Ubiquity: The Journal of Literature, Literacy, and the Arts, Praxis Strand, Vol. 5 No. 1, Spring/Summer 2018, pp. 17-42
Ubiquity: http://ed-ubiquity.gsu.edu/wordpress/
ISSN: 2379-3007

Sustaining Literary Reading and Critical Colleagueship in Audit Cultures: Co-Laboring as Inquiry

© Brandon L. Sams

Iowa State University

© Alyson Whyte

LCC International University

Correspondence concerning this article should be directed to Brandon L. Sams, Iowa State University, Department of English, 203 Ross Hall, 527 Farmhouse Lane, Ames, Iowa 50011-1054

Contact: blsams@iastate.edu

Ubiquity: The Journal of Literature, Literacy, and the Arts, Praxis Strand, Vol. 5 No. 1, Spring/Summer 2018

Abstract

The authors engaged in professional development through common reading and study to understand what a commitment to literary study might mean in a university English education program. Through shared reading of two highly regarded literature pedagogy tradebooks, the authors address tensions between an aesthetic stance toward literature/interpretation and reading as shaped by the languages of audit, testing, and accountability culture. The experience of shared reading and regular conversation helped the authors articulate a provisional program ethos.

Keywords: Teaching literature, teacher development, teacher identity, inquiry, assessment

Sustaining Literary Reading and Critical Colleagueship in Audit Cultures:

Co-Laboring as Inquiry

I always forget to tell you that holding the commonplace books, the feel of the paper in my hand, has given our reading together a ritual quality that sets it apart from everything else I do. When I am reading and handling the paper, it creates a space.

–Whyte, talking with Sams, March 2015

In "Finding Time," Solnit (2007) praises intentional slowness as "an act of resistance, not because slowness is a good in itself but because of all that it makes room for, the things that don't get measured and can't be bought." While slowing down may be a productive goal in many facets of private and public life, "slowness" may be especially difficult for teachers to incorporate in their work. We seem to be given more to do, with higher expectations for performance, while our time and resources remain constant or dwindle. For those teaching in departments and schools governed by logics of audit and accountability, we may be pressured to draw straight lines between acts of teaching and evidence of learning, or feel forced to make an account of only what we can measure, thus valuing only what can be counted. We both teach amid the increasing speed and demanded efficiency of faculty and university life (Berg & Seeber, 2016). While we acknowledge the relatively privileged position of university teacher (both of us were on the tenure-track or tenured at the university where we began the project described here), the time to think, write, teach, and engage with school and community partners is increasingly threatened by the audit and accountability cultures that shape our work (Taubman, 2009). We wanted to help our students, future English teachers themselves, thoughtfully anticipate the audit cultures that will structure and regulate value in their classrooms. Preparing for cultures that speed up learning is especially important for English teachers, whose

disciplinary practices of reading and writing depend on time and revision. What is possible in our lives and classrooms when we slow down? What does slowing down make room for? What follows is an experiment in slowing down and taking notice.

We (Brandon Sams and Alyson Whyte) met as colleagues in an English education program at a research-intensive institution in the southeastern United States. Our writing emerges out of ordinary acts of reading books together and talking about them. For 11 months, we met weekly over shared reading, primarily two highly regarded literature pedagogy tradebooks: Sheridan Blau's (2003) *The Literature Workshop* and Michael Smith and Jeffrey Wilhelm's (2010) *Fresh Takes on Teaching Literary Elements*. We used our shared study to understand what a commitment to literary study as an English education program might mean and how such a commitment might shape programmatic structures and curriculum. The work built slowly; we read, conversed, reflected, wrote. To our shared reading of Blau and Smith and Wilhelm, we brought (literally and figuratively) other readings about audit culture, reading instruction, secondary English education, classroom discourse, Common Core State Standards, literary interpretation and criticism, and education policy (see Appendix A). We continued to read and talk. We stumbled, not sure where we were going or what good our reading and talking might do. We carved out time when there wasn't enough. And we delighted when we happened upon insight. Our common reading and conversation produced as much confusion and tension as epiphany or clarity. In this essay, we represent our thinking through two aesthetically rendered conversations over shared reading to highlight what's possible when intentional slowness becomes part of a teaching life.

