Disciplinary Literacy in English Language Arts: Exploring the Social and Problem-Based Nature of Literary Reading and Reasoning

Emily C. Rainey

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA

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—there are questions about what disciplinary literacy instruction means for the prominent school domain of English language arts. This article investigates the disciplinary literacy practices and teaching approaches of 10 university-based literary scholars who participated in semistructured interviews and verbal protocols with literary fiction. Findings point to the fundamentally social and problem-based nature of academic work with literature and to a set of six shared literary literacy practices that scholars use in their work with literature. These findings were generated as part of a larger study that compared literacy practices and teaching approaches of 10 university-based scholars and 12 high school English language arts teachers (Rainey, 2015).

Recent years have seen multiple calls for K–12 disciplinary literacy instruction (Lee & Spratley, 2010; Moje, 2008; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2012). Disciplinary literacy instruction involves teaching students how knowledge is constructed in the academic disciplines (e.g., biology, history), including the specialized ways that members of those disciplines read, write, and reason (Moje, 2007). Such a vision of elementary and secondary teaching and learning challenges many of the structures, approaches, and commonly held beliefs about K–12 schooling, and in fact, some have questioned whether disciplinary literacy instruction in K–12 classrooms is possible or

even ideal (Heller, 2010). Yet, disciplinary literacy scholars have argued that given the highly complex time in which we live, anything less than rigorous instruction that supports all students' participation within and across the disciplines is insufficient and, further, that routine access to such instruction is a matter of social justice (e.g., Lee, 2004; Moje, 2008).

Disciplinary literacy goals have been advanced in recent years by policy documents such as the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS Lead States, 2013) and the College, Career, and Civic Life Framework for Social Studies (National Council for the Social Studies, 2013), which describe the disciplinary inquiry and literacy practices that students of various grade bands ought to be learning in the natural and social sciences, respectively. It is thanks in large part to scholarship integrating the study of literate practice with learning in disciplines such as history, chemistry, biology, and mathematics (e.g., Goldman & Bisanz, 2002; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; Wineburg, 1991a) that such learning trajectories for students have been mapped; curricula focused on supporting students' disciplinary reasoning and text use have been designed (e.g., Reisman, 2012); and teacher education efforts focusing on historical, scientific, and mathematical literacy instruction within inquiry frames have been developed and implemented (e.g., Bain & Moje, 2012).

Although English language arts (ELA) is a central academic domain in K–12 schooling, the application of disciplinary literacy theory to ELA is relatively underdeveloped, leaving policymakers, teachers, and teacher educators without clear ways of understanding and applying the theory to their work for the benefit of young people (Moje, 2007). 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?

In this article, I seek to contribute to these questions by reporting findings from an empirical study of the literacy practices of a group of 10 university-based literary theorists and researchers of literary studies (hereafter referred to as literary scholars), one of the parent disciplines of the K–12 school domain of ELA. I report six shared literary literacy practices, all of which were used in combination with one another by the scholars to construct, pursue, and

communicate about literary problems. I also report patterns of preferred instructional approaches articulated by the group of 10 scholars. The shared literary literacy practices and instructional approaches of literary scholars provide insight into what disciplinary literacy teaching with literature, or literary literacy teaching, might include in ELA classrooms.

The findings reported herein are part of a larger study (Rainey, 2015) in which I examined and compared the literary literacy practices and instructional approaches of 10 literary scholars with those of 12 veteran high school ELA teachers. Four research questions guided the full study:

1. What are the shared ways of reading, writing, and reasoning among a group of literary scholars?

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

3. What are the shared ways of reading, writing, and reasoning among a group of high school ELA teachers?

4. How do the literacy practices of those ELA teachers relate to their approaches to teaching with literary works?

Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives

Disciplinary Literacy and Disciplinary Literacy Teaching

Sociocultural scholars understand literacy as complex sets of tools or practices that one learns to employ with texts to participate within certain discourse communities (Lankshear & Knobel, 2007; Street, 1984). Such literacy practices vary based on purposes for communicating, long-standing group norms and conventions, and text features and demands (Scribner & Cole, 1981). Like other discourse communities, academic disciplines are made up of people who engage in socially and culturally meaningful practices (O'Brien, Stewart, & Moje, 1995). Disciplinarians, driven by goals of knowledge production, use texts within cycles of inquiry. Disciplinarians frame discipline-specific problems; investigate those problems using disciplinary methods and texts; work with data; consult and produce multiple texts; analyze, summarize, and synthesize data into findings; and communicate and evaluate claims (Moje, 2015). Although all disciplinarians work with texts to accomplish disciplinary goals, the nature of that work varies substantially from discipline to discipline, partly because of the differences in the types of

problems to be pursued and partly because of disciplines' unique histories of development (Moje, 2015).

Based in the understanding that literate practice is inextricably intertwined with the purposes, values, practices, and ultimately the people of the disciplines, Moje (2015) argued that disciplinary literacy teaching must center on engaging students in disciplinary inquiry:

> Students cannot learn the literacy practices of the discipline if they are not engaged in the everyday work of the discipline. Similarly, there is little point in teaching literacy skills that are not warranted or demanded by the purposes of the discipline, at least not under the guise of disciplinary literacy learning. (p. 261)

Because K–12 students are not scholars, Moje also emphasized the careful scaffolding that teachers need to provide to engage students in discipline-aligned work. This scaffolding includes the design of text-based inquiry opportunities that are developmentally appropriate and sequenced, along with deliberate support of students' necessary knowledge, comprehension, and other literate practice and the explicit examination and evaluation of words and discursive choices within and across disciplinary communities.

The Importance of Understanding Disciplinarians' Literacies

If disciplinary literacy teaching in K–12 classrooms requires, at its core, engaging students in cycles of inquiry that motivate increasingly specialized text use so students learn to participate within and across disciplinary discourse communities, then much depends on the thoroughness of the knowledge base regarding disciplinary participation. Those in the fields of literacy education and teacher education need to understand how disciplinarians use texts in specialized ways to accomplish shared goals in community alongside others. What are the questions that drive inquiry in various disciplines? How are texts used to investigate and communicate results? How do the "ways with words" (Heath, 1983, p. 24) of members of various disciplines reflect the fundamentally social and cultural communities of the disciplines, and how do they help achieve the shared goals of each discipline?

Over the past 20–30 years, scholars have sought to empirically describe expertise in various disciplines to ultimately advance K–12 student learning. The bulk of such work, which is still underway, has been conducted in the social and natural sciences, and it has largely been conducted by employing methods of educational psychology to study the cognitive processes and

epistemological knowledge of those with disciplinary expertise as they comprehend texts. These studies have often involved direct comparison with novices' cognitive processes as they read the same texts. Although a review of this research base is outside the scope of this article, I underscore the value of such scholarship for K–12 teaching by briefly characterizing a particular line of research on history and history education (for a review, see Moje, 2007).

