

2022

## Disciplinary Literacy in Practice: Examining How English Teachers Read Literary Texts

Matt Cantrell

Murray State University, [william.cantrell@johnson.kyschools.us](mailto:william.cantrell@johnson.kyschools.us)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/lpr>



Part of the [Language and Literacy Education Commons](#), and the [Secondary Education and Teaching Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Cantrell, Matt (2022) "Disciplinary Literacy in Practice: Examining How English Teachers Read Literary Texts," *Literacy Practice and Research*: Vol. 47: No. 3, Article 2.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/lpr/vol47/iss3/2>

This work is brought to you for free and open access by FIU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Literacy Practice and Research* by an authorized administrator of FIU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [dcc@fiu.edu](mailto:dcc@fiu.edu).

## Introduction

Much of the attention directed toward secondary literacy research has focused on the apparent loss of momentum that plagues American students as they progress through school. The National Council of Teachers of English (2011) notes that the same U.S. students who outperform much of the world in reading as fourth graders will lag substantially behind by the time they are sophomores in high school, and ACT (2006) has shown that those students will actually be closer to college readiness as sophomores than they will be as seniors. Part of the difficulty in correcting this decline is our inability to agree on its cause. The ACT report, for instance, argues for a generalist approach to reading where students refine and practice supposedly universal general literacy strategies with increasingly complex texts, while NCTE suggests students need new, discipline-specific strategies derived from the texts and methods of each discipline.

An increasingly persuasive body of research suggests that this disciplinary approach to literacy is a viable solution for addressing our secondary reading problems (Catts & Kamhi, 2017; Fang & Schleppegrell, 2010; Jetton & Lee, 2012; Rainey & Moje, 2012). However, even as the Common Core and individual state standards have begun distributing literacy instruction across the disciplines (Cronin, 2014; Dyches & Gunderson, 2021; Holschuh, 2014; Manderino & Wickens, 2014; Zygoris-Coe, 2012), little attention has been paid to whether teachers are sufficiently trained and prepared to teach their students the specialized approaches to reading and writing in their disciplines (Conley, 2012; Di Domenico, et al., 2018; Fang & Coatoam, 2013; Moje, 2012).

This study examined one aspect of secondary English literacy—the reading strategies of 21 English instructors as they read a disciplinary text (a poem). Specifically, this study intended to answer two questions:

- 1.) Do English instructors use disciplinary or general literacy strategies when reading a disciplinary text?
- 2.) Is there any relationship between professional training and the use of disciplinary reading strategies?

## Literature and Theoretical Framework

Disciplinary literacy views reading as a constructive process where readers use strategies and methods specific to their disciplinary communities (Moje, 2012; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; Smagorinsky, 2001). These disciplinary strategies are distinct cultural constructions that students must be explicitly taught to use (Brown, Collins, & Duguid, 1989; Peskin, Allen, & Wells-Jopling, 2010; Rodriguez, 2015). Previous research has demonstrated the positive effect of explicit instruction in a discipline's methods on students performing a

disciplinary task (Bortolussi & Dixon, 1996; Burkett & Goldman, 2016; Levine, 2014; Levine & Horton, 2015; Zeitz, 1994). These studies suggest that a command of general reading comprehension strategies is insufficient preparation for reading a disciplinary text, and that reading instruction should be based on the literacy practices of each discipline (McCarthy, 2015; Manderino & Wickens, 2014; Spires et al., 2016).

#### *Disciplinary literacy in English & literary studies*

The literary critic Harold Bloom (1994) warned that our approaches to studying literature are undermined by a mistaken belief that a familiarity with language in general somehow prepares us to study complex literature. Moje (2007) notes that “the study of English literature, which often appears to draw from everyday language and generic literacy processes, actually requires yet again another set of reading skills” (p. 11). Determining what these skills are and how they differ from general reading comprehension skills is complicated since little attention has been paid to the disciplinary practices of English (Rainey, 2016; Reynolds & Rush, 2017). Researchers urge English teachers to design literature instruction so that students “come to see themselves as literary scholars-in-training” (Park, 2013; see also Bruner, 1960; Jetton & Lee, 2012), but how, exactly, do literary critics read literature?

#### *How experts and novices read literature*

A number of studies have identified reading strategies commonly used by disciplinary experts and novices when reading literary texts. The following strategies have been selected due to their frequent appearances in previous research as well as their relevance to the student age group related to this study (see College Board, 2019; Levine, 2019). These strategies are reflected in the rubric (See Table I).

