Literacy Teacher Educators

Literacy Teacher Educators

Preparing Teachers for a Changing World

Edited by;

Clare Kosnik
University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Jennifer Rowsell
Brock University, Ontario, Canada

Peter Williamson
University of San Francisco, California, USA

Rob Simon
University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada

and

Clive Beck
University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada

SENSE PUBLISHERS
ROTTERDAM/BOSTON/TAIPEI

A C.I.P. record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN: 978-94-6209-198-6 (paperback)
ISBN: 978-94-6209-199-3 (hardback)
ISBN: 978-94-6209-200-6 (e-book)

Published by: Sense Publishers,
P.O. Box 21858,
3001 AW Rotterdam,
The Netherlands
https://www.sensepublishers.com/

Printed on acid-free paper

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION

To literacy teacher educators around the world, whose creative, skillful, and dedicated work is of such value to beginning literacy teachers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to thank Michel Lokhorst from Sense Publishing for his support from the initial steps of this very innovative project through all of the stages of development and production. Thank you for helping us share the voices of literacy teacher educators from around the world.

CONTRIBUTORS

Clive Beck is Professor in the Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto (OISE/UT), teaching both graduate and pre-service courses. His books include *Educational Philosophy and Theory*; *Better Schools*; *Values in Adulthood; Innovations in Teacher Education*; *Priorities in Teacher Education;* and *Teaching in a Nutshell* (the last 3 co-authored with Clare Kosnik). He is currently principal investigator of a longitudinal study Teacher Change and Growth and writing a book (with Kosnik) on continuing teacher development.

David Booth is Professor Emeritus at he Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/ University of Toronto, where he teaches courses in literacy and in the arts, and supervises Master's and Doctoral students. He has written and spoken internationally on the issues associated with boys' literacy, and is currently researching the role of creativity and imagination in developing literacy proficiency.

Gerald Campano is Associate Professor and Chair of the Reading/Writing/Literacy Department at the University of Pennsylvania and a former schoolteacher. He teaches and writes about literacy, identity, and practitioner research.

Barbara Comber is a Research Professor in the Faculty of Education at Queensland University of Technology. She is particularly interested in literacy education and social justice. Her current work explores the affordances of place-based pedagogies for the development of critical and creative literacies. She is also undertaking an institutional ethnography on mandated literacy assessment and the reorganisation of teachers' work. She has co-edited a number of books including the forthcoming *International Handbook of Research in Children's Literacy, Learning and Culture* (Hall et al in press), *Literacies in Place: Teaching Environmental Communications* (Comber et al, 2007), *Turn-around Pedagogies: Literacy Interventions for At-risk Students* (Comber & Kamler, 2005), and *Look Again: Longitudinal Studies of Children's Literacy Learning* (Comber & Barnett, 2003).

Karen Dooley is an Associate Professor in the Faculty of Education, Queensland University of Technology. Her research is focused on pedagogy for students in linguistically and culturally diverse schools. She teaches primary English Curriculum.

Cal Durrant is Associate Professor in English Curriculum and Literacy and Director of the Literacy Research Hub at the Australian Catholic University (ACU) in Sydney; he is also the Commissioning Editor for the Australian Association for the Teaching of English (AATE) and editor of AATE's highly acclaimed Interface series. Cal has taught, researched and published in the areas of English curriculum, literacy, technology and media education for the past thirty years, and is the ACU

leader in the 2012 university research consortium that is evaluating the impact of selected reforms of the Improving Teacher Quality National Partnership as part of the Smarter Schools National Partnerships program to report back to the Commonwealth in 2014.

Beryl Exley is a Senior Lecturer in Language and Literacy Education at the Queensland University of Technology, Australia. She has a special interest in pre-service teacher literacies and the teaching of literacy as a social justice issue. She is currently a chief investigator on an Australian Research Council linkage grant exploring the connection between digital and print literacy outcomes in primary school contexts marked by diversity.

María Paula Ghiso is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Curriculum and Teaching at Teachers College, Columbia University. Her research focuses on literacy learning in early childhood and multilingual contexts. She teaches courses on early literacy, children's literature, and literacy and identity.

Valerie Kinloch is a faculty member in the School of Teaching and Learning at Ohio State University, where she teaches courses in literacy studies, urban education, and multicultural and equity studies in education. Her book, *Harlem on Our Minds: Place, Race, and the Literacies of Urban Youth* (2010), is the 2012 recipient of the Outstanding Book of the Year Award from the American Education Research Association, and her most recent book is, *Crossing Boundaries: Teaching and Learning with Urban Youth* (2012). Currently, she is working on a longterm project with local community organizations, a school district and its teachers and students, a teachers' union, and university representatives that explore the significance of community engagement in the academic lives of K-12 students.

Clare Kosnik is Professor in the Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning Department at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/University of Toronto. Using her longitudinal research on beginning teachers she has re-conceptualized her literacy courses to focus on specific priorities rather than trying to cover the waterfront. She is currently conducting a large-scale study of literacy/English teacher educators in four countries (Canada, US, UK, and Australia).

Susan L. Lytle is Professor Emerita of Education in the Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania where she taught for 40 years. During her tenure at GSE as a member of the Standing Faculty she has been holder of the Joseph L. Calihan Term Chair in Education, Chair of the Language and Literacy in Education Division, and Founding Director of the now 25 year old Philadelphia Writing Project (PhilWP), a site of the National Writing Project.

Bethan Marshall is a senior lecturer in education at King's College London. She combines her focus on English studies and ways in which it might be taught with a consideration of how the subject should be assessed.

Lan Ngo is a PhD student at the University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education. A former English as a second language teacher, her research focuses on the literacy practices and language use of immigrant students and English language learners in the United States.

Lydia Menna is a PhD candidate in the department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto. Her doctoral research examines how pre-service teachers construct conceptions of literacy, engage with personal literacy practices, and enact literacy pedagogy throughout their teacher education experience.

Shelley Stagg-Peterson is professor in the Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning at OISE/University of Toronto. A former elementary teacher in rural schools in Alberta, Canada, Shelley now teaches initial teacher education and graduate courses in literacy pedagogy and children's literature in K-8 classrooms. Her research interests include gender issues in writing, feedback as a tool for teaching writing, writing assessment, teaching writing using digital technology and multimedia, play-based assessment and support of young children's oral language and writing development, and collaborative action research.

Rebecca Rogers is an Associate Professor of Literacy Education and Discourse Studies in the College of Education at the University of Missouri-St. Louis. Her scholarship focuses on the sociopolitical contexts of education and situates critical discourse analysis within an ethnographic tradition. Likewise, she integrates inquiry into language, power and identities—or critical literacies—into her coursework with professionals preparing to be literacy specialists. She argues that critical literacy can provide teachers the hope needed to transcend the stifling effects of this era of standardization. Her new book (with Melissa Mosley) is called *Designing Critical Literacy Education through Critical Discourse Analysis: Pedagogical and Research Tools for Teacher Researchers* and will be published with Routledge in 2013.

Jennifer Rowsell is a Canada Research Chair in Multiliteracies at Brock University's Faculty of Education where she directs the Centre for Multiliteracies. She has co-written and written several books in the areas of New Literacy Studies, multimodality, and multiliteracies. Her current research interests include children's digital and immersive worlds; material/immaterial literacies; and ecological work in communities examining everyday literacy practices. She is currently involved in three research studies that explore new definitions for literacy in the 21st century.

Mary Gene Saudelli, PhD is on faculty at Brock University as the Director of the Brock Faculty of Education Reading Clinic, and an instructor in the Brock Adult Education, Department of Teacher Education and Graduate programs. Her research interests focus on diversity (particularly cultural, religious, and ethnic), and multimodality and multiliteracies in relation to digital worlds. This perspective emanates from observations of curriculum and pedagogy that embraces digital logic

in the Middle East and Asia where she lived, taught, and researched for many years prior to returning to Canada.

Rob Simon is Assistant Professor of Multiliteracies in Education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto. His teaching and scholarship draw upon practitioner research and sociocultural theories to explore literacy from the perspectives of teachers and adolescents. Currently, he is the principal investigator for the Teaching to Learn Project, a Connaught-funded intergenerational research community made up of teacher candidates, early-year literacy teachers, and youth.

Tamara Spencer is an Assistant Professor at Montclair State University, New Jersey. Her current research analyzes the intersections of curricular policy and young children's literacy practices. In her work with new teachers, she prepares teachers to assert competence and pedagogical dexterity when faced with an increasingly complex curricular landscape.

Vivian Vasquez currently teaches at American University, in Washington DC. Her teaching is rooted in her experiences as a learner and as a former teacher of young children. She uses these experiences to inform the negotiation of a critical literacy framework in the university classroom and her ongoing research on critical literacies and new technologies.

Maureen Walsh is Adjunct Professor in the Faculty of Education, previously Professor of Literacy Education and founder of the Literacy Research Hub at Australian Catholic University. She received two national awards for university teaching. She is also Adjunct Professor in the Faculty of Education and Social Work, University of Sydney. For several years her work has focused on the impact of digital communication on literacy education, particularly in multicultural classrooms.

Peter Williamson is Assistant Professor of Teacher Education in the School of Education at the University of San Francisco. He is a founding member and the Faculty Advisor of the San Francisco Teacher Residency program, which prepares teachers for San Francisco's high-need schools and subjects. Peter earned his doctorate at Stanford University, where he later became the Director of Stanford's Teachers for a New Era project. He began his career as a middle and high school English and journalism teacher in Bay Area schools, where he also worked with agencies focusing on advocacy for urban and underserved youth. Peter's research focuses on literacy and urban teacher education.

SUSAN L. LYTLE

FOREWORD

The Critical Literacies of Teaching

In 2012, when we talk about literacy teacher education, we speak while we are witnessing, in many (but not all) locations:

- the dismantling of public education
- the de-professionalization of teachers and teaching
- the prevalence of deficit views of students, teachers, schools and communities
- the scripting of teaching and the hegemony of high stakes tests in teacher and student assessment
- the degrading/diminishing of the role of universities in the preparation of teachers

These phenomena are most prominent and problematic in urban and under-resourced communities. They constitute the ground on which crucial issues of the education of literacy teachers must ultimately be addressed.

After decades of provocative, potentially field-transforming theory and research into literacy by differently situated educators, we still struggle with *what it means to do literacy education and literacy teacher education* ***well***. We also have to deal with why there is, in some quarters, certainty about what ***well*** means and what to do about that.

Perhaps it helps to think of literacy teaching as a site of productive struggle, a location. There are politics of locations.

The struggle is the practice. The practice is the struggle.

* * * *

Since retiring in June, after almost 50 years as a literacy teacher and teacher educator, I am now officially detached from any formal institution of education. Maybe this new floating space accounts for my own struggle in writing this Foreword. So at the suggestion of a very close friend, I spent a day reading Adrienne Rich, as a way to "re-mind" myself as a writer. With a great and long-standing debt to Rich who passed away last March, I offer these reflections as a kind of meditation on this collection of essays.

Adrienne Rich wrote: we need to articulate "the truths of outrage and the truths of possibility." What does this mean to literacy teachers and teacher educators?

Some Propositions

From my perspective, theory and research into literacy teacher education includes the frameworks and inquiries conducted by teachers and teacher educators. Literacy teacher education should not be understood as moving theory into practice or even primarily about insuring that practice is research-based.

It's about the reciprocal relationships of—the soup of—theory and practice, and centrally about how these two terms are constructed and for what purpose?

It's about who makes theory? (Rich asks: only certain kinds of people?)

It's about practitioners'—university and school-based—*theories of practice*.

It's about how we understand and each day construct and reconstruct—in local contexts—the relationships of knowledge and practice, from what we think we know and what we do.

It's about theorizing from the classroom.

It's about who we think our students (pre-service teachers) are, and about how they, in turn, come to learn who their students are.

So it's about learning from, with, and about students, from and about practice, in differently configured communities, each day and over the professional life span.

It's about questions and questioning, about what Rich calls "the absolute necessity to raise. . .questions in the world."

It's about the question: What visions do you attach your teaching to?

And it's about how differently positioned educators understand the 'work' of being a literacy teacher/teacher educator, and for whom that matters.

Literacy, teaching, and literacy teacher education are critical social practices.

They are not transmittable.

Learning from and with students occurs in social, cultural, and highly political spaces.

This entails working against the myths of teacher 'training' and the pervasive (and still growing) deficit views of the profession.

It matters what we call this: it matters whether we think of teacher education as *training* or *learning.* Teaching is complex; it is not composed of a set of discrete strategies or routines or even practices, no matter how studied and complicated the description.

Teaching is first and foremost an adaptive, deliberative, agentive process, not a technical one.

> Teaching involves the intentional forming and reforming of frameworks for understanding and enacting practice.
>
> Teaching is not a solitary process. It is about co-laboring and learning across contexts. It happens in communities of inquiry, communities that are inescapably cross-generational, cross-school/university, cross-families and teachers. Teaching is a form of leadership, from within and beyond the classroom.
>
> Literacy teachers do not oppose standards, assessments, or policies that seek to rectify long-standing inequities in the system. What they resist is the gross oversimplification of the task at hand.
>
> Teaching and learning to teach (at all levels) are on-going explorations that involve attention to and wrestling with issues of identity, language, race, culture, institutional histories, community, expectations, and engagement.

Literacy teacher education is about de-centering the university while teaching in and on behalf of it.

> To be literate as a teacher—pre-service, new and experienced—is to engage in an ongoing, searching, and sometimes profoundly unsettling dialogue with students and families and administrators and colleagues, who talk and read and write from very different locations and experiences.
>
> For university-based literacy teacher educators, it's about understanding activism and advocacy as not inimical to their work. This means regarding teaching, research, and service as deeply interconnected, in the efforts of both university-based literacy teacher educators and K-12 literacy teachers.
>
> It involves engaging in a productive dialogue with colleagues and administrators regarding the nature and significance of teacher education in the contested environment pre-service and more experienced teachers are encountering in their fieldwork and in local, state, and national policies.
>
> It's about commitment and democratic values, about working within and against. Rich reminds us also to think about humility and wonder.
>
> We need to talk about what the work of literacy educators and teacher educators is *for*, **and** what it *resists*. Rich suggests we need to ask questions that have been defined (by others) as nonquestions. Rich says that art can never be legislated by any system.
>
> Do we believe that to be true of literacy teaching as well?

Literacy teaching and teacher education are fundamentally about equity, access and justice. They are about learning and teaching as political acts. Rich asks: What is

possible in this life? How do we create "the sheer power of a collective imagery of change and a sense of collective hope"?

The struggles of practice, these prepositions, this book. All these invite an inquiry stance, a kind of certainty about uncertainty.

* * * *

That said, I have never read anything quite like this book:

It contains explicit representations of the conceptual frames and work of distinguished literacy teacher educators at various stages in their careers, accounts that provide a strong counter-narrative to the mainstream discourse in policy and education, that fully embrace the uncertainties and complexities of practice. Pulling together a series of essays, the editors and authors build a line of argument from their experience and knowledge, their 'reading of the world' of literacy teacher education, their sense of what would be useful to others, with attention to their own complex dilemmas and challenges.

I understand that the chapter authors were invited by the editors to explore explicitly how their autobiographies are expressed in their daily work in the field of literacy education. Thus, the essays provide a range of searching accounts of how the authors came to think as they do. Their 'theories of practice' reveal not just their interesting and interested readings of the literacy field writ large, but how these readings play in the specifics of their practice as literacy educators in different institutional contexts, in and out of the university. Importantly, the essays are respectful of their readers, not presuming that we are simply looking for replicable formulas to improve our practice.

Practice is made public and accessible, manifested in particular programs, courses and syllabae, in stories of rich and sometimes problematic interactions with pre-service teachers, in things that don't work, and inevitably in their own research agendas related to literacy and teaching. Many chapters speak directly to the ways these literacy teacher educators deal with system priorities and expectations that may run counter to their own perspectives. These rare insider accounts thus make visible and accessible the legacies, locations, and positionalities of literacy teacher educators as they transact with the complicated and ever-evolving notion of literacy as critical social practice, the framework of multi-literacies and the new and always changing affordances of multimodalities.

The resulting inquiries into pedagogies seem to me especially useful because they reveal and explore the authors' vulnerabilities and courage in wrestling with the inevitable quandaries of their practice. They accomplish this in ways that are highly attuned to and engaged with the life experiences, cultural and linguistic resources of both their students (the pre-service teachers) and the children and youth these teachers are preparing to teach. In doing so, they respond tacitly to Rich's queries: "With any personal history, what is to be done? What do we know when we know your story? With whom do you believe your lot is cast?"

That most of these chapters are co-authored reflects the intent of the book as a whole: to be read as a conversation, inviting a dialogic response, a search for

symmetries and dissonances. The images of agentive teachers and teacher educators make palpable what it means to purposefully and systematically inquire into and learn from day-to-day practice in light of different policies/politics and local contexts. The chapters' authors sketch compelling visions of university-based literacy education while pushing back against the so-called reality that there are mitigating conditions—now "reforms"—that depend upon the de-professionalization of teaching and teachers and the demonizing/denigrating of university-based teacher education. Their frameworks and pedagogies clearly animate their own university-based teacher education programs, in part, because they keep at the forefront *the certainty that we are all educating students for an unknown future*.

The authors also reveal possible pathways for dealing with system priorities and dominant discourses while maintaining *and trusting* their own ever-evolving critical stance, including probing critiques of and challenges to their own work as literacy teacher educators across the professional life span. The collection of essays, taken together, helps us understand what it means for the experiences of pre-service teacher education to be conceptualized in ways that parallel the meanings of literacy and criticality in student teachers' K-12 school contexts, with all the uncertainty and intentional fluidity that implies.

This book comes at a time when I believe literacy teacher educators are looking for powerful accounts that talk back loudly to the central issues, struggles, and conditions of their work, especially through the invention of new and unique collaborative spaces for doing pre-service teacher education that break the mold of typical university courses and fieldwork placements. It cuts into a discourse rife with hidden and explicit claims about deficits, of both students and teachers, and makes us think deeply and imaginatively about what is possible under these conditions and what it will mean to change them.

****

Like the underlying themes in much of the poetry and essays of Adrienne Rich, our work in the world of literacy is unlikely to improve without thoughtfully and intentionally engaging the wider socio-cultural and political struggles that drive current educational controversies. Every day, we need to bring, insistently if necessary, issues of literacy and language, access and equity, into the local discourse and practices of our schools and universities and communities. In that way, the work at hand can build from and connect to the lived experiences and diverse knowledges of the many who have a serious stake in how powerfully literacy is taught and learned, the children and youth and adults for whom this *really matters*.

Susan L. Lytle
Professor Emerita of Education, University of Pennsylvania

PETER WILLIAMSON

INTRODUCTION

From the table behind the one where Marissa is working with Naeem, I can easily listen to their conversation without interrupting it. Marissa, a student teacher finishing her second semester in this 10th grade English class, is working with Naeem on a writing assignment that he has started but has apparently decided not to finish. Naeem's notebook is covered with intricate drawings and text that seem connected like a storyboard or a graphic novel, and the pockets are filled with half sheets of paper steeped in lyrics that he has composed during this and other classes. His backpack is unzipped enough to expose the laptop I saw him using during lunch to post a response to a comment someone left on his election-themed blog. As Marissa asks him about his work, the phone next to his notebook gives off a little buzz, and Naeem glances at it and smiles before texting a response while simultaneously explaining to Marissa that he just can't write any more; he has nothing left to say.

As a teacher educator who is supporting Marissa and also teaching her methods courses at the university, I am struck by the puzzle that Naeem presents. While students' motivation to write and their literacy identities have long been a part of our professional conversation about how to help all learners develop as readers and writers, Naeem highlights the myriad ways that students' rich abilities and interests can seem disconnected from the very school environments upon which we rely to honor and strengthen them. He has nothing left to say? In a "flat" world filled with multimedia and multimodal ways of expressing and creating information, Naeem's art, lyrics, and blog can be relegated to what Kylene Beers has called the "underground literacies" that appear to be undervalued in schools (2007). In this particular moment, I am left wondering how to help Marissa draw upon the rich data around her- in Naeem's notebook, in his blog, in his quick ability to multitask with conversations supported both by technology and oral language skills- to help him make connections across his in-school and out-of-school literacies. How can Marissa leverage Naeem's literacy strengths to help him achieve in school?

But the answers to these questions provide pieces for only a fraction of the puzzle that literacy teacher educators must grapple with in working to prepare educators for our future schools. The world is changing, and literacy is increasingly defined as a set of skills that is much broader than our historical focus on proficiency in reading, writing, and speaking. As scholars and policy makers have recently

C. Kosnik, J. Rowsell, P. Williamson, R. Simon and C. Beck (Eds.), Literacy Teacher Educators: Preparing Teachers for a Changing World, 1–4.

charged, new literacies include skills that provide students with the capacity to represent information and communicate effectively using many forms of text and for many audiences. In a knowledge-based economy, students must now be able to produce ideas rather than just consume them. A particular challenge is the pace of change itself- the abundance of new knowledge and the lightening speed of how new technologies are shaping the world in which we live. As Linda Darling-Hammond argues in *The Flat World and Education*, "the new mission of schools is to prepare students for products and problems that have not yet been identified, using technologies that have not yet been invented" (2010). For teacher educators, this new mission charges us to create opportunities for teacher candidates like Marissa to understand that her role as a literacy teacher is ever changing and evolving. To be effective, she needs to see herself as a student of the many ways that communication and the production of information are shaping what her students will need to know and be able to do to have equitable access to the world around them.

But is teacher education up to the challenge of preparing educators who can adapt to current literacy demands in order to support students who must learn skills that can ensure their success in the 21st century and beyond? Many would argue that it is not. Recent reports charge that much of what has come to be called traditional teacher education is overly theoretical and highly disconnected from the realities of the clinical settings where teachers actually teach. Student teachers report seeing little connection between what they are studying in their coursework and what they see enacted in schools. The knowledge base for teaching is still a contested territory, a fact that is particularly salient in literacy education given the plastic and rapidly evolving terrain of the field. Scholars in teacher education are increasingly called to defend our work.

A paradox of teacher education is that we must prepare teachers for the schools we have while at the same time we must prepare them for the schools we want. Though we must help our students become teachers who can understand the complexities of schools- who can enact the required curricula and meet professional standards- we also want them to see themselves as change agents who can make a difference in how school happens. This means that our courses must invite students to take stock of how their literacy instruction provides kids with access to learning opportunities- to understand the resources and the practices that are available- and then to envision how these can be adapted and enhanced to achieve the rich, rigorous literacy goals that we set for our youth.

A vision for substantive, relevant literacy teacher preparation is at the core of *Literacy Teacher Educators: Preparing Teachers for a Changing World*. This book explores the many central tensions in literacy education, as well as various instructional approaches for preparing teachers to be successful with a range of learners and in different national contexts. It also explores the identities and pedagogical thinking of teacher educators themselves in order to highlight the experiences and scholarship that inform the literacy practices that we enact in our teacher preparation classes.

In order to make the broad topic of literacy teacher education both accessible and practical, we have organized the book into three sections. The first section addresses current issues that are facing literacy teacher educators as well as scholarship that is shaping the field across national contexts. The chapters in this section explore notions of critical literacy and practices that strive for equity and social justice in literacy instruction, as well as the ways that literacy identities can be shaped by social constructs such as gender. The first section also attends to scholarship on the broadening definitions of literacy and our increasing attention to multiliteracies as a way of framing students' literacy assets within and across the contexts of schools and communities.

The second section of the book offers a rich description of literacy teacher preparation practices from a range of educators across national contexts in England, Australia, Canada, and the United States. These chapters home in on the particular approaches to engaging new teachers in key aspects of literacy instruction to highlight overarching themes in preparing teachers for a changing world. They also provide details regarding specific methods for the teaching of literacy practices, including the integration of coursework, scholarship, and fieldwork in various teacher education models. The second section is special in that the chapters offer a glimpse into the professional backgrounds of the literacy teacher educators who wrote them, making it possible to consider how their practice is shaped by both their experiences in schools and their research. Though hardly exhaustive, these diverse examples make it possible for readers to consider how various approaches to literacy instruction can facilitate different learning goals for particular contexts and students.

The book concludes with a discussion of a study that explores the identities, experiences, and dispositions of the literacy teacher educators themselves. The scholarship on who becomes literacy teacher educators and how they are prepared is scant, and we know little about the backgrounds and understandings of the faculty who are engaged in this incredibly complex work. This chapter reports findings from in depth interviews with 25 literacy teacher educators in order to feature common themes in how literacy teacher educators are made, as well as their view of the promises and pitfalls of their work.

This book, which combines both scholarship and practical information regarding the teaching and learning of literacy practice, will be useful to teacher educators from across disciplines as well as school and university administrators, policy makers, and literacy teachers in the field. Though it does not pretend to address each of the many challenges that literacy educators face in this rapidly evolving field, it unearths many of the central issues that underpin these challenges as well as tools that people can use to build stronger, purposeful practice in the preparation of new teachers. Naeem and the puzzles he poses can serve as a familiar touchstone for teachers who strive to understand the literacy challenges of our changing world. This book helps us look ahead to identify the problems and the solutions that can make a difference for our teachers and students in schools.

REFERENCES

Beers, K. (2007). The measure of our success. In K. Beers, R. Probst & L. Rief (Eds.), *Adolescent literacy: Turning promise into practice* (pp. 1–14). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *The flat world and education: How America's committment to equity will determine our future*. New York: Techers College Press.

AFFILIATION

Peter Williamson
University of San Francisco

SECTION 1

CURRENT ISSUES FACING LITERACY TEACHER EDUCATION

REBECCA ROGERS

CULTIVATING DIVERSITY THROUGH CRITICAL LITERACY IN TEACHER EDUCATION

HISTORY AND KEY ISSUES

Those of us who have the privilege and responsibility of teaching literacy teachers are charged with designing learning experiences that support their development of the knowledge, skills and dispositions needed to work confidently with culturally and linguistically diverse children and families, especially those from economically disadvantaged backgrounds. This charge has never been more pressing. Indeed, the United States is becoming increasingly diverse yet teachers continue to be white, middle class females. Over 80% of ethnically and linguistically diverse students live in poverty yet most of their teachers are mono-lingual, middle-class and have been raised in suburban and rural communities (Children's Defense Fund, 2005).

Professional organizations such as the National Council of Teachers of English, the International Reading Association and the National Association for the Education of Young Children have adopted position statements that respond to the challenges of preparing teachers for diverse school settings and stress the importance of valuing language and cultures. NAEYC's position, for example, is as follows:

> For the optimal development and learning of all children educators must accept the legitimacy of children's home language, respect (hold in high regard) and value (esteem, appreciate) the home culture, and promote and encourage the active involvement and support of all families, including extended and nontraditional family units (1995, p. 2)

Likewise, the professional organizations are very clear about the damaging effects of not valuing cultural and linguistic diversity. On the effects of losing a home language, NAEYC (1995) writes, "may result in the disruption of family communication patterns, which may lead to the loss of intergenerational wisdom; damage to individual and community esteem; and children's potential nonmastery of their home language or English" (p. 2).

Further, scholarship has demonstrated the way in which concerns over second language learners and cultural minorities' literacy development gets turned into a disability through ideologies of achievement and ability encoded in the special education referral and testing process (Dudley-Marling & Gurn, 2010; Gebhard, 2004; Rogers & Mancini, 2010). The over-representation of black and Latino in special education has been roundly criticized (e.g., Harry & Klingner, 2005;

C. Kosnik, J. Rowsell, P. Williamson, R. Simon and C. Beck (Eds.), Literacy Teacher Educators: Preparing Teachers for a Changing World, 7–20.

Losen & Orfield, 2002). Many children placed in special education have difficulties from a lack of experience with literacy materials that could be remediated with effective literacy instruction (Allington & McGill-Franzen, 1995). There are many consequences of the over-representation of minority children in special education, including inequity in teachers, curriculum and expectations for students in lower tracks (Collins, 2009; Oakes, 1985) and a high correlation between school failure, drop-out, and imprisonment (Losen & Orfield, 2002). Indeed, Meier, Stewart & England (1989) have argued that special education continues racial and linguistic segregation in schools achieving what is referred to as second-generation discrimination. Thus, difference continues to function as a "discursive tool for exercising white privilege and racism" (Blanchett, 2006, p. 24).

And, educators around the world—in North America, the UK, Australia, New Zealand and China have recommended that literacy instruction be linked to the cultural and linguistic practices that exist in children's home communities (e.g., Heath, 1983; Clay, 1991; Pahl & Rowsell, 2010; Shi-xu, 2007). Literacy teacher educators have responded by developing "culturally responsive," "multicultural," "anti-racist" and "critical literacy" practices.

By critical literacy I refer to those approaches to literacy instruction whose emphasis is on helping people develop agency so that they can accomplish goals they deem important and resist the coercive effects of literacy (Dozier, Johnston, & Rogers, 2006; Freire, 1973; Luke, 2012; Rogers, Mosley, & Kramer, 2009). My commitment to fostering critical literacy education and teacher agency can be found both in the teacher education classroom and in the community. In 2000, I co-founded (with Mary Ann Kramer) a grassroots teacher group called the Literacy for Social Justice Group. This teacher-led group includes educators across the lifespan who are committed to realizing social justice education in schools and communities (see the website for examples of workshops and events www.literacyforsocialjustice.com). This group provides a support network for educators to advocate for best practices, especially in the face of tightening educational reforms characteristic of neoliberal educational reforms (Rogers, Mosley & Folkes, 2009). Also in the spirit of public intellectualism and engaged scholarship, I serve as an elected school board member for a large urban school district and speak up on behalf of public education and educators (Rogers, 2012). In this chapter, I focus on fostering critical literacy education in the teacher education classroom but I join with others who advocate for the importance of crossing the boundaries between the university and community (Janks, 2009; Kinloch, 2012; Lipman, 2003; Morrell, 2007).

While critical literacy has been slow to find its way into teacher education in the US, it has been taken up for some time in Australia. The federally funded "Christie Report" (Christie et al., 1991) advocated for the inclusion of critical literacy as a core component of teacher education programs. While the proposal was not formally adopted, many teacher education programs in Australia feature components of critical literacy (Luke, 2000). There are reports of critical literacy in teacher education (e.g., Clarence-Fishman, 2001; Comber, Thomson, & Wells, 2001; Dozier et al., 2006;

Johnston, 2012; Leland, Harste, Jackson, & Youssef, 2001; Mosley, 2010; Rogers, in press; Souto-Manning, 2010; Wallace, 2001), but it is still very much in development and we know little about how teachers gain the pedagogical knowledge for critical literacy. In this chapter, I demonstrate the potential of critical literacy education to deepen awareness of power and language, cultivate the valuing of diversity, which in turn, supports teachers, as they develop culturally and linguistically diverse literacy pedagogies.

THE POWER OF LANGUAGE

Literacy teachers are the primary brokers of language in the classroom. Verbal and non-verbal modes of meaning are the tools through which meanings are made, communicated, understood and transformed. All of these tools create the contexts of the classroom, many of which are invisible to teachers and students. Howard (2006) likens the invisibility of white privilege to white people, to water to fish. The same is true for language, especially for the majority of the teaching force who are mono-lingual and raised in societies that privilege a dominant language. Imagine asking a teacher education student "What is your theory of language?" They might look at you in puzzlement. "Theory of language? Why would I need a theory of language?" But their actions in the classroom are governed by deeply wired ideas about language: it is neutral, autonomous, develops incrementally and should be accurate. We see this theory of language translated into practice when they focus on spelling instead of ideas, or the hyper-correction of miscues or pronunciations as a child is reading or talking, or when a child is referred for special education testing because of differences in their language development.

Cambourne (2002) points out that we seem to forget what we know about the "conditions of learning" when our focus shifts from language acquisition to print literacy development. When a young child says "go mommy store," the mother doesn't say "you didn't say that the right way." Rather, she accepts the approximation, understands the message and continues to immerse the child in communicative contexts. The shift away from focusing on communication, to correctness occurs at just about the time a child enters school. The problem with this is when a teacher describes Aleshea, a second language learner as "not knowing sight words in English," this language not only represents Aleshea but constructs her as a particular kind of learner, one who is deficient. If the teacher alters her description to focus on what Aleshea is proficient at we get a much different picture of who she is as a learner. "Aleshea can read and understand second grade level texts in Spanish. With support, she can identify a number of sight words in English." It is quite a different task to plan a lesson for a child who understands stories in Spanish than one who knows just a few sight words.

What we say about our students' learning has a great deal to do with the conditions that we set up for them as learners (Johnston, 2012). If we want students in our classes to learn, we must represent them as learners. This shift in emphasis changes the way we view students and our subsequent instructional actions. This is the view

of language that Michael Halliday espouses in his functional theory of language, embedded in systemic functional linguistics (SFL). SFL is oriented toward choice and privileges language users as agents making decisions about the social functions of their language use. This social semiotic theory operates on the understanding that meanings are always being invented and people have choices among representational systems from which to make meanings. Every utterance operates on three levels: textual (mode), interpersonal (tenor) and ideational (field). This theory of language is the foundation of critical literacy education.

Gee (2011) captures this relation between the form and function of language as "discourses" and "Discourses." "discourses" are the language bits that comprise communicative events. This includes the hard and soft structures of language—grammar, morphology, intonation and so on. But these structures do not exist independent of the social function of language (large D Discourse). Discourses include the ways of using, being, and representing language. Discourses draw on and construct larger meta-narratives—narratives about gender, race, and class, for instance. Discourses play many roles in the classroom. They sustain, build, resist or transform existing narratives and ideologies. The goal of critical literacy teaching is to draw students' attention to the ways in which discourses circulate, are constructed, and how they might design culturally and linguistically diverse pedagogies. On the role of building this critical language awareness, Janks (2000) writes:

> Critical language awareness emphasizes the fact that texts are constructed. Anything that has been constructed can be de-constructed. This unmaking or unpacking of the text increases our awareness of the choices that the writer or speaker has made. Every choice foregrounds what was selected and hides, silences or backgrounds what was not selected (p. 176).

One of the responsibilities of literacy teacher educators is to set up the conditions where teachers can become confident and competent with critical literacy education, their own and the students with whom they work.

APPROACHES TO CRITICAL LITERACY EDUCATION AND ASSOCIATED TOOLS THAT FOSTER CRITICAL LANGUAGE AWARENESS AND, IN TURN, CULTURALLY DIVERSE LITERACY TEACHING

The Conference on English Education (CEE), one of the professional organizations that have written position statements on the importance of valuing linguistic and cultural diversity, takes the commitment one step farther. CEE belief #6 focuses on "Critical Users of Language" and states, "all students need to be taught mainstream power codes and become critical users of language while also having their home and street codes honored." The focus is on reconciling the tension of recognizing and valuing primary language and culture and, at the same time, building knowledge and skills of the "code of power" which as the committee writes, "all language users have the right to be informed about and practiced in the dialect of the dominant

culture, also mytholgized as 'Standard English' … teachers need to foster critical examinations with their students of how particular codes came into power…" (p. 7). This inquiry into language and power is the foundation of critical literacy education.

When I set the stage for critical literacy in my teacher education classroom, I introduce three different approaches to critical literacy education: genre approaches, multiple literacy approaches and social justice approaches (Rogers, in press). This underscores the point that there is no one approach to critical literacy. Along the way, I have also found the dimensions of critical literacy set forth by Lewison, Leland & Harste (2007) very useful as well: disrupting the commonplace, focusing on the sociopolitical, examining multiple perspectives and taking action.

First, a genre approach to critical literacy focuses on the importance of students acquiring competence in the linguistic structures of dominant discourses through the analysis of the patterns of texts and the ways these structures carry out social functions. This tradition is influenced by the systemic linguistic theory of Halliday (1994) who points out that the grammatical aspects of texts can be traced to social and ideological functions in the world. Advocates of this approach argue for explicit instruction and direct access to genres of power (Cope, 1993; Cope & Kalantzis, 2000; Delpit & Kilgour Dowdy, 2002; Fairclough, 1992; Schaenen, 2010). Examples of this approach in practice include: the analysis of different advertisements for one product or different websites focused on a topic; reading and analyzing a biography of a person written by different authors; viewing and reading fractured fairytales represented in books or movies.

Another approach to critical literacy education is grounded in the concept of multiliteracies that sprang from the work of the New London Group (1996). The New London group called for a widening of the field of literacy studies to include those new forms of literacy made possible by digital technologies and globalized communication networks. They pointed out that new literacies should be used, critiqued, and studied. Teachers who embrace a multiple literacies approach to critical literacy education begin by inquiring into the literacies that exist in a learner's life and find ways to integrate these literacies into the curriculum (González, Moll, & Amanti, 2005; New London Group, 1996). Tools for learning about students' family and community resources might include: inquiring into family stories through interviews, documenting local literacies through community mapping or inviting parents and community members to be share their expertise (e.g., Marshall & Toohey, 2010; Pahl & Rowsell, 2010). Teachers using this approach also find ways to critique the production and interpretation of such texts. This is important because as Luke, O'Brien and Comber (1994) remind us, "left uninterrupted, everyday texts play major parts in building and reproducing social structures" (p. 113).

Third, a social justice approach to critical literacy is characterized by a "problem-posing, problem-solving" model of education that is rooted in dialogue between the teacher and learners. This approach seeks to move from critical analysis to social action and there is an explicit emphasis on working toward social justice (Comber et al., 2001; Silvers, Shorey & Craftton, 2010). Teachers who use this approach

ask: What issues genuinely motivate and energize my students? Using student issues to drive the curriculum is often a starting point with this approach. Comber, Thompson & Wells' (2001) developed a set of questions as the basis of this approach "What worries you?" "What do you like about your community?" "What do you want to change?" These questions provoke rich discussion around the issues that are interesting and motivating to students. From here, we can develop text sets that explicitly address social issues.

CRITICAL LITERACY AS A TOOL FOR FOSTERING DIVERSE PEDAGOGIES: A CASE EXAMPLE

This case example is drawn from a year-long teacher research project in our preservice literacy teacher education classroom (Rogers & Mosley, in press; Rogers & Mosley, 2010; Mosley & Rogers, 2011). The teacher education program was located at a university in St. Louis. MO, USA and followed a cohort model in which the students took courses together. The literacy courses were located at an urban elementary school in an African American community and included a practice teaching where the student teachers taught literacy to first and second grade students. The school was located in a district close to losing state accreditation and had adopted a scripted reading program that had all but eliminated culturally responsive education. Our class included fifteen students, fourteen of whom were European American. There was one African American woman enrolled in the class. Thirteen of the students were women. The students were diverse in terms of their geographic, religious, and socio-economic backgrounds. Melissa Mosley and myself were the teacher educators in the course. Like many of our students, we are white, speak English as our first language, and come from suburban communities. We have both participated in extensive anti-racism work.

In our teaching and research we pivoted between theories and practices of multicultural teaching (e.g., Banks, 1997), culturally relevant/responsive teaching (e.g., Ladson-Billings, 1994), and critical race/anti-racist teaching (e.g., Dei, 1996; Taylor, Gilborn, & Ladson-Billings, 2009). We integrated different approaches to critical literacy education throughout the course ((Rogers, in press; Rogers & Mosley, under contract).

We encouraged our students to elicit family stories and funds of knowledge from their students and use these as the basis for literacy instruction (Edwards, 1999; Gonzalez, Moll, & Amanti, 2005). This happened through the use of photographs and narratives told during the instructional time. Several of the teachers gave their students a disposable camera to take pictures of their family and community (Allen et al., 2002). The pictures were used as the basis for reading and writing. Other teachers used the "Comber prompts" (Comber et al., 2001) to generate dialogue, meaningful writing, and associated actions. We also asked our students to write their literacy autobiography. When we recognized that their autobiographies generally did not include an analysis of culture, power, and race we asked them to choose

three pieces of children's literature where they could locate themselves culturally and linguistically and revise their narratives.

We centralized inquiry into matters of language, identity, and power to cultivate critical literacy education. At times, this inquiry arose from a question or issue that surfaced in class. For instance, at one point we noticed many of our students were using the term "slang" to refer to African American Vernacular English (AAVE). This signaled to us the importance of spending time teaching about the history, culture, and linguistic background of AAVE. We accomplished this through mini-lectures in class, readings (Perry & Delpit, 1998; Wheeler & Swords, 2004) and student-led inquiry into language variety. And while we wanted our students to learn more about African American language and culture, we realized that this became a barrier to more deeply exploring their own racial and cultural positionings. Therefore, we launched an exploration into whiteness, white privilege, and anti-racism through readings, lectures, read-alouds, book clubs, group discussions and reflective essays. At other times, inquiry into language, power, and identity was built into the design of the course, as was the case with the book club that included themes of linguistic and cultural diversity such as *Noa's Ark: One Child's Voyage into Multiliteracy* (Schwartzer, 2001) and *Of Borders and Dreams* (Carger, 1996).

Inquiring Into Linguistic Diversity

Throughout the year, our intention was to link language to historical contexts, to situate language issues alongside concerns such as domination and conflict and to foreground how these matters are the concern of literacy teachers. Here, I focus on just one student-led inquiry into linguistic diversity that culminated in the formation of a language committee and writing a letter to Dr. Mary Clay, a researcher who developed the reading intervention *Reading Recovery* (Clay, 1994). For a complete description and analysis of this inquiry project, see Rogers & Mosley Wetzel (in press).

It is essential for literacy teachers to understand the difference between reading difficulties and linguistic differences. Too often, linguistic differences are translated into deficits (Artiles, Rueda, Salazar, & Higareda, 2005). One way we sensitized our students' attention to this issue was through our practice of taking, scoring and interpreting running records, an assessment technique in which the teacher documents a student's miscues and strategies while they are reading orally (Clay, 1993). During practice running records, one of us would simulate the reading behaviors of a student, as they had been recorded in a running record. The preservice teachers would take a running record of our oral reading, then analyze the miscues and determine an accuracy rate, self-correction rate, and plan for instruction. We emphasized the importance of referring to students' reading behaviors as miscues rather than errors, the former which values approximations. We modeled miscue analysis for the group, thinking aloud about the linguistic resources the student used

when they made a miscue. We would ask: Because children always strive to make meaning, what does this miscue tell us about how the child is making meaning?

One practice running record included examples of African American Vernacular English, the term we used to describe the syntactical structures and pronunciation patterns used by many of the African American students at the urban elementary school (Baugh, 1999; Rickford, 1999). During the miscue analysis, one of the teacher education students asked, "should linguistic variation be counted as an error in a running record?" Students argued they needed to know what resources students used when reading a book written in Standard English, to bridge AAVE to Standard English grammar and phonology. However, the question came up, if AAVE is a rule-governed language, is the use of that language ever an error? Further, if they did not record the linguistic resources their student did call on in their reading, were they ignoring their students' cultural and linguistic identities? Their discussion was energized. They had been reading about linguistic and cultural diversity in the literacy curriculum and we were pleased to see how they were wrestling with theory and practice. Rather than simply provide an answer to their question, we wanted them to think about the various perspectives on this issue and what this meant for representing children's literacy learning. In essence, we saw this as an opportunity to widen the space for critical literacy in our teacher education classroom.

We asked our students to sort through these questions in the context of the whole running record with colleagues at their tables. One group looked through a copy of Clay's (1993) *An Observation Survey* trying to find a passage that addressed linguistic diversity in assessments. As I listened to them grapple with the complexities of recording and analyzing linguistic diversity, I noted that this was an issue that we could ask Dr. Clay about. Lisa immediately responded, "We should write her a letter!"

Melissa and I encouraged their initiative and they invited their colleagues to join a "language committee" that would be charged with writing a letter to Marie Clay. We ended class by giving the students a question to respond to in writing for the following class. "What are your thoughts about recording and interpreting linguistic variations when you are taking a running record? Outline what you see as the major issues and how you would resolve this in our recording of oral reading…" Between classes, the language committee consulted with me about their work and did some additional reading in Clay's (1991) *Becoming Literate* where she discusses language diversity.

The committee gathered the responses from their colleagues, analyzed the documents for patterns and shared their analysis with the rest of the class. The class agreed that because the miscue was based on a student's primary language and did not obstruct meaning, then it should not be counted as an error. It should, however, be taken note of, so a teacher could learn more about their student's linguistic resources. And, use this knowledge to help students gain access to book language, or what Delpit (1995) refers to as the "codes of power" (p. 40). They also raised a number of

issues about the politics of representation, labeling students, code-switching and the importance of culture and language and identity.

When the language committee began working on the letter project outside of class time, it was clear to us that our students' interest in analyzing language and power was sparked. We could see how they were critically analyzing language—both how students' language should be represented and how teachers might represent language diversity in their assessments. The language committee wrote a letter to Dr. Marie Clay outlining their beliefs about language diversity and literacy learning and asking her how to account for language diversity in the running record.

Dr. Clay responded to our students. In her letter, she emphasized that a running record is not a test but a record of a child's reading behaviors. She pointed out that the child's reading may not match the written text for a number of reasons. For instance, the student may be learning English at the same time she is learning to read or because, drawing upon her oral language, her home dialect tells her to expect different words in the text from what is written. Dr. Clay cleverly concluded the letter by asking the students to decide what to do with her spelling 'errors' of the words 'behaviours' and 'judgement.'

We were pleased by how the preservice teachers claimed the space we made for critical literacy in our classroom. They generated many ideas cultivating diverse pedagogies, including: using literature, music and poetry that included language diversity; clearly establishing contexts for language use so that students could learn how to code-switch; engaging in contrastive analysis of languages; encouraging exploration and a love of language. As they inquired into linguistic diversity, they did so using critical literacy frameworks which, in turn, deepened their understanding and value of diversity. To return to the dimensions of critical literacy outlined by Lewison, Leland, and Harste (2007), they *disrupted the commonplace* by positioning themselves as inquirers and constructers of knowledge. They considered *multiple perspectives*, drawing on their classmates' thoughts to write a letter that was multi-vocal. They focused on the *sociopolitical issue* of language diversity and access to the codes of power. Finally, they *took action* by extending the conversation beyond their classroom space and writing to a leading expert in the field.

DISCUSSION

Many off us charged with teaching teachers have been faced with the nagging question, how will we prepare critical literacy teachers? And, what will these educational practices look like? In this chapter, I discussed the core tenets of critical literacy education: attention to language, power and inquiry. Throughout, I have argued that critical literacy education holds the potential to deepen our awareness of language and power and cultivate the valuing of diversity which, in turn, supports the development of culturally and linguistically diverse pedagogies. And because language is never neutral, teachers and teacher educators can work

to examine the material and discursive structures of social practices so that we might be more responsive and responsible to our students, their families and our communities.

Where will we find the time? Teacher educators, like pre-kindergarten-12 teachers, find constraints on their time and content of their teaching. It is important to reiterate that critical literacy is a stance toward texts, discourses, and social practices, not a new approach. In the example I provided, when students in this teacher education class posed a genuine question that we knew would be the basis for inquiry and action, we invited them to go deeply in their inquiry around linguistic diversity. The goal was to provide a model that they would, in turn, use with their students. Indeed, it has been well established that it may be teachers' perceptions and attitudes toward language diversity that is the most detrimental in learning to read (Compton-Lilly, 2005; Solorzano & Yossi, 2001). The intention was to provide the preservice teachers with multiple opportunities to reflect on their assumptions about language diversity and build new knowledge. Along the way, we built powerful literacies with the students with whom they were responsible for teaching.

As teacher educators, we have to actively seek out the diversity that exists within seemingly homogenous groups of students. Bringing these cultural and linguistic resources into the learning space provides a powerful model of practices. The teacher education students came to this classroom with histories as discourse analysts—they just don't know that is what they are doing. Drawing their attention to these practices is useful. For example, how they read Internet texts looking for the fine print or to compare information across sites. They know when they are being duped by and with language. The role of critical literacy teacher educators is to put this inclination to critically analyze discourses to work in literacy education. Creating space for them to do this kind of intellectual work may be just the kind of intellectual nudge they need to do the same in their own classrooms.

REFERENCES

Allen, J., Fabregas, V., Hankins, K., Hull, G., Labbo, L., & Lawson, H. (2002). PhOLKS lore: Learning from photographs, families and children. *Language Arts Journal, 79*(4), 312–322.

Allington, R. & McGill-Franzen, A. (1995). Placing children at risk: Schools respond to reading programs. In R. Donmoyer & R. Kos (Eds.), *At-risk students: Portraits, policies, programs and practices*. (pp. 197–217). New York: State University of New York Press.

Artiles, A.J., Rueda, R., Salazar, J., & Higareda, I. (2005). Within-group diversity in minority disproportionate representation. *Exceptional Children, 71*, 283–300.

Baugh, J. (1999). *Out of the mouths of slaves*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Banks, J.A. (1997). *Educating citizens in a multicultural society*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Blanchett, W. (2006). Disproportionate representation of African American students in special education: Acknowledging the role of white privilege and racism. *Educational Researcher, 35*(6), 24–28.

Cambourne, B. (2002). The conditions of learning: Is learning natural? *The Reading Teacher, 55*(8), 758–762.

Carger, C. (1996). *Of borders and dreams*. NY: Teachers College Press.

Children's Defense Fund (2005). State of America's Children 2005 Report. Downloaded on April 15, 2012 from http://www.childrensdefense.org/

Christie, F., Devlin, B., Freebody, P., Luke, A., Martin, J., Threadgold, T., et al. (1991). *Teaching English literacy: A project of national significance on the pre-service training of teachers*. Canberra & Darwin: Department of Employment, Education and Training & Northern Territory University Faculty of Education.

Clarence-Fishman, J. (2001). Responding to academic discourse: Developing critical literacy at a South African university. In B. Comber & A. Simpson (Eds.), *Negotiating critical literacies in classrooms* (pp. 273–286). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Clay, M.M. (1991). *Becoming literate: The construction of inner control*. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

Clay, M.M. (1993). *An observation survey of early literacy achievement*. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

Clay, M.M. (1994). *Reading recovery: A guide book for teachers in training*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Comber, B., Thomson, P., & Wells, M. (2001). Critical literacy finds a "place": Writing and social action in a low-income Australian grade 2/3 classroom. *Elementary School Journal, 101*(4), 451–464.

Compton-Lilly, C. (2005). Nuances of error: Considerations relevant to African American Vernacular English and learning to read. *Literacy Teaching and Learning, 10*(1), 43–58.

Collins, J. (2009). Social reproduction in classrooms and schools. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 38*, 33–48.

Cope, B. (1993). *The powers of literacy: A genre approach to teaching writing*. Pittsburg, PA: University of Pittsburg Press.

Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2000). *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures*. London: Routledge.

Council on English Education. Supporting linguistically and culturally diverse learners in English Education. Position statement. Accessed 2/1/12 from http://www.ncte.org/positions/diversity.

Dei, G.J.S. (1996). *Anti-racism education: Theory and practice*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Delpit, L., & Kilgour Dowdy, J. (2002). *The skin that we speak: Thoughts on language and culture in the classroom*. NY: New Press.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: The New Press.

Dozier, C., Johnston, P., & Rogers, R. (2006). *Critical literacy/critical teaching: Tools for preparing responsive teachers*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dudley-Marling, C. & Gurn, A. (Eds.) (2010). *Deconstructing the normal curve (and Reconstructing the education for students with disabilities*). NY: Peter Lang Press.

Edwards, P.A. (1999). *A path to follow: Learning to listen to parents*. NY: Heinemann.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Critical language awareness*. Harlow, Essex: Longman.

Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (new rev. 20th-Anniversary ed.). New York: Continuum.

Gebhard, M. (2004). Fast capitalism, school reform, and second language literacy practices. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(ii), 245–265.

Gee, J. (4th Edition) (2011). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourse*. NY, NY: Routledge.

González, N., Moll, L.C., & Amanti, C. (Eds.) (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households and classrooms*. Malwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Halliday, M. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). London: Edward Arnold.

Harry, B. & Klingner, J. (2005). *Why are so many minority students in special education? Understanding race and disability in schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

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

Howard, G. (2006). *We can't teach what we don't know*. NY, NY: Teachers College Press.

Janks, H. (2009). *Literacy and power*. NY: Routledge.

Janks, H. (2000). Domination, access, diversity and design: a synthesis model for critical literacy education. *Educational Review, 52*(2), 175–186.

Johnston, P. (2012). *Opening minds: Using language to change lives*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.

Kinloch, V. (2012). *Crossing boundaries: Teaching and learning with urban youth*. NY: Teachers College Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Leland, C., Harste, J., Jackson, C., & Youssef, O. (2001). Making teacher education critical. *National Reading Conference Yearbook, 50*, 382–393.
Lewison, M., Leland, C., & Harste, J. (2007). *Creating critical classrooms: K-8 reading and writing with an edge*. New York: Taylor & Francis Group.
Lipman, P. (2003). *High stakes education: Inequality, globalization and urban school reform*. NY: Routledge.
Losen, D. & Orfield, G. (2002). *Racial inequality in special education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Luke, A. (2000). Critical literacy in Australia: A matter of context and standpoint. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult and Literacy, 43*(5), 448–461.
Luke, A. (2012). Critical literacy: Foundational notes. *Theory into practice, 51*(1), 4–11.
Luke, A., O'Brien, J., & Comber, B. (1994). Making community texts objects of study. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy, 17*(2), 139–149.
Marshall, E. & Toohey, K. (2010). Representing family: Community funds of knowledge, bilingualism, and multimodality. *Harvard Educational Review, 80*(2), 221–241.
Meier, K., Stewart, J. & and England, R. (1989). *Race, class and education: The politics of second generation discrimination.* Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
Morrell, E. (2007). *Critical literacy and urban youth: Pedagogy of assent, dissent and liberation.* NY: Routledge.
Mosley, M. (2010). Becoming a literacy teacher: Approximations in critical literacy teaching. *Teaching Education, 21*(4), 403–426.
Mosley, M. & Rogers, R. (2011). Inhabiting the "tragic gap": Preservice teachers practicing racial literacy. *Teaching Education*, *22*(3), 303–324.
National Association for the Education of Young Children (1995). Responding to linguistic and cultural diversity recommendations for effective early childhood education: A position statement of the National Association for the Education of Young Children. Accessed 2/1/12 http://www.naeyc.org/positionstatements/linguistic
New London Group, (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*, 60–92.
Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality.* New Haven: Yale University Press.
Pahl, K. & Rowsell, J. (2010). *Artifactual literacies: Every object tells a story*. NY, NY: Teachers College Press.
Perry, T., & Delpit, L.D. (1998). *The real ebonics debate: Power, language, and the education of African-American children*. Boston: Beacon Press.
Purcell-Gates, V., & Waterman, R. (2000). *Now we read, we see, we speak: Portrait of literacy development in an adult Freirian-based class*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Rickford, J. (1999). *African American vernacular English: Features, evolution, educational implications*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
Rogers, R. & Mosley, M. (under contract). *Designing critical literacy education through critical discourse analysis: Pedagogical and research tools for teacher-researchers.* NY: Routledge.
Rogers, R. (in press). Coaching teachers as they design critical literacy practices. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*.
Rogers, R. (2012). In the aftermath of a state takeover of a school district: A case study in public consultative discourse analysis. *Urban Education*, 1–29.
Rogers, R., Mosley, M., & Kramer, M.A. (2009). *Designing socially just communities: critical literacy education across a lifespan*. NY: Routledge.
Rogers, R., Mosley, M., & Folkes, A. (2009). Standing up to neoliberalism with critical literacy. *Language Arts, 87*(2), 127–138.
Rogers, R., & Mosley, M. (2008). A critical discourse analysis of racial literacy in teacher education. *Linguistics and Education, 19*, 107–131.
Rogers, R. & Mancini, M. (2010). "Requires medicine to progress academically": A critical discourse analysis of the intersections of IDEA, DSM-IV and an IEP. In C. Dudley-Marling & A. Gurn (Eds.) *Deconstructing the Normal Curve (and Reconstructing the Education for Students with Disabilities)*, (pp. 87–103). NY: Peter Lang Press.

