teachers who demonstrated or named each literary literacy practice compared with their literary-literacy teacher colleagues and the literary scholars of the study. None of the five teachers articulated a literary puzzle that they

revisited with an interpretive lens, went back into the text to gather additional details or pursue a pattern or place of confusion, articulated a direction they would want to pursue by investigating any sort of context, or made an interpretive claim. Two teachers appeared to trace patterns through their reading of the short stories and all five teachers noted moments of confusion or surprise while reading. However, these two numbers do not tell the whole story. Even in instances where the strategy-literacy teachers initially appeared to be using a literary literacy practice, these teachers did not seem to use the literacy practices to accomplish a literary purpose.

There were moments in which the strategy-literacy teachers voiced questions of various types. For instance, in Janet's think aloud with "The Story of an Hour," she articulated a question of the text:

"And yet she had loved him—sometimes. Often she had not. What did it matter! What could love, the unsolved mystery count for in the face of this possession of self-assertion which she suddenly recognized as the strongest impulse of her being!" So, is freedom more important than love? It raises a question to me. (T11, I2, 226-230).

Similarly, Diane pointed out a contrast between the internal and external events in the story, saying, "…what's going on outside of her? This is external, and this is…more internal" (T9, I2, 149-150). A bit later in the interview, she articulated a question she had about the main character's true feelings: "It's like there are mixed emotions here. Is she excited that he's gone? Is she sad that he's gone? At the beginning, she seemed sad. Now it almost seems like she's free of him" (T9, I2, 195-197). On their face, such moments might be coded as "articulating a literary puzzle." Unlike the literary scholars and literary-literacy teachers, however, the strategy-literacy teachers did not mark such questions in their thinking aloud as any more important than

any of their other utterances, and they did not return to them with an interpretive lens during or after reading. Because they did not revisit these questions or indicate that they were of more import than their other comments, these types of utterances did not seem to be used as a tool for building interpretive literary knowledge.

Further, when I asked how or if they might use these short stories with their students, the strategy-literacy teachers tended to emphasize the ways they could use the stories to teach students to use metacognitive reading strategies or support their comprehension. Janet said, "as a teacher…the twist in ['The Story of an Hour']" stood out because "it gives you an opportunity to share [with students] how you infer." Were she to teach with this story, she said that she would introduce students to challenging vocabulary words "like exalted and elixir," "tell them that this piece has a twist," and "ask them to predict as they read or we read…together" (T11, I2, 296-307). Rather than considering ways of highlighting disciplinary practices or purposes for students, Janet seemed to see this text as a moment for modeling how to make inferences and teaching vocabulary words.

Similarly, when I asked Diane to elaborate on the question she had stated in her reading, she instead pivoted to how she would support students in reading this short story:

> …there's a comprehension bucket [that I consider as a teacher]. I want to make sure the kids understand what they're getting. With a dated piece like this, I want to make sure that phrases and words that they might not be familiar with…The next bucket…[is to] go into that kind of dazzling, vivid word choice…[and] I like to show them the structure… (T9, I2, 404-433)

Like Janet above, when considering how she might use this short story with her students, Diane said she would focus on supporting students' comprehension by teaching them the vocabulary

words they might not know and pointing out word choice and structure. Even when employing

literacy practices that could on their surface appear to be literary in nature, neither Janet nor

Diane nor their other three literacy teacher colleagues demonstrated or described their use of

literacy tools to accomplish shared literary purposes.

Instructional Practices with Literary Works

As suggested in the prior data exemplars, the strategy-literacy teachers characterized their

instructional approaches in notably different ways than the literary scholars and the literary-

literacy teachers. Rather than striving to support students to construct, pursue, and communicate

about shared literary puzzles in shared ways, the strategy-literacy teachers tended to focus solely

on students' personal comprehension of texts, their individual expository essays, and their

individual study and testing skills.

Janet's primary goal for students was to help students become "engaged and active

readers" by teaching them to recall facts and answer "right there questions," make inferences,

summarize, and "employ the right fix up strategies" (T11, I1).   In order to "develop these

skills," she said, "[I] try to find texts that are interesting and quick. Fast and dirty" (T11, I1, 392-

393). She read short non-fiction articles with students out of a compiled reader published by an

educational materials company, which "gives us a loop to the Common Core for the whole non-

fiction piece." She also reported teaching with literary fiction, including *Catching Fire* (of the

Hunger Games series) and *Of Mice and Men*.

Typical instruction in her Janet's class involved reading texts together as a group with her

modeling reading strategies, including her own methods for monitoring her comprehension. Of

her think aloud with Chopin's "The Story of an Hour," she said, "If I were going to teach

[American Literature] next year, I guess I'd look at this piece from that scope of identifying

inferences. Maybe places where I can do a think aloud in the piece for the students" (T11, I2, 60-61). She emphasized the importance of teaching students to write a summary of their reading:

> Kids need to summarize, and that is hard…They want to tell you what they think about it. I'm sorry, nobody cares what you think…If you can't demonstrate that you understand what this guy thinks, we're looking at his piece. He's the expert. He's the one who really knows something. If you can't tell me what it is that he knows, I don't care what you think about it. (T11, I1, 272-283)

Other assignments involved students writing their personal opinions about something that they had read. For instance, after reading an article about a person who served some but not all of a prison sentence, students were asked to write "whether or not [the person in the article] served enough of his prison sentence [using] a two-chunk paragraph …to support your viewpoint." The term "two-chunk paragraph" is from a writing intervention adopted by the school district, and it refers to a formulaic paragraph that has a topic sentence, a concrete detail, two sentences of commentary, another concrete detail, two more sentences of commentary, and a concluding sentence.

Claire, too, described her primary instructional goal as building students' metacognition and facility with reading strategies, drawing largely from the literacy intervention training she had received from the district:

> Those are my goals, just to get people to…have enough strategies. I'm trying to expose them to lots of strategies…That's why yesterday they picked their own [strategy]…It gives them a little bit more ownership and responsibility with the work that they're doing. "I've chosen this. This is what helps me understand the book or the text." (T6, I1, 150-

156)

The sorts of content area literacy approaches (or "strategies") that she named for supporting students' comprehension included "tweet the text," in which students "had to write in tweet form a summary of the chapter," and "three minute pause," in which students "get three minutes…to write down…main idea questions and issues of clarifications that would need to happen" (T6, I1, 21-22; 34-37). She said, "a couple of times per novel, I'll do a seminar with students" in which students each "pick three people that they follow throughout the course of the discussion…[and they] mark down examples of…[their classmates] referenc[ing] a text or…ma[king] a connection" (T6, I1, 62-67).

Claire's use of content area literacy approaches is based on her desire to make her students better readers and writers. She said, "…that's the bottom line I keep telling [students]. It's my job to make you better readers and writers. It's not just what stories are we going to read in here, it's like how do we read those stories" (T6, I2, 292-294). Claire did not indicate, even when prompted, that she thought about the larger literary purposes that readers might use such reading routines to accomplish. She did not acknowledge that she thought about the meaningful differences among the routines; that a "tweet the text," for example, might be helpful at different times and for different purposes than a "three minute pause." Further, she did not acknowledge that such instruction is only valuable until students have some automaticity with the cognitive process that the routine is designed to support or that such instruction could happen inside of a larger disciplinary inquiry frame.

Diane also emphasized comprehension and metacognition. She said she prefers "the writing teaching as opposed to the lit[erature] teaching" (T09, I1, 57). Influenced by her literacy training, Diane said that she was "still learning" and that she was "trying to use those

133

lovely…strategies" regularly in her teaching to help students "when processing difficult texts,"

but:

> Comprehension has to be the first thing, and getting them to figure out how to
> comprehend things is probably my biggest challenge as a teacher…I'm not super litty,
> that's not my thing. I do a lot of metacognition with them…I'll reread parts. I'll do a lot
> of activities that are things in groups. I'll have them read stories aloud and I'll have them
> pick stopping points. Then I'll say, "What do you know, and how do you know it?"
> Have that conversation and then take notes. "What do you know?" Then we'll come
> back together as a big group and say, "What did you know? What did you find out about
> this story?" (T9, I2, 519-527)

Later in the interview, Diane said, "I do think it's actually a really effective strategy [to ask

students "What do you know, and how do you know it?"], but I think they get bored because

they feel like they're doing the same thing, even though it's different stories. I just want

different [strategies]" (T9, I2, 538-541).

Rather than focusing on instructional routines or activities designed to support students'

comprehension, Kate focused her ELA classes largely on students learning the discrete skills and

knowledge they will need for next year, be that tenth grade in the case of her ninth graders or

college in the case of her seniors. For her, teaching was largely about providing them with a

foundation that they will be expected to have by their future teachers. A primary component of

her instruction involved automaticity with the formulaic method of writing advocated by the

district-adopted writing intervention:

134

I try to tell them, "By the time you leave here, you should be able to look at anyone

and spew the format of an argumentative essay. You should be able to say,

'background information, thesis, topic sentence, proving my point, information around

my point, the C[oncrete] D[etail]s, the commentary explaining what those CDs tell me,

the concluding sentence.'" I'm like, "If you can't walk around just saying that, you have

bigger problems." This is not going away. (T5, I1, 362-368)

Kate also reported prioritized study and testing skills. She described giving students a packet of

"check questions" that they work to complete as a regular part of their classwork. These study

guides ask questions about plot and also ask students to identify "literature terms…like allusion

and metaphor and all those basic things."

For Kate, the study guides:

…lead right into the test. If I want them to know that Mercutio was killed and why, that

question will be there. There are no tricks. I tell them, "You're not being tested on, you

don't have to study every possible nuance and everything. But you still need to know

how to test, because this is still a part of college. This is a part of reality, so you need to

know how to study. I would never make them, for example, responsible for any minor

characters in *Things Fall Apart* when the names are already confusing. That's just

craziness, and there's no need for it. It doesn't fit any standard. Literally, I only test

them with some multiple choice because it's a skill that they have to use. (T5, I1, 78-88)

The study guides and the test questions largely came from published teaching materials:

Most of my stuff is, I've taken test questions. The binders you can purchase…I'm big

into how you can really screw up a test and ask things the wrong way, so I try to be

careful about that. I have Prestwick House binders on all of the major readings, so I just

use those…Here's the one for *Things Fall Apart*. They're kind of nice. They're called teaching units. They're not even that expensive. When I bought one…I was like, "Why are we starting from scratch? I'm like, "25 bucks to me versus reinventing the wheel, time wise… (T5, I1, 123-133)

When I asked Kate how she helped students learn how to identify themes, she replied:

I don't. Somebody just this year said, "You're so good at teaching themes." We don't play this game of, "What are the themes?" Right before we even start, "Guess what? A theme's coming up. See if you can catch it." Then that's also what they choose their notes and quotes from, so they can follow the theme as they go. It makes much more sense contextually, for example, to have talked about Eurocentrism and what it means and what colonization and imperialism is and make sense of all that. Know that that's what this book is about and it's coming, rather than some *aha* moment as you're reading that you may or may not have. Especially for freshmen, that's a losing battle. That doesn't work. (T5, I1, 161-170)

Alongside the study guides and tests, Kate did include essays in her instruction. As students read, they "take notes on the themes" and "they end up ultimately writing an essay" about a selected theme. She described giving extensive feedback on students' writing in these essays, ensuring that they have followed the district-adopted method of academic writing.

As is clear in the excerpted data above, the strategy-literacy teachers' interview data include many references to teaching students metacognitive strategies or assigning them to use routines for school success absent disciplinary purposes. The strategy-literacy teachers did not describe, and certainly did not emphasize or prioritize, the importance of teaching students to construct knowledge in shared and specialized ways or to communicate ideas to a particular

136

disciplinary discourse community.   None of the strategy-literacy teachers indicated that they considered their job to be helping students to learn to participate in specific discourse communities of literature or English. This absence of disciplinary purpose is particularly noteworthy in comparison to the other two groups of participants in this study, especially the literary-literacy teachers who taught the same grade levels of students in the same buildings and with the same curricular materials and expectations. The literary-literacy teachers, in contrast, sought to provide students with instruction that included strategies or study skills in the service of a larger set of literary purposes.

It is important to note that all of the strategy-literacy teachers consistently revealed deep concern for their students and the desire to do all they could for their students. Kate, for instance, shared the devastation she felt when she learned that many students fail tenth grade American Literature:

Kate: We had this whole discussion [in our department] within the last year or two. We put up all the numbers. "She's only failing 5, and you have 13"…That's why I know for sure the numbers have been from 5 to 13 failures, which 13 failures out of 35, that's embarrassing.

Emily: That's a third of the class.

Kate: Honestly, I want to say at that point, "What the hell are you doing that your kids are not in your room every lunch until they get their butts caught up and are figuring it out? What are you doing?" To me, that's the teacher. Yes, you have those kids that come in every day and sit and fill a space, and they have more stuff going on at home than they can handle. They're not going to do any work. Yes, you're always going to have maybe

up to those 5 failures, but 13, to me, says you don't service those students. That's just --

I'll call anybody out on that.

Emily: A third of your students feels like a personal failure.

Kate: Right. I mean, to me, you fill your lunches, you stay after school, whatever it

takes, because something is going on there (T5, I1, 466-480)

…

Kate: …There's something to be said for doing what's right. If something's wrong, it's

wrong. That's me. I just want to protect kids. They're hurting enough. <starts to cry>

(T5, I1, 534-536)

Janet, along with echoing Kate's deep concern for her students, expressed the satisfaction

she gets from helping students become excited about reading: "Getting them to enjoy reading?

Really, it is so lovely to have a kid get excited about finishing a book. [They'll say] 'I haven't

finished a book since, ever.' That's a beautiful thing, because they're not readers" (384-386).

She cared deeply about building personal relationships with students. For her, this included

"reading everything that they write" and "getting a dialogue going" about texts; it also included

"try[ing] as hard as I can to bring students in, to make it a place where they can fall on their head

and not feel bad about themselves" (T11, I1, 350-352).

Diane, too, emphasized her concern about students, prioritizing the power of helping

students gain confidence as learners over the "content" of her courses:

…The content is important, and I want them to walk away better writers and better

readers, absolutely, but the content for me as a teacher is truthfully secondary…It's the

skills and the things they learn about themselves through my content, but for me it's not

really ever about the content. It's much more about just kind of getting them to feel good

138

about themselves and set new goals for themselves, hear other people better, be a good human being, all those sorts of things. For me, it's always those relationships with kids that draw me back every year and that draw me here every day. (T9, I4, 63-75)

The deep concern that these teachers described and demonstrated, in fact, was representative of all twelve teachers in this study. Each teacher in this study acknowledged his/her desires to prevent students from falling through the cracks, to help students be successful in school, and to build meaningful relationships with students. It was not these deep commitments to students that separated the two groups of teachers, but rather their ideas about how to best design learning opportunities for students to meet these ultimate goals, with the strategy-literacy teachers focusing on explicitly teaching students metacognitive and test taking strategies and the literary-literacy teachers attempting to engage students in cycles of shared literary inquiry.

The Case of Josh

Of the twelve teachers in this study, Josh was the only one who did not fit neatly into either the "strategy-literacy teacher" or the "literary-literacy teacher" category. I have not grouped his case into either set of patterns, and I have not reported any data from my interviews with Josh heretofore. In this section, I present the ways in which Josh's case relates to the two teacher groups presented above.

Josh, a teacher with six years of teaching experience who was in his first year in this particular school district, straddled the lines between the two groups of teachers. During his think alouds, he did employ literary literacy practices in the service of considering literary puzzles in his own reading. He also articulated some of the literary literacy instructional practices named by others in this study. However, Josh reported that his actual teaching centered

on metacognitive skills and other content knowledge, not literary inquiry or literary literacy practices.

When beginning to read "A Day's Wait," Josh said, "As I start reading, instantly I think that all good writers sort of establish those questions in your head. So, I'm like, why is this kid fighting against the doctor? He's clearly in bad shape…" (T8, I2, 56-58). He demonstrated seeking patterns within the text, by first noting a potential symbol and then subsequent symbols: "All the symbols for death: frozen ground, the river has frozen over, not moving. All of those in rapid succession sort of bring, the bare trees, another sort of death symbol. About four or five death symbols really quick there" (T8, I2, 70-73). Once he reached the end of the story, he situated the use of symbols within the text to note a puzzle: "It's just loaded with death. The way the kid is acting…this kid is going to die for sure, and then he doesn't" (T8, I2, 114-116). This led Josh to articulate a puzzle that he would want to return to: "Why does [Hemingway] give these death symbols when the kid doesn't die? I thought that [symbols were] supposed to…help us see what's coming" (T8, I2, 148-150).

This puzzle, in fact, he also said he would consider posing to his students: "I would want to lay out the contradictions and let [students] go wherever they want with them." (T8, I2, 160-161). He indicated that he would want to support students as they learn to construct their own literary puzzles: "I think you could have them asking questions throughout, because it brings up so many questions. Maybe that's how I'd [want to] structure [class]. Stop every few lines and say, "What questions do you have?" Maybe have them talk to their neighbors…or do a questions journal or something like that." And, he referred to the value of recursively considering interpretive possibilities: "Something this short, you can potentially read it a couple

times through…you can kind of go through it and figure out meanings" and "have discussions so that all of them pick up on something" (T8, I2, 191-205).

When describing his actual instruction, however, Josh did not talk about using any of these approaches. Like the other strategy-literacy teachers, he characterized his instruction as centering largely on cognitive strategies and metacognition ("We focused on inferences last week, connections this week," 240-241). He attributed the decision to what students will need for success in school and on standardized tests, along with the limited amount of time he has with students: "There are a lot of skills. I think every teacher has different skills that they value. You can only teach so much stuff…[I prioritize] things that I think will help them in life, will help them on standardized tests, and will help them in future classes" (T8, I2, 230-234). Making these decisions, he said, is a "painstaking" process, which involves thinking through the many instructional possibilities and then determining the skills that are the most important for students to develop (T8, I2, 222).

Josh looked in many ways like the literary-literacy teachers. He employed specialized literacy practices to make meaning with literature when reading both short stories as a part of his interview sequence. He also talked about the sort of instruction that he could imagine providing students, were he to have more time or more support. But, given his course schedule of four new preps, his position as a teacher in his first year with the district, and the expectation that teachers in this district teach students metacognitive reading strategies, he reported that his instruction does not include much attention to the literary literacy practices he knows to be important.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I presented patterns representing two groups of high school teacher participants. Of course, there are limits to categorizing participants' literacy practices and

instructional approaches into two distinct groups. Meaning making with texts—and teaching

students to make meaning with texts—involves highly complex and contextually situated sets of

practices. The data guiding this study are interview-based and represent moments in time. It is

possible that individuals of different groups may look more alike under certain conditions. It is

also the case that people could move across categories depending on their particular teaching

goals and students' needs. That said, my data show fairly stable representations of teachers' own

literature reading practices, together with fairly stable literature teaching practices. Thus, given

the data to which I had access and the research questions I posed, the teachers can be

characterized as representing two categories of disciplinary practice and disciplinary literacy

instructional practice.