#### *Interpretation as goal*

Experts consistently read a literary text with the purpose of constructing an interpretation (Goldman et al., 2016; McCarthy, 2015; McCarthy & Goldman, 2019; Miall & Kuiken, 1999; Peskin, 1998; Rainey, 2016; Warren, 2011), while novices tend to focus on basic comprehension (Reynolds & Rush, 2017). In order to construct interpretations, experts read the text as a “unified whole” (Warren, 2011) that demonstrates “thematic unity” (Peskin, 1998), while novices focus on the text as a series of distinct, unrelated parts (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1986). Novices read texts linearly, paraphrasing as they go (Graves, 1996), while experts reread and actively search the text for evidence to support or refute their developing interpretations (Reynolds & Rush, 2017; Reynolds, et al., 2020). As experts develop and test their interpretations, they identify evidence to support

their argument, and they attempt to make explicit the connection between their evidence and their proposed meaning (Goldman, et al., 2016; Hillocks, Jr., 2016; Lee & Goldman, 2015; Spires, et al., 2018).

### *Interpretive methods*

When experts attempt to construct an interpretation, they first try to place the text into some larger scholarly context (McCarthy, 2015; McCarthy & Goldman, 2019; Miall & Kuiken, 1994; Peskin, 1998; Rainey, 2016; Reynolds & Rush, 2017). However, when experts and novices alike are confronted with literary texts outside of any previous knowledge or context, they resort to different types of reading strategies to make sense of the text. Experts rely on discipline-specific interpretive methods to generate meaning (Dorfman, 1996; Goldman, et al., 2016; Graves & Frederiksen, 1991; McCarthy, 2015; McCarthy & Goldman, 2019; Miall & Kuiken, 1999; Peskin, 1998; Spires, et al., 2018; Warren, 2011; Zeitz, 1994). For example, when confronted with an unfamiliar poem, one expert in Warren's (2011) study used literary theory to develop an interpretation, saying "I think I can make an ecocritical reading work" (p. 361), while another used a psychoanalytical approach to interpret a new poem (p. 360). Experts in Peskin's (1998) study used a kind of structuralist approach to interpret unfamiliar poems, while different versions of formalism were popular for a number of experts (Goldman, et al., 2016; Graves & Frederiksen, 1991; McCarthy, 2015; Miall & Kuiken, 1999). Novices, however, tend to rely on general, comprehension-based reading strategies that build toward an accurate understanding of the literal events of the text (McCarthy & Goldman, 2019; Poole, 2013; Zeitz, 1994). As experts work through their disciplinary methods, they tend to ask questions and have conversations with themselves that serve to "[push] the understanding of the text past mere comprehension and into interpretation, with the questions serving as a foundation for the interpretation" (Reynolds & Rush, 2017, p. 209). Novices may also ask questions, but it is a general literacy strategy meant to clarify the literal meaning of the text (Hinchman & Moore, 2013; Lee & Spratley, 2010).

### *The disciplinary expertise of teachers*

Much of the discussion around the disciplinary expertise of teachers has focused on the tension between the pedagogical emphasis of schools of education and the disciplinary training of content areas. Robinson, for instance, warned in 1978 that most college English professors "regard high school teachers as mutant English majors, orphans to be sent over to Schools of Education for care and feeding," (p. 592), and Caughlan et al. (2017), writing nearly 40 years later, found the situation largely unchanged, noting that "English teacher education is often positioned as a subfield within teacher education, and the content domain (that of

English language arts) is considered secondary to the focus on pedagogy” (p. 268). The consequences of this conflict manifest themselves in teachers’ disciplinary awareness. Park (2013), for instance, found that literary theory, which is a common disciplinary strategy among experts, doesn’t figure prominently in preservice English teachers’ conception of disciplinary literary. Graff (2003) has argued that English maintains a strict, harmful distinction between the undergraduate and graduate curriculum that denies young students access to disciplinary strategies, and Strain (2016), Shanahan (2013), and Warren (2011) characterize graduate study in English as the beginning of disciplinary expertise and the place where students are explicitly taught the methods of their discipline.

This study intends to investigate this complex relationship between teachers’ training and their use of disciplinary methods.

## **Method**

### *Procedure*

Participants were asked to think aloud as they read one disciplinary text (Graves & Frederiksen, 1991; McCarthy & Goldman, 2019), Robert Frost’s poem “Never Again Would Birds’ Song Be the Same,” presented without author attribution (see Appendix A). Peskin (1998) and Zeitz (1994) note that experts use the structure of a text to develop interpretations, so a text with a recognizable structure (a sonnet) was chosen to give participants the opportunity to demonstrate an awareness of how structure contributes to meaning. No participants were familiar with the poem.

The participants’ responses were transcribed and coded by pseudonyms. Two independent raters scored each response as either “Disciplinary” or “General” depending on whether the participants used disciplinary or general literacy strategies to make sense of the text. The strategies for each category were derived from previous expert-novice studies in literary reading. A third rater rescored responses that were not in agreement. Interrater reliability analysis showed high agreement using Cohen’s kappa ( $\kappa=0.95$ ).