Wineburg's (1991a, 1991b) landmark expert–novice study documented the reading and reasoning practices of eight historians with various specializations as they read a set of texts about the American Revolution. The historians were driven by historical questions; moreover, regardless of the extent of their factual knowledge of the particular time period, the shared and discipline-specific nature of the historians' questions led them to consistently employ several specific literacy practices when reading historical texts. These historical literacy practices included the systematic consideration of authors and their perspectives and biases (i.e., sourcing), the contexts in which the text was written (i.e., contextualizing), and the relationships among various accounts of the same event or time (i.e., corroborating). Wineburg compared the historians' reading and reasoning practices with those of eight high-achieving high school students and found that the students did not make meaning with historical texts in ways that overlapped with the historians' meaning making, although they could generally recall information from the texts. This mismatch between historians and high school students prompted Wineburg to conclude that "school history must move…to a site of inquiry in its own right, a place to explore the complex cognitive processes we use to discern pattern and significance in the past" (1991b, p. 518).

Wineburg's (1991a, 1991b, 1998) studies of expertise—together with other studies of historians' reasoning and literate practice (e.g., Leinhardt & Young, 1996; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008); studies of novices' ways of reading, writing, and reasoning in the domain (e.g., Monte-Sano, 2010); and analyses of skilled history teaching (e.g., Bain, 2000, 2005; Leinhardt, 1997; Monte-Sano, 2011)—have supported the development of reform efforts to better align classroom-based history teaching and learning with the shared purposes and practices, including literacy practices, of history. These reform efforts have included the implementation of curricular interventions designed to support students' historical reading, writing, and reasoning (De La Paz et al., 2014; Hynd, Holschuh, & Hubbard, 2004; Reisman, 2012, 2015); the creation of student learning standards that support text-based inquiry teaching in history and other social sciences

(National Council for the Social Studies, 2013); and the restructuring of at least one preservice teacher education program to prepare social studies majors to teach disciplinary literacy (Bain, 2012; Bain & Moje, 2012). Studies of natural scientists' reading, writing, and reasoning have similarly contributed to the efforts of those seeking to improve students' learning opportunities in the natural sciences (see Yore, Bisanz, & Hand, 2003).

Even with such advances in disciplinary literacy scholarship and practice, Moje (2007) concluded her disciplinary literacy review with a call to action for literacy researchers to construct "a more carefully detailed archaeology of the disciplinary practices, one that mines both the cognitive processes and the cultural practices that mediate those processes" (p. 36), noting that even though some empirical studies of disciplinary expertise are somewhat difficult to categorize (e.g., Wineburg, 1991a), they have tended to use methods of educational psychology to solely investigate cognitive processes. Moje suggested that productive questions to pose to disciplinarians (including literary theorists) could include "how language is used in the work of the disciplines," "the types of texts used or produced as part of their work," "purposes for using or producing…texts," "standards for warrant," and "what disciplinarians consider critical for novices to learn about the discipline" (p. 36).

Need for Work on Disciplinary Participation in Literary Studies

Although there is important work to be done across disciplines to advance disciplinary literacy theory and teaching, the empirical knowledge base of disciplinary participation in the disciplines related to the school domain of ELA (e.g., literary studies, linguistics, composition/rhetoric, performing arts) is relatively sparse (Moje, 2007; see also Rainey & Moje, 2012). Research on disciplinarians in literary and language studies, including their cognitive processes, social and cultural practices, and ideas about what is essential for novices to learn, would contribute mightily to the fields of literacy education, English education, and teacher education. To date, there have not been empirical studies of English-related disciplinarians designed to explore these purposes at once, although there is a growing research base that could inform such a study with disciplinarians of literary studies.

Literary Expert–Novice Studies

Existing expert–novice studies have contributed in helpful ways to the scholarship on literary reading and reasoning. Like expert–novice studies in other domains, studies of literary cognition have revealed marked differences in the knowledge that experts bring to reading events, their

comprehension and recall of texts, and the specific strategic processes that they tend to employ relative to novices (Dorfman, 1996; Graves & Frederiksen, 1991, 1996; Peskin, 1998; Zeitz, 1994).

In one study of literary cognition, Zeitz's (1994) participants—13 doctoral students of engineering, 16 doctoral students of English, and 24 juniors in high school—read an unfamiliar poem, an unfamiliar short story, and an unfamiliar scientific article. Participants were asked to recall the texts and then respond in writing to a set of questions, 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). The English doctoral students made many more supported interpretive statements (versus factual or other statements) regarding the short story and poem than did the engineering doctoral students and the high school students. Zeitz concluded that the specific knowledge base and strategies of English experts allowed them to recall and more deeply interpret the literary pieces.

In a second study, Dorfman (1996) asked participants—10 graduate students of literature and 10 undergraduates majoring in computer science—to read a set of literary fiction and respond to questions in a group-testing format. There were four types of questions in the task: comprehension ("Was the story easy or difficult for you to understand?"; p. 468), interpretive ("What do you think the message or the point of the story was?"; p. 468), affective ("How much did you like the story?"; p. 469), and literary/critical ("Does this story have the characteristics of a literary work or a popular fiction?"; p. 469). Dorfman's findings revealed group-level differences in participants' interpretive strategies and their comprehension, enjoyment, and appreciation of the texts, with the expert group seeming to hold shared assumptions about how to read texts.

In a third study, Peskin (1998) compared the reading processes of doctoral candidates in English literature with those of undergraduates who had taken one college-level poetry course. Participants were asked to think aloud as they read two unfamiliar poems. Based on these verbal protocol data, Peskin found that the doctoral students tended to draw on their literary knowledge 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. 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.

Results on the cognitive processing of literary experts and novices beg questions about the social and cultural practices of literary studies that mediate those cognitive processes. How do experts—rather, participants in the discourse community of literary studies—use literacy tools to produce and evaluate knowledge within their community? To what extent do the tasks involved in these expert–novice studies approximate disciplinarians' actual ways of reading, writing, and reasoning? Although the methods used were appropriate for the specific questions under investigation, designs that ask those with disciplinary expertise to read unfamiliar texts outside of research contexts do not likely represent typical conditions guiding disciplinarians' professional work. If English educators are to provide disciplinary literacy instruction for students in the ways that Moje (2015) articulated, then the existing studies on literary cognition do not provide all of the information needed.

Advances in Supporting Students' Literary Literacies

Other lines of scholarship also inform the questions under examination. ELA classrooms have long been a site for researching literacy teaching and learning. Such research has illuminated prominent discursive patterns in classrooms (e.g., Nystrand, 1997) and the relationships between social identities and expectations in literacy learning (e.g., Langer, 1998; Rex, 2001; Rex & McEachen, 1999), for instance.