The first was a more discipline-aligned group of six teachers, the "literary-literacy

teachers," who tended to describe and demonstrate literary literacy practices in their own reading

that echoed the literary scholars' literary literacy practices described in Chapter 4. These

teachers also described efforts to provide literary literacy instruction that foregrounded the

shared work of constructing, pursuing, and communicating about literary puzzles, and to provide

comprehension instruction in the service of those aforementioned literary goals, but they

regularly expressed dissatisfaction with their abilities to provide such instruction consistently and

sufficiently.

A second group of five high school teachers, the "strategy-literacy teachers," tended not

to describe or demonstrate the literary literacy practices demonstrated by the other participants in

the study. They tended not to talk about the disciplinary nature of their subject area at all, and

instead they described their work as generally teaching students to read and write. These

teachers centered their teaching on metacognitive strategies, content knowledge, and study skills.

One high school teacher of the twelve participants, Josh, did not quite fit into either category. Although he did seem to share many of the literary literacy practices of scholars and literary-literacy teachers, his instructional approaches were much more similar to the strategy-literacy teachers.

CHAPTER VI: THE MEDIATING ROLE OF CONTEXT

…There are some amazing things happening [at this high school], but we're always fighting against the system. (T12, I4, 643-644)

…I can't imagine graduating from Ed[ucation] school and getting the opportunity to teach in the kind of environment where you are actually able to implement what you were trained to do. (T12, I4, 391-393)

In designing this research study, including everything from defining its scope to constructing specific data collection instruments, I sought to better understand the literary literacy practices and instructional approaches of a group of literary scholars and high school ELA teachers. My initial goal was to contribute to efforts seeking to describe disciplinary literacy practices related to ELA and to begin to define common approaches to disciplinary literacy instruction within ELA, particularly relating to literary studies. In Chapters 4 and 5 of this dissertation, I have reported my findings directly associated with those research aims.

However, given the particular findings, it would be insufficient to conclude here. Despite the pattern that the literary scholars and some high school teachers of this study shared some literary literacy practices and preferences about desirable approaches to instruction that aligned with their literacy practices, there was divergence across the two groups in participants' reporting about their abilities to actually provide this sort of instruction to students. This divergence begs a pressing question for researchers, teacher educators, policy makers, and school leaders interested in students' opportunities to learn disciplinary literacy practices across the content areas: Why would it be that several high school teachers in this study seemed to hold the

necessary knowledge for disciplinary literacy instruction (i.e., they could demonstrate and describe literary literacy practices in ways that were similar to the literary scholars, and they could articulate what rigorous instruction with literature looks like in ways that were similar to the literary scholars) and yet tended to report their dissatisfaction in their abilities to sufficiently and consistently provide such instruction to students? And, why would it be that Josh, even though he seemed to hold the necessary knowledge and practices for disciplinary literacy instruction, described instructional approaches that did not include those practices?

The answer to these questions is suggested in some of the data excerpts in Chapter 5, and, in fact, it seemed to leap off the pages of the transcripts representing my interviews with the literary-literacy teachers: their secondary school context constrained literary literacy teaching. In this chapter, I present data that show how literary-literacy teachers identified the instructional contexts of this particular secondary school context as constraining their literary literacy instruction. In almost all cases, the data representing this pattern are insights shared by participants without initial prompting from me as the interviewer. These data are not data I sought to collect; I did not include questions of context on my interview protocols, and I did not expect that context would emerge as a central finding in this study. These unprompted data related to the constraining nature of the instructional context of secondary schooling underscore both the strength of these patterns and the importance of these issues to the high school teachers in this study. In cases when I do have data from university-based literary scholars regarding their instructional contexts, I will present them as a contrast to the patterns found among the literary-literacy teachers' comments.

Overview

Data from the 12 high school teachers suggest that the instructional contexts of this particular school district constrained their attempts to provide literary literacy instruction. Participants of this study differed by group in their unprompted mentioning of teaching contexts as either supportive or constraining. Whereas literary-literacy teachers mentioned their instructional contexts 121 times total, literary scholars mentioned their instructional contexts 16 times total (See Tables 6.1 and 6.2 for breakdown of mention of context, by participant). Further, teachers' comments about their high school context were generally negative (91% negative), whereas disciplinarians' comments about their university context were generally positive (81% positive). These frequencies, along with the specific comments that participants made regarding this topic, point to a set of contexts that seem to afford or constrain literary literacy instruction. The strategy-literacy teachers also brought up important perspectives about the constraining nature of their teaching context; because they did not specifically focus on their opportunities to provide students with literary literacy instruction, however, I do not focus on their comments in this chapter.

Constraining Contexts of School District for Literary Literacy Instruction

There were five categories of context that I observed in the interview data that seemed to constrain high school teachers' abilities to consistently and sufficiently provide literary literacy instruction: 1) limited access to supportive material resources, 2) district-created curricula that did not foreground inquiry, 3) teachers' limited opportunities for meaningful ongoing learning, 4) teachers' colleagues' implementation of strategy-based academic literacy instruction, and 5) the prevalence of standardized assessments not designed to measure disciplinary reading,

writing, and reasoning. The literary-literacy teachers understood these constraints as occurring

within a broader climate of accountability and the de-professionalization of K-12 teachers.

Table 6.1

Frequency of Unprompted Mention of University Teaching Context by Literary Scholars

	# of times participant mentioned constraining teaching context	# of times participant mentioned supportive teaching context
D1	0	4
D2	0	2
D3	0	0
D4	0	0
D5	0	0
D6	0	1
D7	1	0
D8	0	2
D9	2	3
D10	0	1
TOTAL	**3**	**13**

Table 6.2

Frequency of Unprompted Mention of High School Teaching Context by Literary-Literacy Teachers

	# of times participant mentioned constraining teaching context	# of times participant mentioned supportive teaching context
T1	23	3
T3	13	2
T4	12	4
T7	16	1
T8 (Josh)	14	0
T10	14	1
T12	18	0
TOTAL	**110**	**11**
Note. Although Josh was not included in the original group of literary-literacy teachers, he is included with them in this chapter because of his description of context as a mediator on his literary literacy instruction.		

High School Teachers' Limited Access to Supportive Material Resources

Limited access to scholarly databases and archives. One constraining feature of these high school teachers' literary literacy instruction was their limited access to scholarly databases or archives. Though all six more discipline-aligned teachers shared their desire to carefully select texts and deepen their own knowledge and understandings of those texts, they tended to express frustration that such resources were not easily accessible to them. JSTOR, for instance, was a resource that Amy preferred to use while researching scholarship on particular literary works. As a former master's student at a local university, she had had full access to the archives through her student account. But, at the time of data collection, Amy was not a graduate student, and she was limited to abstracts of scholarly articles unless she was willing to pay a fee per article.

All of the literary-literacy teachers desired to share original versions of literary works with their students. Many understood the potential for the edition of the literary work to matter for opening up interpretive possibilities, and they understood that considering differences in editions is a part of the work of college-level literary studies courses. Nancy, for instance, recounted a time when she wanted to include a full version of a Dorothy Parker short story, which was originally published in *The New Yorker*. She wanted her students to consider the tone of the story as it was originally published within the magazine:

> There was…a Dorothy Parker story…that we could not find the whole thing of… I think
> I even paid some amount… to have access to the issue that it was in of *The New Yorker*.
> Then I couldn't find it, or it was tiny, or it was sideways. I don't know. It was an odd
> sort of thing, and I really didn't know what I was doing. We had it on our final exam. I
> wanted it to try to get students to consider the tone. I ended up just putting the first six

paragraphs, because that's what I had access to, and just [asked students to consider],

"What do you pick up from the beginning?" (T4, I2, 479-486)

Nancy, as she described, personally paid for the issue of the magazine that contained the story.

Notably, because she could not easily figure out how to access the full story, she altered her

assessment question to focus just on the beginning of the text. The ultimate assessment question

was not as rigorous as she had hoped, but she did not have the time or resources to continue to

look for the full version.

Relatedly, each of the literary-literacy teachers asked me if they could have a copy of the

original version of one of the think aloud texts, "The Story of an Hour," which was published in

the late 1800s in *Vogue* under a different title (see Appendix). Though the print was small, it was

possible to read the story and notice features like the difference in the original title of the story,

the pairing of a poem by another author, and pictures of two royals of the time. Each of the

literary-literacy teachers, sometimes after considering initial interpretive possibilities, asked me

if I would be willing to share a copy of the text with them, so that they could use it with students.

For instance, Carl said:

Why are there two pictures here [beside this short story]? Lady Eleanor and Lady Mary

Montague, the daughters of the Duchess of Manchester. Why is that there? That's

weird…Maybe there's something about them. Maybe they died of the joy that kills or

something or disappointment. That's cool. Can I keep this? (T7, I3, 362-367)

Nancy, after examining the original text, decided that she wanted to design a lesson in which

students would read "The Story of an Hour" from their textbook anthology and compare it with

the original version that I provided her. She said that she thought coupling the two versions of

the same text would support students in generating interpretive questions for further exploration, like, "Why are the titles different? What does that change about my reading?"

The literary-literacy teachers also indicated their desire to find accessible, authentic models of literary interpretation and claim-making that they could share with their students. Josh, for example, articulated the potential value of sharing with his students models of the type of writing that he was asking them to write:

> Josh: …I think there are things that would show [students] that style but in an accessible way and in a way that they could reproduce and in a way they can understand. They're out there, but they're hard to find. I think it's definitely a gap, a hole, where there's not a lot of resources for teachers who do what I want to do…I think it would be fun to have a professional type of writing like that. I don't think you really see that.
>
> Emily: And the time it would take to find.
>
> Josh: Yeah, and that's the other thing. Sometimes, you just need a lesson and at a certain point, it's like, screw it. We'll just talk about the ghost [in *Hamlet*]. Okay, we'll just talk about the freakin' ghost. I can't spend an hour trying to find the proper piece that discusses the criticism behind it. We'll talk about the ghost and I'll put a sheet over my head. The class will laugh, and it will all be good. (T8, I1, 499-513)

Though Josh articulated a desire to share authentic models of writing by literary scholars, and though he believed that such models were available, he did not have an easy way to access them. Without enough time to search for and select an appropriate piece, he compromised his instructional vision by simply enacting a lesson that students enjoyed.

Required use of literature textbook. Along with expressing a desire for access to literary criticism and original versions of literary works, and the related desire to incorporate

150

those resources into their instruction with students, three more literary-literacy teachers

expressed their frustration with the district-adopted literature textbook. The textbook, for them,

was problematic because it did not adequately support students as they learned to construct and

pursue original literary questions. Instead, the textbook contained leading questions and images

inserted alongside and within the literary works themselves; the teachers lamented that such

insertions suggest "correct" interpretations and, in some cases, allow students to think they

understand the literary work without even reading it.

The teacher who was the most vocal about her "disdain" for the literature textbook was

Lisa. Lisa, who called the textbook "the monster," said, "There are good pieces of literature in

here, but it's hidden in all this gobbledygook" (T1, I4, 40-41). "The layout, the pictures,

everything is an interpretation of whoever the person is who made this anthology," she went on

to say (T1, I4, 244). Of major concern for her were the ways that the textbook seemed to lead

students to a particular interpretation:

> [The textbook features] give them the answer to the big question about what the metaphor
>
> is…[The questions are] actually a statement with a question mark at the end. They've just
>
> given [students] the answer beforehand. Here's the key to the poem. Here's what it's
>
> about. (T1, I4, 99-102)

A related concern for her was the ways that the textbook seemed to communicate to students that

there is a right answer to be known regarding literary interpretation:

> [These questions are] Giving answers. Basically here, they're giving you half the
>
> answer…Like I said, I'm required to use [the textbook]…It does help the struggling
>
> students, but I don't know if it helps them be better readers [of literature] or just do the
>
> assignments…A struggle with…students is them finding new approaches and creative

151

interpretations and ways of looking at something that they might have not thought. [Instead, the textbook is] training them to be like, "Okay, what's the picture that goes with it, and what does this person say," like there's one interpretation that the teacher wants. This book definitely -- this kind of thing definitely is saying there's an answer that the teacher wants, that there's one way to interpret this. (T1, I4, 143-153)

For Lisa, students' perpetual misunderstanding that literary interpretation is a matter of determining right answers was the result of years of bookwork out of literature textbooks like this one. She lamented that "problems come up" when students are taught to "look for key things that they can spit back at you" year after year of school (T1, I4, 332-337).

Lisa explained that these literature textbooks are designed for teachers who do not have sufficient content knowledge, but that the textbooks do not support the most important ways of thinking about or approaching literary works:

Lisa: …I'm going to say something that's horrible. It's a resource for people who aren't good teachers.

Emily: Say more about that. If you weren't a very good teacher, what would that--?

Lisa: If you're not a very good teacher, then you would have all the answers, so you wouldn't actually have to understand the nuances of the story to teach it. You wouldn't have to read the story to teach it. You could have your sub do it when you're gone. Have them read the story and answer the questions in the back. I have the answers right here, so I can just double check against it, and here are some points, and I don't actually have to have read the story, and you don't actually have to have read the story. We could have this assignment checked.

152

Emily: What is lost in that kind of model where there are answers and the teacher has them and there are checks for the right answers?

Lisa: Alternate interpretations, actually looking at the nuances of the text. I don't think this asks you to look at the nuances. I don't think it asks you to make priorities or what's important or what's not important, because it tells you what's important. It doesn't allow for disagreement. This one, which I hadn't even looked -- this is horrible. It doesn't even allow for you to have your own feelings about the text. You're not even allowed to create your own interaction with the text. You're told what you need to feel and what you are supposed to take from this story. If you don't have that interpretation or if you don't feel that way, then what's wrong with you? Are you stupid, or are you weird? Like, one or the other… (T1, I4, 287-313)

Compounding Lisa's frustration about the district-adopted literature textbook was the requirement that all ELA teachers use it regularly in their instruction. She, along with other teachers in this study, felt monitored by their administrators over their use of the textbook. Lisa said, "I think there are a lot of negatives for using [this literature textbook]. If I wasn't required to use it, I would probably never use it" (318-319). But, she said, "If I'm getting fired, it's for big things, not [my refusal to use the textbook]." She reported telling students, "This is one of the hoops we must jump through in life…We have battles to fight and this is not one of them. We'll just handle it" (T1, I4, 223-226).

Given that her regular use of the textbook with students is expected and monitored, Lisa had created a set of assignments that allowed her to meet administrators' expectations without fully compromising her own commitments to teaching with literary works. For one thing, she recounted telling students that work with "the monster" is "a requirement…not literature" (321).

153

She reported giving them weekly "skills" assignments using the textbook that help students prepare for the ACT. Students were assigned to choose a selection, write a one-line summary, identify an element of craft, make a connection to their history or art class, and write whether they like the literary work or not.

This "skills-based" assignment was purposely disconnected from the rest of her instruction because she did not want students to think that the assignment was literary:

> I don't feel bad about making it this approach. I'll say, "There are some great pieces of literature in [this anthology], but this text is really more like your history textbook or your science textbook…We're going to do a very skill-based thing…that's similar to ACT. You're not asked to think; you're asked to analyze what they want you to analyze.…To me, this is test-prep for ACT. This assignment is prepping them for the ACT. Can you read it quickly? Can you assess the main ideas? Can you look at the cues? Can you answer the questions? We're done. (T1, I4, 322-331)

Nancy, who also described dissatisfaction with the textbook and the requirement that she use it with students, shared a different workaround to the problem. Instead of distinguishing bookwork from "real" work with literature as Lisa described, Nancy recounted her attempts to ask students to ignore the editors' contributions to the textbook as much as possible. After reading, she asked students to come back to the questions and images with a critical lens. She said, "There's often more than one way to read something or understand something" so she asked students to consider questions like, "Does having a picture tweak your thinking?...Does this communicate what you would think of as an accurate picture of the woman in the story, Mrs. Mallard?" (T4, I2, 432-438). By engaging students in critiquing the features of the textbook like

the inclusion of particular images or questions, Nancy sought to support them in developing their meaning making with literary works.

Amy, who was one of twelve teachers on the textbook adoption committee, reflected on the challenges of selecting the textbook. They "had three books to choose from," and the one they selected was the best option of the three. One of the other options, she explained, "was very confusing in terms of its setup. It was set up with the story, but then it had these questions on the side, but the questions were all color-coded and it was boxed in. So this paragraph would be red with the question that's correlating, and it was just too confusing for a teenager, or me" (T3, I4, 409-412). The other option, she said, "had some interesting things, but the stories were all very…male-centered, so you didn't get a lot of alternative voices of American literature" (T3, I4, 413-415).

Required use of specific cornerstone texts. Literary-literacy teachers reported that they were required to teach too many cornerstone texts, given their time with students and the complexity of those texts, and that this requirement constrained their literary literacy instruction. Further, three of the literary-literacy teachers did not find the specific required books best for teaching literary inquiry. Or, at least, these three teachers were unsure about how to best use them to teach literary inquiry.

Margaret considered the curricular design and instructional supports she gave students as highly important. Though she thought she *could* teach students shared literary literacy practices with any literary work, for her some were better for teaching students these practices and approaches. For these reasons, she preferred a text like *Huckleberry Finn*, which she formerly taught in tenth grade American Literature, to a text like *To Kill a Mockingbird*, which was the required course text. In her experience, *Huckleberry Finn* presented so many possibilities for

helping students to move beyond simply talking about "issues" and move into identifying, pursuing, and communicating about text-based puzzles of literary works:

> …The narrator [of *Huckleberry Finn*] is so hard to pin down. Is he a racist or not? That is really subtle. It's incredibly subtle. To separate what your author thinks from what your narrator thinks. I don't think a lot of people even try to do that with [the other cornerstone books]. You have to do it with *Huckleberry Finn*…You have to figure out what he thinks through the irony, and kids have tremendous difficulty with the irony. [Also] the last 10 chapters -- why are they there? Teasing out. If Jim had more of a voice, it would be easier to figure it out. [Twain]'s relentless. He makes us deal with it ourselves. He doesn't let Jim tell us how to read it. He doesn't tell us how to read it. (T10, I3, 436-444)

Margaret's concern about *To Kill A Mockingbird* was that although it did allow for talking about "issues," it did not include such evident literary puzzles for students to identify and consider:

> Margaret: I don't know how to use *To Kill a Mockingbird* to teach a 10th grader how to read [literature], because I think it's all there the first time they read it. …You can talk about issues, but it's not an English task for them. It's not challenging in that way.
>
> Emily: You're saying it's because it's all on the surface? There's no--
>
> Margaret: The reading task is not challenging. For me to teach a kid, I need to give them a hard task and help them do it… (T10, I3, 278-284)

For the literary literacy teachers, the combination of the lack of access to particular texts, especially those of a scholarly nature, the literature textbook itself (and the lack of other good options to select from publishers of K-12 materials, as Amy relayed), and the general lack of pedagogical freedom to select and use materials other than those required meant that they sometimes compromised the instruction they sought to provide students.