Participants were tested individually. Previous expert-novice studies have provided participants with practice prior to reading the text (Peskin, 1998), and some have even demonstrated potential commenting behaviors (Burkett & Goldman, 2016). This study did not provide any modeling or practice out of concern that any modeled behaviors would bias readers toward those strategies. One of the consistent findings of expert-novice studies is that experts will construct interpretations and use disciplinary methods without explicit instructions, so providing no modeling gave participants the opportunity to demonstrate those behaviors unprompted.

Participants were given the following instructions, modeled on Peskin (1998) and McCarthy & Goldman (2015):

I'd like you to think aloud as you read and make sense of this poem. Just say everything that you are thinking, as you are thinking it. Nothing you say will be irrelevant. In the event that you are quiet for more than 10 seconds, I will remind you to think aloud.

After the transcripts were evaluated, I analyzed their self-reported backgrounds to determine if the use of discipline-specific reading strategies seemed related to any specific previous training.

### *Participants*

Participants were volunteers recruited at conferences, meetings, and professional developments across one state. This study did not use purposeful selection of participants. Of the 21 participants, 20 were currently practicing instructors (See Table 2). One former teacher now works for an organization that provides professional development for English teachers. One participant was a middle-school certified freshman English teacher, and two participants were full time community college instructors without terminal degrees who had previous history with secondary English. The remaining 18 were full-time secondary English teachers. (see Table II)

## **Findings**

### *Teachers' use of disciplinary reading methods*

The raters judged ten (10) of the 21 participants to have used at least one disciplinary method as they worked on the poem, while the remaining eleven (11) relied solely on general literacy strategies. For example, the most common feature of the “Generalists” was an almost exclusive devotion to the literal comprehension of the poem. Valerie, for instance, summarized the events of the poem four separate times: “So the girl must be Eve and [the birds have] heard her voice. She has influenced them in some way...So they have incorporated her into their own voices...So she's completely influenced them...So they have completely incorporated her voice.” Likewise, Joyce summarized the poem as “Alright, so it appears that a woman has had an influence on how birds sing,” and Melinda noted “So she's changing the songs of the birds with her own tone.” These represented the high-performing Generalist—those teachers who only summarized, but who summarized correctly. Other teachers developed summaries that simply could not be supported by the text. Austin, for instance, insisted that the poem was

an elegy. So we're looking at the passing of a lover, probably comparing her voice to the song of birds and he's doing it both kind of remorsefully, so he's never gonna be able to hear the bird song again without thinking of her, but also at the same time very happily, so the bird song will always remind him of her voice.

Selena thought the poem was about "a love interest...I'm guessing something happened to her." Neither of these readings can be supported with the text.

"Generalists" in this study also consistently talked about the poem through their personal responses. While the use of personal response has enjoyed great success as a reading strategy, research has demonstrated that reader-response has had a disproportionate (Dressman & Faust, 2014; Harkin, 2005), often negative influence (Appleman, 2014; Oubre, 2014) on literature pedagogy. This study supports those conclusions. Denise, for instance, structured her reading around her own reaction to the poem: "Oh that's beautiful. I like the cadence of the piece...This one is difficult for me to unpack but I leave with a very positive mood as a result of having read it." Austin supplemented his comprehension-based reading with personal reactions throughout his response: "Oh I like it...I really liked the last line...I like it...I like lines six and seven...That's really cool. I like it." Melinda summarized the poem throughout her response and concluded by noting, "I liked this poem. I don't really know *why* I do." In these instances, the personal responses did not lead the participant to an interpretation; instead, the text became a catalyst for the teachers to catalog their responses.

The "Disciplinary" responses, however, all used some degree of a disciplinary method to work toward a defensible interpretation of the poem. Max and Donna, for instance, proposed feminist readings of the poem, with Max reading the poem as "a treatise on a feminine influence...being softer than the obvious male influences, but also as permanent," and Donna focusing on the positive characterization of Eve as something other than "the evil one who tempted Adam." Hugh built a formalist reading around "the theme of loss," while Kate explored the poem's tension between light and darkness before concluding the poet resolves the tension in favor of light which suggests "something very sacred and spiritual" about Eve's influence. Megan, who has a master's in creative writing, approached the poem from a writer's perspective, noting how the poet's use of "assonance and alliteration and sounds coming together" contributes to the idea of sounds merging and influencing each other. These responses in particular, and the disciplinary responses overall, generated readings of the text that moved beyond the literal retelling of the events of the poem and toward meaning-centered interpretations.

“Disciplinary” and “Generalist” participants both dealt with the structure of the poem in contrasting ways. While several “Generalists” observed that the poem was a sonnet, none were able to use that knowledge to develop an interpretation. Molly, for instance, did a “quick check on the number of lines, eleven, twelve, thirteen, fourteen, that’s a sonnet. I love sonnets.” Austin also realized the poem was a sonnet, but in keeping with his personal response reading simply noted that “we’re looking at a sonnet, nice little Shakespearean sonnet with your couplet at the end. It does actually a pretty good job as a sonnet.” While these teachers were aware of the sonnet structure and how it could aid in interpreting the poem, they did not actually use that knowledge in a meaning-producing way. By comparison, Alec recognized that, typically, “a couplet houses something big, so I’m going to look at that again,” and, when he reread the couplet, noted that

So I think it’s a really positive influence that this voice...has had on these birds. There doesn’t seem to be a tone shift [in the couplet]. It seems to simply reinforce at the end the power of the influence of her on these animals.

