

**Conceptions of Responsibility for Disciplinary Literacy Instruction:
A Study of Secondary, Preservice Teachers in History and the Social Sciences**

**Melissa Stull
University of Michigan**

**A Paper Presented at the National Reading Conference
Austin, Texas
November 30, 2007**

Traditionally, intensive work in reading and writing instruction has been the purview of elementary teachers and high school English teachers, while other secondary teachers have focused more heavily on the content related to their specific disciplines. Past research reveals that most secondary, inservice teachers align their teaching responsibilities more closely to their discipline than with strengthening their students' literacy skills (Hall, 2005; O'Brien et al., 1995). This holds true even for teachers of history and the social sciences, who often have a text-based emphasis in their classes. "I'm a history teacher, not a reading teacher," is a representative comment (Massey & Heafner, 2004).

However, as recent national test results reveal, although most of our middle and high school students demonstrate basic reading and writing skills, many secondary students continue to struggle with the content specific reading they encounter in the later grades (Heller & Greenleaf, 2007). Scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) indicate that eighth and twelfth grade students struggle in particular with the ability to analyze, infer, and synthesize information in content area texts (Heller & Greenleaf, 2007). Thus, there is a need for secondary teachers to further develop and strengthen their students' literacy skills. Professional development focused on content area literacy has been fairly wide-spread, but as the professional development literature reveals (Richardson, 2003; Schoenback & Greenleaf, 2000), it is difficult to alter teachers' long-held views about their role as teachers, in part because these views are closely aligned to their ideas on the discipline itself (O'Brien et al, 1995). Given the limitations of short-term professional development workshops (Richardson, 2003) and the now well-acknowledged fact that teachers' conceptions of instruction and the teaching profession develop well before their first year of teaching (Lortie, 1975; Pajares, 1992), explicit and sustained emphasis on disciplinary literacy instruction early on in teachers' preparation is warranted.

In recent years, the University of Michigan's secondary teacher education program has worked to strengthen their approach to content area literacy instruction. Among these efforts are building coherence and consistency across program semesters, grounding content area literacy instruction in the disciplines; cohorting preservice teachers by discipline in order to support disciplinary-specific literacy instruction; and developing stronger partnerships with colleagues in the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, who are responsible for providing the content-specific courses for those seeking secondary education certificates.

A current study, the Advancing Literacies Project, investigates how these efforts are impacting the preservice teachers' conceptions of disciplinary literacy and the instructional practices they imagine using in their classrooms. In this paper, I specifically focus on one cohort of history and social science preservice teachers and their sense of responsibility for disciplinary literacy. My primary research questions are: a) Do these preservice teachers view disciplinary literacy instruction as their responsibility, and if so, what is the nature of this responsibility? b) What is their understanding of the relationship between their discipline and literacy? c) What types of disciplinary literacy practices do they plan to use with their students? d) What seems to be influencing their sense of responsibility for disciplinary literacy?

I begin by reviewing literature related to preservice teacher education, content area literacy, and history/social studies education. I then describe the research context, providing a brief description of Michigan's secondary, undergraduate teacher education program and my involvement with this cohort of preservice teachers (PSTs). After detailing my data analysis process, I provide a brief description of each of the focal students and their field placement contexts. Next, I turn to my analysis of these focal students' sense of responsibility, emphasizing how their conceptions of students, the discipline, disciplinary text, and disciplinary literacy

practices influence their sense of responsibility for literacy instruction in their discipline. Finally, I discuss potential factors impacting how these preservice teachers conceive of their responsibility to disciplinary teaching and learning, and I describe the implications of these findings for teacher education.

Because I focus my discussion in this paper on preservice teachers' *responsibility for disciplinary literacy*, it is useful to define what I mean by this expression. Webster's dictionary defines responsibility as "the state of being responsible, accountable, or answerable, as for a trust, debt, or obligation."¹ Thus, I use the term *responsibility* in reference to what these PSTs see as their duty or obligation as teachers. To what do these preservice teachers respond? To the discipline? To their students' literacy needs and strengths? To the text? To other elements of teacher's work? Do they see developing their students' literacy skills as an aspect of their role as teachers? By *disciplinary literacy*, I mean the literacy related tasks and demands required of the content area, in this case, history and the social sciences. This includes general reading and writing skills applicable across content areas, as well as more domain-specific literacy skills such as considering an author's background, his purpose, the historical context, and audience when reading a text in a history classroom (Wineburg, 1991).

Related Literature

In the literature related to teacher education and content area literacy, there are few studies that directly investigate secondary preservice teachers' sense of responsibility for literacy. There is a large body of research on teacher beliefs (i.e., Kagan, 1992; Pajares, 1992; Richardson, 1996; Richardson, 2004), although there is little here specifically targeting PSTs' responsibility. In terms of content area literacy, several studies look at PSTs' knowledge, attitude, and/or beliefs about reading or literacy (Bean and Zulich, 1990; Freedman & Carver,

¹ <http://webster-dictionary.net/definition/Responsibility>

2007; Hollingsworth, 1989; Nourie & Lenski, 1989; O'Brien & Stewart, 1990; Linek et al., 1999); however, few directly investigate the PSTs' literacy responsibility. Similarly, there are only a small number of studies in history/social studies education that focus on preservice teachers' responsibility or on the connection between the discipline and literacy (Bain, 2000; Virta, 2001; Wilson & Wineburg, 1988; Wineburg, 1990; Yeager & Davis, 1995). Despite the lack of studies *specifically* targeting PSTs' literacy responsibility, there are related studies in teacher education, content area literacy, and history/social studies education that help to provide a framework for our investigation.

Although teacher responsibility is discussed in the teacher education literature, it is usually included in the larger category of teacher beliefs. As Pajares (1992) discusses in his literature review on this topic, the expression *teacher beliefs* is used in numerous different ways by a multitude of researchers. Although teacher beliefs is a "messy construct," several studies that fall within the teacher belief literature raise issues relevant to our investigation. Heeding Pajares advice, I use *teacher beliefs* to mean the ideas, views, and conceptions that preservice teachers' hold with regards to teaching, learning, students, literacy, their discipline, and their role as teachers.

Preservice Teachers' Beliefs on Literacy Instruction in the Content Areas

Several studies in content area literacy examine PSTs' views on learning, teaching, and literacy before and after a content area reading course (Bean & Zulich, 1990; Freedman & Carver, 2007; Linek et al., 1999; O'Brien & Stewart, 1990). In one of the earlier studies in this area, O'Brien and Stewart (1990) examine secondary, preservice teachers' conceptions of the purpose of a content area literacy course, looking at their views before and after the course. Analyzing 100 responses to writing prompts from PSTs in 22 different content areas, O'Brien

and Stewart found that the PSTs' responses could be categorized as follows: those with a general and sometimes strong understanding of literacy and its importance to their discipline; those who thought the course would teach them reading remediation skills and techniques to use with their students; those who thought the course was targeted at helping them to become better readers; and those unclear about the purpose of the course. Almost three-quarters of the PSTs fell into the personal remediation or student remediation categories. Although by the end of the course O'Brien and Stewart found that the PSTs' initial misconceptions about the course's purpose had been dispelled, many PSTs exhibited views that O'Brien and Stewart consider more problematic. For example, a common response among PSTs was that they were unsure of how to institute what they had learned in the course given contextual factors in secondary schools, such as short class periods.

A more recent example of research focusing on preservice teachers' perceptions of literacy before and after a course is Freedman and Carver's (2007) study of secondary, preservice teachers in math, science, social studies, and English/language arts. They investigated what the PSTs knew about literacy development and how the PSTs envisioned their role with regards to supporting students' literacy development. Freedman and Carver (2007) found that their PSTs began the course recognizing that literacy skills are important to student learning, but few articulated how they might be able to work on literacy development with their students given their content area obligations; the latter parallels what O'Brien and Stewart (1990) found at the end of the literacy course. By the end of the class in Freedman and Carver's study, these same PSTs were able to articulate some of the complexities of literacy development and how literacy impacted their students' content learning. What is unclear from these studies is what factors,

besides the content area literacy course, may be influencing the PSTs' ideas on literacy, on its relationship to the disciplines, and on their role with regards to disciplinary literacy.

Influences on Preservice Teachers' Beliefs and the Relationship between Beliefs & Actions

Research suggests that secondary, preservice teachers' conceptions of disciplinary literacy are influenced by the following:

- the preservice teachers' ideas on teaching and learning (Bean & Zulich, 1992; Hollingsworth, 1989; Moje, 1996; Stewart & O'Brien, 1989);
- their general conception of their role and the students' role in the classroom (Harlin, 1999; O'Brien & Stewart, 1990; Stewart, 1990);
- their views on the purpose of schooling (Moje, 1996);
- their own experiences in school, particularly with regards to literacy (Bean & Zulich, 1992; Harlin, 1999; Linek et al., 1999)

Zulich, Bean, and Herrick (1992) contend that all of these factors interact in complex ways, although they found that the preservice teachers' individual biographies – particularly their prior experiences in schools and as a learner – are the most influential. In his review of the teacher belief literature, Pajares (1992) also discusses the power of PSTs' previous experiences, adding that these beliefs have a strong impact on the preservice teachers' actions in the classroom. Applying this to disciplinary literacy instruction, one might argue that if teacher education can encourage the secondary preservice teachers that they are responsible for their students' literacy development, then the instructional practices the PSTs use in their classrooms will reflect this stance. However, as Powers and Zippay (2006), Wilson et al. (1994), and Richardson (1996) highlight, the relationship between beliefs and actions is not necessarily as straight forward as Pajares implies.

For example, Powers and Zippay (2006) found that there were inconsistencies between what the preservice teachers said they believed with regards to the importance of literacy instruction and what teaching practices they actually used with their students. Wilson et al. (1994) come to a similar conclusion in their focused study of one social studies preservice teacher – the beliefs he espoused before student teaching did not reflect the instructional practices he used with his students. Richardson (1996) adds that the “question is still open as to whether beliefs guide action, actions – and particularly the results of action – guide beliefs, or that they interact such that beliefs or action may be dominant and affect the other depending on many factors” (p.5).

Possible Reasons for the Inconsistencies between Beliefs and Actions

Each of the above mentioned studies emphasizes that there are often intervening factors in the relationship between instructional beliefs and actions. The following factors are the most often cited in the literature:

- the subculture of the disciplines in secondary schools (Bean & Zulich, 1992; Grossman & Stoldosky, 1995; Moje, 1996; Virta, 2001)
- the complexity and culture of secondary schools (Bean & Zulich, 1992; O’Brien & Stewart, 1990; O’Brien et al., 1995)
- workplace constraints, such as time (Wilson et al., 1994; Stewart, 1990)
- the preservice teachers’ field-based experiences, particularly the cooperating teacher and her instructional practices (Bean & Zulich, 1992; Linek et al., 1999)

As Grossman and Stoldosky (1995) describe, each discipline has its own set of beliefs, practices, and norms that influence the work of teachers. For example, a practice common in history when engaging with a text is to consider the author, context, audience, and purpose of the piece

(Wineburg, 1991). In contrast, few mathematicians consider these aspects of the texts in their discipline, as Shanahan et al. (2006) found in their study of how historians, mathematicians, and chemists read. Thus, preservice history teachers may have a different conception of disciplinary literacy and what this means for their instruction than do math PSTs. Furthermore, Grossman and Stoldosky (1995), in their study of 400 teachers from five core disciplines found, when comparing the disciplines of history and math, that history has a less defined subject area, is less static, is less likely to have vertical coordination between courses, is less likely to track students, and is less likely to use a common assessment across courses than is true of math. All of these issues impact what it means to be a history teacher (or a math teacher).

These disciplinary subcultures also exist within a larger school context that tends to divide the school curriculum by content area, leading many preservice teachers to see their teaching responsibility as aligned with their discipline, rather than with other aspects of student learning, such as literacy development (O'Brien et al., 1995). Another aspect of the school culture noted by O'Brien, Stewart, and Moje (1995) is that the predominant mode of instruction in secondary schools is teacher-centered. Thus, preservice teachers tend to resist instituting literacy strategies that encourage the students to make their own meaning from the text, as many beginning teachers typically emulate the practices of more veteran teachers, many of whom primarily use didactic instructional practices (Stewart, 1990).

Also part of the secondary school context are the constraints of the workplace, among which many preservice teachers highlight "lack of time" as most prominent. As Stewart (1990) explains, many preservice teachers state that they are not able to engage in disciplinary literacy practices given the instructional time required to implement them. With 50-55 minute class periods the norm, many preservice teachers see covering content as more important than

developing their students' literacy skills, suggesting that they see the two tasks as unrelated. Stewart found that few PSTs articulated that developing students' literacy skills might increase student learning and might enable students to use class time more productively when engaging in reading and writing tasks.

Another factor leading to a lack of coherence between preservice teachers' espoused ideas on disciplinary literacy and their instructional practices is the strong influence of the field experience. In their examinations of different settings for a content area literacy course, Linek et al. (1999) found that the course most closely connected to a field experience and conducted at the field setting site had the most impact on what the preservice teachers' learned about literacy and subsequently on the literacy practices they used when teaching. They conclude that most preservice teachers tend to follow the instructional practices of their cooperating teachers; thus, if the cooperating teacher engages in disciplinary literacy practices, the PST is more likely to do so, and vice versa. Bean and Zulich's (1992) analysis of three secondary, preservice teachers' literacy beliefs and practices also emphasizes the role of the field experience, suggesting that the relationship between the preservice teacher and cooperating teacher has a significant influence on the PST's instructional practices.

Preservice Teachers in History and the Social Sciences

As mentioned previously, the subculture of each discipline influences preservice teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning with regards to their respective content areas (Grossman & Stoldosky, 1995). Related to this discussion of disciplinary subculture is the role that content knowledge plays in preservice teachers' instructional practices (Shulman, 1986; Wilson & Wineburg, 1988).

Wilson and Wineburg's (1988) study of four preservice teachers from different social

science disciplines illustrates the significance of content knowledge. Based on interviews and observations of the PSTs' teaching, Wilson and Wineburg found that the PSTs' ideas about history and their teaching practices reflected their disciplinary backgrounds. For example, the PST with a physical geography and anthropology concentration considered historical causation as linked to geography and human development, whereas the history major stated that historical events do not have singular causes. The PSTs' disciplinary backgrounds also influenced their instruction. An illustrative case is how the political science major began each of his U.S. history courses with a twenty minute discussion on current events; he coupled this with an emphasis on the political and economic aspects of history. Thus, Wilson and Wineburg conclude that the PSTs' content knowledge and disciplinary backgrounds had a critical impact on their instruction.