District-Created Curricula

Another type of constraint the literary-literacy teachers reported was that of curriculum. At all grade levels, teachers reported that the curriculum they were responsible for teaching was broad rather than deep and too fast-paced, with AP Literature as somewhat of an exception. The tenth-grade American Literature curriculum, which was created by some former members of the English department in the district and was a class that every teacher in the sample had taught, was mentioned particularly often by participants. A possible reason for the frequent mention of this particular curriculum includes the importance of tenth-grade ELA in the lives of students, because it was the last ELA class students take before they have the option of enrolling in Advanced Placement courses. Another possible reason is that the particular problems of this curriculum made it a good example for teachers when describing their experiences with using district-created curricula more broadly.

Curriculum breadth and pacing. Teachers reported that the tenth-grade American Literature curriculum was organized around four books: *To Kill a Mockingbird*, *Catcher in the Rye*, *Their Eyes Were Watching God*, and *Great Gatsby*. The major writing assignments were quarterly essays (two argumentation, one expository, one narrative) related to the cornerstone books. There were also many nonfiction texts that were included in the required reading list. Day-to-day objectives were aligned with particular Common Core State Standards, and teachers reported the challenge of sufficiently teaching everything that is required within the time that they had. Instead, they tended to describe the pressure they feel to "cover" or "get through" material. Margaret, for instance, said:

> …There's no time to really teach. I think there are people who don't understand the
> difference between assigning something and teaching it. All there was time for was to

157

assign those pieces [the four cornerstone books], not to teach them, which they needed.

They needed to be really slow units, and instead they are really fast units. (T10, I3, 288-

291)

Later, Margaret said, "I spent more time on [making sense of the American Literature

curriculum] than any other class. You feel this responsibility to teach all this stuff, but you can't

get it all in. It just breaks your heart" (T10, I3, 400-402). Similarly, Josh characterized his day as

"the opposite of staring at the clock. It's like I desperately want the clock to slow down so I can

get more in" (T8, I1, 67-69)

Lisa described the challenge of teaching students to engage in literary inquiry when

responsible for covering so much content within such a limited amount of time:

We are required—you can tell by my passive [language] my feeling about this—we are

required to do argumentation first. We are required to teach that ACT-style

argumentation first and fourth quarter…AP Literature, we have a lot more freedom as

teachers, because we're trying to get them to dig deep, look at the bigger picture, those

big…questions, that's a part of what we're doing. So to me it's much more of a natural

fit for me because that's what I do with literature, whereas in American Lit it's much

more, we want you to teach them surgeon skills and not necessarily the big picture… (T1,

I1, 222-230)

Lisa sought to "meld those two worlds" of teaching students discrete skills and teaching them to

engage in meaningful ways with literature, but she said that the tenth-grade curriculum makes

that work much more difficult because it is not organized with those goals in mind. There was

no time built into the curriculum for teachers to support students to construct their own questions

with literary works, for example, or to support students to learn to write literary arguments.

158

Instead, teachers were responsible for teaching students "surgeon skills" and each quarter culminates with a prescribed essay assignment.

One major consequence of such a broad and fast-paced curriculum with book-length cornerstone texts was that teachers did not have time to reread literary works with students. All six literary-literacy teachers described the value of reading the same text multiple times. Nancy, for instance, said as a part of her think aloud about "The Story of an Hour":

> I know what's coming. That affects, of course, how I'm reading it. I'm noticing things
> that I wouldn't notice before or that I hadn't noticed necessarily before…The first line
> that says, "Afflicted with a heart trouble"…takes on more meaning once you know where
> the story goes, although I think students would take a number of readings to notice that
> and to be tuned into that sort of thing. (T4, I2, 198-203)

Though teachers described personally valuing reading texts multiple times and they believed it to be important that students learn to read texts multiple times, they were constrained by the limited time in the school day coupled with the broad and fast-paced curriculum. Within this structure, they had developed work-arounds that enabled them to teach students to consider texts deeply, though they were not satisfied with them. Lisa, for instance, said that in order to have time for instruction that "retrain[s students] to not read for plot… [or] just basic comprehension" and instead to "analyze the craft," she first showed students the movie version of the cornerstone book *Their Eyes Were Watching God*. "Ideally," she said, "you would read this book once for plot and characters and then we would reread the book together analyzing the art of the book…We don't have time to do the book twice. We just literally don't have the time" (T1, I3, 214-217).

Required use of poorly constructed curriculum. Additionally, all of the literary-literacy teachers pointed to the lack of coherence in the tenth grade American Literature curriculum. Margaret said:

> The transitions are really important to us—drawing these connections between one piece
>
> of literature and the next…the themes and the skills from one book [should] lead into a
>
> much more complex version of them in the next book, a much more complex version of
>
> that in the next book…We couldn't figure out how to create arcs and connections
>
> between these books. Why you would transition from one to the next wasn't at all clear
>
> to us. It was like, "I'll throw this at you. I'll throw that at you." (T10, I3, 292-299)

Lisa also critiqued the confusing sequence of the American Literature curriculum: "Why does this build? How does this scaffold?...How do [the skills we are responsible for teaching] work together?" (T1, I2, 495-496). Of particular concern for her were the relationships between the fiction and nonfiction texts on the required reading list. For her, one of the worst parts was that less experienced teachers also struggled with the curriculum but sometimes "internalized" the problem as their own, rather than understanding it to be a problem with the curriculum itself:

> There were newer teachers who were coming to me and saying, I don't know what to do
>
> with this. I'm so confused. And I would tell them there's a reason you're confused. It
>
> doesn't make any sense. It's stupid, dumb. It's really like I'm misteaching the concepts,
>
> that's what it forces me to do. (T1, I2, 554-557)

The confusion she observed from newer teachers was particularly troubling to her because she understood such district-developed curricula as ideally supporting more inexperienced teachers. Yet, even veteran teachers can benefit from carefully written curricula. At the time of data collection, Lisa was in her first year of teaching AP Literature. That curriculum, she said, was

160

much better because it allowed for "some flexibility" and it was "scaffold[ed] nicely" so that she "get[s] the logic behind every decision and it makes some sense" (T1, I2, 481-486).

Without understanding the relationships between the parts, Lisa was left to help her students make sense of the curriculum-based instruction as best as she could. She sometimes found herself simply telling students that the classwork did not make sense, so that they would not think it was their fault if they were confused about how work fit together:

> In the first year when we were given the list of stuff, I was trying to make it cohesive. After like four times, I'm like, "Okay you guys. This is something I have to make you do. We're just going to do it. Let's just practice skills on it, and we'll call it a day, because this doesn't make any sense and I'm not going to pretend it makes sense." I'm not going to force it to fit in when it doesn't. (T1, I3, 125-130)

Required adherence to curriculum. Of course, these types of constraining curricular features are only problematic insofar as teachers are required to adhere to the curriculum and the curriculum is not easily revised. In this district, at least for the American Literature curriculum, both seemed to be the case.

One year, Lisa decided to teach the cornerstone texts in a different order in an attempt to make her instruction more coherent. This decision meant that her instruction was not aligned from quarter to quarter with her colleagues' instruction. She said she was "scolded" for doing that, and she has since tried to find other ways to work around the constraints of the curriculum. Since then, Lisa tried to advocate for the curriculum itself to be revised. She even volunteered to contribute to the effort, but her suggestions were not taken up.

Similarly, Carl said that he feels "insulted" by the pressure to "all be in lockstep and doing the exact same thing" (T7, I2, 474-475). He also said, "I like to have some academic

161

freedom, so I wish we had a little more of that today" (T7, I2, 26-27). Beyond feeling that his academic and professional competence was not being respected, Carl also articulated the contradiction that though the "script" would likely not lead his students to rigorous learning, he would still ultimately be held responsible for their learning:

> I did not want to be in that scenario -- so disempowered and [having the curriculum] dictating what we do in here. Especially when there's this coinciding push to make us responsible, completely, for the learning that goes on. If our kids' scores go down, then we'll get fired. If you're going to put that responsibility on me, then let me do my best to get to that point where I'm doing a good job. (T7, I2, 499-504)

Along with the requirement of adhering to the curriculum, which was not particularly supportive of teaching students to engage in cycles of inquiry with literary works, teachers reported frustration about how the curriculum was created in the first place and the lack of a clear path for revising it.

Carl said, "It's bizarre how the curriculum gets formed in our district" (T7, I2, 402-403). He was on the American Literature curriculum committee three years ago when it was created. Of the experience, he said:

> …We were brought to the curriculum center. We were in a room for two or three days….[It] struck me as we were going through the process how arbitrary the decisions were. If you picked another date and put us in that room, we would have come up with completely different texts. We didn't involve the whole staff in the process. It was like one person with one particular agenda is getting this bigger say in how things would go. (T7, I2, 427-433)

Ultimately, Carl said, "…I walked away disappointed and not happy. I don't want to necessarily teach [all of the books]…and I want to do them in a different order" (T7, I2, 454-455).

Though there seemed to be general agreement that the curriculum needs to be revised, the teachers were not confident that they would be able to effect such change. Lisa attributed this feeling of lack of agency to the "constant change" of supervisors; they have had "five bosses in five years" and the current boss is "a physics guy, he knows nothing about literature. So if you try to talk to him about why it doesn't make sense," he "doesn't understand what you're talking about" (T1, I2, 518-528).

Margaret echoed the concern that administrators did not understand how the curriculum and required adherence to the curriculum were diminishing the quality of teaching:

> And I don't think administrators have understood to what extent these constraints
> damaged what we were doing. I think they understood eventually what was
> damaged, but they didn't understand how to do anything other than we all need to teach
> the same thing at the same time. (T10, I1, 113-116)

The lack of disciplinary expertise of administrators was a regular concern expressed by the more literary-literacy teachers. In fact, Carl attributed some of the issues with coherence in the curriculum to the administrator who was in place at the time of its creation:

> …There was this misinterpretation from the curriculum director about what we were
> supposed to be doing and about what the Common Core called for. We felt she was
> wrong, because she was claiming that there was this real emphasis on non-fiction texts.
> We agreed that there are some standards written about that, but that didn't mean that in
> American Literature we were supposed to throw out a bunch of the fictional texts and the
> poetry that we were doing and go all non-fiction. …It was so irritating. She'd show up,

and she was really persistent. We felt we…were right. I don't know. I could be wrong, but I'd still rather be wrong and teach the fiction that we've been teaching instead of throwing it all away. (T7, I2, 434-443)

The literary literacy teachers of this study seemed to agree that although a curriculum could be supportive of their goals to provide students with literary literacy instruction, it could also be constraining. In the case of the tenth-grade American Literature curriculum, the combination of breadth, pace, expectations of rigid adoption, and lack of disciplinary expertise of supervisors responsible for ensuring adherence all contributed to these teachers' experiences of constraint.

High School Teachers' Limited Opportunities for Meaningful Ongoing Learning

Relationship between teachers' expertise and their teaching. In part due to the breadth of the curriculum and the number of different courses they taught, teachers occasionally acknowledged that they did not always feel expert. 10 of the 12 teachers at some point acknowledged that they did not feel expert in at least some of what they were responsible for teaching. Carl, for example, said, "I was no expert on [the course themes] when I got the class. I had read some things. I'd read the [cornerstone text] before, but it certainly wasn't my expertise" (T7, I2, 73-74). With more time, many teachers said they would want to deepen their own knowledge and practice.

Teachers' limited time for continued learning. Another constraint of these teachers' literary literacy instruction was the lack of time they had for collaborating with other teachers and continuing their own learning. All twelve teachers described their desire to learn from their colleagues and their insufficient opportunities to do so. Josh shared that, at least in his building, "teachers don't know each other as well" (T8, I1, 317).

Lisa reported a close working relationship she has with one other teacher in the district: "[Margaret] and I met for hours during the summer…We have very similar goals for students…so that's all that really matters in a working relationship. She strengthens my weakness and I strengthen hers" (T1, I1, 54-57). Lisa and Margaret, because they have "very similar goals for students," both described their collaborative relationship as highly important. Yet, they lamented that they have to find time to collaborate mostly outside of their regular work hours. Lisa did give a nod to the district's requirement that teachers participate in professional learning communities; but, from her perspective, the groups were too large, they lacked unity and purpose because teachers did not have common goals for students, and they did not provide teachers enough time to work together. "It makes me laugh," she said, "when [administrators are] like, 'Well, you know you have your P[rofessional] L[earning] C[ommunity] time for 45 minutes one a month.' Yeah, that's accomplishing a lot" (T1, I1, 63-65).

Still, all 12 of the teachers in this study valued continued professional learning and wished that they had more time to devote to their own learning. Josh said, for instance, "[in college] I loved trading ideas with people on paper and reading different perspectives [about literary works]" (T8, I1, 457). "I love to read. I think that's one of the reasons I want to get out of this profession—I don't have time to read as much as I would like to" (T8, I1, 437-438). Similarly, Lisa said, "Pre-becoming a teacher, I liked to read complicated literary texts…My older sister keeps sending me these great novels that are highly complex, interesting pieces which I would have loved to read maybe two decades ago. Now I'm like, they just sit on the shelf. Maybe in the summertime…but this summer I had to read ten books to prep for this class, so there was no leisure reading (T1, I1, 84-107).

165

These data suggest that what drove teachers' desire for ongoing learning was their desire to engage meaningfully with literary works, whether that be independently reading or talking with and learning from others about literary works.

Student Assessments Not Designed to Measure Disciplinary Reasoning

Perhaps most predictably, teachers in this study regularly mentioned the role of various standardized tests in their instruction. The tests, especially the ACT and ACT-style tests administered to students at the building level, seemed to influence the teaching decisions of all of the teachers in the study. Although the literary-literacy teachers described their efforts to provide literary literacy instruction while also teaching students how to be successful on standardized tests (recall Lisa, who assigned ACT-prep assignments out of the textbook each week), the strategy-literacy teachers described being primarily guided by these standardized tests.

Kara, one of the literary-literacy teachers, pointed out the tension between what she thought was important to teach and what was measured on the standardized tests that her students were required to take:

> …How do you measure success? What if my students don't do as well on a test, does that mean I didn't teach as well? I don't know. Do I create more ethical and open-minded humans? I think so. That's good. Did I teach them how to close read, how to write margin notes, how to highlight, how to talk to the text? Yes I did. I still don't know if that improved their test scores compared to [another type of instruction]. (T12, I2, 221-225)

Although she understood the importance of teaching students to "close read" and "write margin notes," among other things, Kara did not believe that these were the skills or practices that were

assessed on the most common standardized tests that her students took. Notably, even as Kara lamented the test-driven curriculum, she assessed her work in terms of students' achievement scores rather than their disciplinary learning or their development of a passion for reading literature, which was at odds with her own feelings about her subject area.

At the time of data collection, Janet, one of the strategy-literacy teachers, taught remedial reading and writing to students who have received low scores on assessments (i.e., Gates-MacGinitie, an hour-long vocabulary and comprehension assessment, EXPLORE, a pre-ACT test taken by all ninth-grade students in the district, and eighth grade state standardized test scores). At one time, she said, she did take grades into account when deciding which students to enroll in literacy intervention, but now:

> …I don't even look at grades anymore. Not this year but the year before, I had 30 kids identified for literacy intervention that were A/B students coming out of middle school. So I spent hours on the phone with parents. That's a hard one. [I'd tell parents] "Down the line, they're looking to take the ACT. Do you want them to be able to choose to want to go to [proximal prestigious university]? We need to look at that. We need to look at how they're doing on that test." I'm not a teach-to-the-test kind of girl, but if the reality is that…we have to consider those factors.

Similarly, Diane, another of the strategy-literacy teachers, described the value of offering students instruction to support their test taking skills:

> I think that in particular is valuable for them. My tenth graders are going to take the ACT next year. I say to them, "This is an ACT prompt, and I'm scoring it using the ACT rubric. I'm going to help you figure out what you're lacking so that when you go to do the ACT, you'll be able to do better." For me, it's worthwhile… (T9, I4, 584-587)

Though she devoted a lot of class time to ACT preparation, Diane also acknowledged that the class time could be used on "something more worthwhile," if she did not have to worry about the pressure of the tests and their effect on students' lives.

Content Area Literacy Initiatives

The six literary-literacy teachers tended to describe the challenges of teaching students to construct, pursue, and communicate about literary questions within a school district that has implemented initiatives focused on cognitive strategy use, metacognition, and comprehension. Two of the primary literacy initiatives adopted by the district were a reading intervention program, which teachers understood to be largely focused on teaching students various reading strategies to help them comprehend text and become more metacognitive, and a writing intervention program, which teachers understood to be focused on teaching students an explicit formula to follow when writing essays.

In what follows, I present patterns in what the literary-literacy teachers said about these two district-implemented literacy initiatives. Although I recognize that both literacy reforms (and other school-adopted literacy initiatives) have tremendous merit, I seek to characterize the ways that the literary-literacy teachers experienced the reforms as they were taken up by their colleagues and students and the ways in which this take-up seemed to be conflicting with their more disciplinary instructional goals.

Reading strategy literacy initiative. All of the literary-literacy teachers acknowledged the helpfulness of some of the reading strategies promoted in their reading intervention training. However, some teachers described the limitations of strategy instruction, particularly for students who were already making meaning with complex texts. Nancy said, for instance, "Some of those reading strategies—it's interesting if you're trying to get them to use them. But the good readers,

a lot of times they're already doing it unconsciously, and the strategies that we're giving them aren't pushing them to the point of, I have to stop and figure this out*" (T4, I2, 159-162). In Nancy's experience, many, if not most, of her students did not need explicit strategy instruction that supported them to be more metacognitive. Instead, they needed explicit support for engaging in specialized reasoning with literature, like recognizing productive places to stop and construct literary puzzles.

Lisa pointed out importance of discontinuing cognitive strategy instruction once students have demonstrated that they do not need it any longer. Although she and her colleague Kara felt pressure to "do more explicit, reading strategy stuff," they sought to resist that pressure when they observed that students were independently monitoring their comprehension. Were they to overemphasize cognitive strategies to students who did not need such instruction, Lisa said, "I would be ruining it. I'd be ruining what's going on" in class (T1, I3, 613-617).