Schaenen, I. (2010). "Genre means...": A critical discourse analysis of fourth grade talk about genre. *Critical Inquiry into Language Studies, 7*(1), 28–53.
Schwartzer, D. (2001). *Noa's ark: One child's voyage into multiliteracy*. New York: Heinemann.
Shi-xu (2007). *Discourse as cultural struggle*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
Silvers, P., Shorey, M., Crafton, L. (2010). Critical literacy in a multiliteracies primary grade classroom: The Hurricane Group. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 10*(4), 379–409.
Solorzano, D.G., & Yossi, T.J. (2001). From racial stereotyping and deficit discourse toward a critical race theory in teacher education. *Multicultural Education, 9*(1), 2–8.
Souto-Manning, M. (2010). Playing with power and privilege: Theatre games in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*, 997–1007.
Taylor, E., Gilborn, D., & Ladson-Billings, G. (2009). *Foundations of critical race theory in education*. NY: Routledge.
Van Sluys, K., Lewison, M., & Flint, A.S. (2006). Researching critical literacy: A critical study of analysis of classroom discourse. *Journal of Literacy Research, 38*(2), 197–233.
Wallace, C. (2001). Critical literacy in the second language classroom: Power and control. In B. Comber & A. Simpson (Eds.), *Negotiating critical literacies in classrooms* (pp. 233–254). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Wheeler, R., & Swords, R. (2004). Codeswitching: Tools of language and culture transform the dialectically diverse classroom. *Language Arts, 81*(6), 326–344.

AFFILIATION

Rebecca Rogers
University of Missouri-St. Louis

DAVID BOOTH

LITERACY EDUCATION AND GENDER: WHICH BOYS? WHICH GIRLS?

INTRODUCTION

When I began researching material in literacy and gender several years ago (Booth, 2002), I was intrigued with the dozens of books and research articles documenting issues in male culture and in raising and schooling boys. Government reports, education journals, and books by authors with differing viewpoints have continued to appear on page and online; some emphasize biological differences in males and females; others take a socio-constructivist approach; others want to create boy-friendly environments; still others struggle to promote the literary canon (Elliott-Johns & Booth, 2009). As teacher educators, we will need to consider these concerns, and to develop programs and resources for teachers who will be helping boys and girls take control of their literacy lives.

We will want to help student teachers uncover many of the assumptions and stereotypes about how boys and girls cope. If we believe that all students should have access to literacy proficiency, we need to ensure that both boys and girls see themselves as readers and writers who can handle the requirements with the variety of literacy texts, on page and on screen of interpreting and constructing a variety of text forms and modes.

As teacher educators responding to new studies and initiatives promoting programs for supporting boys' literacy proficiency, we don't want to generate or fuel new problems for girls. The education of boys is closely connected to the education of girls, and education philosophies and policies on gender will directly influence both (Elliott-Johns & Booth, 2009). As well, there are diverse opinions about the origin and even the nature of the problems that we find inside such a discussion. We will need to move our student teachers forward into understanding the dynamics of how boys and girls construct their gendered literacy lives so that educational change benefits all students.

We know that no single category includes all boys or all girls. We don't want to compress all boys' literacy behaviors, tastes and attitudes into one single frame, but rather recognize the diversity among groups of boys. But as we look at studies and reports that examine boys and girls and their learning styles and special interests, their growth patterns and their stages of intellectual development, we do notice differences, not in all boys or in all girls, but enough of them to cause us to reflect about our demands on their young lives (Brozo, 2010).

C. Kosnik, J. Rowsell, P. Williamson, R. Simon and C. Beck (Eds.), Literacy Teacher Educators: Preparing Teachers for a Changing World, 21–34.

There are definite issues with the ways in which many boys view themselves as literate beings, with how they approach the acts of reading and writing, and with how they respond to assessments of their skills (Rowe & Rowe, 2006). Teachers who work in classrooms with many more boys than girls, or who teach single-gender classes, often express their concerns about differences in interests, abilities and learning styles, and the faltering boys' test scores internationally have opened useful discussions on these issues of literacy and gender that can inform our professional interactions.

RESEARCH IN GENDER AND LITERACY ATTAINMENT

Formal assessment results are most often used as the reason for implementing strategic changes in classroom pedagogy, as schools, districts, provinces, and states attempt to create initiatives for increasing achievement results. Previously, research conducted on gender and education focused on the issues of females (Weaver-Hightower, 2003). Studies had shown that females were disadvantaged relative to males as part of the hidden curriculum implicitly taught to students, and often overlooked by educators (Benevides, 2010). Traditionally, males have outperformed females in science and mathematics but this gap is gradually narrowing, and more women than men are attending university.

During the past ten years, there has been a great deal of assessment, research, and critical examination of the issue of boys' literacy attainment in Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand, and there is growing awareness in the United States. Much documentation has been carried out by government departments/ministries, universities, researchers, educators and authors specializing in the field of gender and literacy (Booth, Elliot-Johns & Bruce, 2010). In actuality, this concern with the boys' lagging literacy attainment has been going on for over thirty-five years (National Assessment of Literacy Progress NAEP, 2012), also revealing that the literacy gap grows as boys continue through school.

Today, educators are faced with the challenge of teaching an extremely complex curriculum and preparing students to be life-long learners who will become engaged, literate, members of society. As in other jurisdictions, the Ministry of Education for Ontario has implemented a system of standards-based education and province-wide testing in an effort to increase student achievement, and differences in literacy scores between boys and girls from these standardized tests have caused school districts to focus on ways to implement change.

The international research agency, PISA (PISA, 2009) confirmed a significant gender gap in reading and writing in all participating countries, with girls performing significantly better than boys on reading and writing tests (*PISA Executive Summary*). The 2010 *State of Learning in Canada: No Time for Complacency* report found that for 2000, 2003 and 2006, girls score on average 32 points higher than boys in reading, and that boys have more difficulties in language and learning, and 11% more female students than males met the expected level in writing. In Ontario over the last

decade, the Education Quality and Accountability Office (EQAO 2011) Literacy Test Scores for grade 3 revealed that boys scored lower (for reading and writing respectively) than girls. For grade 6, scores were better, but boys still scored lower.

Interpreting the Assessment Data

Schools are implementing different strategies to improve the literacy performance of students, and while scores have improved for both girls and boys, girls continue to outperform boys on standardized assessment procedures. The gender gap remains but is stabilizing after widening for a short period. However, many boys achieve extremely well in all areas of literacy, while some girls underachieve, and in many schools. Teachers will need to interpret the data and explore reasons for differences in gender and achievement (Martino, 2008). For example, poverty still appears to be the biggest obstacle to literacy achievement (National Literacy Trust, 2011).

Fortunately, we can benefit from the educational reforms that grew from the changes associated with girls: we can apply those principles of gender equity to the educational needs of boys, even though in many ways, that very system of schooling may have formerly marginalized girls and privileged some boys. Teachers will need to recognize gender differences and know how to respond appropriately to diversities. Not all boys are failing reading tests, doing less well than girls, or 'hate' to read. "It is important to ask which boys in order to avoid a 'one-size fits all' approach to instruction" (Booth, Elliott-Johns, & Bruce, 2010, p. 7).

WHICH BOYS, WHICH GIRLS?

How do individuals acquire gender? Very young children notice and respond to visible differences in boys and girls, and these gender differences will be fundamental to their lives and how they will interact in society (Dietze & Kasin, 2012). Nature and nurture have become catch words, but how the brain thinks, genes, hormones, how the unconscious works, the affective and emotional factors, linguistics, the social, economic and cultural structures surrounding the child—all of these factors will contribute to the child's perception of identity and gender. Authors such as Michael Gurian (2006), Michael Reist (2011), Steve Biddulph (2004) and Leonard Sax (2009) have written widely on boy-girl differences, and are advocates for supporting school success for boys by creating *boy-friendly* environments. However, in the nature versus nurture debate, William Saletan (2011) comments that:

> the word *hardwired* is a misleading metaphor for explaining the brain. Brains, unlike computers, are constantly altered by experience. So while scans may show differences between men's and women's brains, that doesn't prove the differences are innate. So, yes, hormones influence how we think. But we, in turn, can influence our hormones. (http://www.slate.com/articles/health_and_science/human_nature/2011/11/)

Susan Gilbert (2000) says, "Biological differences may endow boys and girls with different strengths and weaknesses to start with, but experience shows they don't close doors. Boys and girls achieve the same overall scores on several different intelligence tests. It is estimated that a child's general IQ is 30 percent to 40 percent inherited genetics. "The remainder is shaped by the quality of life experiences" (p. 112). And Eliot (2010) claims that there is plenty of plasticity in every child's brain to nudge them in either the empathetic or assertive direction" (p. 294).

At school entry, most girls are ahead of boys in their verbal skills, and in phonological development, so their transition to reading and writing, supported by the development of their fine motor skills, gives them an advantage over many boys. Boys appear more frequently in special education classes, or drop out more often, and are less likely to become university students. Males are more likely to have a reading disability, and are twice as likely to have a learning disability (Bainbridge & Heydon, 2013). Eighty percent of autistic children are male; there are two boys diagnosed as dyslexic for each girl; boys are twice as likely to be diagnosed with ADHD as girls, and 5 to 1 are prescribed Ritalin. Boys are more likely than girls to attend special schools, and boys are four times as likely as girls to be identified as having a behavioral, emotional, or social difficulty (Rutter et al., 2004). Interestingly, females are often asked fewer complex questions, and may receive less constructive feedback. Girls may be better at writing tests, or at understanding how tests work. More girls are selected for enrichment programs in elementary schools, but fewer remain in those programs in secondary schools. There are problems for boys related to motivation, lack of engagement, or frustration with extended reading or rewriting. Enjoyment of reading tends to have lessened, especially among boys, signaling the challenge for schools to engage students in reading activities that they find relevant and interesting (OECD, PISA 2011). On average across the participating countries, the percentage of students who said they read for enjoyment every day fell from 69% in 2000 to 64% in 2009. However, the term "reading" may centre mainly on fictional narratives, omitting the variety of other texts that many boys are actually reading.

To help us consider students' behaviors and attitudes, Smith and Wilhelm (2002) have summarized the differences educators have noted concerning boys and girls:

- Boys take longer to learn to read than girls;
- Boys read less than girls, and the larger the gap in reading time, the larger the gap on reading test-scores in high school;
- Girls tend to comprehend narrative texts and most expository texts significantly better than boys do;
- Boys tend to be better at information retrieval and work-related literacy task than many girls;
- Boys generally provide lower estimations of their reading abilities than girls do;
- Boys value reading as an activity less than girls;
- Boys have much less interest in leisure reading and are far more likely to read for utilitarian purposes than girls;

- Boys spend less time reading and express less enthusiasm for reading than girls, defining reading as solitary, nonsocial behaviour;
- Boys increasingly consider themselves to be 'non-readers' as they get older; very few designate themselves as such early in their schooling, but nearly 50 percent make that designation by high school.

(p.10–11)

> Most likely, boys start out with slightly less mature circuits for processing words, and language experience widens this gap as boys and girls start paying attention to different features of their environment. This is all the more reason to talk, read and sing a lot to them, to perhaps lengthen those dendrites and stimulate their left hemispheres in a way that girls' brains may seek out more on their own (Eliot, 2010, p. 189).

There also may be stereotypical expectations held by many parents, teachers, and society at large, that boys are stronger in mathematics and sciences and girls in the arts and humanities. However, in *Pink Brain, Blue Brain*, neuroscientist Lise Eliot (2010) argues against stereotypes, claiming that boys are not better at math, but excel at certain types of spatial reasoning, and that girls, rather than being normally empathetic, are allowed to express their feelings more than boys.

SUPPORTIVE SCHOOL STRUCTURES

What it means to be a boy or a girl in school can depend to a large degree upon the school's culture or the classroom's subculture. Schools can and do influence gender differences in academic achievement. The literacy curriculum may more closely align with the reading attitudes and interests of girls than boys, and many boys feel their reading preferences are not valued in the school-defined literacy environment (Tompkins et al., 2011). Even though programs incorporate masculine texts that may reinforce traditional gender patterns, many boys become alienated from these resources, and see literacy endeavours as valuing female knowledge and behaviors over their interests (Elliott-Johns & Booth, 2009).

If schools encourage a narrow understanding of what masculine behavior should resemble, then that will have an impact on how boys see themselves and how they are seen by others of both sexes. So much of what boys read, how they respond in public, how they capture their thoughts and feelings in writing, is determined by the unwritten but real expectations of school life (Newkirk, 2002).

Many boys and girls have different types of school experiences, such as teachers requiring and rewarding different kinds of behavior from girls and from boys, and, of course, from different boys. For example, some boys may receive more teacher attention than girls, much of it negative, and boys are often disciplined more harshly for the same misbehaviors.

Some researchers feel that the present focus on the boys' agenda is short term and essentialist (Martino & Kehler, 2007), perpetuating conventional masculine

stereotypes rather than working toward a diversity and multiplicity of gender constructions' (Younger, 2007). They want schools to lead a movement to alter the dominant versions of masculinity in our society, to open up different and multiple forms of behaviors for boys to consider.

However, in the research report *Raising Boys' Achievements* (Younger & Warrington, 2005), the authors point out that

> there are typical patterns of behaviour to which many boys conform, and that although boys are not an undifferentiated group, there are broad similarities within subgroups which allow valid generalizations to be made, and if similar groups of boys are compared with similar groups of girls, there is evidence of lower levels of attainment by boys (p. 19).

The boys and girls student teachers will meet in their classrooms come with different life experiences, knowledge, and sets of skills. They may also be at different developmental stages. We do note, however, patterns common to many boys' and girls' behaviors. Not surprising, the students themselves share clear definitions of what a boy or a girl is at very early ages. As well, many girls and boys have grown to prefer different subject areas and different learning strategies. In literacy teaching, these factors may cause us to re-evaluate our programs so that more boys will view language arts activities as useful or worthwhile. We will need to develop literacy programs that provide for different interests and include strategies that appeal to a variety of learners.

What are the factors that appear to influence literacy achievement in boys and how will classroom teachers address them? As educators, we do want teachers to work toward equity in our classrooms: acquire resources that are bias-free, use inclusive or gender-neutral language, and organize activities that welcome the strengths of different individuals (Hammett and Sanford, 2008). Boys and girls need to develop literacy behaviors and skills, but they also need to understand the relationship between gender and how they will read, write and respond. We will need to help teachers to identify the diversity within groups of girls and boys, to highlight multiple forms of literacy and literate practice, and to value different gendered behaviors.

READING INSTRUCTION AND GENDER

The noted educator James Moffett (1975) said nearly forty years ago that we need to make the solitary acts of reading and writing socially constructed events if we want to promote literacy development in young people, and I now add, especially for boys. The "peer group imperative" demonstrated every day may be our greatest classroom asset. While many boys prefer to read information books and girls read more fiction, classroom programs can alter these behaviors when teachers incorporate literature circles and inquiry projects using different themes and resources, on page and online, that can support appropriate choices by girls and boys.

Redefining Literacy

Today, as educators, we have come to understand that there are multiple literacies: we recognize the variety of ways to make shared meaning in our lives- language, of course, (both oral and written), music, art, dance, and all the symbol systems (Baker, 2010). For young people today, learning will require opportunities to explore meaning-making with many of these forms, and in new combinations of them, such as the visual text literacies found in their electronic, computer-filled worlds. There is not one definition of *literacy* since literacy practices are multiple and shift, based on the context, speaker, text, and the function of the literacy event. (e.g., doing a Google search).

Even our definition of the term *text* has gone beyond the traditional acts of reading and writing using an alphabetic code or symbol system, to include digital technology, images, sounds, and oral discourse. Now we refer to a text as a medium with which we make meaning (an audio book, a speech, a magazine, a painting, a film, a computer screen, narratives, information, lists, opinions, persuasive editorials, poetry, songs, scripts, instructions and procedures, graphic texts, etc.).

Our definitions of reading and reading instruction are changing rapidly. A multitude of literacy forms and formats fill the lives of our students. Now we have youngsters at all levels working with word processors, chat lines, blogs, emails, text messages, web searches, Photoshop, and so on. And all of these activities are literacy events. Boys and girls are reading, and especially writing, more than ever. But we need to consider the quality of the literacy events they are engaging in, the kinds of learning processes they are exploring, and what language options they may be minimizing, or even missing. We can be plugged-in at times, and still gather together and sit in a circle, to listen to a tale 2,000 years old.

Martino (2001) suggests that boys may be engaging in literate practices outside school that are not reflected in their poor literacy test results, and that "the boys may be advantaged with electronic forms of literate practice useful in the changing post-industrial labour market" (p. 23). Tapscott, in *Grown up Digital* (2009), strengthens this argument.

Current research supporting the use of computers in the classroom has been overwhelmingly optimistic. Many students find that the computer and hand-held devices offer support for reading, writing and researching, and boys often develop a more positive approach to literacy activities. One of technology's great appeals is that it is intrinsically motivating, and students have a great deal of autonomy in their investigations. We need to be aware that computer use may affect development in areas that boys should and need to cultivate, such as collaborative learning and creating a meta-awareness of texts they read.

It is important to note that girls and boys may come to technology in different ways. Although girls have narrowed the gender gaps in math and science, technology remains largely dominated by boys. Girls consistently rate themselves lower than boys on computer ability, while boys exhibit higher self-confidence and a more positive attitude about computers than girls do. Boys use computers outside of

school more often than girls (Hammett & Sandford, 2008). Just as many boys prefer resources (e.g., books, magazines, websites, and so on.) that favor facts over fiction, they respond to the factual and multimodal (written, image, sound, animation) nature of the Internet.

> It is evident that boys can read, but are selective in what they read; they use reading strategies that they have adopted in school and have morphed them to help make sense of new literacies that appeal to them. (Sanford, 2002 p. 25)

Schools need to recognize and value the types of reading that many boys are engaged in and provide links between school and 'socially oriented' reading, such as including graphic novels and technologically-based texts in their literacy programs. Conversely, teachers need to include more technical and factual reading for girls to prepare them for their future lives. If educators incorporate popular and contemporary texts that interest young people through the content and style, and if they develop their literacy strategies, students may approach and participate in the reading of a wider variety and complexity of texts, online and on screen.

GENDER AND WRITING PROFICIENCY

Understanding the gendered nature of some writing behaviors offers new hope for more effective teaching and learning, but only if we better understand what literacy looks like for many boys and girls and how our classroom practices relate to what they are (or are not) learning. Spence (2008) wants preservice and in-service teachers to learn about creating classroom environments for writing, with effective instructional frameworks and authentic pedagogy with diversity as a focus.

In a special issue of the *Journal of Writing Research* (Stagg Peterson and Parr, 2012) devoted to gender and writing, several issues were synthesized from decades of research on gender patterns in what and how students write. While the impetus for much of the research was generated by gender disparities in large-scale assessments of writing, the researchers focused on the multiple ways that gender can be negotiated in the writing classroom. The insights from the articles can help us understand the issues affecting the writing behaviors of girls and boys, and support changes in our practice. The authors explore the socio-cultural factors that can influence gender differences in student writing, the degree of anxiety associated with the process of writing, the relationship between self-worth and writing, how girls are learning at an earlier stage than boys to develop their transcription skills, and how boys tended to adopt a *report talk* style while girls tended to adopt a *rapport talk* style, speaking at length of human actions, intentions and feelings.

As well, we will need to recognize that the writing content for many boys and girls often differs, as Elliot and Woloshyn (2013) report:

> In general, boys prefer to write about adventures and events beyond their immediate experiences. They tend to produce action-based compositions

> (with or without violence) with main characters who often act alone. Their writings usually contain few female characters ... who assume passive roles (Anderson, 2003, Newkirk, 2000). Girls prefer writing about events within their experiences, including interactions with friends and family. Their work is more likely to be social in nature, with characters who work collaboratively (Anderson 2003 p. 260).

Since many boys need help and motivation in planning, revising, and editing their written work, we can employ other types of texts besides personal narrative for them to explore, opening up their familiarity with the whole world of written forms (Jones, 2012). We will need to help them to develop writing topics that matter, and to find authentic reasons for having boys engage in written activities. We can include technological support, such as composing on computers, using voice-recognition software, as well as visual templates- diagrams such as story boards, graphic organizers and mind mapping tools for organizing, drafting and revision.

We can also make better connections between writing and the curriculum we teach: science and social studies offer opportunities for representing students' knowledge and questions about the issues they are exploring. Many boys can derive respect as writers from their peers as they work with forms and formats often ignored in the traditional writers' workshop.

SUPPORTING DIFFERENTIATED LITERACY INSTRUCTION AS TEACHER EDUCATORS

As teacher educators, we can establish a set of criteria drawn from research and practice that promotes equity in classrooms, recognizes diversities among boys and among girls, and works toward an awareness of the implications of gender in literacy education.

Encourage the Development of School Communities

With our student teachers, we can promote the importance of establishing a learning community, where both boys and girls can participate in the on-going literacy life of the classroom, where they come to value reading and writing in all its forms and formats, where they begin to support one another in developing the attitudes and strategies required as lifelong learners, and where teachers model and demonstrate significant types of literacy activities.

Many school districts are implementing pilot projects in organizing single-gender schools, classrooms or subjects, and many teachers, parents, and students support this attempt at structuring these environments for increasing achievement (Demaske, 2010). Some critics call these attempts *band-aid* solutions (Eliot, 2010), but for some boys and girls, and their parents and teachers, this approach appears to support learning: "Boys and girls may benefit by engaging, but not exclusively,

in some single-sex learning and recreational activities" (Demers and Bennett, 2007, p. 7). However, as Eliot states, "co-ed schools need to remove their neutral blinders and accept that gender is an important basis of children's individual needs" (2010, p. 213). Therefore we will want to discover with our new teachers ways of ensuring that boys have male literacy models in their lives, so that they will associate reading and writing activities with other boys and male adults (Spence, 2008).

Recognize that Every Child Matters as a Learner

We will want to promote an understanding of and an appreciation for the developing characteristics and behaviors of individual boys and girls in a variety of literacy situations, and assist student teachers in how to recognize the effect of gender and social issues on literacy lives of their students. Each child's response to a text will be unique for a variety of reasons: social experience, gender, cultural connections, peer group, and teacher expectations, personal interpretations of words and expressions, knowledge of strategies, relationships with others, and a critical understanding of the author's message. ELL students will require continual support, building on and incorporating their first-language literacy backgrounds (Reichert, Hawley & Tyre, 2011).

We can feature and promote strategies that will help our student teachers provide organizational support for boys in difficulty with their schoolwork, such as daily planners or electronic organizers, and share methods for helping them in breaking down large tasks and projects into smaller components with micro deadlines, as well as offering opportunities for supportive feedback during conferences.

Provide an Enriched Environment

We will need to discuss and offer resources for helping student teachers in creating classroom climates that support both boys and girls. Smith and Wilhelm (2002) suggest we look carefully at the "…individual differences, variety, and plurality that make diversity a strength of our classrooms" (p. 184), rather than identifying achievements and needs only through test scores and statistical averages in which those differences quickly become lost. We can help student teachers locate resources, both in print and online, for all types of readers, from beginning readers to gifted, mature readers, and for readers with different language and cultural backgrounds and interests. For example, the support document *Me Read? And How!* (Ontario Ministry of Education 2009*)* draws from the broad range of learning on boys' literacy development, and promotes user-friendly specific strategies.

Include a Repertoire of Reading Strategies

Student teachers will need to understand how a reader is constructed, what factors affect literacy development, and especially how boys could see themselves as

literate members of society (Cleveland, 2012). We will need to provide methods and strategies for literacy instruction that can help boys and girls who are non-readers or limited readers enter the literacy world as proficient readers and writers (Schwartz & Pollishuke, 2013, Parr & Campbell, 2012).

Recognize Speaking and Listening as Integral to Literacy Development

We will need to include speaking and listening as significant components of literacy, and explore strategies with student teachers that promote authentic language experiences where students engage in authentic conversations, formulate their own questions about the topics and issues being investigated, helping them to "own" the discussion, to find their "voices," and to act as agents of their own learning. Where boys are most successful as learners and in literacy, they have had consistent opportunities for different kinds of talk from very early in their schooling (Elliott-Johns, Booth, Rowsell, Puig & Paterson, 2012).

Incorporate a Variety of Flexible Groupings

We will need to explore with the student teachers the many reasons and strategies for having students work in different types of groups, from partners to literature circles to whole class meetings, in order to achieve different goals and outcomes. Student teachers can acquire methods for creating fluid groupings and regroupings of students for different reading and writing events, sometimes by student choice, by need or ability, and by gender, so that students can experience a variety of teaching/learning situations.

Integrate Reading and Writing across the Curriculum Through Inquiries

We can assist student teachers in discovering opportunities for boys and girls to engage in active inquiries on themes and issues that interest them, sometimes curriculum connected, and incorporating multimodalities (Internet, books, articles, interviews, and so on). The students can see themselves as the experts in their classrooms through their personal choices for research, and the subsequent reading, writing and discussion events can lead to presentations, demonstrations and sharing of their inquiries.

Include the Arts as Literacy

Student teachers can discover the power that the arts can bring to students' literacy learning as they develop activities that encourage students to express and communicate their ideas and feelings, both in constructing and creative processes, and in interpretive responses to texts (Booth & Masayuki, 2004). By teacher educators highlighting for student teachers how incorporating the arts in

the classroom literacy program can open up new possibilities for meaning-making in a variety of modes and forms, they may in their own classrooms motivate their students into representing and interpreting their thoughts and emotions. As well, technology can inform different types of literacy activities, and can engage many boys in responding to and composing a variety of text forms.

Incorporate Ongoing Assessment for Teaching and Learning

We need to offer new teachers strategies for monitoring, tracking, assessing, and reflecting upon each student's literacy progress, to enable both boys and girls to recognize their strengths and uncover their problems. They will then be able to design effective instruction for supporting each student's literacy growth.

SUMMARY

We will want to provide our student teachers with research-based strategies and methods that will support both boys and girls in their literacy development.

> While boys' achievement is improving, the problems of gender difference are connected to a range of factors situated in the society and culture in which boys and girls live, the complex interactions of the variables in their lives, the nature of the individual, the family, the culture of the peer group, the relationship of home and school, the philosophy of the school, the availability of resources, the strategies the teacher incorporates in the classroom program, and the changing nature of literacy. (Elliott-Johns & Booth, 2010 p. 61)

The current and future research and practice in gender behaviors have the potential to inform curriculum development for teacher education programs in literacy instruction. Understanding the relationship among societal factors, literacy achievement and gender can benefit those involved in curriculum design. We would hope that all educators would support best literacy practices for all classrooms while recognizing and appreciating the range of gender diversity (Watson, Kehler & Martino, 2012). Our goals should be to expand the teaching repertoires of our student teachers so that they do not prioritize the learning of one gender over the other. By building and maintaining a classroom culture of literacy that accepts the range and interests of each of the students, both girls and boys, yet expands and enriches their experiences, future teachers will offer their students an equitable and fair learning environment, filled with possibilities.

REFERENCES

Bainbridge, J., & Heydon, R. (2013). *Constructing meaning: Teaching the language arts K-8*. Toronto: Nelson Publishers.

Baker, E. (Ed.) (2010). *The new literacies: Multiple perspectives on research and practice.* New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Benevides, T. (2010). *Appendix 1*: *Boys' literacy attainment: Research and related practice*. <http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/research/boys_literacy.pdf>.

Biddulph, S. (2004). *Raising boys: Why boys Are different – and how to help them become happy and well-balanced men*. Berkley, CA: Celestial Arts.

Booth, D. (2002). *Even hockey players read: Boys, literacy and learning*. Markham: Pembroke Publishers.

Booth, D. (2004). *The arts go to school*. Markham: Pembroke Publishers.

Booth, D. (2011). *Caught in the middle: Reading and writing in the transition years*. Markham: Pembroke Publishers.

Booth, D., Elliott-Johns, S., & Bruce, F. (2010). *Boys' literacy attainment: Research and related practice*. <http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/research/boys_literacy.pdf>.

Brozo, W. (2010). *To be a boy, to be a reader: Engaging teen and preteen boys in active literacy*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Dietze Cleveland, K. (2012). *Teaching boys who struggle in school: Strategies that turn underachievers into successful learners*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Demaske, D. (2010). *The difference between boys and girls and the benefits of single gender schools*. Edinboro: Cleveland State University.

Demers, S., & Bennett, C. (2007). *Single-sex classrooms.* Research Monograph # 4. Literacy and Numeracy Secretariat. Ontario Ministry of Education.

Dietze, B., & Kashin, D. (2012). *Playing and learning in early childhood education*. Toronto: Pearson Education.

Eliot, L. (2010). *Pink brain, blue brain: How small differences Grow into troublesome gaps – and what we can do about Ii*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Elliott-Johns, S., & Booth, D. (2009). Current research and classroom practice: Toward more inclusive approaches to literacy development in schools. *Brock Education*, Fall, *19*(1), 50–71.

Elliott-Johns, S., Booth, D., Rowsell, J., Puig, E., & Paterson, J. (2012). Using Student voices to guide instruction. *Voices from the Middle*, *19*(3), 25–31.

Elliott, A., & Woloshyn, V. (2013). *Language arts: In Canadian classrooms*. Toronto: Pearson Canada.

Gilbert, S. (2000). *A field guide to boys and girls*. New York: Harper/Collins.

Gurian, M. (2006). *The wonder of boys*. New York: Penguin Group.

Hammett, R.F. & Sanford, K. (Eds.) (2008). *Boys and girls and the myths of literacies and learning*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Jones, S. (2012). Mapping the landscape: Gender and the writing classroom. *Journal of Writing Research*. *33*, p. 161–179.

Martino, W., & Kehler, M. (2007). Gender-based literacy reform: A question of challenging or recuperating gender binaries. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *30*(2), 406–431.

Martino, W. (2001). Boys and reading: Investigating the impact of masculinities on boys' reading preferences and involvement in literacy. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*. *24*(1), 61–74.

Martino, W. (2008). Boys underachievement: Which boys are we talking about? [Research Monograph # 12]. *What Works? Research into Practice.* Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.

Millard, E. (1997). Differently literate: Gender identity and the construction of the developing reader. *Gender and Education*, *9*(1), 31–48.

Moffett, J. (1976). *Teaching the universe of discourse.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). (2011). National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education.

National Literacy Trust. (2011). Child Poverty. http://www.literacytrust.org.uk/assets/0001/1032

Newkirk, T. (2002). *Misreading masculinity: Boys, literacy, and popular culture*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

OECD Programme for International Student Assessment PISA (2009). *Executive Summary.*

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2009). *Me read? And how! A practical guide to improving boys' literacy skills*.

Ontario Ministry of Education. EQAO's *Provincial Elementary School Report: Results of the 2010–2011 Assessment of Reading, Writing and Mathematics, Primary Division (Grades 1–3) Junior Division (Grades 4–6).*

Parr, M., & Campbell, T. (2012). *Balanced literacy essentials. Markham: Pembroke Publishers.*
Reichert, M., Hawley, R., & Tyre, P. (2011). *Reaching boys, teaching boys, strategies that work and why*. San Fransisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass.
Reist, M. (2011). *Raising boys in a new kind of world*. Toronto, ON: Dundurn.
Rowe, K., & Rowe, K. (2006). *BIG issues in boys' education: Auditory processing capacity, literacy and behaviour*. Second International Conference on Boys in Education, Massy University. Auckland, NZ, April 19–21.
Rutter, M., Caspi, A., Fergusson, D., Horwood, L.J., Goodman, R., Maughan, B., Moffitt, T.E., Meltzer, H., & Carroll, J. (2012). *Sex differences in developmental reading disability – New findings from 4 epidemiological studies*. *JAMA, 291*(16), 2007–2012.
Saletan, W. (2011). Sex on the Brain: Are boys' brains different from girls' brains? Scientists debate the question. *SLATE Magazine.* http://www.slate.com/articles/health_and_science/human_nature/2011/11/
Sanford, K. (2002). Popular media and school literacies: Adolescent expressions. In R. Hammett, and B. Barrell (Eds.) *Digital expressions: Media literacy and English language arts* (pp. 21–48). Calgary, AB: Detselig Enterprises Ltd.
Sanford, K., & Blair, H. (2002). *Morphing literacy: Boys reshaping their literacy practices*. University of Alberta. Downloaded from: http://www.onlineopinion.com.au/documents/articles/morphing_literacy.pdf
Sax, L. (2009). *Boys adrift, the five factors driving the growing epidemic of unmotivated boys and underachieving young men*. New York: Perseus Books Group.
Schwartz, S., & Pollishuke, M. (2013). *Creating the dynamic classroom: A handbook for teachers.* Toronto: Pearson Education.
Smith, M.W., & Wilhelm, J.D. (2006). *Going with the flow: How to engage boys (and girls) in their literacy learning.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
Smith, M., & Wilhelm, J. (2002). *"Reading don't fix no Chevys": Literacy in the lives of young men.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
Spence, C. (2008). *The joys of teaching boys*. Markham: Pembroke Publishers.
Stagg Peterson, S., & Parr, J. (2012). Gender and literacy issues and research: Placing the spotlight on writing. *Journal of Writing Research*. *3*(3), 154–161.
Tapscott, D. (2009). *Grown up digital*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
Tompkins, G., Bright, R., Pollard, M., & Winsor P. (2011). *Language arts: content and teaching strategies*. Toronto: Pearson.
Watson, A., Kehler, M., & Martino, W. (2010). The problem of boys' literacy underachievement: Raising some questions. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*. *53*(5), 356–361.
Weaver-Hightower, M. (2003). The "boy turn" in research on gender and education. *Review of Educational Research*, *73*(4), 471–198.
Younger, M. (2007). The gender agenda in secondary ITET in England: Forgotten, misconceived or what? *Gender and Education, 19*(3), 387–414.
Younger, M. and Warrington, M. (2005). *Raising Boys' Achievement.* London, UK: Department for Education and Skills, Research Report 636.

AFFILIATION

David Booth
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/University of Toronto

MARY GENE SAUDELLI & JENNIFER ROWSELL

WALKING THE TALK

Towards a Notion of Multiliteracies in Literacy Teacher Education

The roots of multiliteracies rely on a message of hope about what education can be. Grounded on principles of inclusion and equity, the New London Group (1996) sought to create a vision of schooling that is contemporary and that is harnessed to present-day realities and demands. As Mary Kalantzis and Bill Cope contend, hopefully: "Education is something that modernizing people almost unequivocally want" (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000, p. 121). There may not be agreement about what contemporary education needs or demands, but there should be a common desire to modernize education given different, pressing changes in communication and new technologies as well as globalizing shifts in local contexts. In the spirit of and with fidelity to a multiliteracies pedagogy, we set out to write this chapter by revisiting a literacy teacher education course that we both taught that was developed, planned, taught, and now studied/analyzed based on the multiliteracies framework established by the New London Group. The chapter begins with a look at multiliteracies, then we present our data and analysis, and from there identify broader findings on the future of literacy teacher education.

A MULTILITERACIES PEDAGOGY

Technological advancements in our rapidly evolving and increasingly globalized world have changed the nature of what it means to communicate. Children, adolescents, adults and seniors today engage daily in new communicative practices, with new tools, using diverse and multiple modes, and across global landscapes. Being "literate" in contemporary society means much more mastery of the mechanics of reading and writing composition; communicative competencies with digital technology are a social and economic necessity. Because today's world calls for tech-savvy citizens, education is answering the call for inclusion of technology in the classroom.

The pitfall of "implementing technology for technology's sake" (Borsheim, Merritt, & Reed, 2008, p. 87) awaits the educator and/or institution who in their rush to incorporate technology-based instruction do not give enough thoughtful consideration to the pedagogy of technology-based instruction.

One model for thinking about meaning-making is the multiliteracies framework (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000). The New London Group (1996) created the term "multiliteracies" to refer to the new and multiple literacies emerging due to the

C. Kosnik, J. Rowsell, P. Williamson, R. Simon and C. Beck (Eds.), Literacy Teacher Educators: Preparing Teachers for a Changing World, 35–48.

proliferation of technologies and cultural and linguistic diversity that are characteristics of contemporary communicative practices. Multiliteracies pedagogy builds on Street's (1985, 1995) discussion of literacy as a social practice and the work of scholars in the New Literacy Studies. Street conceived of an ideological model of literacy to take account of the social practices and frameworks of society. Another field that was key to the evolution of multiliteracies is critical literacy as a field of theory, research and practice that investigated issues of power and interrogated positioning in texts. Critical literacy is a field in its own right that strongly informs multiliteracies.

In the age of increased global connectedness and cultural, linguistic, and societal diversity, often referred to as "the shift" (Richardson, 2006), the conception of literacy as a social practice and twenty-first century multiliteracies-based pedagogy becomes complex and varied. Twenty-first century multiliteracies pedagogy involves pedagogical consideration of skills that are associated with the consumption, production, evaluation and distribution of digital texts (Borsheim et al., 2008), conventional texts, and global texts as expressions of meaning and communication in order to prepare students for full and equal participation in contemporary society. Anstey and Bull (2006) define a multiliterate person as:

> flexible and strategic and can understand and use literacy and literate practices with a range of texts and technologies; in socially responsible ways; in a socially, culturally and linguistically diverse world and to fully participate in life as an active and informed citizen. (p. 55)

Accordingly, educators who embrace multiliteracies pedagogy will provide:

> … ample opportunities to access, evaluate, search, sort, gather, and read information from a variety of multimedia and multimodal sources and invite students to collaborate in real and virtual spaces to produce and publish multimedia and multimodal texts for a variety of audiences and purposes. (Borsheim, et al. 2008, p. 87)

The New London Group's model for a multiliteracies pedagogy consists of a cycle of four stages: situated practice, overt instruction, critical framing, and transformed practice. Pahl and Rowsell (2006) assert that when students are immersed in learning through situated practices, they will use their previous experiences to build on literacy learning, thus enabling learning from first-hand experience of meaning-making in context-specific ways. Overt instruction complements the situated learning that students engage in. Overt instruction, as a support for students' situated learning, is operationalized through teachers' scaffolding of instruction (The New London Group, 1996; Unsworth, 2008). Caution is warranted as overt instruction can be misunderstood as drill and practice. Overt instruction is directed teaching that aims to help students realize "how" they are learning. This understanding is crucial to supporting students' critical thinking skills through critical framing.

It is often easier to critique and question one's knowledge when removing it from context. Pahl and Rowsell (2006) suggest teachers have students interpret or

question why something works the way it does. Harste (2003) believes it is essential to provide "opportunities for students to explore their own inquiry questions using reading, writing and other sign systems as tools and toys for learning … to reposition themselves, gather information, change perspectives, re-theorize issues, and take thoughtful new social action" (p. 11). This critical questioning by students leads to transformative practice (Unsworth, 2008) and to an understanding of how context and background play a role in their comprehension.

As students realize the impact of context as influencing their learning the "theory becomes reflective practice" (The New London Group, 1996, p. 87). Students are able to reflect on their learning, and the previous three stages, and use this learning in new contexts, either collaboratively or individually (Unsworth, 2008). Awareness of the role of context on learning provides a framework which students can consider when they face new learning situations.

RESEARCH METHODS

We began our research and thinking for the chapter by exploring three existing syllabi for EDUC 4P05 course, Critical Literacy across the Social Sciences and Humanities, which we have taught in the undergraduate (concurrent) teacher education program at Brock University in Canada. We also collected and examined lecture notes and in-class activities. Through observations and discussions, we theorized how a multiliteracies perspective was incorporated into such pedagogic artifacts as syllabi, lecture notes, readings, and activities, both assessed and non-assessed. A research question that guided our work together was: How do we enact and operationalize multiliteracies in higher education for 21st century learning, in a teacher education course?

Our Work Together

We began working together in September 2010—Mary Gene Saudelli as a doctoral student finishing her PhD dissertation on constructivist curriculum design and blended learning in an international higher education program in the United Arab Emirates, and Jennifer as a researcher in the fields of New Literacy Studies, multiliteracies and multimodality. From our first meeting to the present, we have worked together with a common commitment to diversity and to broadening the notion of literacy and language education and meaning-making more generally. Although we have not co-taught courses, we have certainly co-written and we taught the same teacher education methods course, but in interesting, contrastive, and parallel ways.

Jennifer's Story

I have been teaching at different levels (in school as an ESL teacher and in higher education) for some time now. Before teaching, I studied English literature at the undergraduate and graduate levels, I trained as an English as a Foreign Language

teacher, and then I worked with young learners and adult learners on their English language skills before entering educational publishing and then pursuing a PhD in literacy education. Taking this eclectic career path, I found my way into literacy teacher education as a contract instructor in literacy education for large cohorts of elementary preservice students at Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/University of Toronto (OISE/UT), with a focus on New Literacy Studies, multiliteracies, and multimodality. Working with Brian Street during my PhD and then collaborating significantly with Kate Pahl, I embraced literacy as a social practice, multimodal approach to the teaching and learning of literacy education. This approach informed my literacy teacher education work over my five years at OISE/UT. Then, I worked as a tenure-track professor in literacy and English education at Rutgers Graduate School of Education where I worked with secondary school student teachers and, once again, undergird my teacher education work with New Literacy Studies and multimodal principles and epistemologies. During this time, I returned to English and the study of English literature, shaping my research program around adolescent and secondary school learners as multimodal meaning-makers. It was during this time that I worked and taught alongside secondary teachers, developing lessons, units, assignments, and assessments premised on New Literacy Studies, multimodality, and multiliteracies. So it is that I find myself now in a research position with a focus on multiliteracies and multimodality.

Mary's Story

I have been teaching various elements of literacy in many classroom environments for two decades in Canada and in international contexts. However, I have had limited experience as a researcher of literacy except for my work in relation to my graduate studies research and my work with Jennifer. I began my career as an adolescent and adult literacy specialist in a secondary school in Ontario. After several years, I moved to Europe and China and became an English as a Subsequent Language (ESL) educator in governmental secondary schools that functioned to prepare students for academic study in English, the medium of instruction in university. Later, I moved to Dubai, United Arab Emirates, to teach higher education students in the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Education programs. In this position, I worked across departments, was a lead curriculum designer, literacy specialist, and English educator for both programs. A few years ago, I returned to Canada and focused my teaching practice, curriculum design, and research in the area of multiliteracies. Most of my research has focused on curriculum design, interdisciplinary studies, and new literacies across curriculum and instruction.

OUR RESEARCH IN LITERACY TEACHER EDUCATION

We have had the experience of planning, teaching, and assessing the same concurrent education critical literacy education course at Brock University's Faculty

of Education and we are using this mutual, shared journey to inform our analysis of a multiliteracies approach to teacher education. The chapter analyzes how we have slowly moved toward what we regard as a multiliteracies epistemology for teacher education. The focal course is, EDU4P05, Critical Literacies in the Humanities and Social Sciences, which is a concurrent education course offered to undergraduate students at Brock University. The course aims include: "learning to engage the interpretative possibilities of texts. Critical strategies including semiotic, feminist and reader-response used in the analysis of picture books, poetry, traditional texts and contemporary fiction." Over the past five years, there have been three instructors who have taught the course, unwittingly and wittingly, using multiliteracies to inform course content.

To contextualize the course, Mary Gene's class had 160 students and Jennifer's had 120 students; each class gathers in an auditorium for three hours a week to take this course. Clearly, this format is not ideal to implement a multiliteracies pedagogy. That is, to situate practice within student lifeworlds, you ideally need an interactive teaching format with smaller groups and one-on-one, interactive time. It was a challenge, to say the least, for the two of us to devise ways of situating practice, teaching overtly, and critically framing texts with such a large group of students spread across a large space. As a result, we decided to infuse a multiliteracies approach in lecture resources, discussion, and through the use of Sakai, a digital learning management system. Mary Gene separated the 160 students into sections with 20 students each and incorporated a digital presentation into the class syllabus: students in groups were required to deconstruct a text and upload a digital presentation for comment and response from other students in their section.

Evolving Multiliteracies Syllabi

As a gradual movement toward multiliteracies, we analyzed the first of the three syllabi for EDU4P05 Critical Literacies in the Humanities and Social Sciences, which was developed by Dr. Lissa Paul, whose research interests fall in the areas of: children's literature; literary theories; post-colonial discourses; cultural studies; and, eighteenth century studies. This line of research and her heuristic informed her shaping of content for the course. In her course description, she summarized the mission of the course as follows:

> In this course you will learn that understanding texts is not magic: it is the art and science of looking, listening, and making sense of what you see and hear. It is learning to read both words and images. It is recognizing that history matters if there is any hope of figuring out where we've been in order to figure out where we're going. The books required for this course will be of use to you when you are a teacher with a class of your own. The primary texts have broad appeal across a wide age, grade, and gender range. Included are a picture book, a novel, graphic novels, and a work of biographical fiction. All of them have

> been chosen to sensitize you to aspects of difference related to culture, gender and ability. (Paul, 2009)

The description illustrates Paul's emphasis on text interpretation, meta-understandings of texts and texts' ideological, historical layers. Students who took the course honed their reader response and critical reading skills. Without a stated aim of embedding multiliteracies into the syllabus, the syllabus fulfills strands of the multiliteracies pedagogy by situating teaching literacy education to undergraduate (concurrent) teacher education students (who range in age from their early twenties to thirties) within student lifeworlds. The students in the course are comfortable with graphic texts and with animated texts. They have grown up with digital environments and with moving images and Paul situated her text analyses within these kinds of texts and their multimodality. By incorporating contemporary texts such as graphic stories like *Maus I* and *II*; an animated film, *Coraline;* and, the novel, *The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night,* she thereby spoke to the multimodal sensibilities and epistemologies of her students.

The major assignment for Paul's course is a term-length, group project that included individual components. The assignment asked students to create their own graphic representation in the fashion or style of their chosen author. Each group of five focused on the work of a particular artist, poet, or author, and developed a graphic way of representing what it is that students want to communicate about that person. The assignment had oral, written, and visual components. The point of the assignment was to enable each group to become familiar with the entire landscape of an individual author, poet, or illustrator. Without being specifically aligned with a multiliteracies pedagogy, Paul prioritized situated practice with preservice teacher education students' overt textual understandings by analyzing discursive and multimodal techniques for understanding texts. She then asked students to critically frame their interpretations of an author's work, and finally, to remix their own texts so that they apply all of these principles as an instance of transformed practice. That is, students actually designed their own interpretations of an authorial style and aesthetic.

In light of Paul's syllabus, we move to analyzing Jennifer's syllabus. As the second syllabus for the course, it was clear that there was more of a stated aim to embed multiliteracies into the curriculum. The course was constructed on a journey metaphor, moving from the early days of a critical and contested perspective on literacy education with a look at critical literacies, ending with a look at studies on digital literacies (which, in theory, led concurrent education students to the present day). To establish a critical literacy approach, Jennifer discussed Paolo Freire's work on literacy and power and Michael Halliday's work in linguistics and ended with an account of Luke and Freebody's Four Resources Model. After these first two classes, she worked through New Literacy Studies with the works of Shirley Brice Heath, Brian Street, James Paul Gee, David Barton and Mary Hamilton. Then, she spent two classes devoted to examining the work of Bill Cope, Mary Kalantzis, and The New London Group. This theory spanned the course with some practical applications. For every class,

Jennifer presented a visual to analyze in light of theory and attendant frameworks. Then, students engaged in discussions and activities around theories. Key strands in the course dealt with accounting for culture, social class, race, and how these forces manifest themselves in new communication systems, new media, policy, and ways of teaching students to have meta-awareness of these ideologies and technologies. There were activities to align with each theoretical perspective. Another layer in the course was the notion of "artifactual literacy" as a way of thinking about literacy education in relation to artifactual dimensions of literacy in schools, homes, and communities.

The two major assignments for Jennifer's course reflected such multiliteracies strands as fostering an understanding of and critically framing cultural and linguistic diversity with an assignment that asked students to reflect on a literacy practice that they engaged in at home when they were children and to pull out strands that they can build on in their own teaching. Locating their literacy learning within home cultures, different linguistic systems, and tying literacy practices to the identity of the meaning-maker helped push students to think about how their identity impacts their literacy practices now and in the past. Some students wrote about playing videogames; some talked about reading picture books with grandparents; while others talked about learning how to sew and its connections with early reading. The second assignment asked students to apply the multiliteracies framework of available design, design and redesign to a visual in the form of photograph, an advertisement, artwork, or moving-image media. Students wrote a paper analyzing available design features, the nature of the design, and how they would redesign the visual.

Mary Gene's syllabus followed the same structure as Jennifer's except for the assignments. After consultation with Jennifer, Mary Gene wanted to add a stronger pedagogical focus for students to make connections between theory into practice. Thus, throughout her lectures, Mary Gene emphasized the same key strands as Jennifer, but highlighted the role of pedagogical approaches. The first assignment required students to choose a specific expectation in any social sciences or humanities in Ontario Curriculum document, devise a lesson plan to teach that expectation together with infusing a critical literacy component. The second assignment required students to investigate a specific context within the community, locate the literacies present, the potential learning within home communities and cultures (i.e., different linguistic systems), and ultimately tying literacy practices to the community. For the third assignment, students were separated into sections consisting of twenty students. In groups, they were required to create a digital presentation of a deconstruction of a text, using one of the theories of critical literacy presented in class. The presentation was uploaded to an online learning site and students were required to view and respond to the digital presentations.

Vignettes

Although we did not take field notes while teaching our respective courses, we did write post-reflections, almost like post-mortems on the course. To extrapolate how

teacher education students responded to a multiliteracies pedagogy and our own reflections attempting to harness multiliteracies to teacher education, we wrote retrospective narratives about two lessons—one we regard as successful and one that was not successful—to illustrate or operationalize multiliteracies pedagogy in teacher education. The vignettes presented involve visual texts as springboards to larger discussions about modern education, new epistemologies, and shifted pedagogy.

i. Jennifer's reflections on adopting a multiliteracies framework. During the fourth week of the course, Jennifer presented Hilary Janks' approach to analyzing text through four strands: domination that accounts for dominant modes of reproduction in texts; access that accounts for dominant modes of language; diversity that accounts for different literacy practices; and, design that accounts for the production and assembling of semiotic resources to make meaning. Janks argues that "we need to find ways of holding all of these elements in productive tension to achieve what is a shared goal of all critical literacy work: equity and social justice" (Janks, 2010, p. 27). Janks (2010) claims that critical literacy needs to be a part of a much broader framework that is flexible and attuned to both the playfulness and seriousness of literacy education. To illustrate Janks's textual analysis, Jennifer examined two visuals. One visual is Figure 1 below.

Figure 1. Top Photographs for 2010—creative commons. www.creativecommons.com

The photograph is so vivid and depicts strongly another culture, a very different world that students responded to. The vibrant colors, the expression on the young boy's face, the moment in time, probably a festival of some sort in a different part of the world. Students spent half an hour applying Janks' textual framework to unpack issues of power and to lift out ties to literacy education. The whole-class activity

worked well, partially due to the clarity of Janks' framework and partially due to the explicit, vivid nature of the photograph. Students could think about practical ways of implementing Janks' framework. Students were allowed the appropriate time and space to apply a framework to critically frame text. Also, students could use visual texts complemented by a given framework (i.e., they seldom actually use visual texts during their teacher education work). Mary Gene also used this photograph for the same purpose in her class and experienced the same successful effect.

By the sixth week of the course, students were in the thick of the semester with several assignments due and they were less inclined and less receptive to text analyses. Jennifer framed this particular session around the notion of community literacies and ecological approaches to literacy. Part of the course asked students to think about the notion of artifactual literacies. What the notions of ecological approaches and artifactual literacies contributed was a way of connecting a multiliteracies approach to the local. That is, compelling students to think about how they can teach literacy through communities and artifacts that students value. For the first hour, Jennifer talked through the concept of artifactual literacies. That is, literacy as understood as a situated social practice involving print and communication that is linked to everyday life (Street, 1984; Barton & Hamilton, 1998). Artifactual literacies is a way of connecting literacy to everyday life and a way of crossing contexts. Acknowledging, appreciating, and understanding the visual and tactile properties of artifacts is fundamental to using artifactual literacy as a method for teaching and learning. While multimodality applies well to texts, an artifactual approach takes in situated, ethnographic and ecological accounts of lived experiences. Artifactual literacy as an approach to literacy teaching and learning builds on the work of multimodality and situates it within communities and people's lives.

The trouble with this class was that students found it difficult to think about tangible links between community and teaching literacy. Also, students could not imagine the kinds of artifacts that students whom they will teach will value. The failed logic of the class is that Jennifer did not contextualize the session, and, the concurrent education students did not have the experience in classrooms to be able to conceptualize what young children or middle school children actually value. It is tough to think in relation to communities, emic approaches, and personal artifacts from a contextless perspective. The lecture and activities were unsuccessful and Jennifer would certainly make necessary changes to its structure in future sessions.

ii. Mary Gene's reflections on adopting a multiliteracies framework. During the fifth week of the course, Mary Gene designed a lesson to explore Janks (2010) dimension of deconstruction of texts through the intersectionality of multimodality (Jewitt, & Kress, 2003; Jewitt, 2009; Kress, 2003, 2009; Kress & van Leeuwen, 2001), artifactual literacy (Pahl & Rowsell, 2010), and the semiotic turn (Gee, 2003, 2009). Students had already explored each aspect independently in previous lectures, but the goal of this class was to explore this intersectionality as contributing to the meaning-making process and the possibility of creating of pedagogically relevant instruction. Students were about to begin their digital presentations of a deconstruction of text.

In addition, students were also about to begin their ecological papers. Students first discussed concepts: crafting talk, talking craft, the use of semiotics; evoking and use of artifacts in narrative; talk, artifacts, modes of communication and felt emotions and meaning; and artifacts as a tool for listening, deconstructing, retelling in a new manner. Then, a series of digital photographs of inner-city schools and the surrounding areas were presented and deconstructed by the class. Themes such as playgrounds that were vacant, photos of a local drug dealer, gender representation, and a photo of students playing soccer were articulated.