Judith approached the poem similarly, noting after an initial scan that

it is a Shakespearean English sonnet with three quatrains and a couplet, so I’m thinking I need to look for some kind of meaning related to the structure, or at least use the structure to help me figure out what it’s talking about.

As she read the poem straight through, Judith questioned whether Eve’s influence on the birds is positive or negative, and, when she reached the couplet, realized “So it’s *not* a negative thing...It is that her voice has superseded the birds’ beauty, and...her voice is carrying the birds’ voices now, and so she has *improved* the song of the birds.” In both instances, Alec and Judith’s awareness of the couplet’s function within a sonnet led directly to the development of their interpretation.

The types of questions each participant asked differed substantially. Teachers that scored “General” asked strictly comprehension-based questions that did not assist in making inferences. For example, Sydney fixated solely on whether the poem actually dealt with Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden: “garden and Eve. Maybe the Garden of Eden from the Bible...Maybe it’s not the Garden of Eden...Originally I thought the Garden of Eden because of Eve.” Sydney ended her response here, uncertain if the poem was, in fact, about Eve in the garden. Teachers like Sydney asked questions, but they were meant to clarify the literal events of the poem. When Joyce read the word “persisted,” she asked,



“So perhaps it’s had an everlasting effect on the birds?” which is the meaning of the word persisted. While the teachers who relied on general literacy strategies like Melinda asked basic questions like “So what is she doing to the birds?” teachers who used disciplinary methods asked questions meant to figure out the meaning of the poem. For example, when confronted with the final couplet, Nora admitted what many participants were likely afraid to say:

To do what to birds? To influence them? To change their song? To make a different sound? The fact that she did that [intentionally] has me puzzled. I need more time with this...the last couplet, it is really important. But I can’t understand that...I’m really puzzled about “to do that to birds was why she came.”

Of course, the couplet *is* difficult if you are trying to determine the meaning of the poem. If you are only interested in the literal events of the poem, the last sentence isn’t a problem—it is just the final piece in comprehending the plot. This is illustrated by Daisy who, upon reading the couplet, concluded, “So the reason that Eve came was to provide the birds with a beautiful song.” The couplet explicitly says as much.

#### *Relationships between previous training and use of disciplinary methods*

Table II shows the participants, their previous education, any additional discipline-specific training (professional development), and their scores on the reading task. Two factors seemed to be related to teacher use of disciplinary strategies. Six (6) participants had experience as scorers for the AP English Literature exam, and all six were rated as “Disciplinary.” Seven (7) participants had master’s degrees in English, and all seven were scored “Disciplinary.” There was overlap with these factors: Four (4) teachers had master’s degree in English as well as experience as AP readers; three (3) teachers had only master’s degrees, and two (2) had only AP experience. Regardless, the raters scored all “Disciplinary.” This study found no relationship between the use of English-specific reading methods and graduate work in education or in related fields like English education and literacy, nor did it find any relationship between undergraduate concentrations and use of disciplinary strategies. Other in-service trainings and professional developments showed no relationship with the use of disciplinary reading methods. Three teachers had completed three years of Laying the Foundations, a training intended to “empower teachers in grades 3-12 to build and maintain subject matter expertise,” (National Math & Science Institute, 2020), but all three were scored as “General.” Nine teachers had attended at least one week-long AP summer institute that prepares them to teach the AP English course. They also scored “General.”

## Discussion

This study attempted to determine (1) if English teachers use the literacy methods of their discipline to read a disciplinary text and (2) if there is any relationship between a teacher's previous training and their use of disciplinary approaches. The following discussion summarizes and places these findings within the context of implementing disciplinary literacy.

### *Teachers' use of disciplinary methods*

Heller (2010) warned that expecting high school instructors to teach their students the methods of their discipline was unreasonable because “few secondary-level teachers are true members of a discipline” (p. 270). These results suggest that this concern must be taken seriously and that the relationship between teacher training and disciplinary expertise is likely more complex than expected. More specifically, the results raise the possibility that not all English teachers are being trained to do what advocates of disciplinary literacy expect they can do. However, just as previous research has demonstrated that secondary students are capable of being taught to use disciplinary methods to read disciplinary texts (Bortolussi & Dixon, 1996; Burkett & Goldman, 2016; Levine, 2014; Levine & Horton, 2015), these results show that English teachers are, in fact, capable of using the methods of their disciplinary community. The following sections attempt to explain why some English teachers seemed prepared to use disciplinary methods while others did not.