Formulaic academic writing literacy initiative. Similarly, all of the literary-literacy teachers acknowledged the potential helpfulness of the formulaic writing reform adopted by their school district. For them, teaching students how to write a thesis statement and topic sentences accompanied by a particular number of lines of concrete details and reasoning helped some students move beyond a common stumbling block--understanding how much of their essays should be devoted to describing the relationship between their claim and their evidence. Further, they tended to acknowledge the benefits of having a common language to talk about student work with their colleagues across grade levels and content areas.

Still, they also described ways in which the writing intervention as it had been taken up seemed to work against their more disciplinary instructional goals. A major part of this concern for Carl was the way that the formula seemed to mask for students the ultimate purposes of

169

writing in the first place: to communicate ideas to other people. As he said, "why would you write [anything] if you're not really changing anybody's mind or showing them something that they don't already know?" (T7, I1, 319-320).

Related to this concern was the way in which teaching students a formulaic method for essay writing seemed to undercut what he saw as a major part of his job: to teach students the specific discursive norms of literary studies. He said, for instance, "[Students] don't always know, why on Earth are we doing all this? I'm always talking about college academic writing. The way you'd be writing in a history class versus what you would write in an English class" (T7, I1, 437-439). Carl reported that his students seem to come to his class believing that there is one correct way to write an essay, rather than understanding that they have been taught a generic formula that they will need to move past. A small example he offered was that often his students have been taught to write all essays in third person. This is not a discursive norm of literary studies, so Carl tried to "undo" that instruction by teaching students "to use the pronoun I when they're bringing in personal experience to connect to the story" because "I've read essays from professors where they do that sort of thing and make a personal connection with the novel" (T7, I1, 364-366).

A second concern that Carl shared was that the formulaic writing instruction seemed to conflict with his goals of teaching students to engage in literary inquiry. He said, "My goal is to try to get them to come up with, even attempt to come up with something unique. This is a struggle because in ninth grade they're doing this method of writing." In his experience, it is "a real chore to get [students] to analyze more deeply" because "they have this default to just do a certain number of sentences" (T7, I1, 292-314). Beyond simply focusing on a certain number of sentences, Carl noted that his students also tend to resist the idea that they would need to

170

generate unique claims about literary works. He thought that this was in part due to some teachers' practice of giving students a topic to write about using the writing intervention method:

> …I don't like the format of it, but I think maybe it's good for some teachers and they do a good thing with it. But what I've seen is [teachers] give [students] one topic, and all [students] have to write about the same topic. Depending on the teacher, they might actually have the opening sentences be the same…which to me is really bad writing. I don't want them doing that…They've had that in ninth grade. So then my struggle is how to break them from that. They don't like this idea and they're like, "Why don't you just give us a topic?" "No. Part of it is you thinking deeply and coming up with something unique"…That's the starting point for me -- to get them to generate their own ideas. I like it better because then I read, and maybe I get some unique things along the way. (T7, I1, 292-305)

For Carl, the writing instruction that all students receive in ninth grade, rather than being a step towards the instructional goals he has for students by the end of tenth grade, was in conflict. Notably, he did not condemn the writing intervention completely, but he expressed concerns about the ways that some of his colleagues seem to be taking it up and the results for student learning.

Teachers Not Treated As Professionals

All 12 teachers in this study indicated that they did not feel valued as professionals. Teachers in this study regularly made comments that suggested low morale, like "We don't get to think" and "I feel insulted." Carl described the frustration he felt as an attendee of the professional development sequence he was required to attend. In this professional development,

he did not feel that he was treated as a professional educator or that his time was used meaningfully.

Teachers regularly mentioned the distrust that they feel from administrators and the larger community. Diane said:

> …the distrust of teachers that we're here and, I don't know, freeloading, loafing around, talking to kids and getting nothing done…[we] are doing the best we can for kids. Have we made some shortcuts over time because we're tired? Maybe. Yeah, maybe. But aren't I entitled to have a life, too, and still have time to eat dinner with my family and still have time to go away for the weekend with my kids? (T9, I4, 570-580)

Teachers described a new evaluation system in which teachers were to be observed twice while teaching and rated by an administrator as "non-effective," "minimally effective," "effective," or "highly effective." Sally reported that, regardless of seniority, "…if you're minimally-effective you're the first to go now" in the case of layoffs. Carl said that the new system did not feel particularly objective:

> There was a lot of…it seemed like it was not fair. One administrator was giving all easy things and giving all "highly effectives." The one in charge of my department basically said he wasn't going to give any. He was pretty much just going to give everybody just "effective" if they were. But there's a consequence to that. If someone in the middle school gets "highly effective," they can bump me out of my position. (T7, I2, 525-540)

He went on to say:

> It's scary, though. Now you think about speaking your voice, speaking up about something, about some issue with the department, if you get on the wrong side of the administrator. Oh boy. I did that this year. They wanted us to do this grading with other

172

teachers where we swapped a chunk of these pre-assessment essays that we did at the beginning of the semester. I would get 10 from each other teacher and then go through and grade them all. Then we were going to get together and discuss them, but there wasn't any time, they said, to do this during our established meeting times so we were supposed to do this on our own. I got mad. It was this weird, indirect thing…I went to the union. We had to ask them directly, "Is this a mandate?" He didn't respond. So, we didn't do it, but I think I'm on his list now as someone who makes trouble. (T7, I2, 545-566)

Along with their fears of being fired or shuffled to another position, their frustration at having to attend professional development sessions that may or may not be meaningful for their practice, their exhaustion, and their perception that administrators and other stakeholders do not fully trust them, teachers described their lack of adequate compensation for their work. Diane mentioned her decision to regularly take on lunch duty to earn an extra ten dollars a day, which resulted in a loss of prep time, because, as she said, "I've got a kid in college." Kara talked about the potential consequences of low pay combined with the district's decision to freeze employees on the salary scale so that they are not currently getting raises each year commensurate with inflation:

They need to pay us. I am never going to get to the top of the [salary] scale because I'm frozen. What is the plan? Because who's going to be teaching if those are the parameters?...Who are you going to get doing the job? You have to have so little self-respect, honestly, and so few options that you'd be at the bottom of the barrel. When you can do better than that, why would you be there?

173

A moment later, she said, "I don't want my kid being taught by people who are willing to put up with that" (T12, I4, 741-742). "God," she said, "it's so insulting to be frozen on the first step. It's just a slap in the face" (T12, I4, 755).

Teachers expressed fears about losing their jobs, and not being able to sustain their lifestyles or support their families, along with their feelings of being distrusted, seemed to, at least indirectly, constrain their abilities to provide literary literacy instruction. This broader climate of de-professionalization contributed to teachers' decisions about whether to remain in K-12 teaching. I share these decisions at the end of the chapter. But first, for contrast, I present some of the ways that the university context seemed to support scholars' opportunities to provide literary literacy instruction.

Supportive Contexts of University for Literary Literacy Instruction

Although the university-based literary scholars did not frequently mention their instructional contexts, when they did, their comments tended to indicate that they felt generally supported by their instructional contexts, or, at least, they did not feel constrained by them.

Access to Material Resources

The data indicate that the literary scholars seemed to assume their own and their students' access to material resources. In regard to resources, they mentioned only being limited by uncontrollable issues, like an edition going out of print. They also indicated that they had the freedom to select texts that would best align with their scholarly expertise and their students' needs and interests. This relatively easy access to texts was meaningful for their instruction, as 6 literary scholars also described the power of selecting particular texts that best prompt students to learn to construct and pursue literary puzzles. For instance, Sarah said that she preferred giving students texts that seem "rather meaningless" or do not seem to have a "central mystery," so that

students "have to work to get something out of [them]" (D7, I2, 530-533). Further, 5 of the 10 literary scholars described the importance of carefully selecting particular editions of literary works for their students to read. David, for instance, said that he carefully thought about which edition to require students to use "a ton, and I'm always explicit about it on the course description and my syllabi, and I link to the book itself…I want them to see, this is what the cover looks like, this is what you have to get" (D1, I3, 420-423). The importance of using a particular edition stretches far beyond simply being able to turn to the same page at the same time; these literary scholars understood the consequences for meaning making of different editions. David said that, for instance, the "British and American editions" of Woolf's *To the Lighthouse* are "very, very different" in their plot (D1, I3, 441-445). The editors' notes were another consideration that disciplinarians brought to their decisions about which edition to use; they sought to avoid editions with notes that are "obtrusive and interpretive" whenever possible (D1, I3, 394).

Sustainability of University-Based Teaching

The literary scholars described relatively small class sizes as the norm, even in their introductory level undergraduate courses. Anthony, for instance, said of the class he was teaching at the time of data collection: "We have…only 18 students. I think that's a good size to be able to [offer] some personalized attention" (D9, I1, 397). As a graduate student, he was paid to devote approximately 20 hours per week on one course per semester. He used the time to meet one-on-one with students about their thinking and writing and to give detailed feedback to students on their work. He said, "I only teach one class a semester and I don't know what the hell happens when you teach more than that" (D9, I1, 574).

The literary scholars who were faculty members tended to teach two courses per semester, and although they described themselves as busy, they did not indicate that this aspect of their job was unmanageable. Two of the scholars mentioned having teaching assistants who help them grade and lead discussion sections, which reduced the burden of their teaching. The students themselves also had time for deep engagement with course texts. David said, "We only meet for three hours a week, so there's a ton of solitary time for them all to be doing their own reading" (D1, I3, 531-532).

The time that the university-based instructors said that they devoted to preparing for class and meeting with students outside of class was likely largely due to the university's academic calendar and the time protections that faculty members were offered to ensure time for scholarship and service. David said, "the way I teach…is by one-on-one working with their writing," which he is able to manage along with his other commitments. Again, he acknowledged that his practice is a major difference from high school teaching: "But I know if you have a class of 35 or 40 kids and you've got a bunch of those in the day, as a high school teacher, I mean, I remember having just a lot of kids, and there's only so much [individual coaching] you can do" (D1, I1, 348-351).

Relationship between Literary Scholars' Expertise and Their Teaching

In general, the literary scholars were aware of the close alignment of their scholarly interests and their teaching. All 10 scholars indicated at various points their confidence as scholars of a particular author, period of time, or body of literature within literary studies. Four scholars mentioned valuing their pedagogical freedom, saying things like, "[This university] offers you so much autonomy in terms of designing your courses" (D2, I1, 104). The autonomy

176

included designing their own courses, designing their own syllabi, selecting specific editions of texts for students to purchase and read, and designing their own assessments.

Of the literary scholars, those on the faculty indicated the closest alignment between their scholarship and their courses. David specialized in Virginia Woolf and he regularly taught an undergraduate course on Virginia Woolf. He said of his work, "The things I teach, I love to teach, and will model loving it at some point or another" (D1, I3, 184-185). Aware of the boundaries of his expertise, he expressed that he would be uncomfortable teaching *Hamlet*, for instance, to students. He went on to say, "It feels to me like my pedagogy is very much in harmony with my scholarship and my writing, and I feel very fortunate" (D1, I3, 291-292).

Intellectual and Pedagogical Freedom

Underlying the comments by literary scholars was an acknowledgment of their academic and pedagogical freedom. One senior scholar said, for instance, "[This university] offers you so much autonomy in terms of designing your courses" (D2, I1, 104). Relatedly, the scholars generally did not have to teach courses they did not choose. David said, "I hate teaching essays that are about…theory, partly because it doesn't make me excited in the same way…Also because I really dislike paraphrasing the bones of something," so he designed his courses to focus on "getting into the strange textures of [texts] that are literary to me" (D1, I3, 192-197). A former high school ELA teacher himself, David acknowledged the difference between his highly focused, specialized teaching and the work of teaching high school: "A high school teacher having to teach everything doesn't have that luxury [of choosing what she teaches]…I'm totally aware of that" (D1, I3, 529-533).

The graduate student literary scholars also described having pedagogical freedom to design their own syllabi, select specific editions of texts, and design their own assessments based

on their own expertise, though they generally did not have choices about which courses they taught.

Also underpinning the description of literary scholars' teaching was the amount of time that they had to devote to each of their students. Anthony, as mentioned above, talked about meeting with his students regularly during office hours. David, too, described the importance of meeting with students one-on-one about their own questions as they worked through cycles of inquiry. He acknowledged that K-12 teachers, given the many constraints on their time, are not as able to offer such individualized instruction.

Decisions to Remain in the Profession or to Leave

Of the 12 high school teachers in this study, 2 teachers articulated their decisions to leave the profession. After more than 35 years in the classroom, Nancy decided to retire at the end of the school year. Josh, after 6 years in the classroom, was applying to doctoral programs in the hope that academic life would provide a more sustainable career and more financial stability for his family. The remaining teachers tended to be ambivalent about their decisions to remain in K-12 teaching. By contrast, none of the 10 literary scholars indicated that they were considering leaving their profession at the time of data collection. The university-based graduate students each described their desire to secure a tenure-track faculty position so that they could continue to teach and pursue their scholarly interests over their careers.

Josh partially attributed his decision to leave K-12 teaching to the low salary. He said, "I'm unfortunately ready [to quit teaching] because [this state] is not a great place to be a teacher right now and try to support a family" (T8, I1, 53-55). He went on to say:

> With the number of pay freezes that we've had and the lack of raises and stuff,
> essentially, it's a 25% pay cut, counting inflation in the last ten years…These things go in

178

waves. I think it will come back, but I think my generation of teachers is going to be the one that's going to just get decimated by it. Every year of step freeze, we lose like $50,000 in lifetime earnings. There's that. My [spouse and I are]… realizing that if we want to help pay for our kids' college, if we want to ever take a ski vacation…we have to move on. (T8, I1, 56-68)

As Josh said, "[this state] is not a great place to be a teacher right now" (T8, I1, 53). He also attributed his decision to some of the other contexts of teaching, including the pressure of assessments, the sheer volume of work, and his inability to provide the type of instruction he wanted to provide:

…Between the assessments, the amount of kids I have -- I have 35 kids in every class -- also, what I want to do. I think part of it is because I want to be open to students whenever they walk in. I want to conference with kids. I want to give them good feedback on their papers….I'm torn, because I really like it… I always like what I do. No matter how tired I am, I get energized for the day. (T8, I1, 68-72)

Despite Josh's regret about leaving K-12 teaching, he understood this decision as a common one. Of his university teacher education cohort members with whom he graduated in 2008, most, he said, have made a similar choice to leave the profession:

Of my [teacher education cohort], I think there are two left in teaching. They are the two who I would…least want. They were very nice people, but they weren't the best teachers. All the best teachers have gone on to administration or curriculum roles. Most of them have actually gone on to other fields. One is doing fundraising... Another one is in television. Another one got their MBA and is at some horrible corporation. (T8, I1, 94-100)

179

Three teachers (Kara, Claire, Sally) had decided to continue to choose part-time status within the district—at a significant financial loss—so that they would be better able to meet the demands of the job and their own personal expectations. As each of these part-timers said and as I observed, they still put in full-time hours each week, and they each still taught more than 100 students per semester.

The ten teachers who expressed their intention to continue teaching tended to qualify their decisions using phrases like "for now," leaving themselves room to make a different decision in the coming years. Diane described the reality that she might burn out and need to leave the profession before she was of age to retire. Janet also described her uncertainty about being able to sustain the job until she is eligible for retirement:

> Janet: It's a challenging profession. I second-guess myself more than ever as far as what the hell am I doing? I just want to retire and I just want to water the flowers. There are days when you feel like you can't win.
>
> Emily: But, you stay.
>
> Janet: I do.
>
> …
>
> Janet: I'm 51 now. I figure I can do it 9 more years, but I don't know if I can do it 14 more years. (T11, I3, 503-515)

Even though they had decided to stay, at least for the time being, many of the high school teachers in the study articulated that they would not recommend the job to college-aged students considering the profession. Diane said, "The job is so much more than what people realize, and I worry about [young people] who go into it" (T9, I4, 223-225).

For these high school teachers, their reasons for staying centered on their students. Diane said, "For me, it's always the kids. The kids definitely draw me back" (T9, I4, 15). Similarly, Carl said, "And so it goes…Still, I like teaching. The kids are the same. No matter how much the world changes, we still have the same kinds of students" (T7, I2, 593-594).

Conclusion

In this chapter, I described some contexts of instruction at the university that seemed to support scholars' disciplinary approaches to instruction with literary works, including their own deep expertise, their freedom to design courses and syllabi that are aligned with that expertise, their time to plan, teach, and meet one-on-one with students, and their ready access to materials, namely various scholarly editions and first printings of literary works. I also described some contexts of instruction at the high school level that teachers said constrained their disciplinary approaches to instruction with literary works, including their limited and misaligned material resources; the implementation of academic literacy initiatives that masked disciplinarity, required adherence to curricula that do not foreground inquiry, and limited time for ongoing professional learning; and a system of required assessments that do not seek to gather information about students' disciplinary reading, writing, and reasoning. High school teachers tended to understand these constraints as occurring within a broader climate of accountability and de-professionalization of teachers.

The constraining nature of context on high school literary literacy instruction seemed to place a high burden on teachers in this study to supplement and connect the broad and incoherent curricula in order to meet disciplinary literacy instructional aims. They sought to do this despite a lack of material resources and time, with less confidence in their own expertise, and with an

awareness that their students—and they themselves—would ultimately be assessed on a different set of learning outcomes.

In the next and final chapter, I will synthesize the findings of this study and put them in conversation with existing scholarship. In brief, I argue that knowing the discipline and its practices is necessary but not sufficient for instructors to provide disciplinary literacy instruction to students. Supportive contexts are a necessary complement. I will also offer a set of implications based on the findings of this study.

CHAPTER VII: CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

In this dissertation study, I sought to describe some of the shared literacy practices of members of the discipline of literary studies and high school ELA teachers. I also sought to examine the relationship between participants' literary literacy practices and their approaches to teaching students to make meaning with literary works.

The research questions guiding my study were:

1. What are the shared ways of reading, writing, and reasoning among those who study literary works?

2. How do the literacy practices of those who study literary works relate to their approaches to teaching with literary works?

3. What are high school English language arts teachers' ways of reading, writing, and reasoning with literary works?

4. How do high school English language arts teachers' literacy practices relate to their approaches to teaching with literary works?