Multiple scholars have sought to design instructional approaches to scaffold students' literary reasoning and interpretation (Langer, 1995; Lee, 2007; Lewis & Ferretti, 2009, 2011). Lee's cultural modeling framework provides a framework for leveraging students' everyday literacy and language practices to teach literary literacy and language practices. In one description of this approach, Lee's unit goal was to teach her adolescent students to interpret literary symbolism, a type of interpretive problem drawn from Scholes's (1985) conceptualization of rhetorical problems (e.g., symbolism, satire, irony) and literary interpretation. Lee designed instruction to leverage her students' familiarity with using symbolism in African American English and their other shared discourses and practices to accomplish her instructional goal with canonical literature. Building on Lee's contributions, researchers have developed and tested affect-based approaches for engaging students in literary reasoning and interpretation (Levine, 2014; Levine & Horton, 2013). Specifically, students in the

treatment group in these studies—high-poverty, lower achieving students who received instruction on using an interpretive heuristic that supported their claim making through first identifying affect-laden language—showed significant growth in their interpretive reasoning.

Recently, scholars have constructed a framework, the READI (reading, evidence, and argumentation in disciplinary instruction) framework of knowledge informing literary reading, to guide instructional approaches for teaching literary reasoning and argumentation (Lee & Goldman, 2015). The framework includes dimensions of knowledge, skills, and practices that inform literary reasoning (e.g., epistemology, knowledge of types of text, discursive knowledge, knowledge of inquiry strategies such as inferring details about plot), and it is based on scholarship by a set of rhetorical and literary theorists (Rabinowitz, 1987; Rosenblatt, 1978; Scholes, 1985) and existing expert–novice studies of the cognitive processing of literary texts (Dorfman, 1996; Graves & Frederiksen, 1996; Peskin, 1998; Zeitz, 1994).

Humanities-based scholars, who are some of the first to acknowledge the need to make more explicit the often tacit ways of reading, writing, and reasoning with literary works when teaching (e.g., Graff, 2002), have also considered how to best scaffold students' engagement in literary learning. The landscape of literary criticism is vast (see Eagleton, 2008) and can be daunting for novices seeking entry into the scholarly community. Of special relation to this study, Hutchings and O'Rourke (2002) offered a conceptual framework for problem-based teaching and learning in literary studies. Based in the understanding that we should teach as we research, the authors posited that students of literary studies should learn to conduct exploratory research by constructing literary problems and selecting suitable methods of inquiry and interpretation.

With clearer empirical understandings about the markers of current scholars' participation in the social and cultural community of literary studies, the work of Lee, Levine, and others seeking to develop instructional approaches that support all students' uptake of literary literacy practices might be furthered. What are problems that practicing literary scholars grapple with? Are there inquiry-based practices that seem to rise above specific literary scholars' theoretical orientations? How might educators use instructional approaches and heuristics with students to advance goals of literary inquiry and participation?

Methods

Participants

The scholars in this study were literature instructors at a public research university in the Midwestern United States. Five were professors of American literature, and five were advanced doctoral students of American literature; at the time of data collection, eight scholars were teaching at least one course with a literature component. I based the number of disciplinarians on other studies of this type (e.g., Wineburg, 1991a). 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. See Table 1 for profiles.

[COMP: Please insert Table 1.]

Although their scholarly interests and theoretical orientations varied, the scholars were all a part of one university-based literary studies program. The professors each regularly taught undergraduate literary studies courses ranging from Introduction to Literary Studies, to courses focused on a particular author such as Emily Dickinson, to courses focused on bodies of poetry such as African American nature poetry. They also regularly taught graduate-level courses, but the focus of this study did not explicitly include 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, although the courses tended to relate less closely to their scholarly interests and often included the composition course Introduction to Academic Writing that most freshmen students are required to take. None of the faculty participants served as the primary academic advisor of any of the graduate student participants.

Data Sources and Collection

I collected data from January to June in 2014. I interviewed scholars individually between one and four times (mean = 3). Each interview was audiotaped and lasted between 45 and 90 minutes, depending on participants' availability and preferences. While conducting interviews, I emphasized that I had no stake in how participants responded to the interview questions or reading tasks.

The first interview in the sequence was semistructured. 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 semistructured 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. All 10 scholars completed this interview protocol.

Interviews 2 and 3 primarily involved concurrent and retrospective verbal protocols (e.g., Pressley & Hilden, 2004). Participants were given two 19th- and 20th-century American short stories that are commonly taught in upper high school ELA courses and introductory undergraduate courses: Kate Chopin's "The Dream of an Hour" and variant "The Story of an Hour" and Ernest Hemingway's "A Day's Wait." These short stories were selected based on their short length and the likely familiarity of the authors to all participants. Before they read each text, I directed the participants to stop when they were aware of a question or thought; this method is often used to surface cognitive processes and practices that participants may take for granted and/or may not have language to name in a traditional interview (Ericsson & Simon, 1993). After they read each short story, I prompted participants to reflect on the processes and practices they used. Seven of the 10 scholars completed a verbal protocol interview with one text, and two of these seven completed verbal protocol interviews with both texts. In interview 4, I asked the scholars to bring a text of their choosing to one of our interviews. Scholars tended to bring a text that they were using in their scholarship or teaching at the time. Eight of the 10 scholars completed a verbal protocol interview with a choice text. The combination of preselected and participant-selected texts was meant to ensure that some reading events would be comparable across cases while also ensuring some alignment between the research tasks and the participants' actual scholarly work.

Data Coding and Analysis

I used constant comparative analysis throughout my work to break apart the data, code them, and discover themes (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Glaser, 1965). My process had three distinct phases. I began analyzing the literary scholars' interviews immediately after I conducted the first interview. I transcribed and then coded the data line by line with tentative labels, making every attempt to remain open-minded to concepts in the data and recognizing that at this stage, I would not know which concepts held the most interpretive meaning. I wrote memos to capture my ideas and stimulate new insights, and I constructed properties for each code. While I was conducting

interviews, transcribing, and open coding, I brought clarifying questions to participants to ensure that my interpretations were aligned with participants' intended meanings.

As I progressed with my interviews and analysis, I moved to axial coding. I compared moments in the data, looking for places that were conceptually similar. As I noticed patterns in the data or the initial codes that I had assigned, I wrote memos about them and listed them. Then, I worked to iteratively sharpen the codes, seeking to represent concepts or themes with consistent and representative umbrella codes and seeking to subsume minor codes underneath the umbrella codes. To do this iterative work, I moved back and forth between my initial codes and the coded data, continually asking myself questions based on the categories, such as, What are the observable literacy practices? and, What are the relationships among my drafted codes? I paid special attention to the types of problems, purposes, and guiding questions that scholars articulated before reading, how they went about investigating the questions or problems that they set for themselves, the sorts of explanations they gave for what was meaningful about the text, and the sorts of discipline-specific assumptions that they carried with them throughout their interpretive work.