### *The relationship between AP scoring and disciplinary expertise*

Two factors possibly explain the relationship between AP scoring and teacher use of disciplinary approaches. First, the rubric used by scorers on the AP exam explicitly requires several “Disciplinary” strategies. For example, the rubric expects “interpretations” rather than basic comprehension, and it expects students to perform “a persuasive analysis” and to offer “convincing readings,” which require evidence and warrants. These are all behaviors that research suggests disciplinary experts use when reading a literary text. Exam scorers receive explicit rubric training as well as experience evaluating anchor and rangefinder essays to help illustrate what the rubric expects. Teachers who have not participated in this process do not receive this kind of instruction.

Second, there seems to be overlap between the design of the exam itself and the disciplinary methods of literary studies. Critics have long suggested that the AP English Literature exam “overtly emphasizes a New Critical approach to literary analysis” (Oubre, 2014, p. 69; see also Jones, 2001; Thomas, 2012). Participants who have been trained to score literary analysis essays written in

response to a New Critical prompt and rubric have received training on a formalist method of reading that the course and exam reward. In other words, as the research suggests that experts will use discipline-specific methods to read a literary text, AP scorers have at least one disciplinary method of interpretation at their disposal because of their experience grading this exam. The non-AP scorers in this study have not had such training; as a result, they do not seem to have access to this kind of demanding, AP-sanctioned New Criticism. The experienced AP scorers approached the poem the way the literature exam expects students to approach it—through a formalist lens that examines how the parts of the poem contribute to meaning.

### *The relationship between the MA in English and disciplinary expertise*

Previous research characterizes undergraduate English teacher preparation as a site of tension between the discipline's specialized literacy strategies and the School of Education's pedagogical emphasis (Caughlan et al., 2017; Robinson, 1978). These results provide limited support for this characterization. Eleven (11) teachers with bachelor's degrees in English or a related field and master's in non-English disciplines participated, and ten (10) were rated as using only general literacy strategies. Park (2013) noted that preservice teachers paid little attention to disciplinary interpretive methods, and these findings support that conclusion. The results also provide limited support for the characterization of the master's as the true initiation into the English critical methodology (Graff, 2003; Strain, 2016; Warren, 2011). For example, Max, who has a traditional literature-based master's, spent roughly half of his response using general literacy strategies to comprehend what was literally happening in the poem ("Sounds like there's been a change") before transitioning toward disciplinary thinking ("So if I were going to pull from this, maybe, some kind of overlying theme or meaning..."). This aligns with Shanahan & Shanahan (2008) and Zeitz's (1994) conception of disciplinary literacy as building upon and being supported by general literacy. Participants with non-English master's degrees, however, did not make this shift and stayed entirely in the realm of general comprehension and personal response. This supports previous research that suggests readers who lack disciplinary interpretive methods must rely on previously learned general literacy (Peskin, 1998) or personal response (Dorfman, 1996) strategies, both of which are inadequate for disciplinary texts (Manderino & Wickens, 2014).

### **Limitations and Conclusion**

This study has limitations. I have tried to avoid suggesting that a master's in English or experience as a scorer for the AP English Literature exam directly causes teachers to be able to use the literacy strategies of their discipline for two

reasons. First, I relied on volunteers recruited at conferences and meetings from one state, so the sample size for both of those factors is small. Future research that utilizes purposeful recruiting will be necessary to examine this further. Second, it is possible that participants who choose to pursue a master's in English or choose to be a scorer for the AP English Literature exam do so because of greater disciplinary knowledge. Additional research would be needed to explore this relationship between advanced disciplinary training and a teacher's ability to use disciplinary methods.

Still, the findings from this study demonstrate a need for research into how English teachers are trained. In his "Chief Reader Report" for the 2018 AP English Literature exam, David Miller noted that two mistakes consistently plague students when confronted with literature—they confuse summary and personal response for analysis. To combat this problem, Miller urged English teachers to help their students learn to analyze literature by reading unfamiliar texts out loud to demonstrate literary reading strategies. That is a popular (Gallagher, 2004; Tovani, 2000), research-based strategy (Methe & Hintze, 2003; Regan & Berkeley, 2012), but it is only effective if teachers are capable of modeling a disciplinary approach. This study suggests that many teachers would not be able to perform this task. Moreover, it suggests that those teachers might be unintentionally modeling and encouraging the general literacy strategies that Miller warns against. The consequences of this are obvious and dangerous: The success of disciplinary literacy as a framework depends on the expectation that teachers are fully initiated members of their disciplinary community. Our failure to examine closely and critically the relationship between teacher training and disciplinary expertise risks sabotaging the disciplinary literacy model.