The literary scholars in this study demonstrated shared, problem-based ways of making meaning with literary works and teaching students to make meaning with literary works. An analysis of semi-structured interviews and think alouds with literary scholars using multiple texts yielded the following literary literacy practices: (a) seeking patterns within text(s), (b) identifying strangeness, surprise, or confusion within text(s), (c) articulating literary text-based puzzles, (d) recursively considering interpretive possibilities with text(s), (e) considering

histories of use or other contexts, and (f) making original interpretive claims about text(s). Interviews with the literary scholars also revealed shared literary literacy instructional practices. These literary literacy instructional practices included: (a) naming literary puzzles and their features, (b) posing literary puzzles to students, (c) teaching students to construct their own text-based literary puzzles, (d) teaching students to recursively consider interpretive possibilities with text(s), (e) teaching students to make original interpretive literary claims, and (f) coaching students through cycles of literary inquiry.

Across a sample of 12 high school English language arts teachers, 6 teachers indicated similar shared orientations and literary literacy practices. The 6 high school ELA teachers, whom I refer to as literary-literacy teachers, described the inherently text-based and social nature of the discourse community of literary studies, sounding in their talk about texts and reading practices much like the university-based literary scholars. They, too, demonstrated the literary literacy practices of seeking patterns within text(s), identifying strangeness, surprise, or confusion within text(s), articulating puzzles, recursively considering interpretive possibilities with text(s), considering histories of use or other contexts, and making original literary claims about text(s). And, like the literary scholars, they, too, described their preferences for providing literary literacy instruction to students, describing their attempts to name literary puzzles for students, posing literary puzzles to students, teaching students to construct their own text-based literary puzzles, teaching students to recursively consider interpretive possibilities with text(s), teaching students to make original literary claims, and coaching students through cycles of literary inquiry.

However, whereas the university-based instructors' teaching practices were supported by their university context, the high school teachers' teaching practices were constrained by their

school context. These literary-literacy teachers repeatedly (both within and across individual interviews) discussed needing to create "work arounds" in order to provide literary literacy instruction in spite of the limited time, limited resources, and competing school and district expectations placed on them.   They also expressed dissatisfaction in their abilities to provide sufficient instruction, and, given the many tradeoffs involved, some uncertainty about whether or not they were doing what was best for students.

The constraining effects of context were echoed in the other 6 (strategy-literacy) high school teachers' data. However, 5 of these 6 high school teachers did not demonstrate a literary orientation toward their own approaches to text reading, and 6 of the 6 teachers did not demonstrate a literary orientation to their approaches to teaching literature to high school students. In their own reading, the strategy-literacy teachers did ask questions of the texts they read, but they saw those questions as problems to be fixed rather than puzzles to be embraced through further work with the texts. Largely, they asked questions of the text when they were aware that their comprehension was breaking down. In their teaching, they sought to support students' comprehension by teaching metacognitive strategies, and, in many cases, providing instruction designed to prevent struggle of any kind.

Whereas the contexts of secondary school were still challenging for multiple reasons, the strategy-literacy teachers did not express any of the uncertainties, ambivalence, or frustration about how to best provide discipline-aligned teaching. Like the literary-literacy teachers, however, when they spoke about their teaching, the strategy-literacy teachers described the difficulty of teaching strategies for comprehending literature due to broad and fast-paced curricular demands, the pressure of preparing students to be successful on standardized tests, and their desire to prepare students for college. They described their desire to improve their own

185

instruction with literary works and the lack of time that they have to collaborate with colleagues. And, they described their fear of being rated "ineffective" by their administrators and losing their jobs.

In the sections that follow, I describe general conclusions that may be drawn from the findings of this study; I use the findings along with existing scholarship to theorize the relationships among disciplinary literacy instruction, strategy instruction, and secondary school contexts; and I suggest a set of recommendations to education researchers, teacher educators, and policymakers.

General Conclusions

The findings of this study point to a broader set of assertions that have implications for researchers, teacher educators, policymakers, and administrators interested in supporting and advancing disciplinary literacy instruction in different secondary school subject areas.

Theory and research point to the fundamentally social and problem-based nature of disciplinary work with texts. Scholars work with text in shared ways in order to construct, pursue, and communicate about problems in their fields (Moje, 2015; Moje & Rainey, in progress). This study provides empirical evidence that 10 university-based literary scholars— like historians and chemists and mathematicians studied in other work (e.g., Goldman & Bisanz, 2002; Hynd-Shanahan, Holschuh & Hubbard, 2004; Wineburg, 1991a, 1991b, 1998; Young & Leinhardt, 1998)—centered their work on problems important for building new knowledge in their community. And, in constructing and pursuing these problems, they used particular shared literacy practices with texts. So central was the problem-based nature of their work, that they often emphasized the ways they strove to teach undergraduate students to become sensitive to the puzzles of literature and learn to construct their own puzzles.

More than simply documenting *that* literary scholars centered their work on shared types of literary puzzles, the study provides insight into *how* literary scholars construct, pursue, and communicate about interpretive literary puzzles. The identification of a set of shared literary literacy practices directly contributes to existing theoretical, conceptual, and empirical scholarship that focuses on doing and teaching literary studies. The findings both complement and extend the findings of studies by Peskin (1998) and Zeitz (1994), as these studies did not focus on the problem-based or social nature of practices with literary works nor include senior literary scholars as participants, though they did uncover important practices that are likely employed within such a frame. The findings also complement and extend the work of Hutchings and O'Rourke (2002), who offer a framework for introducing undergraduates to the problem-based work of literary studies without naming the ways with texts or literary puzzles that students could benefit from learning. Although the practices and problems offered in this study are not necessarily a complete list, and although the content of the puzzles and interpretive reasoning likely differs as a result of scholars' identities and training, this study offers an explicitly named set of practices and purposes that are likely tacitly held by many literary scholars and teachers. Further, insofar as instructors recognize the practices and purposes identified in this study in their own work, the findings also offer some assurance that the practices are commonly held and thus worthy of teaching students.

Regarding secondary school teachers specifically, this study demonstrates that it is not necessarily the case, as some have suggested (Heller, 2010/2011), that secondary school subject-area teachers do not care about the disciplines or know the practices of the disciplines. Indeed, more than half of the high school ELA teachers in this study (7 of 12) revealed or described literary puzzles as central to their meaning making with texts. And, in their instruction, all but

one of those seven teachers (6 of 12 total) sought ways to introduce and engage students in the work of constructing and considering literary puzzles. Thus, it is possible for high school teachers to take on an inquiry frame, and problem-based disciplinary literacy instruction seems to be happening—to some extent—in some secondary ELA classrooms. In this way, the literary-literacy teachers much more closely resembled Moje's (2010/2011) characterization of secondary teachers in response to Heller: namely, that secondary teachers are often "committed to their disciplinary roots and…eager to engage their students in literacy practices that serve to advance their disciplinary learning" (p. 276).

Yet, for multiple reasons, the literary-literacy high school teachers in this study struggled to teach the various literary literacy practices that they themselves held. The contexts of secondary school teaching presented challenges—sometimes insurmountable—to enacting literary-literacy teaching. For the literary-literacy high school teachers, understanding disciplinary practices was not enough, nor was holding shared disciplinary literacy practices. Contexts mattered. To put a finer point on it, the institutional contexts—including the structures, expectations, and assessment practices of the school district—got in the way for these teachers by preventing them from doing their work and by providing professional development that made comprehension, rather than inquiry, an end goal. Josh's case is particularly telling in terms of the power of constraining contexts. Although Josh seemed to share many of the same literary literacy practices as the literary scholars and literary-literacy teachers, his instruction was not organized around these literary literacy practices. Instead, he deferred to the curriculum in place and to the professional development he received, which was organized around writing various types of essays throughout the year (e.g., narrative, argumentative) and building students' use of reading strategies.

By contrast, the contexts of higher education seemed designed to support the work of literary scholars and their desires to teach students ways of participating inside of literary studies. The irony—or tragedy—of this situation is that the secondary school teachers are being urged, indeed required, to prepare their students for college and career settings. And yet, they are working within settings that not only are nothing like those for which they are expected to prepare students but also are oppositional to the contexts in which students will be reading. When university educators lament the lack of knowledge and skill first-year students bring to their classes, they may well be at least partially reflecting the fact that the contexts of K-12 education are antithetical to the contexts of postsecondary education.

In sum, knowing the discipline and its practices is necessary but not sufficient for instructors to provide disciplinary literacy instruction to students. Contexts that support inquiry practices and position high school teachers as professionals are a necessary complement to knowing the practices of a discipline. Moreover, professional development activity that recognizes the goals of the disciplines and the nature of disciplinary texts while also supporting teachers in helping students who struggle with comprehension is a critical part of context. In the next section of this chapter, I draw upon the findings of this study along with existing scholarship to theorize disciplinary literacy in secondary schooling contexts.

Theorizing Disciplinary Literacy Instruction in Secondary Schooling Contexts

I begin this section by returning to Moje's (2015) four "E" heuristic for teaching disciplinary literacy (i.e., disciplinary literacy instruction involves *engaging* students in the inquiry practices of the discipline, *examining* with students words and ways with words, *evaluating* with students when, why, and how disciplinary language is useful, and *eliciting/engineering* students' necessary knowledge, skills, and practices for engaging in the

189

inquiry). For Moje, the central-most part of the inquiry cycle is engaging students in pursuing a

discipline-aligned question or problem; more than an "essential question," the discipline-aligned

question or problem "needs to be a developmentally appropriate version of a real question that

would be asked in the disciplines" (p. 263). She emphasizes that engineering students'

knowledge, skills, and practices is incredibly important because students are not yet members of

the discipline and it is the responsibility of the teacher to scaffold their learning. Moje names

content area literacy strategies like Questioning the Author (Beck & McKeown, 2006), Word

Generation (Snow, Lawrence, & White, 2009), and Reciprocal Teaching (Palincsar & Brown,

1984) as "engineering tools" that may be used in the service of disciplinary inquiry.   Yet, it is

beyond the scope of Moje's (2015) piece to unpack the ways in which teachers might use content

literacy strategies like Questioning the Author or Word Generation in the service of disciplinary

instruction.

Ideally, disciplinary literacy instruction in secondary schools would be a synthesis of

existing bodies of literacy scholarship. Building on Moje's (2015) model of disciplinary literacy

instruction, I assert that further theorizing the concept of "engineering" student literacy and

learning could contribute to efforts to realize disciplinary literacy instruction in secondary

contexts. How are secondary teachers to think about the relationships among familiar

instructional routines, cognitive strategy instruction, and disciplinary aims? What does it look

like to "engineer" secondary students' knowledge, skills, and practices for disciplinary learning?

The participants of this study represent three different approaches to text-based teaching,

all converging on an ideal approach to disciplinary literacy instruction. The literary scholars

focused on engaging their undergraduate students in cycles of literary inquiry by teaching them

disciplinary ways of reading, writing, and reasoning and by designing tasks that were meant to

support them in learning to participate in literary studies. Some instructors shared heuristics they used in their instruction to support students in moving towards more specialized, disciplinary ways of reading, writing, and reasoning. Elias, for instance, described teaching students four "Ss" to consider as they construct worthwhile literary puzzles. Such a heuristic, though it does not represent everything that a more expert participant would consider when constructing puzzles with literary works, is meant to provide an explicit and accessible set of steps to scaffold students' disciplinary learning. Other times, instructors shared their attempts to prompt and guide students' use of specific literacy practices, like when David described ways he encouraged students to recursively consider interpretive possibilities with texts. The university-based instructors used approaches to engage students in discipline-based work and engineer that discipline-based work through various types of heuristics, assignment guidelines, explicit instruction, and individualized feedback. Yet, these university-based instructors often acknowledged their students' readiness for advanced coursework (largely attributing readiness to the University's high admissions standards) and the likelihood that students who were less ready for the rigor of their courses would avoid taking them. Instructors also sometimes admitted uncertainty about how to best support the students in their classes who needed language and comprehension instruction (e.g., English language learners).

The second group of participants, the strategy-literacy teachers, focused exclusively on students' success on school assessments, their general comprehension with school texts, and their cognitive strategy use. Janet, for instance, described how she used modeling to teach students to make line-level inferences. Claire assigned students routines for capturing main ideas of texts for later use (e.g., "tweet the text") and monitoring their own understanding while reading. For students who are not yet strategic or metacognitive in their reading, these instructional goals and

191

approaches are an important part of engineering students' knowledge, skills, and practices for disciplinary learning[1] (Biancarosa & Snow, 2004). Yet, as explained in Chapters 1 and 2, such instruction is not enough for teaching disciplinary participation (Lee & Spratley, 2010).

The third group of participants, the literary-literacy high school teachers, occupied a sort of middle ground in many ways. Across their various courses (honors/AP and regular), the literary-literacy teachers strove to support their students' participation in discipline-aligned inquiry while also attending to students' cognitive and metacognitive strategy use and their general school success. Margaret, for example, sought to engage students in learning to notice strangeness in literary works as a first step toward constructing literary puzzles. She designed a series of lessons in which she first presented to students some of the strangest materials she could find: videos of avant-garde dance performances. Before watching the video, she gave them a series of steps to follow. On the first viewing, they were to list everything they observed, focusing on the "odd stuff." Then, on the second viewing, they were to look for patterns in what they noticed, and use that process to make an initial interpretive claim. This routine set of steps, like Elias's "four Ss" heuristic, served to explicitly name for students an accessible way in to the invisible work of interpretive thinking and meaning making with literature. Her approach was not meant to be comprehensive or to fully describe disciplinary work at the highest level; instead, it was meant to be a scaffold that students could use until they developed some automaticity with

---

[1] Of course, I do not mean to imply that students are either *always* or *never* in need of such instruction. As the RAND (2002) model of interactive literacy reminds us, as the literacy demands shift from text to text and the purposes of making meaning with those texts shift, students might be more or less in need of strategy-literacy instruction. Even the most "college-ready" undergraduate students of the university-based instructors in this study may sometimes benefit from strategy-literacy instruction. At the same time, for certain groups of students such instruction may be critical for their learning and literacy development, and instruction that regularly fails to provide needed comprehension support to students may well contribute to issues of educational inequity.

the approach. Sometimes the literary-literacy teachers described modifying instructional approaches they learned in professional development sessions (e.g., talking to the text, teaching students to highlight important information, using graphic organizers) so that they would better align with disciplinary goals.

The literary-literacy teachers also deliberately supported students' comprehension in various ways. Lisa, for instance, supported students' comprehension of challenging dialogue in a novel by watching the movie version of the novel first and creating a map of the arc of the plot. Others mentioned modeling specific cognitive strategies for students from time to time, when they found that the text demands warranted it. Yet, what made these approaches distinct from the other group of high school teachers was that they had larger disciplinary goals in mind. It was Margaret's disciplinary teaching goals that drove her to strive to establish unifying, discipline-aligned frames around the "isolate[d]" skills she was responsible for teaching students. And, it was Lisa's disciplinary teaching goals drove her to clearly communicate with students the important distinction between "real" interpretive work with literature and the work of demonstrating comprehension on assessments.

Of the three groups, then, the literary-literacy high school teachers might be said to best reveal a dual-parted approach to "engineering" students' knowledge, practices, and skills in the service of disciplinary learning, as the literary-literacy teachers sought to both 1) support students as individual readers and writers—including teaching comprehension strategies and generic routines for learning and school success—and 2) support students to become participants in the disciplinary community—including teaching the shared orientations and practices of the disciplinary community and providing them with regular opportunities to engage with others in cycles of disciplinary inquiry. Indeed, these two component parts (i.e., instruction that supports

193

individual processes and instruction that supports students in group-level inquiry) are likely both necessary for teaching in most classrooms—including university classrooms—although any given lesson might include these two parts to a greater or lesser extent depending on the specific needs of the students in the room, the text demands, and the purposes of the work.

Indeed, because the literary-literacy high school teachers were attempting to translate disciplinary work for their particular students' needs within specific institutional and community contexts, this group of teachers yielded tremendous insight into what engineering for students' literary learning could include. Whereas the strategy-literacy teachers seemed to be teaching in the name of college and career readiness, they did not seem to attend to questions of disciplinary engagement. And, whereas the university-based instructors seemed to be engineering students' engagement with the discipline in many ways, they did not seem to be routinely supporting students' comprehension. Although this observation is specific to the literary teachers in this study, similar insights into disciplinary literacy instruction in other content areas might be gleaned through similar study designs.

Implications for Education Researchers, Teacher Educators, Professional Development Providers, and Policymakers

Based on the findings and conclusions of this dissertation study, I suggest a set of recommendations to education researchers, teacher educators, professional development providers, and policymakers.

Implications for Teacher Education

This study suggests that teachers must hold deep understandings of disciplinary knowledge and practice and ways of naming and modeling these practices, along with the belief that disciplinary literacy instruction is a central part of their work as educators. It suggests that rather than seeking to be "holders of knowledge," they must seek to be "searchers"—as Margaret

194

put it—of knowledge alongside their colleagues and students. It further suggests that teachers must hold a flexible and deep knowledge of pedagogical approaches and routines, so that they can use them and modify them according to their instructional goals.

One problem for the field is that novices do not often come to their teacher preparation programs familiar with disciplinary literacy instruction, and, in fact, the goals of disciplinary literacy instruction may be quite different from their own experiences in school. Certainly this potential misalignment between one's experience as a student and the vision of disciplinary literacy instruction applies to teacher educators themselves as well. Beyond the challenge of teaching novices to teach in a way that is different from their own experiences as students, it is a programmatic challenge to find veteran teachers who are regularly providing disciplinary literacy instruction to their students and willing to act as mentors for novices. As a result, readily available and shared models of disciplinary literacy instruction are quite rare, leaving many to believe that the endeavor is "pie in the sky" or generally only achievable by a certain group of teachers, with a certain group of kids, and within certain contexts of instruction (Heller, 2010/2011).

Teacher educators, then, in order to support novices in learning to enact a different sort of instruction than is likely most familiar to them, require high quality, accessible examples of disciplinary literacy instruction in multiple content areas and in multiple school and community contexts. One part of this work could include building a searchable video repository that contains high quality examples of disciplinary literacy instruction. A second part of this work could include building a set of videos that represent novice attempts at planning and enacting disciplinary literacy instruction, so that those who are teaching novices—along with novices themselves—can begin to build a vision for this work.

As this dissertation study suggests, an important condition of disciplinary literacy instruction is the teacher's own disciplinary literacy practices and orientations. As part of their teacher preparation program, novices might be supported to identify tacit, discipline-specific practices they hold. An example is an activity I have used in my ELA-specific literacy methods courses to highlight for novices their shared ways with literary works and to begin to build a common language for those practices; the activity includes first prompting novice teachers to read and discuss a shared piece of literature as they would in a university literature course and then engaging them in an effort to identify and name the values, ways with words, and disciplinary questions they brought to the task (Rainey & Moje, 2012). Cohorted foundations of literacy courses go a long way toward supporting such discipline-specific teacher education efforts (Bain & Moje, 2012; Bain, 2012), and they may allow opportunities for teacher educators to also deliberately work on developing novices' content knowledge and disciplinary practices when necessary.