After the deconstruction, Mary Gene informed the class the photos were taken by grade eight students in Toronto as part of a social studies class as an assignment exploring lived experiences. As part of this discussion the class explored potential options to redesign the photos both multimodally and from a social justice perspective. Subsequently, the lesson moved from deconstruction as a form of pedagogy to the role of deconstruction in self narratives to explore power relations as an aspect of self-exploration. Mary Gene provided her own narrative of one of her experiences teaching in Dubai to Emirati (indigenous people of the United Arab Emirates) female students. As part of the narrative Mary Gene used a multimodal presentation, presented artifacts such as an abbayah (Emirati cloak) and shaylah (black veil), and objects such as a painting given to her by an Emirati family. Students deconstructed the story and explored issues such as globalization, national migration, colonialism, gender roles, social change, bias and assumptions, and religion and culture. The class finished with the request for students to consider one of their own lived experiences and to deconstruct it exploring the intersectionality of multimodality, artifactual literacy, and the semiotic turn in the design of their narratives. This particular session was lively with discussion, differing opinions, and critical discourse. Many students responded afterward that their thinking had changed, particularly in relation to generating opportunities for critical literacy through exploration and deconstruction of artifacts used in narratives of lived experiences as a form of pedagogy.

By the eleventh week of the course, students were busy finishing assignments and preparing for exams. They were also immersed in uploading and responding to digital presentations of group deconstructions of texts assignment, which was ultimately challenging, but well received and very well done by students. However, during a class framed on the notion of idealized representations of gender in text, as an exploration of Foucault's regimes of truth, Mary Gene noticed that during the last half of the session, students were notably disruptive and uninterested. This class focused on representations in texts in typical everyday lives of students that form representations, regimes of truth, and the role of deconstruction and redesign of these texts as critical literacy pedagogy.

Mary Gene framed the session using Janks redesign element of her four dimensions of critical literacy and exploring "rubbing" (Morgan, 1994) texts together "to denaturalise them" (Janks, 2010, p. 185). In an effort to use humor and multimodally, she showed an Old Spice commercial, "The man your man could smell like."

The commercial demonstrates several obvious connections to notions typically perceived as women's idealized male in contemporary society: attractive, physically fit, social and economically secure indicated by the presence of a sailboat, and riding a horse in the final frame. Students enjoyed deconstructing the commercial for all of the obvious references. Mary Gene then presented a YouTube parody of this commercial called "The woman you'd love your woman to be like." This parody is an exact replication of the same Old Spice commercial, but demonstrates obvious connections to notions typically perceived as men's idealized female in contemporary society: attractive, scantily clad, physically fit, on a beach, and riding on the top of a red Ferrari in the final frame. Further, another YouTube parody called "The chaser—the man your man can't marry" was presented to students. Again, this parody is an exact replication of the same Old Spice commercial, but depicts representations of typical stereotypes of gay men in contemporary society and contains a strong political message of inequity. This was intended to elicit connections and explore both the "**P**olitics," larger social cultural issues, governmental, capitalism, globalization, environment, and "**p**olitics," the micropolitics of everyday life, choices and decisions, desire and fear, haves and have nots (Janks, 2010, p. 188).

The trouble with this activity was that students found it extremely difficult to make a tangible link between this notion of deconstruction and design of texts, societal issues of gender representation and inequity, use of humour, and critical literacy. Thus, students could not make the connection between the session and their future teaching practices. Mary Gene did not highlight meaningfully or contextualize the technique for these concurrent education students to demonstrate how this technique can be adapted, and content changed to meet suitability needs for students they will eventually teach. Considering that content of the session explored controversial elements and societal issues, it was challenging for students to explore these concepts for themselves, much less to see the relevance in their teaching aspirations.

IMPLICATIONS FOR 21ST CENTURY EDUCATORS

Ferdinand de Saussure (as quoted in Hodge & Kress, 1988) defined semiotics as "the science of the life of signs in society." Certainly, many scholars study the design process and how texts become more or less powerful as they move across contexts (Janks, 2010; Hodge & Kress, 1988). Jennifer and Mary Gene facilitated this teacher education course on critical literacy with an approach that emphasized the notion of meaning-making related to cultural and linguistic diversity (i.e., exploring the social turn in literacy) and conflated with a semiotic account. Through reflection, both authors emphasized the salience of this approach. The approach had the ring of authenticity and relevance for students. Students in these large lecture classes not only were able to use the theoretical framework required in the deconstruction task, they also were able to make meaning from the activity in terms of their own lived experiences and their future pedagogy. Conflating the social turn in literacy with a semiotic account provided a space for students to explore critical literacy in

their own lives and allowed them to consider their future pedagogy. Using both the principles of critical literacy and New Literacy Studies were effective segues into adopting multiliteracies as a pedagogy.

Upon reflection, both authors recognized the crucial role of contextualizing in the meaning-making process. The session that Jennifer felt dissatisfied with centred on the difficulty students encountered in attempting to envision the kinds of artifacts their future students will value and the kinds of communities they will teach in their futures. The session that Mary Gene was dissatisfied with centred on the difficulty students encountered in linking "rubbing" (Morgan, 1994) texts against each other to explore societal regimes of truth in relation to controversial social justice issues to their future pedagogy. Thus, both authors argue that 21st century educators must acknowledge the crucial role of contextualizing their instruction as connections are not automatic—dialogue and discussion are valuable in this endeavour. While it is particularly challenging to ensure in large lecture-oriented classrooms, it is possible as both authors had successfully done so in other sessions.

CONCLUSION

This chapter does not intend to present a utopian situation of teaching Critical Literacy across the Social Sciences and Humanities. This chapter explores both successes and less satisfactory sessions as two educators walk the talk of twenty-first century educational practices in practice. In large lecture classes, they lectured and incorporated a pedagogy of multiliteracies in both sessional classes and assessment. Both educators found success when they highlighted the social turn in literacy with a semiotic account, and contextualized both students' lived experiences and relevance to their future pedagogy. Both educators experienced dissatisfaction when they felt their sessions were not contextualized appropriately for students' lives or future practice. What this discovery means is that it is one thing to present, talk through, and operationalize multiliteracies for teacher education students, but of course you have to emulate these very same principles in your own teacher education teaching. This was highlighted as these literacy educators reflected, compared, and contrasted their experiences of teaching this course as 21st century teachers who desired to walk the talk. Both Mary Gene and Jennifer believe that a pedagogy of multiliteracies provides a mechanism to ground teaching practices to a realities of students. Reflecting on the trials and tribulations of realizing that belief has certainly reinforced this belief.

REFERENCES

Anstey, M., & Bull, G. (2006). *Teaching and learning multiliteracies***,** Delaware, USA: International Reading Association.

Barton, D., & Hamilton, M. (Eds.) (1998). *Local Literacies: A study of reading and writing in one community. London, UK:* Routledge.

Borsheim, C., Merritt, K., & Reed, D. (2008). Beyond technology for technology's sake: Advancing multiliteracies in the 21st century. *The Clearinghouse, 82*(2), 87–90.

Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (Eds.) (2000). *Multiliteracies: Designing social futures.* London, UK: Routledge.
Gee, J. (2003). *What video games have to teach us about learning and literacy*. New York: Palgrave.
Haddon, M. (2003). *The curious incident of the dog in the night*. New York: Doubleday.
Harste, J. (2003). What do we mean by literacy now? *Voices from the Middle, 10*(3), 8–12.
Hodge, R., & Kress, G. (1988). *Social semiotics*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
Janks, H. (2010). *Literacy and power.* New York, NY: Taylor and Francis.
Jewitt, C., & Kress, G. (2003). *Multimodal literacies*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
Jewitt, Carey (2009). *What is Multimodality?* In *The Routledge Handbook of Multimodal Analysis.* London: Routledge. pp. 14–27.
Kress, G. (2009). *Multimodality: A social semiotic approach to contemporary communication,* London: Routledge.
Kress, G. (2003). *Literacy in the new media age*. London: Routledge Falmer.
Kress, G., & Van Leeuwen, T. (2001). *Multimodal Discourse: The modes and media of contemporary communication.* London: Edward Arnold.
Luke, A., & Freebody, P. (1997). The social practices of reading. In S. Muspratt, A. Luke & P. Freebody (Eds.), *Constructing critical identities.* St. Leonards, NSW: Allen and Unwin.
Morgan, W. (1994). *Ned Kelly reconstructed*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*(1), 60–92.
Pahl, K., & Rowsell, J. (Eds.) (2006). *Travel notes from the new literacy studies: Instances of practice.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Richardson, E. (2006). *Hip-hop literacies*. London: Routledge.
Selick, H. (2009). Coraline (film). Los Angeles: Focus Features.
Spiegelman, A. (1991). *Maus: A survivor's tale*. New York: Pantheon.
Street, B. (1985). *Literacy in theory and practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Street, B. (1995). *Social literacies.* London, UK: Longman.
Unsworth, L. (2008). Multiliteracies, e-literature and english teaching. *Language and Education, 22*(1), 62–75.

AFFILIATION

Mary Gene Saudelli & Jennifer Rowsell
Brock University

SECTION 2

LITERACY TEACHER EDUCATORS' PRACTICES

MARÍA PAULA GHISO, TAMARA SPENCER, LAN NGO &
GERALD CAMPANO

CRITICAL INQUIRY INTO LITERACY TEACHER EDUCATION

Accounting for Students

INTRODUCTION

A common predicament among teacher educators concerns the deficit-views about students and communities that at times surface in the context of our courses. As literacy scholars of color who are also former schoolteachers ourselves, we often experience these perspectives with a particular sense of alarm and contradiction. On the one hand, it is hard to remain dispassionate when children and families—many of whom might be from our own communities—are positioned as somehow lacking and academically inferior. On the other hand, our preservice and in-service teachers are our students as well, and we aspire to create classroom communities where we learn from one another and inquire together about these issues.

One initial way to work through this contradiction in our teacher education courses is by beginning with the critical assumption that many deficit views are not merely a matter of individual attitudes. They are rather indicative of deeper ideological currents that circulate in larger society, and which take particular manifestation in dominant literacy policies and practices, such as scripted curricula, hyper-remediation, and high-stakes testing and accountability measures. Moreover, such policies are often positioned within a social justice narrative and equated with closing the "achievement gap." In so doing, stakeholders frame curricular decision-making as a civil rights issue, arguing that these changes are seminal to school reform and that uniformity, rather than equity, is needed. We find these policies and practices especially prevalent in under-resourced schools with children who are most vulnerable to being "placed at risk" (Vasudevan & Campano, 2009) by historical and contemporary inequalities. These are the very contexts we have been committed to in our careers as both school and university-based researchers and educators.

While literacy policy has narrowed curricula and homogenized reading and writing in schools, demographic shifts have necessitated quite the opposite: that teachers develop cultural competencies with regard to the burgeoning diversity of their classrooms. Literacy research has likewise expanded understandings of texts and practices to include their multimodal dimensions and inform school pedagogies that are more attuned to the plurality of student experiences. As literacy teacher

C. Kosnik, J. Rowsell, P. Williamson, R. Simon and C. Beck (Eds.), Literacy Teacher Educators: Preparing Teachers for a Changing World, 51–64.

educators, we feel the tensions between multiliteracies approaches and the "single story" (Adichie, 2009) of literacy being mandated through policies (Ghiso & Spencer, 2011). Most importantly, these are the tensions our pre- and in-service teachers must grapple with as they navigate the realities of their internships in city elementary schools.

Supporting our university students to better understand, learn from, and advocate for the multiple literacies of their students calls for a different orientation to "accountability." How might we foster an alternative sense of accountability, not merely to abstract notions of success (e.g., "No Child Left Behind," "Race to the Top" and "Success for All"), but rather to the actual people and relationships we forge in contexts of teaching and learning (Campano, 2007)? And how do we enact a stance of advocacy for and solidarity with students and families in our literacy courses? These are the questions we take up in this chapter, and which we examine within the three contexts of our literacy teacher education courses. Tamara spotlights how teachers grapple with the tensions of supporting their students' capacities within the high-stakes testing regime, and how she structures her course to critically interrogate these tensions. María Paula showcases pedagogies within her courses that invite pre- and in-service teachers to disrupt deficit assumptions about students' languages and literacies, and to view these as connected to their own varied histories and identities. Gerald and Lan examine their re-orientation of a literacy assessment course to focus on relationship building and community knowledge, and to locate discourses of assessment within larger social and political dynamics. Throughout our contexts, we situate our work in relation to our own professional and cultural identities, which are the roots to our teaching commitments, and invite students to take a critical inquiry stance into literacy pedagogy. We also hope to demonstrate how, for us, teaching and research are ineluctably intertwined.

TAMARA: RETHINKING PERCEPTIONS OF CHILDREN AND TEACHING WITHIN MANDATED CURRICULA

In some ways, it seems obvious that I chose a profession in education. I am the daughter of an African American mother who attended grade school in segregated New Orleans during the 1950s. She proudly identified as a member of the "civil rights era" and often focused discussions of inequality on public education. As a result, my own interest in teaching linked the way young children made meaning in their worlds with a commitment to advocating for and working alongside traditionally marginalized populations. During the interview for my first teaching position, I experienced firsthand competing visions for social justice education. My principal told me to ignore what I had learned in my teacher education program and instead follow a scripted program to teach reading, writing, and math. I shared my commitment to equity and education, and I recall being puzzled as the principal echoed the same sentiment. We united in a commitment to work with urban schoolchildren and yet he concluded the conversation with the summation that scripted programs

were exactly how we would achieve our shared goal. I went on to teach in several urban school districts and to serve as a staff developer and administrator, continually being told that standardization was the key to curricular "reform." I always felt in solidarity with the children and families on the other side of the "gap" and had difficulty fully accepting the current ways that reform was being typified in schools. I ultimately elected to change my professional trajectory to my current position as an assistant professor in literacy at Montclair State University, where I support students in grappling with the same tensions I experienced.

Over the past few years, my university has undergone an ambitious partnership known as the Urban Teacher Residency Program (UTRP) (all names are pseudonyms). I serve as its lead elementary literacy faculty member. The UTRP is a grant-supported apprenticeship program to prepare future teachers for careers in an urban school district located in a mid-sized northeast U.S. city. The students, or "residents," participate in a year and a half long program where they are placed in classrooms and simultaneously complete coursework for their graduate degree. The purpose of my two-semester course is to integrate and build upon the residents' experiences in classrooms as the foundation for our in-depth exploration of literacy teaching and learning.

The Course

I ground my course in two principled beliefs: (1) it must be child-centred, and reflect content that builds upon the linguistic and cultural diversity of the school district's population, which often entails countering assumptions that urban school children are by definition "low" or "struggling readers" and (2) our discussions of literacy teaching and learning cannot shy away from the realities of teaching, including the influence of federal, state, and local policies on curricula.

In the first semester of the course, the residents rotate through a series of special and general education placements, observing teachers and children. They read a range of texts for researchers, teachers, and children; engage in a shared blog that chronicles our thinking; watch videos on pedagogical issues; and discuss foundational issues in literacy studies. Written assignments ask residents to describe and chronicle children's literacy experiences, such as the interactive read aloud. During the second semester of the course, residents work full time in their mentor's classrooms. Our course is "embedded" in the field, which means that I spend a significant amount of time in classrooms, meeting one-on-one or in small clusters, and observing the residents teach. Our evening course speaks to the experiences they are having in schools, including an assignment that asks them to use qualitative protocols to "get to know" one literacy learner and then administer all district reading and writing assessments. Historically, the residents have been guided by their mentors to focus on a "struggling reader," a term that is widely evoked and yet rarely troubled in its oversimplification (Spencer, 2011; Triplett, 2007). To complicate this term, I ask residents to analyze and reflect upon a more expansive array of student "data,"

urging a capacities-based approach to observing children and curricular planning. The residents use this information to inform a series of literacy tutorials that build on student strengths.

Policies and common discourses often reduce urban teaching to "saving children" or filling "empty vessels" with overly simplified reading and writing skills. In the first semester of our course, we merge our autobiographies with our commitment to urgent, and yet nuanced, work as urban teachers. We read a broad range of perspectives on literacy teaching and learning—psycholinguistic, sociocultural, developmental, new literacies, current event newspaper articles, and so forth—as I urge the residents to draw their own conclusion as to what counts as literacy in today's schools. Residents share curricular artifacts, memos, and personal accounts of their experiences with literacy mandates and policies. I believe that as a community, we need to be invested in the belief that literacy (and literacy teaching) is far more complicated than has been characterized in the current discourse of reform.

As residents rotate among placements, they are in general quite amenable to understandings of literacy that "undo" common assumptions about literacy teaching and learning. For example, Joe, one of the residents, became quite inspired by perspectives that broadened what "counts" as literacy (e.g., Heath, 1983; Dyson, 2003), as they provided more opportunities for students and helped him understand his own negative memories of learning to read. Joe writes,

> [The readings] made me think of teaching in [city], or in an any city for that matter, and coming into the system with a pre-existing assumption that these children can't learn or do not already know something. We have learned that we must believe in every child and also believe that they are coming to our class with some sort of knowledge … I think it is important to remember that just because these children maybe be brought up differently from a "mainstream" environment, does not mean they are less likely to succeed in school ... As prospective teachers, we need to figure out how to use that knowledge and how to further construct knowledge from their cultural resources.

Joe provides a resource-oriented reading of his work as a teacher and echoes the theoretical disposition of many of the professional texts in the course.

Another student, Rachel, uses the readings to further complicate the scripted reading program she had observed in a special education placement:

> Government and school officials endlessly attempt to fix a non-scientific problem with a systematic, scientific solution. As we've discussed and read in our disabilities studies course, human variance exists and there is really no easy scientific path to follow in order to find out why differences exist or how to account for them in education. Each learner comes to school with a unique set of talents, abilities, strengths, weaknesses, experiences and many other attributes that apply solely to him or her as an individual. The same is true for teachers.

As she fuses content across courses with classroom observations, Rachel questions the role that "science" plays in literacy teaching and learning, and asserts that there is no "one-size fits all" approach to literacy teaching or teacher education. While her school district did not endorse the reductive curricular mandates prevalent elsewhere in the current reform climate (Spencer, Falchi & Ghiso, 2011), it nonetheless had models of teaching that were heavily scripted. It is important to stress that reflections like Joe's and Rachel's typically took place *before* students were teaching full-time. Things consistently got more complicated once the residents were pressured by the high-stakes world of instruction in their classrooms.

Toward the end of the course sequence, the pluralistic approach to literacy we embraced the previous semester feels distant; the residents have been habituated into the "ways with words" (Heath, 1983) that are all too common in urban schools. They readily adopt terms like "struggling" or "low" reader and discuss children based on their relational reading level or assessment scores. Expressions like "I DRA-ed him" (referring to a reading assessment, the DRA) reduce children to their test scores. While this pedagogical lapse troubles me, it speaks to the pervasive power of curricular mandates. To address this, I teach the residents to be as critical of mandated curriculum as some are of children.

Margaret, for example, used course readings to unpack the scripted reading program used in her pre-Kindergarten classroom:

> I started to struggle with the program's Teacher-in-a-Box approach. Literally—a red box that comes at the beginning of each month with a theme for the month and books with morning message suggestions and math, science, and social studies support lesson ideas.

Margaret noted "how bland may of [the] books had been" and went on to recount the excitement generated by a student-selected text, which produced "a level of attention I had never seen," and how based on this incident she made space for "unrushed afternoons" where children were able to share texts of their choosing with each other, allowing for linguistic play and student-driven intellectual inquiry. Unlike Rachel, Margaret's prescribed curriculum did provide the children with authentic print experiences, that is, real books to be read on a daily basis. Her reflection demonstrates how any mandate, even one with a more progressive agenda, can "impos[e] limits" (Kontovourki & Siegel, 2009) on children and teachers. Providing residents with opportunities to analyze, question, and adapt their curricular programs led to better understandings of literacy as enacted in their contexts, and to the development of practices that did not merely follow the imposed agenda, but accounted for the varied trajectories of children's learning.

MARÍA PAULA: PEDAGOGICAL INQUIRIES THAT TROUBLE DICHOTOMIES

My work as a literacy educator situated at the university is inextricable from my own history as an immigrant and English Language Learner and my background

as a teacher and professional development facilitator. Moving to New York City from Argentina when I was in elementary school, and again in middle school, I had to negotiate new cultural and linguistic settings, and witnessed firsthand how students who do not fit the norm are often labeled and remediated by school systems. I attended an English speaking school on weekdays, and an Argentinean school on Saturdays. In the Argentinean Saturday school I was one of the top performing academic students, and in my English language public school I was in a low-tracked grade receiving intervention services. On Saturdays I was part of the "majority": My discourse was the dominant discourse, and school included elements that spoke to my cultural and linguistic identity. During the week my language and cultural knowledge set me apart as not belonging. Within these two educational settings, my academic abilities and my intellectual potential were constructed on opposite ends of the spectrum. Through these experiences, I learned about the power of education to shape students' life opportunities. This personal journey has shaped my professional choices—working as an early childhood educator, a teacher in a Dual Language program, a prekindergarten-12 staff developer supporting English Language Learning populations, and now a university professor partnering with schools—and my commitments to supporting students in the diversity of their experiences. These, in turn, infuse my research and the literacy courses I teach.

The Courses

As a faculty member in the Literacy Specialist Program at Teachers College, I teach Master's courses on literacy in the early years, literacy and culture, and children's literature. As part of my research agenda, I also teach an in-service professional development course focused on literacy learning and language diversity, which affords me the opportunity to investigate how educators in a multilingual school district learn from and work in solidarity with immigrant communities to challenge deficit ideologies and better support students pedagogically. In both these contexts of my work, inquiries are predicated on theorizing from the location of the classroom (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999, 2009). Students are either full-time teachers currently in their own classrooms or already certified teachers placed as literacy interns with co-teaching responsibilities, and the assignments for the courses and questions we investigate together are rooted in these school experiences. As such, concerns regarding the narrowing of what counts as literacy and the pressures of a rigid accountability system, and the increasing diversity—and resources—of our school populations are central themes woven throughout the courses.

In all these courses I emphasize the need to consider literacy frameworks alongside the rich cultural and linguistic legacies of diverse student populations. I interweave literacy theories, investigations of children's works, and pedagogical strategies for structuring interactions with literacy. I invite students to center their learning on the synergy between university and elementary classrooms, analyzing the experiences of elementary school children through assignments such as conducting

literature discussions, undertaking a semester-long case study, and a carrying out a critical literacy inquiry with peers. I infuse data and student work from my own research throughout the course sessions, which we examine alongside concepts in the educational literature.

One of my goals as a literacy educator is to foster an orientation that values students' languages, identities, and histories as resources. I know from experience that merely stating this stance is not sufficient, but that our classroom community must arrive at this understanding together. When I left the elementary school classroom and began working with adults as a professional development facilitator, I often encountered strong anti-immigrant sentiments, which I not only found personally hurtful, but which were divisive to our professional learning community and, most importantly, to the classroom experiences of youth. I decided to engage participants in literacy lessons conducted in Spanish, my native language, as a means of reflecting on the role of language and culture in learning, an experiential approach that has since become a cornerstone of my literacy teacher education courses.

The grounding activity is a read-aloud of Sandra Cisneros' (1997) bilingual picturebook, *Hairs/Pelitos* (though I deliberately cover the English text) and a related writing response. Since the text focuses on family relationships, I invite students to bring in pictures of their families, which we engage with, in Spanish, prior to reading the book. Throughout the reading and writing engagement, I ask students to remain attuned to their emotional responses and the strategies they used to make sense, so that these may serve as points of reflection. Invariably, the experience surfaces the tensions and challenges of navigating literacy learning in another language, as well as the multifaceted resources and networks students must draw on for participation. The following student comment captures a typical response:

> My heart was pounding. My brain was scurrying for connections, and it was only the first fifteen minutes…My teaching style always included my trying to attain a full picture of each student. Although I always thought I understood, actually being a second language learner was the best way to feel the anxiety. Feeling this I wondered how my anxiety would be decreased, but more importantly I was looking to see how I could decrease this feeling for my students.

Another student notes, "I left feeling mentally drained. Some of my familiarity with the language came back to me, but so did the realization that I had to work very hard to follow the teacher and the assignments." This pedagogical experience has provided pre- and in-service educators an opportunity to gain a small sense of what it means for students to navigate school expectations in a different language, feeling both the strains of acquiring an additional language as well as the benefits in this process provided by facilities in their native tongues, their collaboration with peers, and curricular adaptations. Most importantly, as a learning community, we begin to cultivate an intellectual and nurturing dialogue about how to support immigrant students in schools.

Concurrently, I also strive to support students in self-reflection about how their own learning is related to, rather than different from, that of their students. In an ethnographic spirit, students in my courses investigate their own literacy practices, documenting their interactions with texts, and analyzing how their various identities shape their readings of the world (Freire, 1983). This inquiry becomes a lens through which they learn about the multiple literacies of their students and how these are positioned vis-à-vis what is valued in the official curriculum.

These two pedagogical dimensions of my teacher education courses—the Spanish language activity and the investigation of one's own literacies—work in concert. Empathy and appreciation for students' languages, cultures, and experiences are a necessary, but not sufficient, aspect of seeing ourselves as teaching in solidarity with diverse communities. This must also be coupled with denaturalizing our own literate trajectories and understanding the historical contingency of our practices, rather than hewing to an uninterrogated "norm." In the words of one of my students, "It is very easy to take for granted what you believe 'everyone' should know." Critical inquiry into our languages and literacies, coupled with empathy for historically minoritized students, creates a space that challenges binary thinking (e.g., "gifted" vs. "at-risk") and where various practices and ways of knowing are affirmed.

GERALD AND LAN: RE-ORIENTING LEARNING TOWARD COMMUNITY

Lan

As a current PhD student in a literacy program, I often reflect on my identity and legacy (Lytle, 2000) in terms of my students, who are pre- and in-service teachers. My reflections always bring me to my mother, an immigrant who is unable to read in any language, and therefore, considered "illiterate." For a long time, I did not realize that this label stemmed from a deficit discourse common in describing individuals from immigrant and minoritized communities, though I witnessed and experienced the effects of the marginalization attached to this label. Working with English Language Learners in various contexts and continually reflecting on my lived experiences have (re)shaped my understanding of literacy and language as nuanced practices situated in histories, politics, and sociocultural contexts. These considerations and reflections are what I bring to my work as a literacy educator.

In helping to teach courses in a literacy specialist program, I seek to cultivate a learning environment conducive to taking a critical inquiry stance in considering the deeper social structures underlying definitions of literacy and language, particularly in the context of language learners and immigrant students. As a literacy educator, I am most excited about working in solidarity with schools and communities. When literacy programs take seriously local knowledge through on-the-ground partnerships, we are able to see that the true value of a learner cannot be measured by standardized assessments alone.

Gerald

There are two aspects of my own identity salient to my stance as a literacy educator: my background as a teacher and my family's legacy of immigration. I was professionally socialized as a full-time classroom teacher. For a decade I worked in predominantly under-resourced schools with multilingual and multicultural student populations where issues of inequality were hard to ignore. This formative aspect of my identity exists in, ideally, productive tension with my current position as a university scholar. For example, I find that the reward system of academia promotes competition and individual distinction, sometimes at the expense of an ethos of community and relationship building that was the cornerstone of my work as a teacher. I understand my own teaching and research to be inseparable and, in the courses I design, attempt to create spaces for collaborative inquiry into practice.

Similar to Lan, I am also the child and grandchild of immigrants and have had to unlearn assimilationist ideologies and autonomous models of literacy (Street, 1995) that function to marginalize individuals and sometimes whole communities. Although my own grandfather knew at least five different languages—English, Spanish, Visayan, Tagalog, and Ilocano—and lived a life negotiating cultural boundaries and political borders, he was often positioned as being somehow between languages and not fully literate in any of them. In my research and teaching, I try to remain attentive to the ways in which race, class, gender, and language oppressions intersect to devalue diversity in schools. I also invite my pre- and in-service teachers to imagine literacy curricula that learn from and build off of the multifarious cultural and linguistic practices of 21st century students, honoring them as "cosmopolitan intellectuals" (Campano & Ghiso, 2011).

The Course

In this chapter, we discuss our practices in a course titled, "Assessing Language and Learning Differences." One might conceptualize the course as a means of transmitting methods for evaluating students' literacy abilities and thus classifying them along a predetermined "norm." Instead, we invited our university students to dig beneath these assumptions and investigate how the ways in which we assess and respond to learners are invariably informed by both our explicit and implicit theories of practice. Class discussions and assignments provided a space for students to examine some of the major issues in assessment, such as its relationship to instruction, policy, and equity. Many of the readings were from scholars who have adopted sociocultural and critical perspectives on assessment and literacy (e.g., Genishi, 1997; Janks, 2000).

We wanted to investigate, rather than reify, the "objectivity" of evaluation tools, and shift the emphasis from numerical measures of student ability toward accountability to students and families. With this in mind, the course was reoriented to focus on building a relationship with a culturally and linguistically diverse community.

This reframing provided an entry point into examining what it means to actually conduct literacy assessments in a way that builds on the "funds of knowledge" (Gonzalez, Moll, & Amanti, 2005) of a community, rather than look for what might be lacking and try to fill in gaps. For the past two years, Gerald and a community literacies research group, which Lan later joined when she began the PhD program, had been collaborating with a faith-based organization, the K-8 independent school associated with the Parish, and its surrounding culturally and linguistically diverse communities. The literacy assessment course was specifically situated in a partnership with the Parish school's English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) classroom, whose learners were primarily from immigrant families that lived in the area. The ESOL teacher, Mrs. Cruz, and her students became integral members of our collaborative inquiry into literacy assessment.

Rather than aim to transmit "best practices," the course was designed as a critical inquiry into issues surrounding literacy assessment, grounded in experiences in Mrs. Cruz's classroom. Throughout the semester, we guided and supported our university students in collaborating with the immigrant children, and created assignments that built on these interactions. Importantly, we unpacked together what it means to participate in a course that stands alongside, and learns from, a community. The human connection fostered through the community partnership made concrete for the university students that, when we assess individuals, we are also assessing their families, languages, backgrounds—everything that makes them who they are. Against this backdrop of critical inquiry, our course modeled literacy assessment strategies that prepared students for the realities of working in schools. Discussions surrounding our partner community and the multilingual learners were folded into explorations of deeper issues, including Bourdieu's (2002) argument that rather than merely assess technical skills, we often unconsciously assess learners' social personas and identities, resulting in labels such as "weak," "remedial," or "gifted."

In the beginning of the semester, students in the course were given their first major assignment, which asked them to assess a piece of writing by one of the ESOL students without having met them. After submitting this assignment, the university students gathered at the Parish school for an orientation where they met Mrs. Cruz and the multilingual writers. They sat down with the children to get to know them and learn about their in- and out-of-school literacy practices. In addition to providing the university students with background on the ESOL program and answering their questions, Mrs. Cruz also spoke with each individually to provide further context regarding the learners whose writing they had assessed. In turn, the university students provided their perspectives on the children's writing and strengths. Reflecting on the experience, Stephanie, one of the students in the course, wrote the following:

> I came to the realization that this assignment was almost like a simulation of what happens when standardized tests are evaluated at the state or even district level. Students are asked to write different types of essays or stories and then their work is evaluated in [the state capital] by people who have not

> met them. In theory this seems like it would be a fair process that puts students on even playing fields. In actuality I have come to realize that this not true. Without knowing the student and where the student is coming from it is hard to judge the progress that is made within a school year and to use those results to evaluate a student, teacher or school.

As evidenced in this reflection, the experience not only provided an opportunity for the university students to begin building a relationship with Mrs. Cruz and her students, but also served as a springboard for interrogating distal literacy assessments and their role in the lives of learners. In the above comment, Stephanie questions the fairness and purpose of standardized exams, and situates the experiences of a particular learner within a larger high-stakes assessment paradigm. Bringing such reflections to the course discussions, our class interrogated the constraints of current accountability policies and explored alternatives that might allow us to grasp and support children's full potentials.

The particular structure of the collaboration with Mrs. Cruz and her students formed organically, with many of its roots in the classroom itself rather than the university. We sought to disrupt common hierarchies whereby the community's voice is lost in a power imbalance heavily in favor of the university (Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011), and we must continue to be aware of power dynamics. After the initial group meeting at the Parish school, the university students interacted with Mrs. Cruz and her students throughout the semester, working one-on-one with the children. Each visit began with an introduction by Mrs. Cruz to orient our university students to the classroom context, the day's lesson, and the learners' current work, and often ended with informal discussions about the experience. The university students then wrote follow-up reflections that were intended as a dialogue—sharing noticings, giving feedback, and asking questions. Many visited the classroom beyond the requirement of our course, and volunteered to help prepare for a major school event hosted by the ESOL class. The university students also corresponded with Mrs. Cruz via email, as per her suggestion. Weaving themselves into these layers of communication and interaction, the pre- and in-service teachers worked alongside Mrs. Cruz to support the university-school partnership, with an orientation to better understanding and building on the children's community knowledge.

SHIFTING DISCOURSES AND PRACTICES THROUGH CRITICAL INQUIRY

Current education discourse has a tenor of certainty that belies the ideological and contested nature of literacy teaching and learning. Calls for "highly qualified teachers" may differ in their pedagogical approaches, from explicit phonics instruction to engagement with children's literature, but nonetheless forward knowledge of teaching as constructed outside of classrooms (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999). The prevailing message is, too often, that there is a defined set of "best practices" developed by experts that must be taught to pre- and in-service

teachers, who implement such models with "fidelity," and that students' failure to take up these practices in the ways we expect indicates a deficiency that requires intervention. We see our role in literacy teacher education not as forwarding allegiance to particular practices, regardless of whether we may have more or less affinity with specific approaches, but to engage students in critical inquiry into such practices and the broader social and political dynamics within which they are situated.

We view the tensions pre- and in-service teachers experience between policy and curricular mandates and the diversities of their student populations and school communities as productive. When faced with contrasting world views, in the words of philosopher Maria Lugones (1990),

> One may also inhabit the limen, the place in between realities, a gap 'between and betwixt' universes of sense that construe social life and persons differently, an interstice from where one can most clearly stand critically toward different structures. (p. 505)

It is this type of space we hope to create for and with students in our university courses—a space where their multiple positionings and day-to-day work in classrooms is an epistemic resource.

Jon, a student in Gerald's and Lan's literacy and assessment course, exemplifies the promise of a critical inquiry stance. Drawing from Foucault, he reflects on his previous teaching experiences in a school that

> "was not simply a failing school, it was constructed to fail. The labels of my students as learning disabled, emotionally disturbed, or at risk—that discourse was waiting to embrace them with open arms before they set foot inside the building."

He describes the dominant discourse as reflected in statements such as the following: "Don't smile until November"; "You are beating your head against the wall. That student will be in prison before he's through high school"; "Since a lot of these students haven't seen a lot of structure at home, we have to provide it here"; and even…"When detention got out of hand, I'd whip the loudest one with an extension cord—that shut 'em up real quick." Jon then compares what he perceives to be this dominant discourse of deficit with what he heard in his graduate education program, which included, "Learn from your students"; "Learning is social"; "You never know the total amount of a person"; "Children are infinitely rational"; "NEVER give up on a child." In some ways it would be easier for us as literacy educators to merely transmit "proven best practices" to our pre- and in-service teachers. We are often pressured to make sure that teachers are trained in skills-based, often scripted, curricula so they can "hit the ground running" in their job placements. However, our approach has been to create spaces in our literacy courses to critically interrogate the dominant, sometimes racist, discourses in education and how they are manifested in policy and practice. Our hope is that we contribute to a larger professional project of shifting both discourses and practices to address inequality and more fully honor students' potentials.

Each of us and our students come to this joint project with histories. As the practices we have featured reflect, these cultural and linguistic backgrounds, experiences with educational systems, and memberships in varied communities intimately inform our educational commitments. At the university, we strive to provide spaces for pre- and in-service teachers to inquire into their practices and school contexts, but also the lenses they bring to their work. Being accountable to school communities, students, and families entails grounding our teaching in the relationships we build, and questioning practices and assessments that may not fully represent students' capacities.

Often learning is retrospective. It is important to plant the seeds of these ideas, even to pre-and in-service teachers who may seem initially reluctant or even resistant. We have had the experience where educators have recounted a situation that induced them to retroactively go back to the content and orientation of our courses. We hope our university learning communities can become sites for inquiring into what counts as literacy knowledge and teaching, and for creating educational opportunities more attuned to the robust diversity of our schools and neighborhoods. This work does not end with the semester, but, hopefully, persists across the professional lifespan.

Authors' Note: We would like to thank the Netter Center for Community Partnerships for their funded support of one of the projects featured in this chapter.

REFERENCES

Adichie, C. (2009). The Danger of a Single Story. Retrieved October 25, 2011 from http://www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda_adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story.html

Bourdieu, P. (2002). The forms of capital. In N.W. Biggart (Ed.), *Readings in economic sociology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Campano, G. (2007). *Immigrant students and literacy: Reading, writing, and remembering.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Campano, G., & Ghiso, M.P. (2011). Immigrant students as cosmopolitan intellectuals. In S. Wolf, K. Coates, P. Enciso, & C. Jenkins (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Children's and Young Adult Literature* (pp. 164–176). New York, NY: Routledge.

Cisneros, S. (1997). *Hairs/Pelitos.* New York, NY: Dragonfly Books.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S.L. (2009). *Inquiry as stance: Practitioner inquiry in the next generation.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S.L. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. In A. Iran-Nejad & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Review of research in education v. 24* (pp. 249–305). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Dyson, A.H. (2003). Popular literacies and the "all" children: Rethinking literacy development for contemporary childhoods. *Language Arts, 81*(2), p. 100.

Freire, P. (1983). The importance of the act of reading. *Journal of Education, 165*(1), 5–11.

Genishi, C. (1997). Assessing against the grain: A conceptual framework for alternative assessments. In A.L. Goodwin, *Assessment for equity and inclusion: Embracing all our children*. London, UK: Routledge.

Ghiso, M.P., & Spencer, T. (2011). Editorial: Early literacy in contested spaces. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood, 12*(4), 293–296.

Gonzalez, N., Moll, L.C., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Heath, S.B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Janks, H. (2000). Domination, access, diversity and design: A synthesis for critical literacy education. *Educational Review*, *52*(2), 175–186.
Kontovourki, S., & Siegel, M. (2009). Discipline and play with/in a mandated literacy curriculum. *Language Arts, 87*(1), 30–38.
Lugones, M. (1990). Structure/Antistructure and agency under oppression. *The Journal of Philosophy, 87*(10), 500–507.
Lytle, S.L. (2000). Teacher research in the contact zone. In M Kamil, P. Mosenthal, D. Pearson, and R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research*, Volume III. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 691–718.
Saltmarsh, J., & Hartley, M. (2011). Democratic engagement. In J. Saltmarsh and M. Hartley (Eds.), *"To serve a larger purpose: Engagement for democracy and transformation of higher education"* (pp. 14–26). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Spencer, T. (2011). Learning to read in the wake of reform: Young children's experiences with scientifically based reading curriculum. *Penn GSE Perspectives on Urban Education*, *8*(2), pp. 41–50.
Street, B. (1995). *Social literacies: Critical approaches to literacy in development, ethnography, and education*. London: Longman.
Triplett, C.F. (2007). The social construction of 'struggle': Influences of school literacy contexts, curriculum, and relationships, *Journal of Literacy Research*, *39*(1), 95–126.
Vasudevan, L., & Campano, G. (2009). The social production of risk and the promise of adolescent literacies. *The American Educational Research Association's Review of Research in Education, 33*(1), 310–353. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

AFFILIATIONS

María Paula Ghiso
Teachers College, Columbia University

Tamara Spencer
Montclair State University

Lan Ngo
University of Pennsylvania

Gerald Campano
University of Pennsylvania

KAREN DOOLEY, BERYL EXLEY & BARBARA COMBER

LEADING LITERACIES

Literacy Teacher Education for Inclusion and Social Justice

INTRODUCTION

Literacy education is often seen as a key pedagogic site for inclusion and social justice as a great deal of academic learning done in schools and beyond is contingent upon students' literacy capabilities. Without the capacity to make meaning with texts through various modes and media people remain limited in their participation as learners and citizens. More recently governments have recognized the centrality of literacy in fostering competitive knowledge economies and the social justice and literacy agenda has been complicated, at the least, by standardization of student literacy achievement through high stakes testing. Paradoxically the focus on measurable literacy practices coincides with an era of increased cultural and linguistic diversity across many nation states and rapidly changing digital communication practices. Further, it is students from equity groups—and their teachers and schools—who bear some of the strongest impacts of the new literacy testing regimes (Comber, 2012). In the Australian context *equity group* is the term applied to groups of students who traditionally have not gone on to higher education. This includes Indigenous students, people from low socio-economic backgrounds, people from non-English speaking backgrounds, and those from regional and remote areas.

In this chapter we explore the challenges of the contemporary educational moment for us as literacy teacher educators. We begin by outlining our educational priorities and the principles which bring us together and the research and theory which inform our practice. The context for our literacy teacher education program is introduced, with attention to the student demographic and the priorities of literacy education policy and practice. To illustrate, we describe our approach in two areas: grammar and reading comprehension. We then consider a recent learning and teaching project, "Leading Literacies," which involved observations and discussions with exemplary practising educators who promote technically competent critical literacies for diverse student groups. We conclude with reflections on the feasibility of creating such spaces.

BACKGROUND OF THE AUTHORS

Our work together is relatively recent; it began in September 2010 when Barbara joined the Faculty of Education at the Queensland University of Technology (QUT).

C. Kosnik, J. Rowsell, P. Williamson, R. Simon and C. Beck (Eds.), Literacy Teacher Educators: Preparing Teachers for a Changing World, 65–78.

However, our collaboration is founded on common, long-standing commitments to literacy teacher education—in particular, histories of prioritising social justice, critical literacy, and inclusive pedagogies. Together we work with both pre- and in-service teachers through research; formal teacher education programs (online and face-to-face); community outreach; and service to professional associations, such as the Australian Literacy Educators' Association (ALEA), the Primary English Teaching Association Australia (PETAA), and the Australian Council of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) Associations. We mention these different sites because we see teacher education as an ongoing and distributed process that extends throughout careers and occurs in different places. Increasingly, our students" are international and/or internationally located, yet of course they will be teaching somewhere specific, in all likelihood in communities comprising culturally diverse groups. When Barbara joined Karen and Beryl at QUT she was keen to learn more about their approach to literacy education, for which the team had recently won a faculty teaching award.

Barbara was initially a secondary school teacher of English, humanities, and reading. She came into teacher education around thirty years ago driven by a desire to understand how young people learned to read and write and why it was so much harder for some students to assemble school literacies than it was for others. She has always been interested in the relationships between young people, literacy learning and poverty and the ways in which teachers, curriculum, and pedagogy can make a difference. How literacy teachers can work for social justice is the continuing focus of her collaborative inquiries with teachers at all stages of career (Comber & Kamler, 2009).

Karen was attracted to teaching more than thirty years ago by prospects of both sharing her love of literature with children and of making a difference in disadvantaged schools. Karen's first appointments were to linguistically diverse public pre-schools and primary schools in high poverty outer suburbs hard hit by loss of unskilled jobs at a time of recession and structural economic change. Experience of the inequitable distribution of reading and writing outcomes in these conditions prompted reflection on schooling's role in reproducing social disadvantage that continues now in her work as a teacher educator. Karen is interested in assisting preservice teachers to acquire dispositions and capital for technically competent and socially just pedagogic work.

Beryl worked as a primary and middle school teacher in a range of contexts with students aged 5 to 13 years. Some of these students had experienced acute emotional trauma and were in the care of the state while others attended a middle-class private school. More recently, her work in schools has been as a teacher/researcher in a remote Indigenous community and as a consultant/researcher in a number of large low-socio-economic multicultural primary schools. Beryl sees literacy acquisition as a social justice issue. She adopts a socio-critical lens for curriculum, planning, and assessment and supports teachers to work within and against the political context of education so that their students can "view" and "construct" the world.

Not surprisingly given our common priorities, each of us draws upon key theorists whose work examines relationships between discourse and power, language and identity, pedagogy and class (e.g., Bourdieu, 1996; Bernstein, 1996; Foucault, 1988). Together we now have the opportunity to engage in reflexive sociology (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) and ongoing inquiry (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009) about our practices as literacy teacher educators and their effects.

UNDERSTANDING TEACHER EDUCATION, SOCIAL JUSTICE AND LITERACY: RELATED RESEARCH AND THEORETICAL RESOURCES

While literacy education has long been infused with theories of social justice following in the tradition of Paulo Freire (1972), only recently has research attended to the specific responsibilities of literacy teacher educators with respect to building preservice teachers' understandings of cultural diversity, racism, poverty, gender, and sexuality and their dispositions to act for equity in curriculum design and pedagogical practices. Ironically some of the initial work was triggered by the seminal papers of feminist scholars *critiquing* critical pedagogy, such as Elizabeth Ellsworth's (1989) "Why doesn't this feel empowering?" and Marylyn Cochran-Smith's (1991) "Learning to teach against the grain." These educators opened up key questions about critical pedagogy and teacher education by looking at the micropolitics of their own university classrooms and institutions, bravely questioning the effects of their own practices.

Within the context of her work as a white middle-class professor teaching an anti-racism university course with culturally diverse students, Ellsworth (1989) examined the claims made for critical pedagogy. Importantly she asked: What diversity do we silence in the name of "liberatory" pedagogy? (Ellsworth, 1989, p. 299). She argued that many tenets of critical pedagogy concerning student voice, empowerment, and dialogue are simultaneously undermined by its patriarchal and rationalist underpinnings which ultimately assumed the "superiority of the teacher's understanding" (Ellsworth, 1989, p. 307) and in privileging abstract theory tended to ignore people's actual experiences.

Cochran-Smith (1991) similarly questioned the dominance of theory in education reform programs at the expense of professional knowledge, arguing that what is needed to make a difference is collaborative work between university and school-based educators. She described a program where preservice teachers worked with school-based teachers to engage in inquiry and discussion about the serious intellectual work of teaching. At the same time they were inducted by teacher activists into interrogating problematic assumptions about what different children could accomplish based on their "backgrounds." Cochran-Smith illustrates a range of serious dilemmas which confront teachers in urban schools and which have no simple *and* just solutions within the current organisation of schooling. More recently Cochran-Smith (2003) has reviewed her body of work on teacher education from an *inquiry as stance* perspective, where she conceptualises the education of

teacher-educators as an ongoing, across the life span "process of learning and unlearning" which has resonance for us as we educate changing populations in changing policy conditions.

In literacy teacher education, Dozier, Johnston and Rogers (2007) summarised developments in this field of research, noting that in the 1990s, the US National Commission on Teaching and America's Future stated that universities did not practise what they preach in terms of investigating the effects of their own practices on their graduates' knowledge. Dozier and colleagues take up this challenge in reporting their attempts to align their teaching and research by constituting their work as an ongoing action research project, akin to Cochran-Smith and Lytle's (2009) *inquiry as stance*. At the heart of their discussion is a perennial issue: How do we attend to both the technical and the critical dimensions of literacy education? Their response entails changes in teacher values, dispositions, and agency in relation to students historically under-served by schooling, and further, building a "critical literacy" cell into program planning templates so that critique of text and context is a regular part of lessons. In addressing challenges of limited instructional time and teacher discomfort about critical literacy, Dozier and colleagues prioritize acceleration of students' reading skills while establishing a framework for critical practice. Their argument is that some of what is required for acceleration—student agency, attention to dissonance, new literate identities, and attention to language—are prerequisite also for critical literacy.

OUR APPROACH TO LITERACY TEACHER EDUCATION

Queensland University of Technology (QUT) is a comprehensive university in the Australian state of Queensland with a student population of about 40,000. The Faculty of Education is also large. The four year Bachelor of Education (Primary) (henceforth, BEd) has an enrolment of approximately 900 preservice teachers. During our careers as teacher educators there has been a significant shift in the demographics of the preservice teacher population. Now about one-third of students enter the BEd directly from school, another third are aged 20–44 and the remainder are either 19–20 or over 44 years (Exley, Walker & Brownlee, 2008). One of the implications of the changing demographic is that many preservice teachers bring experiences of parenting and of studying and working in other fields. Another implication is that students' personal experience of school literacy education ranges across many changes in the field. The past four decades have seen a succession of curricular and pedagogic moments: process writing; shared reading; language across the curriculum; a genre approach to writing grounded in functional grammar; critical pedagogic and text analytic approaches to critical literacy; multiliteracies; explicit and systematic phonics; and most recently, explicit comprehension strategies instruction. In each of these moments particular knowledges, competences, and dispositions have been accorded differential value as student and teacher capital.

The BEd has existed in its current form for about a decade. The primary literacy program consists of a suite of three units. In the first year of their degree preservice teachers take a foundational unit in visual-verbal literacies; in the second and third years they take two English curriculum units. The units were designed in the early 2000s and were informed not only by long-established traditions of scholarship about phonics, fluency, comprehension, and other aspects of print literacy, but also by visions of multiliterate futures. While treatment of print basics remained important, the re-developed English curriculum units assumed an expanded definition of literacy and took account of multimodal texts, that is texts employing linguistic, visual, auditory, spatial, gestural design, and their combinations, and of the multiplicity of contemporary linguistic and cultural worlds (New London Group, 1996).

Multiliteracies thinking entered primary literacy units through engagement with both the scholarly literature and initiatives of the public school system. Key initiatives in the public school system included "Literate Futures" and the "New Basics Project." Literate Futures was a state literacy strategy that reconceptualised "literacy" as "multiliteracies." It attended to not only the multimodality of contemporary literate practice, but also to implications of cultural and linguistic diversity in literacies and to the necessity of critical practice (State of Queensland, 2002). The New Basics aimed to improve learning outcomes by decluttering curricula, drawing on the professional capabilities of teachers and better engaging young people in schooling. It entailed "new basics"—a set of curriculum content organisers that included "multiliteracies and communications media" as essentials for new times; productive pedagogies—a framework for principled selection of teaching strategies to promote intellectual quality and other pedagogic priorities; and "rich tasks"—transdisciplinary assessable tasks (The State of Queensland, 2004).

The systemic reforms had some common priorities that were of interest to us. Chief among these were: (1) translation of multiliteracies thinking into pedagogic practice; (2) teacher professional learning; (3) extension of reading education to every level of the school system; and (4) pursuit of higher intellectual quality in schooled outcomes.

QUT English curriculum units were informed also by a local iteration of Learning by Design (Kalantzis & Cope, 2005). The Learning by Design project sought to translate multiliteracies theory into classroom practice in Australia and Malaysia. In the context of curriculum and pedagogic renewal then in place in the Queensland school system some local curriculum leaders and exemplary teachers linked their responses to systemic developments to the Learning by Design project. Annah Healy, then Primary Literacy Coordinator at QUT, assisted these local educators with their projects in three linguistically and culturally diverse local schools (Neville, 2005). Curriculum planning materials, exemplar multiliteracies projects and pedagogic practices generated by the project were made available for use in QUT English curriculum units. In addition, two of the teachers from the local schools worked as tutors in the QUT program and QUT lecturers wrote a textbook to

assist preservice teachers to translate multiliteracies theory into plans for classroom practice (Healy, 2008).

The current moment is very different from that in which the units we coordinate and teach were developed. As in the United Kingdom and the United States, recent years have seen active intervention in literacy education by the federal government in pursuit of economic goals. Changes include the 2008 introduction of the high-stakes *National Assessment Program—Literacy and Numeracy* (NAPLAN) which tests Reading, Writing and Language Conventions (Spelling, Grammar and Punctuation) in Years 3, 5, 7 and 9 (http://www.nap.edu.au/). This represents a change in what is most valued as teacher capital in the local field of literacy education (Bourdieu, 1977). It generates anxiety for preservice teachers who, by virtue of their prior schooling, find themselves in weak positions in the re-configured field. In a context of discourses of accountability, transparency, and parental choice (Comber, 2012), overall school results are published on a Federal Government website (http://www.myschool.edu.au/). Increasingly frequent and detailed analyses of the data are conducted and published by a player from the economic field—the print media (e.g., Chilcott & Davies, 2012).

Another major change at the Federal level is the 2012 implementation of the *Australian Curriculum—English* (ACE)—Australia's first national curriculum (Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2012). In the Queensland state school system the new curriculum has been translated into centrally prepared units—a major shift from long-established practices of school-based curriculum development. This has been particularly consequential for schools where NAPLAN scores are lowest and expectations of compliance with the units are strongest.

We continue to bring some of the materials developed in the course of our professional development work in schools to preservice teacher education. In doing so we recognise the expertise of school-based educators; like Cochran-Smith (1991) we question the dominance of theory. The most recent of these materials relate to comprehension and grammar instruction—priorities in the local field at present. However, while addressing current priorities, we teach a curriculum that provides a systematic introduction to the components of literacy education. Preparation for teaching reading/viewing includes attention to phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension of print and digital texts; preparation for teaching writing/designing includes attention to handwriting, spelling, and the grammars of print and digital texts. The preservice teachers use comprehensive English curriculum textbooks supplemented by readings from the international professional literature and materials produced by the state curriculum authority.

Our aim is to prepare teachers who are capable of and disposed to developing substantive and balanced literacies for all students in diverse schools. By "substantive" we mean literacy connected to students' lifeworlds and content area studies (Luke, Dooley & Woods, 2011); by "balanced" we mean literacies to which

critical textual analysis is as intrinsic as decoding (Freebody & Luke, 1990). We view children not only as learners of literacy in school, but also as critical actors in their worlds. With Freire then, we assume that the technical and the critical must be inextricably intertwined: "[t]he technical mastery is just as important for students as the political understanding is for a citizen" (2006: 41). The implication is that our literacy education program must develop student teachers' dispositions to and resources for teaching technically competent critical literacies in conditions of diversity. In what follows we look at two areas of recent activity in curriculum activity: first, development of grammatical knowledge for analysis of multimodal texts; and second, critical engagement with currently popular techniques of comprehension instruction.

RESOURCES FOR CRITIQUE

The foundation literacy unit seeks to develop the student teachers' confidence with a technical language for "reading" multimodal text. An earlier version of this text-context model of grammar was first institutionalised in Queensland curriculum by the state English syllabus of 1994. However, given the priority on written and spoken language and the newness of the functional metalanguage, translation of the model into classroom practice was still being developed and was therefore adopted in different ways in different contexts. As a consequence, our students bring a wide range of grammatical knowledge and dispositions to the formal study of grammar. Even those students who bring a grounding in grammar from schooling need more complex understandings of grammar in order to teach the design of multimodal text (see Exley & Mills, in press). Given the new national curriculum and high stakes literacy testing, traditional grammar has been re-valued as teacher capital. These ongoing changes to the professional knowledge base have required an adjustment to the grammatical content of our units, increasing attention to traditional grammar to describe linguistic form, maintaining functional grammar content for describing linguistic meanings and developing a technical metalanguage for multimodal text design such as that encountered with visual, auditory, spatial and gestural designs in text.

Consistent with critical literacy traditions which have been institutionalised in the Queensland curriculum since the 1994 syllabus, we assist preservice teachers to use a grammatical metalanguage to analyse language choices for the purposes of reading comprehension and writing instruction. One tutorial activity, developed by Beryl and Amber Cottrell, an Acting Head of Curriculum at a local school, encouraged the preservice teachers to use a grammatical metalanguage for "reading" multimodal text (see Exley & Cottrell, in press). The stimulus text is from one episode of *Animalia,* a DVD published by the Australian Children's Television Foundation (2011). The book *Animalia*, first published more than two decades ago, showcased Base's (1986) rich and detailed imagery. *Animalia* is a fictional animal kingdom, "a magical place .... inhabited by Zebras in zeppelins, hogs on bikes, media mice delivering news bulletins on blue butterflies' wings, dragons and unicorns; a drum playing gorilla,

prima donna alligator, scheming tiger and one very gallant iguana" (ten.com, 2011). Since 2010, in Australia, *Animalia* is shown on the ABC (Australian Broadcasting Commission) free-to-air channels. We focus on an excerpt from Episode 15, *Save Our Swamp,* entitled *Signing the Petition,* where two human teenagers, Alex and Zoe, become involved in the politics of *Animalia* and the environmental issues of the swamp.