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 were linked back to the transcribed and coded data. Using the data chart, I continued to write memos 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 a subset of 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, I established inter-rater reliability with an experienced qualitative researcher by asking her to code a select portion of the raw data using the coding scheme. Initially, inter-rater agreement was 82%. We resolved disagreements through discussion. See Table 2 for coding categories and data exemplars.

[COMP: Please insert Table 2.]

Findings

Based on my analysis of data collected with 10 scholars of literary studies, I assert that a set of shared disciplinary understandings and practices emerged that could be characterized as literary in approach. 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 with texts, including seeking patterns; identifying strangeness, surprise, or confusion; articulating an interpretive puzzle; recursively considering interpretive possibilities; considering histories of use and other contexts; and making original claims. 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.

Social Nature of Literary Studies

All 10 literary scholars indicated that their academic work is fundamentally a social pursuit, involving, as one scholar said, "participating in an academic community." For example, Millie explained recognizing the "connective tissue between [an] individual text and a larger conversation," in which the concerns of the individual move "to some sort of collective." Similarly, 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.

In these excerpts, the scholars revealed an understanding of their extended work with texts as situated within the larger academic community. The understanding that literary scholarship is situated within a social community was so basic to one senior scholar that he replied to an interview question about the social nature of his work with apparent boredom: "Well, I'm addressing a community of scholars, that's my audience, so I know what they said."

Not only did the literary scholars understand their scholarship as fundamentally about participation in an academic community, but they also tended to describe the social functions and

representations of the literary works under study. Far from static, Grace described literary works as "part of processes…and part of social relationships. [For example,] there are a lot of different hands on any one Dickinson poem, both during her time period and between when she lived and now." David said, "There are whole conferences and whole books, literally, on editions of *Ulysses* [by James Joyce] and huge debates [about its history of publication]." Of 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."

There was also a pattern of thinking about the work of literary interpretation as so multifaceted that it demands the efforts of many people. For example, David said, "I feel like with great works of art like this [story], and…with visual art, too, that I can never be adequate by myself to honor the work and that we can only read it together." In class and in the broader field, he went on, "we all need each other to make the richness of the text manifest." Five participants, in fact, noted that literary works are artistic works that invite multiple perspectives and collaboration.

Problem-Based Nature of Literary Studies

Also central to the data is the theme of constructing knowledge through identifying and pursuing literary problems. All 10 of the literary scholars articulated and/or demonstrated the centrality of constructing literary questions or problems—or "puzzles," as three participants called them without prompting—in their own scholarship. As Grace put it, literary puzzles typically begin either by "start[ing] from the text and mov[ing] out, or…start[ing] from the critical conversation and mov[ing] back," although all puzzles ultimately involve careful work with texts to produce knowledge of significance for a larger scholarly community.

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 [that texts] resist thematic summary, and they often work back against themselves in some ways" or otherwise "refus[e] to mean one thing only." Like David, Elias emphasized the centrality of constructing interpretive puzzles in doing literary studies. As an instructor, he 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 texts." 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."

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

> I think of that book as weirdly having two endings…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.

In this example, Elias, who identified as a New Critic, offered a question about the form of the novel and its meaning. However, puzzles described by scholars were not only focused on the form or language of one specific text.

Alexa, for instance, sought to understand a new body of texts that had not been fully explored by other literary scholars. 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 with digital archival, 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"—in sum, "the ways in which word and image meet together in the 19th century to make stories." Alexa's work represents a different type of literary problem or puzzle, one that involves a set of texts and reveals her motivation to contribute to ongoing scholarly conversations about how photography influenced prevalent narratives of the 19th century.

For others within literary studies, as Grace put it, "the place they start is scholarly debates." For her, this meant that "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 [the common narrative]." 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. Anthony's scholarship, grounded in New Historicism, 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." 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." As the questions of William and Anthony suggest, even problems directly centered on the ways that other scholars have characterized literary works also demand extended, careful analytic work with specific literary texts.

These literary scholars, who represented a range of theoretical traditions and academic interests, all described seeking to construct problems or puzzles of concern within a broader community and pursue them through extended work with texts. The problem-based and community-based nature of doing literary studies was reflected in participants' descriptions of both their scholarship and their teaching. In the following sections, I describe a set of shared literary literacy practices that scholars used with texts to construct and pursue literary puzzles and a set of preferred instructional approaches that they described using to teach students to participate in the community of literary studies.

Shared Literary Literacy Practices

Data from semistructured interviews and verbal protocols revealed that these literary scholars not only brought similar shared understandings to their work but also used particular literacy practices to construct, pursue, and communicate about literary questions. Although 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, although they are presented below separately, the literary literacy practices should be understood as tools that are used iteratively and in combination with one another for constructing and pursuing questions or puzzles of varying types. See Table 3 for use of literacy practices per scholar.

[COMP: Please insert Table 3.]

Seeking Patterns

All 10 literary scholars described or demonstrated seeking patterns with texts as a central part of their work. One way that scholars sought patterns was in their early work to construct a literary question or puzzle. "Trying to find patterns" (Millie), rather than being initially somehow guided by particular questions, was characterized by deliberate openness to possibilities for meaning. 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." 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]."

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….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*.

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 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."

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 sentence "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." 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," and "Again, it's very clinical." Ultimately, Millie's "pattern tracing" supported her construction of an initial literary puzzle that could guide further investigation with "A Day's Wait." 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 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." Of course, seeking patterns across texts also involves seeking patterns within them. Further, seeking patterns seemed to be a practice that scholars used not only in the early phases of constructing an initial puzzle but also in their ongoing investigation of a given puzzle. No matter the scope and scale of the project, the practice of seeking patterns was one that all 10 literary scholars seemed to share.

Identifying Strangeness, Surprise, and Confusion

Eight literary scholars described and demonstrated the importance of noticing and potentially exploring 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 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]…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." For her, then, the strangeness she identified came directly out of a pattern that she had identified; together, these practices supported her construction of an interpretive puzzle about the relationship between this section of the text and the text as a whole.

Other times, scholars described the importance of noticing "strange," "weird," "peculiar," "incoherent," "twisted," or "confusing" aspects of one or more texts. David offered an example that highlighted how noticing strangeness can support the construction of a worthwhile literary puzzle:

There's a strange passage in *To the Lighthouse* [by Virginia Woolf] 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 Mrs. Ramsay's legs, and Mr. Ramsay is standing over him, a weird passage….It's a very violent passage.