Novice preservice teachers could likely benefit from exercises that engage them in considering the purposes or affordances of established instructional routines and activities (e.g., What are the ways of reading, writing, reasoning that are being supported when a teacher models making inferences? What about when s/he uses Questioning the Author?). They might be encouraged to sort known routines into those that support individuals' mental processes and those that build shared ways of participation. Novices could also be engaged in constructing versions of content area literacy approaches and routines that could more explicitly serve discipline-aligned purposes, drawing on scholarship like Bain's (2000) for examples of what this could look like. Finally, they might also benefit from developing flexible scripts for specific moments inside of familiar lesson structures. For example, they could build into their early

196

lesson plans phrases like "The puzzle of our unit is…" or "As readers of literature, one thing we always want to pay attention to is…" A risk of such phrases is that they are only used in mechanical, rote ways; this seems most likely when a novice's disciplinary knowledge is weaker. However, an affordance of such phrases is that they could help prompt novices to be explicit at key instructional moments, and they could help guide novices to focus their instruction on the shared, problem-, and text-based work of the discipline.

Even after teachers have developed necessary disciplinary knowledge and pedagogical knowledge for disciplinary literacy instruction, it is not a foregone conclusion that they will provide disciplinary literacy instruction in their own classrooms. Josh's case serves as a reminder that even when teachers hold disciplinary literacy practices and can articulate disciplinary literacy instructional practices that would benefit their students, they do not necessarily enact such instruction. The forces of school, district, and national policy, including school-wide literacy initiatives, are strong, and it is easy to understand why a teacher—especially a more junior teacher such as Josh—would decide to generally defer to them. Teacher education programs would do well to explicitly teach novices ways of negotiating such complex systems of expectations and challenges in the service of disciplinary literacy instruction. But, the field requires policymakers and administrators to make meaningful changes to the contexts of K-12 schooling so that teachers are supported in these endeavors.

Implications for Supporting In-Service Teachers

The findings of this study suggest that learning standards and associated school and department-level curricula would benefit from close examination of the ways that they currently do and do not support students to learn about the problem spaces of the disciplines of English, the sorts of knowledge that "count" most when making meaning with literature, the ways that

197

claims are made and warranted within the communities of English, and the ways that these literacy tools are distinct from those of other disciplinary and non-disciplinary discourse communities.

In-service teachers may benefit from engaging in such evaluation of their current learning standards and curricula and, when appropriate, working together to design disciplinary inquiry cycles that join required knowledge and skills together in different ways. In-service teachers may also benefit from professional development opportunities that are content-specific, that offer a framework for considering potential purposes of instructional routines, and that support them as they work to develop discipline-specific versions of familiar instructional routines and approaches.

Professional development providers have a role to play in supporting teachers' abilities to provide disciplinary literacy instruction. The strategy-literacy teachers in this study cited the two major district-implemented literacy initiatives as important resources for their teaching. Their talk about strategy instruction often involved the reading intervention training they had received. Even though research of explicit strategy instruction has shown it to be helpful for students, research has also shown it can be overused (McKeown, Beck, & Blake, 2009). The strategy-based literacy teachers in this study gave no indication in their interviews that they could misuse or overuse strategy instruction. Of particular concern regarding the instruction that the strategy-based literacy teachers described was the lack of a clear purpose other than general comprehension or skill-building. Providers of professional development who work with teachers on developing literacy instruction are well positioned to contribute to the effort of helping teachers situate metacognitive strategy instruction inside of a disciplinary inquiry frame, and they may consider the sorts of tools and support that they could provide teachers.

Scaling up disciplinary literacy instruction in ELA will likely require a shift in thinking for some practicing teachers and administrators, who commonly think of secondary English language arts as the place where students go to learn generic, transferrable, academic literacy skills (Rainey & Moje, 2012). Where are students to go when they need help with a science paper? Their ELA teacher, of course! Where do students learn how to make careful choices about language use? Their ELA class! What about generic academic speaking and listening skills? ELA is the place for that, too. This perspective is complicated by the reality that many ELA teachers also think of themselves within the school community as responsible for academic literacies writ large, in part due to the fact that many sets of learning standards across content areas have been written to be broad rather than deep. But whereas other content areas seem to be moving toward a focus on inquiry-based, disciplinary work, English language arts seems to be going in the opposite direction. The *ELA Common Core State Standards*, for instance, include a major emphasis on reading nonfiction texts for information, including historical sources and scientific documents. How are teachers to accomplish disciplinary literacy instruction with such a broad set of responsibilities and learning expectations? In order to fully realize disciplinary literacy instruction and to shift teachers' understandings of their responsibility to their students, standards documents and assessments will need to reflect this shift.

Many implications for supporting teachers' disciplinary literacy instruction at scale involve the institutional structures and contexts of K-12 schooling. Student assessments, teacher evaluation systems, and teaching resources must not interfere with goals of disciplinary literacy instruction. The data gleaned from the 12 high school ELA teachers represented in this study suggest that aligning the contexts and material structures of the schooling with the goals of disciplinary inquiry is essential to enabling the teachers who hold disciplinary knowledge and

practices and an orientation to disciplinary literacy instruction to provide such instruction to students. Further, the data suggest that scaling up disciplinary literacy instructional approaches will require that the organization of time, the actual learning materials, and the curricula be redesigned in order to support these goals. And, they suggest that building leaders and administrators could likely benefit from developing an orientation toward problem-based, text-based, disciplinary teaching and learning.

Literature textbooks could be organized to deliberately support literary puzzle construction and investigation. For example, as one literary scholar suggested, they could include multiple versions of the same Emily Dickinson poem, including a scanned copy of her original writing and then variations of the poem as they have been represented over time. Such organization prompts all sorts of questions that are worthy of consideration and could be pursued with that body of materials. Similarly, sharing with students the original *Vogue* layout of "The Dream of an Hour" alongside a later version with the title "The Story of an Hour" would promote students' learning to participate within the discourse community of literary studies by learning to read, write, and reason with literary works. As publishers of K-12 learning materials house more and more resources online, such supplemental resources as text variants may become easier to provide without significant additional expense.

The use of materials to support instructional aims is certainly not a new idea in education. Textbooks have long been used to supplement—and sometimes even substitute for—teacher knowledge. More recent textbooks, like the literature textbook adopted by the school district in this study, seem to be largely designed to support students' comprehension, basic inferential thinking, and metacognition. Some of the literary literacy teachers of this study worried that the additions meant to support students' comprehension actually interfered with their deeper literary

engagement with the literary works, both because the additions included "right answer" questions that they feared contribute to students' misunderstandings about the work of doing literature and because the supportive features often seemed to sharply steer students' interpretive thinking in a particular direction.

Reorganizing K-12 literary learning materials could be guided by the more recent work of history teachers and teacher educators, who have reimagined history instruction and assessments to support students' development of historical reasoning (e.g., Monte-Sano, 2010; Reisman, 2012). Document-based questions (DBQs), for example, are organized sets of historical documents that allow students to make data based claims about historical questions that historians would recognize. The instructional and evaluative use of DBQs meaningfully shifts what students are learning from memorizing isolated facts or general comprehension to historical reading, writing, and reasoning.

Indeed, disciplinary literacy instruction seems to require deep disciplinary and pedagogical knowledge of teachers and supportive structures and materials. Without supportive instructional contexts, teachers like Josh who hold disciplinary literacy practices may not decide to teach them to students, and teachers without disciplinary orientations, like the strategy-literacy high school teachers in this study, are highly unlikely to provide disciplinary literacy instruction to students.

Limitations and Recommendations for Further Study

Recommendations for Future Research

The discourse communities of English. There are many worthy directions to pursue that would build on the findings of this study. Replications of this study within other institutional contexts could help to verify the patterns I found and potentially help to produce a more

comprehensive set of literary literacy practices. Larger studies could examine the extent to which secondary ELA teachers participate in literary studies and seek to teach students to do the same, or document the relationships between preservice teachers' literary literacy practices and those of veteran teachers or literary scholars. Finally, instead of seeking to identify shared practices of making meaning, as was the focus of this study, future studies could seek to identify a more comprehensive range of content considerations that individuals use shared practices to pursue.

Another set of questions rests on mapping the discourse communities of English. How do the literacy practices of literary scholars relate to those of compositionists, for instance, or those of dramatic and theatric arts? What might these relationships suggest about improving on the school domain of English language arts? What might these relationships suggest about how to best train novice teachers or how to best support practicing teachers? How do practicing ELA teachers understand the relationships among these discourse communities? How do scholars of English understand the relationships among these discourse communities?

The relationships between prominent disciplinary discourse communities. It is also necessary for the field to pursue the relationships between the literacy practices of literary studies and other more distant disciplinary discourse communities. How do the historical reading, writing, and reasoning practices documented by other scholars (e.g., Wineburg, 1991a, 1991b, 1998) relate to those of literary studies? To chemistry? To mathematics? Such work will be crucial for researchers to pursue so that practitioners can consider how to best support students in navigating these various discourse communities throughout their school day (Moje & Sutherland, 2003). Such work could also contribute meaningfully to the theoretical and conceptual scholarship of studying discourse communities.

Considerations of power and disciplinary literacy. Another set of questions relate to the power issues of researching disciplinary literacy that have been taken up in recent years by scholars (e.g., Brandt, 2008; Brown, 2004). Who counts as a disciplinarian? Are such individuals necessarily university-based? What about the sort of expertise of those in applied fields, for example? If not bound by the existing content areas of K-12 school, how are scholars to think about which disciplines are most important for study, and, ultimately, for K-12 student learning? And, how are social science researchers to think about and guard against the sorts of assumptions and biases that they might bring to these questions? Further, what are the relationships between disciplinary discourse communities, literacy practices, and race, class, gender, sexuality, and nationality? How can disciplinary communities shift over time to become more just and more equitable? How can and do participants produce such shifts?

Conclusion

The twelve high school teachers in this study all might be thought of as a select group. For one thing, they self-selected into the study and they agreed to read literature with me before and after school, on vacation days at coffee shops, and in the infrequent quiet moments between meetings and classes during the school day. They were all employees of a large, suburban school district, which even after major budget cuts was certainly better resourced than many districts. The least experienced teacher had been a teacher for more than five years, which, again, separates this group of participants from much of the teaching force in the country.

In spending time with the high school teachers in this study, I came to believe that they each deeply cared about their students, content area, and profession. The teachers' demonstrated commitment and relative expertise makes their regular expressions of frustration more troubling in many ways. If disciplinary literacy instruction was not happening consistently and sufficiently

203

in these teachers' classrooms—particularly those literary-literacy teachers who brought a more literary approach to their reading and teaching of text—and if, when it was happening, it was mostly happening in those teachers' advanced and honors courses, then there is much work to be done by researchers, teacher educators, professional development providers, and policymakers.

The burden of providing literary literacy instruction rested on individual teachers' knowledge, commitments, and, at least in some cases, willingness to actively resist explicit job expectations. There is great insight to be gained by studying the disciplinary literacy instruction that is happening against the odds in classrooms of teachers such as these, both for considering (a) potential changes to K-12 school curricula, professional development, other contexts; (b) the accompanying sorts of practices and orientations that pre-service teachers may need to be explicitly taught, such as advocating for revisions to district created curriculum or integrating a disciplinary framework with a given curriculum that is not disciplinary-based, in order for them to have some chance at providing disciplinary literacy instruction in less-than-supportive contexts; and (c) informing the teaching of university-based instructors, particularly in relation to determining the types of literacy instruction students need and engineering students' comprehension in the service of disciplinary goals.

If all students are to have meaningful opportunities for disciplinary literacy learning in school—the sort of learning that Lee (2004) calls the "civil right of the twenty-first century"— then we must listen to what K-12 veteran teachers are saying. They are trying to serve students. They are tired. They want to be excellent. They need time with colleagues, supportive administrators, space to learn and grow, and respect as professionals and intellectuals. And without attending to the contexts of schooling, no depth of disciplinary understanding or desire

to teach it to students will be enough to ensure consistent and sufficient disciplinary literacy

instruction in their classrooms.

Appendix A: Interview Protocol One (Literary Scholars)

Background Information

1. What is your current job title?

2. What is your area of specialization?

3. For how many years have you been a faculty member or graduate student instructor (including other institutions, if applicable)?

4. What is your highest level of education?
   a. Master's degree
      (School/program_____)
   b. Master's degree plus some additional graduate coursework
   c. Doctoral degree
      (School/program_____)

5. What literature courses have you taught in the past?

6. What literature courses are you teaching this semester?

7. What are some key texts you read with students?

8. What do you like to read on your own?

Purposes of Reading Literature

9. When you read literature, what do you often think about?

10. What do you find interesting or important about the study of literature?

11. How do you think about the relationship between K-12 English language arts and literature?

12. What are the questions/problems that drive your reading of literature?
      a. unfamiliar literature?
      b. familiar literature?

13. What are other big questions people ask in the study of literature?

14. What do you think is the value of reading literature/teaching others to read literature?

Conventions and Assumptions about Literature

15. What makes a literary claim well-warranted?

16. What is a type of claim you might make about one or more pieces of literature?

17. What is a non-example of a literary claim? What makes it a non-example?

Social Nature of Reading Literature

18. Some people think of reading literature as a solitary pursuit. What do you think about that?

19. How do you think about the disciplinarians who read literature?
     a. Do you consider them or their ideas when reading?

Approaches to Teaching Literature

20. What does a typical day in your classroom look like?
     a. What types of literature do you read with students?
     b. What types of tasks do you assign?
     c. What types of discussions do you have?

21. What are your semester- or year-long goals for your students?
     a. What reading practices do you want them to learn?
     b. What ways of thinking do you want them to learn?
     c. What does a successful reader of literature look like in your class?

22. How do you communicate to students the purpose of reading literature?

23. What would be your response to a student who took a shortcut to reading an assigned piece of literature (e.g., Cliffs Notes)?

24. What do the "struggling" students in your class look like? Paint a portrait of a typical student who is not meeting expectations.

25. What do you do when your students struggle to read literature successfully?

Appendix B: Interview Protocol Two (Literary Scholars)

Interview 2, Text A

Say: "Members of any given discipline have some specialized, shared ways of thinking and communicating. I'm going to have you think aloud as you read a piece of literature. The purpose is to understand how <u>you</u> make meaning from this text as a reader, not how you read for the purposes of planning for student learning. The following questions I will ask are designed to prompt you, so that you are able to name some of the specialized practices that are tied to your work. Everything you say will remain confidential. If at any point you decide you don't want to participate in the study any more, you have the option of stopping."

Pre-Reading

Say: "I'm going to have you read a piece of literature. Before you read, take a second to look at it."

1. What do you think you might get out of this text?

During Reading

Say: "Read this text silently or aloud. When you think of ideas that seem important to you or have questions, stop and think aloud. When you see a stop sign, you should also stop and think aloud. Try not to censor what you say."

After Reading

2. Were there aspects you found challenging? What did you do to help yourself?

3. What is most important about the reading? Why?

4. How did you go about reading this text?

5. How did you know how to approach this type of text?

Conventions and Assumptions about Literature

6. How is the academic reading of literature different from reading a book for pleasure?

7. How is the academic reading of literature different from the academic reading of other disciplines (e.g., historical accounts, scientific articles)?

8. What is a type of claim you might make about this text?
    a. How would you need to support this claim in order to make it well-warranted?

9. What is an example of a claim you would never make about this text?

208

a. What makes it a poor literary claim?

Approaches to Teaching

10. If you were going to use this text with your students, what would that look like?
    a. What would you plan for?
    b. What do you anticipate students might struggle with?
    c. What types of instruction would you give?
    d. What purposes would you set?

Appendix C: Interview Protocols Three/Four (Literary Scholars)

Interview 3, Text B

Say: "As we did before, I'm going to have you think aloud as you read a piece of literature. The purpose is to understand how <u>you</u> make meaning from this text as a reader, not how you read for the purposes of planning for student learning."

Pre-Reading

Say: "I'm going to have you read a piece of literature. Before you read, take a second to look at it."

1. What do you think you might get out of this text?

During Reading

Say: "Read this text silently or aloud. When you think of ideas that seem important to you or have questions, stop and think aloud. When you see a stop sign, you should also stop and think aloud. Try not to censor what you say."

After Reading

2. Were there aspects you found challenging? What did you do to help yourself?

3. What is most important about the reading? Why?

4. How did you go about reading this text? What do these practices "buy" you?

5. How did you know how to approach this type of text?

Conventions and Assumptions of Literature

6. What is a type of claim you might make about this text?
    a. How would you need to support this claim in order to make it well-warranted?

7. What is an example of a claim you would never make about this text?
    a. What makes it a poor literary claim?

Approaches to Teaching

8. If you were going to use this text with your students, what would that look like?
    a. What would you plan for?
    b. What do you anticipate students might struggle with?
    c. What types of instruction would you give?
    d. What purposes would you set?

Appendix D: Interview Protocol One (High School Teachers)

Background Information

1. What is your current job title?

2. For how many years have you been a secondary ELA teacher (including other schools/districts, if applicable)?

3. What is your highest level of education?
    a. Bachelor's degree
(School/program_____)
    b. Bachelor's degree plus some graduate coursework
    a. Master's degree
       (School/program_____)
    b. Master's degree plus some additional graduate coursework
    c. Doctoral degree
       (School/program_____)

4. What courses have you taught in the past?

5. What courses with a literature component are you teaching this semester?

6. What are some key texts you read with students?

7. What do you like to read on your own?

Purposes of Reading Literature

8. When you read literature, what do you often think about?

9. What do you find interesting or important about the study of literature?

10. How do you think about the relationship between English language arts and literature?

11. What are the questions/problems that drive your reading of literature?
    a. unfamiliar literature?
    b. familiar literature?

12. What are other big questions people ask in the study of literature?

13. What do you think is the value of reading literature/teaching others to read literature?

Conventions and Assumptions about Literature

14. What makes a literary claim well-warranted?

15. What is a type of claim you might make about one or more pieces of literature?

16. What is a non-example of a literary claim? What makes it a non-example?

Social Nature of Reading Literature

17. Some people think of reading literature as a solitary pursuit. What do you think about that?

18. How do you think about the disciplinarians who read literature?
    a. Do you consider them or their ideas when reading?

Approaches to Teaching Literature

19. What does a typical day in your classroom look like?
    a. What types of literature do you read with students?
    b. What types of tasks do you assign?
    c. What types of discussions do you have?

20. What are your yearly goals for your students?
    a. What reading practices do you want them to learn?
    b. What ways of thinking do you want them to learn?
    c. What does a successful reader of literature look like in your class?