In this activity the overall analysis of 20 turns of talk offered a description of the specific characteristics of each of the multiple modes of presentation, in this case, linguistic, visual, auditory, spatial, and gestural design (New London Group, 1996). The analysis showed the regular structure of each of the design elements. For example, the different characters draw on particular linguistic resources to establish sympathy for their case. The number of action verbs Allegra Alligator threatens to use ("oughta chomp-a-lomp," "will wallop" and "will whop slop") contrasts with the way teenage Alex uses subordinating conjunctions to present a more logical front ("if," "but"). Allegra's character uses figurative noun groups ("a pot load of times," "your stink bug head," "some true enough smarty talk," "flipping flapper screens," "that big ol' horn of yours") in contrast to the specific noun groups Alex uses ("one less person fighting to save your home," "the same thing they're doing," "this swamp draining business"). The analysis of the other design systems reveals the complexity of the "reading" demands. Sometimes simultaneously presented design elements produced a semantic displacement (simultaneous conflicting messages), reiteration (repeating the message without enhancing it) or enhancement (combining design elements to emphasize the message). Thus, the analysis uncovered examples where the structure and organisation of the multiple modes of text was not as straightforward as might have been expected. An example of each is shown in the Figures below.

Source: ACTF, 2011.
Scence from Animalia clip.
Reproduced with permission.

Semantic displacement (simultaneous conflicting messages) occurs when Zoe says, "Well Alex, very smooth." What seems like a compliment from Zoe is really sarcasm that only shows through when the Zoe's tone of voice (auditory design) and stance (gestural design) are "read" together.

Source: ACTF, 2011.
Scene from Animalia clip.
Reproduced with permission.

Semantic reproduction (repeating the message without enhancing it) is evident when Alex approaches Rennie Rhino with the request to "have a word" (spoken dialogue). The visual display literally shows Alex approaching Rennie. This part of the scene is unremarkable in that what is said and shown in the visuals align.

Source: ACTF, 2011. *Scene from Animalia clip.* Reproduced with permission.

Semantic enhancement (combining design elements to strengthen the message) shows through as Tyrannicus Tiger attempts to persuade the residents to sign a petition to drain the swamp. The social purpose of his talk is enhanced by simultaneously presented commands directed at "you" (linguistic design), rising music for optimism (auditory design), a soft bell for a new idea (auditory design) and a demanding close up (visual, gestural and spatial design). The design elements work together to enhance the force of the message.

The point is that we make opportunities for the preservice teachers to critically explore the design systems that have to be reconciled as young children "read." We draw texts from children's life worlds as well as the rich heritage of children's literature from mainstream Australia, Indigenous Australia and Asia, in particular. Preservice teachers are encouraged to work with texts of and about students' worlds and in doing so to look at how language creates particular perspectives. Grammar is developed not for its own sake but in service of intrinsically critical text analytic practices of comprehension. At the same time, we look at other approaches to comprehension, assisting preservice teachers to engage critically with currently popular instructional techniques.

Critique of Literacy Education Techniques

Our example is our treatment of comprehension instruction during the second and third year curriculum units. As in the U.S. (National Reading Panel, 2000), comprehension strategies instruction has generated much interest in local schools during the 2000s. Indeed, we have been asked to conduct professional development sessions in local schools on this approach to comprehension. In our curriculum units we introduce student teachers to comprehension strategies and in doing so draw on the materials we have developed alongside teachers in schools, for example, activities involving QtA (Questioning the Author), vocabulary development, and QAR (Question-Answer Relationships). One assignment requires students to prepare a plan for comprehension strategy instruction.

To help student teachers build their skills in strategy instruction we engage with critique of this approach to comprehension. To begin, we look at evidence of the efficacy of 'dialogic' instructional approaches involving rich talk around the ideas of factual and literary texts (e.g., McKeown, Beck & Blake, 2009; Wilkinson & Son, 2011). We attend to critique of student-centred pedagogy—whether in dialogic approaches such as literature circles or strategies approaches such as that of making

"text-to-self connections." In both cases the focus is on the problem of young readers over-identifying with characters whose lives are shaped differently by relations of social power and dismissing perspectives that are 'uncomfortable' (e.g., Jones & Clarke, 2007; Thein, Guise & Sloan, 2011). We consider relations of power in the participant structures of school literacy interactions. In doing so we attend both to Au's (1980) critique of comprehension lessons and to more recent work on relations of gendered, racial, and other forms of power in literature circles (Thein, Guise & Sloan, 2011). Finally, we consider the problem of decontextualisation, assisting preservice teachers to build comprehension instruction into plans for units of work that entail intellectually substantive engagement with texts involved in students' multiliterate everyday and schooled worlds. In short, while addressing local priorities to improve comprehension scores, we aim to help preservice teachers enter into still-developing critical traditions of literacy research.

Leading Literacies

One ongoing issue is that the technical and critical content we promote is not necessarily what student teachers see in their school-based practicums. As practice teaching placements were outside of our control, we designed an optional additional program called Leading Literacies. One of the program's key elements was a school visit. The QUT team approached sixteen highly effective literacy teachers known to them to open up their classrooms and talk to the student teachers. Each teacher was able to nominate a time and date for the visit between April and September of 2010 and/or 2011 when the bulk of the preservice teachers were not in practice teaching. The focus and structure of the school visit was of the teacher's choosing and a range of options were discussed.

As it transpired, no two school visits were conducted in the same way. For example, one middle primary teacher, Angela Burt, had implemented literature circles in her classroom to re-position reading as a social rather than independent activity and as a critical rather than perfunctory activity. Angela planned for the student teachers to watch her students for 40 minutes. Angela then provided a 40 minute lecture on the theories that informed her planning, pedagogy, and assessment. Angela served morning tea and hosted a question and answer session. At another school, invited because of its reputation of working with grammar across the curriculum areas, the Deputy Principal, Chris Roseneder, met with the student teachers for one hour to overview the school-based planning for the teaching of literacy. The second hour was then spent in a classroom watching Michelle Lowe teach a lesson on expansion of the noun group and use of modals to enhance the descriptive qualities of a text.

All the lessons and discussions made an impact on the student teachers. We use the grammar lesson as an example here. In the weeks leading up to the school visit, Karen had—serendipitously—been teaching expansion of the noun group and had encountered some disbelief as to whether such content was realistic for primary school students. This had not surprised us: the Queensland School Reform

Longitudinal Study rated Queensland classrooms high for social support but low for intellectual quality (Luke, 2001). These were the classrooms in which many of our students had undertaken their own schooling and formed dispositions that they brought to teacher education. Use of metalanguage was explicitly identified as one means to higher "intellectual quality" in this field.

For the student teachers the school visit dispelled disbelief; indeed, one student turned to Karen and said: "I didn't believe schools taught this." In the context of ongoing discussions between Karen and the students during a year of curriculum studies, this was understood as a comment about new insight into children's capacity for understanding and using grammatical metalanguage. For us this was a telling moment; it highlighted the value of a different space for literacy education. This is a space that is neither in the university nor the school but overlaps both; it differs from practice teaching because it is designed specifically for dialogue about exemplary literacy education practices; it differs from the tutorial room or lecture theatre because it offers an embodied experience of primary school literate practice high in intellectual quality. With this experience preservice teachers were able to problematise deficit thinking about children's capabilities that is "the worst enemy of equitable and socially just outcomes" (Luke, 1999, p. 11).

TEACHER EDUCATION FOR INCLUSION AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

Inclusion and social justice are long-standing concerns of literacy education. The failure of mass compulsory schooling to distribute literate outcomes equitably in the population is an enduring theme of literacy teacher education and literacy research; so too are transformative visions of literate futures. Like other literacy educators internationally (Dozier, Johnston & Rogers, 2009) we draw deeply on traditions of intervention and explicit teaching of print literacies while pursuing critical goals. Specifically, we view technical competence as necessary for critical activity; further, we view critique as integral to effective implementation of literacy teaching techniques in diverse populations. We translate these understandings into practice in a context where the schooled outcomes of equity groups are now the focus of intensive efforts to improve human capital for purposes of competition in a global knowledge society and economy and reforms have impacted with particular force on equity groups and the educators who cater for them.

In preparing preservice teachers in and for such contexts we problematize the possibilities of existing teacher education arrangements. The combination of university-based theory and school-based practice teaching does not necessarily best enable preservice teachers to acquire new dispositions to literacy education or to question toxic beliefs and values about literacy, literacy education, and literacy learners. The Leading Literacies project enabled us to create a space where preservice teachers, exemplary literacy teachers and teacher educators came together to experience and dialogue about literacy instruction. However, questions arise about scaleability and sustainability.

Finding the time to meet with the teachers to plan the school visits was a challenge. It took approximately five hours to negotiate each visit and to secure approval to bring student teachers on site. Although the feedback points to the success of the 2010 visits, only four teachers agreed to participate in 2011. Reasons for declining varied from being transferred to a new site, being seconded to a position away from the classroom, or being on an extended period of personal leave. The time invested by the QUT academics in 2010 was not recouped in 2011.

Another issue centred on the level of uptake. Even though this initiative was targeted to approximately 1000 Bachelor of Education (Primary) student teachers over two periods of six months across two years, the uptake for any one visit was usually less than 10, with one visit attracting 24 participants. We laboured over how to increase attendance rates—providing teacher professional association memberships prizes, including different geographical areas, scheduling visits outside of the university semester to spread the load, providing details about public transport and car pooling arrangements and an online discussion board on a Faculty-wide community Blackboard site for debriefing—with limited success.

These pragmatic difficulties highlight a larger ongoing dilemma. Ironically educators' work conditions do not easily accommodate the time that goes into such visits and conversations. Valuable learning opportunities such as Leading Literacies compete to some extent for discretionary time. Similarly, such visits are not part of preservice teachers' accountabilities and requirements. For those who are working 20+ hours per week to pay university costs and support families, the question of time for extracurricular learning is not trivial. Hence it is not easy to sustain such initiatives. The place of such programs is cause for consideration for us—an example of the lifelong learning of the teacher educator (Cochran-Smith, 1991). Creating spaces where preservice teachers can see and hear inclusive and critical approaches to complex literacy teaching with diverse student communities remains a key priority and an ongoing challenge.

ACKNOWLEGEMENTS

This article reports conceptual work that has been used as the foundation of coaching relationships at the research site of an Australian Research Council Linkage scheme project, LP0990289 (2009–2013). Karen Dooley and Beryl Exley would like to thank their research colleagues (Annette Woods, Allan Luke, Karen Dooley, Vinesh Chandra, Michael Dezuanni, Amanda Levido, John Davis, Katherine Doyle, Wendy Mott, and Adrienne McDarra), the Queensland Teachers' Union (in particular John McCollow and Lesley McFarlane), and the staff, students and community of the school where the research is based. Karen and Beryl also thank QUT colleagues involved in Leading Literacies: Louise Mercer, Mary Ryan, Kathy Mills, Erika Hepple and Jennifer Alford.

We also thank the Australian Children's Television Foundation for permission to use images and text from *Animalia* in our teaching work and in this publication.

REFERENCES

Au, K.H. (1980). Participation structures in a reading lesson with Hawaiian children: Analysis of a culturally appropriate instructional event. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 11*, 91–115.

Australian Children's Television Foundation. (2011). *Persuasive Text DVD.* Melbourne: ACTF.

Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2012). *The Australian Curriculum.* Accessed at: http://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/

Base, G. (1986). *Animalia*. Viking: London.

Bernstein, B. (1996). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity: Theory, research, critique.* Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1996). *The state nobility: Elite schools in the field of power* (Trans. L.C. Clough). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L.J.D. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Chilcott, T., & Davies, A. (2012). Overall NAPLAN improvement applauded. *The Courier Mail* (April 30, p. 1).

Cochran-Smith, M. (1991). Learning to teach against the grain. *Harvard Educational Review*, *61*(3), 279–311.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2003). Learning and unlearning: the education of teacher educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *19*(1), 5–28.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (2009). *Inquiry as stance: Practitioner research for the next generation.* New York and London: Teachers College Press.

Comber, B. (2012). Mandated literacy assessment and the reorganisation of teachers' work: Federal policy, local effects. *Critical Studies in Education, 53*(2), 119–136.

Comber, B., & Kamler, B. (2009). Sustaining the next generation of teacher-researchers to work for social justice. In B. Somekh & S. Noffke (Eds.) *Handbook of Educational Action Research (pp.177–185).* London: Sage Publications.

Dozier, C., Johnston, P., & Rogers, R. (2007). *Critical literacy, critical teaching: Tools for preparing responsive teachers.* New York and London: Teachers College Press.

Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, *59*(3), 297–324.

Exley, B., & Cottrell, A. (2012, in press). Reading in the Australian curriculum English: Describing the effects of structure and organisation on multimodal texts. *English in Australia.*

Exley, B., & Mills, K. (2012, in press). Parsing the Australian Curriculum English: Grammar, multimodality and cross-cultural texts. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy.*

Exley, B., Walker, S., & Brownlee, J. (2008). Characteristics of preservice teachers in multi-campus settings: Using demographics and epistemological beliefs to unpack stereotypes, *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *33*(6), 1–11.

Foucault, M. (1988). The political technology of individuals, in L. Martin, H. Gutman & P. Hutton (Eds.) *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault* (Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press).

Freebody, P., & Luke, A. (1990). 'Literacies programs: Debates and demands in cultural context,' *Prospect, Australian Journal of TESOL, 5*(7), 7–16.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Freire, P. (2006). *Pedagogy of the heart.* New York: Continuum.

Healy, A. (Ed.) (2008). Multiliteracies and diversity in education: New pedagogies for expanding landscapes. South Melbourne: Oxford Univrsity Press.

Jones, S., & Clarke, L.W. (2007). Disconnections: Pushing readers beyond connections and toward the critical, *Pedagogies, 2*(2), 95–115.

Kalantzis, M., & Cope, B. (2005). *Learning by design*. Altona, Victoria: Common Ground Publishing.

Luke, A. (2001). How to make Literacy Policy Differently: Generational Change, Professionalisation, and Literate Futures. Available: http://www.education.tas.gov.au/curriculum/standards/english/english/teachers/discussion/luke

Luke, A. (1999). Education 2010 and new times: why equity and social justice still matter, but differently. Available: http://education.qld.gov.au/corporate/newbasics/html/library.html

Luke, A., Dooley, K., & Woods, A. (2011). Comprehension and content: Planning literacy curriculum in low socioeconomic and culturally diverse schools. *Australian Education Researcher, 38*(2), 149–66.

McKeown, M.G., Beck, I.L., & Blake, R.G.K. (2009). Rethinking reading comprehension instruction: A comparison of instruction for strategies and content approaches. *Reading Research Quarterly, 44*(3), 218–53.

National Reading Panel (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implication for reading instruction: Reports of the subgroups*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Development.

Neville, M. (2005). Innovation in Queensland Education, in M. Kalantzis & B. Cope and the Learning by Design Project Group, *Learning by Design* (pp. 231–56). Melbourne: Common Ground.

New London Group (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*(1), 60–93.

ten.com (2011). *Animalia*. http://ten.com.au/animalia.htm. Accessed 13 September, 2011.

Thein, A.H., Guise, M., & Sloan, D.L. (2011). Problematizing literature circles as forums for discussion of multicultural and political texts, *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 55*(1), 15–24.

The State of Queensland (2004). The New Basics Project. Available: http://education.qld.gov.au/corporate/newbasics/

The State of Queensland (2002). *Literate Futures: Reading*. Brisbane: State of Queensland (Department of Education).

Wilkinson, I.A.G., & Son, E.H. (2011). A dialogic turn in research on learning and teaching to comprehend. In M.L. Kamil, P.D. Pearson, E.B. Moje & P.P. Afferbach (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research* (vol IV) (pp. 359–87). London: Routledge.

AFFILIATION

Karen Dooley, Beryl Exley & Barbara Comber
Queensland University of Technology

VIVIAN VASQUEZ

LIVING AND LEARNING CRITICAL LITERACY IN THE UNIVERSITY CLASSROOM

BACKGROUND OF THE AUTHOR

As a young child I experienced schooling in a Montessori school, Catholic school, public school, and private school. My grandfather was a professor in the Philippines and my mother was an early primary school teacher in the Philippines, and in Canada where I grew up. From a very young age I found great pleasure in assisting her in her classroom and by the time I graduated from high school, I had landed a teaching job at a local pre-school. While teaching I was simultaneously going to community college and focusing on early childhood education. Eventually I realized I wanted to teach elementary school as well as pre-school so I completed an honors degree at the University of Toronto and then went on to teacher's college at Lakehead University to become qualified to teach in the primary/junior grades (kindergarten- sixth grade). I was hired as a primary school teacher in Ontario, Canada, immediately after graduation.

My first few months of teaching were very frustrating as I struggled with being told by colleagues that I had to use the imposed organic reading program, which, at the school, was combined with the Dolch word list as central components of literacy teaching. While in teacher's college I had become interested in the research done by Harste et al. (1984) and his colleagues and had imagined teaching literacy in ways that took into account the rich experiences of children and using their language stories to inform my literacy lessons. The imposed curriculum conflicted with my ideas about how to teach literacy. In response I sought out every possibility for professional development including pursuing a master's degree. Eventually I became president of my local reading council and became an officer of the Ontario Reading Association. These experiences laid the groundwork for my later experiences in elected offices in professional organizations such as the National Council of Teachers of English and the American Educational Research Association. While pursuing my master's degree I had the privilege of studying with Jerome C. Harste, Judith Newman, and Andrew Manning and it was during these studies in the late 80s and early 90s that I first met Barbara Comber, Hilary Janks, and Allan Luke and was introduced to critical literacy. It was also during this time that I began positioning myself as a researcher in my own classroom and researching became a way of teaching (Vasquez, 2004; 1994). Through the years I have become recognized for my work in critical literacy with young children (Vasquez, 2004; Vasquez, et al. 2003). This later

C. Kosnik, J. Rowsell, P. Williamson, R. Simon and C. Beck (Eds.), Literacy Teacher Educators: Preparing Teachers for a Changing World, 79–92.

work is heavily rooted in my days as a pre-school and elementary school teacher of fourteen years.

While a classroom teacher I worked as an adjunct professor for York University working with teacher education candidates and then as an instructor for Mount Saint Vincent University, co-teaching literacy courses. It was at this time that I was awarded a scholarship and internship to pursue doctoral studies with Jerome C. Harste (Jerry) at Indiana University (IU), Bloomington. While at IU I team-taught with Jerry in the teacher education program housed at the Centre for Inquiry in Indianapolis. I graduated with a doctorate after two years and was immediately hired as an Assistant Professor at American University (AU) in Washington DC. Thirteen years later and I am now a Full Professor at AU in the School of Education, Teaching and Health.

In his book *Angela's Ashes*, Pulitzer Prize winning author Frank McCourt, writes about how he decided which moments in his life to highlight in the book. McCourt notes,

> "For years I wondered if anything that had happened to me would have broad appeal to readers. But, now I realize that everyone has a story. Nothing is significant until you make it significant. It's not what happens to you but how you look at it."

As an academic the life I attempt to live is one that deliberately "makes significant" diverse cultural and social questions about the world. For me this happens as I frame my scholarship, teaching, and service from a critical literacy perspective.

RESEARCH AS A WAY OF TEACHING

As a pre-school and elementary school teacher I had learned to use researching as a way of teaching, from books I had read (Bissex, 1980; Brice Heath, 1983; Burke, Harste & Woodward, 1984; Calkins, 1983) as well as from professional development events I attended such as a workshop led by Jerome C. Harste on Teacher Research in 1986. However, it was an incident that took place during my first year teaching that opened my eyes to the importance of creating curriculum based on "kid-watching" (Goodman, 1978).

Early in my career, while teaching first grade, at a time when learning centers were all the rage, I experienced a literacy event with six-year-old Kevin who opened my eyes to how much I could learn from my students. During writing time one day, I noticed Kevin was drawing. "Kevin, it's writing time and during writing time I expect you to write," I said. He responded, "But Miss Vasquez if I don't draw then I won't know what to write about." I left Kevin alone that day and watched as he drew and then wrote and then drew and then wrote some more. He taught me to watch more closely and to interpret and re-interpret what I was observing and then use my interpretations and analysis of those observations to construct powerful learning opportunities for my students. On that day I realized how powerful it would be to use research as a way of teaching.

My experience with Kevin created a space for me to begin to imagine what I might learn from engaging in further research in my own classroom. Taking courses for a master's degree in literacy helped me to sort out how to engage in more formalized research studies that cut across my teaching rather than simply focusing on informal observations of my students. My studies were informed by the work of groundbreaking researchers such as Haas-Dyson (1993), Rowe (1994), and Comber et al. (1994).[1] My transition into researching from my current position as an academic was therefore seamless as a result of my experiences as a teacher researcher.

Regardless of the focus of my research I maintained a commitment to engage in studies that not only push forward the knowledge base in teacher, literacy, and early childhood education, but also interrogate issues of fairness, equity, and social justice. I believe this type of research moves away from ivory tower sensibilities, having the potential to make a real difference in people's lives. Following is a sampling of some of the research topics I have pursued and whether I worked on these as a public school teacher or as an academic:

Research Topic	*Position*	*Setting*
Critical Literacy and Writing with Young Children • Case study • Document analysis	Public School Teacher	Grade 1 & 2 Classroom Mississauga, Ontario
Critical Literacy Across the Curriculum	Public School Teacher	Pre-K Classroom Mississauga, Ontario
• Ethnographic research • Narrative inquiry	Public School Teacher	K Classroom Mississauga, Ontario
• Case study	University Professor	K-6 Classrooms Falls Church, Virginia
Critical Literacy and Popular Culture in Early Childhood Classrooms • Ethnographic research • Narrative Inquiry • Case Study • Document Analysis	University Professor	Pre-K & K Classrooms Mississauga, Ontario
Technology and Critical Literacy in Early Childhood Education • Ethnographic research • Narrative Inquiry • Case Study	University Professor	Pre-K—Grade 2 Classrooms: Washington DC, Virginia, South Carolina, & New York
Critical Literacy in Preservice and In-Service Settings • Ethnographic research • Narrative Inquiry • Case Study	University Professor	Undergraduate & Graduate Teacher Education: Washington DC & Indiana

CRITICAL LITERACY

My research and creative activities focus on my work in the growing field of critical literacy. Themes common in each of the studies include creating spaces for critical literacies, using my students' interests and inquiries (pre-K to tertiary) to negotiate a critical literacy curriculum, and doing work that had real life effects rather than solely for academic grading.

Critical literacy has been a topic of debate for many years with part of the debate focusing on how best to define it. There is a belief among many critical literacy theorists and educators that as a framework for engaging in literacy work, it should look, feel, and sound different, and it should accomplish different sorts of life work depending on the context in which it is used as a perspective for teaching and learning. In other publications, I referred to this framing as a way of being where I have argued that critical literacy should not be an add-on but a frame through which to participate in the world (Vasquez, 2004, 2010; Vasquez & Felderman, 2013). This suggests issues and topics that capture students' interests as they participate in the world around them should be used as text to build a curriculum that has significance in their lives. For instance, while working with a group of kindergarten students, four-year-old Jessica raised issue with a poster of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) which was on the classroom wall when she noticed only male officers were represented. After engaging in an inquiry project focused on gender inequity, Jessica took social action by re-designing the poster and including female officers. Together, we sent the re-designed poster to the local RCMP office as a model for the kinds of posters that should be circulated. What makes this work critical is the combination of critically analyzing the poster, taking up how these sorts of everyday text put on offer inequitable ways of being, and resisting those ways of being by taking social action through designing a new more equitable text and then submitting this new design to the RCMP.[2]

Key tenets that comprise a critical literacy perspective that frame my work are as follows:

1. Critical literacy involves having a critical perspective, suggesting that critical literacy should not be taken on as a topic to be covered but rather should be a different way, lens, or framework, for teaching throughout the day (Vasquez, 2004; 1994).
2. Students' cultural knowledge and multimedia literacy practices should be used in constructing curriculum (Comber, 2001; Vasquez & Felderman, 2013).
3. The world is a socially constructed text that can be read (Frank, 2008).
4. Texts are never neutral (Freebody and Luke, 1990).
5. Texts work to position us in particular ways, therefore, we need to interrogate the perspective(s) of others (Meacham, 2003).
6. We read from a particular position(s) and so our readings of texts are never neutral, and we need to interrogate the position(s) from which we read (speak, act, do...).

7. What we claim to be true or real is always mediated through Discourse (Gee, 1999).
8. Critical literacy involves understanding the sociopolitical systems in which we live and should consider the relationship between language and power (Janks, 1993).
9. Critical literacy practices can contribute to change and the development of political awareness (Freire & Macedo, 1987; Luke & Freebody, 1990).
10. Text design and production can provide opportunities for critique and transformation (Larson and Marsh, 2005; Vasquez, 2005; Janks, 1993).

Contribution to the Field

Until the early 1990s scholarship on critical literacy focused primarily on adolescent and adult learners with some work in upper elementary settings. A focus on young children did not happen until the early 1990s when Dr. Barbara Comber, from the University of South Australia, began working on critical literacies in elementary school settings. The children with whom she initially worked were between the ages of six to eight-years-old. I was working on a Master of Arts degree at the time and was fortunate, as part of my studies, to have the opportunity to go to Australia, in the summer of 1993, to study with Dr. Comber. At the time, I was an elementary school teacher working with children between the ages of three to seven. While there, I wrote an article, "A Step in the Dance of Critical Literacy," which was accepted for publication in the peer-reviewed United Kingdom Reading Association Reading Journal the following year. In the article, I re-visited my teaching of writing in a classroom for six to seven-year-olds by asking what I could have done differently form a critical literacy perspective. The publication of that article, in 1994, represented my first attempt at creating a space for myself in the field of critical literacy. My work from 1995 until 2007 focused on creating spaces for critical literacies in pre-kindergarten and early childhood settings. More recently I have included work at the intersection of critical literacy and technology (Vasquez & Felderman, 2013) and critical literacy and teacher education (Vasquez, Tate & Harste, 2013; Albers, Vasquez & Harste, 2011) in my work.

RESEARCH AS A WAY OF TEACHING IN THE UNIVERSITY CLASSROOM

When I first decided to pursue doctoral studies it was based on the idea that upon graduating I would continue my work as a public school teacher of young children. I really had no intention of becoming an academic. Once in academia however, I realized I could create a space to fulfill my need to be with children as well as engage in scholarship. Being able to work at this intersection helped in my decision to teach in the tertiary system.

In the School of Education, Teaching and Health at American University, where I work, we offer certificate programs and a Master of Arts program in early childhood education, elementary education, secondary education and special education. We

also offer an undergraduate program in elementary education. Although we offer these programs for both pre-service and inservice teachers, my focus here will be on pre-service teachers. Some of our programs are much more populated than others and so I often find myself teaching a blended group of undergraduate and graduate students from a combination of the previously mentioned programs. Since we are located in the District of Columbia our programs are guided by the policies and requirements set forth by the District of Columbia Public Schools System. As a school of education we are accredited by The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Subsequently we are also required to adhere to subject specific standards set forth by professional organizations such as the National Council of Teachers of English and the National Association for the Education of Young Children. Regardless, I make sure to create the spaces I need to be able to engage my students in a way that I believe best supports and pushes their learning.

My work as a pre-school and elementary school teacher for fourteen years prior to working at American University has directly influenced my work as a teacher educator in a number of ways. My experience working in the public school system has helped me to create learning spaces and opportunities for my pre-service students that are grounded in both my academic experience as well as my professional experience in pre-school and elementary school settings. Therefore, when I talk about the need to work with young children from a critical literacy perspective, such as helping them analyze and critique children's literature and other texts, I do so from the position of one who has experienced this kind of work first-hand. As a former teacher of young children I also realize the need for pre-service teachers to 'live' the theories they are learning and the importance of helping them to become teachers who engage in theorized teaching practices (Vasquez, Tate, & Harste, 2013). In my classes, all my students, undergraduates and graduate students alike, are active participants. They work in pairs, in small groups and as a whole group. They do work in the university classroom and engage in experiences outside the university classroom, such as in elementary school settings.

In 2004, together with a group of colleagues from Indiana University, we published findings from our research study on the role of theory and practice in teacher education. In our paper "Practice makes practice, or does it?: The relationship between theory and practice in teacher education" (Harste et al. 2004), my co-authors and I concluded that education is "theory all the way down." What we mean is the theories that inform the work we do makes a significant difference in the literacies produced through our teaching practices. For instance, my work as a professor is grounded in a theoretical toolkit that includes theories of learning and language that work in concert to produce a critical literacy perspective that is socio-culturally and socio-politically grounded. As such, in my work I draw from critical language theories such as critical discourse theories, postmodern and postcolonial theories, feminist theories, new literacies, as well as learning theories including inquiry learning and Whole Language.

My intent in my teaching is to ground my students' academic learning in real world issues and to help them to become, what Luke (1994) refers to as glocalized

citizens, who are able to take what they learn locally to do work globally. In order to this I have capitalized on the use of technology including social networking tools such as podcasting, Twitter, and blogging. In my syllabi I often do not have readings but "multimodal readings" that include websites, podcasts, blog sites and other e-texts. Increased access to digital technologies around the world has changed what counts as literacy and social networking has produced new forms of interacting and new kinds of texts. There are therefore new spaces in which my students can participate in global online communities. In my teaching, I want to make sure these new spaces are accessible to my students. I then hope my students will do the same for the children with whom they work. Making these tools accessible means making sure I include in my course syllabi opportunities for using technology in meaningful ways. For instance if I have students write and record podcasts, they do so knowing that their shows will be published online and made available to a broader audience to make accessible to that audience particular sorts of information such as ways of using children's books critically with children.

GETTING BEYOND WHAT GETS IN THE WAY

Like most teachers across the United States the pre-service teachers with whom I work face the challenges of the increased pressure of standardized tests and mandated curricula and the fear of "big brother" looming overhead. They also have the DC credential requirement of passing *Praxis I* **(**basic skills in reading, writing, and mathematics), and Praxis II (subject-specific content knowledge, as well as general and subject-specific teaching skills). These challenges often get in the way of doing the work they believe needs to be done. To help get over these hurdles I share with my students my own experiences in breaking down barriers and disrupting dominant ideologies. I also in my classes create space for conversations dealing with:

- Knowing theoretical positions from which they do what they do as pre-service teachers
- Understanding their own privileges and disadvantages
- Knowing the standards and mandates from which they are expected to teach
- Knowing how to resist those standards and yet work within the system
- Knowing how to get beyond the standards (e.g., understanding exactly what you are being asked to do and showing that what you are doing surpasses what is mandated)
- How to critique the standards and explore their histories
- Connecting with professional organizations and be resourceful about where to get support in order to engage in the kind of teaching that you feel best supports children's learning
- Connecting with others of like-mind with whom to think, discuss about teaching and learning, and to talk about credentialing hurdles such as taking the Praxis exams. In this regard online spaces; discussion boards and listservs, widen the realm of possibility.

CRITICAL LITERACY AS ONE FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

In this section I will focus on a children's literature course that I teach from a critical literacy perspective. I teach versions of this course to both undergraduate and graduate students most of whom are pre-service teachers.

Children's Literature: A Critical Literacy Perspective

In the university catalog the course is described as the critical exploration of picture books and adolescent literature with a focus on using children's literature to explore issues of social justice and equity.

I include the following quote at the beginning of the course syllabus.

> *When people use language to speak or write, they have to make many choices. They have to decide what words to use, whether to include adjectives or adverbs, whether to use the present, the past or the future, whether to use sexist or non-sexist pronouns, whether to join sentences or to leave them separate, how to sequence information, whether to be definitive or tentative, approving or disapproving. What all these choices mean is that written and spoken texts are constructed from a range of possible language options. However, not all the options are linguistic- many texts are a combination of verbal and non-verbal elements. (Janks, 1993—Critical Language Awareness Series)*

Throughout the course I create spaces for my students to explore verbal and non-verbal elements in children's literature. We often begin with Freire's premise that the word and the world are texts that can be read (Freire & Macedo, 1987). In doing so we use sociocultural theory, critical literacy, and a new literacies perspective, to explore the notion that texts are never neutral. More specifically we have discussions regarding how texts are constructed, by whom, for what purpose(s), and in what ways texts advantage some while disadvantaging others through foregrounding particular themes and "back grounding" other themes. We also unpack the positions and stances from which texts are written and consumed including the use of new technologies such as podcasting, and we unpack the positions from which we read and engage with texts.

My students not only read and hear about theorized practice, they also "live through" various strategies for reading the world and the word including disrupting the normalized or commonplace, interrogating multiple perspectives or standpoints, focusing on sociopolitical issues, and taking social action (Lewison et al., 2002). As part of this work we explore the notion that "Texts are no longer considered to be timeless, universal or unbiased," and that "texts are social constructs that reflect some of the ideas and beliefs held by some groups of people at the time of their creation" (Frank, 2008).

While working with children's literature, we explore both language and image choices, and the ways in which texts are socially constructed, as well as consider

what we do as we go about constructing meaning from texts. We work from the premise that reading children's literature, involves the active process of predicting and confirming, or re-visiting our hypothesis about the words and images on the page based on our own past experiences and the privileges through which we come to read particular texts.

Throughout the course my student and I:

- Discuss sociopolitical issues reflected in books written for children such as issues of gender, race, class, sexuality, ability, age, region, and religion. Frank (2008) notes that issues such as these are ongoing and less temporal than issues of poverty or diversity.
- Consider how the language and visual images in books work to construct particular versions of the world.
- Construct alternate versions or counter narratives of existing texts.
- Deconstruct the structures and features of texts and ask questions of texts such as, for what purpose has the text been constructed in this way?
- Explore the use of multimodal texts and new literacies including podcasting.
- Hear about, read, and discuss, the ways in which particular classroom teachers and caregivers use children's literature from a critical literacy perspective in school settings and beyond.

I also expect my students to keep up with the multimodal reading and listening, fully engage in class discussions and activities, and fully engage in a series of Research in the Community projects as a way to connect the role that children's literature plays/can play in the wider world outside of school. The research projects are meant to enrich our class discussions.

Following is a sampling of the multimodal readings my students read.

Vasquez, V. (2010) *Getting Beyond I Like the Book: Creating Spaces for Critical Literacy in K-6 Settings*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Critical Literacy in Practice Podcast—www.clippodcast.com

Oyate Website at http://www.oyate.org/

American Indians in Children's Literature (AICL) Blog at http://americanindiansinchildrensliterature.blogspot.com/

Assignments & Projects

One of my goals as a teacher is to create projects and assignments for my students that are useful in the settings in which they work or that have real-world effects. Following are descriptions of some projects and assignments that I have created with input from my students.

Social action project. This involves doing action research in the local community for the purpose of engaging in a form of social action or service in the community that connects in some way with children's literature. For example, together with

a local bookstore owner a group of students developed informative pamphlets and bookmarks on the importance of cultural and linguistic diversity in children's literature for distribution to those who frequent the bookstore.

Personal inquiry projects. With this assignment students, propose and negotiate with me the development of a project that stems from the work we are doing in the university classroom that they can use in their settings. For example one student submitted a paper for presentation at a national conference that focused on working at the intersection of children's literature and technology for taking up critical literacies with young children.

Critical analysis podcast & QR code. The focus of this assignment is to analyze a picture book or adolescent novel from a critical literacy perspective. I ask my students to create a 3–4 minute (maximum) audio recording to be linked on a children's literature/critical literacy website I created located at http://criticalliteracybooks.blogspot.com/. Making their work public in this way adds a usefulness to their work beyond simply getting a grade.

Counter narrative text. For this assignment I ask my students to craft a counter narrative text for a traditional Cinderella story. In their counter narrative they are to disrupt the inequitable ways of being, doing, and/or thinking often represented in 'traditional' tales.

Cinderella represents the quintessential fairy tale, with its damsel in distress, wicked step sisters, patriarchal royalty, Prince Charming, and of course "the wish come true." There exist over 800 versions of the tale each of which varies depending on time and culture. In class we talk about how traditional Cinderella tales originated in communities where women were seen as subservient to men, and where women's roles in society were restricted. We then talk bout how similar versions continue to be published today portraying characters in traditionally stereotypical roles (Cinderella mops the floor while Prince Charming trots around on his white horse). They read such texts such as an interview with author Catherine Orenstein, the author of *Little Red Riding Hood Uncloaked: Sex, Morality and the Evolution of a Fairy Tale*, for a critical analysis of such stereotypes. Orenstein offers a critical analysis of the traditional Little Red Riding Hood (located at http://www.msmagazine.com/arts/2004-07-02-orenstein.asp) as a demonstration of unpacking such traditional tales. In her analysis Orenstein notes "fairy tales socialize boys and especially girls." For instance, fairy tales in their original form often socialize girls into less powerful societal roles. In this assignment I ask my students to come up with a counter narrative that works to position the characters differently and disrupt problematic representations. Some questions I ask them to consider are:

- What roles do the females play? What roles do the males play?
- Which are the more powerful roles? Why?
- What words and/or images are used in the text to convey this?

- Which are the less powerful roles? Why?
- What words and/or images are used in the text to convey this?
- What possible effects do the portrayals of the various characters have on the reader? On male readers? On female readers? On children?

We then look at some contemporary counter narratives such as *The Paper Bag Princess, Princess Smartypants* , and *Prince Cinders*. I then talk to my students about the need to look critically at even those texts that we are meant to like noting that even counter texts can have problematic issues. When they turn in their assignment they are asked to include a one-page description that includes what differences make a difference and for whom? As part of this they are also asked to include a brief critique of their counter narrative.

Research in the community. This assignment involves doing research in different neighborhood and community settings such as a bookstore, local library, classroom, television station, and the media. While in these settings my students make observational notes focused on the following types of questions.

- What linguistic and cultural diversity is represented by the books in various settings?
- How are books displayed?
- What sorts of books are given spaces of prominence?
- What sorts of books are less accessible?
- What sorts of books do you feel are missing from the collection?

The intent of this assignment is to create a space for my students to understand how the use and sale of children's books plays out in the communities in which they live. It also helps them to explore how institutions like bookstores and libraries help shape how books are consumed and circulated in different communities.

CREATING SPACES FOR GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Aside from working locally, I also want my students to gain an understanding of teaching, learning and researching from a global perspective. To this end I organized Skype conversations or chats with international colleagues such as Dr. Barbara Comber from Australia and Dr. Hilary Janks from South Africa. Also through the use of technology I have had my students engage in, online chats, with authors of assigned articles and readings. As a result my students have had a chance to participate in conversations with experts in various fields of education from around the globe and across the nation.

WORKING WITH STUDENTS OUTSIDE THE CLASSROOM

Over the years I have had the pleasure of working with a number of students outside of the classroom. For instance in fall 2000 I presented, at an international conference,

a paper on critical literacy and children's literature with an undergraduate student and recently, a group of students and I presented together at the National Council of Teachers of English convention in Chicago. Aside from having my own research published, I worked closely with several students to have book reviews accepted for publication in the *Journal of Adult and Adolescent Literacy.* Most of these students crafted their book reviews as part of their course work while taking my graduate children's literature class.

MOVING FORWARD

More recently, together with some colleagues, we have been looking more systematically at our pedagogical approaches to teacher education. In particular we want to look more closely at the what literacies are produced through our teaching practice and in the future how these literacies play out in the classrooms of our students. We also want to explore what kinds of supports our students need post certification.

While moving forward I also want to continue to explore what new developments in communication technologies might afford the work I do in teacher education settings. Finally, I would like to revise my theoretical toolkit to make better use of literacy frameworks such as Pahl and Rowsell's (2010) artifactual literacies and Comber's (forthcoming) affordances of place based pedagogies.

A conversation I am currently having with my dean is the need for faculty to continuously revisit and re-design the courses that we teach to best support the changing needs of our students and as we do this I would love for us to explore ways to ensure that we students and faculty, are able to live compassionately and ethically together in the academy.

NOTES

[1] For more on my research please refer to Vasquez (1994; 2003; 2004; 2010; Vasquez & Felderman, 2013; Vasquez et al, 2013). My transition into researching from my current position as an academic was therefore seamless as a result of my experiences as a teacher researcher.

[2] For more on Jessica and further explanation regarding what makes this work critical please refer to my book *Getting Beyond I Like the Book* Chapter 2 (Vasquez, 2010).

REFERENCES

Albers, P., Vasquez, V., & Harste, J.C. (2011). Section IV: The many faces of text. In Lapp, D. & Fisher, D. (Eds). *The handbook of research on teaching the English language arts*. (pp. 159–160). Mahwah, NJ: Routledge-LAE.

Bissex, G.L.(1980). *Gnys at work: A child learns to write and read.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Brice Heath, S. (1983). *Ways with words*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Burke, C., Harste, J.C., & Woodward, V. (1984). *Language stories and literacy lessons*. New York, NY: Heinemann.

Calkins, L. (1983). *Lessons from a child*. New York, N.Y.: Heinemann.

Comber, B. (Forthcoming). Critical literacies in place: Teachers who work for just and sustainable communities. In J. Lavia & M. Moore (Eds.). *Cross-cultural perspectives on policy and practice: Decolonizing community contexts* (pp. 43–57). London: Routledge.

Comber, B. (2001). *Negotiating critical literacies*. School Talk, *6*(3), 1–2.

Comber, B., Nixon, H., Badger, L., & Hill, S. (1994). *Literacy, diversity and schooling* video and book, Eleanor Curtain Publishing, Melbourne (distributed by Heinemann, USA).

Frank, B. (2008). *Critical literacy*. Presentation Given at the InterLERN Summer Institute, Mississauga, ON.

Freebody, P., & Luke, A. (1990). Literacies programs: Debates and demands in cultural context: Prospect. *Australian Journal of TESOL*, *5*(7), 7–16.

Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the word and the world*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Gee, J.P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis theory and method* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Goodman, Y.M. (1978). Kid-watching: an alternative to testing. *National Elementary School Principal, 57*(4), 41–45.

Haas Dyson, A. (1993). *Social worlds of children learning to write in an urban primary school. New York, N.Y.: Teacher's College Press.*

Harste, J.C., Leland, C., Schmidt, K., Vasquez, V., & Ociepka, A. (2004). Practice makes practice, or does it? The relationship between theory and practice in teacher education. *Reading Online, 4*(7).

Harste, J.C., Woodward, V.A., & Burke, C.L. (1984). *Language stories and literacy lessons*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Janks, H. (1993). *Language, identity and power*. Johannesburg, South Africa: Witwatersrand University Press.

Larson, J. & Marsh, J. (2005). *Making literacy real: Theories and practices for learning and teaching*. New York: Sage.

Lewison, M., Flint, A.S., & Van Sluys, K. (2002). Taking on critical literacy: The journey of newcomers and novices. *Language Arts 79*(5), 382–392.

Luke, T.W. (1994). Placing power/siting space: The politics of global and local in the New World Order. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, *12*(5), pp. 613–28.

McCourt, F. (1996). *Angela's Ashes*. New York, NY: Scribner.

Meacham, S.J. (2003, March). Literacy and street credibility: Plantations, prisons, and African American literacy from Frederick Douglass to Fifty Cent. Presentation at the *Economic and Social Research Council Seminar Series Conference*, Sheffield, United Kingdom, March, 2003.

Orenstein, C. (2002). *Little red riding hood uncloaked: Sex, morality and the evolution of a fairy tale.* New York: Basic.

Pahl, K., & Rowsell, J. (2010). *Artifactual literacies*. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Rowe, D.W. (1994). *Preschoolers as authors: Literacy learning in the social world of the classroom.* Creskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Vasquez, V. (2010). *Getting beyond I like the book: Creating spaces for critical literacy in K-6 Settings.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Vasquez, V. (2005). Creating spaces for critical literacy with young children: Using everyday issues and everyday text. In Evans, J. (Ed.). *Literacy moves on*, (pp. 78–97). David Fulton Publishers (UK) and Heinemann (USA).

Vasquez, V. (2004). *Negotiating critical literacies with young children.* New York: Routledge-LEA.

Vasquez, V. (2003). What engagement with Pokemon can teach us about learning and literacy. *Language Arts, 81*(1), 118–125.

Vasquez, V. (1994). A step in the dance of critical literacy. *UKRA Reading*, *28*(1), 39–43.

Vasquez, V., & Felderman C. (2013). *Critical literacy and technology in early childhood*. New York, N.Y.: Routledge.

Vasquez, V., Muise, M., Nakai, D., Shear, J., & Heffernan, L. (2003). *Getting beyond I like the book: Creating spaces for critical literacy in K-6 classrooms.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Vasquez, V., Tate, S., & Harste, J.C. (2013). *Negotiating critical literacies with teachers: Theoretical foundations and pedagogical resources for pre-service and in-service contexts.* New York, N.Y.: Routledge.

AFFILIATION

Vivian Vasquez
American University

SHELLEY STAGG PETERSON

LITERACY TEACHER EDUCATION TO SUPPORT CHILDREN'S MULTI-MODAL AND PRINT-BASED LITERACIES

BACKGROUND OF THE AUTHOR

My work with student teachers is grounded in eight years of classroom teaching, primarily in grades one-four in elementary schools in rural Alberta, Canada. My Bachelor of Education (BEd) degree in elementary education at the University of Alberta included two 39-hour courses in literacy; one in reading and the other in writing. In addition, with a minor in teaching French, I took additional courses in language learning and in French children's literature. The practice teaching placements in my four-year concurrent BEd program were for four weeks in my third year and for 13 weeks in my fourth year, so I had extended periods of time under the mentorship of excellent teachers. The courses and practice teaching mentorship provided me with a strong foundation for teaching literacy.

A language arts consultant, Dr. Patricia Payne, who had been hired on contract from the university by the northern school district in which I taught and a colleague in my grades K-2 school in Lac La Biche, Alberta, Debra Hamer, were the most powerful influences on my continued professional learning in teaching literacy as a credentialed teacher. Dr. Payne had also been the instructor of my BEd core course in teaching writing, so there was continuity in my professional learning as I moved from being a student teacher to a first year teacher. Debra Hamer, an extraordinary grade one teacher, mentored me in using forward-reaching teaching practices, such as teaching writing through group drama (Booth, 2005; Heathcote, 1985). A wise principal, Randy Clarke, matched me with Debra—a mentorship practice that is common today but was very rare when I started teaching in the early 1980s.

Another very powerful influence on my literacy teaching was the Edmonton local council of the International Reading Association (IRA). Edmonton was a 2.5 hour drive from Lac La Biche, but the conference was well worth the effort and funds that I expended. At the two-day conference I met other teachers from northern and central Alberta and learned from leading researchers of the time, such as Canadian Dr. Carl Braun and American Dr. Lucy McCormick Calkins. The IRA continues to be an important professional home for me and I encourage student teachers and graduate students to become active IRA members.

While completing my PhD in elementary education, I taught a number of sections of the core literacy course, as well as two sections of a content area literacy course for

C. Kosnik, J. Rowsell, P. Williamson, R. Simon and C. Beck (Eds.), Literacy Teacher Educators: Preparing Teachers for a Changing World, 93–106.

secondary student teachers and an elective in teaching reading for elementary student teachers. Since the completion of my doctoral degree, I have taught at least one core literacy course in either the graduate preservice programs at the Ohio State University at Lima, where I worked for three years, on the graduate and consecutive programs at OISE/University of Toronto where I have worked for 14 years.

RESEARCH INFORMING MY TEACHING

Four branches of my research have influenced my teaching in the preservice teacher education program: (1) gender issues in teaching and assessing writing; (2) teaching practices in grades four-eight classrooms across Canada; (3) action research in teaching writing; and (4) teacher and peer feedback on writing. My research brings me into classrooms many months of the school year. Because the elementary degrees in Ohio and Ontario span Grades K-8 and my teaching experience is in Grades 1–4, I complement my primary classroom experience by conducting research in Grades 6–8 classrooms.

One branch of my research examines gender issues in teaching and assessing writing. Conducted in two Canadian provinces and one American state, my research has shown that Grades 3–9 teachers and students tend to have a perception of girls as better writers than boys, particularly in the areas of organization, inclusion of details, and use of writing conventions—criteria that are prominent in many scoring guides (Peterson, 1998, 2000). This perception has not influenced teachers' scoring of student writing in research conducted across the three sites, though it is borne out in the results of large-scale writing tests across three continents (Department for Children, Schools and Families, 2010; Ministry of Education & University of Auckland, 2006; Education Quality and Accountability Office, 2011). My research has led me to examine, question, and revise my own assumptions and marking practices. I now ask students to write a qualitative assessment of their goals, the work they did to achieve their goals, and their assessment of how well they achieved their goals to provide me with a deeper understanding of what was important to them and what they have learned through completing the written assignments for their course. I feel that this reflection deepens students' learning about their own writing and learning processes and also gives me greater insight into what they have learned.

The *content* of my preservice courses has also been informed by my research. I draw on large-scale interview research conducted with Dr. Jill McClay of the University of Alberta where we interviewed 216 Grades 4–8 teachers in rural and urban communities across Canada's 10 provinces and two of the three territories (Peterson & McClay, 2010; Peterson, McClay & Main, 2010). Student teachers and I discuss the research results in terms of the Ontario Language curriculum requirements for teaching writing and various theoretical approaches. We talk about teachers' propensity to assign creative writing more frequently than informational or persuasive writing; and about teachers' provision of opportunities for their students to talk to each other while writing and to engage in peer editing. Student teachers and

I also discuss research findings regarding teachers' use of oral rather than written feedback and their use of computers as a tool for students to retype handwritten compositions to create polished copies rather than compose on computers.

Results of action research that teachers in Grades 1–8 have conducted with me are also part of my course curricula. Student teachers participate in literature circle discussions, selecting from a wide range of award-winning Canadian, American, and British novels. Through this classroom activity, I introduce student teachers to outstanding literature for grades 4–9 classrooms and demonstrate an effective teaching practice. When student teachers discuss the novels in literature circles, I provide information from action research with a Grade 8 teacher regarding the importance of providing choice for students, rather than mandating a class novel for all students to read; and the efficacy of assigning roles and ways to assess students' learning in literature circles, for example (Peterson & Belizaire, 2006, 2008). Because the action research topics are selected by teachers, they address issues that are salient to contemporary classrooms. In addition, by bringing in the results of this teacher-directed action research, I provide student teachers with models of teachers engaging in inquiry to address important issues in their teaching.

Not only has my research informed my teaching, the reverse is true, as well. The success I have observed in my own teaching as peers and I provide feedback to students has led me to develop a new line of research on feedback on writing (Peterson & Kennedy, 2006; Peterson & Portier, in press). Teachers participating in my research say that they feel under-prepared to support students in giving feedback to peers on their writing, and are not convinced of the value of peer feedback. Yet, they feel compelled to incorporate peer feedback in an educational climate emphasizing assessment for/as/of learning and developing students' metacognitive awareness (Black, Harrison, Lee, Marshall, & Wiliam, 2003). I discuss with student teachers the issues that have arisen in my research: when feedback is most useful, how to scaffold students' giving of feedback to peers and their use of the feedback in their revisions, and the types of teacher feedback that students find most useful.

FRAMEWORK FOR MY LITERACY COURSES

My current preservice literacy course is a two-hour per week course offered for 10 weeks each term, entitled: Junior/Intermediate English (EDU 1101). This is a required course for all student teachers who have a teachable (specialization) in English/language arts and are aiming for certification to teach grades 4–9. The class meets for eight weeks before the practice teaching blocks and for two weeks following the practice teaching in each of the fall and winter terms. Topics include: reading fluency, reading comprehension, teaching poetry, informational and narrative writing, teaching writing conventions, literature response, using texts to learn, reading/writing connections, issues in using a reading series, and sociocultural issues in literacy learning and instruction. Because student teachers take a core literacy course in which reading is emphasized and because my observations show

that teachers are generally not well prepared to teach writing, I attempt to balance their experience and knowledge by delving deeply into the teaching and assessment of writing.

I consider the mandated curriculum to be a representation of the theoretical perspectives and socio-cultural assumptions that policy-makers and curriculum-designers hold about students and their learning, and about teachers and their teaching. For example, the many specific expectations in the Ontario Language curriculum (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2006) for "applying knowledge of language conventions and presenting written work effectively" imply a more skills-oriented approach to teaching writing, whereas the expectation that students are to "address the demands of an increasing variety of purposes and audiences" and "reflect on their final drafts from a reader's/viewer's/listener's point of view" in the Newfoundland and Labrador writing curriculum (Government of Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Education, 1998) reflect more of a social practices discourse. (For an expanded discussion, please see Peterson, 2012). As a result, I use it as a text for critical reading in my course. As student teachers do a critical analysis of the various components of the curriculum document in terms of their own theories and assumptions about literacy and literacy learning and teaching, they are discussing the content of the curriculum, as well. In their analysis, student teachers reflect on areas where the curriculum is compatible with their views and areas where they may feel conflicts and have to compromise what they believe in order to fulfill curriculum mandates. The Ontario Literacy curriculum is fairly well aligned with current theory regarding the teaching of all strands except for writing (Peterson, 2012), where there is little evidence of the influence of Bakhtin's sociocultural theory (1986), New Rhetorics (Chapman, 1999; Freedman & Medway, 1994) and New Literacies (Lankshear & Knobel, 2006) theories. The shortcomings of the writing strand of the curriculum reinforce my decision to devote more time to the teaching of writing in my J/I English course.

Informed Observers of Children's Learning

One important goal in my teaching of initial teacher education courses is to foster student teachers' recognition that they must be wide awake to the everyday evidence of their students' learning. Good teaching starts with these observations and is enhanced by a deep understanding of theories of how children learn and of cognitive, affective, social, and cultural influences on children's learning. One of my assignments, a literacy case study, attempts to foster this awareness. Student teachers assess a sample of one student's writing, the student's responses to traditional comprehension questions that are assigned in large-scale and classroom assessments of reading comprehension (e.g., analysis, synthesis, prediction, inference, evaluation and making connections types of questions), and conduct a literacy interview based on Carolyn Burke's reading interview (Goodman, Watson & Burke, 1987). They use their analysis of the data to identify two objectives for supporting the student's

literacy learning and developing learning activities for supporting the student in achieving the objectives. The importance of gathering daily evidence of children's learning is underscored in my course, as I devote five of the 20 class meetings to providing theoretical underpinnings for analyzing the data. For example, I introduce student teachers to P. David Pearson's and Taffy Raphael's reading comprehension model (Pearson & Johnson, 1978; Raphael, 1986; Raphael & Au, 2005; Raphael & Pearson, 1985). I have found that teachers talk about comprehension as an omnibus skill that their students either possess or do not possess. They often do not consider what sources of information readers must draw upon to be able to synthesize, analyze, infer, predict, and evaluate, and so on. In my view, the Pearson/Raphael model provides teachers with a framework for understanding why their students might struggle in synthesizing or inferring. The model is helpful to them to support students in understanding that they can use information from a number of sources in the text, or can draw upon their background knowledge, as well as text information, to infer something about the character's motives, and so on. I also model and provide guided practice in carrying out the interviews, developing comprehension questions, analyzing responses and writing of grades 4–8 students, in addition to providing principles for planning instruction from the assessment results.