He asked of this scene, "Why is James there, too? Why is there a kid in this scene?…Really interesting question and one that any reader…is going to want to know also, Why the hell is James there?"

Still other times, the surprise came in the contrasts among two or more concepts, words, or features. 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." For Grace, these sorts of "key binaries" were critical features of Dickinson's work that offer the reader a point for reflection and interpretive meaning making both within and across texts, as do the many variant words and multiple versions of Dickinson's poems.

Articulating an Interpretive Puzzle

All 10 scholars demonstrated or described moving from their early noticings—about a text, a set of texts, or the relationships among literary scholarship and literary texts—to "asking [a] very rigorous question" that focused and drove their further interactions with text(s). Elias said that he regularly reevaluates his noticings about a given text and considers, "What is this thing doing, and how does it function…as part of a larger…ecosystem of this text?" This general question often leads him to a tentative interpretive puzzle that serves to drive his subsequent work with the text.

David, after identifying the weird passage in *To the Lighthouse* where a boy is present in a sex scene, described the potential for using a surprising phrase in another text by the same author as a way of illuminating something important to the scholarly community about both texts. *A Sketch of the Past*, a late memoir that Woolf wrote about her childhood, includes the phrase "but in me, though not in her, rage alternated with love." David reported that a productive puzzle could be to compare the two texts, because "in the [passage from *To the Lighthouse*], you're at exactly a point where rage and love are occurring side by side." This might involve focusing, for instance, on the "figurative language, because [Woolf] uses very bizarre

metaphors" in the scene, or it might involve bringing this lens to "sex passages in [Woolf's other] novels, [which are also] so bizarre."

Grace similarly indicated the centrality of constructing questions or puzzles that can motivate and guide interpretive reading and reasoning. After having read "A Day's Wait," she said,

> 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.

Based in part on her uncertainty about the tensions at the end of the story, she offered the following puzzle: "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."

Whatever the specific focus, this work of developing interpretive puzzles—questions of potential interest to a scholarly community that motivate extended work with texts and will ultimately allow for interpretive claim making—was central to these scholars' work with literature.

Recursively Considering Possibilities

When time allowed in the verbal protocol interviews, the scholars would often read and then continue to reread parts of the short stories. Rereading and continuing to attend to layers of the text, including seeking additional patterns and moments of surprise, allowed the scholars to sharpen their questions and initial interpretive thoughts. For example, 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 that 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." Although 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." 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." Such effort to "find…all these multiple possibilities" enables her to pursue her initial puzzle and revise it as needed.

Rereading one or multiple texts with their particular question or puzzle in mind was a critical feature of the work that nine of the literary scholars either demonstrated or described.

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, 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" (Alexa). 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?

Along with her interest in examining other Hemingway stories, Grace also described wanting to research "where [people are] drawing their knowledge about influenza" at that time in France and the meaning of "Schatz" to find out if it is a "nickname or last name." She also mentioned the potential importance of researching "how parents or boarding school instructors or doctors were instructed to talk with children about influenza." 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.

Making Original Text-Based Claims

Offering readers an original way of thinking about the featured puzzle or problem was central to communicating about literary works for all of the scholars. As Millie put it, "the goal [of communicating about literature] is to help your reader understand the text in a new way." 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 multimedial text had at the time."

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, and interpretive claims seek to "construct some kind of value or meaning or productivity from…that thing that will never be certain to you." They are both supportable using texts and "vision shifting" for readers.

Shared Literary Literacy Instructional Approaches

The literary literacy practices described in the previous section 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, regardless of their specific theoretical orientations or academic interests. When describing their approaches to teaching undergraduate students, the scholars tended to describe approaches to instruction that required students to construct knowledge through identifying literary puzzles or questions, pursuing those puzzles or questions, and communicating about them to others in particular ways. The scholars also tended to express the literary values and orientations that they strive to teach students.

The literary scholars all emphasized the importance of teaching students to construct literary knowledge that is "new," "surprising," "original," "risky," or otherwise "productive." 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.

Nine scholars, in fact, named original interpretation as a primary instructional goal for their introductory-level undergraduate literary studies courses. Although participants often acknowledged differences in scope and scale between an undergraduate's project and a literary scholar's project, as William put it,

> 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….In terms of the writing, basically they're doing a miniversion of what I'm doing.

To teach students to engage in academic work that aligns with their scholarship, participants seemed to favor instruction that asked students to identify, pursue, and communicate about their own literary questions, problems, or puzzles. Such an emphasis was particularly important to participants because often they expressed that undergraduate students do not come to their introductory-level literary studies courses with an understanding of literary inquiry. On this point, Anthony said that 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." 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. William said 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." 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]"; thus, teaching students what counts as literary knowledge and how to construct it was a primary concern for him.

All 10 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 they had individually identified and pursued. In David's undergraduate courses, students "design their own projects, [often]…shorter essays….The ideal…is that it's always a topic of their making and that they care about." 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 based on an understanding of literary puzzles and the literary community.

In the remainder of this section, I present the patterns in shared literary literacy instructional practices. See Table 4 for a breakdown of articulation of each literary literacy instructional approach per participant.

[COMP: Please insert Table 4.]

Posing Literary Puzzles to Students

Nine literary scholars described the importance of inviting students to consider rich questions or puzzles that they or other scholars had already constructed. The literary puzzles that scholars reported posing to students could be answered in multiple ways and could be of interest to a larger literary community, and the respective instructor does not have a preferred answer. Jane, for instance, said that she tries to resist giving students an "answer masked as a question," and she instead seeks to "lay out what we can all agree on about what's going on in the story" and then "get to where you really don't know, where you as a professor haven't decided about something, and trying to bring [students] to that precipice. And then, put [the question] to them."

An example of a puzzle that David 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 left out from many later editions. When reading *Ulysses*, then,

> half of the editions in a given class…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…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….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.

By calling students' attention to the presence or absence of this symbol, David invited them to engage with a literary puzzle that was constructed by noticing strangeness, this time among multiple editions of the same text, and considering interpretive possibilities.

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 posing a

question about how a Dickinson "quatrain has been quoted and what kinds of arguments it has been used to make" to explicitly engage students in developing interpretive meaning of relevance to a broader community of scholars.