21. How do you communicate to students the purpose of reading literature?

22. What would be your response to a student who took a shortcut to reading an assigned piece of literature (e.g., Cliffs Notes)?

23. What do the "struggling" students in your class look like? Paint a portrait of a typical student who is not meeting expectations.

24. What do you do when your students struggle to read literature successfully?

Appendix E: Interview Protocol Two (High School Teachers)

Interview 2, Text A

Say: "Members of any given discipline have some specialized, shared ways of thinking and communicating. I'm going to have you think aloud as you read a piece of literature. The purpose is to understand how <u>you</u> make meaning from this text as a reader, not how you read for the purposes of planning for student learning. The following questions I will ask are designed to prompt you, so that you are able to name some of the specialized practices that are tied to your work. Everything you say will remain confidential. If at any point you decide you don't want to participate in the study any more, you have the option of stopping."

Pre-Reading

Say: "I'm going to have you read a piece of literature. Before you read, take a second to look at it."

1. What do you think you might get out of this text?

During Reading

Say: "Read this text silently or aloud. When you think of ideas that seem important to you or have questions, stop and think aloud. When you see a stop sign, you should also stop and think aloud. Try not to censor what you say."

After Reading

2. Were there aspects you found challenging? What did you do to help yourself?

3. What is most important about the reading? Why?

4. How did you go about reading this text?

5. How did you know how to approach this type of text?

Conventions and Assumptions of Literature

6. How is the academic reading of literature different than reading a book for pleasure?

7. How is the academic reading of literature different than the academic reading of other disciplines (e.g. historical accounts, scientific articles)?

8. What is a type of claim you might make about this text?
        a. How would you need to support this claim in order to make it well-warranted?

9. What is an example of a claim you would never make about this text?

a. What makes it a poor literary claim?

Approaches to Teaching

10. If you were going to use this text with your students, what would that look like?
    a. What would you plan for?
    b. What do you anticipate students might struggle with?
    c. What types of instruction would you give?
    d. What purposes would you set?

Appendix F: Interview Protocol Three/Four (High School Teachers)

Interview 3, Text B

Say: "As we did before, I'm going to have you think aloud as you read a piece of literature. The purpose is to understand how <u>you</u> make meaning from this text as a reader, not how you read for the purposes of planning for student learning."

Pre-Reading

Say: "I'm going to have you read a piece of literature. Before you read, take a second to look at it."

1. What do you think you might get out of this text?

During Reading

Say: "Read this text silently or aloud. When you think of ideas that seem important to you or have questions, stop and think aloud. When you see a stop sign, you should also stop and think aloud. Try not to censor what you say."

After Reading

2. Were there aspects you found challenging? What did you do to help yourself?

3. What is most important about the reading? Why?

4. How did you go about reading this text? What do these practices "buy" you?

5. How did you know how to approach this type of text?

Conventions and Assumptions of Literature

6. What is a type of claim you might make about this text?
      a. How would you need to support this claim in order to make it well-warranted?

7. What is an example of a claim you would never make about this text?
      a. What makes it a poor literary claim?

Approaches to Teaching

8. If you were going to use this text with your students, what would that look like?
      a. What would you plan for?
      b. What do you anticipate students might struggle with?
      c. What types of instruction would you give?
      d. What purposes would you set?

Appendix G: Text A, Chopin, K. (1894). "The Story of an Hour"

Knowing that Mrs. Mallard was afflicted with a heart trouble, great care was taken to break to her as gently as possible the news of her husband's death. It was her sister Josephine who told her, in broken sentences; veiled hints that revealed in half concealing. Her husband's friend Richards was there, too, near her. It was he who had been in the newspaper office when intelligence of the railroad disaster was received, with Brently Mallard's name leading the list of "killed." He had only taken the time to assure himself of its truth by a second telegram, and had hastened to forestall any less careful, less tender friend in bearing the sad message.

She did not hear the story as many women have heard the same, with a paralyzed inability to accept its significance. She wept at once, with sudden, wild abandonment, in her sister's arms. When the storm of grief had spent itself she went away to her room alone. She would have no one follow her.

There stood, facing the open window, a comfortable, roomy armchair. Into this she sank, pressed down by a physical exhaustion that haunted her body and seemed to reach into her soul.

She could see in the open square before her house the tops of trees that were all aquiver with the new spring life. The delicious breath of rain was in the air. In the street below a peddler was crying his wares. The notes of a distant song which some one was singing reached her faintly, and countless sparrows were twittering in the eaves.

There were patches of blue sky showing here and there through the clouds that had met and piled one above the other in the west facing her window.

She sat with her head thrown back upon the cushion of the chair, quite motionless, except when a sob came up into her throat and shook her, as a child who has cried itself to sleep continues to sob in its dreams.

She was young, with a fair, calm face, whose lines bespoke repression and even a certain strength. But now there was a dull stare in her eyes, whose gaze was fixed away off yonder on one of those patches of blue sky. It was not a glance of reflection, but rather indicated a suspension of intelligent thought.

There was something coming to her and she was waiting for it, fearfully. What was it? She did not know; it was too subtle and elusive to name. But she felt it, creeping out of the sky, reaching toward her through the sounds, the scents, the color that filled the air.

Now her bosom rose and fell tumultuously. She was beginning to recognize this thing that was approaching to possess her, and she was striving to beat it back with her will--as powerless as her two white slender hands would have been.

When she abandoned herself a little whispered word escaped her slightly parted lips. She said it over and over under her breath: "free, free, free!" The vacant stare and the look of terror that had followed it went from her eyes. They stayed keen and bright. Her pulses beat fast, and the coursing blood warmed and relaxed every inch of her body.

She did not stop to ask if it were or were not a monstrous joy that held her. A clear and exalted perception enabled her to dismiss the suggestion as trivial.

She knew that she would weep again when she saw the kind, tender hands folded in death; the face that had never looked save with love upon her, fixed and gray and dead. But she saw beyond that bitter moment a long procession of years to come that would belong to her absolutely. And she opened and spread her arms out to them in welcome.

There would be no one to live for during those coming years; she would live for herself. There would be no powerful will bending hers in that blind persistence with which men and women believe they have a right to impose a private will upon a fellow-creature. A kind intention or a cruel intention made the act seem no less a crime as she looked upon it in that brief moment of illumination.

And yet she had loved him--sometimes. Often she had not. What did it matter! What could love, the unsolved mystery, count for in the face of this possession of self-assertion which she suddenly recognized as the strongest impulse of her being!

"Free! Body and soul free!" she kept whispering.

Josephine was kneeling before the closed door with her lips to the keyhold, imploring for admission. "Louise, open the door! I beg; open the door--you will make yourself ill. What are you doing, Louise? For heaven's sake open the door."

"Go away. I am not making myself ill." No; she was drinking in a very elixir of life through that open window.

Her fancy was running riot along those days ahead of her. Spring days, and summer days, and all sorts of days that would be her own. She breathed a quick prayer that life might be long. It was only yesterday she had thought with a shudder that life might be long.

She arose at length and opened the door to her sister's importunities. There was a feverish triumph in her eyes, and she carried herself unwittingly like a goddess of Victory. She clasped her sister's waist, and together they descended the stairs. Richards stood waiting for them at the bottom.

Some one was opening the front door with a latchkey. It was Brently Mallard who entered, a little travel-stained, composedly carrying his grip-sack and umbrella. He had been far from the scene of the accident, and did not even know there had been one. He stood amazed at Josephine's piercing cry; at Richards' quick motion to screen him from the view of his wife.

But Richards was too late.

When the doctors came they said she had died of heart disease--of joy that kills.

THE DREAM OF AN HOUR

Knowing that Mrs. Mallard was afflicted with a heart trouble, great care was taken to break to her as gently as possible the news of her husband's death.

It was her sister Josephine who told her, in broken sentences; veiled hints that revealed in half concealing. Her husband's friend Richards was there, too, near her. It was he who had been in the newspaper office when intelligence of the railroad disaster was received, with Brently Mallard's name leading the list of "killed." He had only taken the time to assure himself of its truth by a second telegram, and had hastened to forestall any less careful, less tender friend in bearing the sad message.

She did not hear the story as many women

She sat with her head thrown back upon the cushion of the chair, quite motionless, except when a sob came up into her throat and shook her, as a child who has cried itself to sleep continues to sob in its dreams.

She was young, with a fair, calm face, whose lines bespoke repression and even a certain strength. But now there was a dull stare in her eyes, whose gaze was fixed away off yonder on one of those patches of blue sky. It was not a glance of reflection, but rather indicated a suspension of intelligent thought.

There was something coming to her and she was waiting for it, fearfully. What was it? She did not know; it was too subtle and elusive to name. But she felt it, creeping out of the sky, reaching toward her through the sounds, the scents, the color that filled the air.

Now her bosom rose and fell tumultuously.

belong to her absolutely. And she opened and spread her arms out to them in welcome.

There would be no one to live for during those coming years; she would live for herself. There would be no powerful will bending hers in that blind persistence with which men and women believe they have a right to impose a private will upon a fellow-creature. A kind intention or a cruel intention made the act seem no less a crime as she looked upon it in that brief moment of illumination.

And yet she had loved him—sometimes. Often she had not. What did it matter! What could love, the unsolved mystery, count for in face of this possession of self-assertion which she suddenly recognized as the strongest impulse of her being!

"Free! Body and soul free!" she kept whispering.

Josephine was kneeling before the closed door with her lips to the keyhole, imploring for admission. "Louise, open the door! I beg; open the door—you will make yourself ill. What are you doing, Louise? For heaven's sake open the door."

"Go away. I am not making myself ill." No; she was drinking in a very elixir of life through that open window.

How fancy was running riot along those days ahead of her. Spring days, and summer days, and all sorts of days that would be her own. She breathed a quick prayer that life might be long. It was only yesterday she had thought with a shudder that life might be long.

She arose at length and opened the door to her sister's importunities. There was a feverish triumph in her eyes, and she carried herself unwittingly like a goddess of Victory. She clasped her sister's waist, and together they descended the stairs. Richards stood waiting for them at the bottom.

Some one was opening the front door with a latch key. It was Brently Mallard who entered, a little travel-stained, composedly carrying his grip-sack and umbrella. He had been far from the scene of accident, and did not even know there had been one. He stood amazed at Josephine's piercing cry; at Richard's quick motion to screen him from the view of his wife.

But Richards was too late.

When the doctors came they said she had died of heart disease—of joy that kills.

Kate Chopin

LADY ELLEN AND LADY MARY MONTAGUE, TWIN DAUGHTERS OF THE DUCHESS OF MANCHESTER

have heard the same, with a paralyzed inability to accept its significance. She wept at once, with sudden, wild abandonment, in her sister's arms. When the storm of grief had spent itself she went away to her room alone. She would have no one follow her.

There stood, facing the open window, a comfortable, roomy arm-chair. Into this she sank, pressed down by a physical exhaustion that haunted her body and seemed to reach into her soul.

She could see in the open square before her house the tops of trees that were all aquiver with the new spring life. The delicious breath of rain was in the air. In the street below a pedler was crying his wares. The notes of a distant song which some one was singing reached her faintly, and countless sparrows were twittering in the eaves.

There were patches of blue sky showing here and there through the clouds that had met and piled one above the other in the west facing her window.

She was beginning to recognize this thing that was approaching to possess her, and she was striving to beat it back with her will—as powerless as her two white slender hands would have been.

When she abandoned herself a little whispered word escaped her slightly parted lips. She said it over and over under her breath: "free, free, free!" The vacant stare and the look of terror that had followed it went from her eyes. They stayed keen and bright. Her pulses beat fast, and the coursing blood warmed and relaxed every inch of her body.

She did not stop to ask if it were or were not a monstrous joy that held her. A clear and exalted perception enabled her to dismiss the suggestion as trivial.

She knew that she would weep again when she saw the kind, tender hands folded in death; the face that had never looked save with love upon her, fixed and gray and dead. But she saw beyond that bitter moment a long procession of years to come that would

360

WITH A LACE HANDKERCHIEF

I send this little bit of lace
As emblematic of the grace
That makes your heart its resting-place,
        My gentle Mary.

You know that it has oft been told,
In rhymes and tales in days of old,
There lives in every snowy fold
        A little fairy.

If this be true, I have no fears
That all time in the coming years
This lace will ever dry your tears—
        For all will love you.

And I have charged each elfish sprite
To tell you all I wish to-night,
And make forever fair and bright
        The sky above you.
                James G. Burnett.

Appendix I, Text B: Hemingway, E. (1933). "A Day's Wait."

He came into the room to shut the windows while we were still in bed and I saw he looked ill. He was shivering, his face was white, and he walked slowly as though it ached to move. 'What's the matter, Schatz?'

'I've got a headache.'

'You better go back to bed.'

'No, I'm all right.'

'You go to bed. I'll see you when I'm dressed.' But when I came downstairs he was dressed, sitting by the fire, looking a very sick and miserable boy of nine years. When I put my hand on his forehead I knew he had a fever.

'You go up to bed,' I said, 'you're sick.'

'I'm all right,' he said.

When the doctor came he took the boy's temperature.

'What is it?' I asked him.

'One hundred and two.'

Downstairs, the doctor left three different medicines in different colored capsules with instructions for giving them. One was to bring down the fever, another a purgative, the third to overcome an acid condition. The germs of influenza can only exist in an acid condition, he explained. He seemed to know all about influenza and said there was nothing to worry about if the fever did not go above one hundred and four degrees. This was a light epidemic of flu and there was no danger if you avoided pneumonia. Back in the room I wrote the boy's temperature down and made a note of the time to give the various capsules. 'Do you want me to read to you?'

'All right. If you want to,' said the boy. His face was very white and there were dark areas under his eyes. He lay still in bed and seemed very detached from what was going on. I read aloud from Howard Pyle's Book of Pirates; but I could see he was not following what I was reading.

'How do you feel, Schatz?' I asked him.

'Just the same, so far,' he said.

I sat at the foot of the bed and read to myself while I waited for it to be time to give another capsule. It would have been natural for him to go to sleep, but when I looked up he was looking at the foot of the bed, looking very strangely.

'Why don't you try to go to sleep? I'll wake you up for the medicine.'

'I'd rather stay awake.' After a while he said to me, 'You don't have to stay here with me, Papa, if it bothers you.'

'It doesn't bother me.'

'No, I mean you don't have to stay if it's going to bother you.'

I thought perhaps he was a little light-headed and after giving him the prescribed capsule at eleven o'clock I went out for a while.

It was a bright, cold day, the ground covered with a sleet that had frozen so that it seemed as if all the bare trees, the bushes, the cut brush and all the grass and the bare ground had been varnished with ice. I took the young Irish setter for a little walk up the road and along a frozen creek, but it was difficult to stand or walk on the glassy surface and the red dog slipped and slithered and fell twice, hard, once dropping my gun and having it slide over the ice. We flushed a covey of quail under a high clay bank with overhanging brush and killed two as they went out of sight over the top of the bank. Some of the covey lit the trees, but most of them scattered into brush piles and it was necessary to jump on the ice-coated mounds of brush several times before they would flush. Coming out while you were poised unsteadily on the icy, springy brush they made difficult shooting and killed two, missed five, and started back pleased to have found a covey close to the house and happy there were so many left to find on another day.

At the house they said the boy had refused to let anyone come into the room.

'You can't come in,' he said. 'You mustn't get what I have.'

I went up to him and found him in exactly the position I had left him, white- faced, but with the tops of his cheeks flushed by the fever, staring still, as he had stared, at the foot of the bed. I took his temperature. 'What is it?'

'Something like a hundred,' I said. It was one hundred and two and four tenth.

'It was a hundred and two,' he said.

'Who said so?'

'The doctor.'

'Your temperature is all right,' I said. It's nothing to worry about.'

'I don't worry,' he said, 'but I can't keep from thinking.'

'Don't think,' I said. 'Just take it easy.'

'I'm taking it easy,' he said and looked straight ahead. He was evidently holding tight onto himself about something.

'Take this with water.'

'Do you think it will do any good?'

'Of course it will.' I sat down and opened the Pirate book and commenced to read, but I could see he was not following, so I stopped.

'About what time do you think I'm going to die?' he asked.

'What?'

'About how long will it be before I die?'

'You aren't going to die. What's the matter with you?'

Oh, yes, I am. I heard him say a hundred and two.'

'People don't die with a fever of one hundred and two. That's a silly way to talk.'

'I know they do. At school in France the boys told me you can't live with forty-four degrees. I've got a hundred and two.' He had been waiting to die all day, ever since nine o'clock in the morning.

'You poor Schatz,' I said. 'Poor old Schatz. It's like miles and kilometers. You aren't going to die. That's a different thermometer. On that 95 thermometer thirty-seven is normal. On this kind it's ninety-eight.'

'Are you sure?'

'Absolutely,' I said. 'It's like miles and kilometers. You know, like how many kilometers we make when we do seventy in the car?'

'Oh,' he said.

But his gaze at the foot of his bed relaxed slowly. The hold over himself relaxed too, finally, and the next day it was very slack and he cried very easily at little things that were of no importance.

222

REFERENCES

ACT. (2013). *The condition of college and career readiness 2013*. Retrieved from

http://www.act.org/research/policymakers/cccr13/pdf/CCCR13-

NationalReadinessRpt.pdf

Alvermann, D. E., & Moore, D. W. (1991). Secondary school reading. In R. Barr, P. D. Pearson,

M. Kamil & P. Mosenthal (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research, 2* (pp. 951-983).

Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Andrews-Beck, C. S. & Rycik, J. (1992). Teachers reflect on their experience as readers: The

literacy club luncheon. *Reading Horizons, 33,* 121-130.

Atwell, N. (1987). *In the middle: Reading and learning with adolescents.* Upper Montclair, NJ:

Boynton.

Bain, R. B. (2000). Into the breach: Using research and theory to shape history instruction. In P.

Stearns, P. Seixas and S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching and learning history:*

National and international perspectives (pp. 331-353). New York: New York University

Press.

Bain, R. (2005). They thought the world was flat: Applying the principles of how people learn in

teaching high school history. In M. S. Donovan & J. D. Bransford (Eds.), *How students*

learn: History in the classroom (pp. 179-214). Washington, DC: National Academies

Press.

Bain, R. (2006). Rounding up unusual suspects: Facing the authority hidden in history textbooks

and teachers. *Teachers College Record, 108*(10), 2080-2114.

Bain, R. B. (2012). Using disciplinary literacy to develop coherence in history teacher

    education: The Clinical Rounds Project. *The History Teacher, 45*(4), 513-532.

Bain, R. & Moje, E. B. (2012). Mapping the teacher education terrain for novices. *Kappan,*

    93(5), 62-65.