Yeager and Davis (1995) reach a similar conclusion in their replication of Wineburg's (1991) study. They had three preservice social studies teachers read the same eight historical sources that Wineburg used with historians and high school students. The student teachers exhibited a range of historical reading skills, with one approximating the analysis of one of Wineburg's historians and another more similar to one of Wineburg's high school students. Yeager and Davis attribute these differences to the quality of previous experiences that the PSTs had had with analyzing historical texts; interestingly, none had an explicit exposure to this in their university coursework. One of the implications of Yeager and Davis' findings is that if PSTs are not able to interact with disciplinary text in sophisticated ways, they will not be able to teach their students how to do this either.

Altering Preservice Teachers' Beliefs through Teacher Education

What this literature review reveals thus far is that preservice teachers' beliefs matter, though their relationship to teacher action is constrained by numerous factors ranging from the

context of secondary schools to the preservice teachers' disciplinary background and knowledge. Given all of these variables, it is not surprising that altering PSTs' beliefs and ultimately actions through teacher education is incredibly challenging (Ball, 1989; Kennedy, 1999; McDiarmid, 1990; Richardson, 1996).

If teacher education is to be successful in encouraging all secondary preservice teachers to take responsibility for developing their students' literacy skills, then several factors must be considered and addressed. Richardson (2004), in her review of the literature addressing preservice teacher beliefs and teacher education, suggests that it will take more than a stand-alone course to alter the previously held convictions of PSTs. On-going work with disciplinary literacy concepts and practices across the duration of the teacher education program, and ideally during the first few years of teaching, is one avenue to pursue. Kagan (1992), in her review of the learning-to-teach literature, offers some further suggestions. She concludes that teacher educators need to first assist the preservice teachers in reflecting on their prior experiences and how these experiences impact how they see themselves as teachers and how they see their students as learners. Secondly, preservice teachers need extended interactions with students, which show the need for all secondary teachers to work on students' literacy development. Finally, Kagan suggests that disrupting preservice teachers' previous understandings through creating cognitive dissonance is important, because if their views are not challenged in the teacher education setting, it is likely that their preconceived notions will become more solidified by the field, a point supported by other researchers (Pajares, 1992; Richardson, 1996).

As this review highlights, there are multiple factors influencing preservice teachers' instructional beliefs and practices, only one of which is teacher education. I contend that if teacher education is to have a stronger influence on secondary preservice teachers' commitment

to disciplinary literacy and to their ability to engage effectively in disciplinary literacy practices, then we need to first broaden and deepen our understanding of how our preservice teachers are making sense of this literacy responsibility. With the knowledge gained from such an analysis, we can amend, adjust, and enhance our programs in ways that are responsive to our preservice teachers' strengths and needs – a practice that we encourage them to use with their middle and high school students. The following analysis is an attempt to further our efforts in this regard. Because the context of preservice teachers' professional preparation influences their learning, I will first provide some details regarding the teacher education program at the University of Michigan.

Research Context

The undergraduate, secondary certification program - which is the one of interest in this paper - includes three semesters of coursework and field placements (see Table 1). During semester one, the PSTs' take three courses in the School of Education: Content Area Literacy, Education in a Multicultural Society, and a field practicum seminar. The social studies² PSTs were all in the same section of the Literacy course, which enabled the professor to focus on disciplinary literacy as it pertains specifically to history and the social sciences. PSTs also spend two half days per week in a field placement classroom at the middle or high school level; they are placed in pairs for this experience. The social studies PSTs' involvement in their field classrooms varied, but all at least taught a one-day lesson and analyzed student work.

During the second semester of the program, the PSTs take three additional courses: a methods course in their discipline – in this case, Teaching History and Social Sciences in Secondary Schools, Educational Psychology, and a field practicum seminar. All sections of

² I use the expression “social studies preservice teachers” to mean history and social science preservice teachers. I use “social studies,” as this is the expression used most frequently in the literature.

Teacher Education Program for Prospective Secondary Education Teachers

Semester I	Semester II	Semester III
Reading and Writing in the Content Areas	Content Area Methods for Teaching	Student Teaching Professional Development Seminar
Education in a Multicultural Society	Educational Psychology and Human Development	
Practicum Seminar	Practicum Seminar	Practicum Seminar
Field Experience: 2 half days per week	Field Experience: 2 half days per week	Field Experience: full-time student teaching

Table 1

these courses are open only to PSTs in the same discipline; thus, the social studies cohort had all three of their courses together. Similar to semester one, PSTs spend two half days in their field placement classrooms with varying levels of participation in teaching; however, they are now placed individually, and the social studies cohort remained in these same classrooms for their student teaching semester.

During their final semester in the teacher education program, the PSTs student teach full-time, assuming responsibility for lead teaching for at least eight weeks of the semester. They also take a field seminar class and participate in a series of professional development workshops that meet on campus. The teacher education program requires the preservice teachers to create, teach, and analyze their teaching of a two to three week unit. Assignments in all three semesters encourage the PSTs to make connections between their teacher education coursework and their field placement sites.

Our teacher education program recruits cooperating teachers from area middle and high schools, and the program randomly pairs preservice teachers with a cooperating teacher for their

practicum one experience. Because the social studies PSTs would be placed with the same cooperating teacher for their practicum two and student teaching experiences, the preservice teachers had to complete a resume, cover letter, and letter of intention prior to their second semester in the program. The field placement supervisor then sent these materials to interested cooperating teachers, who had an opportunity to meet the PST prior to agreeing to work together.

I have been highly involved with this cohort of social studies preservice teachers. First of all, I served as their practicum field instructor during their first and second semesters in the program, and as a field instructor for six of these PSTs during their student teaching semester (three of whom are the focal students for this paper). As a field instructor, I visited the PSTs several times each semester at their field placement sites, providing them with feedback on their teaching. I also facilitated meetings between the cooperating teachers, PSTs, and myself, where we discussed the preservice teachers' progress and offered suggestions for improvement. During semesters one and two of the program, I led bi-monthly seminar sessions in which I worked with the PSTs to strengthen their understanding of teacher education coursework with regards to their field placement classrooms. During semester three, I led weekly seminars with six of the student teachers. In addition, I was a graduate student intern in their social studies methods course during semester two of their program, observing every class session and analyzing their submitted assignments. To assure the reader that I have made efforts to limit the extent to which my background knowledge of this social studies cohort impacts my analysis, I describe my data analysis process in what follows.

Methods

As mentioned previously, my investigation in this paper emanates from the larger body of data collected for the Advancing Literacies Project. To study the development of secondary,

preservice teachers' ideas about literacy instruction in the disciplines, the Project collected two main forms of data: four teacher education program assessments and three semi-structured interviews that occurred over the three semesters of the PSTs' teacher education program. Supplementing this data are field placement observations; videotapes of PSTs leading instruction; and, syllabi, assignments, and field notes from observations of their teacher education courses. I am one of several graduate students involved in this study, and I have been responsible for helping to create interview protocols, for scheduling and interviewing preservice teachers, for transcribing some of these interviews, for analyzing interview data, and for observing teacher education courses.

All secondary, preservice teachers took the program assessment four times – once before they started their coursework and then at the end of each of the three semesters in the program. The assessment seeks to measure PSTs' understanding of literacy and of its relationship to their respective disciplines. The assessment consists of four components. We ask students to: 1) indicate on a survey the degree to which they agree or disagree with statements about their literacy responsibility and about reading and writing in their content area; 2) indicate what type of information they would need to know about their teaching context, students, and text to effectively plan a lesson in their content area; 3) analyze a discipline-specific text, and 4) analyze student writing in their discipline (see Appendix for survey questions). Of the original 18 social studies preservice teachers in this cohort, we have complete assessment data for nine of these students.

A sub-sample of PSTs across all of the disciplines agreed to participate in a set of three, semi-structured interviews – one occurring near the end of each of their three semesters in the program. Similar to the assessment, the interview questions focused on the PSTs' conceptions of

literacy, the discipline, and discipline-specific literacy practices (see Appendix for all three interview protocols). Of the original 18 students in the social studies cohort, seven students completed all three interviews.

I engaged in constant comparative analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), examining each interview transcript multiple times (interview 1 = 13 respondents; interview 2 = 12; interview 3 = 8). I, along with other researchers on the project, began by exploring each respondent's interview as it was transcribed, coding for general patterns. Based on this initial analysis, we noted that many of the preservice teachers discussed their responsibility for disciplinary literacy in light of their views on students, on text, on literacy practices, and on their discipline. I then re-examined each of the interview transcripts with these codes in mind, eventually writing case notes for each interview. Finally, I looked across the responses from interview one, seeking larger patterns in the PSTs' sense of responsibility for literacy. Other members of the research team assisted in this latter process, as well.

To corroborate some of that patterns that were emerging and to provide additional contextual information, I also explored the assessment data, field observations, and course syllabi, assignments, and field notes. This process led me from my initial, broad research question – *how do social studies preservice teachers conceive of their responsibility to literacy?* – to the more specific questions outlined at the beginning of this paper. The interviews serve as the focal data in this paper, as we specifically ask the preservice teachers questions about their literacy responsibility and about their conceptions of literacy and the discipline.

Preservice Teachers' Responsibility for Disciplinary Literacy

As mentioned earlier, previous research on content area preservice teachers suggests that they are reluctant to accept responsibility for teaching literacy, as their allegiance is more

directly tied to the content (Hall, 2005; O'Brien et al., 1995). Our data on the social studies cohort also shows that these PSTs are committed to teaching their respective disciplines; however, they all indicate that they are responsible for literacy instruction, as well. This is substantiated by both the PSTs' responses to the survey portion of the assessment as well as by their interview comments. For example, on the survey the first 11 questions measure the PSTs' attitudes towards literacy instruction in their discipline (see Appendix 1). The table below summarizes the social studies cohort's responses to five of these key questions:

Social Studies Preservice Teachers' Attitudes Towards Literacy & Their Discipline

Assessment Administration	Prior to Content Area Literacy Course	Near End of Content Area Literacy Course
1. A social studies teacher is obliged to help students improve their reading abilities.	100% agree	100% agree
2. Social studies teachers should teach content and leave reading instruction to reading teachers.	100% disagree	100% disagree
3. Knowing how to teach reading in social studies should be required for teaching certification in social studies.	94% agree	93% agree
8. The primary responsibility of a social studies teachers should be to impart subject matter knowledge.	88% agree	27 % agree
11. Social studies teachers should feel a greater responsibility to the content they teach than to any reading instruction they may be able to provide.	38% disagree	87% disagree
	N=16	N=15

Table 2

Our Likert scale for the survey ranges from 1-7, with 1 being “strongly disagree” and 7 being “strongly agree.” To ease readability, I categorized responses of 1-3 as “disagree,” 4 as “neutral,” and 5-7 as “agree.” With regards to the first item, the social studies cohort expresses, at both survey administrations, that they are responsible for improving their students’ reading abilities. When we reword this statement slightly to read – *Social studies teachers should teach content and leave reading instruction to reading teachers* – the PSTs again agree that they are responsible for reading instruction. The PSTs’ responses to survey question 3 – *Knowing how to teach reading in social studies should be required for teaching certification in social studies* – suggest that the vast majority of the cohort believes it is important to understand how to teach reading in history and social science classrooms.

Although the PSTs’ responses to the first three survey items indicate that they take responsibility for reading instruction in their discipline, when asked to weigh their responsibility for the content versus literacy, these preservice teachers at first favor the content. However, this changes dramatically by survey administration 2, which occurs near the end of the content area literacy course. The majority of the PSTs now agree that content is *not* their primary responsibility. Although the survey data do not clearly indicate why these preservice teachers’ initial commitment to content has changed, we might infer that the content area literacy course and their field experiences have helped to strengthen their understanding of the connection between their respective disciplines and literacy and the importance of disciplinary literacy instruction.

To further our investigation of why these patterns are emerging and to provide us with additional information about what these preservice teachers mean when they indicate that they are responsible for disciplinary literacy, I turn to the interview data. My overall analysis of the

13 PSTs who we interviewed during semester one indicates that the nature of this responsibility varies between individuals along several dimensions. These dimensions include the PSTs' conceptions of students, the discipline, disciplinary text, and disciplinary literacy practices. Although I discuss each of these elements separately, there is clearly overlap between them, and this will become apparent in the later discussion of the focal students' interviews.

Based on my analysis, here are the broad findings:

- These preservice teachers all assume responsibility for disciplinary literacy, but the nature of this responsibility varies.
- The nature of responsibility appears to vary along several dimensions: the preservice teachers' conceptions of students, of the discipline, of disciplinary text, and of disciplinary literacy practices.
- Having a strong understanding with regards to one of the dimensions of responsibility, such as a keen understanding of students, does not necessarily mean that the PST will have a strong understanding with regards to the other dimensions.
- Several factors appear to be influencing the PSTs' sense of responsibility, including their field placement experiences, their prior experiences, and their teacher education coursework.

Focal Students

Because I am ultimately interested in exploring *changes* in the PSTs' sense of responsibility for disciplinary literacy, I focus the rest of my analysis in this paper on the six preservice teachers for whom we have complete data sets - four assessments, three interviews, and six teaching observations. All six of these PSTs self-identify as Caucasian, and all were 21

FOCAL STUDENT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Name	Major(s)	Minor(s)	Field Placement – Grade and Subject	Field Placement – School Type	Cooperating Teachers’ Common Instructional Practices*
Christa	History	Political Science	9 th -12 th grade African Civilization & 9 th -12 th grade Law course	Small, alternative high school in small city	Some disciplinary literacy practices utilized with reading assignments; multiple forms of text
Jared**	History	Political Science	8 th grade U.S. History	Large, suburban middle school	Heavy reliance on <i>History Alive</i> textbook; some general literacy strategies utilized
John	History	English	9 th grade U.S. History & 11 th & 12 th grade A.P. European History	Large, suburban high school	Multiple disciplinary literacy practices utilized with reading assignments; multiple forms of text
Kathy	Social Studies	Psychology & Political Science	10 th grade U.S. History	Mid-sized, under-resourced high school in large town	Heavy reliance on textbook; read text aloud in class; answer textbook questions for each section; historical movies
Mark	History & Social Studies	n/a	9 th grade U.S. History & 11 th & 12 th grade Sociology	Small, urban, charter high school	Heavy reliance on textbook; some general literacy strategies utilized; differentiated instruction
Rick**	Political Science	Spanish	8 th grade U.S. History	Large, suburban middle school	Heavy reliance on <i>History Alive</i> textbook; some general literacy strategies utilized

Table 3 * = Description of instructional practices based on my observations and preservice teacher comments
 ** = Field placement in same classroom

or 22 years old when they entered the teacher education program. Four are history majors, the typical concentration area for University of Michigan PSTs seeking certification in history and the social sciences. One of the other PSTs is a social studies major and the other is a political science major. Two of the six had their field placement assignment in a middle school, whereas the others were in high school classrooms. Each of the cooperating teacher’s instructional practices varied; thus, some of the PSTs observed mainly traditional classroom practices, such as textbook-driven lessons, whereas others observed their cooperating teachers utilizing disciplinary literacy practices similar to the ones our teacher education program promotes (see Table 3). The preservice teachers range in terms of their previous experiences with their respective disciplines and with the literacy tasks related to these disciplines (this will be discussed in the “Sources of Understanding” section).