Supporting Students' Construction of Literary Puzzles

Seven literary scholars described their approaches for teaching students to construct literary puzzles. Alexa, for instance, relayed regularly presenting students with "an image…a weird picture" and supporting them as they generate puzzles from it. One example she offered in her interview was a recent moment of instruction, in which she showed students an "image of Tupac…dressed in what appears to be slave's garb or the garb of someone in the 1870s," and the image is "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." She asked students to consider, "First, what do you see?" and then, "Do you see things that are weird?" This supported students to construct literary puzzles, such as, "Oh yeah, [Tupac]'s wearing tattered pants and no shoes, but he's also wearing his shirt the way 21st-century gangsta rappers wear their shirts." 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 shared a number of heuristics that he uses for helping his students construct their own literary puzzles. The first is what he called "the four *S*s." For this heuristic, he named four types of literary puzzles that can come out of initial observations such as surprise and confusion: puzzles that seek to reveal the *substance* of a particular feature of the text, puzzles that seek to reveal how the parts of a text work together as a *system*, puzzles that explore why a particular feature is *significant*, and puzzles that explore the *safety* and 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." The puzzle question, then, allows them to pursue worthwhile directions and construct new knowledge from their initial observations about texts.

Scholars also described supporting students' construction of literary puzzles by sharing original versions of literary works with them (e.g., reading Harriet Beecher Stowe's 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." His students often will read a piece of literary fiction and think, "'Oh well….It's beyond criticism…because it's already been collected in this volume. It's already been hung on the wall. It's behind glass.'" Yet, as Anthony pointed out, "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."

Supporting Students' Literary Claim Making

Each of the literary scholars 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 each essay ended in a different or more complicated place than it began. This structure may be contrasted to 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 five-paragraph essay model:

> It's been really useful…to establish, What does the five-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.

Millie taught her students to organize their writing so 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." 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 resulted in writing that is "more exploratory." From Millie's point of view, offering students an essay structure that supports their exploration better approximated the types of reading and reasoning that she sought to advance.

The literary puzzle was frequently at the core of literary scholars' expectations for their students' literary essays. Jane, for example, said, "I'll really encourage [students] to end their opening paragraph with a question instead of a thesis." This move supports students to engage in a "journey of discovery" with literary texts that is more likely to result in new or "illuminating"

analysis. Similarly, Elias 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." 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".... [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."

Here, Elias underscored the importance of both 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 pursuing and 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* [by Tony Kushner] 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.

By asking students to write "big but" statements in groups and individually, Elias sought 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 seeing text." Even in his "big but" heuristic, which may on the surface appear to be designed to support students' rhetorical moves, Elias was actually supporting their abilities to construct, pursue, and communicate about literary puzzles. It was important to him that students not focus on summary; by offering students a structure that helped them quickly move past

summary, he sought to support students' literary interpretation and participation within the community of literary studies.

Coaching Students Through Cycles of Literary Inquiry

Seven literary scholars described the importance of coaching students through full cycles of literary inquiry. Sometimes the scholars 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 in the text that are strange or surprising, posing a literary puzzle, and then having them consider multiple interpretive possibilities. "After 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.'" 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 that 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. A central component of his teaching was one-on-one conferring with his students to help them construct their own literary puzzle and then pursue it:

> I have each of them…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 e-mail and visits to office hours.

Importantly, although David described these conferences as often beginning with personal noticings, he understood his coaching as, in part, a way of supporting students to develop a puzzle and an argument that moves beyond the solely personal. In other words, a student's emotional or affective response would ideally launch an academic investigation that would motivate the student's turn outward to the larger concerns, practices, and settled knowledge of the community of literary studies.

Similarly, Anthony explained his teaching practice of holding meetings with individual 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,] "OK, 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.

Grace, too, conveyed the importance of this sort of individualized 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." From there, she described a series of coaching conversations that she would have with the student to build on his or her initial idea, including first finding out from the student answers to questions such as, "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]?" Then, from there, she is "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. After this first meeting with the student, she said she would "ask [the student] to come back" for additional meetings throughout the semester.

In sum, because participants understood their scholarship as necessarily based in literary puzzles and the ongoing conversation with others in the literary community, they tended to favor instructional approaches that aligned with these orientations and the resulting literacy practices. Because undergraduate students often came to their introductory literary studies courses early in their development of these orientations and literacy practices, instructors tended to emphasize them in their instruction.

Discussion and Implications

Theory and research point to the fundamentally social and problem-based nature of disciplinary work with texts. Scholars work with texts in shared ways to construct, pursue, and communicate about problems in their fields (Moje, 2015). This study provides empirical evidence that 10 university-based literary scholars, like disciplinarians studied in other work (e.g., Wineburg, 1991a), centered their work on problems that are important for building new knowledge in their community. So central was the inquiry-based nature of their work that they often emphasized the

ways that they strove to teach undergraduate students to become sensitive to the problem spaces of literature and learn to construct and pursue their own generative questions or puzzles. This finding complements and extends the work of Hutchings and O'Rourke (2002), who offered a general framework for introducing undergraduates to the problem-based work of literary studies, and Scholes (1985), who theorized interpretive problems of text such as satire and irony. The 10 scholars who participated in this study revealed the centrality and complexity of constructing and pursuing literary puzzles of relevance to a current scholarly community, highlighting the relationships among the construction of puzzles and the literacy tools they used to construct, pursue, and communicate about them.

In constructing and pursuing literary puzzles, the literary scholars seemed to use a combination of particular shared literacy practices. Although the literary literacy practices offered in this study are not necessarily a complete list, and the specific 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 may be tacitly held by many literary scholars. The empirical identification of a set of shared literary literacy practices directly contributes to existing theoretical, conceptual, and empirical scholarship that focuses on participating in literary studies and teaching students to do the same. This study suggests that cognitive processes and knowledge representations such as those uncovered in English/literary expert–novice studies (e.g., Peskin, 1998; Zeitz, 1994) may be best understood as operating alongside the problem-based practices of members of the academic literary community. Further, they complement Rabinowitz's (1987) theorization of the rules of notice and significance that are routinely employed by skillful literary readers. Noticing ruptures in a text for their interpretive potential, for instance, is a practice that may hold much in common with the empirically identified practice in this study, identifying and seeking to explore strangeness, surprise, and confusion. Again, however, these findings highlight the importance of constructing, pursuing, and communicating about literary puzzles that motivate such practices and processes. Further, the findings also offer some assurance that the identified literary literacy practices are worthy of teaching students, both because scholars of varying theoretical perspectives used them as tools in their own research and because the scholars emphasized them in their teaching.