In a time when teachers are expected and required to articulate learning goals and outcomes from the start, we push against foreclosure by examining the value of provisional

direction that stems from presence, conversation, and the surprise and delight of shared reading, talk, and writing. Our conversations—jointly produced, partial teacher narratives—represent self-reflection and a reckoning of and proposal for what literary reading might become and make possible. Two years have passed since our experiment reading together as professional growth and as social critique of audit and accountability culture. We now teach at universities far away from each other. Yet our shared reading years ago still animates our interests, our practices as teachers, and our projects as scholars—not only at rare times like this one, writing this article, but in our later university lives now. We offer our conversations as rendered examples of the thinking that is possible when teachers read and study together.

Co-Labor: Theory, Method, Stance

Our collaboration often felt like co-*labor*-ation—provisional and ongoing—and our theoretical framework takes up the playfulness of language (collaborate and co-*laboring*) and integrates complimentary literature from critical friends practice (Dunne et al., 2000; Franzak, 2002) and critical colleagueship (Lord, 1994; Gallagher et al., 2002); practitioner inquiry (Sumara &Luce-Kapler, 1993; Cochran-Smith and Lytle, 1993); and inquiry as stance (Cochran-Smith and Lytle, 2009). Critical friends practice is site-based, teacher-directed professional development, concerned with ongoing self-reflection and generous criticism in service of teacher growth and student learning. Like critical friends practice, critical colleagueship is organized through reciprocal teaching relationships rooted in ongoing dialogue, self-reflection, and mutual critique—of teaching practices and conditions of education structuring teachers' work (Gallagher et al., 2002). Sumara and Luce-Kapler (1993) acknowledge collaborative practitioner inquiry as uncomfortable, a process that seeks and works through confusion and problem solving. Inquiry as stance is an orientation to teaching that values local knowledge production in communities of

practice (Lave and Wenger, 1991/1999); continual reflection and revision of practice; reading and participating peripherally in the research of other practitioners; and, importantly, considering and responding to the conditions of schooling (Senge, 1990/1994, Senge et al., 1994, Scheetz and Benson, 1994) as supportive of or detrimental to teacher development and student learning.

We owe Lewis Hyde's *The Gift* (1979) for what we mean by *labor*. Hyde's distinction between work and labor frames teaching as closer to vocation and art than passing the time. While work can be measured quantitatively and associated with context-less (and repeated) procedure or technique, labor is akin to processes of gradual becoming and knowing. Emotion, intention, and connoisseurship (Eisner, 1991) of the laborer are essential. A product of labor, like a poem or painting, receives and is formed by the imagination of the creator. Processes that qualify as labor evoke change in the one who writes, paints, or teaches, even as the material responds to the laborer's intention. Who one is and what one does or makes are mutually related. When one is immersed in labor, the direction of the process is formed over time through the resistance of the material, the intention of the artist, and the context of the process. Through the recurrence of these processes, one arrives, gradually, at a sense of provisional direction or meaning.

Data Sources, Analysis, & Representation

We valued re-reading and focused conversation throughout our inquiry and treated the tradebooks as commonplace books (Sumara, 2002). We photocopied the pages on cotton rag paper, with wide margins for annotation and critical commentary. After reading to a predetermined point in each text, we wrote extended reflective memos focused on the text itself and on our guiding research questions about literary study and program commitments—specifically, 1) what might a commitment to literary study as an English education program

mean; and 2) how does such a commitment shape programmatic structures and curriculum? Our provisional intention was to better understand our commitment, as a program, to literary study. As we read together, taught our classes, and brought other readings to bear on our work, this commitment grew in complexity. Both of us learned more about audit culture, the influence of the learning sciences on education and on reading instruction, and emphases in the Common Core State Standards on "close reading" and "informational" texts (contrasted in the Common Core State Standards with "literary" texts). While every reader might not be familiar with these issues, the arts-informed (Ewing & Hughes, 2008) approach we have taken to represent our practitioner research invites your knowledge and curiosity to grow as you read (and experience) the scripts in this article, which we performed in a conference setting as reader's theater as we were completing our year of common reading.