Social Constructivist Approach

I believe that building respectful, positive relationships with students and among students is important to being an effective teacher of preservice students. My students are my top priority among the many demands on my time. I meet individually with all of the students in order to get to know them and to address their individual learning needs. When students' papers are handed in, I set aside time in the next few days to assess them and provide feedback. I try not to allow anything else to prevent me from sending students their feedback within five days of the due date. Another way to show respect for students is to give them a clear sense of my expectations early in the term. I include the scoring guides for the two assignments in the course syllabus so that student teachers have a starting point for self-assessment and improving the quality of their work, thus enhancing their learning. Before the free-choice assignments are submitted, I ask student teachers if the criteria and relative weighting of each criterion seem fair to them so that my assessment will reflect the strengths of their work.

I model social constructivist (Vygotsky, 1978) practices in my teaching by having student teachers grouped around tables to facilitate interaction while they are involved in class learning activities. In addition to modeling and providing opportunities to practice various teaching approaches, I encourage student teachers' reflection on and critical questioning of purported "best practices" in light of various theories. Through inductive teaching, I provide examples of particular approaches to teaching literacy and invite student teachers to generate principles on which they can frame and assess their practice, rather than to collect an assortment of practices.

Course Reader

The course reader includes articles by Ken Goodman (1993) and Donald Graves (2004) because I want beginning teachers to have a sense of where the taken-for-granted approaches for teaching reading and writing have come from and to know the names of these two important theorists and researchers. It also includes an article by Constance Weaver (1992) about the political aspects of using a reading series and by Mitzi Lewison, Amy Seely Flint, and Katie Van Sluys (2002) about teaching critical response to literature. I continue to use the former because the late 20th century voices of concern about the de-professionalism of teachers and homogenization of literacy practices through the use of basal readers seem to be quiet in our modern era of find-a-worksheet-on-the-internet and school district-mandated "best practices." I believe that student teachers should be aware of the reading series published by educational publishers, but should use a critical lens to assess what each component of the resource will contribute to their students' learning. As such, I devote a class to student teachers' reviewing of Ministry of Education-recommended resources using criteria generated from the Weaver (1992) article. The Lewison, Flint and Van Sluys (2002) article introduces approaches for teaching *students* to read critically, as I believe that teachers should not be the only ones who ask questions about the social, political, and cultural assumptions within texts.

The course reader includes reading guides to give student teachers a sense of key ideas that they can think about before, during, and after their reading. The reading guides serve as starting points for small group and whole-class discussions. My practices align closely with research on reading comprehension that indicates students should have a sense of the kinds of information they should be seeking and thinking about before they read (e.g., Gunning, 2012; Vacca & Vacca, 2004).

Process Approach to Teaching Writing

I also model a process approach to teaching writing (Graves, 2004; Pritchard & Honeycutt, 2006). I offer students a choice of topic, audience, and genre (though the topics must be related to literacy teaching and assessment, with *literacy* being defined broadly). I ask students to create a project, such as a handbook/website/newsletter/PowerPoint presentation for teachers or parents, that they will be able to use in their future professional lives; not to consider their professor as the exclusive audience. In addition, I provide verbal feedback regularly on drafts of student writing, and provide extended periods of time to work on one major composition. I give students choice in their topic, so that they delve into a topic that is meaningful to them and feel a sense of commitment to their writing. Students receive ongoing feedback on their writing in two one-on-one meetings that take place during scheduled class time. In the first meeting, students and I discuss their plan for their writing, an provide suggestions for their reading and for possible genres they might use to communicate what they learn. In the second meeting, I give students feedback on a draft that they submit

prior to the meeting. My students and I have noticed remarkable improvements in the quality of students' writing and their satisfaction with the quality of their learning experience as a result of the ongoing feedback and expectations for revisions. In addition, many students have created texts that they went on to use to inform parents of students in their classrooms or to share with colleagues.

MULTILITERACIES

My student teachers typically have a wealth of experience and knowledge in using media and digital technologies. I encourage them to apply what they have learned in their topic-of-choice assignments. These assignments often take the form of wikis, blogs, Tumblrs, Prezis, websites, PowerPoint presentations, XTra Normal movies, podcasts, Comic Life- or BitStrips-generated graphic novels, and newsletters that require the use of media and digital technology. Student teachers can use any genre and form that best achieves their purpose except an essay. Often, students hand in a URL for their website/wiki/blog/Prezi, and so on, and their self-assessment when they submit their free-choice assignment. I believe that essays are not as challenging as other forms, particularly in an era where students can cut and paste from websites without thinking deeply about the ideas and making the ideas their own. My feedback to students during student-teacher conferences often involves looking at how the ideas from materials students have read can be shaped to further their purposes in a voice and register appropriate for the genre, context, and audience; one that moves away from the impersonal essay voice and tone that they tend to have taken up throughout their undergraduate years.

As shown in Figure 1, my assessment of the free-choice project involves consideration of how student teachers have made the best use of what the genre and technology afford and how they use graphic design and other elements of style to achieve their purpose (adapted from Peterson, 2008).

Student teachers submit their assignments just before their practice teaching placement. To ensure that they do not have to wait to receive feedback and grades, I send them written feedback via email while they are in their practice teaching.

Another aspect of multiliteracies, addressing the needs of individual children by building on what they bring from their out-of-school lives, is an important part of my course. For example, drawing on my own experience as a volunteer for the Toronto Public Library's Leading to Reading program (see http://www.torontopubliclibrary.ca/support-us/volunteering/leading-to-reading/), I provide theoretical frameworks, principles and approaches for developing fluency and word recognition abilities (e.g., Kuhn, Groff & Morrow, 2011) through whole-class activities and through tutoring individual children. In addition, I tell stories of my tutoring experiences with culturally and linguistically diverse children struggling with reading. I create a reader's theatre context for student teachers to apply the principles and approaches in a role play where one student teacher takes the role of a student who makes many miscues. My goal for future years is to work with classroom teachers in

Content	Points out of 4
1. Creates a context that presents a thoughtful and perhaps new way of looking at the concept	_____
2. Provides specific supporting details consistently so the writing is easy to understand and creative/engaging	_____
3. Maintains a clear focus and clear connections between ideas	_____
4. Uses multiple sources of information	_____
Organization	
1. Writer makes the best possible use of the genre structure to achieve her/his purpose	_____/6____
Style	
1. Uses language, sentence structure, and voice appropriate for the audience and genre	_____
2. Uses specific words and expressions, a variety of sentence structures/ graphic design in a creative and effective way	_____
Conventions	
1. Consistently and effectively uses spelling, grammar and punctuation	_____
Total /34	_____

Self Assessment /6

Please write about how well you feel you achieved the goals for your writing.

Figure 1. EDU 1101: Junior/Intermediate English Free-choice Project/40.

schools within a short commute of the university to match grades 4–8 struggling readers with student teachers and provide a more authentic context for their tutoring.

Related to the theme of bringing children's lives into the classroom, I draw on my experience as a member of the Notable Books for a Global Society (see: http://clrsig.org/nbgs.php), a committee of the Children's Literature and Reading Special Interest Group of the International Reading Association. During the class where we discuss the Lewison, Flint and Van Sluys (2002) article on critical response, I introduce student teachers to multicultural literature that addresses issues of power and privilege for particular groups and represents diverse cultures across the world.

CHALLENGES

Because of the limited number of course hours devoted to literacy, a significant challenge to preservice instructors at OISE/University of Toronto is determining what is fundamental to student teachers' professional learning. Should the course address a wide range of topics and issues or a smaller number of topics in order to achieve greater depth of understanding? The greater the depth, the higher the stakes in determining which topics should be included because each one has to be highly significant. In my English specialization course, the decision is made easier because I try to address the topics that the core literacy course instructors are not able to take up. There is no credential requirement nor is there a mandated textbook, so my research observations, experiences as a preservice instructor and classroom teacher, theoretical and socio-cultural perspectives, values and professional knowledge drive my curriculum decisions.

I do not require students to read a great volume of articles because of the extensive other demands of their nine-month consecutive preservice program (examples of the readings are outlined in the *Framework for my Literacy Course* section). Student teachers are in class for at least six hours five days a week, so there is little time to do readings for courses and complete assignments for every curriculum area, a general course in teaching methods, a sociology course and a psychology course, as well as an elective and the Junior/Intermediate specialization course. I would like to introduce students to more of the literacy research, theory and practical literature, especially on topics that are not addressed in class. My experience teaching in this program has shown that whenever additional assignment or reading loads are placed on student teachers, they are forced to choose between attending classes and completing assignments that have a direct impact on their grades.

The need to give sustained attention to the teaching of writing is supported by observations of the amount of extended writing that grades 4–8 students are composing in Ontario classrooms. When my student teachers carry out their literacy case study, for example, they often have difficulty gathering a writing sample from their focus students because so little extended writing has been assigned between September and the end of November. A recent document outlining the foundation for teacher preparation in literacy education in Ontario initial teacher education programs (Wade-Woolley, 2011) indicates that the emphasis on reading pedagogy will continue, as this blueprint for teacher education programs places greater emphasis on preparing beginning teachers to support children's reading comprehension, word-level reading, and vocabulary than the cognitive and socio-cultural aspects of teaching writing.

MOVING FORWARD

It is undeniably important to introduce new teachers to the communication and meaning-making possibilities afforded by new literacies in order to prepare them

to teach in 21st century classrooms (Evans, 2004). In my experience, however, student teachers are well versed in these possibilities and simply need open-ended assignments that allow them to develop the manual/artistic/technical skills and collaborative Web 2.0 approaches and values to create multimodal texts, along with the time and space to experiment with the texts' social and communication potential. The manual/technical/artistic/collaborative competencies and approaches are not sufficient for children to be able to make meaning from and to create texts, however. My observations of grades 5 and 6 students creating wikis and blogs in science and social studies, for example, show that many struggle with creating texts that pull together information from a range of digital and multimodal sources, often cutting and pasting chunks of text from websites that assume a reading level in advance of elementary students' abilities. Students change a few of the familiar words and present the results as their synthesis of the ideas. They will not have the opportunity to gain deeper understanding of the concepts, nor to create socially powerful texts without also having traditional reading and writing capacities. The challenge for teachers is to find ways to teach the skills that are needed to be able to construct meaning and synthesize ideas.

Another characteristic of 21st century classrooms that should be considered when preparing beginning teachers is the linguistic and cultural diversity of the student population. These students have experienced varying levels of formal literacy instruction and must learn the linguistic and socio-cultural aspects of English along with developing their meaning-making capacity when interacting with print, visual, and aural texts. I draw from a wealth of knowledge, created from decades of research about how children learn to make sense of symbolic text and to communicate with others within a range of social environments, to prepare student teachers to teach literacy in an increasingly multi-model, multicultural and multi-linguistic world. I draw on work published in the 1970s (e.g., Goodman, 1970; Rosenblatt, 1978) in the 1980s (e.g., Cummins, 1986; Graves, 1983), in the 1990s (e.g., Clay, 1998; Heath, 1992) and the 2000s (e.g., Cai, 2008; Coiro, 2011). I believe that in order to capitalize on the potential of new literacies and on the linguistic and cultural knowledge that children bring to classrooms, teachers will require a solid foundation in supporting reading comprehension and writing print-only and multimodal texts to achieve a purpose using (or manipulating for their chosen social purposes) conventional spelling, punctuation, and grammar. Student teachers generally do not have a strong background in teaching the more traditional aspects of reading and writing.

Finally, the voice of Lisa Delpit (1988) should continue to guide the preparation of student teachers to teach in 21st century classrooms. In a pedagogical era predominated by whole language perspectives, Delpit advocated for the explicit teaching of powerful literacy practices alongside out-of-school literacies and to explore the histories and implications of the relative social, political, and economic power of various literacy practices and texts. Drawing exclusively upon popular culture texts and familiar multimodal literacy practices limits children's literacy learning, as it does not teach "the codes needed to participate fully in the mainstream"

(Delpit, 1988, p. 296). Beginning teachers must be able to support children's awareness of the social/cultural power implicit in being able to make sense of, to create, and to recognize in which contexts they are more likely to achieve their social/political purposes when using various conventional and informal texts. This will require knowing how to support children's multimodal *and* print-based literacy learning. It is important for beginning teachers to be prepared to create learning environments that bring in literacy texts and practices drawn from students' out-of-school social worlds, that support all students' abilities to read and write a wide range of texts, and that encourage a critical assessment of the valuing of particular literacy practices and texts over others.

REFERENCES

Bakhtin, M.M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. (V.W. McGee, Trans., C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Eds.). Austin: University of Texas Press. (Original work published 1979).

Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B., & Wiliam, D. (2003). *Assessment for learning: Putting it into practice*. Berkshire: Open University Press.

Booth, D. (2005). *Story drama: Creating stories through role playing, improvising and reading aloud* 2nd Ed. Markham, ON: Pembroke Publishers.

Goodman, Y., Watson, D., & Burke, C. (1987). *Reading miscue inventory: Alternative procedures*. New York: Owen.

Cai, M. (2008). Transactional theory and the study of multicultural literature. *Language Arts, 85*(3), 212–220.

Chapman, M. (1999). Situated, social, active: Rewriting genre in the elementary classroom. *Written Communication, 16*(4), 469–490.

Clay, M.M. (1998). *By different paths to common outcomes*. York, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.

Coiro, J. (2011). Predicting reading comprehension on the Internet: Contributions of offline reading skills, online reading skills, and prior knowledge. *Journal of Literacy Research, 43*(4), 352–392.

Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Education Review, 15*, 18–36.

Department for Children, Schools and Families (2010). *Early years foundation stage profile achievement by pupil characteristics, England 2008/09*. London: Author.

Department for Children, Schools and Families (2010). *Early years foundation stage profile achievement by pupil characteristics, England 2008/09*. London: Author.

Department for Education and Skills (2006). *Raising boy's achievement: Key findings*. London: DfES. Found on October 5, 2011 at: https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/RR636.pdf

Delpit, L. (1988). *The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in education other people's children. H*arvard Educational Review, *58*(3), 280–298.

Education Quality and Accountability Office (2011). *Ontario provincial report on achievement*. Toronto: Author. Retrieved on September 30, 2011 at http://eqao.com/pdf_e/11/EQAO_ProvincialReport_Elementary2011.pdf

Evans, J. (2004). Introduction: The changing nature of literacy in the twenty-first century. In J. Evans (Ed.), *Literacy moves on: Using popular culture, new technologies and critical literacy in the primary classroom* (pp. 6–13). New York: David Fulton.

Freedman, A., & Medway, P. (1994). Introduction: new views of genre and their implications for education. In A. Freedman & P. Medway (Eds.), *Learning and teaching genre* (pp. 1–22). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Goodman, Ken. (1970). Behind the eye: What happens in reading. In Ken. Goodman & O.S. Niles. (pp. 3–38). *Reading: Process and program*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Government of Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Education. (1998). *English language arts grades 4–6: A curriculum guide*. St. John's, NL: Author.
Graves, D. (1983). *Writing: Teachers and children at work*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
Graves, D. (2004). What I've learned from teachers of writing. *Language Arts, 82*(2), 88–94.
Goodman, K. (1993). *Phonics phacts*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
Goodman, K., Watson, D.W., & Burke, C.L. (1987). *Reading miscue inventory: Alternative procedures*. Katonah, NY: Richard C. Owen.
Gunning, T.G. (2013). *Creating literacy instruction for all students* 8th Ed. Boston: Pearson.
Heath, S.B. and Wolf, S.A. (1992). *The braid of literature: Children's worlds of reading*. Cambridge, MA: Oxford University Press.
Heathcote, D. & Herbert, P. (1985). A drama of learning: Mantle of the expert. *Theory into Practice, 24*(3),173–180.
Kuhn, M.R., Groff, C., & Morrow, L.M. (2011). Reading fluency beyond the primary grades: Helping make difficult texts accessible. In J.R. Paratore & R.L. McCormack (Eds.), *After early intervention, then what? Teaching struggling readers in grades 3 and beyond* 2nd Ed. (pp. 3–20). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2006). *New literacies: Everyday practices and classroom learning* 2nd Ed. Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.
Lewison, M., Flint, A.S., & Van Sluys, K. (2002). Taking on critical literacy: The journey of newcomers and novices. *Language Arts, 79*(5), 382–392.
Ministry of Education & University of Auckland (2006). *Achievement in writing. Information kit: Student achievement in New Zealand.* Wellington: Ministry of Education.
Ontario Ministry of Education (2006). *The Ontario curriculum grades 1–8: Language*. Toronto, ON: Author.
Pearson, P.D., & Johnson, D.D. (1978). *Teaching reading comprehension*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
Peterson, S. (1998). Evaluation and teachers' perceptions of gender in sixth-grade student writing. *Research in the Teaching of English, 33*(2), 181–208.
Peterson, S. (2000). Fourth, sixth, and eighth graders' preferred writing topics and identification of gender markers in stories. *The Elementary School Journal*, *101*(1), 79–100.
Peterson, S.S. (2008). *Writing across the curriculum: All teachers teach writing*. 2nd Ed. Winnipeg: Portage & Main Press.
Peterson, S.S. (2012). A five discourses analysis of writing curriculum and support documents across Canada. *Curriculum Inquiry, 42*(2), 260–284.
Peterson, S., & Belizaire, M. (2006). Another look at roles in literature circles. *Middle School Journal, 37*(4), 37–43.
Peterson, S.S., & Belizaire, M. (2008). Literature discussions and assessment: Bringing literary and social learning together. *Ohio Journal of English Language Arts, 48*(1), 48–56.
Peterson, S., & Kennedy, K. (2006). Grade six teachers' feedback on girls' and boys' narrative and persuasive writing. *Written Communication, 23*(1), 36–62.
Peterson, S.S., & McClay, J. (2010). Assessing and providing feedback for student writing in Canadian classrooms. *Assessing Writing, 15*(2), 86–99.
Peterson, S.S., McClay, J., & Main, K. (2010). Teaching writing in Canadian middle-grades classrooms. *Middle Grades Research Journal, 5*(2), 77–90.
Peterson, S.S., & Portier, C. (in press). Grade one student and teacher feedback on writing. *Education* 3–13.
Pritchard, R.J., & Honeycutt, R.L. (2006). The process approach to writing instruction: Examining its effectiveness. In C.A. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 275–290). New York: Guilford Press.
Raphael, T.E. (1986). Teaching question-answer relationships. *Reading Teacher, 39*(6), 516–532.
Raphael, T.E., & Au, K. (2005). QAR: Enhancing comprehension and test taking across grades and content areas. *Reading Teacher, 59*(3), 206–221.
Raphael, T., & Pearson, P.D. (1985). Increasing students' awareness of sources of information for answering questions. *American Educational Research Journal, 22*(2), 217–235.

Rosenblatt, L.M. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem: Transactional theory of the literary work*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
Vacca, R.T., & Vacca, J. (2004). *Content area reading* 8th Ed. New York: Longman.
Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Wade-Woolley, L. (2011). *Towards a foundation for teacher preparation in literacy education in Ontario*. Kingston, ON: Ontario Association of Deans of Education.
Weaver, C. (1992). Questions and answers. In O. Cochrane (Ed.). *Questions about models of literacy development*. (pp. 17–22). Winnipeg, MB: Whole Language Consultants.

AFFILIATION

Shelley Stagg Peterson
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/University of Toronto

VALERIE KINLOCH

DIFFICULT DIALOGUES IN LITERACY (URBAN) TEACHER EDUCATION

BACKGROUND OF THE AUTHOR

As a faculty member in Literacy Studies at Ohio State University, I am invested in preparing pre-service literacy teacher education candidates and doctoral students to think critically about teaching, learning, stories, and location. This investment stems from my familial background. I was born and raised in the segregated South to working-class parents whose lives indicated, and continue to indicate, the importance of stories as a way to critique racism and segregation, especially in the spaces and places they did not have access to because of skin color. I center stories in my work with teacher education candidates as we consider the peril of place, and as we consider, in the words of Darling-Hammond (1998), ways "to seek, create, and find a myriad of possible places for themselves in society" (p. 91). Thus, I see myself as a facilitator of learning that happens across multiple spaces, with multiple perspectives, and through multiple stories.

My Story

As I reflect on my familial background—one that includes a seventy-something year old mother who is a retired Licensed Practical Nurse and an eighty-something year old father who is a retired Naval Shipyard driver—I recognize that my university teaching is a direct result of who I am, where I have lived, and the educational challenges that have confronted me and that confront many students of color attending schools in segregated urban and/or rural environments. Challenges associated with access to high-quality educational resources, inequitable educational structures, and negative media portrayals of what students of color cannot do are abundant. In the face of these challenges are possibilities and promises: students of color excelling academically (Perry, Steele, & Hilliard, 2004), narratives of successful African American educators (Ladson-Billings, 1994), as well as students and teachers engaging in difficult dialogues about place, race, and power (Delpit, 2003; Haddix, 2010; Kinloch, 2010). With pre-service literacy teacher education candidates, doctoral students, and in-service teachers, I believe that to center these challenges and the promises that can arise from them is to engage in critical teaching and humanizing work.

C. Kosnik, J. Rowsell, P. Williamson, R. Simon and C. Beck (Eds.), Literacy Teacher Educators: Preparing Teachers for a Changing World, 107–120.

As a teacher educator, I realize the importance of centering challenges, or what I call difficult dialogues (e.g., moments, lived experiences, literacy interactions), in my practice. Graduating with a Bachelor of Arts degree in English from an undergraduate Historically Black College or University (HBCU) in the South, and completing my Master of Arts degree in English/African American Literature and Doctor of Philosophy degree in Composition and Rhetorical Studies at a Predominately White Institution (PWI) in the North have given me a perspective that draws on critical literacy and equity pedagogy. With this perspective, I call into question the multiple, complex ways pre-service literacy teacher education candidates who, in my case, are mostly White females, think about and learn to work within urban schools whose student population is mainly poor and/or working-class middle and high school students of color. My work with candidates, particularly in one of the required courses I teach titled, Reading Across the Curriculum, helps me to think about my familial background and connections to place and space as I participate in teaching and research initiatives that support literacy teachers working in urban schools. My work with pre-service and in-service literacy teacher educators, doctoral students, high school students, and school administrators, and my teaching of literacy courses across the last twelve years have encouraged me to engage with others in difficult dialogues about place, race, and identity as these relate to literacy teacher education.

MY RESEARCH ON LITERACY TEACHER EDUCATION

As a teacher educator and educational researcher, I see an ongoing need for teacher preparation programs to better prepare prospective literacy teachers to work within urban teaching settings. In my work, I examine stories—of place, race, identity, and justice—as I collaborate with pre-service literacy teacher education candidates to question educational structures (e.g., schooling; school policies) and role exchanges (e.g., young people as teachers and learners; teachers as learners and listeners). My current research projects represent such examinations.

Teacher Education as Community Engagement

Working with public school educators has helped me to think carefully about theoretical and practical implications of teaching in urban schools. As principal investigator and researcher for a nationally funded service-learning and community engagement project that has collaborated with over 80 teachers, 2,700 public school students, 55 community organizations, and educational leaders in the school district and the teachers' union in Columbus, Ohio, I began to question how this work could impact my involvement with pre-service literacy teacher education candidates. What might it look like for practicing teachers to collaborate with pre-service teacher education candidates to design rich literacy experiences (e.g., service-learning initiatives; community action projects) for students? How could an invitation into

the university for practicing teachers to talk with pre-service teacher education candidates enhance candidates' emerging philosophical beliefs and pedagogical practices, as well as my own? This project and these ensuing questions have led me to enact seven principles, or lessons, in my teacher education courses. They are (Kinloch, 2012):

- Approaching teaching as a reciprocal act in order for teachers and students to share, design, and negotiate rigorous instructional objectives and goals;
- Reframing teaching content from routine "Do Now" warm-ups at the beginning of class to sophisticated, group-supported inquiries into texts, experiences, and learning encounters from a variety of contexts;
- Practicing multiple ways to effectively model for students and for students to model for one another and for me skills, practices, and teaching dispositions that reflect interpretative, analytical attitudes;
- Confronting debates around skills and process approaches to learning and teaching;
- Being explicit about the culture of power and its codes that operate within schools and within many of the approaches we take to "teach" literacy to students;
- Accounting for cultural relevancy, centering equity pedagogies, recognizing students' prior knowledge, and honoring their community affiliations in our instruction;
- Imagining teaching and learning as Projects in Humanization (PiH) that support and include a variety of epistemological and ideological stances.

These principles frame my work with candidates, push me to question how I teach and why, and encourage candidates to see themselves in the curricula as they learn to see their future urban public school students in the curricula, too. This work is supported by the willingness of in-service teachers to work with candidates on topics of literacy and urban teaching.

Urban Teacher Education and Confronting Differences

One study that derives from a larger project I have conducted that is relevant for this chapter is on lessons learned from a joint class session with pre-service literacy teacher education candidates and students from an urban high school in New York City. During this session, which occurred in the spring of 2007 at a local teaching college, both groups of students crossed boundaries to discuss teaching, teachers, and students in urban public schools. They thought silently and talked aloud about difficult questions: Why do they (teacher candidates and high school students) have intersecting beliefs about urban schools and urban students? What do diversity, difference, privilege, and achievement mean, and what are their (candidates and students) understandings of these topics in relation to public perceptions about urban schools?

At the conclusion of the joint session, I was reminded of:

- The importance of literacy teachers and students learning how to question public and personal assumptions of urban students and their academic abilities;
- The damage of teachers silencing students and/or asking them to abandon their lived realities and community voices upon entrance into classrooms;
- The significant responsibility teachers have to move with their students toward a "multi-disciplinary understanding of language, literacy, and pedagogy" (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999, p. 16) in listening to, talking with, and accepting students and the communities from which they come;
- The value of teachers (in training, new, and practicing) to confront assumed difficult topics alongside students to improve practice and "call educational space into question" (Fecho, 2004, p. 156);
- The need for students to know they can author new ways of learning and new selves that speak against inequitable educational practices, institutional structures, and racist ideologies, and that teachers will support them as they do this work.

Including diverse perspectives in my pre-service literacy teacher education course helped us (candidates, high school students, and me) critique personal assumptions, pedagogical practices, and lived realities about, and within, urban schools and communities.

MY APPROACH TO LITERACY TEACHER EDUCATION

I constantly grapple with the following questions as I prepare to teach and as I am teaching the reading course: What might it mean to prepare pre-service literacy teacher education candidates for the changing landscape of schooling, especially in urban contexts? In what ways can interactions among pre-service literacy teacher education candidates and in-service teachers facilitate difficult, yet dynamic conversations on reading instruction, urban education, and youth identities? How are we to theorize difficult dialogues—among pre-service literacy teacher education candidates, in-service teachers, the course instructor, and course texts—in ways that lead to meaningful practical implications for (urban) literacy teaching and learning?

Beginning with the premise that difficult dialogues in literacy teacher education courses—especially in a course that purports to explore reading *across* the curriculum—are important for new literacy teachers, I approach the teaching of this course by emphasizing how learning is multiple, complex, and contextualized; collaborative, reciprocal, and active; and guided by principles in social justice. I emphasize that teaching, in this case teaching in urban schools, requires us to attend to (and/or work with others to strengthen) linkages across schools and communities in ways that center student academic, social, and personal lives as well as achievements. This emphasis is grounded in a literacy framework that draws on humanizing work and culturally sustaining pedagogy. My reading course is not the only literacy course required of literacy teacher education candidates who specialize

in English Education at OSU. Therefore, I am able to witness students grappling with aspects of this framework and its applicability to urban teaching all throughout the academic year. This grappling is important as candidates come to envision themselves as urban educators.

Literacy as Humanizing and Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy

Although I did not name it as such, my previous work points to a humanizing and culturally sustaining pedagogical approach. I recall my research with African American youth, mainly Phillip and Khaleeq, on gentrification in New York City's Harlem community, and the moment that the video camera turned from youth participants to me. "But you already know that," echoed Phillip, just as Khaleeq said, "So, what about you? What you think about gentrification? Let's hear it." It was in this moment, after a couple of years collaborating with Phillip, Khaleeq, and their peers, that I was asked to speak up, to share, to do what I was always asking participants to do. I felt the exchanges we were having and their invitation for me to "keep it real" by "speaking up, honestly" (Phillip) became humanizing. In other words, our "relationships became redefined against dichotomous categories of researcher-and-participant to researcher-as-participant-as-listener-as-learner-as-advocate" (Kinloch & San Pedro, forthcoming). I spoke up. They listened. They questioned. They spoke back. I listened. I questioned. And our work humanized us just as much as we humanized it.

Thus, I feel that to work within a critical literacy framing requires the explicit inclusion of humanizing work that leads to culturally sustaining pedagogy. It is such pedagogy that reflects my educational philosophy and that frames my literacy teacher education courses. Specifically, I draw on the following principles of literacy as humanizing and culturally sustaining pedagogy in my teaching:

i. Literacy as ideological, multiple, and situated in various contexts. Many other literacy scholars conceptualize literacy as ideological, rather than autonomous, in their contention that literacy is directly associated with social structures, social practices, and belief systems. The ideological model of literacy, for Street (2005), provides a "culturally sensitive view of literacy practices as they vary from one context to another." He continues, "this model starts from different premises than the autonomous model—it posits instead that literacy is a social practice, not simply a technical and neutral skill, that it is always embedded in socially constructed epistemological principles" (p. 418). If this is true, then literacy, which "is always contested" (p. 418), is about the knowledge people have of the world, of their experiences in the world, and of their interactions with reading, writing, and being. Hence, literacy as ideological is multiple and situated in a variety of contexts. As concerns literacy teacher education and the reading course I teach, this view of literacy pushes us (candidates and me) to think deeply about our ways of interacting with others (to include our processes of reading and writing) and the relations of power that are present in our interactions. Recognizing this push and working within

it to make sense of what it might mean to be and become urban educators is crucial if we are committed to humanizing work and culturally sustaining pedagogy.

ii. Literacy as culturally sustaining and socially just. Within the broad view of literacy as ideological should exist a conceptual understanding of culturally sustaining pedagogy (CSP). CSP is pedagogy that not only recognizes the import of multiculturalism and multilingualism, but also "seeks to perpetuate and foster—to sustain—linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as part of the democratic project of schooling" (Paris, 2012, p. 95). In this way, culturally sustaining pedagogy relies on Ladson-Billings' (1995) formulation of culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP) to deepen one's cultural competencies, linguistic variances, and literacy practices in, and from, schools and communities. In conducting critical, humanizing work, especially with pre-service literacy urban teacher education candidates and school-aged youth, it becomes important to inquire into perceptions of success and achievement in mainstream contexts that have, historically, neither affirmed nor sustained traditionally marginalized cultures, languages, and literacies. Literacy as culturally sustaining and socially just points to instructional practices that provide students with opportunities to openly engage in meaning-making processes, draw on lived experiences, and critique existing educational structures and scripted curricula. In this way, students "read the word and the world" (Freire & Macedo, 1987).

iii. Literacy as democratic engagement. I view Democratic Engagement (DE) as situated practice contextualized within lived conditions, histories, daily realities, and people's civic, or democratic, interactions. Elsewhere, I write that DE is grounded in "the ideals of education, the values of literacy acquisition, and the principles of creative pedagogies [that support] conversations and relationships people have with one another in multiple spaces of interaction" (Kinloch, 2005, p. 109). Among other things, DE highlights learning as reciprocal, collaborative, complex, active, and rooted in mutual exchanges. Connections between engaging in learning and practicing DE leads to participatory forms of learning that, according to Darling-Hammond (1996), gives "students access to social understanding developed by actually participating in a pluralistic community by talking and making connections with one another and coming to understand multiple perspectives" (p. 6). This framing points to an ideological conceptualization of literacy, which is important for literacy teacher education candidates as they, themselves, think about and practice forms of participatory learning that centers justice and democracy.

These three principles influence the direction I take in my Reading Across the Curriculum course.

Overview of the Course

Prior to the university-wide conversion to a semester system from a quarter system in Summer 2012, my section of the Reading Across the Curriculum course met once a week for 10 weeks. Generally, the course enrollment per quarter averaged 30 students, with the majority of students entering into the Master of Education

(M.Ed.) program in English Education upon completion of an undergraduate degree. Other students were returning students, having worked in professional settings after acquiring post-bachelorette degrees. Whatever the make-up of the course, students were asked to use a social justice lens to debate theoretical and practical implications of reading across the curriculum.

Candidates were asked to engage in processes of reflexive inquiry and critical questioning to explore multiple approaches to, meanings of, and strategies for cross-curricular reading. Doing so encouraged us to work toward a view of reading as highly complex and bounded situationally. Such a conceptualization required us to understand connections among reading, readers, texts, and location as interactive and situated in multiple problem-posing and problem-solving strategies. We agreed that reading is embedded within a larger context of cultural, linguistic, cognitive, social, and political factors that influence people's engagement with learning in classrooms and the larger world.

Consistent with the framing that I previously discussed of literacy as ideological, culturally sustaining, and as democratic engagement, I sought to have students participate in difficult dialogues about place, race, and literacy. At the same time, I needed students to examine how content, setting, identity, and power influence reading processes; to learn different ways to provide instruction in, use diverse strategies for, and interact with students to facilitate reading; and to recognize the teaching of reading as processes rather than as a discreet series of skills. While I needed students to think about these things, they identified additional needs, including learning how to select reading materials and why; determining ways to embed reading instruction in meaningful contexts and for meaningful purposes; and knowing when and how to try out different teaching approaches with students as learning standards and objectives were not only addressed, but met.

The curriculum and assignments are neither fixed nor rigid, but flexible in that we openly negotiate and reframe assignments to meet candidates' literacy learning and teaching needs. As described in the distributed version of the syllabus, the three major assignments include:

- In-Class Workshops on Lesson Planning and Plans
- Reading Group Book Project
- Case Study of a Reader

These major assignments are paired with other activities—facilitating discussion, responding to texts, and responding to class visits from in-service teachers and/or doctoral researchers. The collective assignments and student/instructor negotiations of them reiterate the framing of literacy described above.

The primary course text is Fisher and Frey's (2012), *Improving Adolescent Literacy: Content Area Strategies at Work.* Additional readings include articles on reading strategies and practices across the curriculum, adolescent literacy, apprenticeship models, and language and cultural practices. While this list is not exhaustive, it does provide grounding in literacy issues for adolescent learners

and their teachers. These readings and the activities that accompany them support interactive, hands-on engagements that prepare candidates to complete (and/or propose variations of) individual and group assignments. In what follows, I provide two examples of difficult dialogues that speak to my framing of literacy, my collaborations with candidates, and my dedication to prepare them to work within urban educational contexts.

Inviting Teachers In

Earlier, I described seven principles that I have begun to enact in my teacher education courses as a result of a joint class session with pre-service candidates and high school students. I return to these principles here because they guide my teaching of the reading course at OSU. From approaching teaching as a reciprocal act, reframing traditional methods for teaching content, to imagining teaching and learning as humanizing, I believe it is important to include diverse perspectives, especially in relation to urban teaching, inside my course. I want candidates to think openly, deeply, and differently about students in urban schools. I want them to do more than read about "the whirlwind that too many Black and Brown students face" but to seriously consider "the ways that schools can contribute to their [students] blooming in the midst of their many difficulties" (Lee, 2007, p. 185). However, as Lee explains, "unfortunately, public education has in too many instances been a significant contributor to the maelstrom" (pp. 185–186). What is it that a reading across the curriculum course and its instructor can do to address this "maelstrom" and to prepare candidates for urban teaching?

For one thing, if I rely on a framing of literacy as ideological, socially just, and culturally sustaining, and if I understand teaching as a reciprocal and humanizing act, which I do, then I must collaborate with practicing teachers. That also means I must invite them to collaborate with pre-service candidates and with me. Thus, I devote class sessions for candidates to work with teachers from Columbus City Schools (CCS). Recently, five veteran CCS teachers attended a class session to work in small groups with candidates, share reading lessons and student work samples, and discuss approaches to teaching students in urban schools. In small groups, they talked openly about how they create guided reading questions with students, make time for readers' workshops, encourage students to keep reading journals, how they select and teach young adult novels, and how they design lessons. During the second part of the class, teachers participated in a panel discussion in which they offered candid suggestions to candidates. They talked about getting to know students, not lowering expectations or teaching down to students, and not making assumptions about students' academic abilities because of public stereotypes about urban schools and urban students. One candidate asked, "What's your advice for teaching struggling readers in urban schools?" To this, a teacher responded, "Remember why you want to be a teacher, remember yourself as a student, but also think about how you'd feel if teachers called you struggling. You got to do

right by students, be real because they're smart. If you believe in social justice, be it and teach it. Don't be nothing but rigorous in your instruction with any type of reader." The other teachers agreed. They reiterated the idea of rigor and insisted that teachers listen to students and recognize their reading abilities to effectively teach them.

This sentiment about being "rigorous" connects to arguments from course readings that "make the case that reaching our adolescent struggling readers does not necessitate a retraction from rigorous content learning, but rather that content learning and reading to learn are deeply intertwined and that the very students who need it the most currently have the least opportunities to become literate across the content areas" (Lee & Spratley, 2010, p. 20). Many difficult dialogues with candidates resulted from this shared session: Can I call students struggling readers or not? How do I create lessons that meet students' reading needs? What am I supposed to do if other teachers don't think it's their job to also teach reading, so they don't? How do I respond if I'm teaching a text and students make personal connections to their lives? Will students shut down if I don't respond because I might not know how? You are asking us to think about teaching reading deeply and differently, but suppose we've never had to think about that before let alone practice it? These difficult dialogues and their ensuing questions (as connected to course readings, framings of literacy, and input from teachers) must become a central part of literacy/reading courses. Undoubtedly, literacy teacher education programs and their pre-service teacher education candidates must talk more often with veteran in-service teacher educators as they confront challenging questions, learn a variety of reading strategies, and prepare to enter into (and remain in) urban teaching contexts. The in-class workshops on lesson planning/plans, one of the three major assignments highlighted earlier, allow students to confront such challenges, tackle difficult dialogues, and practice designing lessons in the space of our class and in the presence of supportive peers.

Listening to Urban Youth

Going back, again, to the joint session helps me enter into my reading course at OSU knowing the importance of confronting difficult topics alongside students, and supporting them as they author new ways of learning that speak against inequitable educational structures. In this case, I draw on examples from my teaching in an urban high school to discuss with candidates students' resistances to my reference that they are readers and writers.

This specific OSU reading class session began with a direct question from a candidate: "Suppose students don't want anything to do with reading. Do I move on or what?" This question followed the previous week's discussion of students of color, reading, and cultural competencies. After listening to the candidate's question and comments offered by others, I directed their attention to a passage from one of our readings: "Educators are frequently unable to see the considerable

cognitive competencies these children possess … Students of color, particularly when they represent different cultures, are seldom represented in relationship to each other. We also rarely encounter students of color when the focus of the research examines learning strengths" (Meacham, 2001, p. 190). I talked about reading with urban students and offered examples from Robert, Aureliano, and Christina (from my English class at Perennial High School in East Harlem) and Phillip and Khaleeq (from my research at the NYC High School in Central Harlem). For the most part, the aforementioned youth did not see themselves as readers and writers. Khaleeq, who at the time was about to graduate from high school, confessed to me that he was on a 10th grade or below academic level. He expressed feelings of being failed and being a failure. I told candidates that it was later that he explained how too many teachers gave up and moved on, and that he suffered from this. Khaleeq is not alone in his feelings, for Robert and Aureliano's resistance to being called readers and writers had a lot to do with how some teachers "move on or what" with the curriculum and ignore the very students they are supposed to teach.

Candidates began to connect these narratives with arguments from course readings, with non-required texts they brought into class, and with experiences they were having in their student teaching experiences. Connecting this discussion with one of our course goals—engaging in reflexive inquiry and critical questioning in regards to reading instruction—helped us map out challenges with *not* moving on. We relied on a social justice lens to examine the layered tensions within this challenge (e.g., not moving on; not ignoring, but teaching students), and we pondered what it means to confront these challenges as beginning teachers. What are some of the demands these challenges might have on candidates as they enter into urban teaching contexts? How can candidates address their resistances to moving, or not moving, on, resistances that might have to do with inexperience in urban teaching environments, assumptions about urban students and their academic abilities, and years of not addressing their (candidates') racial and economic privileges? The narratives I shared with candidates and their need to learn how to not move on led to more difficult dialogues. Two of the major course assignments I referred to earlier—Case Study of a Reader and Reading Group Book Project—provide the space for candidates to observe a middle or high school student during their student teaching placement, ask questions about students' reading habits, engagements, and influences in and out of school, and reflect on pedagogical possibilities for enhancing reading instruction (case study assignment). They also allow candidates to work with their peers in constructing a collection of lessons, assignments, and culminating projects geared toward involving students in high-quality reading activities (book project assignment). The course conversations, assignments, and narratives about students as readers and writers (or not) point to my belief that difficult dialogues in literacy teacher education should be a part of the educational experiences for pre-service teacher education candidates in all literacy courses if candidates are to really be prepared to enter into urban teaching settings.

Difficult Dialogues and Lessons

For the above examples (Inviting Teachers In; Listening to Urban Youth), I made conscious attempts to weave into them my framing of literacy as humanizing and sustaining. Candidates and I (as well as those who accepted invitations into the class) addressed students' cultural competencies, reading practices, and ways of knowing across school and community contexts. We explicitly discussed ways to teach reading by positioning students at the center, instead of on the outside, of our instruction, and by recognizing how students construct and reconstruct their academic identities. Such discussions support pre-service literacy teacher education candidates' work toward culturally sustaining pedagogies for students (and for themselves) in urban contexts—pedagogies that are meaningful and challenging, and pedagogies that are grounded in equity, fairness, and justice.

Such difficult dialogues enhance pedagogical practices around reading instruction as well as support a critical focus on narratives of race, place, identity, and power. As mentioned in the description of literacy as ideological, sustaining and socially just, and democratic, there is a need for instructional practices that provide teacher education candidates with opportunities to engage in meaning-making processes, draw on lived realities, and critique educational structures including scripted curricula. Candidates can do these things by participating in difficult dialogues in literacy teacher education. For me, these difficult dialogues materialize in the ways candidates and I interact with each other and with course texts, reconstruct course assignments, debate reading strategies and instructional approaches, and collaborate with in-service teachers. These collective experiences push us to prepare to engage in (urban) literacy teaching and learning.

CHALLENGES

As I reflect on my work with pre-service literacy teacher education candidates, I am aware that there are lots of other experiences we neither have time nor space to cover in one academic term. There are many topics that need to be addressed as candidates prepare to become urban literacy educators (e.g., multiliteracies and technology; testing; varied forms of assessment; linguistic diversity; working with parents/families; social justice in theory and practice). However, because my course is not the only literacy course required of candidates in the English Education program, I remain hopeful that what we do not address in my one course is taken up in other courses.

I wonder and worry about how candidates process the difficult dialogues we have and if they, in turn, can actualize ways to support such dialogues with their future students. Because many of the candidates are not from, and have not worked within, urban communities, their associations with "urban" students are often limited in scope. I cannot fully assume that candidates will know how to broker particular types of conversations with students about reading, writing, power, and identity in

relation to the demands faced by some urban schools and communities. I hope that candidates do not leave my course assuming an expert status on facilitating difficult dialogues and on fully understanding students' educative and social engagements within urban educational contexts. Candidates should learn to read their own lived conditions, privileges, and identities as texts if they seek to build educational communities with students and if they want to strengthen their teaching practice.

The framework of literacy I rely on provides a foundation for me to invite candidates to have difficult dialogues with their peers, class visitors, with me, and with course readings. However, I realize that my framing can appear challenging for beginning teachers who have not spent years actualizing and putting into practice culturally sustaining pedagogy and humanizing work. At the end of each term, I am left to consider: Have I made the right decision in my framing of literacy and of teaching? Am I being unfair to candidates by insisting that they learn to center students in the curriculum through a humanizing, socially just, and democratic lens? Is it too much to ask them to complete a case study of a student reader when they, themselves, are questioning what it means to teach reading to students, on the one hand, and what it means to teach in urban schools, on the other hand? When I raise these questions to candidates at the end of the term, I am happy to hear many of them express a commitment to humanizing teaching and difficult dialogues, even in their uncertainty with the type of teacher they will become.

MOVING FORWARD

I move forward thinking about recommendations I have for my teaching, for literacy teacher educators, and for my academic and administrative colleagues. Teaching the reading course for more than four years at OSU has convinced me of the necessity of long-term educational partnerships among candidates, in-service teachers, school administrators, and university instructors. Being strategic about such partnerships could begin with scheduling our university literacy teacher education courses at urban public schools and local community sites. It could also mean that we encourage teaching collaborations between literacy in-service teachers and university instructors. From my research on community engagement, I seek opportunities to work with local educational leaders and bring that work into my literacy courses as I make public my commitment to urban teaching and urban schools. The possibilities that could emerge from this work are action-oriented: groups of people addressing literacy teaching and urban education; groups of people co-constructing a literacy teacher education course; and groups of people deepening their understanding of, and involvement with, urban education in moving toward improved academic opportunities for students.

Additionally, such partnerships could enhance the university's outreach and engagement initiatives in ways that better align with the framing of literacy I propose in this chapter. This framing builds on the expertise of people committed to urban teaching and learning including literacy in-service teachers, school administrators,

guidance counselors, and students. The university could work more closely with the school district and the teachers' union to implement peer-mentoring programs that pair beginning literacy teachers with veteran in-service teachers for an initial three years. In this way, beginning teachers can receive professional development opportunities and curricular support from veteran teachers, and veteran teachers can continue to refine their practices. All of these recommendations are attentive to the need to support candidates as they enter into the field and their future urban students who benefit from engaged-instruction (and instructors). While these recommendations may appear challenging to implement, especially in a reading course, they should be understood as suggestions that could impact how literacy instructors design curriculum, interact with candidates, collaborate with in-service teachers, and encourage difficult dialogues in literacy teacher education courses and programs.

REFERENCES

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (1999). The teacher research movement: A decade later. *Educational Researcher, 28*(7), 15–25.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). Education for democracy. In W.C. Ayers & J.L. Miller (Eds.), *A light in dark times: Maxine Greene and the unfinished conversation* (pp. 78–91). New York: Teachers College Press.

Delpit, L. (2003). *The skin that we speak: Thoughts on language and culture in the classroom.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Fecho, B. (2004). *"Is this English?" Race, language, and culture in the classroom.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2012). *Improving adolescent literacy: Content area strategies at work* (3rd edition). New York: Allyn & Bacon.

Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the word and the world.* Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Haddix, M. (2010). No longer on the margins: Researching the hybrid literate identities of Black and Latina preservice teachers. *Research in the Teaching of English, 45*(2), 97–123.

Kinloch, V. (2005). Poetry, literacy, and creativity: Fostering effective learning strategies in an urban classroom. *English Education, 37*(2), 96–114.

Kinloch, V. (2010). *Harlem on our minds: Place, race, and the literacies of urban youth.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Kinloch, V. (2012). *Crossing boundaries—Teaching and learning with urban youth.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Kinloch, V., & San Pedro, T. (in press). The space between listening and story-ing: Projects in Humanization (PiH). In D. Paris & M.T. Winn (Eds.), *Humanizing research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32,* 465–491.

Lee, C.D. (2007). *Culture, literacy, and learning: Taking bloom in the midst of the whirlwind.* New York: Teachers College Press.

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

Meacham, S.J. (2001). Vygotsky and the Blues: re-reading cultural connections and conceptual development. *Theory into Practice, 40*(3), 190–197.

Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher, 41*(3), 93–97.
Perry, T., Steele, C., & Hilliard, A. (2004). *Young, gifted, and black: Promoting high achievement among African-American students.* New York: Beacon Press.
Street, B.V. (2005). At last: recent applications of New Literacy Studies in educational contexts. *Research in the Teaching of English, 39*(4), 417–423.

AFFILIATION

Valerie Kinloch
Ohio State University

ROB SIMON

LITERACY TEACHER EDUCATION AS CRITICAL INQUIRY

> When you go at life with a question and simply try to follow the trail of answers, then all the familiar contours of culture begin to shift. Everything is connected to everything else, and the web shakes with any touch at the farthest margins.
>
> —Mary Rose O'Reilley, *The Peaceable Classroom* (1993, p. 37).

INTRODUCTION: SHIFTING THE FAMILIAR CONTOURS OF LITERACY EDUCATION

Social justice educator Mary Rose O'Reilley (1993) describes literacy teaching as a process of raising and exploring questions. This can be can be a means of making purposeful connections in classrooms. It can also be unsettling. Questions, O'Reilley suggests, can alter understandings of the "familiar contours" of educators' understandings. Normative assumptions are troubled, opened to critique. Classrooms become sites of critical inquiry.

In the context of literacy teacher education, the process of raising and exploring questions can connect aspects of learning to teach that may otherwise seem disjointed or fragmented (Britzman, 2003). What might it mean to approach learning to teach literacy as a process of asking questions and following the trails of answers? What are the implications of inquiry for literacy teacher education, as a critical framework for pedagogy and a stance on practice (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009)?

In this chapter I explore how inquiry has influenced my practice as a literacy teacher educator in the United States and Canada. I first describe my background as a teacher at an alternative high school, Life Learning Academy, built on the principle that "at-risk" or "delinquent" students are creatively and intellectually capable. I then provide a brief overview of practitioner inquiry and social practice theories of literacy (e.g., Street, 1995) as frameworks for teacher education. In the remainder of the chapter, I describe how these ideas and experiences shape courses I have taught at University of Pennsylvania and Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/University of Toronto. I explore several examples of how collaborative inquiries in my courses unsettle assumptions about literacy and learners, encouraging student teachers to develop their own theories of practice, critical readings of policy contexts, and more relational pedagogies in urban classrooms.

C. Kosnik, J. Rowsell, P. Williamson, R. Simon and C. Beck (Eds.), Literacy Teacher Educators: Preparing Teachers for a Changing World, 121–134.

LEARNING TO TEACH LITERACY AT LIFE LEARNING ACADEMY

In many respects my acculturation into literacy teaching was atypical. In 1997, I participated in an inquiry into the San Francisco juvenile justice system. In partnership with the mayor's office and a self-help rehabilitation program for former adult offenders, Delancey Street Foundation, our investigation pointed to the need for new programs, including an alternative high school, Life Learning Academy, for adolescents who had been involved or were deemed "at risk" of involvement in the criminal justice system (Simon, 2005). Life Learning Academy was founded on the belief that students who had been inscribed within narratives of failure, deficit, risk, and violence, could transcend these ascriptions and flourish academically with the proper support.

Life Learning Academy developed through ongoing inquiry. We built our school with our first cohort of students. They put up walls, and painted them. As a faculty, we attempted to envision, also from the ground up, what school might look like. This involved unsettling assumptions about students' abilities, institutional structures, and our own methods of teaching. Recognizing that traditional approaches had failed our students, we began with a set of questions: Who are our students? What are their needs? What structures and curriculum might encourage them to develop more beneficial relationships to schooling and to each other?

We experimented with mixed-age grouping and teaching core subjects through multidisciplinary arts and vocational projects, such as a student-run café, an organic community garden, and a digital storytelling studio. Life Learning Academy became a crucible for teachers to learn with colleagues, as well as from students, who in many cases brought very different experiences of schooling than their teachers, as well as varied cultural backgrounds, and an array of (often unrecognized) talents, individual needs, and interests.

As I have described elsewhere (Simon, 2005; 2009; Simon, Campano, Broderick, & Pantoja, 2012), teaching at Life Learning Academy also presented opportunities to draw on my own background, including interests in film and cultural studies, and my experience as a printmaker. I taught English through arts-based inquiry projects (e.g., Albers & Harste, 2007; Simon, 2011). For example, my students analyzed images of urban adolescents in media as a basis for developing a 25-minute film, *Life Learning*, which followed a group of students in their senior year at Life Learning Academy. For a collaborative project in art, social studies, and English, we explored the civil rights movement through color, collage, and literary analysis. Inspired by Tim Rollins and Kids of Survival (Berry, 2009), this involved painting on book pages torn from the civil rights memoir *Warriors Don't Cry* (Beals, 1995).

As Cummins (2009) notes, literacy learning is strongly tied to engagement. This has proven true in my experiences. One of the most poignant aspects of working with students on these and other arts-based projects was how deeply invested we became. During the summer following their graduation, I was surprised and

encouraged when student filmmakers volunteered to complete final editing for our film. Years later several of them expressed interest in making a sequel about the lives of graduates since their commencement. For our civil rights project, students spent hours doing color studies on book pages. One student, who had a long history of systemic violence, was completely absorbed in his art. At one point, after painting intently for several hours, he said: "I feel totally at peace."

I describe my involvement with Life Learning Academy because it deeply informs my teacher education practice. Learning to teach literacy at Life Learning Academy shaped my image of what school can look like; my emphasis on the local and relational aspects of teaching; my belief in the capabilities of all students; and my suspicion of programs and policies that position adolescents, like those at Life Learning Academy, as academic failures. These foundational experiences taught me how inflexible pedagogies and structural certainties construct many adolescents as deviant or deficient, and how a critical, questioning stance can support productive alternatives for teaching them.

PRACTITIONER INQUIRY AND LITERACY STUDIES: FRAMEWORKS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

Literacy education is influenced by discourses that regard student teachers as neophytes, recipients rather than generators of knowledge for practice (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999; Simon, 2009, 2012). These discourses and associated practices "hail" (Althusser, 1971) new teachers as novices entering a field of hierarchical expertise. As Althusser (1971) notes, social organizations are shaped by ideology, which frequently masquerades as common sense—"obviousnesses as obviousnesses"—that reinforces power relationships, institutional structures, and subject positions. In literacy teacher education, expert/novice models support binaries—such as those between "practical" realities of classrooms and the "theoretical" or scholarly traditions of universities (Wideen, Mayer-Smith, & Moon, 1998). Connections between research and teaching are conceived of as moving one way, carrying university-based knowledge into sites of practice (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999).

As the example of Life Learning Academy suggests, inquiry can provide foundations for constructing more dialectical visions of literacy education, positioning teachers and students as knowledge generators. In teacher education, this can form the basis for connecting schools and universities through collaborative explorations of practice (Simon et al., Forthcoming; Simon, Campano, Broderick, & Pantoja, 2012; Kamler & Comber, 2005), encouraging individual agency for new teachers and more horizontal notions of expertise (Campano et al., 2010). Inquiry can support student teachers to become "active and interactive, developers rather than developed" (Lieberman & Wood, 2001).

Practitioner research suggests that knowledge for teaching is context dependent, and that teachers are uniquely positioned to develop conceptualizations and

consequential pedagogies. In its emphasis on local knowledge generation (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999), practitioner research has resonance with New Literacy Studies (Gee, 2008; Street, 1995; Pahl & Rowsell, 2012), which regards literacy as local, embedded within social contexts and practices, and meaningfully shaped by individuals. Echoing the experiences of practitioners, scholars have theorized literacy as political and realized within classrooms and communities.