I highlight the interview responses from three PSTs who exemplify patterns found in the larger cohort: Rick, Kathy, and John. Their sense of responsibility for disciplinary literacy varies with regards to their conception of students, the discipline, disciplinary text, and disciplinary literacy practices. The following table summarizes how they compare along these dimensions:

DIMENSIONS OF DISCIPLINARY LITERACY RESPONSIBILITY

Level of Understanding*	Conception of Students	Conception of Discipline	Conception of Disciplinary Texts	Conception of Disc. Literacy Practices
Basic	Rick and John	Rick	Rick	Rick and Kathy
More Developed		Kathy	Kathy	
Most Developed	Kathy	John	John	John

Table 4 * = Levels are based on comparison of these three preservice teachers to one another

Rick – Political Science Major, Spanish Minor

Field Placement: 8th Grade U.S. History; Large, suburban middle school

Rick's overall responses in interview one indicate that he is responsible for supporting his students' literacy development, and he seems to equate literacy with giving his students reading strategies. Despite acknowledging a range of literacy levels within his classroom, Rick explains that he plans to use the same literacy strategies with all of them. When referencing his content area, Rick routinely discusses the social sciences as a whole, rarely making a clear link between political science and literacy. In terms of text, Rick states that he will work primarily with the given textbook for his course and supplement it as needed with primary sources. When discussing how he will support students with literacy tasks in his classroom, Rick mentions using general literacy strategies, not domain-specific ones. He credits his content area literacy class for introducing him to the idea of literacy strategies.

Conception of Students and Literacy Responsibility

Early in the interview in response to a question about the types of texts his students need to produce in a civics class, Rick states:

It depends on the age and the grade level as well as the individual backgrounds of each student. It's difficult to walk into a class where it's a homogenous group. I'm sure you rarely ever do that. So expect an entire class to produce a set level, a standard, of a text is really unrealistic (line 236-239).

Here Rick states that it is likely that his students will range in terms of several different characteristics, naming age, grade level, and individual background. Rick also implies that his students' writing abilities will vary, as it is "unrealistic" to expect a class to produce the same standard text.

Despite acknowledging that students may vary along several dimensions, Rick later categorizes students into only two groups, explaining that he plans to use the same literacy

strategies with all of them. In response to a question about how he is envisioning using texts with students who range in literacy abilities, he replies:

I guess I would just treat the group as a whole to begin but focus my teaching more using strategies that would help not only struggling readers but also help good readers identify their strengths, as well. So giving strategies to help the weak readers while also further strengthening good readers' skills. So maybe forceful homogenization. I don't know (line 414-418).

Unlike the previous passage in which Rick defines a number of student differences, here he names only the extremes in reading ability, struggling and good readers. Categorizing students into these two reading levels is typical of other PSTs in the larger social studies cohort, as well. Although Rick appears to notice that there are at least some differences in student reading abilities, he does not state that he would use different strategies to address different students' strengths and needs. His statement that he would "treat the group as a whole" indicates that he may be thinking that there is a one-strategy-fits-all approach to supporting students' literacy growth. Or, that his responsibility is to bring all students to the same level – "forceful homogenization." His use of the phrase "I don't know" suggests that he is still uncertain and tentative about how to actualize his responsibility for *all* students' literacy development, which is another common pattern across the larger cohort's responses in interview one.

Conception of the Discipline and Its Connection to Literacy

In terms of the literacy demands of his discipline, Rick references reading, writing, and computer literacy.

They [students] need to be able to read and write because the social sciences are mainly based upon those two forms of representation. If you can't read the material, you can't really understand the content. And if you can't write about it then you can't give your own opinions on it... It's necessary to have computer literacy because of the amount of research that social sciences take. You can go to a library and you can do research that way (line 254-271).

Rick's comments suggest that he believes reading and writing are the dominant literacy forms in the social sciences, though he later adds computer literacy as important for research. Nowhere in this passage does he specifically name his own discipline, political science. One might infer that his statement about writing being a means for expressing an opinion is a reference to the discipline, as taking a position on an issue is an activity common in many civics classes; however, position taking is also common in history and other social science classes.

Moreover, Rick's response here indicates that he believes students need to be proficient at reading and writing to access the content: "if you can't read the material, you can't really understand the content." Rick does not express in this passage, or elsewhere in this interview, that there are other avenues by which students can explore and make meaning about the content. If Rick's conception of the discipline is indeed about decoding or sending a message about the content, it is not surprising then that he would emphasize giving strategies to students as a means for aiding their comprehension and creation of text.

This idea of giving strategies to students to foster their comprehension of disciplinary text is also apparent later in the interview. When asked to explain how he is thinking about teaching his students to read like members of the discipline, he states: "Teaching them the right questions to ask when reading a particular text. So again, strategies. And questioning the author. There's different strategies that they can employ to facilitate that learning" (line 337-339). When pushed to further explicate his thinking here, he adds: "questioning the author, note taking, concept mapping, stuff like that" (line 344). Rick's initial response suggests that he recognizes that different texts require different types of questioning techniques, an understanding we try to develop in our teacher education program. However, he does not seem to make any deeper disciplinary connections, such as indicating that what one might ask of a primary document in a

history class may not be the same as what one might ask of a political party platform statement in a civics class. The strategies Rick mentions – questioning the author, note taking, and concept mapping – are all applicable to civics, but can also be used across content areas. Rick’s responses here suggest that he has a responsibility for literacy, but he has not fully connected his conception of literacy to his discipline or to domain-specific practices and strategies.

Rick’s statements at the end of the interview offer further evidence that he is conceiving of his responsibility in more general than discipline specific terms. When asked, *If you had to summarize you thinking about literacy instruction in your subject area what would you say?* he states:

I think it’s important to teach students strategies before they handle the text because it’s impossible to know whether or not they’ve had prior experiences with texts as such. And it’s important to give them a guide and structure to ensure that what’s needed to be comprehended is in fact learned (line 509-512).

Although the question prompt specifically references literacy in the discipline, Rick makes no mention here of the content and its implications for his literacy instruction. As he does throughout interview one, Rick again acknowledges that he is responsible for supporting his students’ literacy development, and he turns to general strategies to meet his students’ needs, not domain-specific ones. Furthermore, as Rick alludes to throughout the interview, his conception of learning seems to focus on comprehension – “what’s needed to be comprehended is in fact learned.” Thus, literacy strategies are useful in helping students to extract information. Rick’s comments here suggest that he has an awareness of how literacy strategies can aid students’ comprehension, but he does not articulate their value beyond this basic level or connect the strategies specifically to his discipline, political science.

Conception of Disciplinary Text

When asked to discuss his ideas on choosing and using text in his discipline, Rick focuses

on the given course textbook and literacy strategies to support students' comprehension of it. In the following passage, Rick discusses his ideas about choosing text:

Well first and foremost probably would be texts I've already had experiences with. That may be problematic because most of the texts in my discipline that I've had experiences with have been college level texts. However, if I teach an A.P. government class they may be expected to understand those types of texts. So in choosing them, as of now I would go along with whatever the primary textbook is in the class. Not primary source, the text that's used in the classroom, and then build upon that using primary sources (line 379-385).

Rick appears to define text here in terms of written texts such as textbooks and primary sources.

He recognizes that the types of political science texts with which he is familiar are probably not appropriate for high school students, implying that the reading level may be too advanced.

Although Rick implies that there are challenges to using his college texts with high school students, he does not suggest that there also may be challenges with the high school textbook.

Similar to other PSTs in the larger cohort, Rick states that he would begin by using the classroom textbook and supplementing it with primary sources. He does not explain here or elsewhere in the interview his idea of primary sources or provide examples of primary sources that he may use in a civics class.

However, in the following passage Rick shares his ideas on how to support students' work with disciplinary texts:

Making sure that we not just read the text as a class but we go through the text the day after or the day before if I want to maybe give some questions to help guide their reading. But giving them strategies, not just, "Here, read this book. Did you get the information out of it? Good." But actually delving down into the text with the students and exploring it with them. Making sure they understand the material and just helping them strategize their reading (line 404-409).

Rick appears to reference here the idea of supporting students before, during, and after reading.

As he has mentioned throughout the interview, Rick sees giving students strategies as one way to support them in their reading. He implies that his responsibility is to assist students in

comprehending the material, and this requires him to explore the text “with the students.” Rick does not provide more detail here about what types of strategies he might use with students or how he envisions what it means to investigate the text *with* students.

Conception of Disciplinary Literacy Practices

The ways in which Rick is conceiving of students, the discipline, and text have implications for the types of instructional practices he imagines using with his students. As mentioned previously, Rick acknowledges that students have differing literacy levels but he plans to use the same literacy strategies with everyone. Furthermore, the strategies he imagines using are more general than discipline specific. Because Rick finds it important for students to extract information out of written text, using strategies becomes an important tool for him in assisting students with this task.

Rick’s response to the question – *What do you see as your responsibility in developing literacy in your students?* – provides some additional insight into the instructional practices he might use when supporting students’ literacy development in the discipline:

Give strategies in reading and writing to help them get through the difficulties of reading content area texts. They’re not always engaging and intended for a specific age group. So I think it’s important they have strategies to break through these barriers and comprehend the text (line 243-246).

Here Rick suggests that the writing style of content area reading texts is sometimes a challenge for students, so he sees it as his responsibility to provide students with strategies for supporting their reading. As an active agent in assisting his students, Rick perceives of his responsibility in terms of transmission - “giving” his students strategies which they then apply to the text.

Throughout interview one, Rick uses the expression “giving strategies” seven times. Only when he is directly asked to do so does he name any strategies: questioning the author, note taking, concept mapping, and KWL. He does not provide an explanation as to how he might teach

students to use these strategies or what these might look like in practice. When asked when he might use these strategies, his response is brief: “whenever we face a piece of text” (line 469). This suggests that Rick recognizes that literacy strategies can be useful to students, but he does not yet have a clear understanding of how to use these strategies and which ones may be most beneficial for a political science class or for particular students.

Rick’s ideas on how to support students’ literacy needs, particularly students who struggle with reading, also reveal this reliance on general literacy strategies:

Just giving strategies and helping them overcome the obstacles that they’re facing with the text. Finding out what that is. Asking them questions that will hopefully help identify what those struggles are. And then giving them strategies to overcome it (line 311-314).

Again, Rick states that giving literacy strategies to his students will help them to deal with the text and any challenges they may face when reading. Rick suggests that he will take an active role in helping students to identify what aspects of reading are challenging for them, but he does not offer any more specifics on how he might accomplish this task.

Sources of Understanding

Although we cannot make any causal claims about what is influencing Rick’s sense of responsibility for literacy within his discipline, we do have a number of questions in the interview that ask the preservice teachers to explain what may be impacting their thinking.

In terms of Rick’s perception of the discipline and literacy, it is important to note that his field placement this semester is in an eighth grade U.S. History class, so he is working in a discipline outside of his certification area. This may impact how he is connecting – or not connecting – literacy and the discipline. In addition, Rick mentions several times in this interview that his cooperating teacher does not use literacy strategies; there is an assumption that students can do the reading and writing required of the class on their own. Although I do not

have data to substantiate Rick's claim here, his perception is that literacy strategies are not being used, which may influence why he is not making stronger connections between literacy and the discipline. In terms of Rick's prior experiences with the discipline and literacy, he admits that he never encountered primary sources until he came to college. This may help to explain why he does not offer a more detailed explanation of primary sources in this interview. In addition, Rick is the only political science major in the social studies cohort. Although his literacy and methods courses speak specifically to history *and* the social sciences, Rick states that there is an emphasis on history. It is unclear from the data how this may have also influenced Rick's understanding of disciplinary literacy.

Furthermore, Rick states that the content area literacy course has had a strong influence on his thinking about literacy and his instructional practices. Early in the interview he explains that the course has "definitely shaped my whole perception of it [literacy]. Where I thought it was one specific, print based reading I realize it's lots of different things" (line 154-155). As noted previously, however, he describes text within the interview as print-based, such as a course textbook or a primary source. This suggests that the content area literacy course may be challenging some of Rick's previous ideas on literacy, and he is still working through what this means in terms of the instructional practices he utilizes as a teacher.

Rick also describes how the course has helped him to recognize the literacy strategies he was using unconsciously before the course: "before that [the literacy course], again, I was totally ignorant with literacy practices and formal strategies, things you do that I already employed during my reading that I wasn't aware was actually techniques that you used to help teach students" (line 357-359). Rick suggests here that the course may have "introduced" him to the idea of literacy strategies, and he now recognizes how he employs them in his own reading. The

evidence we have here seems to suggest that one of the reasons why “giving strategies” to his students is such a prevalent pattern throughout Rick’s interview one responses is because he is beginning to recognize the value of strategies in his own interactions with text. If they are useful to him, they should be useful to high school students, as well.

To summarize, Rick does acknowledge in interview one that it is his responsibility to assist students with reading comprehension in his content area. This support consists primarily of him giving all his students the same, undefined literacy strategies, which are not clearly connected to his area of certification, political science. In terms of text, Rick focuses on the textbook, and although he mentions primary sources, he does not elaborate on what this might mean in a civics class. The content area literacy course, particularly its discussion of literacy strategies, seems to have made a strong impression on Rick.

Kathy – Social Studies Major, Psychology and Political Science Minors

Field Placement: 10th Grade U.S. History; Mid-sized, under-resourced high school

Similar to Rick, Kathy also expresses that she is responsible for supporting her students’ literacy development; however, she continually refers to her field placement as influencing the ways in which she is thinking about literacy and her responsibility. Kathy acknowledges that her students’ literacy skills vary, and she seems to align her responsibility more with struggling than advanced readers. Although she seems to have a stronger understanding of the discipline and a broader conception of disciplinary text than does Rick, Kathy still emphasizes the use of general, not disciplinary specific, literacy practices. However, she is more descriptive than Rick in terms of how she might use these practices with her students.