Our meetings were guided by the provisional directions established through prior meetings, ongoing reading and reflection, and the research questions. Each conversation was audio-recorded. After each meeting, we listened to the transcripts and took notes on emerging themes and patterns—two themes that emerged early in our inquiry, for instance, included 1) the relationship between literary study and testing culture and 2) the role of and need for surprise in literary reading and classroom teaching. We noticed, at the conclusion of our shared reading and study, that the themes named above appeared frequently in our handwritten notes, in our audio-recorded conversation, and in our reflective writing—and that these issues took up a healthy portion of our co-laboring time. Building on methods of narrative inquiry and performance research, we represent our work as aesthetically rendered conversation that centers these two themes (Alexander, 2006; Connelly & Clandinin, 2006; Leavy, 2015). The scripts presented contain our words and exchanges from the audio-recorded conversations. The moments have

been carefully edited and arranged to highlight the two major themes that emerged from our shared study and our ongoing analysis. To increase readability, we have removed unnecessary "ums" and have compressed the exchanges to make visible and center the two themes mentioned above. We intend the scripts to be expressive and evocative so that the reader can understand—indeed, feel—our commitments to literary reading and literary study. Our scripts also render threads of an argument about literature pedagogy and teacher education, which we return to and extend in the discussion and implications section. Below, we briefly introduce our two common books: Sheridan Blau's *The Literature Workshop: Teaching Texts and their Readers* (2003) and Smith and Wilhelm's *Fresh Takes on Teaching Literary Elements: How to Teach What Really Matters about Character, Setting, Point of View, and Theme* (2010).

Blau's approach to the teaching of literature starts with a paradox: students need to switch places with teachers. While preparing a lecture for a college literature class, Blau—close reading and figuring out a difficult text for himself—realizes that if students could experience the process that he, as a teacher, is experiencing, literature classrooms would be more fruitful for students as well as teachers. If teachers assume their role is to tell students what texts are about, students will continue assuming that their role is to be told what texts are about. To address the problem of the "culture of interpretive dependence," he provides a series of workshops for teachers to experience and learn a conceptual framework for the posing of genuine questions or problems that face readers of literature individually and in groups as they engage in literary study (p. 24). None of the workshops reduces literary study to receiving the teacher's interpretation. Instead, as students think through fundamental problems in literary study—such as "Which interpretation is the right one?", "Where do interpretations come from?", or "What's worth saying about a literary text?"—confusion is a virtue and a starting point for (more) reading and inquiry. Blau notes with

some hyperbole that reading is more like writing than writing is to emphasize the importance of making reading processes visible in our classrooms. Like writing, good reading generally and "a good reading" of a text are produced gradually—in drafts, through reflection, conversation, and persistence. His approach depends on and develops habits of mind that experienced readers (and thoughtful people) regularly practice, including a willingness to suspend closure; tolerance for failure; tolerance for ambiguity, paradox, and uncertainty; and intellectual generosity and fallibilism.

Like Blau's *The Literature Workshop*, Smith and Wilhelm's *Fresh Takes on Teaching Literary Elements* (2010) offers a more intellectually authentic (Newmann, King, & Carmichael, 2007) way of teaching literature than typical methods of literature instruction. The authors advocate for an *inquiry method* (e.g., Wilhelm, 2008) supporting readers' understanding of what are referred to in elementary and secondary school curricula as "the elements of literature." Their lively approach fosters understanding of four dimensions (*character*, *setting*, *point of view*, and *theme* and their interrelation) that is more complex than the typical fragmented way of training students to identify oversimplified elements of narrative writing for the purpose of audit on a mass scale.

Smith and Wilhelm provide precisely detailed plans including master copies of handouts for classroom activities. Their curriculum incorporates interpretation of visual media, exploratory informal writing, drama, graphic representation, and, most prominently, ranking activities using *simulated texts* constructed to help students internalize ways of interpreting character, setting, perspective, and theme. The authors recommend teaching these elements within inquiry units driven by essential questions (Smith & Wilhelm, 2010, p. 50; Wilhelm, 2007). Essential questions for literature inquiry units are questions central to the texts read, satisfy state and/or

local curriculum specifications, and connect closely with what students "know and care about," such as "What does it take to be happy?", "Who will survive?", "What makes a good friend/parent/teacher/leader?", "What makes a person mature?", and "What is loyalty/courage?" (Smith & Wilhelm, 2010, p. 50, 182, & 92). Two rendered conversations follow that highlight pertinent struggles we experienced in relation to our burgeoning commitment to literary study. We have entitled both segments of conversation to help frame the issues for the reader.

The Literary Mind as Untimely Concept

Sams: When you were reading me parts of "The Parenting Trap," there was that passage about testing filling kids with a fear of failure. And I immediately thought of Blau's attributes of a literary mind. To read, or think or create requires a tolerance for failure, ambiguity and uncertainty. Testing culture undermines those attributes, I think. So that's something important.