Social practice theories have importance for educators. Policy often defines literacy as abstract skills that float above local contexts, what Street (1995) has called "autonomous" conceptions. From an autonomous perspective many of the ways that adolescents use language do not count as "real" literacy. For example, online communications, which are governed by changing technologies, new forms of social relationships, and fluid orthographies, may be deemed flawed or ungrammatical, impediments to, rather than instructional resources for, literacy in school. New Literacy Studies regards adolescents' engagements with language in their lives as unique forms of literacy practices, supporting arguments for policies that better account for local needs and interests of students and teachers.

In this sense and others, New Literacy Studies has connections with other traditions, such as critical literacy (Friere, 1987; Christensen, 2009; Janks, 2010; Rogers, Mosley, & Kramer, 2009; Vasquez, 2004), that consider pedagogy as political activism, entailing drawing on the cultural and linguistic resources of learners, toward individual and broader social change. Critical traditions challenge instrumental institutional structures and practices in literacy education. Combined with practitioner research methodologies, critical literacy and New Literacy Studies frameworks encourage student teachers to regard teaching as embedded in sociocultural and political contexts, shaped by complex relationships among students, teachers, school administrators, policymakers, researchers, parents, and others. As the examples I explore in the remainder of this chapter suggest, learning to teach through critical inquiry productively destabilizes the ways that literacy teachers and teacher educators conceive of their work.

TEACHING TO LEARN IN A LITERACY METHODS COURSE

Inquiries Into Inquiry

My first two years as a teacher educator I co-taught a literacy methods course with Susan Lytle at University of Pennsylvania. We modified a syllabus that she had developed over many years. We researched our course together, exploring the paradoxes and challenges of teaching an "inquiry stance" (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009) in a policy context that promoted increased certainties about what and how to teach (e.g., Simon & Lytle, 2006). It was through these formative experiences that I was introduced to inquiry as a framework for research and practice in teacher education.

Literacy methods courses I have since taught at University of Pennsylvania and University of Toronto are not, in any simple way, about "how to teach" English. These

courses are structured as collaborative inquiries into literacy teaching and learning. I integrate social practice perspectives on literacy (e.g., Gee, 2008) with practitioner research methodologies (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009; Campano & Simon, 2010; Simon, Campano, Broderick, & Pantoja, 2012), as a basis for encouraging individual and collective investigations into what it means to teach English in intermediate and secondary schools. Rather than forward "best practices," I invite students to consider inquiry as a framework for investigating and addressing issues in practice; an approach to pedagogy and curriculum design; a means of analyzing the broader field of English education; a foundation for creating rich and varied learning environments; and a basis for constructing their own theories of practice.

Students raise questions about this approach, as the following exchange from one of our first class sessions illustrates:

Kim: What is the difference between "*inquiry as a stance*" and "*an approach to pedagogy*"?
Rob: Does inquiry call up anything for anyone?
Kate: Not having a pat or simple answer …
Emma: Well, is it a question that you have that you consistently reflect on?
Rob: Hmm-hmm. Inquiry as not a having "pat" answers. It involves asking questions.
Kim: And is it continually questioning things?
Janie: Or having a genuine dialogue with your students. As opposed to just ... telling them stuff.
Rob: Hmm-hmm.
Anna: On a continual journey of wanting to know more …
Steven: I was thinking about the questions that are asked of students? That foster critical thinking ...
Janie: It kind of seems like you don't need to come to a conclusion. The important part is that you're asking questions, and following where those questions may lead you. And at the end, it brings you to a new question. And in that way, you've accomplished your inquiry, and you keep looking.
Rob: So it's not conclusive …
Janie: Yeah.
Kristen: It's sort of what the syllabus had said, there's not a "best practice," but promising practices? Something like that. Especially inquiry into curriculum: There may not be one set way to teach something to everyone. Which I think is what we sometimes want! (*Laughter*).

As this conversation suggests, inquiry is both a subject and framework of my course. Students called up a range of associations, definitions of and purposes for inquiry: inquiry as involving ongoing reflection, not settling for "simple" answers; inquiry as a relational or dialogic approach to teaching; a basis for encouraging

students' own questioning and criticality. Janie noted teaching through inquiry suggests that process matters: means are ends in themselves (Campano, 2009; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009; Simon, 2009). Learning to teach is a process of ongoing inquiry—"following where those questions may lead you." The trail of answers (O'Reilley, 1993), as Janie put it, does not lead to certainties, but to further questioning.

Kristen suggested that approaching learning to teach as ongoing investigations rather than a collection of "best practices" is not what student teachers often expect or desire. My students at Life Learning Academy were products of systems shaped by "best practices" and "pat answers"—certainties about what an ideal student looks like, about what counts as curriculum, learning, and literacy. A speculative stance—"continually questioning things," as Kim put it—cultivates suspicion of literacy education mired in certainties, and encourages teachers' curiosity about adolescents' concerns, questions, and needs, as a basis for developing understandings and meaningful pedagogies.

Inquiries Into What Counts as Literacy in Schools and for Adolescents

Student teachers in my courses explore a range of research literature—I expect a considerable amount of reading from student teachers, as much as in my graduate courses—and make use of ethnographic methodologies, including documenting practice through collecting field notes, analyzing data from their own and others' classrooms, and using inquiry methods adapted from practitioner research communities (e.g., Carini, 2001). This approach blurs the boundaries between universities and schools and between research and practice. It encourages student teachers to develop flexible, context-based pedagogies, and to regard themselves as change agents, activists, researchers, and contributing members of local and broader conversations in the field.

The course begins with exploring conceptual frameworks for literacy teaching. For their first inquiry project, I invite student teachers' to use literacy autobiographies as a basis for developing questions related to teaching and learning, placing their own experiences in dialogue with investigations into what counts as literacy in schools and for adolescents. Student teachers interview adolescents about their literate lives. These inquiries help to counter discourses that emphasize urban adolescents' propensity for "risk," drop-out, violence, or incarceration, and the need for teachers and schools to contain, remediate, or rescue them (Vasudevan & Campano, 2009). Student teachers explore questions such as: Who are our students? How do they encounter literacy, in school and out? How are their experiences of literacy informed by culture, family, community, and schooling? How does what we know (and don't know) about adolescents inform how we teach them?

Elsewhere (Simon, 2012), I have written about how teachers become connoisseurs of adolescents' array of talents and interests as a basis for developing more accurate readings of them and more relational pedagogies. Student teachers use inquiries

into adolescents' literacies to critique some of their own initial readings of students, to recognize their creative and intellectual capabilities (Campano & Ghiso, 2011; Simon, 2012). For example, in her inquiry Laura took on the perception that students in her class regarded literacy with disinterest. She described building connections with a student who had initially seemed to her to be disengaged in class:

> Will came to second period English a bit distracted. As my classroom teacher and I did our rounds around the room, checking papers and helping students, Will asked me if I knew who Emmett Till was. I told him that I did, and Will began discussing the topic with me. He was angry that he had never learned about Till's murder before in history classes, and frustrated because he thought that was an important part of history, a part of history that mattered to him. While my classroom teacher shrugged it off as 'something that is taught in the upper levels of history,' I was intrigued by Will's interest in the topic and I wanted to encourage him to learn more about it. By talking with Will, I found that he was frustrated with school as a whole, wondering why African American history is overlooked, or why all the authors are white. I was intrigued that a 14-year-old boy was telling me the problems with the educational system, shocked because I did not think I would hear a student complaining that they aren't learning enough, and thrilled because there was a student in front of me asking questions and seeking information. The next day, I brought two articles about Emmett Till for Will and he literally devoured them. Although he read them during class, I let it slide because I was certain that he was learning something. The next day, Will came to class early to talk to me. He had gone home the day before and looked up more information about Emmett Till that he wanted to share with me. I was excited to hear that Will had sought out information on his own free will and could now teach me things that I did not know.

Laura investigated what mattered to Will, including his critiques of institutions that neglected to expose him to African-American history. Their relationship crystallized how cultivating an inquiry stance toward adolescents and an appreciation of their interests can open new kinds of learning opportunities for both students and teachers. Laura reflected on how this altered her understanding of student engagement:

> This incident with Will gave me hope. Will proved that students do care, but teachers need to give them something to care about. We need to help them discover the motivation and the interest to continue learning outside of the classroom … It is not enough that we go through the motions, but we have to respond to the questions that they ask us.

Through this inquiry, Laura explored what it means for teachers to take responsibility for students' engagement (Nieto, 1999). Echoing my own experiences as a classroom teacher at Life Learning Academy, Laura noted that teachers need to begin with students—with their questions, with their needs—to view these interactions as a

basis for curriculum and pedagogy. Laura re-viewed Will's apparent disinterest as "budding … critical social consciousness" (Fine, 1991, p. 126), and regarded her role as cultivating rather than stifling her student's curiosities and critiques. Laura's interaction with Will demonstrated the generative possibilities of moving from recognizing students' interests to responding to them.

Inquiries Into Classroom Literature Discussions

I currently teach in the Master of Teaching Program (MT) at University of Toronto. As one of the few master's level, two-year programs in a province in which most teachers are credentialed in one-year consecutive bachelor of education programs, the MT is unique. Middle and secondary students are jointly certified in two subjects. As a result, my students commonly come from diverse educational backgrounds, including university majors in history, philosophy, sociology, cultural studies, even science or mathematics, as well as English. They bring interdisciplinary perspectives, and in some cases, apprehension about teaching English in secondary schools.

In my course student teachers complete six inquiry projects. The first inquiry involves qualitative analysis of classroom data to investigate how teachers orchestrate—and students respond to—opportunities to talk together about texts. For a similar project in the course I taught at University of Pennsylvania I asked student teachers to co-design, teach, transcribe, and analyze literature discussions. Because the MT program does not have ethical clearance for graduate students to collect classroom data, I have collaborated with a colleague, Mary Kooy, who allowed my students to analyze data from her longitudinal research project investigating intergenerational book clubs (e.g., Kooy, 2006). We analyzed video data from a mother-daughter book club made up of fifteen African-Canadian girls, three mothers, and two teacher researchers, which met regularly for four years in an urban secondary school. In class, we viewed a brief excerpt together that student teachers used to raise questions to inform their analyses of book club conversations: What encourages individuals to feel connected to classroom communities? Who asks questions? Who talks and to whom? Who doesn't talk? What do we make of their silences? How is teaching literature a form of advocacy? What are implications of voluntary book club discussions for teaching literature in secondary classrooms?

In their collaborative analyses, student teachers touched upon a range of issues, from pedagogical to political. In the following exchange, two student teachers discuss their first impressions of conversations about the young adult novel *Push* (Saphire, 1996), a text chosen by book club participants:

Julie: Giving them a space to talk about the social, cultural, and maybe racial and local issues that they face on an everyday basis, I guess I will borrow the word, "empowers" them: It allowed them to stand up to what oppresses them. I think the book and the literary space gave them a chance to stand up and say, 'The way we are treated in school and institutions is not right. I have

> a voice, and through the book club I get to talk about it. I get to make my stand.' I thought it was liberating. I think they saw themselves as being free from all those influences that they get from school … as if they are liberated from all the processes and problems that they face on an everyday basis.
>
> *Lenora*: What really stood out to me was [the] girl who was describing what it is they do for Black History Month: They play "Black music." I think they are venting their frustrations with how the wider society portrays the superficial representation of their own music. What they really need is something that represents their identity, for instance, stories [that are] more meaningful to them. And I think it is through meaning that these girls connect to each other.

This exchange demonstrates how analysis of classroom data is a means of exploring the intersections of race, identity, power, and pedagogy. Julie and Lenora express how classroom literature discussions can be platforms for interrogating texts, as well as the purposes of reading and broader social issues. Moving past recognizing that student choice matters, they describe how participation in these conversations braided ontological as well as epistemic dimensions of literacy. Recalling Laura's encounter with Will, Lenora was struck by teenagers' insightful critiques of schooling—in particular "superficial" attempts to promote curriculum that claims to be responsive to students' ethnic identities and interests. Julie noted a link between academic engagement and social empowerment: Rather than getting in the way of education, schooling can "liberate" students in the sense of encouraging their literary and social imaginations (Sumara, 1996).

To build on student teachers' analyses of data drawn from classroom literature discussions, I have developed inquiry projects in my course that invite adolescents and early-year literacy teachers to discuss and collaboratively author curriculum for young adult novels exploring issues of culture and identity. These projects have become sites for my own research, including a practitioner inquiry community made up of early-year literacy teachers, The Teaching to Learn Project (Simon et al., Forthcoming). Drawing on the work of other community-based, teacher research collaboratives (Campano et al, 2010; Carini, 2001; Kamler & Comber, 2005; Rogers, Mosely, & Kramer, 2009), we have explored the potential of intergenerational inquiry as a basis for ongoing learning from and for teaching. This has included a participatory action research project with adolescents from a socially and economically diverse community in West Toronto. Youth and student teachers have developed curriculum for the Holocaust memoir *Night* (Wiesel, 2006), and used the text for broader inquiries into individual and communal experiences of oppression.

Central to this work is making common boundaries—such as those between researchers and teachers, or between universities, schools, and communities—more permeable. One of the hallmarks of our project has been the ways that collaborative investigations are conceptual as well as pragmatic, inviting participants to explore literacy at the level of ideas as well as promising practices. We have used the phrase "teaching to learn" to reflect our attempts to cultivate more horizontal notions

of expertise (Campano at al., 2010), as well as to signal how learning to teach is something that happens communally and over a professional lifespan, for teachers as well as for teacher educators.

Inquiries Into Literacy Policy

One of my dilemmas as a teacher educator concerns my students' encounters with literacy policy. This was particularly true at University of Pennsylvania, where the increasing primacy and impact of policy in the form of mandated curricula moved to the center of my students' realities. I became concerned that the course I taught would become (or be perceived by my students as being) removed from the material realities they faced. To address this problem I began inviting student teachers to analyze literacy curriculum and policy.

For example I uploaded the then recently published (and since abandoned) Writing Plan, Grade 9–12 (Office of Curriculum and Instruction, School District of Philadelphia, 2005) to my course Blackboard site and asked students to post responses. The Writing Plan was a supplement to the Pennsylvania state standards and the district's mandated literacy curriculum. It claimed to prepare students "to navigate the writing needed in the world of work, college and personal life" (p. 4). The Writing Plan consisted mostly of tables, specifying dates, modes of writing, teaching objectives, and characteristics of effective writing/standards that teachers were expected to emphasize during prescribed time periods.

Many student teachers were critical of the Writing Plan's apparent disregard for their material circumstances. For example Mona wrote:

> Nothing is wrong with the School District's Writing Plan. I, however, wonder what it will mean for us: English teachers. The goals are great, and I am happy to hear that curriculum specialists, policymakers, and the CEO are assured that their program will ensure effective writing from the district's students. What do they ensure us?

Others, such as Alex, expressed concerns about how the Writing Plan would support students:

> In the cover story of today's *Inquirer*, Susan Snyder discusses the School District's efforts to help grieving families in the wake of last week's murders: Six Philly School District children were killed. How does a rigid writing curriculum help students deal with situations like this?

Alex went on to question the plan's "focus on improving test scores":

> Test score practice exercises are listed as "notable required writing" at every grade level. What are we telling students when we are clearly teaching to the test? What does this tell our students about the value of writing and its potential for personal use?

Mona and Alex took on the idea that the district's curriculum provided appropriate support for writing teachers or for their students. Alex noted that the Writing Plan did little to address his students' needs or help them make sense of or "navigate" the worlds they inhabited. Mona raised concerns about the implications of policy mandates for teachers, wondering about how teachers may be positioned as implementers without appropriate flexibility or support. She went on to write, "I just feel hampered by top-down initiatives that seem to treat me like a robot."

The policies that my students at University of Toronto encounter in their classrooms are not as restrictive. Nonetheless, student teachers' readings of Ontario Ministry of Education literacy curricula in my course have raised fundamental questions about how Ministry documents are rooted in hierarchical notions of students' abilities that maintain institutional practices such as streaming/tracking. Observing that "university" streamed students are asked to critique demographic data while "workplace" streamed students are invited to "critically read" instructional manuals, one student teacher asked, "What are the alternatives?"

The objective of critical inquiry into literacy policy is to imagine how documents like these can be instructional resources without governing instruction, how student teachers can teach within, and sometimes against, external initiatives that figure their work. Questions like "What are the alternatives?" are never, in any simple way, settled. That they are asked, however, allows ideology to be acknowledged and critiqued, rather than remain "obviousnesses as obviousnesses" (Althuser, 1971). Questions become critical heuristics, inspiring ongoing investigations into normative limits and promising responses.

TAKING AN INQUIRY STANCE ON LITERACY TEACHER EDUCATION

> We have a lot to tell our students, but I believe that our primary job should be to bring them to asking, by whatever means we can devise, the questions that will elicit what they need to know. Students do not really listen well to the answers to questions they have not learned to ask.
>
> —Mary Rose O'Reilley, *The Peaceable Classroom* (1993, p. 34).

Like our students, literacy teacher educators find ourselves at the intersection of countervailing developments. While policies like those I highlighted above intend to encourage learning by providing teachers with greater certainty about what and how to teach (Achenstein & Ogawa, 2006), they precipitously narrow curriculum and pedagogy. At the same time, increasingly diverse students engage in multilingual, multimediated language practices that are often not accounted for in school. What does it mean to teach literacy teachers at this critical impasse?

Alan Luke (2004) has noted that one of the characteristics of neoliberal education policies is that they foster "counter-aesthetic, anti-intellectual, and uncritical training … and a more general focus on instrumental knowledge and technique" (p. 94). Or as Mona stated in our conversation about the School District of Philadelphia's Writing

Plan, "Teaching can feel like a minimalized Foucaultian ordeal." Preparing individuals to teach in these contexts should not be reduced to standardizing and forwarding collections of methods. Literacy teacher educators need to encourage new teachers to develop flexible approaches to curriculum and pedagogy that begin with students, with their questions and needs, grounded in acknowledging their full humanity.

Approaching literacy teacher education as a process of "asking questions, and following where those questions may lead you," as Janie stated in our conversation about inquiry, entails cultivating rather than silencing students' and teachers' critiques of schooling, learning from dissonance, and encouraging student teachers to not take anything for granted. As a teacher at Life Learning Academy of students who were largely failed by systems intended to support them, I learned that teaching literacy within larger social and cultural contexts, including policies that promote unequal outcomes, requires cultivating suspicion of old certainties as a foundation for exploring alternatives. O'Reilley (1993) writes that the job of teachers should not be to give students answers, but rather "to bring them to asking." The practices I have described in this chapter reflect my attempts to take up this approach in my teacher education practice: Inviting my students to adopt a critical, questioning stance on teaching, and listening back to their questions—constructing opportunities for our mutual learning through collaborative inquiry.

REFERENCES

Achenstein, B., & Ogawa, R.T. (2006). (In)Fidelity: What the resistance of new teachers reveals about professional principles and prescriptive educational policies. *Harvard Educational Review, 76*(1), 30–63.

Albers, P., & Harste, J. (2007). The arts, new literacies, and multimodality. *English Education, 40*(1), 6–20.

Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses. In *Lenin and philosophy and other essays*. NY: Monthly Review Press.

Beals, M.P. (1995). *Warriors don't cry: A searing memoir of the battle to integrate Little Rock's Central High*. NY: Washington Square Press.

Berry, T. (2009). *Tim Rollins and K.O.S.: A history*. Boston, MA: MIT Press.

Britzman, D.P. (2003). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach, revised edition.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Campano, G. (2009). Teacher research as a collective struggle for humanization. In M. Cochran-Smith & S. L. Lytle (Eds.), *Inquiry as stance: Practitioner research in the next generation* (pp. 326–341). NY: Teachers College Press.

Campano, G., & Ghiso, M. P. (2011). Immigrant students as cosmopolitan intellectuals. In P. Coates, P. Enciso, C. Jenkins & S. Wolf (Eds.), *Handbook on research on children's and young adult literature* (pp.164–176). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Campano, G., & Simon, R. (2010). Practitioner research as resistance to the normal curve. In C. Dudley-Marling & A. Gurn (Eds.), *The myth of the normal curve* (pp. 221–240). NY: Peter Lang.

Carini, P. (2001). *Starting strong: A different look at children, schools, and standards*. NY: Teachers College Press.

Christensen, L. (2009). *Teaching for joy and justice: Re-imagining the language arts classroom.* Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S.L. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. In A. Iran-Nejad & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Review of Research in Education* (vol. 24) (pp. 249–305). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S.L. (2009). *Inquiry as stance: Practitioner research for the next generation.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Cummins, J. (2009). Transformative multiliteracies pedagogy: School-based strategies for closing the achievement gap. *Multiple Voices for Ethnically Diverse Exceptional Learners*, *11*(2).

Fine, M. (1991). *Framing dropouts: Notes on the politics of an urban public high school*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Freire, P. (1987). The importance of the act of reading. In P. Freire and D. Macedo (Eds.), *Literacy: Reading the word and the world*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.

Gee, J.P. (2008). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses, 3rd edition*. London: Routledge.

Janks, H. (2010). *Literacy and power*. London: Routledge.

Kamler, B., & Comber, C. (2005). Turn-around pedagogies: Improving the education of at-risk students. *Improving Schools*, *8*(2), 121–131.

Kooy, M. (2006). *Telling stories in book clubs: Women teachers and teacher development*. Boston, MA: Springer

Lieberman, A., & Wood, D. (2001). When teachers write: Of networks and learning. In A. Lieberman and L. Miller (Eds.), *Teachers caught in the action: Professional learning that matters*. NY: Teachers College Press.

Luke, A. (2004). The trouble with English. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *39*(1), 85–95.

Nieto, S. (1999). *The light in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning communities.* NY: Teachers College Press.

O'Reilley, M. (1993). *The peaceable classroom.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Pahl, K. & Rowsell, J. (2012). *Literacy and education: The New Literacy Studies in the classroom, 2nd edition.* London: Sage.

Rogers, R., Mosley, M., Kramer, M.A., & the Literacy for Social Justice Teacher Research Group (2009). *Designing socially just learning communities: Critical literacy education across the lifespan*. NY: Routledge.

Saphire. (1996). *Push*. NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

Simon, R. (2005). Bridging life and learning through inquiry and improvisation: Literacy practices at a model high school. In B. V. Street, (Ed.), *Literacies across educational contexts* (pp. 124–144). Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.

Simon, R. (2009). Constructing a language of learning to teach. In M. Cochran-Smith & S. L. Lytle (Eds.), *Inquiry as stance: Practitioner research for the next generation* (pp. 275–292). NY: Teachers College Press.

Simon, R. (2011). On the human challenges of multiliteracies pedagogy. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood, 12*(4), 362–366.

Simon, R. (2012). "Without comic books there would be no me": Teachers as connoisseurs of adolescents' literate lives. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 55*(6), 516–526.

Simon, R., Campano, G., Broderick, D., & Pantoja, A. (2012). Practitioner research and literacy studies: Toward more dialogic methodologies. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, *11*(2), 5–24.

Simon, R., Edwards, W., Pisecny, A., Brennan, J., Jung, H., Bresba, S. (Forthcoming). Investigating literacy through intergenerational inquiry. In H. Pleasants and D. Salter (Eds.), *Community-based multiliteracies and digital media projects: Questioning assumptions and exploring realities*. NY: Peter Lang.

Simon, R., & Lytle, S.L. (2006). The literacies of teaching teachers: Troubling inquiry in a time of certainties. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association meeting, San Francisco.

Street, B.V. (1995). *Social literacies: Critical approaches to literacy in development, ethnography, and education*. Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd.

Sumara, D.J. (1996). *Private readings in public: Schooling the literary imagination*. NY: Peter Lang.

Vasquez, V. (2004). *Negotiating critical literacies with young children.* NY: Routledge.

Vasudevan, L., & Campano, G. (2009). The social production of adolescent risk and the promise of adolescent literacies. In V. Gadsden, J.E. Davis, & A.J. Artiles (Eds.), *Review of research in education 33, Risk, schooling, and equity* (pp. 310–353). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wideen, M., Mayer-Smith, J., & Moon, B. (1998). A critical analysis of the research on learning to teach: Making the case for an ecological perspective on inquiry. *Review of Educational Research, 68*(2), 130–178.
Wiesel, E. (2006). *Night*. Revised edition. New York: Hill and Wang.
Writing Plan, Grade 9–12 (2005). Office of Curriculum and Instruction, The School District of Philadelphia. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: SDP.

AFFILIATION

Rob Simon
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/University of Toronto

PETER WILLIAMSON

ENGAGING LITERACY PRACTICES THROUGH INQUIRY AND ENACTMENT IN TEACHER EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

Current expanded views of literacy are recasting the debate in the U.S. about "why Johnny can't read" (Flesch, 1955) from focusing narrowly on improving language instruction to looking more broadly at disciplinary literacy instruction across content areas. Terms like *multiliteracies* and *situated literacies* highlight our new understandings about the multimodal, cultural, and contextual nature of literacy practices, and the implications of these ideas are having a considerable impact on schooling. Though resources remain tight and curricula have generally become more restrictive, teachers are being asked to innovate and enact methods for helping students develop skills for new kinds of multimodal interpretation and knowledge production. The importance of preparing students to be successful in the information economy of the "flat world" (Darling-Hammond, 2010) places literacy teachers at the heart of every meaningful school improvement effort.

The persistence of the achievement gap between historically underserved students and their white and Asian counterparts foregrounds a particular set of issues facing literacy teachers and those who prepare them. First, it has been widely documented that the resources for creating information-rich learning environments with the capacity and technology for inventive interdisciplinary literacy instruction are unequally distributed to higher achieving schools in wealthier districts (e.g., Ladson-Billings, 2006). Literacy teachers in under-resourced schools face the probability that their students will have fewer opportunities to actually practice the concepts and skills that they aim to teach, especially those associated with the digital and multimedia literacies that are fast becoming the currency of our information economy. Second, research indicates that highly qualified teachers are also unequally distributed, and that students in poor and urban schools experience "a revolving door" of new and underprepared teachers who are less able to enact deep disciplinary literacy instruction and the creativity required to do more with fewer resources (Darling-Hammond, 2010). These inequities have led some scholars to reframe the achievement gap as an *opportunity gap* (A. Flores, 2007), given the unequal access that poorer students have to the experience

C. Kosnik, J. Rowsell, P. Williamson, R. Simon and C. Beck (Eds.), Literacy Teacher Educators: Preparing Teachers for a Changing World, 135–148.

information-rich learning environments called for in the position statements issued by organizations like the National Councils for the Teachers of English (NCTE) or Math (NCTM).

The work of preparing teachers for new literacy classrooms involves helping them take stock of the opportunities that students have to engage in meaningful literacy activities while at the same time preparing them with strategies for enriching those opportunities. Visionary teacher education necessarily embraces the paradox that we must prepare teachers for the schools that we have while simultaneously preparing them for the schools that we want. For new teachers, this means developing strategies for understanding and assessing the literacies that students bring to school, building upon available resources for developing and strengthening those literacies, and then pressing students to traverse the usual disciplinary landscapes so that they can make meaning from signs and symbols that include but are also beyond the printed word.

BACKGROUND OF THE AUTHOR

I began my career as a special education teacher working with students who had been removed from the general pubic education system because of emotional and behavioral problems. As a new teacher operating on an emergency credential, I joined the ranks of the many underprepared teachers who have historically staffed high-need schools. After several years of teaching English but also serving as the science teacher, the PE teacher, the behavior "specialist," and the occasional cooking instructor, I realized that my lack of preparation made me part of the problem of inadequate instruction at my school rather than a part of the solution. After a year of graduate school where I earned my secondary English credential, I returned to public education to teach language arts and journalism in an urban Bay Area high school. Like many teacher educators, it was my collaborations with novice teachers in my English classroom that led me back to graduate school to pursue a PhD in Curriculum & Teacher Education at Stanford. After completing my degree and then serving as the Director of Stanford's *Teacher's For a New Era* project for two years, I followed my passion for urban education into a faculty position at the University of San Francisco (USF). At USF I teach courses such as *Academic Literacy*, *English Methods*, *Learning & Teaching*, and *Curriculum Development & Design*. I am also a founder and the Faculty Director of the *San Francisco Teacher Residency* program, which aims to recruit and prepare highly qualified teachers who are committed to serving in San Francisco's hardest to staff schools and subjects. A related line of work takes me to the school within the *San Francisco Juvenile Justice Center*, where I collaborate with English and special education teachers on literacy curricula for incarcerated youth. Across the settings of my teaching and scholarship, I focus on how teachers learn and enact effective disciplinary literacy practices. I will always be a student of teaching, and I am continually amazed at how much more there is to know.

CONNECTING RESEARCH AND PRACTICE: CORE COMPETENCIES AND LITERACY EDUCATION

My research focuses on how teachers learn to enact complex literacy-related practices within the settings of their teacher education coursework, and how these practices are connected with what they later enact in the field. With a particular focus on how English teachers learn to engage their students in discussions of literature, I study what teachers seem to learn when they participate in activities like instructional simulations in their methods courses. Through qualitative case studies and discourse analysis, I seek to understand how teachers learn practical and conceptual pedagogical tools for responding to student thinking while they also foster literacy environments where students can build upon each other's ideas and negotiate meaning. A central tenet of my work is that classroom talk is a key aspect of literacy development, and that literacy itself is now broadly conceptualized as communication practices that vary across textual and graphical representations as well as across cultures and contexts (Gee, 1999; Luke & Freebody, 1997). As the facilitators of classroom talk, teachers are chiefly responsible for helping students participate in literacy-rich school environments. As Douglas Barns has argued, if teachers can "Change the nature of the communication, [then they can] change the nature of what is learned" (Barnes, 1976).

The findings from my research point to the importance of explicit and participatory modeling in the teaching of methods. By explicit, I mean that it is not enough for teacher educators to model instructional practices without being transparent about their pedagogical thinking. Much about teaching is invisible to the novice eye, and explicit modeling allows educators to unpack the pedagogical decisions that they make in their planning and in the fleeting moments that characterize classroom interactions. By participatory, I mean that novices must have opportunities to try out the roles that they will play as teachers in the classroom. Engaging in instructional enactments as graduate students may not be enough for them to fully "see" (Warren-Little, 2003) the work involved in accomplished teaching. Novices need opportunities to enact complex practices such as discussion facilitation so that they can try out the role of the teacher, receive feedback, and perhaps rehearse and even retry particular questioning and responding strategies (Horn, 2010).

My research is situated within a profession-wide push to reshape the teacher education curriculum around the work that teachers actually do. Teacher education has been widely criticized for its uneven and often poorly supported approach to preparing novices for clinical practice (Esch, 2010; Larabee, 2004; Zeichner, 2010). In response, educators, researchers, and policymakers have called for teacher education to be "turned upside down" to focus more centrally on the development of effective clinical practice (Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Student Learning, 2010). New efforts to anchor the teacher education curriculum in everyday practice have led scholars to examine methods for helping novices learn "high leverage" teaching practices in the contexts

of their university coursework (Ball & Forzani, 2009). For example, Deborah Ball and others have identified practices that are likely to be "fundamental elements of professional work" and that tend to be more difficult to learn through experience in the field alone (Ball, Sleep, Boerst, & Bass, 2009). Given that the work of teaching involves more than can be learned in single courses or even programs, teacher educators must highlight particular features of practice over others in order to help novices develop core competencies and understandings (Ball & Forzani, 2009; Kosnik & Beck, 2009).

In literacy education, the work of helping novices develop core competencies necessarily begins with an examination of how literacy is defined and what these definitions mean for classroom instruction. While there is broad consensus among theorists that new literacies are social practices that are multiple in nature and vary according to their contexts and communicative purposes (New London Group, 2000), literacy educators must facilitate opportunities for new teachers to explore the multimodal, intertextual, and rapidly evolving nature of literacy in the modern world. The new core competencies may be different than the commonplace assessment and instruction practices that do not take into account more multimodal approaches such as dramatic performance, digital representations of content, and inventive uses of graphic text as a means of expression (Oldham, 2005). Literacy teachers must be ready to keep breathtaking pace with how language and communication are changing in our schools and society.

In addition to developing core competencies for accomplished literacy instruction, candidates must also become critical consumers of the instructional resources that are available to them and evaluators of the environments where they teach. All schools are not created equal, and teachers play a central role in determining the kind of language that is valued in the classroom and how this relates to the distribution of power and authority. Despite decades of attention to issues of language bias and discrimination in society and in schools (B. Flores, Cousin, & Diaz, 1991; Lippi-Green, 1997), ample evidence indicates that the education system in the United States continues to track language minority students into low achieving classes that lack rigorous instruction and adequate resources-including qualified teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2010). While educators have responded by developing "culturally responsive" and "multicultural" approaches to teaching, literacy instruction must go further to empower students to value and leverage their language resources as tools for critiquing the system and establishing their voice. This "critical literacy" stance requires educators to help candidates understand their roles in setting the conditions for students to resist and even reverse the dominant patterns of language discrimination in schools (Gutierrez, 1994). By asking candidates to consider how teachers structure opportunities for students to engage in rich literacy activities across content areas, literacy educators can help candidates develop the skills and habits of mind to assess the learning environments where they teach (Miller et al., 2011; Scherff & Piazza, 2009).

TEACHER EDUCATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Teacher education in California is generally limited to "fifth year" post-baccalaureate programs that candidates attend once they have demonstrated subject matter competency on a range of tests focused on content and, to a lesser degree, content pedagogy. Coursework and fieldwork requirements vary, though accredited programs are structured to meet the Standards for Educator Preparation and Educator Competence issued by the California Commission for Teacher Credentialing. The Teacher Education Program at the University of San Francisco (USF) annually enrolls around 70 candidates who complete 36 units of coursework in addition to nearly one academic year of student teaching in schools. The credential program is structured so that students select to pursue either multiple (k-8) or single subject (6–12) certification; single subject candidates specialize in a content area such as English or math, and some choose to pursue a credential in more than one area. Given that subject matter competency is assumed at the start of fifth year programs, teacher education courses do not provide substantive content area preparation. There is one semester long course at both the multiple and single subject levels dedicated specifically to literacy instruction, and these go by the names *Early Literacy* and *Academic Literacy* respectively. While literacy instruction is woven throughout many other courses in the teacher education curriculum - *The Education of Bilingual Children*, for example - candidates generally report that they would like to have additional preparation in enacting literacy strategies with diverse learners.

At the secondary level, the certification courses do not go far enough to help novices across disciplines form identities as literacy teachers. Though they may study the teaching of discipline-specific terminology or ways of making texts accessible in their single subject *Curriculum and Instruction* course, not all candidates come to the *Academic Literacy* course seeing literacy development as their responsibility. A primary purpose of the course, therefore, is to help them adopt this identity and to reposition themselves as language teachers within their disciplinary instruction of math or science or history.

EXPANDING LITERACY DEFINITIONS AND APPLYING THEM TO PRACTICE: *ACADEMIC LITERACY* IN THREE ACTS

The *Academic Literacy* course described in this chapter strives to address the key issues in literacy instruction outlined above by drawing upon three strands of scholarship. First, the course works to help new teachers problematize the traditional notion that literacy instruction is the domain of English teachers alone, and that literate people are just good readers and writers. Second, rather than serve as a survey course of possible literacy strategies that teachers can use, *Academic Literacy* strives to help novice teachers hone in on "high leverage" (Ball, et al., 2009) practices that are linked with student success and can be taught in the setting of a teacher education classroom. Finally, the course challenges new teachers to consider the purposes of

literacy instruction and the ways that schools provide or deny students access to rich literacy environments based on the practices and resources of those environments. Drawing upon Moje's (2007) distinction between teaching for social justice and social justice pedagogy, the student teachers consider how students have access to literacy instruction and what it looks like when they do.

Challenging Popular Conceptions of Literacy

The *Academic Literacy* course takes student teachers through three distinct curriculum units that are designed to challenge their assumptions about literacy - and literate people - before we examine and then apply teaching strategies that we can use to develop literacy across content areas. Beginning with the following quote from Jerome Bruner (1987), which boldly sits at the center of the first page of my syllabus, we start to unpack the idea that we make meaning together as we draw upon what we can "read" in the world around us (Freire & Macedo, 1987). In essence, effective communication and comprehension are about more than being a good reader and writer of printed text.

> So if one asks the question, where is the meaning of social concepts - in the world, in the meaner's head, or in interpersonal negotiation - one is compelled to answer that it is the last of these … If one is arguing about social 'realities' like democracy or equity or even gross national product, the reality is not the thing, not in the head, but in the act of arguing and negotiating the meaning of such concepts. Social realities are not bricks that we trip over or bruise ourselves on when we kick at them, but the meanings that we achieve by the sharing of human cognitions.

By taking up the idea that literacy is socially constructed and that our identities as literate people are dependent on who we are with and in what contexts, candidates begin to challenge their assumptions about what it means to be literate and how literacy develops. Over the first weeks of the course, students consider this topic from a variety of different angles, including how literacy identities can be shaped by gender, social class, and race (e.g., Smith & Wilhelm, 2002). Gee's (1992) distinction between discourses and Discourses (with a capital D) serves as a particularly useful heuristic for helping candidates problematize the notion that literacy is something static that we can learn and keep rather than being plastic and context specific. Gee contends that discourses are the ways that we communicate, through language and words and syntax, but that all communication is bound up in Discourses (with a capital "D") that are governed by the social rules, specific vocabularies, and norms relating to larger constructs such as gender, class, race, and culture. Grappling with these ideas allows candidates to consider how each of us is more or less literate in particular Discourses, and that our literacy identities can shift over the course a day as we move from our kitchens to the bus to the synagogue to soccer practice to the cafeteria where we serve food. The implications for school seem great, given

that students are being asked to continuously shuffle between classrooms, subject matters, and social settings where they will feel varying degrees of competency as literate people.

The first phase of the course extends the discussion of Discourses to take up the question of how students are already literate in ways that teachers often overlook. By inviting the candidates to question their assumptions regarding the resources, supports, and skills of students from diverse backgrounds (B. Flores, et al., 1991), candidates discuss the communicative assets that their diverse students bring to school and how instruction can begin with what students already know and are able to do. Learning about students' "underground literacies" (Beers, 2007) such as blogging or gaming, for example, can help teachers tap into students' interests and motivations. Understanding students' cultural ways of communicating can help teachers connect new material with the skills and knowledge that students already possess (Gonzalez, Moll, & Amanti, 2005; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 2001).

In order to press the idea that all language is literate and linguistically valid (Lippi-Green, 1997), the first phase of the course concludes with an in depth examination of language variation and of African American English (AAE) in particular. As literacy teachers, I want the candidates to understand that language bias plays an important role in shaping the literacy identities of students (Dickar, 2004; B. Flores, et al., 1991), and that teachers can enhance literacy instruction by understanding, respecting, and validating the language that students bring into their classrooms. An important aspect of literacy instruction is helping students understand the differences between academic discourse and other forms of communication so that they can become accomplished "code-switchers" who have a range of language options at their command (Baker, 2002). By studying the linguistic rules that govern non-standard language like AAE, the candidates learn how to help their students become "language detectives" who are critically aware of how popular conceptions of literacy function as a gatekeeper in school and in society.

The final project for this phase of the course is a Literacy History, where the candidates describe their own literacy journey in relation to that of a student who they have chosen to interview from their fieldwork classroom. The purpose of the project is for candidates to consider the similarities and differences between their experiences and those of their students, and to think deeply about what they can learn about a student's understandings and beliefs about language. Even after several weeks of redefining literacy as a class, the candidates are often surprised by the assumptions they have made about the student they interviewed and the varied literacy practices of their students outside of school.

High Leverage Literacy Practices

The second phase of the course addresses literacy instruction more explicitly. Candidates work in interdisciplinary groups to explore strategies for supporting students' reading, writing, and oral communication skills using a range of tools

for modeling language and scaffolding student practice. Rather than try to "cover the waterfront" (Kosnik & Beck, 2009) of literacy strategies and risk presenting teaching tools as a sort of "bag of tricks," I try to focus on "high leverage practices" (Ball & Forzani, 2009; Ball, et al., 2009) that are at the core of what literacy teachers must accomplish if they are to help students learn. Deborah Ball and her colleagues outline criteria for identifying high leverage practices in the teaching of math, emphasizing the importance of practices that are central to the discipline, that are frequently enacted, that apply to multiple instructional topics, and that are likely to improve student learning (Ball, et al., 2009). They also stress that these activities must be teachable by "decomposing" complex tasks into skills that can be practiced in the settings of teacher education coursework (Grossman et al., 2009).

Because literacy instruction is interdisciplinary and broadly focused on helping students make sense of a range of multimodal and multi-representational texts, it is easy to see how high leverage literacy practices might seem general or not necessarily focused on the particular work of literacy instruction. For example, teachers regularly present vocabulary across content areas - often in lists with definitions on the board or on an overhead - and students memorize the words so that they can use them correctly on a test or in a lab later in the week. While vocabulary instruction is widespread and necessary in some forms, I want literacy teachers to learn high leverage practices for introducing new words, explaining and contextualizing new meanings, and supporting students as they use the new words in new ways. In *Academic Literacy*, candidates can practice explaining and representing new words while also considering their role in modeling the use of new language and situating it within the broader concepts under study.

Whole-class discussions of content are a key literacy practice across disciplines. Accomplished discussion facilitation is complex, though candidates are frequently unable to "see" the work of experienced teachers as they respond to student contributions or navigate student understandings. In order to slow down and "decompose" (Grossman, et al., 2009) the work of discussion facilitation so that candidates can analyze and practice the different aspects of the teacher's role, this phase of the course concludes with a multi-step discussion unit where candidates observe and enact facilitation practices using a variety of representations and tools.

For example, I begin the unit by modeling discussion facilitation in class, and then we explicitly debrief the strategies that I used. We also examine discussion transcripts from different disciplines to consider what students seem to be learning through talk and how. Through the analysis of videos of whole-class discussions across grade levels and content areas, we study the ways that teachers can empower students to take the floor and marshal nuanced interpretations. Finally, the candidates videotape themselves leading discussions in the field, and then facilitate discussions about their discussions with their peers when we return to class the following week. Throughout the discussion unit, candidates are encouraged to think about how each mode of representation enhanced their understanding of discussion facilitation, and

they are asked to reflect on their evolving understanding of the role of the teacher in leading classroom talk.

Opportunities to Learn in School Literacy Environments

The final phase of the course invites candidates to look across the data that they have gathered over the semester in order to characterize the literacy opportunities that are available to students across content areas. The data come primarily from course assignments and artifacts from the candidates' teaching. Data include, but are not limited to:

- Interview notes with focal students for the Literacy History project;
- Texts from content area instruction;
- Samples of student work, which we have assessed together in class for both assets and areas for growth;
- Notes and sometimes transcripts from student "think aloud" reading assessments, including the texts that were used;
- Evidence of multimodal tools for teaching content such as websites, videos, presentations, blogs, and other ways of representing information;
- Evidence from the classroom walls and other public spaces of vocabulary and comprehension strategies such as word walls, visuals, algorithms, etc.;
- Videotapes of discussions in the candidates' classrooms, including transcripts and an analysis of the content under study.

To provide a framework for the candidates' analysis of the opportunities that students will have to engage literacy-rich disciplinary activities, we draw upon Moje's (2007) distinction between "socially just pedagogy" and "social justice pedagogy." While both terms recognize that students must have access to the knowledge and skills that are valued in society, the terms also provide a distinction that is useful in considering the purposes and outcomes of literacy instruction. Socially just pedagogy is concerned with ensuring that all students have equal opportunities to learn, while social justice pedagogy is more concerned with the critical literacy skills that will be required for students to consume and produce knowledge on their own. As I have argued elsewhere, in literacy instruction "this distinction frames the difference between teaching that draws on and celebrates students' myriad linguistic and cultural backgrounds on the one hand, and teaching that goes further to empower students to become producers and critics of new literacies on the other" (Miller, et al., 2011, pp. 65).

The Literacy Case where the candidates present their analysis asks them to integrate what they have learned about students' abilities and interests with how students are invited to engage in literacy activities in school, and to what extent. A goal of the assignment is to focus candidates' attention on the role that teachers play in constructing and facilitating learning environments for students with an eye toward how the candidates will take up particular practices when they are the teachers of record the following year.

CHALLENGES

For candidates who are immersed (and perhaps even submerged) in both coursework and fieldwork, the *Academic Literacy* course runs the risk of seeming redundant or reductionist or both. Rather than being a part of the spiral curriculum (Bruner, 1960) for teacher preparation, candidates can dismiss the intensive focus on literacy as either too nuanced or too obviously intertwined with everything else they are learning in their teacher education program. As one candidate, Emily, wrote in the introduction to her Literacy Case project:

> I'm going to take a somewhat embarrassing risk and admit that I spent a great deal of the first part of this semester confused as to what academic literacy actually is. When described, the concept of the class seemed to make sense enough: A course designed to help learning teachers offer students the best possible access to their respective courses. Then again, didn't we cover that in [other classes]?

As a teacher educator, my challenge is to make sure that courses like *Academic Literacy* are sufficiently linked with what the candidates are seeing in the field, and sufficiently accessible in terms of what candidates can take away for ready use in their own classrooms. Linking teacher education coursework to what teachers actually do in the field is an essential goal, but it is also true that my courses must then keep pace with the rapid changes that are taking place in the field and in society.

A related challenge is that at the time this book is being published, schools across the U.S. are preparing to implement the new Common Core Standards in many content areas. A state-led initiative facilitated by the National Governors Association for Best Practices, the Common Core Standards were developed by teachers and other education experts to bring clarity to the guidelines that schools follow to prepare children for both college and work. Though the standards themselves hold a great deal of promise for increased coherence and rigor in some content areas, the implementation process itself promises some level of confusion across schools and districts. Implementation is almost never even, and it will be important for teacher educators to engage in this process directly. Given the traditional divide between the university and the field, the structures for this sort of collaboration are frequently fragile or missing.

MOVING FORWARD

With the advent of online learning and even online learning communities, traditional learning environments are being reconceptualized and perhaps even challenged. Gee (2007) and others have pressed us to consider what particular literacy skills can be learned in virtual environments, and how they afford new opportunities for teaching. For example, educators from around the world are constructing "schools" in Second Life, a virtual world where participants interact as personalized avatars

that can engage in complex activities. In a multi-semester experiment, I took my entire *Academic Literacy* class into Second Life together to see what we - as relative outsiders - might be able to learn about the Discourses for participating in virtual worlds. While I eventually abandoned that unit because I felt the student teachers needed more structure and guidance than I could provide in one or two class sessions in order to make the journey into a virtual world educative enough to warrant the time in class, I am keenly aware that literacy instructors will be called upon to make sense of these opportunities and we cannot shy away from seriously considering what teachers need to know about what students can learn by participating in these rapidly developing virtual spaces.

I would also like to investigate what teachers understand about the purpose and impact of focusing on particular high leverage practices such as instructional explanations. Though we spend considerable time over the semester breaking down different aspects of teaching, the candidates reflections at the end of the course indicate that they understand literacy practices as more of a general approach rather than a set of specific skills and understandings. For example, Emily continued:

> Though my skepticism clung on, eventually … academic literacy melded into one great picture of how these different modes of instruction are distinct from, though vitally engrained in, every field of teaching. Without this realization, and by default the combination of experiences that led me to it, I would undoubtedly be an inferior teacher. Given my extreme uncertainty about the concept of academic literacy at the beginning of the semester, I am almost confounded to say that I now see it is perhaps the most important tool we can give students. I feel passionate about incorporating the development of academic literacy into instructional practices and student activities in order to make content more accessible, enable students' success, and build scholars who can produce these very texts themselves.

Though Emily indicates that some of my broad course objectives have been reached, her readiness to enact particular literacy practices remains elusive.

REFERENCES

Baker, J. (2002). Trilingualism. In L. Delpit (Ed.), *The skin that we speak: Thoughts on language and culture in the classroom* (pp. 49–61). New York, NY: The New Press.

Ball, D.L., & Forzani, F.M. (2009). The work of teaching and the challenge for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*(5), 497–511.

Ball, D.L., Sleep, L., Boerst, T.A., & Bass, H. (2009). Combining the development of practice and the practice of development in teacher education. *The Elementary School Journal, 109*(5), 458–474.

Barnes, D. (1976). *From communication to curriculum*. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.

Beers, K. (2007). The measure of our success. In K. Beers, R. Probst & L. Rief (Eds.), *Adolescent literacy: Turning promise into practice* (pp. 1–14). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Student Learning. (2010). Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers. Washington DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Bruner, J. (1960). *The process of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Bruner, J. (1987). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *The flat world and education: How America's committment to equity will determine our future*. New York: Techers College Press.
Dickar, M. (2004). "Words is changin' every day: Langauge and literacy in the urban contact zonne. In B.R.C. Barrell, R.F. Hammett, J.S. Mayher & G.M. Pradl (Eds.), *Teaching English today: Advocating change in the secondary curriculum* (pp. 68–80). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
Esch, C. (2010, November 16). Training better teachers: The bulk of U.S. teachers recieve training that is disconnected from what they will experience in actual classrooms- that must change, *LA Times*.
Flesch, R. (1955). *Why Johnny can't read, and what you can do about it*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers Inc.
Flores, A. (2007). Examining disparities in mathematics education: Achievement gap or opporunity gap? *The High School Journal, 91*(1), 29–42.
Flores, B., Cousin, P.T., & Diaz, E. (1991). Transforming deficit myths about learning, language, and culture. *Language Arts, 68*(5), 369–379.
Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the word and the world*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
Gee, J.P. (1992). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*. New York: Falmer.
Gee, J.P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. New York: Routledge.
Gee, J.P. (2007). *What video games have to teach us about learning and literacy*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
Gonzalez, N., Moll, L., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Grossman, P., Compton, C., Igra, D., Rondfelt, M., Shahan, E., & Williamson, P. (2009). Teaching practice: A cross-professional perspective. *Teachers College Record, 111*(9), 2055–2100.
Gutierrez, K.D. (1994). Language borders: Recitation as hegemonic discourse. *International Journal of Educational Reform, 3*(1), 22–36.
Horn, L. (2010). Teaching replays, rehearsals, and re-visions: Learning from colleagues in a mathematics teacher community. *Teachers College Record, 112*(1), 225–259.
Kosnik, C., & Beck, C. (2009). *Priorities in teacher education: The 7 key elements of preservice preparation*. London: Routledge.
Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in U.S. schools. *Educational Researcher, 35*(7), 3–12.
Larabee, D. (2004). *The Trouble with Ed Schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Lippi-Green, R. (1997). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States*. New York, NY: Routledge.
Luke, A., & Freebody, P. (1997). Shaping the social practices of reading. In S. Muspratt, A. Luke & P. Freebody (Eds.), *Constructing critical literacies: Teaching and learning textual practice*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
Miller, S.J., Williamson, P., George, M.A., King, J., Charest, B., Bieler, D., & Bolf-Beliveau, L. (2011). Applying the CEE position statement beliefs about social justice in English Education to classroom praxis. *English Education, 44*(1).
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), 1–44.
Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (2001). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 31*(2), 132–141.
New London Group. (2000). A pedagogy of multiliteracies designing social futures. In B. Cope & M. Kalantzis (Eds.), *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures* (Vol. 9–37). London: Routledge.
Oldham, J. (2005). Literacy and media in secondary schools in the United Kingdom. In B.V. Street (Ed.), *Literacies across educational contexts: Mediating learning and teaching* (pp. 170–187). Philadelphia: Caslon.
Scherff, L., & Piazza, C. (2009). Why now more than ever, we need to talk about opportunity to learn. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 52*(4), 343–352.

Smith, M., & Wilhelm, J. (2002). *Reading don't fix no Chevys: Literacy in the lives of young men*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Warren-Little, J. (2003). Inside teacher community: Representations of classroom practice. *Teachers College Record, 105*(6), 913–945.

Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college-and-university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*, 89–99.

AFFILIATION

Peter Williamson
University of San Francisco

BETHAN MARSHALL

MULTIMODAL LITERACY AT KING'S COLLEGE LONDON

Before going into higher education at King's College London I taught in London 11–18, mixed comprehensives for nine years. When I started at King's I combined the job with work as an English advisory teacher. That meant that I continued teaching, but in a variety of schools for another five years. Only when I had finished as a teaching advisor did I start my PhD, which was on the philosophies of English teachers. While doing my PhD I also carried out research into literacy as part of the King's Centre for Media and Literacy, which was at the time headed up by Professor Brian Street. After completing my PhD, my research interests shifted predominantly to work on assessment.

BACKGROUND

In England there are a number of different ways to become a secondary (ages 11–18) schoolteacher, but still the most common is completing a Post Graduate Certificate of Education (PGCE) which is a year-long course. 60% of this course is completed in two schools and 40% is done through a higher education college, which is also the awarding body for the course. In this respect, although you spend more time in school, it is seen as a college-based route into teaching. The partnership between the schools, which are selected by the college, is seen as important. To be admitted to a PGCE you must have a degree or related degree in the subject you are going to teach. In English that can mean a media or drama degree, a linguistics or language degree as well as the traditional English literature degree. Some students may have a degree in an unrelated subject, for example law, but usually, at King's College London, at least, we require them to take an additional course or courses in English literature before they begin the PGCE.

Until five years ago the PGCE, while it was a post-graduate course, students only achieved a certificate, as the name suggests. This changed when the Labour government thought it was important that teachers had a master's degree. This meant that the vast majority of education departments in England offered two modules of a master's course as the college-based part of the PGCE. In order to gain a master's qualification at King's College London you must have four modules and double dissertation, in other words a dissertation that counts for two modules. Someone with a PGCE, therefore, has a third of a master's degree that can be completed within

C. Kosnik, J. Rowsell, P. Williamson, R. Simon and C. Beck (Eds.), Literacy Teacher Educators: Preparing Teachers for a Changing World, 149–160.

five years. On the PGCE we require students to do two pieces of written work, one for each module. The first is subject-specific and the second is whole-school related. Both involve a theoretical understanding and action research based on their experiences in school. I will return to this later.

The program is somewhat front-loaded in that the majority of teaching at college takes place in the first term. During this time the majority of course sessions are subject-specific but we also run, once a week, sessions which are generic. In these students from all the different subjects attend so you might have a group that contains mathematicians, scientists, and English students. It is from this course that the whole-school related work comes.

RESEARCH INTO MULTIMODALITY

The what and the how of what we teach is heavily research-based and permeates all the teaching that we do on the PGCE, master's course, and the undergraduate module that we teach entitled the *Film of the Book* (this module is taught in the second year of a BA degree course in *Communication and Language Study*). The rationale for this is based on two research projects that we carried out—one almost thirteen years ago, the other slightly more recently. The first was *A Report on Literacy and Media Research Projects* (MacCabe et al., 2000), the second was *Animated English* (Jensen et al., 2005). The main finding of both these research projects was that literacy is multimodal, that one form of being literate can influence and possibly enhance another. Although this research may seem somewhat dated (as I said before, I became involved in research on assessment and so did not pursue the data as I might), the findings of the research still pertain and are not unsympathetic with other research that has been done in this area (see for example Jewitt and Kress, 2003, Pahl and Rowsell, 2006). Both these research projects were carried out with the British Film Institute as partners.