Conception of Students and Literacy Responsibility

In response to the literacy responsibility prompt, Kathy states:

Challenging them, I think. Challenging them and encouraging them at the same time. And being able to adapt to the different students' literacy levels. Because I'm planning to teach in an urban underdeveloped school, at least for my first couple of years. So as I see now I'm going to be faced with a wide range of skills. So knowing which students are reading at a 12th grade level and which students are reading at a third grade level and helping them adapt. Like, maybe being harder on the students who are better at reading, in a way. Like, challenging them. And then being there for the ones who are struggling. And being there after school and letting them know that I'm there to help them. And just really encouraging them and making sure that I'm giving them things that they can handle that aren't just going to totally discourage them (line 274-283).

What is striking about Kathy's response in comparison to Rick's is that she clearly links her sense of responsibility to her future ambitions and to her field placement site. Similar to a few other students in this cohort (including two of the other focal students, Mark and Jared), Kathy expresses an explicit desire to work in urban schools. Some of Kathy's statements above suggest that she has some assumptions about what it means to work in such settings. For example, she uses the term "underdeveloped" to describe urban schools, and she depicts her students' literacy levels as ranging from the third to the twelfth grade level. This latter statement may seem like an assumption or an exaggeration; however, my observations in her field placement classroom and my knowledge of the classroom context indicate that she did indeed have students reading at these grade levels.

Another difference between Kathy and Rick's sense of responsibility has to do with supporting the range of students within the classroom. Although Rick later in the interview indicates that he is responsible for supporting all of his students, both struggling and advanced readers, Kathy states her responsibility for this up front and directly. Despite linking her responsibility to assisting the range of student literacy levels in her classroom, Kathy – similar to Rick and other PSTs in this cohort – describes only the extremes in reading ability. She does not mention the majority of the students who fall within the struggling-advanced reader dichotomy.

In addition, she, like Rick and the majority of other PSTs in interview one, does not mention writing with regards to her responsibility.

Unlike Rick, Kathy links her sense of responsibility more closely to students who have difficulties with reading tasks. Although she begins by stating that she wants to challenge her students, most of her statements have to do with supporting or “encouraging” struggling readers: “. . . being there for the ones who are struggling. And being there after school and letting them know that I’m there to help them. And just really encouraging them and making sure that I’m giving them things that they can handle that aren’t just going to totally discourage them” (line 280-283). Kathy’s comments here suggest that she recognizes that students’ emotional responses to school tasks are something she must consider when planning instruction. However, she is not very specific here on how she might “encourage” students.

In addition to acknowledging the range of literacy abilities within her classroom, Kathy addresses another aspect of working with students – their level of engagement in classroom activities and assignments. She describes her students as reluctant readers and writers:

. . . they don’t really like reading. They hate writing, they don’t write complete sentences. They hate answering test questions that aren’t multiple choice because they actually have to write something themselves. So it’s just like, doing things to help them realize that that’s important. And to somehow get them to *like* doing it if that’s possible (line 543-547).

Unlike her previous discussion of students in which she recognizes both struggling and advanced readers, Kathy here describes her students as a whole - they dislike reading and hate writing. Similar to other PSTs in the larger social studies cohort, Kathy makes a large generalization, which other data sources do not substantiate. Despite her strong language, Kathy does not seem to shirk from the responsibility of working with students on these literacy tasks. Instead, she suggests that it is her responsibility to engage students in tasks that “help them realize” the

importance of being skillful at reading and writing. Furthermore, Kathy states that encouraging students to enjoy reading and writing is important, though she does not make an explicit connection here between engagement and improved learning.

Although she does not expand upon the idea of engagement here, she does reference it in an earlier passage. When discussing how she might support struggling readers, Kathy states that she is:

Trying to introduce the students to literature that they will like and be engaged in. Trying to find texts and resources that they will actually find exciting. Even if it means getting a little bit off topic. Maybe finding something they can relate to that you can then relate back to the topic that they're learning about so that they can actually be engaged and actually enjoy what they're doing (line 334-339).

Here, Kathy suggests that if students are able to relate to the topic or content under study, they may enjoy it more. What is unclear from the data is whether or not Kathy is suggesting that when students are engaged and find literacy tasks relevant to their lives that this improves their learning. Although Kathy does not make an explicit link between engagement and learning, she is one of the few PSTs in her cohort to even raise the issue of engagement and relevancy.

Conception of the Discipline and Its Connection to Literacy

Kathy, like Rick, conceives of her literacy responsibility in more general than domain-specific ways, though she makes a few more disciplinary links than he does. For example, midway through the interview, Kathy explains what literacy skills students need to have in history:

Being able to read and understand text is the biggest thing. In history or in social studies you're going to read a lot, and being able to interpret things - interpret, like, primary sources. Learning how to do that is a big thing. But also in your textbook, being able to relate things that you read back and see how they're connected to previous things that we have learned about. And just being able to understand that all of this is related, and cause and effect and things like that (line 300-305).

In this passage, Kathy notes several disciplinary specific skills that our teacher education program suggests are important for teachers to develop within their students, namely, interpreting texts, making connections, and understanding cause and effect. However, Kathy's explanation of these skills is vague, and some of her statements suggest that she still has some misunderstandings of the discipline and of disciplinary literacy. For example, although she states that reading in history has to do with interpretation, she links this only to primary sources, and not to other forms of text. She also indicates that it is important for students to be able to make connections between what they are reading and learning, but she discusses this only with regards to the textbook. Kathy's comments here and her use of terms like "interpret" and "cause and effect" suggest that Kathy is appropriating the language of the discipline though she is still developing her understanding of what this means in terms of her teaching.

Later in the interview, Kathy more specifically addresses her responsibility for supporting her students' disciplinary literacy development. When asked how she is thinking about teaching her students to read like historians, she states:

What has worked for me to learn how to read like a historian is learning – learning how – learning *what* reading like a historian is, if that makes sense. I think primary sources, again, are one of the best ways to do that. But what I was getting at with that is to let the students know what they're doing. Tell them, "I'm teaching you to read like a historian. It's different than reading this book that you read for fun." *Telling* them what you're having them do and why they're doing it. And making them aware of it, I think, is really important (line 364-370).

Here Kathy makes a connection between how *she* learned to read like an historian and how she might teach her students to do so. She seems to recognize that what it means to read a history text is different than what it means to read a book "for fun." Kathy's statements here indicate that she thinks it is her responsibility to teach students how to read like historians. She suggests that using primary sources is one avenue by which to do that, but she does not provide detail here

or elsewhere in the interview about how she might use primary sources in the classroom to teach “historical” reading skills.

Kathy’s comments about when to use literacy strategies in a history classroom further our understanding of how she is conceiving of the discipline and its connection to literacy:

I think in a history classroom it [literacy strategies] would be something that you would use almost on a daily basis. You’re almost always going to have to do some type of reading before you can tackle an activity or an assignment or something that’s related to history, because it’s all related to texts. So, now I see it as something that’s really important in a history classroom that really needs to be practiced all the time (line 498-502).

Kathy explains that history, and history learning, is “all related to texts.” She seems to be defining text here as written text; thus, reading becomes an important aspect of learning. If she thinks that one learns history primarily through written text, it is not surprising that she views literacy strategies as a regular and significant feature of history classrooms.

Conception of Disciplinary Text

Throughout the interview, Kathy refers to text primarily as written text, referencing the textbook, primary sources, and young adult literature. As mentioned in the previous discussion about her conception of students, Kathy thinks it is important to use text that students find relevant and engaging. When asked how she is thinking about engaging texts, Kathy refers to the young adult literature she has been reading for one of her teacher education courses.

Although she explains that she is not clear how she might link this literature to social studies content, she implies that these texts may serve to spark students’ interest in reading and this may carry over to content courses. Kathy is the only preservice teacher in interview one to mention young adult literature.

When asked about how she will choose texts for her classroom, Kathy states that she will seek ideas from internet sites and other teachers in her building. Similar to Rick she discusses

beginning with the given course textbook, but she provides much more detail about how she might evaluate its worth.

I think starting with the textbook and looking at the textbook and seeing if that's a good section for that topic, if that's something good for the students to read or not. Even if it's not, you can still use that as a resource, like look at the main events. . . . But then once I've found some texts to look at them and to read them and just think about the goals that you have for that subject that you're teaching and see if they meet those goals. And see if the text that you've found is something that you can use to evaluate the students on the learning objectives that you have for that class, see if it's something that will actually teach them the objectives that you have set up for that (line 385-395).

Kathy's statements here suggest that she is not just using the textbook because it is readily available, but will evaluate it to determine whether or not it is "something good for students to read." Although she does not specify how she may determine the textbook's worth, her comments later in this passage suggest that she may evaluate the textbook similar to other texts – does the text "actually teach them [the students] the objectives" she has set forth. Kathy suggests here that the textbook – not the teacher, not the interaction between student and text – teaches students the objectives. Similar to Rick and other PSTs in this cohort, Kathy appears to view texts as message senders or transmitters of knowledge and information. She does not acknowledge here how comprehension has to do with the interaction between text, reader, and context. Also noteworthy is Kathy's comment that text selection depends on the teacher's goals and objectives – a point that few other PSTs make in interview one.

Kathy then discusses at length how she might use the selected texts with her students:

I think introducing what they're going to be reading before they actually do it. Maybe through a KWL, I guess. Tell them what the subject is on, say "Okay, now tell me what you already know about this subject" before you jump into reading the text. Or doing a, I forget what it's called but, give them the name of the texts and be like, "Okay, now what do you think this is going to be about and why do you think that?" And making them back it up. So they have some type of introduction before they read it. And then depending on the text, if it's something kind of difficult say, "Now, I know this is going to be kind of hard but work your way through it." Or actually if it's hard, another thing you can do is read it as a class and stop every couple of paragraphs and say, "Okay, now

what was that about? How do you know that? What was the author trying to say here?” And I think just really going through it step by step. If it’s the textbook, maybe drawing a timeline on the board and saying, “Okay, now what did we just read about what happened?” and go through the series of events that they just read about. Just going through it bit by bit, I think, is important to make sure they understand everything (line 423-436).

Kathy focuses here on what she might do to support students before and during their reading of a text. She offers two different ways to introduce a text: activate students’ prior knowledge on a topic through a KWL approach or ask students to make predictions about the text based on the title. If reading a challenging text, Kathy suggests that she would have students read it together in class, stopping periodically to summarize or she might create a timeline together with students to make sure they understand the chronology of events. Although these literacy practices might still be considered quite general, she provides much more detail than Rick does about how she might use them.

What is also significant about this passage is Kathy’s use of “teacher talk” to explain how she might support her students with reading tasks. Instead of just explaining how she might use the strategies, Kathy actually states what she might say to the students, such as, “Okay, now what do you think this is going to be about and why do you think that?” Describing her responsibility through “teacher talk” suggests that Kathy is giving meaningful consideration to the ways in which she will institute these practices.

Conception of Disciplinary Literacy Practices

Throughout this interview, Kathy expresses that literacy practices are important in her work as a social studies teacher. When referencing these practices, sometimes Kathy only provides a vague explanation, as with her initial statements about “challenging” and “encouraging” students (see discussion in “Conception of Students” section). At other occasions in the interview she is more articulate about how she might use literacy practices in her

instruction, as her discussion of using text in the section above reveals. Thus, it appears that Kathy is working through her understanding of literacy practices, and her fluctuation between being articulate and vague is similar to other PSTs in the larger cohort.

A clear example of this vacillation is apparent in Kathy's response to a question asking her to discuss the literacy routines and strategies she can use effectively with her students in history. Initially, Kathy provides some detail about how she might use a strategy – jigsawing – with her students:

. . . my students don't have enough books to take home so we can't give them a reading assignment to take home and do the night before. So it's really hard to get through the text and then still be able to do some type of activity with it within that hour. So jigsaw is a great way to break it down and it saves time. Have each group read two paragraphs and explain it to the rest of the class. And then that kind of puts them on the spot too, so they really need to know what's going on so they can explain it (line 461-467).

Unlike Rick who does not provide much explanation on the purposes of using the literacy practices he names, Kathy explains a number of benefits of using the jigsaw strategy. First, it enables her to work with one of her classroom constraints – not having enough textbooks for each student to take home and read. Because Kathy notes that she wants to do an activity around the reading, jigsawing makes it possible to save enough time for this. Kathy's final comment here suggests that she sees this strategy as a way to engage all students – it “puts them on the spot.”

This passage also reveals a number of assumptions Kathy has about text, the strategy itself, and her students. Kathy seems to suggest that the only type of reading she may ask students to do for homework is textbook reading; she does not reference primary sources or young adult literature as she has in previous parts of the interview. In addition, Kathy does not acknowledge the cognitive benefits to using jigsawing; she appears to see it more as a time-saving practice that enables her to work within her classroom constraints. Kathy also seems to

imply that her students might not engage as fully with the text if she did not put “them on the spot” and make them responsible for explaining their assigned portion of the text to the class.

Despite providing some detail here on why jigsawing is a relevant strategy given her classroom context, Kathy immediately follows this explanation with a vague discussion of another literacy practice, working with key words:

Making sure they understand key words. If they’re reading I’ll ask them, “Do you guys know what that word means?” And they would probably all say, “Yeah.” And then I’ll say, “Okay what does it mean?” And no one will be able to define it. So just making sure that they understand vocabulary and stuff that’s important (line 471-474).

It appears that Kathy recognizes the importance of working with key vocabulary, but she does not articulate here or elsewhere how she might support students in developing a deeper understanding of these words. Similar to her discussion of jigsawing, Kathy’s comments reveal that she has some assumptions about her students, specifically that they will not know the meaning of key words. The secondary data do not substantiate this claim. Nonetheless, her perception is that students do not know important terms, and she sees it as part of her responsibility to provide students with some instruction about them. She is one of only a few PSTs in this cohort to state any responsibility for vocabulary. Thus, although Kathy is more articulate than Rick and many other PSTs in her cohort about how she might use some literacy practices in her classroom, she still appears to have a vague understanding of some strategies, and some misconceptions about the most effective use of others.

Sources of Understanding

Although we can infer that Rick’s field experiences impact the ways in which he thinks about his responsibility for disciplinary literacy, Kathy’s comments make this connection more clear. Throughout the interview, Kathy articulates how her experiences in the field are influencing her conception of literacy practices. The following passage is illustrative:

I guess I've learned that too from my classroom that I'm observing and because, like I said, they read just as a class and they watch a lot of movies. I think movies are important but I think that they really need to do more literacy related things because they, the students don't really like reading. They hate writing, they don't write complete sentences. They hate answering test questions that aren't multiple choice because they actually have to write something themselves. So it's just like, doing things to help them realize that that's important. And to somehow get them to *like* doing it if that's possible (line 540-547).

My observations in Kathy's classroom suggest that the practices she describes, reading aloud and viewing movies, were common. Instead of emulating this, Kathy explains that it is important for her to place more emphasis on reading and writing tasks in her instruction. Her comments here indicate that even if students dislike reading and writing – as she indicates her field placement students do – she must find ways “to help them realize that that's important.” Not only does Kathy express her responsibility for literacy here, but her sense of responsibility is also connected to the discipline and students' general learning.