If, as Moje (2015) argued, disciplinary literacy teaching requires engaging students in problem-based and text-based learning that is aligned with disciplinary work, and if literary

scholars' practices center on constructing, pursuing, and communicating about literary puzzles alongside others, then this prompts new questions for scholars, policymakers, and practitioners in the fields of literacy and English education. How "disciplinary" are the learning opportunities that students tend to receive in ELA classrooms? How might literary literacy practices and processes best be taught in K–12 classrooms so they are not disconnected from larger cycles of inquiry and the social nature of disciplinary communities? For instance, what are the types of literary puzzles that 12th-grade students can and should learn to construct and pursue? What about second graders? What about students in the middle grades? How might the ways that literary scholars sought to scaffold undergraduates' literary inquiry in this study, often around literary puzzles that held personal meaning and potential meaning for a broader literary community, be applied to existing efforts designed to support adolescents' literary reading, writing, and reasoning (Langer, 1995; Lee & Goldman, 2015; Levine, 2014)? How might even content literacy routines such as K–W–L (Ogle, 1986) be repurposed to support students' literary literacy participation? Finally, given disagreements in the field about the feasibility of teaching disciplinary literacy in K–12 classrooms, questions remain about how inservice and preservice educators might be best supported to provide such instruction.

Other questions for theory and research involve the full range of puzzles and practices within literary studies and how they relate to the other discourse communities of English (e.g., rhetoric, linguistics). Analyzing the reading, writing, and reasoning of literary scholars of multiple institutions and of a wide range of professional and personal perspectives and identities would enable scholars to document other literacy practices that are central to literary studies. Involving non–university-based individuals who hold literary expertise could also be helpful for building the field's understanding of literary literacy practices, as disciplinary expertise is not solely housed in research universities' academic departments. Also, given that ELA learning standards typically include not only literary learning goals but also goals of composition and rhetoric, linguistics, and performing arts, among others, more theory and research is needed on each of these discourse communities to move the field toward a shared understanding of how disciplinary literacy is best taught within K–12 ELA classrooms.

Indeed, there is much yet to learn about disciplinary literacy in the school domain of ELA. Yet, this study offers helpful language for some literary literacy practices and teaching

approaches that could be further explored by researchers and taken up by teachers and teacher educators committed to forwarding disciplinary literacy teaching in K–12 classrooms.

References

Bain, R.B. (2000). Into the breach: Using research and theory to shape history instruction. In P.N. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching and learning history: National and international perspectives* (pp. 331–353). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Bain, R.B. (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.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.B., & Moje, E.B. (2012). Mapping the teacher education terrain for novices. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *93*(5), 62–65. doi:10.1177/003172171209300514

Corbin, J.M., & 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., Felton, M., Monte-Sano, C., Croninger, R., Jackson, C., Deogracias, J.S., & Hoffman, B.P. (2014). Developing historical reading and writing with adolescent readers: Effects on student learning. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *42*(2), 228–274. doi:10.1080/00933104.2014.908754

Dorfman, M.H. (1996). Evaluating the interpretive community: Evidence from expert and novice readers. *Poetics*, *23*(6), 453–470. doi:10.1016/0304-422X(96)00004-6

Eagleton, T. (2008). *Literary theory: An introduction*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Ericsson, K.A., & Simon, H.A. (1993). *Protocol analysis: Verbal reports as data* (Rev. ed.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Glaser, B.G. (1965). The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis. *Social Problems*, *12*(4), 436–445. doi:10.2307/798843

Goldman, S.R., & Bisanz, G.L. (2002). Toward a functional analysis of scientific implications for understanding and learning processes. In J. Otero, J.A. León, & A.C. Graesser (Eds.), *The psychology of science text comprehension* (pp. 19–50). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Graff, G. (2002). The problem problem and other oddities of academic discourse. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, *1*(1), 27–42. doi:10.1177/1474022202001001003

Graves, B., & Frederiksen, C.H. (1991). Literary expertise in the description of a fictional narrative. *Poetics*, *20*(1), 1–26. doi:10.1016/0304-422X(91)90031-J

Graves, B., & Frederiksen, C.H. (1996). A cognitive study of literary expertise. In R.J. Kreuz & M.S. MacNealy (Eds.), *Empirical approaches to literature and aesthetics* (Vol. 52, pp. 397–418). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Heath, S.B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Heller, R. (2010). 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. doi:10.1598/JAAL.54.4.4

Hutchings, B., & O'Rourke, K. (2002). Problem-based learning in literary studies. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, *1*(1), 73–83. doi:10.1177/1474022202001001006

Hynd, C., Holschuh, J.P., & Hubbard, B.P. (2004). Thinking like a historian: College students' reading of multiple historical documents. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *36*(2), 141–176. doi:10.1207/s15548430jlr3602_2

Langer, J.A. (1995). *Envisioning literature: Literary understanding and literature instruction*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Langer, J.A. (1998). Thinking and doing literature: An eight-year study. *English Journal*, *87*(2), 16–23. doi:10.2307/821546

Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2007). Sampling "the new" in new literacies. In M. Knobel & C. Lankshear (Eds.), *A new literacies sampler* (pp. 1–24). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

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. (2007). *Culture, literacy and learning: Taking Bloom in the midst of the whirlwind*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Lee, C.D., & Goldman, S.R. (2015). *Assessing literary reasoning: Text and task complexities*, *54*(3), 213–227. doi:10.1080/00405841.2015.1044369

Lee, C.D., & Spratley, A. (2010). *Reading in the disciplines: The challenges of adolescent literacy*. New York, NY: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Leinhardt, G. (1997). Instructional explanations in history. *International Journal of Educational Research, 27*(3), 221–232. doi:10.1016/S0883-0355(97)89730-3

Leinhardt, G., & Young, K.M. (1996). Two texts, three readers: Distance and expertise in reading history. *Cognition and Instruction*, *14*(4), 441–486. doi:10.1207/s1532690xci1404_2

Levine, S. (2014). Making interpretation visible with an affect-based strategy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *49*(3), 283–303. doi:10.1002/rrq.71

Levine, S., & Horton, W.S. (2013). Using affective appraisal to help readers construct literary interpretations. *Scientific Study of Literature*, *3*(1), 105–136. doi:10.1075/ssol.3.1.10lev

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*, *25*(4), 250–270. doi:10.1080/10573560903120656

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*(4), 334–354. doi:10.1016/j.cedpsych.2011.06.001

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. doi:10.3102/0091732X07300046001

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. doi:10.1598/JAAL.52.2.1

Moje, E.B. (2015). Doing and teaching disciplinary literacy with adolescent learners: A social and cultural enterprise. *Harvard Educational Review*, *85*(2), 254–278. doi:10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.254

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. doi:10.1080/10508406.2010.481014

Monte-Sano, C. (2011). Learning to open up history for students: Preservice teachers' emerging pedagogical content knowledge. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *62*(3), 260–272. doi:10.1177/0022487110397842

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: Author.