## References

- ACT (2006). *Reading between the lines: what the ACT reveals about college readiness in reading*.
- Appleman, D. (2014). Response to Euclid at the core: Recentering literary education. *Style*, 48(1), 36-41.
- Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1986). Educational relevance of the study of expertise. *Interchange*, 17(2), 10-24.
- Bloom, H. (1994). *The Western Canon*. Riverhead Books, New York, NY.
- Bortolussi, M., & Dixon, P. (1996). The effects of formal training on literary reception. *Poetics*, 23(6), 471-487.
- Brown, J., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher*, 18(1), 32-42.
- Bruner, J.S. (1960). *The process of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Burkett, C., & Goldman, S. (2016). "Getting the point" of literature: Relations between processing and interpretation. *Discourse Processes: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 53(5-6), 457-487.
- Catts, H., & Kamhi, A. (2017). Prologue: Reading comprehension is not a single ability. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 48(2), 73-76.
- Caughlan, S., Pasternak, D.L., Hallman, H.L., Renzi, L., Rush, L.S., Frisby, M. (2017). How English language arts teachers are prepared for twenty-first-century classrooms: Results of a national study. *English Education*, 49(3), 265-297.
- College Board. (2019). "AP English literature and composition: course and exam description," *AP Central*. <https://apcentral.collegeboard.org/pdf/ap-english-literature-and-composition-course-and-exam-description.pdf?course=ap-english-literature-and-composition>
- Conley, M. (2012). Foregrounding the disciplines for teacher preparation in secondary literacy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 56(2), 141-150.
- Cronin, M. (2014). The Common Core of literacy and literature. *The English Journal*, 103(4), 46-52.
- Di Domenico, P., Elish-Piper, L., Manderino, M., & L'Allier, S. (2018). Coaching to support disciplinary literacy instruction: Navigating complexity and challenges for sustained teacher change. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 57(2), 81-99.
- Dorfman, M. (1996). Evaluating the interpretive community: Evidence from expert and novice readers. *Poetics*, 23(6), 453-470.

- Dressman, M., & Faust. (2014). On the teaching of poetry in "English Journal," 1912-2005: Does history matter? *Journal of Literacy Research*, 46(1), 39-67.
- Dyches, J. & Gunderson, M.P. (2021). "I learned the rules": Using a critical disciplinary literacy model to foster disciplinary apprenticeship. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 64(4), 379-387.
- Fang, Z., & Coatoam, S. (2013). Disciplinary literacy: What you want to know about it. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 56(8), 627-632.
- Fang, Z., & Schleppegrell, M. (2010). Disciplinary literacies across content areas: Supporting secondary reading through functional language analysis. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 53(7), 587-597.
- Gallagher, K. (2008). *Deeper reading: Comprehending challenging texts, 4-12*. Stenhouse Publishing.
- Goldman, S.R., Britt, M.A., Brown, W., Cribb, G., George, M., Greenleaf, C., Lee, C.D., Shanahan, C., Project READI. (2016). Disciplinary literacies and learning to read for understanding: A conceptual framework for disciplinary literacy. *Educational Psychologist*, 51(2), 219-246.
- Graff, G. (2003). *Clueless in Academe: How Schooling Obscures the Life of the Mind*. Yale University Press.
- Graves, B. (1996). The study of literary expertise as a research strategy. *Poetics*, 23(6), 385-403.
- Graves, B., & Frederiksen, C. (1991). Literary expertise in the description of a fictional narrative. *Poetics*, 20(1), 1-26.
- Harkin, P. (2005). The reception of reader-response theory. *College Composition and Communication*, 56(3), 410-425.
- 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.
- Hillocks, G, Jr. (2016). The territory of literature. *English Education*, 48(2), 109-126.
- Hinchman, K., & Moore, D. (2013). Close reading: A cautionary interpretation. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 56(6), 441-450.
- Holschuh, J. (2014). The Common Core goes to college: The Potential for disciplinary literacy approaches in developmental literacy classes. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 45(1), 85-95.
- Jetton, T., & Lee, R. (2012). A model for teacher planning with text in the academic disciplines. In T. Jetton & C. Shanahan (Eds.), *Adolescent literacy in the academic disciplines: General principles and practical strategies*. Guilford Press.
- Jones, J. (2001). Recomposing the AP English exam. *The English Journal*, 91(1), 51-56.