Baker, L., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Metacognitive skills and reading. In P. D. Pearson, R. Barr,

    & M. L. Kamil & P. Mosenthal (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research, 1* (pp. 353-394).

    Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bean, T. W. (1997). Preservice teachers' selection and use of content area literacy strategies.

    The Journal of Educational Research, 90(3), 154-163.

Beck, I. L., & McKeown, M. G. (2006). *Improving comprehension with questioning the author:*

    A fresh and expanded view of a powerful approach. New York: Scholastic.

Biancarosa, G., & Snow, C. E. (2004). *Reading next—A vision for action and research in*

    middle and high school literacy: A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York.

    Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Brandt, C. B. (2008). Scientific discourse in the academy: A case study of an American Indian

    undergraduate. *Science Education, 92*(5), 825-847.

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (Eds.). (2000). *How people learn: Brain,*

    Mind, Experience, and School. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Bridge, C. A., & Hiebert, E. H. (1985). A comparison of classroom writing practices, teachers'

    perceptions of their writing instruction and textbook recommendations on writing

    practices. *Elementary School Journal, 86,* 155-172.

Brown, B. A. (2004). Discursive identity: Assimilation into the culture of science and its

    implications for minority students. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41*(8), 810-

834.

Carnegie Council on Advancing Adolescent Literacy. (2010). *Time to act: An agenda for advancing adolescent literacy for college and career success.* New York, NY: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Chopin, K. 1894. The dream of an hour. *Vogue, 4*(23), 360.

Coburn, W. W., & Loving, C. C. (2001). Defining "science" in a multicultural world: Implications for science education. *Science Education, 85*(1), 50-67.

Corbin, J. M., and Strauss, A. L. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

De La Paz, S. (2005). Effects of historical reasoning instruction and writing strategy mastery in culturally and academically diverse middle school classrooms. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 79*(2), 139-156.

Dole, J. A., Duffy, G. G., Roehler, L. R., & Pearson, P. D. (1991). Moving from the old to the new: Research on reading comprehension instruction. *Review of Educational Research, 61*(2), 239-264.

Draper, R., & Siebert, D. (2004). Different goals, similar practices: Making sense of the mathematics and literacy instruction in a *Standards*-based mathematics classroom. *American Educational Research Journal, 41*(4), 927-962.

Ericsson, K. A., & Simon, H. A. (1993). *Protocol analysis: Verbal reports as data* (Rev. ed.). Cambridge, MA: Bradford.

Fahnestock, J., & Secor, M. (1991). The rhetoric of literary criticism. In C. Bazerman & J. Paradis (Eds.), *Textual dynamics of the professions: Historical and contemporary studies of writing in professional communities* (pp. 77-96). Madison: University of Wisconsin

Press.

Flower, L. S., & Hayes, J. R. (1977). Problem-solving strategies and the writing process. *College English, 39*(4), 449-461.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication, 32*(4), 365-387.

Garner, R., & Alexander, P. A. (1989). Metacognition: Answered and unanswered questions. *Educational Psychologist, 24*(2), 143-158.

Gee, J. P. (1990). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*. New York: Falmer.

Glaser, B. (1965). The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis. *Social Problems, 12*(4), 436-445.

Goldman, S. R., & Bisanz, G. L. (2002). Toward a functional analysis of scientific implications for understanding and learning processes. In J. Otero, J. A. Leon, & A. C. Graesser (Eds.), *The psychology of science text comprehension* (pp. 19-50). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Graff, G., & Warner, M. (1989). *The origins of literary studies in America: A documentary anthology*. Routledge.

Graff, G. (2002). The problem problem and other oddities of academic discourse. *Arts & Humanities in Higher Education, 19*(1), 27-42.

Greene, S. (1994). Students as authors in the study of history. In G. Leinhardt, I. Beck, & C. Stainton (Eds.), *Teaching and learning history* (pp. 137-170). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Greenleaf, C. L., Schoenbach, R., Cziko, C., & Mueller, F. L. (2001). Apprenticing adolescent readers to academic literacy. *Harvard Educational Review, 71*(1), 79-129.

Harker, W. J. (1994). "Plain sense" and "poetic significance": Tenth grade readers reading two poems. *Poetics, 22*(3), 199-218.

Heller, R. (2010/2011). In praise of amateurism: A friendly critique of Moje's "call for change" in secondary literacy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 54*(4), 267-273.

Hemingway, E. (1933). A day's wait. *Winner take nothing*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Herber, H. L. (1970). *Teaching reading in content areas*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hirst, P. H. (1972). Liberal education and the nature of knowledge. In R. D. Archambault (Ed.), *Philosophical analysis and education* (pp. 113-138). New York: Humanities Press.

Hutchings, B., & O'Rourke, K. (2002). Problem-based learning in literary studies. *Arts & Humanities in Higher Education, 1*(1), 73-83.

Hynd-Shanahan, C., Holschuh, J., & Hubbard, B. (2004). Thinking like a historian: College students' reading of multiple historical documents. *Journal of Literacy Research, 36*, 141-176.

Janssen, T., Braaksma, M., & Rijlaarsdam, G. (2006). Literary reading activities of good and weak students: A think aloud study. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 21*(1), 35-52.

Kidd, D. C., & Castano, E. (2013). Reading literary fiction improves theory of mind. *Science, 342*(6156), 377-380.

Kintsch, W. (1974). *The representation of meaning in memory*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Konopak, B. C., Wilson, E. K., & Readence, J. E. (1994). Examining teachers' beliefs, decisions and practices about content area reading in secondary social studies. In C. K. Kinzer & D. J. Leu (Eds.), *Multidimensional aspects of literacy research, theory and*

practice: Forty-third yearbook of the National Reading Conference (pp. 127-136).

    Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference.

Kucer, S. B. (2001). *Dimensions of literacy: A conceptual base for teaching reading and writing*

    in school settings. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2007). Sampling "the new" in new literacies. *A new literacies*

    sampler, 29, 1-24.

Learned, J. E., Stockdill, D., & Moje, E. B. (2011). Integrating reading strategies and knowledge

    building in adolescent literacy instruction. In A. E. Farstrup & S. J. Samuels (Eds.),

    What research has to say about reading instruction (pp. 159-185). Newark, DE:

    International Reading Association.

Lee, C. D. (2004). Literacy in the academic disciplines and the needs of adolescent struggling

    readers. *Voices in Urban Education, 3*, 14-25.

Lee, C. D. (2006). "Every good-bye ain't gone": Analyzing the cultural underpinnings of

    classroom talk. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 19*(3), 305-

    327.

Lee, C. D. (2007). *Culture, literacy and learning: Taking Bloom in the midst of the whirlwind*.

    New York: Teachers College Press.

Lee, C. D., & Spratley, A. (2010). *Reading in the disciplines: The challenges of adolescent*

    literacy. New York, NY: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Lehr, S. (1988). The child's developing sense of theme as a response to literature. *Reading*

    Research Quarterly, 23(3), 337-357.

Leinhardt, G., & Young, K. M. (1996). Two texts, three readers: Distance and expertise in

    reading history. *Cognition and Instruction, 14*(4), 441-486.

Levine, S. & Horton, W. S. (2013). Using affective appraisal to help readers construct literary interpretations. *Scientific Study of Literature, 3*(1), 105-136.

Levine, S. (2014). Making interpretation visible with an affect-based strategy. *Reading Research Quarterly, 49*(3), 283-303.

Lewis, W. E., & Ferretti, R. P. (2009). Defending interpretations of literary texts: The effects of topoi instruction on the literary arguments of high school students. *Reading & Writing Quarterly: Overcoming Learning Difficulties, 25*(4), 250-270.

Lewis, W. E., & Ferretti, R. P. (2011). Topoi and literary interpretation: The effects of a critical reading and writing intervention on high school students' analytic literary essays. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 36*, 334-354.

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Martin, D., & Wineburg, S. (2008). Seeing thinking on the web. *The History Teacher, 41*(3), 305-319.

McKeown, M. G., Beck, I. L., & Blake, R. G. (2009). Rethinking reading comprehension instruction: A comparison of instruction for strategies and content approaches. *Reading Research Quarterly, 44*(3), 218-253.

Moje, E. B. (1994). Life experiences and teacher knowledge: How a content teacher decides to use literacy strategies. In C. K. Kinzer & D. J. Leu (Eds.), *Multidimensional aspects of literacy research, theory, and practice. The Forty-Third yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 153-161). Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference.

Moje, E. B. (2007). Developing socially-just subject matter instruction: A review of the literature on disciplinary literacy teaching. *Review of Research in Education, 31*, 1-44.

Moje, E. B. (2008). Foregrounding the disciplines in secondary literacy teaching and learning: A

    call for change. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 52*(2), 96-107.

Moje, E. B. (2010/2011). Response: Heller's "In praise of amateurism: A friendly critique of

    Moje's 'call for change' in secondary literacy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy,*

    54(4), 275-278.

Moje, E. B. (2015). Doing and teaching disciplinary literacy with adolescent learners: A social

    and cultural enterprise. *Harvard Educational Review*, *85*(2), 254-278.

Moje, E. B., & Rainey, E. C. (in preparation).   What does it mean to engage students in

    disciplinary literacy and disciplinary learning?

Moje, E. B., & Sutherland, L. M. (2003). The future of middle school literacy education.

    English Education, 35(2), 149-164.

Monte-Sano, C. (2010). Disciplinary literacy in history: An exploration of the historical nature

    of adolescents' writing. *Journal of the Learning Sciences, 19*(4), 539-568.

Moore, D. W., Readence, J. E., & Rickelman, R. J. (1983). An historical exploration of content

    area reading instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly, 18*(4), 419-438.

Morrell, E., & Duncan-Andrade, J. (2003). What they do learn in school: Hip-hop as a bridge to

    canonical poetry. In J. Mahiri (Ed.), *What they don't learn in school: Literacy in the lives*

    of urban youth (pp. 247-268). New York: Peter Lang.

Morrison, T. G., Jacobs, J. S., & Swinyard, W. R. (1999). Do teachers who read personally use

    recommended literacy practices in their classrooms? *Reading Research and Instruction,*

    38(2), 81-100.

Moses, R. & Cobb, C. E. (2001). *Radical equations: Civil rights from Mississippi to the Algebra*

    Project. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Mour, S. I. (1977). Do teachers read? *The Reading Teacher, 30*, 397-401.

National Assessment of Educational Progress. (1981). *Reading, thinking and writing: Results*

    from the 1979-1980 National Assessment of Reading and Literature. Denver, CO:

    National Educational Commission of the States.

National Council for the Social Studies. (2013). *The college, career, and civic life (C3)*

    framework for social studies state standards: Guidance for enhancing the rigor of K-12

    civics, economics, geography, and history. Silver Spring, MD: NCSS.

National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School

    Officers. (2010). *Common core state standards*. Washington, DC: National Governors

    Association Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers.

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000). *Report of the National*

    Reading Panel. Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the

    scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction (NIH

    Publication No. 00-4769). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Newell, A., & Simon, H. A. (1972). *Human Problem Solving*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice

    Hall.

NGSS Lead States. (2013). *Next generation science standards: For states, by states*.

    Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Norris, S. P., & Phillips, L. M. (2003). How literacy in its fundamental sense is central to

    scientific literacy. *Science education*, *87*(2), 224-240.

O'Brien, D. G. (1988). Secondary Preservice teachers' resistance to content reading instruction:

    A proposal for a broader rationale. In J. E. Readence & R. S. Baldwin (Eds.), *Dialogues*

    in literacy research (pp. 237-243). Thirty-seventh yearbook of the National Reading

Conference. Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference.

O'Brien, D. G., & Stewart, R. A. (1990). Preservice teachers' perspectives on why every teacher is not a teacher of reading: A qualitative analysis. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 22*, 101-127.

O'Brien, D. G., Stewart, R. A., & Moje, E. B. (1995). Why content literacy is difficult to infuse into the secondary curriculum: Strategies, goals and classroom realities. *Reading Research Quarterly, 30,* 442-463.

Ogle, D. M. (1986). K-W-L: A teaching model that develops active reading of expository text. *The Reading Teacher, 39*(6), 564-570.

Palincsar, A. S., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities. *Cognition and instruction*, *1*(2), 117-175.

Palincsar, A. S., & Brown, A. L. (1988). Teaching and practicing thinking skills to promote comprehension in the context of group problem solving. *Remedial and Special Education, 9*(1), 53-59.

Paris, S. G., & Jacobs, J. E. (1984). The benefits of informed instruction for children's reading awareness and comprehension skills. *Child Development, 55*, 2083-2093.

Paris, S. G., Lipson, M., & Wixson, K. (1983). Becoming a strategic reader. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 8*, 293-316.

Paris, S. G., Wasik, B. A., & Turner, J. C. (1991). The development of strategic readers. In R. Barr, P. D. Pearson, M. Kamil & P. Mosenthal (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research, 2*, (pp. 609-640). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Parker, W. R. (1967). Where do English departments come from? *College English, 28*(5), 339-351.

Parks, T. (2014, Dec. 18). How I read. *The New York Review of Books*. Retrieved from

    http://www.nybooks.com/blogs/nyrblog/2014/dec/18/how-i-read/

Peshkin, A. (1988). In search of subjectivity—One's own. *Educational Researcher, 17*(7), 17-

    21.

Peskin, J. (1998). Constructing meaning when reading poetry: An expert-novice study. *Cognition*

    and Instruction, 16(3), 235-263.

Phelps, S. (2005). *Ten years of research on adolescent literacy, 1994-2004: A review*.

    Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates.

Pressley, M., & Afflerbach, P. P. (1995). *Verbal protocols of reading: The nature of*

    constructively responsive reading. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pressley, M., & Ghatala, E. S. (1990). Self-regulated learning: Monitoring learning from text.

    Educational Psychologist, 25(1), 19-33.

Pressley, M., & Hilden, K. (2004). Verbal protocols of reading. In N. Duke & M. Mallette,

    (Eds.), *Literacy research methodologies* (308-321). New York: Guilford Press.

Probst, R. E. (1990). *Five kinds of literary knowing*. Albany, NY: University of Albany.

Rainey, E., & Moje, E. B. (2012). Building insider knowledge: Teaching students to read, write

    and think in ELA and across the disciplines. *English Education, 45*(1), 71-90.

Rampey, B., Dion, G., & Donahue, P. (2009). *NAEP 2008: Trends in academic progress*.

    National Center for Education Statistics. 56pp.

RAND Reading Study Group. (2002). *Reading for understanding: Toward an R&D program for*

    reading comprehension. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Reisman, A. (2012). Reading like a historian: A document-based history curriculum intervention

    in urban high schools. *Cognition and Instruction, 30*(1), 86-112.

233

Renker, E. (2010). *The origins of American Literature Studies: An institutional history*.

    Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Richardson, V., Anders, P., Tidwell, D., & Lloyd, C. (1991). The relationship between teachers'

    beliefs and practices in reading comprehension. *American Educational Research*

    Journal, 28(3), 559-586.

Rumelhart, D. E. (1984). Toward an interactive model of reading. In R. B. Ruddell, and N. J.

    Unrau (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (pp. 1149-1179). Newark,

    DE: International Reading Association.

Scribner, S., & Cole, M. (1981). *The psychology of literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard

    University Press.

Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching disciplinary literacy to adolescents: Rethinking

    content-area literacy. *Harvard Educational Review, 78*(1), 40-59.

Shreiner, T. L. (2009). *Framing a model of democratic thinking to inform teaching and*

    learning in civic education. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest

    Dissertations and Theses. (3354111).

Shreiner, T. L. (2014). Using historical knowledge to reason about contemporary political issues:

    An expert-novice study. *Cognition and Instruction, 32*(4), 313-352.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard*

    Educational Review, 57(1), 1-21.

Siegel, M., & Borasi, R. (1994). Demystifying mathematics education through inquiry. In P.

    Ernest (Ed.), *Constructing mathematical knowledge: Epistemology and mathematics*

    education. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

Snow, C., Lawrence, J., & White, C. (2009). Generating knowledge of academic language

among urban middle school students. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 2*(4), 325-344.

Snow, C., & Moje, E. B. (2010). Why is everyone talking about adolescent literacy? *Phi Delta Kappan, 91*(6), 66-69.

Street, B. V. (1984). *Literacy in Theory and Practice*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Sturtevant, E. G., Duling, V. P., and Hall, R. E. (2001). "I've run a 4,000 person organization—and it's not nearly this intense": A three-year case study of content literacy in high school mathematics. In E. B. Moje & D. G. O'Brien (Eds.), *Constructions of literacy: Studies of teaching and learning in and out of secondary schools* (pp. 77-103). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Sweeney, M. (2010). *Reading is my window: Books and the art of reading in women's prisons*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

Titchener, E. B. (1912). The schema of introspection. *The American Journal of Psychology, 23*(4), 485-505.

Voss, J., & Wiley, J. (2000). A case study of developing historical understanding via instruction: The importance of integrating text components and constructing arguments. In P. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching and learning history: National and international perspectives* (pp. 375-389). New York: New York University Press.

Weiss, R. S. (1994). *Learning from strangers: The art and method of qualitative interview studies*. New York: Free Press.

Wilder, L. (2002). "Get uncomfortable with uncertainty": A study of the conventional values of

literary analysis in an undergraduate literature course. *Written Communication, 19*, 175-221.

Williamson, J. (1991). Teachers as readers. *Reading*, *25*(2), 30-38.

Wilson, S., & Wineburg, S. (2001). Wrinkles in time and place: Using performance assessments to understand the knowledge of history teachers. In S. Wineburg (Ed.), *Historical thinking and other unnatural acts: Charting the future of teaching the past* (pp. 173-214). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Wineburg, S. (1991a). Historical problem solving: A study of the cognitive processes used in the evaluation of documentary and pictorial evidence. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 83*, 73-87.

Wineburg, S. (1991b). On the reading of historical texts: Notes on the breach between school and the academy. *American Educational Research Journal, 28*(3), 495-519.

Wineburg, S. (1998). Reading Abraham Lincoln: An expert/expert study in the interpretation of historical texts. *Cognitive Science, 22*(3), 319-346.

Young, K. M., & Leinhardt, G. (1998). Writing from primary documents: A way of knowing in history. *Written Communication, 15*(1), 25-68.

Yore, L., Bisanz, G. L., & Hand, B. M. (2003). Examining the literacy component of science literacy: 25 years of language arts and science research. *International Journal of Science Education, 25*(6), 689–725.

Yore, L. D., Hand, B. M., & Florence, M. K. (2004). Scientists' views of science, models of writing, and science writing practices. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *41*(4), 338-369.

Zeitz, C. M. (1994). Expert-novice differences in memory, abstraction, and reasoning in the

domain of literature. *Cognition and Instruction, 12*(4), 277-312.