When asked directly about what is influencing the ideas she has about literacy practices, Kathy again refers to the field:

It has just made me realize that you need to use strategies. They really just read, and he'll [cooperating teacher] just take answers from the four or five students who always volunteer. So just making sure that they're doing different things every day, like using different reading strategies each day. Or mixing it up and just making sure that all the students are getting involved. You've got to find a way to make sure that everyone's doing something, everyone's there and awake and alive and knows what's going on (line 484-489)

Here Kathy seems to suggest that she will not use the same literacy or general instructional practices that she has seen in the field, as she does not think that these engage everyone in the classroom; she plans to use a variety of activities and strategies to involve more students.

Although she is not specific in this passage about what strategies she might use or how she might ensure that everyone is involved, it is apparent that the field is impacting her ideas on the importance of using literacy practices.

In terms of her conception of the discipline, it is unclear to what extent the field is influential, as Kathy makes no direct reference to this throughout the interview. However, one might infer that the weak link she makes between the discipline and literacy may be in part due to the fact that she appears to not be seeing many literacy practices being utilized in her field site. She also notes at the beginning of the interview that she did not get much exposure to primary sources until college, and she explains that this is why she has struggled with interpreting and using primary texts in her college classes. Her self-description as a “new” user of primary sources may also help to explain why she primarily defines text in this interview as the textbook.

Furthermore, the field also seems to be influencing her conception of students. As noted previously, Kathy recognizes that students’ engagement in classroom tasks is important. Her comments suggest that she is responsible for ensuring that all students are “awake” and involved in the classroom. It is also important to note that Kathy’s understanding of her students may be more developed than other PSTs, such as Rick, because she has been working as a tutor at her field placement high school for the past year. This may also help to explain why she discusses her literacy responsibility more in terms of supporting struggling than advanced readers, as she has more experience in working with students below grade level in reading.

Unlike Rick, Kathy rarely mentions her teacher education coursework. She makes only one explicit reference to the content area literacy course as impacting the ways in which she is thinking about using text. Although it is not clear from the data why this is the case, one might infer that because her field experiences have been so influential, other factors, such as her teacher education coursework, seem less so in comparison.

In summary, it is clear that Kathy accepts responsibility for supporting students’ literacy development, and she connects this with her experiences in her field placement site. Although

she states that there is a range of student literacy levels in her classroom, she specifically discusses her responsibility for struggling readers, recognizing that she must also contend with students' engagement levels. Kathy appears to have a general understanding of the discipline, though she has not made a clear link to what this means for her instruction. Similar to Rick, Kathy focuses on print-based texts, though she does provide some more detail about how she imagines using them in her classroom. Also similar to Rick, the literacy practices she discusses throughout interview one – such as before and during reading practices, jigsawing, and working with key words – are all more general than domain-specific practices. However, Kathy's use of "teacher talk" and the level of detail she provides about how she might use these literacy practices suggest that she is at a different level of development than Rick.

John: History Major, English Minor

*Field Placement: 9th Grade U.S. History & 11th & 12th Grade A.P. European History;
Large, suburban high school*

As do Rick and Kathy, John also expresses his responsibility for developing his students' literacy skills. Although John states that students' literacy levels vary, he focuses on another dimension of student difference - their diverse, personal reading interests. Unlike Rick and Kathy, John has a deeper understanding of his discipline and is more articulate about how history and literacy are connected. In addition, John has a broad conception of text, which he explicitly links to his history instruction. Similar to Kathy, John references his field placement site throughout interview one, but he focuses on how he plans to use the teacher's disciplinary literacy practices with his own students.

Conception of Students and Literacy Responsibility

Similar to Rick and Kathy, John also notes that his students' range in their literacy ability levels, though he acknowledges less of a range than they do. He attributes this to the socio-

economic status of the student body:

...in high school there's still a ton of students who might struggle with reading and even in that setting [field placement] . . . It's a very affluent community and I feel like a lot of those students have the opportunity more so than students from other districts to like learn how to read and I think a lot of them have a higher literacy rate than in other schools, but you still have to be aware of the students who struggle with reading (line 360-364).

John seems to acknowledge that there are students who struggle with reading, “even” in affluent schools like his field placement site. Unlike Kathy who directly links her responsibility to supporting struggling readers, John explains that “you still have to be aware of the students who struggle with reading.” It is not clear from this passage whether or not he considers himself responsible for these students. John’s use of the undefined “you” in his final statement – instead of “I” – also suggests that he may still be unclear about his role with regards to students reading below grade level.

John addresses the issue of struggling readers again at the conclusion of the interview:

. . . a 14 year old is a 14 year old and just cause they can't read in ninth grade doesn't mean that they're doomed for the rest of their life. . . . it's your responsibility as an educator to help those students or at least find resources that can help them (line 778-781).

Unlike the previous passage, John here implies that it *is* his responsibility to support struggling readers, or non-readers in his example. Similar to most of his cohort peers, John explains that a teacher should at least “find resources” to help struggling readers; this comment may suggest that he does not feel he can adequately address these issues on his own. His use of the expression “your responsibility” instead of “my responsibility” suggests that he may see supporting struggling readers as part of a teacher’s professional responsibility, not an individual teacher’s personal or moral responsibility. Or, his use of the undefined “you” may indicate that he is still unsure of his responsibility towards struggling readers.

Although these are the only two passages in interview one in which John mentions his students' reading levels, he does discuss students as ranging in other ways, specifically in terms of their text preferences. Similar to Kathy, John also refers to students' engagement levels. He states:

I guess my responsibility in developing it [literacy] would sort of be giving them, especially in history, giving them different sources, different pieces of information of all different kinds. Be it art work, essays, poetry, so on and so forth in order to really get at all students, because some students might not be able to - some students might not be interested in say like a textbook. And some students might not just be interested in poetry, but hopefully if you get sort of a, if you include a lot of those things or all of those things, not only do you really get to those students who appreciate any particular kind of reading, but you also sort of bring them in and make them feel more included in the class and hopefully that will sort of encourage them to do the other reading (line 462-470).

John at first appears to tie his responsibility more directly to the discipline than do Rick and Kathy – “especially in history, giving them different sources, different pieces of information of all different kinds.” Despite this statement, John does not expand here on this link between literacy and the content area, instead suggesting that he might use different sources – not as means of exploring the discipline – but to meet the varying interest levels of his students. John states that using a variety of text formats may make it possible to appeal to more students and thus encourage students to feel more included in the class. Similar to Kathy, John does not make an explicit link between engagement and learning, but he does provide a more concrete example than does Kathy of how he might peak students' interests. His concern with appealing to all students' interests suggests that John sees himself as responsible for all students' learning.

It is also noteworthy that John does not mention in this interview the two student groups, struggling and advanced readers, that Rick, Kathy, and others in the cohort describe. It is unclear from the data whether John sees less of a range of students than the other PSTs do – which may be attributable to his classroom context or to not having as developed a lens as Rick or Kathy –

or if he is more focused on other aspects of diversity among students, such as their reading interests.

Conception of the Discipline and Its Connection to Literacy

In contrast to Rick and Kathy, John expresses a more robust understanding of his discipline and its relationship to literacy. Throughout the interview he discusses primary sources and the literacy demands that accompany them. For instance, when asked to discuss the necessary literacy skills in history he responds:

I think it's the ability to parse out unnecessary language and be able to really find a thesis in everything. . . I think that's really important, because a lot of, especially a lot of primary documents, a lot of speeches and stuff like that, and then even essays by contemporary writers that are very dense or the language is very just seemingly like poetic like, the author is sort of overloaded with a lot of fluffy language, which can be good sometimes but there's a balance between like too fluffy and then really dry. And especially with like a lot of political speeches, it's very fluff and trying to parse out the substance is difficult. So that would be something that I would hope that students could walk away with ability to do that better. But I feel like it's something that we'd have to work on through the course of the class to really help them with. Gaining that ability. (line 478-489).

John, unlike Rick, Kathy, and most of his other cohort peers, not only defines what he means by primary sources but also explains some of the skills necessary for being able to successfully interpret them. John here references two types of primary documents: political speeches and contemporary essays. He notes that both require the ability to read through the dense, “fluffy language” to find the thesis of the text. Although Rick and Kathy also explain that it is important for students to understand the disciplinary texts, John seems to have a more nuanced understanding, as is evidenced by his identification of the language challenges inherent in many primary texts. Few of John's cohort peers explicitly state how the language of primary sources may be difficult for students, and few articulate that they are responsible for developing students' abilities to work with these language challenges, as John does.

Further evidence of John's conception of literacy and history occurs later in the interview when he is discussing how to address students' literacy needs. Here he makes a distinction between general and disciplinary literacy:

...with history it's [literacy] more difficult because there's the idea of understanding facts and dates and times which I don't know if it's necessarily the same thing as being able to tackle a reading passage and understand it. I think those are two very different things and so literacy would be helping them get through a passage and I would sort of have to walk them through it probably and sort of ask them what they thought the main point of it was or something like that sort of gauge how they've read maybe. Or rather gauge where they are and sort of like offer that extra assistance" (line 508-514).

John suggests here that he has a responsibility to support students' general literacy, such as their ability to read and comprehend a passage, as well as their disciplinary literacy, such as understanding "facts and dates and times." He states that he sees these as "very different things," but he does not expand here or elsewhere in the interview on these differences. Nonetheless, John is one of a few in the cohort who attempts to make a distinction between general and discipline-specific literacy skills.

When discussing his conception of the discipline and literacy, John frequently references his field placement site, describing how he plans to utilize many of his cooperating teacher's practices. This is very apparent in his discussion of how he plans to teach students to read like historians. He begins by explaining how his cooperating teacher problematizes history; she raises an open-ended, historical question, has students analyze numerous primary documents, some of which conflict, and then has students develop an argument that addresses the initial question and uses evidence from the primary sources. John suggests that this approach – "forming something called the historical method" – is what he would like to do, as well (line 559). In the following passage, John provides more detail on his conception of the historical method:

. . . my CT likes to do debates and presentations where students are either assigned or they choose to be on a particular side of an issue, or they have to have a concrete argument about something and then they have to have evidence to support it. And I think that's really, really important, because it allows students, it gives students like the ability to find the argument, and then find the evidence. Which can carry over to when they're actually just reading something later, and it could be in a different course or for something else where they're reading it, and they're pulling out those arguments and that evidence without even having to do it for, specifically for an assignment. So I think that's important (line 587-596).

Unlike Rick and Kathy, John uses the language of the discipline here, suggesting that it is important for students to learn how to identify the author's argument and the evidence used to support it. Although John does not specify how he might work with students to develop these skills, he describes how his cooperating teacher fosters these skills through debates and presentations in which students have to take a position, develop a "concrete argument," and use evidence to support their position. John suggests that once students strengthen their skill at identifying arguments and evidence, they may transfer this skill to their reading in other courses. This is significant, as John is one of the only preservice teachers in the cohort to discuss literacy skills as transferring from one content area to another. Furthermore, John's comments here indicate that he has a more sophisticated understanding of the discipline than Rick and Kathy do.

Conception of Disciplinary Text

As has been noted previously, John has a broader conception of text than Rick and Kathy, as he refers to the textbook, primary sources such as political speeches and essays, poetry, and art work. He also differentiates between primary texts and the high school history textbook as requiring different literacy skills. John makes this distinction in his discussion of how he plans to teach students to read like historians:

. . . trying to pull out arguments from primary sources and stuff like that. And I think that's what a lot of students have problems with primary sources. You don't really get that so much in like a ninth grade textbook, cause it's very like this is this and that is that and this leads to this (line 566-569).

John's comments suggest that he sees determining the argument of a primary text as more difficult than doing so with a high school textbook. Although he is not explicit here on the difference, John implies that a textbook is written in a more straightforward manner than a primary text, "this is this and that is that and this leads to this." For this reason, students have an easier time determining the argument in a textbook than in a primary source. John does not discuss what this means in terms of his instruction, but he does articulate a distinction between types of texts that few others in the cohort make.

Similar to Rick and Kathy, John states that he also would begin by reviewing the textbook when deciding which texts to use with students.

I would definitely go through the textbook first of all that is given to me by the school and see what it is that, like what kind of things that that ninth grade textbook is supposed to convey to the students and how it like literally like how it's written to see how difficult I feel the reading is. And then from there I would try to find sources and things like that that are on the same level, at least I feel are on the same level, in terms of the difficulty of the writing (line 604-609).

As Rick and Kathy also describe, John does not plan to rely solely on the textbook, but he wants to use it as a starting point. However, John departs from Rick and Kathy in that he plans to analyze the textbook with regards to how difficult the language is. John explains further that he would seek additional texts with writing levels similar to that of the textbook. It is unclear from his discussion here what elements of the writing he will be assessing and how he will determine what level is appropriate for his students. Furthermore, John does not explain what types of supplementary materials he will seek and how they will be related to the textbook, other than that the writing level will be similar.

In response to a question asking him what other elements of the text besides the writing level he might consider when choosing texts, John replies:

I guess I'd also look for like, a lot of textbooks include sidebars and they'll mention like different documents and things like that. And they'll also include the documents in the book itself. And then like pictures and artwork and things like that. I think I would use the textbook as like a starting point really and sort of build from there (line 614-617).

John here notes several elements of the textbook that he suggests are relevant to whether or not he will use the textbook with his students; these include the sidebars, additional texts within the larger textbook, pictures, and artwork. Again, this is a more detailed explanation than Rick or Kathy present, but John does not explicate here what he is looking for in terms of these other aspects of the text. It is still not clear what about the additional documents or artwork might encourage him to use, or not use, the textbook with his students.

When asked to describe how he plans to use these texts in the classroom, John again references his field classroom:

I guess I like what my CT [cooperating teacher] does, and that she takes the texts, especially like primary sources, and that she has students interact with them in a very active way. She doesn't just have them do worksheets. She usually has them, the primary texts to be involved in some sort of debate, and it's usually group involved so that students who might not feel like they are, might not be able to read the text as well as others at least are working with people who can ideally help them through the concept so that they can understand what that was about, like what that particular reading was about. And when they're working in that group like formulating the big ideas of that reading the arguments and the examples and the evidence and things like that. And so that always helps those who aren't able to read as well as others to understand what that reading was - like why I assigned that reading and what was important about that reading (line 644-653).