- Lee, C., & Goldman, S. (2015). Assessing literary reasoning: Text and task complexities. *Theory into Practice*, 54(3), 213-227.
- Lee, C., & Spratley, A. (2010). *Reading in the disciplines: The challenges of adolescent literacy*. Carnegie Corporation of New York.
- Levine, S. (2014). Making interpretation visible with an affect-based strategy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 49(3), 283-303.
- Levine, S., & Horton, W. (2015). Helping high school students read like experts: Affective evaluation, salience, and literary interpretation. *Cognition and Instruction*, 33(2), 125- 153.
- Levine, S. (2019). A century of change in high school English assessments: An analysis of 110 New York State Regents Exams, 1900-2018. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 54(1), 31–57.
- Manderino, M., & Wickens, C. (2014). Addressing disciplinary literacy in the Common Core State Standards. *Illinois Reading Council Journal*, 42(2), 28-39.
- McCarthy, K. (2015). Reading beyond the lines: A critical review of cognitive approaches to literary interpretation and comprehension. *Scientific Study of Literature*, 5(1), 99-128.
- McCarthy, K., & Goldman, S. (2019). Constructing interpretive inferences about literary text: The role of domain-specific knowledge. *Learning and Instruction*, 60, 245-251.
- Methe, S., & Hintze, J. (2003). Evaluating teacher modeling as a strategy to increase student reading behavior. *School Psychology Review*, 32(4), 617–622.
- Miall, D., & Kuiken, D. (1994). Beyond text theory: Understanding literary response. *Discourse Processes*, 17(3), 337-352.
- Miller, D. (2018). Chief reader report on student responses: 2018 AP English Literature and Composition free-response questions [PDF file]. <https://secure-media.collegeboard.org/digitalServices/pdf/ap/ap18-chief-reader-report-english-literature.pdf>
- Moje, E. (2007). Developing socially just subject-matter instruction: A review of the literature on disciplinary literacy teaching. *Review of Research in Education*, 31(1), 1-44.
- Moje, E. (2012). Foregrounding the disciplines for teacher preparation in secondary literacy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 56(2), 141-150.
- National Council of Teachers of English. (2011). *Literacies of disciplines*. Urbana, IL.
- National Math & Science Initiative. (2020). *Laying the foundation*. Retrieved from <https://www.nms.org/Our-Programs/Teachers/Grades-3-12/Laying-the-Foundation.aspx>

- Oubre, K. (2014). Many “right answers,” many “wrong ones”: A defense of close reading in the high school classroom. *Style*, 48(1), 66-70.
- Park, J. (2013). All the ways of reading literature: Preservice English teachers' perspectives on disciplinary literacy. *English Education*, 45(4), 361-384.
- Peskin, J. (1998). Constructing meaning when reading poetry: An expert-novice study. *Cognition and Instruction*, 16(3), 235-263.
- Peskin, J., Allen, G., & Wells-Jopling, R. (2010). "The educated imagination": Applying instructional research to the teaching of symbolic interpretation of poetry. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 53(6), 498-507.
- Poole, A. (2013). Fiction reading strategies of college readers. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 43(2), 91-109.
- Rainey, E. (2016). Disciplinary Literacy in English Language Arts: Exploring the Social and Problem-Based Nature of Literary Reading and Reasoning. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 52(1), 53-71.
- Rainey, E., & Moje, E. (2012). Building insider knowledge: Teaching students to read, write, and think within ELA and across the disciplines. *English Education*, 45(1), 71-90.
- Regan, K. & Berkeley, S. (2012). Effective reading and writing instruction. *Intervention in school and clinic*, 47(5), 276-282.
- Reynolds, T., & Rush, L.S. (2017). Experts and novices reading literature: An analysis of disciplinary literacy in English language arts. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 56(3), 199-216.
- Reynolds, T., Rush, L.S., Lampi, L.J., & Holschuh, J.P.(2020). English disciplinary literacy: Enhancing students' literary interpretive moves. *Journal of Adult & Adolescent Literacy*, 64(2), 201-209.
- Robinson, F. (1978). English education in the English department. *College English*, 39(5), 592- 594.
- Rodriguez, T. (2015). A content area reading course re-imagined: A situated case study of disciplinary literacies pedagogy in secondary English teacher education. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 54(2), 163-184.
- Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching disciplinary literacy to adolescents: Rethinking content-area literacy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 78(1), 40-59.
- Smagorinsky, P. (2001). If meaning is constructed, what's it made from? Toward a cultural theory of reading. *Review of Educational Research*, 71(1), 133-169.
- Spires, H.A, Kerkhoff, S.N., Graham, A.C., Thompson, I., & Lee, J.K. (2018). Operationalizing and validating disciplinary literacy in secondary education. *Reading and Writing*, 31(6), 1401-1434.



- Strain, M. (2016). Degree of change. In M. Strain, & R. Potter (Eds.), *Degree of change: The MA in English studies*, (pp. xi-xxviii), National Council of Teachers of English.
- Thomas, P. (2012). "A richer, not a narrower, aesthetic": The rise of New Criticism in "English Journal." *The English journal*, 101(3), 52-57.
- Tovani, C. (2000). *I read it, but I don't get it: Comprehension strategies for adolescent readers*. Stenhouse Publishers.
- Warren, J. (2011). "Generic" and "specific" expertise in English: An expert/expert study in poetry interpretation and academic argument. *Cognition and Instruction*, 29(4), 349-374.
- Zeitz, C. (1994). Expert-novice differences in memory, abstraction, and reasoning in the domain of literature. *Cognition and Instruction*, 12(4), 277-312.
- Zygouris-Coe, V. (2012). Disciplinary literacy and the Common Core State Standards. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 32(1), 35-50.