The first, *A Report on Literacy and Media Research Projects* (MacCabe et al., 2000) was based on two case studies—one in a primary school with eight year olds, the second in a secondary school with twelve year olds. In the primary school we taught Roald Dahl' s book, *The Fantastic Mr. Fox*, to two separate classes (Parker, 1999). The first case study created an animated, moving image version of the book, the second, a control class, just studied the first subject. At the end of the project both classes undertook the same writing tasks.

What is interesting is that the group who animated the text not only out performed their own previous scores but they also out performed the control group as well. To begin with they improved their use of adjectival description and the use of spatial delimiters to suggest the locale and mood in their writing. One person, for example, wrote, "I saw some metal in the moonlight night [sic]." Another wrote, "All I can see is the 4 brown walls. Brown, dim and muddy like a pison [sic]." Yet another wrote, "I can see the opening to our den. Its daytime and the light light is coming in" (MacCabe et al., 2000, p. 30). The use of repetition in the last two examples

is particularly effective. Moreover, as well as being able to describe the situation clearly they also communicate causality between events. One eight year old wrote, "Dear Diary I've been trapped down in a whole for six hours at least. Some farmers want to kill my dad (MacCabe et al., 2000, p. 31)," thus linking his current situation to the intent of the farmers to kill his father. Finally, they made effective use of vocabulary, tone, pace, and style in their description of the events of the story: "My ears hurt the same as my tale. That was the loudest bang I ever heard. Now I can't even speak to anyone because I feel very sad for what I did" (MacCabe et al., 2000, p. 31). None of these features were found in the control group to the same extent. The researcher, David Parker, wrote:

> Both classes more than adequately summarized the character's feelings of guilt and sadness. Both sets of pupils displayed that they had read with meaning. However, the written work from the moving image class seemed to have a little more depth and detail. And it is interesting to note that the additional material is distinctly visual (MacCabe et al., 2000, p. 31).

In the secondary school case study we also had a control group and a moving image group, but in this instance we were comparing a group watching film versions of *Oliver Twist* with a class who read the book without watching any moving image representation. The class who watched the film versions of the novel both looked at the book and engaged in media studies-type activities looking at, for example, camera angles, lighting, music, and so on. As with the eight year olds, we got the moving image class and the control group to complete a writing task, this time on a part of the novel that was not shown in the film. The moving image group again out performed the control group in that they could comprehend the part of the novel not seen in the film better than a class which had not watched any adaptation of the book (Oldham, 1999). This was interesting given that the class that had not watched the film had taken part in many other activities which might have worked, including drama, and a very forceful reading of the novel, so forceful in fact that the teacher cracked a rib in the rendering of a particular scene in which he beat his breast.

What is significant about the written work that the pupils did on the unseen part of the text is that they were more visual in their descriptions. For example one pupil wrote:

> One of the magistrates said to Oliver who look pale and alarmed. What is the matter with you? Oliver fell on his knee's, and clasping his hand's together and prayed that he wouldn't go with Mr Camfield. Oliver was frighten and he was trembling violently and he burst into tears (Oldham, 1999, p. 40–41).

It is as if these pupils could see what they were writing, as if they had a picture in their heads about what the scene might look like. One possible way for understanding the pupils' development is that moving image media acts as a scaffold for their learning. If you are to read effectively you, in some ways, have to visualize what the author is

saying. To write is again to imagine the world visually, before committing it to paper. I will return to this idea later.

The second piece of research we carried out, *Animated English* (Jensen et al., 2005), was funded by the Arts Council and was based in a secondary school in west London. The project involved a writer in residence and an animator from the BFI. Both were involved in enabling a class of eleven and twelve year olds to animate the novel *Groosham Grange* by Anthony Horowitz. The class was split into groups, and each group had to animate a section of the book using stop-frame animation. The findings were very similar to those of our previous project in that the pupils' written work improved.

To begin with all the films had a clear representation of action within the given time-frame. Similarly, there were no disruptive jumps, loose ends, or confusions within the story. Moreover, all narratives had a clear sense of audience and this was also true of their written work. The pupils bore in mind what an audience might be thinking at any given moment and the narrative was expressed clearly. This may have something to do with the fact that, when making the animation, they had to look through the camera before editing. This meant that they saw events and characters as an audience. In other words, in order to edit something they had to appreciate what was happening as an audience so that they could make an editorial decision. They then retained this capacity when writing. So, for example, they might begin with having a vampire coming out of a fridge with no explanation, but when they looked at it through a camera and saw that this move made no sense within the story, they then edited it so that it did make sense; they gave it an explanation. Later, when they wrote up the story they added this explanation, which they might not have done otherwise.

Realizing that you have an audience when writing is key. Dewey, in his book *Art as Experience* wrote, "To be truly artistic, a work must be aesthetic—that is framed for enjoyed receptive perception" (Dewey, 2005, p. 49). In so doing he combines the act of creating with that of receiving, almost as if it were the same. Almost a century later Elliot Eisner wrote, in *The Arts and the Creation of Mind*, "The writer starts with vision and ends in words. The reader, however, starts with the writer's words and ends with vision. The circle is complete" (2002, p. 89). What our research seemed to indicate is that seeing literacy as a multimodal activity is important in achieving this synergy. Students not only improved in their writing, but literacy critical skills also emerged as a result of this multimodality. In order to produce an animation, pupils had to scan the text for the central events in the part of the story they were looking at and this created a familiarity with the book in a way that a comprehension exercise, for example, might not. They also had to revise and criticize the text as a result of what they were doing.

Theoretical Underpinning

When conducting the second piece of research we turned at first to Halliday (1994) and his theory of systemic functional linguistics (Jensen et al., 2005). In particular, we

looked at the three functions—ideational, interpersonal, and textual. Although these are traditionally applied to linguistic features it was felt that they had an explicitness of meaning within the moving image. The ideational, for example, was important in that film represents character and setting. The interpersonal looked at point of view as well as the relationship between, for example, events and characters while the textual considered time, for instance,—sequence, coherence, continuity, and causality. The moving image, then, dealt with all of these. When looking at the pupils' writing, each one of these was also dealt with when they wrote their accounts of the book. In this way there was a synergy between what they saw and how they wrote about it.

But it also has another dimension: Moving image media acts like a kind of more capable other, in terms Vygotskian (1978a and b). Vygotsky considers how learners progress, describing the area where learning takes place as the zone of proximal development or ZPD. Bruner, building on the work of Vygotsky, explains the process within the ZPD in the following way:

> If the child is enabled to advance by being under the tutelage of an adult or a more competent peer, then the tutor aiding the peer serves the learner as a vicarious form of consciousness until such a time as the learner is able to master his [sic] own action through his own consciousness and control. When the child achieves that conscious control over a new function or conceptual system, it is then he is able to use it as a tool. Up to that point, the tutor performs the critical function of 'scaffolding' the learning task to make it more possible for the child, in Vygotsky's word, to internalize external knowledge and convert it into a tool for conscious control (Bruner, 1985, p. 24–25 cited Corden, 2000, p. 8).

Central to both Vygotsky's theories and Bruner's is that learning has a social dimension. One possible way of theorizing the benefits of the moving image media is that it is a form with which pupils are more familiar, allowing them to bring this 'conscious control' to bear on the printed form within the context of peer and teacher-led discussion.

In none of the research projects did we assume that the pupils were media-literate, however. We looked, for example, at the opening sequence of the David Lean adaptation of *Oliver Twist*, which opens with Oliver's pregnant mother arriving at the workhouse. Pupils were asked to look at lighting and camera angles. They then compared this to the musical version. This meant that they had to examine the film text closely rather than simply watching it, but it may have meant that they were more familiar with the film version than a nineteenth century novel so the film became "the more competent peer."

The PGCE and MA Courses

We explicitly teach this research and the theories that underpin it in the two modules of the master's courses—Notions of English and English as a *Language Art*.

This means that students who embark on an a masters degree at King's, as well as those students who have completed the PGCE course, share some of our understandings regarding the multimodal nature of English. We teach it less explicitly, in that we don't run sessions on the various research projects, but do teach multimodally in the PGCE.

Before our students start in the PGCE they visit a primary school (ages 4–11) for one week. In that week they look at the various ways in which children are taught literacy. When they arrive with us, one of the first things we do is hold a session on what they have discovered. We look at the statutory way literacy is taught, through the use of synthetic phonics. We do this because it is important that secondary teachers, who teach from 11–18, realize that the children they teach have already, in England at least, seven years of formal schooling. This experience may well have influenced how these pupils think of literacy and what it means to be literate. But we also explore other ways in which literacy might be approached. For example, we look at how being able to read the illustrations in a book can be as significant as understanding the print on the page. In this respect our view on literacy can be seen as multimodal.

One of the most explicit ways in which we approach the multimodality of texts in the PGCE course is through the teaching of Shakespeare. In particular, we have two sessions on teaching Shakespeare—one based at Shakespeare's Globe Theatre and one based on film versions. Both are multimodal, the first because it brings a kinesthetic experience to the teaching of his plays (see Franks and Jewitt, 2001 and Franks, 2003) the other because we look at film.

The Royal Shakespeare Company ran a campaign in 2008 called *Stand Up for Shakespeare*, and in many respects the Globe session is geared to the same message. This is, to a large extent, based on the work of Rex Gibson, who wrote extensively on the subject (e.g., Gibson, 1990 and 1998) and was the editor of the *Cambridge Shakespeare*. He saw Shakespeare as a playwright whose plays ought to be explored actively and dramatically, as someone whose scripts ought to be seen rather than as texts to be read. With this in mind our students read- and more importantly rehearse- a number of excerpts from Shakespeare's plays. What is important, however, is that they explore meaning through a number of different modes. One such exercise that we have used has been reading Ophelia's speech "Oh what a noble mind in here o'erthrown." The reader is walking while reading. At each punctuation mark they have to change the direction they are walking in. This can have quite a disorientating effect on the reader. When the students come together at the end they discuss their sense of confusion and the probability that Ophelia is similarly distraught. It is the fact that they are having to perform the speech in a very different mode from simply reading it aloud, or even simply watching the play, that can bring about this type of debate regarding the mind of Ophelia. They almost share her confusion in a real as well as empathetic manner.

The approach when teaching Shakespeare using film is different. The appearance of Shakespeare on film has been well documented (e.g., Jackson, 2007), and some

critics have looked at what that might be like in the classroom (e.g., Reynolds, 1991). Our approach echoes the latter but looks in particular at the use of film in teaching interpretations of Shakespeare. We have, for instance, looked at two distinct versions of *Richard III*—the Ian McKellan version and the Al Pacino version, but in so doing we emphasize media techniques such as camera angles, lighting, and diachronic and non-diachronic sound to differentiate the films. We also look at acting techniques such as facial expressions and spatial positioning of the characters. We examine, too, the Olivier version of *Henry V* and the one made by Kenneth Brannagh. Again, we look at the film grammar but also consider when the films were made. In this respect we attempt to build a richer, more multimodal approach to watching a film and hope that through this approach students will begin to ask more questions of the printed text.

As I mentioned earlier, our PGCE students have to complete a Specialist Subject Assignment, which is the first of the four modules PGCE students have to complete to get an Masters. The assignment is based on the teaching of a topic that they have undertaken in their first school placement. Historically, around a third of our students choose to complete the assignment on the teaching of a Shakespeare text. They have to complete a literature review as well as discuss how the lessons they taught went. What is interesting is that they tend to combine the *Stand up for Shakespeare*-type teaching with a look at moving image media. What comes over very strongly is that they do not think that he can be understood simply by reading the text. Moreover, they seem to think that the multimodal approach helped the students, "play a larger role in the creation of new meanings in text" (Clarke, 2012).

Significantly, however, a number of students believe that it does not improve the quality of the pupils' writing. This was particularly evident when pupils had to complete a written test, at the age of fourteen, on a Shakespeare play they had studied. There was also considerable anxiety that this made the teaching of his plays more dependent on the interpretation of the teacher's reading of what the exam board wanted (see Coles, 2003, p. 4 and p. 9). Little research has studied, however, on what the pupils might have done had a more "active," multimodal stance not been taken or rather it has been done by default.

Film of the Book

This module is taught in the second year of a BA degree course titled *Communication and Language Study*. While it does not have anything to do with teacher education, two or three students apply to the PGCE every year when they have finished their degrees. Students have to complete two assignments—one is to adapt a short story of their choice and produce a twelve-frame storyboard based on that adaptation, the other is to analyze two scenes of a film adaptation of a book or short story.

When teaching this module we concentrate on film narrative and grammar, so to an extent more attention is paid to the film versions of the adaptations. We consider the *mise on scene* by looking, for example, at camera angles, cutaways, and the number

of shots with one or both of them in frame. But we also explore, literary critical terms such as pathetic fallacy, which can be found in both moving image and printed text. This kind of multimodality helps the students see that film adaptations can, to cite the PGCE student again, create "new meanings in text" (Clark, 2012). It is this sense of new meanings that we are trying to reproduce and critique in the assignments which we set.

MULTILITERACY AND ITS CHALLENGES

Despite our attempts to teach literacy multimodally we live in a climate in England, at least, which is very print-oriented. Our current national curriculum (Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, 2007) makes scant reference to multimodality, but there are two nevertheless. The section titled "Reading for Meaning" states that pupils should be able to "analyze and evaluate the impact of combining words, images and sounds in media, moving-image and multimodal texts "(QCA, 2007, p. 88). Also, in the section on range for non fiction and non literary texts it says pupils should read about "forms such as journalism, travel writing, essays, reportage, literary non- fiction, print media and multimodal texts including film and television" (QCA, 2007, p. 95). It is perhaps significant that it only mentions multimodality under non-fiction. There is no mention of multimodality in anything other than reading.

We now, however, have a new coalition government and the rhetoric coming from Westminster is very different. Michael Gove, the Secretary of State for Education, it would seem, wants a very traditional curriculum indeed. In a speech given at Cambridge University at the end of 2011 he said, "In an age before structuralism, relativism, and post-modernism it seemed a natural and uncomplicated thing, the mark of civilization, to want to spread knowledge, especially the knowledge of great human achievement, to every open mind" (Gove, Nov. 24th , 2011). Though he does not use the term multimodal, for him the term is probably included in those first three items which stand against "the mark of civilization"—"structuralism, relativism and post-modernism." Instead he cites Matthew Arnold, who believed that we should introduce "young minds to the best that had been thought and written" (Arnold, cited QCA, 2007). On other occasions Gove has listed authors he feels should be on a statutory list:

> We need to reform English—the great tradition of our literature—Dryden, Pope, Swift, Byron, Keats, Shelley, Austen, Dickens and Hardy—should be at the heart of school life. Our literature is the best in the world—it is every child's birthright and we should be proud to teach it in every school (Gove, Oct.5th, 2010)

This is a very conservative view of what should be taught and it is likely that these authors, among others, will appear in the statutory national curriculum when it comes out in 2014. It may well also be that any form of course-based assessment will go. At the moment we have exams to be taken when pupils are sixteen (GCSEs)

and for these they must complete controlled assessments as well as terminal exams. Controlled assessments are taken during class time and pupils know the questions that they will be asked as they will have been working on them for weeks. But they are similar to examinations in that they must be taken in silence and pre-prepared answers or drafts cannot be used. Even these may soon go, however, and the whole of the English curriculum, both English language and literature will be terminally examined.

These changes will not materially alter the way we teach any of our courses. If we are convinced that literacy is a multimodal practice then what is important is the processes that we teach in the classroom rather than the end product. Certainly teaching the films of the books will remain, particularly if we are to teach pre-twentieth century novels. What is important, as we have seen, is that providing moving images may encourage a ZPD for pupils who do not immediately translate print into an internal visual representation of what they see. This Vygotskian principle is significant and yet we are doing more than this. We are creating spaces where pupils can switch between one form of literacy and another and in so doing extending these skills. When they look at a film version of the book that they are studying they are using both the ability to read images and print.

Certainly teachers will feel more constrained because of the types of examinations offered. This is particularly so for the type of assessment we offer in the Film of the Book, where undergraduate students have to produce a storyboard of a short story they want to adapt. While school pupils may do something of the sort in preparation for an exam, however, their work will not be summatively assessed as it might have been with coursework. Similarly the stop-frame animation of a text may be seen as too time consuming. This may affect the richness of the curriculum we currently offer, or rather it may affect the type of curriculum that is found in schools. Certainly at the moment our students still provide their pupils with multimodal literacy. For example, one student who is currently completing her MA has asked her pupils to make a stop frame animation of Wordsworth's poem *We are Seven* (1995). Another was teaching *Private Peaceful* by Michael Morpurgo. The student teacher gave her class an array of materials that she had collected from the web including archive soundtracks of jingoistic poems as well as footage of the trenches and propaganda war posters. They also studied Wilfred Owen's poem *Dulce Et Decorum Est*. (2007). During the lesson they wrote poems based on a combination of the novel and Owen's poem and also analyzed the posters and talked about the footage that they had seen. It was the combination of all these resources that made the end result of the lesson so impressive. The multimodality of her lesson contributed to its success. Students saw as well as read about the atrocities of the First World War and then contrasted this with the jingoism of the posters and poems that they analyzed.

We can only hope this will continue, though in both instances it was with a class of twelve year olds who at present do not have summative exams. It is possible that there might again be tests of some kind for pupils after two years in secondary

school and that these will possibly be limited comprehension-type exercises with an emphasis on "correct" grammar, spelling, and punctuation.

MOVING FORWARD

In the current climate it is hard to argue cogently for multimodal literacy. In many respects those of us in teacher education are having to grapple with a government that seems wedded to an extremely canonical view of print literacy. We are also having to face large potential cuts in the teacher education budget. The Coalition is arguing for more teacher-training to take place exclusively in schools and not in higher education. The numbers in our courses, therefore, could be cut severely. It is possible that one reason for this is that the government thinks that colleges and universities are a place where Tory ideals are subverted. The desire for multimodality would seem anathema to them.

Our next research project, then, is not to look at multimodality itself but to compare the teaching of secondary English in classrooms in England and Scotland. In Scotland they have neither a canon of authors nor a statutory curriculum (SOEID, 1992). That means that they only have guidelines regarding what they might do in schools. England and Scotland are neighboring countries which have differing education systems. The fact that they exist so closely together and yet have developed alternate systems of education is significant and worth exploring to see if and how these differences have affected the teaching of English. If this research proceeds it should illuminate what matters in the relationship between policy aspirations and practice in secondary English classrooms in two different policy contexts. It may also reveal to what extent policy shapes teachers' views on what they are seeking to achieve and the experiences pupils have of secondary English.

We will look at two classrooms in four secondary schools in England and Scotland and we will examine if and how practices differ between the two countries and if policy statements make difference to the way English is delivered. The research will include classroom observations, semi-structured interviews with the staff involved and focus group interviews with the pupils, and samples of pupils' work.

If we receive the money to complete the research it may put us in a stronger position to challenge the Coalition's thinking on the English curriculum. We hope it may influence them too on how to best train teachers, but that is not our chief aim. We are interested in the pedagogy of English teaching. For us that means being multimodal.

REFERENCES

Austen, J. (1811, 2012). *Pride and Prejudice*. London Penguin

Bruner, J. (1985). Vygotsky: A historical and conceptual perspective. In J. Wertsch (ed.) *Culture, Communication and Cognition: Vygotskian perspectives*. (p. 21–33) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, S. *Teaching the Tempest.* Unpublished MA essay London, King's College London.
Coles, J. (2003). Alas poor Shakespeare: Teaching and testing at KS3. *English in Education 37*(3), 3–12.
Corden. R. (2000). *Literacy and learning through talk*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
Dahl, R. (1974 , 2004). *The fantastic Mr. fox*. London: Puffin.
Dewey, J. (2005). *Art as Experience*. New York: Perigree.
Dickens, C. (1839, 2007). *Oliver Twist.* Middlesex: Penguin Books.
Eisner, Eliot, (2002). *The arts and the creation of mind.* New Haven: Yale University Press.
Franks, F., & Jewitt, C. The meaning of action in learning and teaching. *British Education Research Journal 27*(2), 201–218.
Franks, A. (2003). Transforming meaning across modes. In C. Jewitt, and G, Kress (eds.) *Multimodal Literacy* Lodon: Peter Lang.
Gibson, R. (1990). *Secondary school Shakespeare: A collection of papers by secondary teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge Institute of Education.
Gibson, R. (1998). *Teaching Shakespeare*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Gove, M. (2010). Michale%20Gove%20Speech.webarchive (Accessed on: January 27, 2011).
Gove, 24.11.2011, http://www.education.gov.uk/inthenews/speeches/a00200373/michael-gove-to-cambridge-university (Accessed on March 6, 2012).
Halliday, M. (1994). *Functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
Horowitz, A. (2003). *Groosham grange*. London: Walker Books.
Jackson, R. (2002). *The Cambridge companion to Shakespeare on film.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
Jensen, H. (2005). *Animated English*. *A report given to the Arts Council New Audiences Fund.* London, King's College London.
Jewett, C., & Kress, G. (Eds.) (2003). *Multimodal literacy*. Oxford: Peter Lang.
MacCabe, C., Marshall, B., Oldham, J., Parker, D., & Street, B. (2001). *Report on Literacy and Media research Projects: October 1997–November 2000*, London: King's College London.
Morpurgo, M. (2003). *Private peaceful*. London: Harper Collins.
Oldham, J. (1999). The book of the film: Print literacy at KS3. *English in Education*, *33*(1), 36–46.
Owen, W. (2007). *Wilfred Owen: The War Poems*. London: Chatto and Windus.
Parker, D. (1999). You've read the book, now make the film: Moving image media, print literacy and narrative. *English in Education*, *33*(1), 24–35.
Phal, K., & Rowsell, J. (Eds.) (2006). *Travel notes from the new literacy studies: Instances of practice*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (2007). *The English Curriculum*, London, HMSO.
Reynolds, P. (1991). Unlocking the box: Shakespeare on film and video. In L. Aers and N. Wheale *Shakespeare in the changing Classroom*. London: Routledge.
Royal Shakespeare Company (2008). Stand Up for Shakespeare. http://www.amazon.co.uk/dp/1853264016/ref=rdr_ext_tmb
Scottish Office Education Department (1992). *Curriculum and assessment in Scotland: National guidelines: English language 5–14* (Edinburgh, HMSO).
Vygotsky, L. (1978a). *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Vygotsky, L. (1978b). *Mind in Society*. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
Wordsworth, W. (1995). *The Collected works Of William Wordsworth*. Ware: Wordsworth Editions Limited.

AFFILIATION

Bethan Marshall
King's College

CLARE KOSNIK & LYDIA MENNA

USING OUR RESEARCH TO REFRAME OUR LITERACY COURSES

A Work-in-Progress[1]

BACKGROUND OF THE AUTHORS

We began working together in September 2010—Lydia as a teaching assistant in Clare's literacy methods courses. From the moment we met, it has been a highly productive teaching partnership with the lines between graduate student and professor blurring entirely. We simply see ourselves as co-teaching and co-writing.

Clare's Story

Like many teacher educators, I began my career as a classroom teacher, teaching mainly in the primary grades (grades 1–3) then assuming roles as a school librarian, curriculum consultant, and coordinator of a field centre for the school district. I completed many inservice courses while teaching; once I felt more comfortable with day-to-day teaching, I did my PhD in philosophy of education. Like many other teacher educators, my move into the university was accidental (Martinez, 2008); I helped to establish a school-based teacher education program jointly supported by the university and my school district. During my doctoral studies, I taught a variety of courses (curriculum methods and foundations) in the teacher education program which led to me securing a tenure-line position at the University of Toronto in 1997. My entire career as an academic has combined teaching, research, and administration; I have held many leadership roles (Coordinator of a cohort of 65 students), Director of the Elementary program (600 students), Head of the Centre for Teacher Education and Development at the University of Toronto, Director of the Master of Teaching Program (150 students, two-year teacher education program) and Executive Director of Teachers for New Era at Stanford (for 3 years). As a result of my administrative work and research, I came to understand that literacy teacher educators adopt very different approaches to their courses. As I became aware of and alarmed by the huge discrepancies among literacy methods courses, my area of research focused on the question: How can teacher education programs best prepare student teachers to be literacy teachers? This research spanning two disciplines—teacher education and literacy education—has been rewarding, frustrating, confusing, and fascinating.

C. Kosnik, J. Rowsell, P. Williamson, R. Simon and C. Beck (Eds.), Literacy Teacher Educators: Preparing Teachers for a Changing World, 161–174.

Lydia's Story

While I followed a circuitous path on my way to becoming an educator, as I reflect on the diversity of my experiences the "threads of continuity that unite diverse moments in time" surface and render visible my persistent interest in teaching and learning (Huebner, 1967, p. 173). Certain pivotal moments have led me to my current work in teacher education. I completed a Master of Museum Studies degree and held educational programming, teaching, and research positions in various museum settings. I learned a great deal about visitors' engagement within multimodal contexts. During this time I became fascinated with the educational processes that captivated children and piqued their curiosity; experiences that I believe have the potential to foster a life-long love of learning. My interest in pedagogy was further enhanced by my work with adult learners. While working as a senior researcher in the fundraising division of a university, I designed, implemented, and evaluated a research curriculum for staff across the division. I was surprised to discover how much I enjoyed engaging with adult learners. Having found these experiences to be extremely rewarding, I completed my Bachelor of Education degree and embarked on a teaching career in the primary/junior division (kindergarten -6th grade) in order to encourage and support student learning.

I returned to graduate school and completed a Master of Arts in the department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning at OISE/UT where I am currently a doctoral student. My dissertation research examines student teachers' conceptions of literacy, personal literacy practices, and enactment of literacy pedagogy throughout the course of their teacher education program. My work with Clare, teaching the two pre-service teacher education literacy courses, and as a researcher on her two large-scale research projects focused on teacher education and literacy, have uniquely positioned me to complete my doctoral research.

OUR RESEARCH ON LITERACY TEACHER EDUCATION

As a very active researcher, Clare has systematically studied many aspects of teacher education with two large-scale studies dominating her work during the last decade.

Longitudinal Research

Working with Clive Beck, Clare felt that they could only understand the impact (and shortcomings) of teacher education by following beginning teachers. With Lydia as one of the researchers on the project, we have followed 22 teachers for eight years and 23 teachers for five years. The central finding from this exhaustive research was the need to prioritize in teacher education. We found that in many teacher education programs, literacy teacher educators tried to *cover the waterfront*, touching on many topics which left student teachers overwhelmed, with only superficial knowledge, a host of jargon, an idealistic vision for teaching, but not sufficient knowledge, skill,

or confidence in how to actually develop and implement a literacy program in their classrooms. This research led to us identify seven priorities for teacher education (Kosnik & Beck, 2009):

- program planning
- pupil assessment
- classroom organization and community
- inclusive education
- subject content and pedagogy
- professional identity
- a vision for teaching

Perhaps these are not the correct priorities, but the belief that we cannot do it all and that some topics need far more emphasis in teacher education is gaining momentum (Darling-Hammond, 2006). Working so closely with student teachers, we felt the need to share our findings with students which led us to write a text for student teachers: *Teaching in a nutshell: Navigating your teacher education program as a student teacher* (Kosnik & Beck, 2011).

Teacher Educators

In addition to our longitudinal research on new teachers (both Canadian and American) we have also studied literacy teacher educators (Kosnik & Beck, 2008a). Cochran-Smith (2003) calls teacher educators "the linchpins in educational reforms of all kinds" (pp. 5–6), and literacy teacher educators throughout the world have increasing demands placed on them. Our most recent large-scale grant *Literacy teacher educators: Their backgrounds, visions, and practices* (2011–2015), builds on earlier work. It is allowing us to go into much more depth about the background, goals, and course design of faculty from a number of English speaking universities.

Digital Technologies

One of our joint small-scale studies that is relevant for this chapter is a self-study of our work to infuse digital technology into our literacy courses. At the conclusion of our courses in 2010, we identified 32 ways that we used digital technologies and then analyzed these using Ottenbreit-Leftwich's six different ways to incorporate technology:

1. information delivery,
2. hands-on skill building activities,
3. practice in the field,
4. observations and modeling,
5. authentic experiences,
6. reflections (2010, p. 20).

We found that our efforts were predominately in the categories of information delivery and modeling. Since then we have become much more focused on using digital technologies to support student learning (e.g., analyzing videos of exemplary literacy teachers). More of our efforts are described in the section titled *Framing Our Courses Around a Big Question*.

Lydia's Doctoral Research

A central premise in my dissertation research is that a multiliteracies framework must become a central component of teacher education (Ajayi, 2010; Rowsell, Kosnik, Beck, 2008). Student teachers' previous years of schooling and personal experiences have a substantial impact on what they view as the priorities of teaching (Britzman, 2003; Kosnik & Beck, 2009). In the case of literacy pedagogy, a dissonance is likely to exist between the prior schooling experiences of student teachers, their on-going literacy practices, and what they recognize as relevant literacy pedagogy. What kinds of opportunities can teacher education programs create for pre-service teachers to explore literacy in their lives, their classrooms, and the lives of the students they are and will be teaching?

My dissertation research examines how student teachers construct their conceptions of literacy and enact literacy pedagogy throughout their program of study. I focus on those individuals who are becoming credentialed to teach grades 4–10. My preliminary analysis suggests that while the student teachers *personally* engage with a variety of literacy practices, their initial views of what constitutes literacy are quite narrow/conventional. However, their conceptions of literacy and the potential for literacy teaching expand throughout the course of their studies. I have identified factors that contribute to the student teachers' expanding conceptions of literacy (e.g., the consideration of pupils' out of school literacy practices), as well as some of the challenges that impede their enactment of literacy pedagogy (e.g., limited opportunities for literacy teaching in practice teaching). It is my hope that the results of this research will contribute to the improvement of teacher education; offering student teachers ways to rethink and redefine literacy may in turn facilitate the implementation of a multifaceted approach to literacy instruction in classroom contexts, and assist pupils to successfully navigate contemporary culture.

In conclusion, our research has had a tremendous impact on our work as literacy teacher educators. We realized that we cannot assume that what we are teaching is what student teachers are actually learning. We now more fully appreciate that student teachers' previous experiences with literacy greatly filter their learning in teacher education (McGlynn-Stewart, 2012). Student teachers acquire individual bits of knowledge and particular skills but very little sense of how to put the pieces together. Student teachers' content knowledge (knowledge of literacy) varies so widely that many do not have the knowledge to actually be literacy teachers. Knowing the jargon (e.g., balanced literacy) gives student teachers a false sense of security. During the

first three years of work as teachers, all quickly realize that literacy is one of the priorities in teaching and that literacy is integrated into all teaching.

OUR APPROACH TO LITERACY TEACHER EDUCATION

Most teacher education at the University of Toronto is post-baccalaureate. The vast majority of students complete a one-year program (6 courses, 2 practice teaching placements, and a self-directed internship) which includes only one literacy course of 36 hours. One literacy course is woefully inadequate! We teach two literacy courses: One for student teachers preparing to teach children from kindergarten to sixth grade (Primary/Junior—P/J) and one for those becoming certified to teach from fourth to tenth grade (Junior/Intermediate—J/I) in one of the small two-year programs. The latter course is extremely cumbersome (and illogical) because it spans both elementary and secondary education. Students enrolled in this program must select a teaching subject (e.g., mathematics, health and physical education) which leads them to believe they will be teaching this subject exclusively; however, in reality, they most likely will be generalists, teaching almost all subjects (e.g., literacy, mathematics, arts, history, geography) and will only be able to secure a teaching job in elementary schools (kindergarten to eighth grade). The structure of the J/I program has another serious unintended consequence: Many student teachers believe that literacy instruction will be handled by the literacy/English teachers. Not all see themselves as literacy teachers.

Social Constructivist Framework for Our Literacy Courses

When Clare first began teaching literacy courses her goal was to provide student teachers with practical resources because that was what she sorely lacked as a beginning teacher. Through examination of her work and a deeper reading of the research (e.g., International Reading Association, 2003) her courses are now a much better balance of theory and practice. Eventually she "formally" adopted social constructivism as the framework for her courses. We feel that social constructivism reflects our philosophy and by having an explicit framework it gives our course a theoretical base while guiding practical decisions. We recognize there many interpretations of social constructivism and use the five principles of social constructivism discussed by Beck and Kosnik (2006).

i. Knowledge is constructed by learners. Constructivism argues that knowledge is constructed by learners. As Dewey (1916) said, "education is not an affair of 'telling' and being told, but an active and constructive process" (p. 46). Even when we use other people's ideas, we assess and modify them rather than just absorbing them in a pre-set form. We cannot grasp new ideas without linking them to existing concepts. According to Dewey (1916), "no thought, no idea, can possibly be conveyed as an idea from one person to another." Learners must interpret new ideas in the context of their present interests and understandings if they are to have thoughts at all (p. 188).

For example, if we are considering for the first time the idea that teacher-student dialogue is important for learning, we need our previous concepts of "teacher" and "student" as a basis for pondering this insight. At a later stage, we may modify these concepts to make them consistent with the new insight. The knowledge students bring to the classroom influences their learning - they are not empty vessels waiting to be filled.

ii. Knowledge is experience-based. Knowledge cannot simply be transmitted from professor to student; rather, it is experience-based. "[A]ll principles by themselves are abstract. They become concrete only in the consequences which result from their application…" (Dewey, 1916, p. 20). We want students to experience and think broadly and deeply about teaching, question their assumptions, read research, ask questions, investigate topics in depth, respond to the literature, and look at teaching/learning from different perspectives. We help them to learn how to use research to guide their teaching, and in our actual teaching, theory and practice are completely enmeshed. We hope to help students develop an approach to teaching that is guided by a vision, is systematic, is based on what we know from research about effective teaching, and is relevant. Students must have opportunities to implement theories and teaching strategies in order to fully understand them.

iii. Learning is social. Although Piaget stressed social factors (e.g., Piaget, 1932), Vygotsky and later writers developed this perspective further and in new ways. Like Piaget, they noted the importance of dialogue with others in knowledge construction. Vygotsky in particular spoke of the importance of teacher-student dialogue, and the need for teachers to stimulate learning within a "zone" consistent with each student's current level of development (Vygotsky, 1978). Student teachers learn to be teachers in a social context (university courses, practice teaching, and in involvement with the broader community).

iv. All aspects of a person are connected. In a constructivist view, knowledge is dependent not only on social interaction but all other aspects of the person: attitudes, emotions, values, and actions. The paradigm is strongly *holistic*. Dewey argued continually against dualisms in thought and life. We encourage students to share their interests, hobbies, strengths, and talents because we believe you teach *who you are*. And as their teachers, we need to know our students and go to great lengths to know each personally.

v. Learning communities should be inclusive and equitable. Consistent with our constructivist approach, we believe that the class must be a community, a place where all students feel a sense of belonging and can safely explore difficult questions. To truly support learning, there must be a place in the community for each person. Community-building begins from the first meeting of our class and continues throughout the duration of the course. We develop community by: Talking explicitly about it; engaging in community-building activities; sharing some of our personal stories; and making links between community and learning.

In later sections we try to show some of the ways that we actualize social constructivism in our courses.

Overview of Our Literacy Courses

Each literacy course has 12 classes of three hours and each class follows a similar format: lecture on the topic (could include a video), large-group discussion of the topic and the required readings, small group discussion and activity (applying the concept to practice), and ticket out the door (to monitor student learning). Consistent with social constructivism we work extremely hard at developing a warm, friendly atmosphere in the class where students can pose questions in a supportive environment. Although we distribute the official syllabus at the start of the semester, we are extremely flexible, willing to alter the course if students need more time on a specific topic or have a special interest. There are four major assignments:

- Literacy Autobiography
- All About Me books
- Response to a text on reading
- Response to a text on writing

Each of the assignments is congruent with our social constructivist approach: Students have tremendous choice; they can tailor them to specific interests; students share their assignments with their classmates, often being recognized as experts in a specific aspect of literacy; and they must link their new knowledge with practice.

Like many teacher educators we try to model effective pedagogy. Given our social constructivist framework, we use a range of teaching pedagogies which actively involve students: For example, focused small-group work, using a class set of notebook computers; encouraging student initiatives; engaging in debates; and going to conferences with students. We model a number of pedagogies yet modeling is not sufficient. Loughran (2006) notes, "if students of teaching are to genuinely 'see into teaching,' then they require access to the thought and actions that shape such practice; they need to be able to see and hear the pedagogical reasoning that underpins the teaching that they are experiencing" (p. 5). Through discussions, we hope to reveal the complexity of teaching which in turn gives student teachers a more realistic view of being a teacher. On-going discussions and reflection on their learning (using multiple modes, not just text-based) helps students study teaching in more informed ways. We try to make explicit to our student teachers our decision-making process—why we constructed the course as we did, why we have structured a class in a particular way, the new initiatives we are launching (inviting their feedback), our views on the limitations in the course, and so on. This kind of insight into our thinking does make us vulnerable; however, we recognize that we are not just teaching student teachers about literacy we are also teaching them about teaching (Loughran, 2006) which makes the task demanding. Students in the beginning are quite struck by our frankness and openness, but they respond positively to our values and style.

We have two course texts: For P/J, *Beginning Reading and Writing* (Stickland & Mandel-Morrow, 2000), and for J/I, *Improving Adolescent Literacy: Content*

Area Strategies at Work (Fisher & Frey, 2012). We distribute additional academic readings, post optional readings for those who want to read more about a specific topic, and duplicate a substantial numbers of teaching strategies (e.g., activities for novel study, activities for non-fiction texts). Overall our courses are well received by student teachers and are very lively and interactive. We attempt to weave theory and practice into every session which is a huge challenge. Given space limitations, we cannot fully describe our courses, we have chosen to describe a few aspects of teaching which we feel actualize our social constructivist framework.

Prioritizing Topics

As we mentioned earlier in this chapter, our longitudinal research has led us to identify seven priorities for teacher education. Social constructivism as a theory is suited to developing the seven priorities because the theory is very student-centred, considers the context for teacher education, and is generative. Developing general priorities was a start, but we need to go the next step to define priorities for literacy courses in our current program. Since we wanted to avoid a "cover the waterfront" approach, we identified key concepts and topics that we felt students needed to learn. Of course, our choices are open to scrutiny but we used the research literature (e.g., Cunningham & Allington, 2007), student feedback, and our own experiences as teachers, teacher educators, and researchers in developing our priorities for our courses. In the J/I course-which is preparing students for middle school teaching (fourth—tenth grade)-we constructed a chart. Below is an edited example of the course planning which we use in developing one of our literacy courses. Not all information could be included given space restrictions. Planning so specifically for a course forced us to identify exactly what we felt needed to be taught and how we were going to go about our courses. We provide students with the full plan.

Course Content
*Definitions of literacy *History of literacy instruction *Political context of literacy instruction * Multiliteracies *Reader response theory *Reluctant readers/writers vs Poor readers/writers * Cueing systems *Content area literacy *Comprehension *Responding to text *Genres of literature *Writing development *Finding your style as a literacy teacher
Teaching Strategies (examples)
*Lecture *Analysis of videos of literacy instruction *Focused small group-work *Application of comprehension strategies *Book talks *Literature Circles *Analysis of texts from different content areas *Debates (e.g., direct instruction of comprehension strategies vs engagement) *Field trips (Student Forum) *Attend a conference (Reading for the Love of It)* Debrief after practice teaching *Use a class set of computers for writing workshop *Respond to a text (e.g., writing in role) *Identifying components of a balanced literacy program

Web-based support (examples)
7th grade literacy—http://www.learner.org/vod/vod_window.html?pid=1820 Novel study—http://www.learner.org/resources/series111.html?pop=yes&pid=1302#jump1 Literacy strategy—http://www.readwritethink.org/classroom-resources/student-interactives Lamont Carey—I can't read **http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lByDfPOG0LA**
Learning Outcomes (examples)
Students will understand: * literacy in a broader context * that different content areas require specific literacy skills * that teachers must teach comprehension skills explicitly * that teachers must engage students * that students must have choice * the importance of using multiple modalities * that all teachers are literacy teachers * Web 2.0 is a form of communication * literacy instruction has many components which must be developed into a coherent program * assessment and program planning are interconnected * routines and community are integral to teaching/learning

We recognize that we are not addressing all topics traditionally covered, yet we feel it is more important to teach for depth (know how to do a few aspects of literacy well and know why they are important) rather than teach for breadth.

Framing Our Courses Around a "Big Question"

Compounding the problem of having many literacy topics to cover in a short period of time (36 hours), we felt that our student teachers entered the literacy course with narrow views of literacy education informed in part by their prior experiences as elementary and secondary school students. To overcome these two challenges we have a key question frame our courses: *What does it mean to be literate in the 21st century?* We drew on the theory and practice of multiliteracies because it helped us rethink what literacy encompasses and the types of literacy experiences students have on an almost daily basis. As the term implies, one of the central ideas of multiliteracies pedagogy is that there are many types of literacy: A "burgeoning variety of text forms" (New London Group, 1996, p. 61). We felt this question was sufficiently broad, relevant, and enticing that it would signal to students that we were thinking differently about literacy. It is also consistent with social constructivism because it honours the experiences that students bring to the program. Further, a framing question we hoped would give our course a level of consistency.

i. Unpacking students' literacy practices. Although our student teachers seemed to be incessantly using social networking resources, they did not see them as part of their academic learning and more importantly as part of teaching. In the first class of each course, we posed the question: How do you communicate with your family, friends, and acquaintances? At first the students responded with conventional means like telephone, letter writing, email, and then stopped. We had to push them to think about all of the ways they communicate: Facebook, Twitter, Blogs, and so on.

In Lydia's research on students who had completed this activity she found that it had a tremendous impact on them. Sarah, a student teacher, characterized this activity as a pivotal moment in her learning, which shifted her definition of literacy. She recalls:

> After the first few classes, when we talked about incorporating outside literacy into the classrooms, you know talking about text messaging as literacy and I remember being so wowed by this concept.

In a subsequent class, rather than provide students with a definition of literacy we examined two quotes:

- "See the Internet not as a technology but rather as a context in which to read, write, and communicate" (Leu, et al. 2009, p. 265).
- View web 2.0 as "a term that attempts to highlight a new wave and increased volume of users who have developed new ways of using digital technology to interact with each other" (Davies and Merchant, 2009, p. 3).

Through lively discussion students started to think of digital technologies as literacy tools and to make many connections to their personal lives. Often they would identify points of tension between their personal and professional literacy practices as they pondered the potential implications of "new" technologies for literacy teaching. For instance, Lukas acknowledged that certain technological resources allow one to "type things and then have it broadcasted worldwide," thereby extending the boundaries of communication; however, his trepidation also surfaced as he considered possible consequences for literacy instruction. He explains:

> My concern I guess with the communication is [using] a lot of slang … So I feel like … we're encouraging different forms of writing through blogs or even random posts on like Facebook, [and] I have some friends who post poetry on Facebook … you're incorporating [a] new generation of literacy, which is where the slang comes in … we bring [students' writing] back into the classroom [then we say] you can't have that slang, you can't say ain't and you don't want to use too many contractions or short forms.

Many times we returned to the big question and over time we noted that our students' responses were much fuller and more thoughtful. For instance, upon considering the potential implications of digital technologies on her future teaching practice one of the student teachers commented:

> Everything is going into social media and everything is at the palm of your hand now and if we're not teaching to that, if we're still expecting kids to get answers out of text books or to communicate through a written letter we're not teaching to their needs. We need to teach them how to email, we need to teach them how to critically evaluate information especially on Facebook or web sites, skimming and scanning something like that is much more in my opinion useful to them.

ii. Integrating digital technology into our teaching. We took to heart Cervetti et al.'s statement that "... future teachers should learn about, through, and with technology-based media" (2006, p. 383). In our pedagogy of teacher education (Loughran, 2006) we aim to fully integrate technology into the literacy courses—we have to teach with it and help students acquire the skills, knowledge, and attitudes to incorporate technology into their own teaching (Bullock, 2011; Cervetti, 2006; Kirkwood, 2009). In addition to including a number of readings on multiliteracies we have integrated digital technology into our teaching/learning activities:

- View various international newspapers (e.g., *The Guardian*, *Al Jazeera News*, *South China Daily News*, *New York Times*) on how the Japanese earthquake was being described
- View websites of different authors whom we have read in class e.g., Jon Sciezska http://www.readingrockets.org/books/interviews/scieszka/ and Gwendolyn Brooks *www.youtube.com/watch?v=_3kF6MGBjzk*)
- As a class, make a movie using iMovie
- View rap videos (what stereotypes are being presented? What literacy skills are being used?)
- Discuss pupils' out-of-school literacy practices to consider what teachers should be doing (or not doing)
- Discuss visual literacy using a variety of modalities
- Create a pictorial history of the program using the shared site Shuttefly

In response to student feedback we also revamped the assignment responding to a text on writing. Students had to read a book on one aspect of writing (e.g., narrative writing, spelling, assessment of writing), and rather than write a paper/essay which only Lydia and Clare would read, we asked them to summarize the book and present their response and analysis to a small group of their fellow students using a digital technology (e.g., iMovie, a graphic organizer, a web quest, a comic book template, Wordle, Word Puzzle, digital photos, music, podcast, activity from the *Read, Write, Think* site, etc.). The students present their insights into the topic noting why they chose a particular digital technology and how they think it will support the learning of the audience members. The students then post their presentation on our Wiki, which will disseminate their analysis more widely. This assignment actualizes our social constructivist approach because there is student choice, opportunity for co-construction of knowledge, and a chance to consider when and how particular technologies might be used to support literacy teaching and learning.

One of our most successful efforts has been building a course Wiki, which we use as a repository for literacy-related materials. Currently our Wiki has the following pages: Course materials, professional literature, children's literature, websites and digital technologies, lesson/unit plans, and so on. Each week we add to it and are constantly encouraging student teachers to upload to it. We are glad that we did not make posting to the Wiki mandatory (other than the final assignment of the course)

because it has changed it from an assignment to a collaborative resource co-authored by the student teachers.

CHALLENGES

We constantly feel pressure to address many topics in literacy. There is not sufficient time in a 36 hour course and helping students appreciate that they will be teaching literacy even in content areas is a huge challenge. The misleading structure of our teacher education program (e.g., spanning fourth to tenth grade) means that on top of everything else, we have to help students reorient to being elementary teachers, which often leaves them feeling frustrated. They expected that the program would lead to them being like secondary school teachers, teaching their specialization exclusively, but this is unlikely to happen.

A lesson we have taken away from our experience is that we need to make explicit to student teachers the changes in literacy practices in the 21st century. As one student commented, "I never would have thought of instant messaging as a form of writing." Beyond having a particular question as the framework for the course, we need a substantial amount of time for discussion about literacy and opportunities for students to unpack their own literacy practices. We cannot assume that students are fully aware of ways digital technologies have influenced their own communication practices and the implications for their developing teaching style/philosophy. Finding the balance between lecture and giving students time to experience first-hand a concept is a constant juggling act. We feel that being clearer about what we are trying to accomplish has eased some of the pressure on us but we still feel a weight to address many topics because we know how much beginning teachers need to know.

Our social constructivist framework we feel has given our courses a firm foundation; however, we recognize that we have made choices (e.g., spending time building community). Are these the right choices? A second issue, which is more relevant at an institutional level, is the huge discrepancy among literacy courses in the same program. We know that some of our colleagues spend much of their time distributing practical hand-outs while others devote a majority of time to theory. A greater consistency between sections of the same course would be wise for a number of reasons.

We are quite fortunate in Ontario that our student teachers do not have to complete a standardized assessment at the end of the program to be credentialed. In Ontario there are standardized tests in grades three, six, and ten but in some ways they are not as omnipresent in the school system as they are in other countries (e.g., the U.S., China, Japan). But we are fully aware of the pressure to improve literacy scores on international tests; newspapers recount the poor showing of some schools on provincial and international tests with an unintended (or intended) blame being put on teachers (and in turn teacher education programs). One gap in our teaching is addressing the provincial literacy curriculum. We touch on it but feel that we do not thoroughly examine it. Part of our reluctance to spend more time on the official

document is just that—time; but also partly, we are not sure how to address it in a way that makes sense for students at this point in their development or in a way that engages them.

MOVING FORWARD

As we move forward we have three central goals: First, we want to study systematically our approach to our literacy courses namely our choice to prioritize certain topics and to use a social constructivist framework. Have we made "good" decisions? Second, we want to more fully use our longitudinal research to guide course development. For example, which assignments and readings help students in their work as beginning teachers. Drawing upon the findings from Lydia's research, we want to revise some of our teaching in light of how our student teachers are approaching our literacy courses. And finally, we are going to continue to lobby for more time for literacy courses. Our advice to our Dean, who is extremely committed to literacy, is that since all teachers are literacy teachers we need to make this a priority in our program. All student teachers regardless of their specializations need a significant amount of time (and coursework) devoted to literacy. We take this stance not because of self-interest; we simply believe that literacy should be the framework for the entire teacher education program.

NOTE

[1] We wish to thank the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for their generous support of this research.

REFERENCES

Ajayi, L. (2011). Pre-service teachers' knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions of their preparation to teach multiliteracies/multimodality. *The Teacher Educator, 46(*1*),* 6–31.

Beck, C., & Kosnik, C. (2006). *Innovations in preservice teacher education: A social constructivist approach.* Albany, New York: SUNY Press.

Britzman, D. (2003). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach.* Albany, NY*:* SUNY Press.

Bullock, S. M. (2011). Teaching 2.0: (re)learning to teach online. *Interactive Technology and Smart Education, 8*(2), 94–105.

Cervetti, G., Damico, J., & Pearson, P. D. (2008). Multiple literacies, new literacies, and teacher education. *Theory into Practice*, *45*(4), 378–386.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2003). Learning and unlearning: the education of teacher educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19*, 5–28.

Cunningham, P., & Allington, R. (2007). *Classrooms that work: They can ALL read and write.* Toronto: Pearson.

Davies, J., & Merchant, G. (2009). *Web 2.0 for schools: Learning and social participation.* New York: Peter Lang.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education: Lessons from exemplary programs.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: Macmillan.

Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2012). *Improving adolescent literacy: Content area strategies as work.* (3rd edition) Toronto: Peason.

Huebner, D. (1967). Curriculum as concern for man's temporality. *Theory into Practice, 6*(4), 172–179.

International Reading Association (2003). *Prepared to make a difference: An executive summary of the national commission on excellence in elementary teacher preparation for reading instruction.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Kirkwood, A. (2009). E-learning: You don't always get what you hope for. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education, 18*(2), 107–121.

Kosnik, C., & Beck, C. (2011). *Teaching in a nutshell: Navigating your teacher education program as a student teacher.* London: Routledge.

Kosnik, C., & Beck, C. (2009). *Priorities in teacher education: The 7 key elements of preservice preparation.* London: Routledge.

Kosnik, C., & Beck, C. (2008a). In the shadows: Non-tenure-line instructors in preservice teacher education. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 31*(2), 185–202.

Kosnik, C., & Beck, C. (2008b). We taught them about literacy but what did they learn? The impact of our preservice teacher education program on the practices of beginning teachers. *Studying Teacher Education: A Journal of Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices*, *4*(2), 115–128.

Leu, D., O'Byrne, I., Zawilinski, L., McVerry, J.G., & Everett-Cacopardo, H. (2009). Expanding the new literacies conversation. *Educational Researcher, 38*(4), 264–269.

Lougrhan, J. (2006). *Developing a pedagogy of teacher education: Understanding teaching and learning about teaching*. London: Routledge.

Martinez, K. (2008). Academic induction for teacher educators. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 36*(1), 35–51.

McGlynn-Stewart, M. (2012). *An exploration of beginning teachers' early literacy learning and the relationship to literacy teaching identity and practice.* Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Toronto.

New London Group (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, *66*, 60–92.

Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A., Glazewski, K., & Newby, T. (2010). Preservice technology integration course revision: A conceptual guide. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, 18*(1), 5–33.

Piaget, J. (1932). *The moral judgment of the child*. Tr. M. Gabain. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Rowsell, J., Kosnik, C., & Beck, C. (2008). Fostering multiliteracies pedagogy through preservice teacher education. *Teaching Education, 9*(2), 109–122.

Stickland, D., & Mandel-Morrow, L., (Eds.) (2000). *Beginning reading and writing.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

AFFILIATION

Clare Kosnik & Lydia Menna
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/University of Toronto

MAUREEN WALSH & CAL DURRANT

MULTILITERACIES

A Slow Movement in LiteraCy Minor

INTRODUCTION

Maureen Walsh and Cal Durrant have come together in the Literacy Research Hub at the Strathfield Campus, Sydney of the Australian Catholic University (ACU). Maureen and Cal have similar research interests around the impact of digital communication technologies on literacy education. Their career backgrounds have similarities and differences. Together their teaching in pre-service and post-graduate teacher education degree courses has encompassed both primary and secondary fields, so they provide information on each of these within this chapter. It is of interest to signal here that while both have extensive experience in research and publications in the field of multiliteracies the reality of embedding theory and pedagogy within teacher education programs has not been simple. The chapter will highlight some successes as well as challenges around this area.

BACKGROUND OF THE AUTHORS

Maureen's Story

I have been at ACU for 25 years moving to a university appointment from teaching in secondary schools as an English Subject Head and editor of the journal, *The Teaching of English*, during the 1980s. My further studies in children's literature and reading education led me to conduct research in primary schools for my PhD on the development of reading for young second language learners learning to read in English. Thus my tertiary teaching became more focused on literacy education in primary degree courses. During my career I have balanced lecturing, coordination of undergraduate and postgraduate courses, administration, and research. For several years I held the role of Assistant Head in the School of Education NSW responsible for research and I have been acknowledged as building the culture of research through various initiatives so that the School's publications and research grants improved significantly. I established the Literacy Research Hub of ACU in 2010. As most rewards in teaching are intrinsic, I was honoured to receive a national citation for contributions to literacy teacher education in 2006 and an 'Excellence in Teaching in Higher Education' award in 2009 from the Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC). Such acknowledgements validate that research-based

C. Kosnik, J. Rowsell, P. Williamson, R. Simon and C. Beck (Eds.), Literacy Teacher Educators: Preparing Teachers for a Changing World, 175–188.

approaches in teacher education have impact, and I would like to see more public acknowledgment of the work of other educators rather than the constant critique that occurs in our media in Australia.

My research interests moved from 'reading' to the reading of visual texts (Walsh, 2000; 2003), then on to reading on screen (Walsh, 2006). Influenced by the work of Kress & van Leeuwen (1996), I was fortunate to be awarded a fellowship at London Institute of Education in 2002 where I was able to work with Gunther Kress and Carey Jewitt and follow their work on multimodality (e.g., Kress & van Leeuwen, 2001; Kress, 2003; 2010; Jewitt, 2002). From ongoing classroom research since 2004 in Sydney I have developed a research-based theory of "multimodal literacy" (Walsh, 2009; 2010; 2011). Currently I am continuing research into the classroom teaching of reading with 21st century texts (this includes print and digital texts) with Associate Professor Alyson Simpson (University of Sydney) and a team in Canada and the United States led by Associate Professor Jennifer Rowsell, Canada Chair in Multiliteracies at Brock University. This study is funded by an Insight Development Grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and is particularly looking at the teaching of reading with iPads across primary and secondary classrooms. With Associate Professor Cal Durrant and other members of the Literacy Research Hub at ACU we are embarking on new research to examine culturally responsive pedagogy for multilingual learners in school and tertiary contexts.