John describes how his cooperating teacher has students interact with texts and other students in group settings, which he implies is a practice that he also plans to utilize. He suggests that one of the benefits to the group work is that students who are more skilled at reading can assist those who are less adept by helping "them through the concept" of the reading. John also implies that working in groups may help the students understand the "big ideas" and argument of the reading, as well as enable them to identify evidence and the purpose behind reading the text. John's

conception here of what it means to work with text is quite different than that articulated by Rick or Kathy. Recall that Rick's has more to do with extracting information from the text and Kathy's focuses on working with a text as a whole class to understand the author's message. John adds an additional layer to these by articulating how students might work together to create meaning, a meaning embedded in the disciplinary aspects of the text, the argument and evidence. Thus, John's conception of text seems to be more closely aligned to the discipline of history than does Rick or Kathy's.

Conception of Disciplinary Literacy Practices

In contrast to Rick, John rarely uses the term "strategy"; however, he does refer to literacy practices throughout the interview. The practices that he notes are more discipline-specific than those that Rick and Kathy mention and he also names a wider range of literacy practices. For example, as noted in the passage above, John plans to have students work with texts in small groups to determine the author's argument and the evidence for his or her position. John also mentions teaching his students to use the "historical method," a disciplinary practice with literacy implications, as students develop arguments based on their interpretation of numerous sources. Related to this, John states that he will use a variety of "different sources, different pieces of information of all different kinds," such as essays, art work, pictures, and political speeches (line 456).

John's response to how he plans to work with struggling readers provides us with additional insight into how he is conceiving of literacy practices. He states:

. . . including a lot of different strategies and reading, like not only having them do a worksheet after every reading, but also have them do like a fun assignment be it like a debate or something to really see if they've understood the material. There's also like making like charts or whatever. It depends on like what the reading is, but if it's sort of like categorizing things like that would be like making a chart for a more like concise

visual representation of the reading. Doing like note cards with important definitions stuff like that (line 521-527).

John names several literacy practices here: using a variety of readings, engaging the students in “fun” activities like debate, making charts to categorize important information, and creating note cards with definitions. Similar to Rick, John does not explicate here on how or when he envisions using these literacy practices, though he does provide some additional insight into his view of charts. In determining whether or not to use a chart, John states that it depends on the reading. Although he does not go into more specifics, one might infer that John is suggesting that certain literacy strategies are more applicable to a reading than others; neither Rick nor Kathy raises this issue. Furthermore, John describes the chart as a “concise visual representation of the reading,” which suggests that he recognizes what this literacy strategy does, though he does not directly connect this to student learning.

When asked directly to discuss the literacy practices and strategies he can use effectively with students, John names several practices, but with little detail:

. . .using primary sources and group projects and things like that. Like the including big words or maybe events or something that happened outside of what we're studying, but the students probably would still be interested in. Like including those in brackets or something, the definitions of those and stuff like that (line 691-694).

As with his comments about working with struggling readers, John also lists here a number of practices: using primary sources and group projects, and including “big words,” events of interest to students, and definitions in brackets. It is noteworthy that John includes here instructional practices that link the discipline and literacy, such as using primary sources and including events of interest to the students. Although John does not describe in detail, as Kathy does, about how he plans to use these practices, he mentions more types of strategies than either Kathy or Rick.

John provides more specificity about some of these literacy practices in an earlier passage where he discusses the types of literacy practices he plans to use with text:

. . . my CT does this too where she'll edit it down for her ninth graders to just getting the, just like the meat and the main part of the essay or whatever she has them doing. She'll include important vocabulary like literally if she thinks a word is too big or long. And actually I had this yesterday with the word that I thought, didn't think it was very long at all, and I forgot what the word was but it really shocked me that. It really opened my eyes - it didn't shock me but - how I'm six years older than these students, and sometimes what I think is common sense or what I know or think that everybody should know already is not necessarily the case especially for 14 year olds. And so that really was sort of like, "Oh, ok. Now I have to go back and address this" (line 625-633).

John discusses his cooperating teacher's practice of "editing down" primary text and translating words within the text to assist her ninth grade students with understanding the "main part of the essay." He then connects this literacy practice to his own teaching when students were not familiar with a word that he thought they would know. John discusses how this incident made him realize that he was naively expecting his students to have the same knowledge that he has. John's comments suggest that he sees it as his responsibility to support students' understanding of key words; moreover, he implies that he will use a similar strategy as his cooperating teacher when using primary text with challenging vocabulary.

John follows up this description of his own realization with more explanation as to why defining key words within the text might be useful for students:

And then also just like literally in the text my CT will, if she thinks that there's a word that's too big, she'll include like the definition or a synonym in brackets right next to it . . . I know a lot of people are like, "Well, you know I'll have the students go look in the dictionary," whatever for a word if they think it's a problem. But I think that that sort of helps those students who would just look over the words or skip over them and not really try to interpret them anyway (line 634-639).

Again, John describes his cooperating teacher's practice of defining difficult words in a text by placing a synonym or definition in brackets behind the word. He suggests that other teachers direct students to the dictionary to define challenging words, but John seems to recognize that

there are students who will just skip the word rather than go to a dictionary. John's comments imply that by placing the definition of difficult words within the text he may be able to ensure that more students understand the meaning of these words. In contrast to Rick, Kathy, and the majority of his cohort, John describes the rationale for why a particular literacy strategy is needed.

Sources of Understanding

As with Kathy, John directly references his field placement site as influencing his understanding of literacy practices and the discipline. It is important to note that John's cooperating teacher is a graduate of our teacher education program and at the time was pursuing a master's degree in history education. She appears to be implementing many of the disciplinary literacy practices that our program promotes, providing a level of coherence between the field and teacher education coursework that neither Rick nor Kathy experienced.

As discussed previously, John plans to incorporate several of his cooperating teacher's practices, namely, having students work in groups to interpret the messages in primary texts and defining challenging words in brackets within the text. In the following passage, John discusses another instructional practice that his cooperating teacher uses that he plans to adopt:

. . . she [the cooperating teacher] actually had her students draw posters about these [the components of the historical method] and everything. And I thought that was really interesting cause it was approaching history as a thing where you - especially if you're writing a paper, like you develop a thesis, you gather your research and then you formulate . . . an historical argument . . . so the historical method is something that I found really interesting and hopefully something that I use in the future (line 560-571).

John describes his cooperating teacher's use of the historical method, and how the process mirrors that which might be used in writing a paper: developing a thesis, gathering evidence, and formulating an argument. John clearly finds this approach relevant to his future instruction as he states that he sees this as "something that I [will] use in the future." What is unclear from this

passage is whether or not he has encountered this approach in other areas of his life, such as in his college history classes or his teacher education coursework.

John speaks even more explicitly about the influence of his field placement site with regards to how he is conceiving of using text in his classroom:

I think my field experience has also sort of made me not afraid of primary sources and that they can be used and they aren't too difficult for students. Because my teacher uses them in a very proactive way, and she has the students really interact with the texts. And I think that was something that I might have been concerned about if I had never been in with that particular CT or a CT with that particular pedagogy. Just encountering those and using those texts in a very productive way and not just in an, "Ok, read this and then that's important and then we can move on." Like it's, "Read this, work with it, understand it" (line 674-680).

John explains that he finds his cooperating teacher's use of primary sources to be "proactive" and "productive," as she has students interact with the texts in ways that aid their understanding. John suggests that, prior to seeing his cooperating teacher's approach to using primary sources, he was concerned that such texts might be "too difficult for students." He adds that if he had not worked with her or with a teacher with a similar approach to primary texts, he may still think that these texts are too challenging for students. John's comments here indicate that his field placement site has had a definite impact on the ways in which he is thinking about using primary sources in his classroom.

John's field placement is at a large, suburban high school in a ninth grade U.S. history course and in an eleventh and twelfth grade A.P. European history class. John claims earlier in the interview that his students' literacy levels do not range much, which he attributes to their access to quality instruction due to their socio-economic status. I do not have data to substantiate this, but one might infer that the students John encounters at least in the A.P. course may have fewer difficulties with literacy tasks than students in the general track. This may help to explain

why John does not identify the two groups of readers – struggling and advanced – that Rick, Kathy, and others in the cohort describe.

Similar to Kathy, John also discusses some of his prior experiences with text in high school, emphasizing his own struggles with identifying theses. When asked to discuss the literacy skills necessary in his discipline, John explains:

I think it's the ability to parse out unnecessary language and be able to really find a thesis in everything. . . Which is something that I struggled with when I was a student and it wasn't even until my A.P. history class, or my teacher forced us to go through readings and find the thesis (line 478-481).

John admits here that he had a difficult time identifying the thesis in text until his A.P. history teacher required him to do so for the course readings. He implies that the teacher “forced” him to do this for more than just a course reading, thus the repetitious practice improved his skill in identifying a text's thesis. Recall that John explains at several different places in the interview that he believes it is important for students to be able to find a text's thesis. Although John does not link his high school experiences here directly with his current ideas on his instruction, one might infer that his previous experiences have influenced them. Furthermore, it is also possible that John's own experiences with focusing on the thesis of each text enabled him to more clearly identify this practice in his field classroom.

Also similar to Kathy, John references his teacher education courses only briefly in this interview. He references his teacher education courses in general with regards to how he is thinking about assisting struggling readers:

I think it's [the teacher education coursework] sort of empowered me in the sense that I feel like before if I hadn't taken these particular courses, I would have been just like, “Oh, those students are having a difficult time. I'll just send them like to the resource center or whatever in the school.” And it's sort of helped me understand why these students are struggling, and that I have a direct effect on them. That I can at least address them and hopefully help them with those problems (line 531-535).

Being familiar with all three of the teacher education courses that John took during this semester, I believe he is referencing the content area literacy course here as “empowering” him to take responsibility for students with reading challenges. John states that prior to this course, he would have referred struggling readers to someone else for support, but he now realizes not only why these students struggle but that he can positively affect their performance.

Later in the interview, John again references his teacher education courses, this time focusing on how they impact the ways in which he is thinking about choosing text:

. . . Like using only the text that you think are really, really important for your students to know, not just the ones that interest you. And like sometimes you include those, but you have to be aware of the students who may not like history so much and also their ability levels in terms of reading. And then also especially like 392 [Education in a Multicultural Society course], knowing about what texts might interest students who don't typically, like you know, old dead white guy history texts which unfortunately is what a lot of American texts or a lot of American history classes focus on almost entirely. So I think it's really important to include those as well. Not just for those students but for all students, too, encounter those kinds of materials so (line 661-670).

John begins here by discussing how the content area literacy course has helped him to think about selecting text based primarily on his students, not his own particular interests. He states that it is important to be aware of students' interest and ability levels with regards to choosing text to use in a history class. John then refers to the course, Education in a Multicultural Society, as encouraging him to think about using texts which might interest students outside of the “old, dead, white guy history texts.” He suggests that it is important to include these texts not just for students who have interest in other types of history, but for all students so that they are all familiar with more than the traditional history texts and content.

In summary, John takes responsibility for literacy, as do Rick and Kathy, but his conception of literacy is more closely linked to the discipline. In terms of students, John does not note much of a range in students' literacy levels, describing his responsibility more with

engaging all students' interest in his class. John has a fairly sophisticated understanding of the discipline, citing argumentation and evidence as key components of a history class. Linked to his views on the discipline are his broad conception of text and the importance of utilizing a range of texts within the history classroom. John mentions numerous types of literacy practices, many of which are closely linked to the discipline, and that he sees his cooperating teacher utilize; however, he does not provide much detail on how he envisions using these practices in his classroom. Unlike Kathy and Rick, John's field experiences, prior experiences with text, and his content area literacy course all seem to be sending him similar messages about what it means to use disciplinary literacy practices in a history classroom.

Discussion and Implications for Teacher Education

Because this study focuses on one cohort of secondary preservice teachers in history and the social sciences, and six PSTs in particular, it is important to not over-generalize the findings here to preservice teachers in other disciplines or to those in different teacher education contexts. Nonetheless, this study's findings do offer us some additional information on factors to consider when working to strengthen secondary PSTs' ability to support their students' literacy development.

First of all, unlike previous research on PSTs' views on content area literacy, this study reveals that all of the PSTs in this social studies cohort express a responsibility for their students' literacy development (O'Brien & Stewart, 1990). If we were to look no further than the survey data, we might infer that our work in teacher education might be easier because of this. Since the PSTs appear to take responsibility for developing their students' disciplinary literacy skills, we, as teacher educators, can now concentrate on other aspects of content area literacy. However, as the analysis of the interview data reveals, the preservice teachers' sense of responsibility varies

considerably with regards to their conceptions of their students, of their content area, of disciplinary texts, and of disciplinary literacy practices. Although this is not necessarily surprising given the range of factors impacting each of these preservice teachers, recognizing the nuances and diversity in our PSTs' understandings about disciplinary literacy does not necessarily make our work "easier."

For example, as Rick exemplifies, some preservice teachers may have naïve or basic understandings about their disciplines, which tends to lessen their ability to make strong connections between the discipline and literacy practices. Recognizing this as teacher educators suggests that we may have to expand our focus in a content area literacy course to include work on strengthening the PSTs' understanding of their disciplines. This may mean working more closely with the content area methods instructor and with colleagues outside of the school of education who teach the preservice teachers' disciplinary courses. As we suggest that our PSTs do for their students, we, as teacher educators, may also have to differentiate our instruction, expanding our repertoire of instructional approaches, course readings, and assignments to meet our preservice teachers' developmental needs and strengths.

In addition to these insights about the variance in the preservice teachers' responsibility for disciplinary literacy, the findings of this study support previous research that suggests that preservice teachers' prior experiences (Bean & Zulich, 1990; Harlin, 1999; Linek et al., 1999; Zulich et al., 1992), disciplinary backgrounds (Grossman & Stoldosky, 1995; O'Brien et al., 1995; Wilson & Wineburg, 1988; Wineburg, 1989; Yeager & Davis, 1995), field experiences (Harlin, 1999; Hollingsworth, 1989; Linek et al., 1999; Virta, 2001), and teacher education coursework (Freedman & Carver, 2007; Harlin, 1999; Hollingsworth, 1989; O'Brien & Stewart, 1990) impact their understanding of content area literacy. These factors interact in complex

ways, influencing how this study's focal preservice teachers make sense of their disciplinary literacy responsibility (Bean & Zulich, 1990).

In terms of prior experiences, for example, both Kathy and Rick explain that they had limited exposure to primary sources before entering college, and both identify this as a reason why they struggled with analyzing such texts in their content area courses. Conversely, John describes how his high school A.P. teacher required her students to find a thesis in everything. Although none of the three PSTs make a link between their past experiences here and the types of literacy practices they image using with their students, we might infer that there is a relationship between them. For instance, John discusses several times in the interview his desire to work with his students on identifying the thesis or argument in historical text, a point that neither Kathy nor Rick raises.