Appendix A

“Never Again Would Birds’ Song Be the Same”

He would declare and could himself believe  
That the birds there in all the garden round  
From having heard the daylong voice of Eve  
Had added to their own an oversound,  
5 Her tone of meaning but without the words.  
Admittedly an eloquence so soft  
Could only have had an influence on birds  
When call or laughter carried it aloft.  
Be that as may be, she was in their song.  
10 Moreover her voice upon their voices crossed  
Had now persisted in the woods so long  
That probably it never would be lost.  
Never again would birds' song be the same.  
And to do that to birds was why she came.

Table I. Rubric of reading strategies

Rubric	
	Description
<b>Disciplinary</b>	Disciplinary experts use discipline-specific methods to develop a defensible interpretation of the poem
Evidence	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experts choose from a variety of discipline-specific methods, including Formalist close reading, Psychoanalytic, Feminist, or other similar approaches</li> <li>• Experts propose an interpretation and actively look for evidence to support or refute their interpretation, often in a non-linear way</li> <li>• Experts engage in conversations with themselves as they read</li> <li>• Experts read the language and structure of the text as a deliberate act, and they recognize that those authorial choices contribute to meaning</li> <li>• Experts read the text as a unified whole that expresses a significant attitude about the world</li> <li>• Experts make explicit the connection between their evidence and their interpretation</li> </ul>	
	Description
<b>General</b>	Disciplinary novices use general literacy strategies to read for basic comprehension.
Evidence	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Novices rely exclusively on summary, paraphrase, or personal responses</li> <li>• Novices work toward a literal understanding of the events in the poem</li> <li>• Novices don't participate in a conversation with themselves and, instead, attempt to find the "right" answer</li> <li>• Novices may notice textual or structural features, but they fail to attribute them to the author's purpose or to the meaning of the work</li> <li>• Novices may summarize or paraphrase the entire poem, but they fail to see the poem as a coherent, unified whole</li> <li>• Novices may propose readings of the poem that cannot be supported with the text</li> </ul>	

Table II. Participant backgrounds and scores

	Teacher	Education	Additional Disciplinary Training	Scores		
				Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3
1.	Nora	BA English MA English Ed.S. Sec. Ed	AP Reader	Disciplinary	Disciplinary	
2.	Valerie	BA English MA Eng. Ed	Laying the Foundations (LTF)	General	General	
3.	Selena	BA Eng. Education MA Special Education	None	General	General	
4.	Denise	Sec. Eng. Ed MA Teacher Leadership	AP Summer Institute Literature (2) (APSI)	General	General	
5.	Joyce	BA English MA Secondary Education MA Teacher Leadership	APSI Language LTF	General	General	
6.	Daisy	BA Integrated Strategic Communications MA Teaching MA Instructional Supervision	APSI Language	General	General	
7.	Megan	BA English MA English (Creative Writing) MFA	None	Disciplinary	Disciplinary	
8.	Austin	BA Eng. Ed MA Teacher Leadership	None	General	General	
9.	Evelyn	BA Sec. Eng. Ed MA Teacher Leadership	APSI Literature (2)	Disciplinary	Disciplinary	
10.	Hugh	BA English MA English MA Ed. Leadership	AP Reader AP Consultant	Disciplinary	Disciplinary	

11.	Leona	BA English MA Literacy Specialist Rank I Teacher Lead. (In-Progress)	APSI Literature	General	General	
12.	Judith	BA English MA Eng. Sec. Ed. Rank I Eng. Sec. Ed.	AP Reader National Board Certified Teacher	Disciplinary	Disciplinary	
13.	Molly	BA English MA Sec. Education	APSI Language (1) APSI Literature (1) NBCT (In- Progress)	General	General	
14.	Donna	BA English MA Education	AP Reader NBCT	Disciplinary	Disciplinary	
15.	Alec	BA English MA English (Writing)	AP Reader NBCT	Disciplinary	Disciplinary	
16.	Lester	BA English MS Edu. Cur. & Instr. MA English (unfinished)	APSI Literature (2) NMSI APSI (2) APSI Language (1)	General	Disciplinary	General
17.	Wendy	BA Eng. Lit MA English (Linguistics)	AP Reader	Disciplinary	Disciplinary	
18.	Melinda	BA English Education MA Education	NBCT APSI Language (2)	General	General	
19.	Sydney	BA Middle School Eng. & SS MA Education Rank I CEO	LTF	General	General	
20.	Max	BA English MA Teaching	None	Disciplinary	Disciplinary	

		MA English (Finished Coursework)				
21.	Kate	BA English & Theater MA Liberal Studies MA English (Drama) MA Library Science	None	Disciplinary	Disciplinary	