NGSS Lead States. (2013). *Next Generation Science Standards: For states, by states.* Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Nystrand, M. (1997). *Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English classroom.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

O'Brien, D.G., Stewart, R.A., & Moje, E.B. (1995). Why content literacy is difficult to infuse into the secondary school: Complexities of curriculum, pedagogy, and school culture. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *30*(3), 442–463. doi:10.2307/747625

Ogle, D.M. (1986). KWL: A teaching model that develops active reading of expository text. *The Reading Teacher*, *39*(6), 564–570. doi:10.1598/RT.39.6.11

Peskin, J. (1998). Constructing meaning when reading poetry: An expert–novice study. *Cognition and Instruction*, *16*(3), 235–263. doi:10.1207/s1532690xci1603_1

Pressley, M., & Hilden, K. (2004). Verbal protocols of reading. In N. Duke & M. Mallette (Eds.), *Literacy research methodologies* (pp. 308–321). New York, NY: Guilford.

Rabinowitz, P.J. (1987). *Before reading: Narrative conventions and the politics of interpretation.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Rainey, E.C. (2015). *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* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Rainey, E.C., & 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.

Reisman, A. (2012). Reading like a historian: A document-based history curriculum intervention in urban high schools. *Cognition and Instruction*, *30*(1), 86–112. doi:10.1080/07370008.2011.634081

Reisman, A. (2015). Entering the historical problem space: Whole-class text-based discussion in history class. *Teachers College Record*, *117*(2), 1–44.

Rex, L.A. (2001). The remaking of a high school reader. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *36*(3), 288–314. doi:10.1598/RRQ.36.3.3

Rex, L.A., & McEachen, D. (1999). "If anything is odd, inappropriate, confusing, or boring, it's probably important": The emergence of inclusive academic literacy through English classroom discussion practices. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *34*(1), 65–129.

Rosenblatt, L.M. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Scholes, R. (1985). *Textual power, literary theory and the teaching of English.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

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. doi:10.17763/haer.78.1.v62444321p602101

Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2012). What is disciplinary literacy and why does it matter? *Topics in Language Disorders*, *32*(1), 7–18. doi:10.1097/TLD.0b013e318244557a

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

Weiss, R.S. (1994). *Learning from strangers: The art and method of qualitative interview studies*. New York, NY: Free.

Wineburg, S.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*(1), 73–87. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.83.1.73

Wineburg, S.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. doi:10.3102/00028312028003495

Wineburg, S. (1998). Reading Abraham Lincoln: An expert/expert study in the interpretation of historical texts. *Cognitive Science*, *22*(3), 319–346. doi:10.1207/s15516709cog2203_3

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. doi:10.1080/09500690305018

Zeitz, C.M. (1994). Expert–novice differences in memory, abstraction, and reasoning in the domain of literature. *Cognition and Instruction*, *12*(4), 277–312. doi:10.1207/s1532690xci1204_1

[COMP: Please set the authors' names per RRQ's design.]

EMILY C. RAINEY is a postdoctoral fellow in the School of Education at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA; e-mail q.

TABLE 1

Profiles of Participating Literary Scholars

Pseudonym	Position held	Highest degree	Years of experience	Scholarly orientations and academic interests
David	Professor	PhD	29	Formalism, historicism, Anglo-American modernism, poetry and poetics, 20th-century writings about war, pedagogy
Flora	Professor	PhD	40	Materialist-feminist, genre criticism and theory, American literature and culture (1850–1920)
Jane	Associate professor	PhD	27	Cultural history, Early American studies, Southern studies, history of science, environmental humanities
Elias	Senior lecturer	MFA	16	New Criticism, Midwestern U.S. literature, regionality, literature of the environment
William	Professor	PhD	37	Poetry and poetics, 19th- and 20th-century American literature, Whitman, Stevens
Grace	Doctoral candidate	MFA	7	New Formalism, historical poetics, 19th-century American and British poetry and poetics, 19th-

				century print culture (1773–1865)
Sarah	Doctoral candidate	MA	6	History of the book, reception studies, American literature and culture (1880–1945)
Millie	Doctoral candidate	MA	8	Narrative theory, poetics of participation, 21st-century American literature
Anthony	Doctoral candidate	MPhil	13	New Historicism, Early American literature and culture, the novel, religion and literature
Alexa	Doctoral candidate	MA	5	New Historicism, African American literature, 19th-century American literature, visual culture studies, media studies

Note. Participants received their highest degrees from the following institutions: Johns Hopkins University; Princeton University; Stanford University; Trinity College; Université Rennes 2; University of California, San Diego; University of Leeds; University of Michigan; and University of Virginia.

TABLE 2

Coding Scheme and Data Exemplars

Code	Operational definition	Data exemplar
Shared orientations		
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."
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."
Literary literacy practices		
Seeking patterns	The subject articulates or demonstrates the practice of seeking patterns to make meaning with text(s).	"[I am] trying to find patterns."
Identifying strangeness	The subject articulates or demonstrates the practice of identifying strangeness, surprise, or confusion to make meaning with text(s).	"I look for words that seem unique or weird."
Articulating a 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?"
Considering	The subject articulates or demonstrates	"[I try to consider] all of the possibilities that

possibilities	the practice of recursively considering interpretive possibilities with text(s).	the text affords."
Considering contexts	The subject articulates or demonstrates the practice of considering histories of use, variants, and other contexts.	"[I'd want to do] research about the…historical, cultural, social context in which the text was produced and circulated."
Making a claim	The subject articulates or demonstrates the practice of making an original claim about text(s).	"The goal is to help your reader understand the text in a new way."
Literary literacy teaching approaches		
Posing a puzzle	The subject articulates the instructional practice of posing a literary puzzle for students to consider.	"I would want my students to think about and respond to…this idea that being conscious both entraps and frees us."
Constructing a puzzle	The subject articulates the instructional practice of teaching students to construct literary puzzles.	"All these *S* words not only help [students] build ideas…, but they allow them to move from that thing to a puzzle question."
Considering possibilities	The subject articulates the 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."
Making claims	The subject articulates the instructional practice of teaching students to make original literary claims.	"I'll really encourage [students] to end their opening paragraph with a question instead of a thesis."
Inquiry process	The subject articulates the 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 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 to a thesis."

TABLE 3

Articulation or Demonstration of Literary Literacy Practice by the Literary Scholars

Pseudonym	Seeking patterns	Identifying strangeness	Articulating a puzzle	Considering possibilities	Considering contexts	Making a claim
David	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Flora	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Jane	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Elias	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
William	Yes		Yes		Yes	Yes

Grace	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sarah	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Millie	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Anthony	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Alexa	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note. Yes = present in the data collected.

TABLE 4

Articulation of Literary Literacy Instructional Approach, by Literary Scholar

Pseudonym	Posing a puzzle	Constructing a puzzle	Considering possibilities	Making claims	Inquiry process
David	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Flora	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes
Jane	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Elias	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
William				Yes	
Grace	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sarah	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Millie	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes
Anthony	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Alexa	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes

Note. Yes = present in the data collected.