Cal's Story

I arrived at ACU in time for Semester II in 2010, moving to Sydney from Murdoch University in Perth. Like Maureen, I began teaching English in a secondary school during the late 1970s, and in 1983, I first started teaching English Curriculum units for a local tertiary institution. After completing postgraduate studies at Newcastle University, I commenced a MEd in English Education at Sydney University in 1986, where I studied under Ken Watson. Based on some research we did on teenagers' interpretations of a John Gordon short story during 1988, we co-presented a paper at an International Conference held at the University of East Anglia in Norwich in 1989. Shortly after, a full-time teaching position in English Education arose at the University of New England in Armidale, New South Wales. It was while at UNE that I attended a national conference hosted by the Australian Association for the Teaching of English (AATE) in Hobart and met Sandra Hargreaves, who was in the School of Education at Macquarie University at the time. We began to collaborate on a national research project on the use of computers in secondary English classrooms funded by AATE and Acorn computers in Sydney. Based on this research (Durrant and Hargreaves, 1995) and a chapter we co-wrote for St Clair Press (Durrant & Hargreaves, 1994), I was invited to guest edit an issue of *English in Australia*, AATE's national journal, on the theme of 'Computers in the Classroom' in early 1995.

It was from these rather modest beginnings that my interest began to shift from traditional adolescent reading practices to how rapidly expanding digital technologies invited readers to negotiate texts in different ways, and the role technology was playing in changing both government policies in Education and teachers' own classroom practices. Between 1995 and 1997, I was the NSW coordinator on the national research project team that included Colin Lankshear, Bill Green, Wendy Morgan and Ilana Snyder. In 1997, we produced the report: *Digital Rhetorics: Literacies and Technologies in Education—Current Practices and Future Directions,* funded by the Commonwealth Department of Employment, Education, Training, and Youth Affairs (DEETYA) through the Children's Literacy National Projects Programme (CLNPP). At the end of the decade, Bill Green and I wrote our widely quoted article *Literacy and the new technologies in school education: Meeting the l(IT)eracy challenge?* (Durrant & Green, 2000). I have continued to research in the areas of technology and media education (Durrant, 2012) as well as recently developing a 'Literacy Boomerang' model (Durrant, 2012a) with adaptations for digital games (Durrant, 2012b) and a forthcoming one for multimodal texts (Durrant & Walsh, 2013). On Maureen's retirement, I accepted the invitation to become Director of ACU's Literacy Research Hub in Sydney.

RESEARCH INFORMING PRACTICE

Maureen

I have always believed in research informing practice in education (Hutchings & Schulman, 1999; Baldwin, 2005; Krause, 2006). As my research has been based in multicultural, urban primary classrooms for several years I have been able to apply my research to work in teacher education programs. Of significance was an early book, *Story Magic* (1991), which incorporated my PhD findings into ways of teaching reading in classrooms from Kindergarten to year 3. This was Oxford's bestselling book for teachers for a few years and was used as a text for teacher education students who responded to the book by having ACU t-shirts printed with the illustration of the book's cover. This approach to integrating research findings into practice has typified my approach to teacher education programs and in lectures and tutorials I have endeavoured to have students consider evidence of research and implications for classroom practice. An example of the way I have tried to maintain the teaching-research nexus is documented on the following website, http://trnexus.edu.au/uploads/examples%20June%203/Literacy%20Education%202.pdf, an exemplar chose by the Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC, 2009).

Thus my research findings have been regularly communicated to staff in the Faculty of Education through seminars and bulletins and to both undergraduate and postgraduate students. Research material has been presented in lectures and workshops for students to consider implications and applications for their own

current or future teaching contexts. Several outcomes have resulted from my communication of this research:

- Examples of theories of multimodal literacy, e-texts and classroom practice, including video exemplars, have been presented within several undergraduate English Curriculum units and postgraduate literacy education units
- Some teachers from the research project have enrolled in ACU's postgraduate courses and have presented their work at national literacy conferences
- Copies of publications have been circulated to staff and students
- Seminars have been presented to ACU students and staff by teacher participants in the research
- Findings of the research presented to to ACU staff increased awareness of pedagogical change and contributed to a decision in 2007 to purchase and induct staff into using new technology such as Smart Boards, podcasting and video editing
- Communication of the research within ACU's Literacy Research Hub has enabled the research to be disseminated to students nationally in literacy education units and has led to a collaborative research project and publication between academics in Victoria and NSW

While these have been pleasing outcomes there are several challenges in communicating this research so that it contributes to sustainable change in teacher education, students' understandings, and practice. Challenges also lie in the most effective way of communicating research to teacher education students. While they are responsive to it in many ways, other research (e.g., Bennett, 1991; Darling-Hammond, 2006) has shown that new teachers often slip back into the way they were taught themselves or adopt the approaches being used by grade teachers in their school. As will be discussed later in this paper, aspects of multimodality and multiliteracies are still given tokenistic mention in new curricula despite the existence of pedagogical applications during the last decade (Cope and Kalantzis, 2001; Bull & Anstey, 2010; Kalantzis & Cope, 2012). Some possibilities could include involving teacher education students in this field research yet there are logistical difficulties with large student numbers, their program and assessment issues, negotiating with other lecturers and organizing large numbers of sessional staff. Teacher education at ACU has not attracted many full time doctoral students, so those engaged in their doctoral research are completing it part time while employed full-time and often unable to participate in research projects.

Cal

Like Maureen, I have tried to maintain a connection between the theoretical aspects of my research and my classroom practice, particularly in relation to teacher education, throughout my academic career. Most of my research has been conducted in secondary English Education, specifically around the roles technology has

played in the discipline over the past thirty years. I have been a conduit to both my colleagues and my students at the various schools of education to which I have belonged; here at ACU, that is through classroom teaching and presentations via the ACU Literacy Research Hub seminars as well as to the profession more broadly through AATE's (The Australian Association for the Teaching of English) highly respected Interface series (I have been the national association's Commissioning Editor for the past seven years, and its Research and Initiatives Officer for a seven year period before that). During this same period I have also worked as a secondary practicum placement coordinator as well as the Program Chair for all initial teacher education courses during my time at Murdoch University in Perth, and in 2011 I was Course Coordinator for the Master of Teaching (Primary) program at ACU.

Over the past decade I have co-edited three books that have had a direct influence on fellow English teachers as well as my own students, including *P(I)ctures of English* (2001) with Catherine Beavis, an early foray into the impact of technology on secondary English teaching in Australia, *Media Teaching* (2008) with Andrew Burn from the Knowledge Lab at the London Institute of Education, and English for a *New Millennium* (2009) with Karen Starr from Deakin University, which examined the impact of the 2008 Australian Government's Summer School for English teachers, a $2.4 million investment in change. As a consequence, I believe that my connection with the profession—and thus the nexus between my research and practice—has remained as strong as it could possibly be.

THE FRAMEWORK OF LITERACY EDUCATION AT ACU

Primary Teacher Education Courses

ACU is a national university with campuses in Melbourne, Sydney, Canberra, and Brisbane with Primary Teacher Education offered through a four year Bachelor of Primary Education degree and a combined Bachelor of Early Childhood/Primary Education. The national nature of ACU means that the courses are the same across all campuses, with some variations allowed to suit the context. For example, the Literacy and English Education units in Sydney (New South Wales) incorporate more of a focus on second language learners because of the state's larger multicultural population while the units in Brisbane (Queensland) allow for more focus on Indigenous learners as there are more Indigenous students in remote and regional areas of that state. Courses also have to meet the different accreditation requirements in each state for the registration of teachers. This occurs within a current context of the introduction of a new National Curriculum (ACARA, 2011) to be implemented in NSW schools from 2014 and the development of a national accreditation body with national professional standards for teacher education, AITSL (2012). The history of Australia has long shown a tension between federal and state legislation and this recent attempt to nationalize curriculum and teaching standards is fraught with challenges. In this context our Literacy/English pre-service and postgraduate

courses in teacher education at ACU are well placed to meet these challenges as they have pre-empted the requirements of the National Curriculum for some time.

Goals for Literacy Education in Early Childhood/Primary Courses

The national literacy teacher education courses for primary teaching at ACU are designed to deepen students' knowledge of literacy and language education within a sociocultural framework (e.g., Heath, 1983; Barton, 1994). Students examine the nature of literacy and literacies and review the social, political, and historical development of the concept of 'literacy' in society and in education and while considering how literacy practices vary in different social and cultural contexts. It is expected that students will be trained to teach the subject 'English' itself as well as apply literacy and language learning strategies across all curriculum areas. Thus the study of children's literature is an important focus, along with the study of linguistics that is influenced by sociolinguistics, particularly Halliday's (e.g., 1985) social semiotic approach to language. Students examine current research in areas that impact on literacy learning such as emergent literacy, home and community literacies, critical literacy, visual literacy, multimodality, multiliteracies, and the pedagogical implications of recent research in these areas. These are all considered within the context of current syllabi, curriculum documents and participants' own teaching situations.

The National Curriculum for English (ACARA, 2011) mandates the teaching of English through three interrelated strands of language, literature, and literacy. ACU's Primary Education units require students to study separate language and literature units as discipline studies in their first year and in subsequent years this discipline learning is integrated within a focus on Literacy Education in the Curriculum. Table 1 shows the sequence of these units.

Table 1. Literacy education units within the bachelor of education (primary) at ACU

Year 1	Children's Literature for Literacy	Linguistics for Literacy
Year 2	Literacy Education 1	
Year 3		Literacy Education 11
Year 4		

The two discipline units in the first year provide students with a thorough knowledge of Children's Literature and Linguistics. The literature unit covers a history of children's literature and literary theories intertwined with a study of award winning picture books, novels for younger and older readers and the emerging growth of literature in a digital environment.

The linguistics unit provides students with a sound in-depth study of the structure of language and focuses on the interdependent relationship between context, meaning, and grammar. Theories of first and additional language learning from early

childhood (0–5 years) are examined and provide a basis for the pre-service teachers' understanding of pre-school language development and the interdependence of language and emergent literacy. Students study examples of patterns of language interaction between parents and children along with classroom discourse, and they study the role language plays in communication. Assessment covers students' knowledge as well as use of language.

These two discipline units are the basis for subsequent curriculum studies units for the teaching of English and literacy with the second year unit focusing on teaching language and literacy in grades kindergarten to year 3. In the third year the unit focuses on years 4–6. These studies are balanced with field experience with weekly classroom observations from the first year to practicum placements in the middle of each of the four years of study.

The Master of Teaching, a two year graduate degree, follows a similar approach to ensure that students have a strong basis in literature and language as core components of curriculum studies. There are opportunities for further in-depth study of literacy and language within the Master of Education degree. Students who wish to proceed to further study in the field may apply for a Master of Research in Education, a Doctor of Education, a Master of Philosophy or a Doctor of Philosophy.

Multiliteracies or Multimodal Literacy within Primary Teacher Education Units

There are essential requirements for students to develop specific ICT skills, participate in online discussions, use the University's management system, and build an e-portfolio throughout their Course. However there has only been a gradual inclusion within the literacy education curriculum of multiliteracies or multimodality. Students have been given theoretical articles and shown classroom examples, as mentioned previously, but there has not been a real inclusion, especially in terms of assessment. Some examples of innovative approaches over the last few years are listed here.

- In the literature unit one approach has been to set up a "book club" and for students to participate in a literature blog, to foster discussion within class while counting this as an assessment
- Students have been given separate lectures on e-literature and have examined and evaluated the differences between literary qualities and technological features in literature online and digital narratives
- Students have been shown ways of developing literacy pedagogy to balance the teaching of reading and writing with print-based and digital texts. Specific classroom examples used to demonstrate where "literacy" can be developed through use of digital resources, including movie maker, podcasts, animation, blogs and wikis
- As an assessment in the children's literature unit students were required to write their own picture book, chapter of a novel or short story for children as a print or multimodal text. Students responded enthusiastically to this assessment

and created imaginative texts that they could use as a resource for their future teaching. A few students chose to create a digital narrative but this was a small proportion of the group
- Where students were required to develop group or pair presentations some chose to present these using digital technologies but, despite encouragement, only two groups in classes I've taught have developed their presentation into a video. At the same time many chose to use videos from YouTube as part of their presentations
- Several Master of Education students have completed research projects in the area. For example, students have implemented projects on visual literacy; investigated the impact of Interactive White Boards; the influence of technology on boys' literacy; and a PhD student is investigating how the incorporation of technology can enhance the reading of non-achieving adolescent students

Secondary Teacher Education Courses

As with the Primary Teacher Education courses that Maureen has outlined, ACU offers different pathways at the pre-service level into Secondary Teacher Education via both undergraduate and postgraduate courses:

1. Undergraduate
   - Combined degrees. The Bachelor of Teaching/Bachelor of Arts is a four-year (or part-time equivalent) double degree for students who want to teach in secondary schools. Specialisations in the BA include Humanities (Business Studies, History, Literature and Theology), Indigenous Studies, Mathematics, Technology and Visual Arts
   - The Bachelor of Education (Secondary) (fourth year upgrade) is a 12 to 18 month program designed for secondary school teachers who want to upgrade their diploma or Bachelor of Teaching studies to a Bachelor of Education. This can help them meet employer requirements for a fourth year of teacher education
2. Postgraduate
   - The Graduate Diploma in Education (Secondary) is a one-year (or part-time equivalent) program for graduates who want to become qualified teachers in secondary schools and who already have a Bachelor degree in an area other than Education
   - The Master of Teaching (Secondary) is a two-year (or part-time equivalent) program for graduates who want to become secondary school teachers and have an appropriate undergraduate degree. Graduates of both of these postgraduate courses are eligible for employment in Catholic and other faith-based schools, independent and government high schools and other secondary schools

While not all of these combinations are available across every ACU campus, individual units are designed with a national focus, particularly in relation to the introduction of the new Australian Curriculum. Courses also have to meet

individual state and territory teacher education accreditation requirements, though standardisation across state and territory borders will commence in October 2012 under the umbrella of AITSL (Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership). As with the primary teacher education courses, ACU is well positioned to accommodate such changes because it is already a multi-state/territory campus university.

Secondary teacher preparation in Australia is based predominantly around the subjects typically taught in high schools throughout the nation, so dedicated literacy units are still few and far between. Literacy tends to be seen as the domain of each subject teacher, along the James Gee notions of (D)iscourse (2003). At ACU, all undergraduate secondary teacher education courses contain a generic unit called *Curriculum Literacies*, generally taken by students in the final year of their combined degrees, though this unit is not available in the postgraduate initial teacher education courses. *Curriculum Literacies* examines the range of literacies and learning required for different curriculum areas in secondary school subjects and the way these literacies need to be developed for learners from diverse language and cultural backgrounds. Students engage with the range of literacies typically needed for humanities, mathematics and science content areas, including the technical vocabulary, linguistic forms and structures of different curriculum areas and the role of language in learning. Particular attention is paid to spoken, written, visual, symbolic, graphic and multimodal texts and the interconnectedness of learning in content areas.

A Secondary Education Example

As previously stated, the remainder of ACU's literacy work with pre-service secondary teachers is done within their core units in education and teaching specialisations. In 2012, Cal took over as principal lecturer for the two Secondary English Curriculum and Teaching units, having taken tutorials in these units since my arrival at ACU. These units had been taught in the same way for a long period of time, and while the university student management system had been utilised, firstly through Blackboard and then through LEO (Moodle), this predominantly comprised posting lecture and workshop notes and resources; the impact was minimal in terms of teaching and assessment using multiliteracies pedagogies. This year I have re-introduced group presentations for part of the unit assessment (30% in Semester I and 20% in Semester II). In my lectures and tutorials/workshops I endeavour to model as much 'natural' incorporation of technology and multimedia into my teaching as possible, including PowerPoint slides, Prezi (zooming editor) constructions, YouTube videos, podcasts and general website direction, particularly in relation to state and national English curriculum documents and related teaching resources. What I noticed was that the group presentations in the first semester pretty much mirrored my presentation formats; PowerPoint presentations dominated with one or two Prezi variations and one group used iMovie to showcase their theme.

Now as an educator, one might be tempted to bask in the misplaced glory of one's students having learned all they knew from their *English Curriculum* lecturer, but common sense would suggest that this same process was happening across the spectrum of their subjects, so the modeling was being reinforced by my colleagues (and vice versa) and there would appear to have been some transfer of learning taking place as well. Just as Maureen has noted about her classes, I didn't notice much innovation among these presentations, with the exception of the group that used the iMovie format to help reinforce their message. This presentation used good examples of Australian humor in the footage that they shot themselves as well as insightful and creative adoptions/adaptations of pre-existing material downloaded from the Web. The main insight I have gained from this review and reflection is that while I don't subscribe to Prensky's (2001) early claims about "digital natives and immigrants," there is some truth in the claim that our students are expecting more and more of their teachers by way of making their classes engaging, using digital technologies and also that they need less instruction in HOW to do this.

So for the second semester, 2012, my colleagues and I have made a small step in this direction. While students are still required to produce an academic argument around an assigned *Secondary English* topic, they will also need to post that essay on a website of their own creation (we have mandated a WIX site to maximise a 'level playing field' assessment task, but it could just as easily have been WordPress or any of the other free web construction sites available). The URLs for every student website will be published towards the end of the year so that student essays (not their grades and accompanying comments) will be available to their peers along with each site's topic resource lists and hotlinks for further consideration.

Our initial belief was that we should be taking them all to a computer lab and putting them through a training session by way of support, but upon reflection we realized that this was precisely "digital immigrant" thinking; the whole point of the task is to get students familiar with website construction, and to do that they really have to go away and spend some time 'playing' with it, using Prensky's principle that these students don't need manuals but rather that the programs themselves will teach them to use it, just as they have grown to expect of their digital gaming experiences (Prensky, 2001, p. 2). Of course, such assumptions need fall-back plans because not all of our students are "digital natives" simply because they fall into Prensky's age brackets. Additionally, many of them are middle-aged career changers who do need some assistance with such concepts, but the website building sites are very helpful here, and this is also part of their education: Knowing where to look to find out what you want/need to know. However, to encourage those who were feeling intimidated by the task, I did a mock-up front page showing them how they could select a themed page, change the colour combinations and add images all in the space of about five minutes during the first lecture. It is now over to them.

How will it work? Already we are fielding questions about how graphically rich the sites need to be; what parameters they should be placing around word length and support pages; how they will present their resources; how we will assess their sites;

what criteria they need to meet, and so on. They are questions that we hoped they would ask because it means they are moving beyond Bill Green's operational stage of his 3D literacy model (Durrant and Green, 2000). Literacy has traditionally anchored itself to reading and writing processes; in my opinion, this task incorporates design capabilities far more in keeping with a multiliteracies educational focus.

CONCLUSION

It is puzzling that so little has been achieved in integrating multiliteracies, particularly within undergraduate programs at ACU. We believe there are several reasons with the main one following the pattern of school education: that educational policies, curricula, and pedagogy have not adjusted to the explosion of digital communication that has occurred in society (despite the millions of dollars that state and federal governments have injected into the sector over the past two decades). Another reason is that teacher registration requires that students fulfill specific hours of content in each curriculum area. In a crowded tertiary curriculum it is difficult to incorporate areas that are not mandated or pedagogically developed. It has been commonly accepted for some time that digital technology is a tool that can be incorporated into the curriculum and the new National Curriculum: English includes the use of multimodal and digital texts. However there is no developed pedagogical framework presented or recommended for teachers within the National Curriculum. Furthermore, with large groups of students (e.g., 450 in one undergraduate year group) it is difficult to ensure that large numbers of sessional staff have a similar research background to the full-time academic staff to ensure a consistent, research-based approach to praxis within programs.

For Cal, there has been a certain "inheritance factor" implicit in moving to another university and taking over literacy units from other people who have either shifted direction and remain at the institution or who have retired or moved on. This is particularly the case when one observes that what has been done in the past is perceived by all to have been of a very high standard. To further complicate matters, one cannot change very much in any particular unit without calling into question the issue of the institution's professional accreditation of its courses and units by state and federal statutory bodies. In other words, resistance to change is very much built into the whole educational environment. Yet we observe that political and school sector personnel continually call for raising the bar both for teacher education entry and exit levels. Somewhat confusingly for us, what we are doing in teacher education is often both applauded and condemned in the same breath, as illustrated by a recent media release from the NSW Minister for Education:

> Teachers in NSW already do an amazing job, but as we prepare our students for the challenges of the 21st century, we need to think very carefully about how we can ensure the teachers in their classroom are world class.
>
> (Piccoli, 2012)

Of course, few would argue with such concerns; after all, we do want the best education for our students and we know that teacher preparation is paramount to achieving this (NSW DEC, 2012). Clearly, part of the imperative that accompanies such rhetoric is an increased and 'smarter' use of technology that has both an enabling effect for student teachers in the 21st century and also factors in engagement with the students that they themselves will teach during their working lives. Undoubtedly multiliteracies is a major way in which people in the real world communicate. It is essential that it does not remain a minor part of teacher education courses.

REFERENCES

Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA) (2011). *The Australian Curriculum. English.* http://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/English/Rationale

Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership Ltd (AITSL) (2012). *National Professional Standards for Teachers*. http://www.teacherstandards.aitsl.edu.au/

Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) (2009). *The Teaching-Research Nexus. A Guide for Academics and Policy Makers in Higher Education.* http://trnexus.edu.au/uploads/examples%20June%203/Literacy%20Education%202.pdf,

Baldwin, G. (2005). *The teaching-research nexus: How research informs and enhances learning and teaching in the University of Melbourne*. Melbourne: The University of Melbourne.

Bennett, C. (1991). The teacher as decision maker program. *Journal of Teacher Education, 42,* 119–131.

Barton, D. (1994). *Literacy: an introduction to the ecology of written language.* London: Blackwell.

Bigum, C., Durrant, C., Green, B., Honan, E., Lankshear, C., Morgan, W., Murray, J., Snyder, I., and Wild, M. (1997). *Digital rhetorics: Literacies and technologies in education - current practices and future directions*, Volumes I–III plus Executive Summary, Canberra, Department of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs (DEETYA),

Bull, G., & Anstey, M. (2010). *Evolving Pedagogies. Reading and Writing in a Multimodal World.* Melbourne: Curriculum Press.

Burn, A., & Durrant, C. (Eds.) (2008). *Media Teaching: Language, Audience and Production*. Adelaide: Wakefield Press.

Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (Eds.) (2000). *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures.* London: Routledge.

Darling-Hammond, L. (Ed.) (2006). Powerful Teacher Education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Durrant, C. (In Press). The 3D model and media literacy. In B. Green and C. Beavis (Eds.) *Literacy in 3D: An integrated perspective in theory and practice*. Melbourne: ACER.

Durrant, C. (2012). Whispering to the hippopotamus about the 'literacy boomerang': Literacy wars and rumours of wars. In B. Down and J. Smyth (Eds.) *Critical voices in teacher education: Teaching for social justice in conservative times, (pp. 185–195).* New York: Springer Publishing.

Durrant, C. (In Press). Play up!, Play up! and Play the Game!: Digital games and the literacy boomerang. In C. Beavis, J. O'Mara and L. McNeice (Eds.), *Digital games: Literacy in action*, Adelaide: Wakefield Press.

Durrant, C., & Hargreaves, S. (1994). Computers in the English Classroom. In K. Watson, C. Durrant, S. Hargreaves, & W. Sawyer (Eds.), *English teaching in perspective: In the context of the 1990s*, (pp. 130–138). Sydney: St Clair Press.

Durrant, C., & Hargreaves, S. (1995). Literacy online: The use of computers in the secondary classroom, *English in Australia*, Vol. 111, April, 37–48.

Durrant, C., & Green, B. (2000). Literacy and the new technologies in school education: Meeting the l(IT)eracy challenge?, in *The Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, *23*(2), June, 89–108.

Durrant, C. and Beavis, C. (Eds.) (2001). *P(ICT)ures of English: Teachers, learners and technology*, Adelaide: Wakefield Press.

Durrant, C., & Starr, K. (Eds.) (2009). *English for a New Millennium: Leading Change,* Adelaide: Wakefield Press.
Durrant, C., & Walsh, M. (In Press). A multimodal app for the literacy boomerang. In A. Goodwyn, L. Reid, and C. Durrant (Eds.) *English in a globalised world: International perspectives on the teaching of English*. London: Routledge.
Gee, J.P. (2003). *Discourse In and Out of School: Looking Back*. Accessed on 28 July, 2012 at: http://www.jamespaulgee.com/node/27
Halliday, M.A.K. (1985) *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social—Semiotic Perspective.* Geelong, Victoria: Deakin University Press.
Heath, S.B. (1983). *Ways with words: language life and work in classrooms and communities.* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
Hutchings, P., & Shulman, L.S. (1999). The Scholarship of Teaching: New Elaborations, New Developments, *Change*, *31*(5), 10–15.
Jewitt, C. (2002). The move from page to screen: the multimodal reshaping of school English. In *Visual Communication*, *1*(2), 315–32.
Kalantzis, M., & Cope, B. (2012). *New Learning. Transformational designs for pedagogy and assessment.* http://newlearningonline.com/kalantzisandcope/
Krause, K. (2006). Undergraduate curriculum issues in Australian higher education: Looking back, looking forward. *RIHE International Studies Series: A cross-national comparison of undergraduate curriculum models*. Hiroshima: Research Institute for Higher Education.
Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (1996). *Reading Images. The Grammar of Visual Design.* London: Routledge.
Kress, G., & Van Leeuwen, T. (2001). *Multimodal Discourse*, London: Routledge.
Kress, G. (2003). *Literacy in the New Media Age.* London: Routledge.
Kress, G. (2010). *Multimodality. A social semiotic approach to contemporary communication.*
NSW DEC (New South Wales Department of Education and Communities) (2012). *Great Teaching, Inspired Learning Discussion Paper*, Sydney: New South Wales Government.
Piccoli, A. (2012). *Asking the Tough Questions about Teacher Quality in New South Wales,* Media Release, Tuesday, 31 July, Sydney: New South Wales Government.
Prensky, M. (2001). *Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants*, Accessed on 20 August, 2012 at: http://www.marcprensky.com/writing/
Walsh, M. (1991). *Story Magic.* Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
Walsh, M. (2000). Text-related Variables in Narrative Picturebooks: Children's responses to visual and verbal texts. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, *23*, 139–56.
Walsh, M. (2003). Reading Pictures: What do the reveal? Young children's reading of visual texts. *Reading*, 37, 123–30.
Walsh, M. (2006). The textual shift: Examining the reading process with print, visual and multimodal texts. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, *29*(1), 24–37.
Walsh, M. (2009). Pedagogic Potentials of Multimodal Literacy. Chapter 3 in L. Tan Wee Hin & R. Subramanian (Eds.) *Handbook of Research in new Media Literacy at the K-12 level: Issues and Challenges. Volumes 1 and 11.* USA: IGUI Global, 32–47.
Walsh, M. (2010). Multimodal literacy: what does it mean for classroom practice? *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy. 33*(3), 211–239.
Walsh, M. (2011). *Multimodal Literacy: Researching Classroom Practice.* Sydney: e.lit, Primary English Teachers' Association.

AFFILIATION

Maureen Walsh & Cal Durrant
Australian Catholic University

SECTION 3

CONCLUSION

CLARE KOSNIK, JENNIFER ROWSELL & ROB SIMON

THE SHIFTING LANDSCAPE OF LITERACY TEACHER EDUCATION

Working With Integrity, Commitment, Skill, and Vision

INTRODUCTION

We have taken a novel approach to this concluding chapter. Rather than simply outline some next steps for literacy teacher education, we used the previous 14 chapters as a form of data. We read through the chapters to identify common themes which we present here as a kind of educational significance of the work of our exemplary literacy teacher educators. We had not intended this "type" of conclusion, but the chapters provided such rich descriptions, common arguments, shared frustrations, and intriguing insights that we felt it behooved us to rethink our plan and make connections among these chapters. Beyond providing cross-case analysis, we are trying to place the authors' work in dialogue; granted this is somewhat artificial but we hope our endeavour will lead to more discussion among literacy teacher educators. Although these literacy educators are located in different countries, work in a range of institutions (e.g., teaching-focused, research-intensive), teach in different programs (e.g., undergraduate, master's level), and are at various stages of their careers (e.g., junior faculty, full professors) we have much to learn from each other. One commonality among the 23 teacher educators who are part of this text is their passion. Their fervor and commitment literally jump off the page, which made editing this text inspiring and rewarding. At the same time, reading about the challenges they face was sobering. Being an effective and responsible literacy teacher educator is not for the faint of heart.

We have organized this chapter around a set of salient issues and themes. We begin with a discussion of the urgency to address literacy instruction, which is immediately followed by the political context in which teacher and teacher education occurs. The contrast between the two is stark. This is followed by a fairly detailed section on thoughtfulness and integrity, topics not commonly found in discussions of practice but that are prevalent in our teacher educators' work. This leads to a discussion of practice. We conclude with some suggestions for future research and collaboration.

C. Kosnik, J. Rowsell, P. Williamson, R. Simon and C. Beck (Eds.), Literacy Teacher Educators: Preparing Teachers for a Changing World, 191–204.

URGENCY TO ADDRESS LITERACY INSTRUCTION

Rebecca Roger's chapter opens with the following statement:

> Those of us who have the privilege and responsibility of teaching literacy teachers are charged with designing learning experiences that support their development of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to work confidently with culturally and linguistically diverse children and families, especially those from economically disadvantaged backgrounds. This charge has never been more pressing. Indeed, the United States is becoming increasingly diverse yet teachers continue to be white, middle class females. Over 80% of ethnically and linguistically diverse students live in poverty yet most of their teachers are mono-lingual, middle-class, and have been raised in suburban and rural communities (Children's Defense Fund, 2005).

These beliefs are echoed in all of the chapters. There is an urgency to address literacy education at both the school level and in teacher education because so many children and adolescents are not being well-served by current initiatives. Many children and youth are either disengaged from the literacy programs in their classes or feel alienated from their current schooling. Yet many youth have active online literacy practices which are disregarded in their schooling. Failing to build on the capital that youngsters have (e.g., first language, strong online literacy skills) is a wasted opportunity. Although not explicitly stated, a theme throughout the chapters is that teachers need to support the well-being of our next generation—not just through the acquisition of knowledge in the disciplines but in developing well-rounded, literate lives.

Regardless of the context where literacy teacher educators work, we recognize there are a vast number of issues facing teachers and teacher educators: A more diverse student population, gaps between the genders, a loss of a first language, unequal funding, and an increased number of children living in poverty. Simplistic solutions such as providing student teachers with a "bag of tricks" are ineffective for addressing the many socio-political issues we face as educators. Each of the authors describes their attempts to navigate these and other issues in their research and practice, highlighting the ways that individuals and institutions must work toward developing promising solutions to these highly complex challenges.

CLASH WITH GOVERNMENT INITIATIVES

The backdrop to the work of these highly committed literacy teacher educators includes conservative government agendas which often bump up against their beliefs and practices. The juxtaposition of the two is evident and at times painful to read. Most literacy educators are living in a state of accountability narrowed to raising test scores, which contributors to this volume feel is not an appropriate indicator of students' identities, literacies or learning, with limited value in the scheme of life.

The political climate in which we work creates many barriers to doing what we feel should be done. Across the chapters, authors argue that we should not capitulate. Ghiso describes this tension and contradiction as indicative of deeper ideological currents in society:

> … [M]any deficit views are not merely a matter of individual attitudes. They are rather indicative of deeper ideological currents that circulate in the larger society, and which take particular manifestation in dominant literacy policies and practices, such as scripted curricula, hyper-remediation, and high-stakes testing and accountability measures. Moreover, such policies are often positioned within a social justice narrative and equated with closing the achievement gap.

Building on Ghiso's observations, as we work our way across the globe comparing and contrasting literacy education initiatives and agendas, there are remarkable similarities across contexts, with a broad adherence to tradition and to accountability by raising test scores. In the UK, for instance, Michael Gove, Secretary of Education, "wants to return to the 'Golden Age' of education in the 1950s when children learned the canon—Pope, Swift, Byron, Dickens—so that students are steeped in literature and so that teachers can rekindle Matthew Arnold's credo "to introduce young minds to the best that had been taught and written" (October 5, 2010). In Marshall's chapter, she highlights the stark contrast between multimodal, diversified forms of communication and the conservative rhetoric coming from policy-makers:

> This then is a very conservative view of what should be taught and it is likely that these authors [from the canon], amongst others, will appear in the statutory national curriculum when it comes out in 2014. It may well be also that any form of course based assessment will go.

Similar trends are evident in Australia, where literacy researchers and educators have traditionally been praised for their innovations and exemplary approaches to literacy teaching and learning. Despite this tradition and reputation, literacy policy has gravitated far more of late to accountability through assessment and reporting. Dooley, Exley, and Comber address the conservative shifts in policy in their chapter:

> The current moment is very different from that in which the units we coordinate and teach were developed. As in the United Kingdom and the United States, recent years have seen active intervention in literacy education by the state in pursuit of economic goals. Changes include the 2008 introduction of the high-stakes *National Assessment Program—Literacy and Numeracy* (NAPLAN) which tests Reading, Writing and Language Conventions (Spelling, Grammar and Punctuation) in Years 3, 5, 7 and (http://www.nap.edu.au/). This represents a change in what is most valued as teacher capital in the local field of literacy education. It generates anxiety for preservice teachers who, by virtue of their prior schooling, find themselves in weak positions in the re-configured field.

With the institution of the Common Core Standards, the United States may be moving away from its recent narrow views of literacy and accountability. It remains to be seen how new standards and new policies will shape literacy instruction, and how these changes will impact literacy teacher education across the U.S. Like Marshall, Williamson notes the irony of negotiating complex, multimodal, new literacies practices and understandings that we witness outside of school within narrow, even restrictive policies taking place in school:

> Terms like *multiliteracies* and *situated literacies* highlight our new understandings about the multimodal, cultural, and contextual nature of literacy practices, and the implications of these ideas are having a considerable impact on schooling. Though resources remain tight and curricula have generally become more restrictive, teachers are being asked to innovate and enact methods for helping students develop skills for new kinds of multimodal interpretation and knowledge production.

Canada's provincial curricula are not much better, with some exceptions in western and eastern provinces, curricula emphasize mastering words, comprehending print-based texts, with some token initiatives on 21st century literacy that often suffer from the old wine in new bottles syndrome (Lankshear & Bigum, 1999). Booth situates literacy policy in a similar manner to other authors, talking about the emphasis on testing in provinces such as Ontario:

> As in other jurisdictions, the Ministry of Education for Ontario has implemented a system of standards-based education and province-wide testing in an effort to increase student achievement, and differences in literacy scores between boys and girls from these standardized tests have caused school districts to focus on ways to implement change.

The counter tendencies evident in Canada are also happening in other parts of the world such as the United Kingdom which have policy initiatives that encourage teachers and teacher educators to embrace 21st century teaching, but these same initiatives reinforce the same rather narrow, print-based logic—hence, the old wine in new bottle syndrome cited above. Lankshear and Knobel (2003) note that "many researchers have identified the 'old wine in new bottles' syndrome, whereby longstanding school literacy routines have a new technology tacked on here or there, without in any way changing the substance of the practice" (Lankshear & Knobel, p. 5). International curricula and policy have a tendency to view digital technologies from a print-based logic and approach, as opposed to teaching digital technologies through more of a design-based, multimodal logic (i.e., based on the visual-representational nature of screens).

Stepping outside of our collection and even further afield to places like Africa, literacy policies are even more standardized, out-dated, and conservative. Issues such as opening up literacy to multimodality and multiliteracies gets lost in bigger, more pressing questions around persisting inequalities and severe poverty.

The natural response to these challenges has been more testing and drawing up policy statements, which hardly touch teachers' work in schools and supporting teacher professional development (Prinsloo, 2012). To illustrate, Prinsloo offers the adage that testing is like weighing the cow repeatedly as a strategy to fatten it up.

RETHINKING LITERACY IN A DIGITAL AGE

Since this text is focused on literacy teacher educators, it is not surprising that all authors included a discussion of literacy in general. Since many of the authors in this collection have been involved in schooling for many years, as a group we have seen the pendulum swing wildly from whole language to phonics-based instruction, lived through a variety of national agendas, have tried valiantly to work with standards that are continuously being revised, and experienced radical changes in ways that teacher education programs have been delivered. Perhaps because of our lived experiences, we have found it necessary to take a step back and ask: What does it mean to be literate? The responses range along a continuum but each of the authors explores how the definition of a literate person is changing. It was not surprising that most have adopted a very expansive view of literacy. Whether talking about multiliteracies, critical literacy, or more conventional literacy instructions, the view of literacy as a social practice (e.g., Street, 1995) was evident. As Saudelli and Rowsell argue, the definition of being literate is changing:

> Technological advancements in our rapidly evolving and increasingly globalized world have changed the nature of what it means to communicate. Children, adolescents, adults and seniors today engage daily in new communicative practices, with new tools, using diverse and multiple modes, and across global landscapes. Being 'literate' in contemporary society means much more mastery of the mechanics of reading and writing composition; communicative competencies with digital technology are a social and economic necessity. Because today's world calls for tech-savvy citizens, education is answering the call for inclusion of technology in the classroom.

Clearly, many of the changes in how, with what, and in what ways we communicate and make meaning with texts have transformed with the expansion of digital technologies and new media, yet these are not the sole reasons for the changing nature of literacy. Globalization and increased movement across spaces and places shifts how we conceptualize literacy as well as how we teach it. As well, there are issues concerning social justice and equity, related to who has and does not have access to new technologies. Vasquez notes these inequalities and inequities in access in her chapter:

> In my teaching, I want to make sure these new spaces are accessible to my students. I then hope my students will do the same for the children with whom they work. Making these tools accessible means making sure I include in my

> course syllabi opportunities for using technology in meaningful ways. For instance if I have students write and record podcasts, they do so knowing that their shows will be published online and made available to a broader audience to make accessible to that audience particular sorts of information such as ways of using children's books critically with children.

Rather than view digital technologies as anathema to schooling because of access issues, it is even more pressing that public schooling level the playing field by not only incorporating digital technologies, but also critically framing their use and understandings so that all students can benefit from them. Although there is a general agreement that literacy teacher education needs to be rethought in a digital age, there is still much to learn in terms of what the nature and practices of such learning is. Across all of the chapters, there are common goals related to expanding literacy beyond narrow terms to account far more for social practices that we engage in across contexts (Street, 2005; Pahl & Rowsell, 2012). For example, Walsh and Durant have a number of highly innovative activities incorporating digital technology: "In the literature unit one approach has been to set up a 'book club' and for students to participate in a literature blog, to foster discussion within class while counting this as an assessment."

Social practices include such aspects of everyday life as social networking, videogame play, media consumption, remix, convergence, and the list goes on in terms of new concepts and practices should inform aspects of what literacy is and how it should be taught, but we are still researching these practices and their implications for literacy education. Literacy teacher educators are therefore left in the difficult position of negotiating fairly conservative policy perspectives on literacy with new literacies and multimodality and, add to this, time constraints within year-long or two-year programs with their own structural expectations and limitations. Contributors to the volume go some way in offering possibilities, options, and ways forward to face the changed landscape of literacy education.

THOUGHTFULNESS AND INTEGRITY ABOUT TEACHING AND RESEARCH

One of the criticisms levelled at teacher educators (Kennedy, 2005) is that their work is often too idealistic or removed from the reality of teaching. After reviewing these chapters, we feel that our authors are the exception to Kennedy's claim. Their conclusion is based on compelling reasons. First, the 23 literacy teacher educators' work is driven by a vision for literacy instruction as a way to have a more equitable society, a vision rooted in their own practices as classroom teachers and on their own research (Kinloch's seven principles are a fine example). Second, their continued heavy involvement in schools and communities ensures that they do not become detached from the reality of teaching (Booth works in schools weekly). And third, they see literacy as a means of helping pupils develop a meaningful way of life rather than an end in itself (Walsh and Durant position their work in a broad social context).

Thoughtfulness and integrity, the title of this section, has many aspects: Being realistic about what can be accomplished, tying university courses to actual practice, and a characteristic that is not commonly identified but which is evident in the chapters-honesty. Honesty takes many forms: Assessing our own practices, trying to determine the effectiveness of our work, and closely monitoring student learning and well-being. Saudelli and Rowsell painstakingly describe the limited effectiveness of two course assignments; rather than simply blaming student teachers, they probed the situation which led them to appreciate the many demands on their students and empathize with their confusion about their teaching of certain topics. Williamson, who first began teaching without a credential admits, "I realized that my lack of preparation made me part of the problem of inadequate instruction at my school rather than a part of the solution." Dooley, Exley, and Comber acknowledge that their initiative, Leading Literacies, which aimed to connect the academic courses with practice teaching, had limited value because there was low student uptake and they are considering abandoning the initiative in its current iteration. Durant recounts how they were somewhat disappointed with their student teachers' projects, "Just as Maureen has noted about her classes, I didn't notice much innovation amongst these presentations." Spencer admits that her initial successes with her student teachers were not long-lasting:

> Toward the end of the course sequence, the pluralistic approach to literacy we embraced the previous semester feels distant; the residents have been habituated into the 'ways with words' (Heath, 1983) that are all too common in urban schools. They readily adopt terms like 'struggling' or 'low' reader and discuss children based on their relational reading level or assessment scores. Expressions like 'I DRA-ed him' (referring to a reading assessment, the DRA) reduce children to their test scores.

How many teacher educators would be willing to put their own work under a microscope? This willingness to constructively problematize their own practices suggests a unique commitment to student teachers' learning and well-being.

Honesty has not led to despair or deficit thinking; interestingly a sense of hope is evident across the experiences and practices documented by these literacy educators. This is not a new-found sentiment or a passing fancy but rather a long-standing *way of being*. Reading across the autobiographical sections of these chapters, it became clear that all have long histories of tackling difficult issues. Many taught in hard-to-staff schools or worked with marginalized communities. Williamson worked with adolescents who had been removed from schools because of emotional and behavioural problems; Stagg-Peterson taught in rural communities; Campano lived and worked in communities marked by extreme poverty; and Kinloch taught secondary school in Harlem. Simon helped build Life Learning Academy, for adolescents who had been involved or were deemed "at risk" of involvement in the criminal justice system. Throughout our careers we have all tried to make a difference in the lives of individual students, many of whom had experienced significant school struggles.

As a collection, the work documented by the teacher educators in this volume suggests that literacy teacher educators are not disengaged academics removed from the realities of the classroom (e.g., Kennedy, 2005). Even if our actual work as classroom teachers was fairly distant, our experiences working in schools and communities shaped our worldviews, which in turn influenced our work as literacy teacher educators. Vasquez's position reflects the sentiments of many:

> Regardless of the focus of my research I maintained a commitment to conduct studies that not only push forward the knowledge base in teacher, literacy, and early childhood education, but also interrogate issues of fairness, equity, and social justice. I believe this type of research moves away from ivory tower sensibilities, having the potential to make a real difference in people's lives.

This desire to make a difference in the lives of teachers, students, and communities is one of the most persistent and profound commitments reflected in the work of these educators.

DEVELOPING A RICH PEDAGOGY

Thoughtfulness, hope, and integrity could be easily dismissed as soft values especially in this age of "scientifically-based" research and accountability, but the literacy teacher educators in this volume use this stance as a basis for developing rich pedagogy. Forthrightness and self-examination are coupled with strong teaching and research skills. Neither resting on our laurels or accepting the status quo we are constantly developing and refining our pedagogies. Drawing on theoretical frameworks to underpin our courses (e.g., Cope & Kalantzis, Janks' approach to analyzing text, Halliday's theory of systemic functional linguistics, Pearson and Raphael's reading comprehension model) pedagogical choices emanate from research-based conceptualizations of literacy, language, and learning. The wonderful examples of practice are highly informative and reflect the commitment to specific principles and a clear vision of literacy. We noted three aspects of pedagogy common to all: Drawing on our own teaching and research experiences; adopting and encouraging an "inquiry stance" on practice (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009); and making links between the content of our courses and the field-based experiences of our students.

Drawing on Our Own Teaching and Research Experience

All contributing authors are familiar with the work of classroom teachers and aware of the dynamics of the teaching-learning process. Most remain involved with teachers through in-service observations, collaborations, and research. Drawing on our own experiences as classroom teachers goes far beyond simply telling stories about our teaching. Yes, stories from practice are important for credibility with student teachers, and can provide concrete examples of what may otherwise feel to our students to be theoretical abstractions, but stories are used strategically in our

pedagogy—not just to engage or entertain student teachers. Vasquez explains why she draws on her own experiences:

> "…[W]hen I talk about the need to work with young children from a critical literacy perspective, such as helping them analyze and critique children's literature and other texts, I do so from the position of one who has experienced this kind of work first-hand."

Further, many go to great lengths to include the voice of pupils. Marshall like many of the authors quotes from children's work, others use video clips, some hold classes in schools—all in an effort to make their teaching and the student teachers' experiences more meaningfully connected. Kinloch brought together pre-service literacy teachers and students from an urban high school in New York city to discuss difficult questions about beliefs, diversity, privilege, and achievement. Simon notes that:

> Learning to teach literacy at Life Learning Academy shaped my image of what school can look like; my emphasis on the local and relational aspects of teaching; my belief in the capabilities of all students; and my suspicion of programs and policies that position adolescents, like those at Life Learning Academy, as academic failures.

As these and other examples suggest, for literacy teacher educators, histories of working in communities and classrooms provide both an epistemic foundation for our understandings of literacy and theories of practice, as well as a basis for building meaningful connections with student teachers in our university classrooms.

In terms of drawing on our research, there are many examples of how research is woven into pedagogy. None of the authors describe survey-type courses which march students through a huge range of topics. Rather, these chapters document attempts to encourage student teachers to deeply engage with issues. An emerging strand of research on teacher education (Kosnik and Beck, 2009; Darling-Hammond, 2006) argues that teacher educators need to prioritize key concepts to ensure that student teachers have acquired essential pedagogical skills. This is evident in Kosnik and Menna's chapter where they argue that based on their research on beginning teachers they revamped their courses from trying to "cover the waterfront" to a few essential key goals. Walsh and Durant describe some very innovative ways for incorporating research into their courses and disseminating their research to both their student teachers and fellow faculty (e.g., web-sites). Other contributors, for example Simon and Campano, describe their attempts to invite student teachers into research collaborations. These examples suggest that the relationships of research and practice in literacy teacher education are often recursive and mutually informing (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009).

Adopting an Inquiry Stance

It is abundantly clear that none of our literacy teacher educators act as a sage on the stage. This is in part because we attempt to adopt what Cochran-Smith & Lytle

(2009) have called an "inquiry stance" toward our own teaching and encourage our student teachers to develop a similar approach to teaching. Helping student teachers develop an inquiry stance cannot be done generically or by following a script. Simon notes that "inquiry is both a subject and framework of my course." For example, in describing inquiry-based projects in his course, he notes "The first inquiry involves qualitative analysis of classroom data to investigate how teachers orchestrate—and students respond to—opportunities to talk together about texts." Stagg-Peterson believes that she needs to know her student teachers well so that she can help them develop into effective literacy teachers. "My students are my top priority among the many demands on my time. I meet individually with all of the students—in order to get to know them and to address their individual learning needs." Student teachers are encouraged to reflect on and unpack their previous school experiences through discussion or perhaps by completing a literacy autobiography. Ghiso sees community as essential to helping student teachers develop an inquiry stance:

> One of my goals as a literacy educator is to foster an orientation that values students' languages, identities, and histories as resources. I know from experience that merely stating this stance is not sufficient, but that our classroom community must arrive at this understanding together.

Throughout the chapters there are many examples of highly engaging pedagogy which have the hallmarks of student teachers being actively involved in every class through hands-on activities, working in schools, asking questions, writing letters to authors, analyzing video, going on field trips, and so on. These efforts are premised on the belief that we need to go beyond the superficial and the rhetorical. For example, Campano and Ngo set aside time for student teachers to meet with the classroom teacher in the parish school where they work every week to ask questions about her practice, her decisions, her students, and so on.

Many involve their student teachers in their research and share their research with their student teachers. Simon's students are part of the entire research cycle, including co-authoring papers. Stagg-Peterson uses examples from her middle school literacy research to help student teachers overcome deficit thinking about students and communities. Rogers shares with her student teachers her own activism as an example of her inquiry stance and invites student teachers to join her network:

> In 2000, I co-founded (with Mary Ann Kramer) a grassroots teacher group called the Literacy for Social Justice Group. This teacher led group includes educators across the lifespan who are committed to realizing social justice education in schools and communities.

A theme common in the literature on teacher education is modeling (Loughran, 2006). Durrant describes his efforts:

> In my lectures and tutorials/workshops I endeavour to model as much 'natural' incorporation of technology and multimedia into my teaching as possible,

> including PowerPoint slides, Prezi (zooming editor) constructions, YouTube videos, podcasts and general website direction, particularly in relation to state and national English curriculum documents and related teaching resources.

Modeling is not a simply a strategy to engage student teachers in entertaining activities but is used as a meaningful pedagogical tool. As Williamson explains:

> The findings from my research point to the importance of explicit and participatory modeling in the teaching of methods. By explicit, I mean that it is not enough for teacher educators to model instructional practices without being transparent about their pedagogical thinking. Much about teaching is invisible to the novice eye, and explicit modeling allows educators to unpack the pedagogical decisions that they make in their planning and in the fleeting moments that characterize classroom interactions. By participatory, I mean that novices must have opportunities to try out the roles that they will play as teachers in the classroom.

These and other examples suggest that "modeling" is not merely about performing good teaching, but rather is an important part of an inquiry stance in teacher education: a means of surfacing, naming, and interrogating aspects of practice that may otherwise remain naturalized or unnoticed.

Making Links between Practice Teaching and Academic Program

Developing a rich pedagogy is not restricted to the academic program. All of the literacy teacher educators conceptualize our courses expansively to include connections to the field. Although most have limited control over practice teaching placements, we go to great lengths to connect theory and practice. We do this for a number of reasons: to make theories of literacy and learning explicit, to help student teachers develop their own theories of practice and teaching skills, and to support student teachers in developing an inquiry stance that is not quickly undone by the realities of teaching. Regarding the last point, Lan argues that "When literacy programs collaborate with schools and communities—working on the ground—we are able to see that the true value of a learner cannot be measured by standardized assessments."

Using ingenuity, our connections with teachers, schools, and research sites, and sacrificing our own course hours, we involve student teachers in a variety of fieldwork experiences. There were a number of excellent examples of literacy teacher educators designing course assignments that bridge university-based courses with practice teaching. For example, Williamson describes the final project of the course Literacy History:

> [C]andidates describe their own literacy journey in relation to that of a student who they have chosen to interview from their fieldwork classroom. The purpose of the project is for candidates to consider the similarities and differences between their experiences and those of their students, and to think deeply about what they can learn about a student's understandings and beliefs about language.

Kinloch invited veteran teachers to a class session to work in small groups with student teachers to:

> [S]hare reading lessons and student work samples, and discuss approaches to teaching students in urban schools. In small groups, they talked openly about how they create guided reading questions with students, make time for readers' workshops, encourage students to keep reading journals, how they select and teach young adult novels, and how they design lessons.

Each of these examples suggests how these educators attempt to make boundaries between universities, communities, and classrooms more permeable. As a result, rather than removed from classroom realities, teacher education classrooms can become sites for connecting and exploring links between the field of literacy education and fields of practice. Dooley, Exley, and Comber describe their Leading Literacies Project as follows:

> This is a space that is neither in the university nor the school but overlaps both; it differs from practice teaching because it is designed specifically for dialogue about exemplary literacy education practices; it differs from the tutorial room or lecture theatre because it offers an embodied experience of primary school literate practice high in intellectual quality.

CONCLUSION

The authors of this volume describe how being a literacy teacher educator is demanding yet fulfilling work. Ghiso states, "I believe that as a community, we need to be invested in the belief that literacy (and literacy teaching) is far more complicated than has been characterized in the current discourse of reform." The work of these educators suggests the need for more research that explores how teacher educators develop approaches to negotiating the complexity of literacy and pedagogy in their practices. We need research on literacy teacher educators as individuals—their vision and development, research on their literacy courses, research on student teachers, and research on graduates of our literacy courses. This has the potential not merely to document the work of exemplary teacher educators, but also to influence public discourse, policy, and practice. In a time in which literacy education internationally is increasingly shaped by test-driven, high stakes accountability, research by and on literacy teacher educators can help to shift attention to the ways that literacy is meaningfully shaped in local contexts, classrooms, and communities.

This text provides some insight into addressing some of the pressing issues, but in reflecting on this international picture, we are in dire need of re-visioning curricula and policy to account for research, for the changing landscape of literacy, and for significant shifts in teacher education. There are exceptions, of course, but these exceptions that align research with policy, with practice, and within teacher education are few and far between. The authors in our collection recognize and

contend with the reality of the local and global situation and have sought ways to prepare student teachers for the realities of teaching in the midst of standards-based accountability while at the same time trying to stay true to what we know should be taught in literacy teacher education courses. Yes, we despair about the time spent on documenting outcomes for external bodies (e.g., NCATE), money spent on short-sighted initiatives, and policies that constrain our work and constrain what counts as literacy in schools. Yet in spite of these and other challenges, underpinning every chapter is a sense of hope.

REFERENCES

Children's Defense Fund (2005). State of America's Children 2005 Report. Downloaded on April 15, 2012 from http://www.childrensdefense.org/

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S.L. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. In A. Iran-Nejad & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Review of Research in Education* (vol. 24) (pp. 249–305). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S.L. (2009). *Inquiry as stance: Practitioner research for the next generation.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education: Lessons from exemplary programs.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kennedy, M. (2005). *Inside teaching: How classroom life undermines reform.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kosnik, C., & Beck, C. (2009). *Priorities in teacher education: The 7 key elements of preservice preparation.* London: Routledge.

Lankshear, C., & Bigum, (1998). Literacies and technologies in school settings: Findings from the field. In *Proceedings of ALEA AATE Joint National Conference.* Canberra: ALEA.

Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2003). *New Literacies: Changing knowledge and classroom learning.* London: Open University Press.

Loughran, J. (2006). *Developing a Pedagogy of Teacher Education: Understanding Teaching and Learning about Teaching*. London: Routledge.

Pahl, K., & Rowsell, J. (2012). *Literacy and education: The New Literacy Studies in the classroom, 2nd edition.* London: Sage.

Prinsloo, M., & Rowsell, J. (2012). Digital Literacies in the Vinelands. Special Issue in *Language and Education*. Special Issue Edited by M. Prinsloo and J. Rowsell.

Street, B.V. (1995). *Social literacies: Critical approaches to literacy in development, ethnography, and education*. Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd.

AFFILIATIONS

Clare Kosnik
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/University of Toronto

Jennifer Rowsell
Brock University

Rob Simon
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/University of Toronto

INDEX