Another example of how prior experiences may be impacting these PSTs' conception of responsibility is Kathy's previous work as a tutor in the same school as her field placement. Her familiarity with some of the students here may have enabled her to articulate the range of literacy abilities within her classroom and may have influenced her to take a greater sense of responsibility for struggling readers than either Rick or John express. Conley et al. (2005), in their investigation of the impact tutoring has on preservice teachers' understanding of content area literacy, found that those PSTs who tutored a struggling reader had a stronger commitment to utilizing disciplinary literacy strategies in their classrooms. Utilizing a sustained and well-planned tutoring experience in conjunction with the content area literacy course may be an additional area for us as teacher educators to pursue.

Rick, Kathy, and John's disciplinary backgrounds and experiences also seem to impact the connections they make, or fail to make, between their respective disciplines and literacy

practices. Of the three, John most clearly articulates how the discipline and literacy are connected. In his comments throughout the interview, he rarely differentiates between literacy and history; he appears to see the two as linked. This is in stark contrast to the preservice teachers in O'Brien et al.'s (1995) research, as they found most PSTs to hold the opinion that "content seems to exist for content's sake and literacy is part of content's proliferation of itself" (p. 449). In addition, recall that John's conception of texts appropriate for a history class includes speeches and essays, as well as poetry and artwork. John's minor field of study is English, so this may also be influencing what he includes as important to use in his history instruction. There is a cautionary note here, however, as the data we have on the preservice teachers' perceptions of their discipline is limited, as we did not ask specifically about their disciplinary understandings and backgrounds in interview one. However, interview two does include such lines of questioning; thus, our on-going analysis of the larger data set may provide us with a clearer picture of the disciplines' impact.

What is most apparent in this study is the influence of the preservice teachers' field experiences. All three refer specifically to their field classrooms throughout the interview, with Kathy and John speaking directly to the impact of these experiences. Kathy describes her field classroom as follows: "They read their textbook and they watch movies. And I think that you need more than that. So it's kind of taught me what not to do" (lines 411-413). Instead of emulating the instructional methods of her cooperating teacher, Kathy discusses with a fair level of detail how she might use literacy practices to engage her students with other forms of text, such as primary sources. Bean and Zulich (1990) found that the preservice teachers in their study also experienced a similar disconnect between their teacher education coursework and field experiences. Although Kathy does not directly state what may have enabled her to articulate a

model of instruction different from her field placement classroom, we may infer that she was also influenced by her content area literacy course and her own experiences working with students.

In contrast to this is John, whose field placement was in a classroom with a recent graduate of our teacher education program. He plans to engage in many of the same instructional practices as his cooperating teacher, such as having his students actively engage with historical texts, teaching them the historical method, and supporting students' reading of primary sources by embedding synonyms or definitions of key terms in the text itself. It is unclear from the data if John, who seems to have a fairly sophisticated understanding of the discipline, might have discussed these instructional practices *even if* he had not been with this cooperating teacher. And what might have happened to Rick's disciplinary literacy understanding had he been in a civics class with a teacher engaged in using disciplinary literacy practices? It may be the case that had Rick worked with a cooperating teacher like John's, who regularly engaged in disciplinary practices, Rick may have been able to better articulate how his discipline and literacy are connected. What this comparison suggests is that we as teacher educators may want to more purposefully match each preservice teacher with a cooperating teacher, as Clift & Brady (2005), Richardson (2004), and others advocate.

A final influence that all three of the preservice teachers mention to varying degrees is their teacher education coursework. Given the focus of the interviews, it is not surprising that the PSTs discuss the content area literacy class more often than other courses. Of the three PSTs, Rick references the course the most, explaining that it has had a strong influence on the ways in which he thinks about literacy strategies and practices – it “totally has shaped them” (line 433). In contrast, Kathy and John only reference the content area literacy course a few

times and do not accord it the same level of influence as Rick does. Although it is not explicitly evident what may account for these differences, one might conclude that, because Kathy and John have a more nuanced and developed understanding of the connection between their disciplines and literacy, the course has not been as “eye opening” to them as it has been to Rick. Their prior experiences with disciplinary literacy, particularly for John, may also account for some of this difference, as well.

The PSTs’ description of the content area literacy course’s impact on their thinking about disciplinary literacy raises a significant issue for us as teacher educators. Specifically, it is important that we keep in mind that our students’ prior experiences and disciplinary understandings influence the ways in which they interpret our courses. Eliciting and working with our students’ understandings in an on-going and deliberate fashion may help us to better work with – and counter where necessary – the ways in which the students are making sense of disciplinary literacy and what it means for their work as teachers (Harlin, 1999; Hollingsworth, 1989; Kagan, 1992). As our initial analyses from the interview data from semester two and three reveals, it may be the case that some preservice teachers do not see the value of content area literacy until later in their teacher education program.

Future Research

Although this study has shed additional insight onto the factors influencing preservice teachers’ conceptions of their disciplinary literacy responsibility, there are still many questions left unanswered. Our on-going work analyzing the data from all three semesters of the teacher education program will provide us with opportunities to explore some of the following questions:

- Why do these preservice teachers accept responsibility for supporting their students’ disciplinary literacy development? Do they feel an obligation to give the “right

answer”? Or does it have to do with their conception of the discipline? Other factors?

- How does the preservice teachers’ sense of responsibility for disciplinary literacy change over time? To what are these changes attributable?
- What is the relationship between the preservice teachers’ articulated sense of literacy responsibility and the disciplinary literacy practices they utilize in their classrooms?
- How does this cohort of preservice teachers compare to other disciplinary cohorts within the program? Is there a differing sense of responsibility? If so, why might this be the case?
- How does this cohort compare to other social studies cohorts within our teacher education program?

Developing a deeper understanding of the ways in which preservice teachers make sense of their role as teachers will ultimately enable us as teacher educators to better support them as they learn to develop *their* students’ disciplinary literacy skills.

References

- Bain, R. (2000). Into the breach: Using research and theory to shape history instruction. In *Knowing, Teaching & Learning History: National and International Perspectives*, edited by P. Stearns, P. Seixas, and S. Wineburg. New York: New York University Press, p.331-353.
- Ball, D. (1989). Breaking with experience in learning to teach mathematics: What do they bring with them to teacher education? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Bean, T. & Zulich, J. (1990). Teaching students to learn from text: Preservice content teachers' changing view of their role through the window of student-professor dialogue journals. *National Reading Conference Yearbook*, 39, p.171-178.
- Bean, T. & Zulich, J. (1992). A case study of three preservice teachers' beliefs about content area reading through the window of student-professor dialogue journals. *National Reading Conference Yearbook*, 41, p.463-474.
- Donahue, P., Voelkl, K., Campbell, J., & Mazzeo, J. (1999). *NAEP reading report card for the nation and states*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics.
- Freedman, L. & Carver, C. (2007). Preservice teacher understandings of adolescent literacy development: Naïve wonder to dawning realization to intellectual rigor. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 50(8), p.654-665.
- Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Grossman, P. & Stoldosky, S. (1995). Content as context: The role of school subjects in secondary school teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 24(8), p.5-11.
- Hall, L. A. (2005). Teachers and content area reading: Attitudes, beliefs and change. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, pp. 403-414.
- Harlin, R. (1999). Developing future professionals: Influences of literacy coursework and field experiences. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 38(4), p. 351-370.
- Heller, R. & Greenleaf, C. (2007). Literacy instruction in the content areas: Getting to the core of middle and high school improvement. Report created for Alliance for Excellent Education, Washington, D.C.
- Hollingsworth, S. (1989). Prior beliefs and cognitive change in learning to teach. *American Educational Research Journal*, 26(2), p.160-189.

- Kagan, D. (2002). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(2), p.129-169.
- Kennedy, M. (1999). The role of preservice teacher education. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice*, p. 54-85. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Linek, W., Nelson, O., Sampson, M., Zeek, C., Mohr, K., & Hughes, L. (1999). Developing beliefs about literacy instruction: A cross-case analysis of preservice teachers in traditional and field based settings. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 38(4), p.371-386.
- Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Massey, D. & Heafner, T. (2004). Promoting reading comprehension in social studies. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 48(1), p. 28-40.
- McDiarmid, G. (1990). Tilting at webs: Early field experiences as an occasion for breaking with experience. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(3), p. 12-20.
- Moje, E. (1996). "I teach students, not subjects:" Teacher-student relationships as contexts for secondary literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 31(2), p.172-195.
- Nourie, B. & Lenski, S. (1989). The (In)effectiveness of content area literacy instruction for secondary preservice teachers. *The Clearing House*, 71(6), p.372-374.
- O'Brien, D. & Stewart, T. (1990). Preservice teachers' perspectives on why every teacher is not a teacher of reading: A qualitative analysis. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 22(2), p.101-129.
- O'Brien, D., Stewart, T. & Moje, E. (1995). Why content literacy is difficult to infuse into the secondary school: Complexities of curriculum, pedagogy, and school culture. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30, p.442-463.
- Pajares, M. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), p.307-332.
- Pomerantz, F. & Pierce, M. (2004). From literacy methods classes to the real world: Experiences of preservice teachers. *New England Reading Association Journal*, 40(2), p. 55-62.
- Powers, S., Zippay, C., & Butler, B. (2006). Investigation connections between teacher beliefs and instructional practices with struggling readers. *Reading Horizons Journal*, 47(2), p.121-157.
- Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula (Ed.) *Handbook of research on teacher education*. NY: Simon and Schuster Macmillan.

- Richardson, V. (2003). The dilemmas of professional development. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 84(5), p.401-406.
- Richardson, V. (2004). Preservice teachers' beliefs. In J. Raths and A. McAninch (Eds.) *Teacher beliefs and classroom performance: The impact of teacher education*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Schoenbach, R. & Greenleaf, C. (2000). Tapping teachers' reading expertise: Generative professional development with middle and high school content-area teachers. Paper presented at the National Center on Education and the Economy Secondary Reading Symposium.
- Shanahan, C., Shanahan, T., & Misischia, C. (2006). Frameworks for literacy in three disciplines. Paper presented at the annual convention of the National Reading Conference, Los Angeles, California.
- Shulman, L. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15, p.4-14.
- Stewart, R. (1990). Factors influencing preservice teachers' resistance to content area reading instruction. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 29(4), p.55-63.
- Stewart, R. & O'Brien, D. (1989). Resistance to content area reading: A focus on preservice teachers. *Journal of Reading*, 32(5), p.396-401.
- Virta, A. (2001). Becoming a history teacher: Observations on the beliefs and growth of student teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18, p.687-698.
- Wilson, S. & Wineburg, S. (1988). Peering at history through different lenses: The role of disciplinary perspectives in teaching history. *Teachers College Record*, 89(4), p.525-539.
- Wilson, E., Konopak, B., & Readance, J. (1994). Preservice teachers in secondary social studies: Examining conceptions and practices. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 22(3), p. 364-379.
- Wineburg, S. (1991). On the reading of historical texts: Notes on the breach between school and academy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 28(3), p.495-519.
- Yeager, E. & Davis, O. (1995). Between campus and classroom: Secondary student-teachers thinking about historical texts. *Journal of research and development in education*, 29(1), p.1-8.
- Zulich, J., Bean, T., and Herrick, J. (1992). Charting stage of preservice teacher development and reflection in a multicultural community through dialogue journal analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 8(4), p.345-360.

APPENDIX 1 – Survey Questions

**Pre-Service Teacher Assessment
University of Michigan, Teacher Education Program
SOCIAL STUDIES**

Name: _____

Subject(s) You Teach or Intend to Teach:

Academic Major(s) and Minor(s):

I. Background Information

Please mark and print your answers clearly.

1. Please provide us with any background information that you feel *comfortable* sharing.

Year of Birth: _____ Ethnicity: _____

Years of experience working with adolescent students: _____

Please describe where, how long, what type of work you did:

Please circle the grade levels that you currently teach:

6th 7th 8th 9th 10th 11th 12th Not applicable

Please circle the grade levels that you hope to teach in the future:

6th 7th 8th 9th 10th 11th 12th

Location of High School **you attended**:

Urban Suburban Rural

Type of High School attended:

Public Private

(1 = STRONGLY DISAGREE; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Somewhat disagree; 4 = In-between; 5 = Somewhat agree; 6 = Agree; 7 = STRONGLY AGREE)

	SD	D	SW D	IN- BTW N	SWA 5	A 6	SA 7
how to read social studies materials.							
The primary responsibility of a social studies teacher should be to impart subject matter knowledge.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A social studies teacher should be responsible for helping students comprehend at an interpretive level as well as a literal level when they read.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Social studies teachers should help students learn to set purposes for reading and how to monitor their own success.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Social studies teachers should feel a greater responsibility to the content they teach than to any reading instruction they may be able to provide.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teachers who want to improve students' interest in reading should model their own use of reading to obtain information in social studies.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How clearly a social studies text is written matters most in how a reader comprehends a passage.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Text reading in social studies requires a special understanding of how language is used in disciplines such as history, economics, or government.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Social studies teachers are responsible for teaching technical vocabulary terms in the social studies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Social studies teachers are responsible for teaching students to learn words of many different types to help develop their understanding of the social studies.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
When students read in social studies, the readers interact with the social studies text to invent new meaning not found in the text or possessed by the readers.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

(1 = STRONGLY DISAGREE; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Somewhat disagree; 4 = In-between; 5 = Somewhat agree; 6 = Agree; 7 = STRONGLY AGREE)

	SD	D	D	IN- BTW	SWA	A	SA
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Prior social studies knowledge is required for social studies text reading to be more than just an exercise in saying words.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The ideas that a reader brings to a social studies text matter most in how well a reader comprehends a passage.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To understand social studies, a student needs the ability to determine the accuracy of information when reading primary text sources.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The ideas that an author conveys in a social studies text matter most in how a reader comprehends a passage.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
While comprehending a new social studies concept from reading, most readers relate text information to familiar examples in their memory.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The social studies text contains all the information needed by the reader to understand the idea or concept.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Students require no background on a topic to read and comprehend text on that topic.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To understand history and the social sciences, a student must develop the ability to corroborate evidence across from multiple text sources.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Readability formulae are a good way to determine whether a text is appropriate for a particular age group.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sentence and paragraph structure in social studies textbooks need to be different from that of other content area textbooks because of the type of information they convey.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

(1 = STRONGLY DISAGREE; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Somewhat disagree; 4 = In-between; 5 = Somewhat agree; 6 = Agree; 7 = STRONGLY AGREE)

	SD	D	SW D	IN- BTW N	SWA 5	A 6	SA 7
Students who can read age-appropriate non-social studies texts will have no trouble reading age-appropriate social studies texts.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The problem with poor readers is that they do not follow the logical structure of paragraphs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To understand history and the social sciences, a student must develop the ability to assess the quality and impact of data when reading primary text sources.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The ability to predict upcoming text can be used to distinguish between good and poor readers.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To understand historical and social science texts, a student must approach texts with a problem or question in mind.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Titles and headings in a text are useful for effective reading comprehension.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Social studies technical vocabulary should be introduced to students in class before they encounter those terms in a text passage.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sentence and paragraph structure in social studies textbooks need to be different from that of other content area textbooks because of the way historians, economists, psychologists, and other social scientists communicate their findings.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To understand social studies, a student needs the ability to analyze point of view in a text when reading primary text sources.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Most texts for secondary social studies are written at or below the grade level for which they are intended.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

(1 = STRONGLY DISAGREE; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Somewhat disagree; 4 = In-between; 5 = Somewhat agree; 6 = Agree; 7 = STRONGLY AGREE)

	SD	D	SW D	IN- BTW N	SWA	A	SA
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To understand history and the social sciences, a student must be able to situate the text within multiple contexts (e.g., historical, cultural, geographic, political) in which it was written.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sentence and paragraph structure in social studies textbooks must be different from that of primary sources in the social studies because textbooks are written for younger audiences than are primary sources.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Writing in social studies requires knowledge of how to synthesize primary and secondary source information, work with data, and provide reasoned warrant for claims.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The context (e.g., the room, the class, or the political environment) in which a person reads can shape the meaning the person makes of a social studies text.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If readers have an idea of why they're reading a particular social studies text, then they are more likely to comprehend the ideas in the text.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Writing in the social studies is like writing in any other discipline.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Primary source texts useful in social studies are written like any other texts students might encounter in high school.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The context (e.g., the room, the class, or the political environment) in which a person writes can shape the information the writer chooses to include in a social studies text.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It is not necessary for the reader to know the purpose for reading social studies text material.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

APPENDIX 2 – Interview Protocols

Interview Protocol 1

Advancing Literacies Semi-Structured Interview Protocol 1 *not for distribution*

- Before we start, would you mind telling me quickly what each of the courses are that you're taking this term? I already know that you're taking Ed 392, 402, and 307. What else? (If they don't know the exact course number, make sure to get instructor name and some sort of course title.)
- Also, can you tell me the school/grade level(s)/subject(s) that you're currently observing in your field placement right now? And what is your technical major/minor right now?

1. How did you think about literacy before entering this program?
 - a. Do you see yourself as a reader?
 - i. What kind things do you read? (Ask about text types)
 - ii. Is there a particular type of reading that you are really good at?
 - iii. Is there a particular type of reading that you struggle with yourself as a student?
 1. What strategies do you use when you find yourself challenged by a text? (Perhaps ask them to think about a specific text.)
 2. OR, if they say they don't struggle, ask: Have you ever thought about what makes you a good reader? What are your reading skills?
 - b. Do you see yourself as a writer?
 - i. What kind things do you write? (ask about multiple forms of representation, particularly slam poetry, online fanfiction, letters to editor, work-related writing, etc.)
 - ii. Is there a particular type of writing that you are really good at?
 - iii. Is there a particular type of writing that you struggle with yourself as a student?
 1. What strategies do you use when you find yourself challenged by a text? (Perhaps ask them to think about a specific text.)
 2. OR, if they say they don't struggle, ask: Have you ever thought about what makes you a good writer? What are your writing skills?
2. Now I want to ask you a twist on these questions: Do you see yourself as a teacher?
 - a. What does it mean to you to be a teacher?
 - b. What made you decide to become a teacher?

We've been talking about your thoughts about and experiences with literacy apart from your undergraduate course work. Now we'd like to ask you a few questions about how your views of literacy are being shaped by your university courses and teacher education field experiences.

3. How have the courses you've been taking shaped your notions of literacy?
 - a. How has the ED 402 class affected your notion of literacy?
 - b. How has your field experience affected your notion of literacy?
 - i. Describe the nature of your involvement in your field classroom?
 - ii. How are reading and writing or general literacy practices approached in your field classroom?
 - iii. How does your notion of literacy cohere with your cooperating teacher's notion?
 - c. How has ED 392 shaped your notions of literacy?
 - d. How do your LSA courses shape your notions of literacy?
 - i. How are reading and writing or general literacy practices approached in your other university courses, particularly in the classes for your major requirements?
4. Given all these different perspectives, how would you define literacy?
5. Before starting the program, had you given a thought to the type of reading and writing you would or should ask your students to do?
6. What do you see as your responsibility in developing literacy in your students?
7. What literacy skills do students need to have in your content course?
8. How can you determine what literacy skills or needs students bring into your content course?
9. How can you address students' literacy needs in your teaching?
10. How do you think about meeting the needs of students who struggle to read?
 - a. How do your teacher education courses help you think about meeting those needs?
 - b. How does your field experience help you think about meeting those needs?
11. How do you think about teaching students to read like members of the discipline (fill in appropriate one)?
 - a. How do your teacher education courses help you think about that?

- b. How does your field experience help you think about that?
12. How would you go about choosing appropriate text for your students?
 - a. How do your teacher education courses help you think about choosing text?
 - b. How does your field experience help you think about choosing text?
13. How would you go about using these texts with your students, particularly in a classroom with a mix of reading and writing ability levels?
 - a. How do your teacher education courses help you think about using text?
 - b. How does your field experience help you think about using text?
14. What are some of the literacy routines and strategies that you could use effectively in your content area?
 - a. How do your teacher education courses help you think these routines/strategies?
 - b. How does your field experience help you think about these routines/strategies?
15. When do you imagine using them?
 - a. How do your teacher education courses help you think about this?
 - b. How does your field experience help you think about this?
16. Based on your experiences this term, what are your expectations for what will happen in the methods class?
17. Based on your experiences this term, what do you hope will happen in the methods class?
18. Sometimes when one participates in an interview, the questions make you think about things you've never considered before. Is there anything that you didn't get a chance to say about literacy and/or teaching in your area that you just have to say before we conclude?
19. So, if you had to summarize your thinking about literacy instruction in your subject area at this moment, what would you say?

Interview Protocol 2

Advancing Literacies Semi-Structured Interview #2 Protocol *not for distribution*

- Before we start, would you mind telling me quickly what each of the courses were that you took last term as well as the courses that you are taking this term? (If they don't know the exact course number, make sure to get instructor name and some sort of course title. Include education courses incase they happen to be taking a non-traditional SOE class)

• Also, can you tell me the school/grade level(s)/subject(s) that you have had so far for your field placements both last term and this term? And what your technical major/minor is right now?

- 1) What made you decide to pursue a major in (major subject)?
- 2) Of the courses that you have taken since starting college (non-education courses), which of those—you're welcome to mention as many as you think relevant—do you feel have prepared you well for the types of knowledge, skills, and practices that are necessary for success in your discipline?
- 3) How would you characterize your own content knowledge in your discipline right now?
- 4) Similar to the question I just asked you, of the courses that you have taken since starting college (non-education courses), which of those—you're welcome to mention as many as you think relevant—do you feel have prepared you well for the types of knowledge, skills, and practices that are necessary for teaching in your discipline?
 - a) What is it about those courses that makes you feel that way?
- 5) Last term, you talked a little bit about what your expectations for your methods course were. What do you remember about what you expected?
 - a) How have those expectations been met, not met, or expanded now that you're well into your second term and more familiar with the nature of that course?
- 6) How have your methods courses corresponded with your courses from last term, particularly in relation to literacy and instruction in your discipline?
- 7) How have the courses you've been taking this term affected your notion of literacy?
 - a) How has your methods course affected your notion of literacy?
 - b) How has your field experience affected your notion of literacy?
 - i) Describe the nature of your involvement in your field classroom?
 - ii) How are reading and writing or general literacy practices approached in your field classroom?
 - iii) How does your notion of literacy cohere with your cooperating teacher's notion?
 - c) How has ED 391 shaped your notion of literacy?
 - d) How do your current non-education courses affect your notion of literacy?
 - i) How are reading and writing or general literacy practices approached in your other university courses this term, particularly in the classes for your major requirements?
- 8) Given all these different perspectives, how would you define literacy?
- 9) What do you currently see as your responsibility in developing literacy in your students? (wait for response) How are you currently thinking about diversity in relation to your students' literacy development? (wait for response) How are you currently defining the term "diversity"?
- 10) What literacy skills do students need to have in your content course?

- 11) How can you determine what literacy skills or needs students bring into your content course and how could you go about addressing those needs in your teaching?
- 12) How do you think about meeting the needs of students who struggle to read and write?
 - a) How have your teacher education courses (both this term and last term) helped you think about meeting those needs?
 - b) How have your field experiences (both this term and last term) helped you think about meeting those needs?
- 13) How do you think about teaching students to read and write like members of the discipline (fill in appropriate discipline here)?
 - a) How have your teacher education courses (both this term and last term) helped you think about that?
 - b) How have your field experiences (both this term and last term) helped you think about that?
- 14) How would you go about choosing and using appropriate text for your students, particularly in a classroom with a mix of reading and writing ability levels?
 - a) How have your teacher education courses (both this term and last term) helped you think about that?
 - b) How have your field experiences (both this term and last term) helped you think about that?
- 15) In thinking about text and the teaching profession, what kinds of texts do teachers need to be able to read and write?
- 16) What are some of the literacy routines and strategies that you could use effectively in your content area and how do you imagine using them in your teaching?
 - a) How have your teacher education courses (both this term and last term) helped you think about that?
 - b) How have your field experiences (both this term and last term) helped you think about that?
- 17) As you encounter different ideas, instructional practices, teaching approaches, readings, etc. in your education courses and field work, how do you decide how valuable that information is and whether or not you will incorporate it into your own teaching?
- 18) Now thinking about your own literacy, have you noticed anything about your own personal literacy practices that you hadn't considered or noticed prior to starting the TE program? Are you approaching reading or writing differently?
- 19) Literacy Portfolio/Record: So can you walk me through the different things that you do on a daily or weekly, or even monthly basis, in terms of how you spend your time? So things like work, school, social activities, family activities, volunteer work, personal hobbies, religious or political groups for example, or sports or card or game playing, clubs that you're a part of?

We just want to get an idea of how you spend your time in general. (allow for response) Do you consider any of those things to be personal literacy practices?

20) To wrap up, is there anything that you didn't get a chance to say about literacy and/or teaching in your area that you would like to say before we conclude?

21) And finally, if you had to summarize your thinking about literacy instruction in your subject area at this moment, what would you say?

Interview Protocol 3

Advancing Literacies Semi-Structured Interview Protocol 3 *not for distribution*

*Any reference to "your teacher education courses" should be understood to include courses they took during their first two semesters as well as the student teaching seminars and professional development workshops that they are attending during the current semester.

**XXX notation in questions requires interviewer to refer to the interviewee's discipline.

At beginning of interview, ask student for the specifics surrounding their student teaching placement: Placement School, list of specific courses/grade levels that they teach/participate in throughout the day, additional activities they've participated in at school (i.e. attending shows/games, department meetings, etc.)

1. Tell me about student teaching.

- a. How's it going? What are you teaching? How often are you teaching? What are the school and the community like?
- b. What kind of interaction have you had with the other teachers and staff at the school? How about your interaction with you CT? How's that relationship going?
- c. What challenges have you faced so far? How did you handle them?
- d. What are your students like?
 - i. What ages do you have in your class?
 - ii. What are the racial/ethnic/gender/class distributions in your classes?
 - iii. What's the range of abilities?
 1. Do you have any sense of what's contributing to differences among students?
 2. How do you deal with that range of abilities?
 3. What do you do to respond to individual students' abilities?
 4. What resources do you have to help you?
- e. Are there things that you'd like to do in your student teaching that you don't feel like you're able to do? (Prompt for examples)

2. Tell me about your students' literacy skills.
3. How do you assess their skills?
4. What have you been doing to support the range of literacy skill levels in your classroom?
5. Tell me about some literacy practices you use in your classroom. Which of these would you identify as XXX literacy practices? Give some examples of how you've taught students to read like members of the discipline.
6. Describe the most successful lesson you have taught this semester. Why successful? Is there anything you would have done differently?
 - a. What do you think the students learned? How do you know?
 - b. Which of the activities in that lesson were intended to help develop students' XXX literacy skills and strategies?
 - c. Where did you learn these practices/activities?
7. Describe the least successful lesson you have taught this semester. Why unsuccessful? What could you have done differently?
 - a. What do you think the students learned? How do you know?
 - b. Which of the activities in that lesson were intended to help to develop students' XXX literacy skills and strategies?
 - c. Where did you learn these practices/activities?
8. So, how are you defining literacy, anyway?
9. What do you currently see as your responsibility in developing your students' literacy? (If they do not respond as a responsibility issue, ask them: So, I heard you say this, but what I actually asked about was what you think YOUR responsibility is in making that happen?)
10. How do you think about meeting the needs of students who struggle to read and write?
 - a. How do your teacher education courses help you think about meeting those needs?
 - b. How does your field experience help you think about meeting those needs?
11. How you would define XXX literacy?
 - a. How has that definition been shaped by your experiences in student teaching?
 - b. How has that definition been shaped by your experiences in your teacher education courses?
 - c. How has that definition shaped by your experiences in your non-SOE courses?
12. In what ways do you model literate practices (be prepared to clarify "literate practices") in your subject area/discipline for your students?

13. Give some examples of texts you've chosen to use with your students. Given those examples, can you talk a bit about how you're defining text? How do you make your text selections? What other resources do you use for teaching? (Probe responses.)
14. How would you go about using these texts (and other resources) with your students, particularly in a classroom with a mix of reading and writing ability levels?
 - a. How do your teacher education courses help you think about using text?
 - b. How does your field experience help you think about using text?
15. What kinds of reading and writing do you find yourself engaging in most of the time now that you're student teaching? Are there other kinds of texts that you think you, as a teacher, need to be able to read and write as part of your profession? What other activities do you think you will need to engage in as a professional?
16. As you encounter different ideas, instructional practices, resources, teaching approaches, etc. in your teacher ed program and your field work, how do you decide how valuable that information is and whether or not you will incorporate it into your own teaching? Can you give me some specific examples of ideas, resources or approaches that you've decided to use or not to use during student teaching and why you made that decision?
17. So, if you had to summarize your thinking about literacy instruction in your subject area at this moment, what would you say?
 - a. What do you feel you know about literacy instruction in your discipline?
 - b. What do you think you need to know more about (in terms of literacy instruction)?
18. Do you plan on teaching next year and if so, where are you looking for jobs? What kind of job are you looking for? (middle school vs. high school; additional subjects or jobs beyond certification major such as coaching or teaching a minor course)
19. Is there anything that you didn't get a chance to say about literacy and/or teaching in your area that you just have to say before we conclude?