Whyte: That's really important.

Sams: One of the things we might think about is that the literary mind is antithetical to testing and audit…or Pinar [(2012)] uses the phrase "untimely concept" to talk about disrupting the machinery. So maybe the literary mind is our untimely concept?

Whyte: Why is it untimely? Meaning out of time?

Sams: Or out of sync with testing or approaches to schooling that value certainty or control or measurability. Remember last week, you made a lot of comments about teaching the literature workshop to our students as a competent method of literary study. But, you said they would doubt it unless they experienced it first as a participant. Without experiencing the workshop directly, they would not be convinced. The whole approach is, well, untimely.

Whyte: I do think that. Go on.

Sams: I didn't fully understand you at the time about "being convinced" but I think I see your point. I'm even thinking about your student's comment a few weeks ago—"Can we really teach this way?"—when talking about the workshop. Her anxiety about giving up teacher authority, and how impossible such a classroom is to imagine given what they know about how classrooms can feel. They are experiencing their courses and readings, now, through a lens of the imagined constraint and regulation of school. For them and for us, the constraint is foreclosing these other possibilities that Blau mentions for literary instruction. If the teacher isn't pictured telling students what to notice and using words like "comprehension" and "strategy" and "think-aloud," I think our students are taken aback.

Whyte: So of Blau, they are likely to ask, "Can we really teach this way?" I can understand their question. I do like that notion of the literary mind as antithetical to testing culture—

Sams:—even literary study; hmmm…testing culture and maybe *study culture*; maybe that's a distinction that is helpful? All of Blau's dimensions, if you look at them, they reflect an assumption that understanding is gradual and provisional. That reading is pleasurable but sometimes difficult and disorienting. And takes lots of time. The process of understanding and interpretation never ends— that's study, right?

Whyte: and it's inefficient—

Sams: Yes, very inefficient. It's a struggle. He has a wonderful line about the limited nature of human knowledge. [here it is] We must accept, he says, our *limitations and the developmental nature of our understanding and the paradoxical, ambiguous and*

provisional condition of most human knowledge at any moment. This is so different from what Taubman is going to say about knowledge in an audit culture. Knowledge is assumed to be demonstrable at a moment's notice. Measurable and available on command—

Whyte:—and it is so deeply ironic that they are called the learning sciences.

For Taubman, audit and accountability cultures shape our classrooms, particularly what counts as knowledge, how knowledge may be demonstrated, and the relationship between knowledge and time. As we speculate above, the tensions between a testing and literary mind highlight the pressures teachers face to measure frequently and to gather the most easily presentable data. Deep reading and thinking, however, depends on time and inefficient processes that inevitably include failure and revision. When teachers face pressure to speed up learning, to cover more curricula and standards, how can they articulate, much less practice, an alternative?

Aesthetic Pedagogy, or, Suffering, Surprise, and the Possible

I wear the rings of Saturn, all

nine of them on my hands,

and when I listen to the keyboard

I hear a music

beyond what anyone can play -- Diane Wakoski (1986),

"Joyce Carol Oates Plays the Saturn Piano"

Whyte: I was just starting to look through Blau's book and one of the things he mentions is surprise. And it's almost impossible for me to have a reading experience that I enjoy—whether informational or aesthetic—if there is not surprise that is fitting within the text.

> And I think Smith and Wilhelm eliminate too much surprise as a part of reading in their approach. If I still have some kind of complaint, that would be it.
>
> **Sams:** Yeah, you *have been* uncomfortable with the emphasis on essential questions.
>
> **Whyte:** I think the essential questions are bothering me. It seems to lend itself to an approach that basically says, "These books are *about this* and we are going to have a conversation *about this* and we are only going to grapple *with this* [both laughing at Whyte's dramatic hand gestures]." There is a point where it becomes a straitjacket.
>
> **Sams:** That's really important. I think it is part of a larger potential weakness with the inquiry unit as a genre of instruction. Don't you think? Because your problem with the inquiry unit, and mine too, is all the frontloading that the teacher does to "prepare" the students for the text. These are the essential questions. This is what the text is about. This is what we are talking about. Smith and Wilhelm's approach is better than traditional instruction, certainly, but the surprise and delight of reading can disappear. I would have to experience their approach in action, but the conversations one might have feel too…certain. The essential question, over the course of many weeks, could become quite cumbersome for both teacher and student.

We initially read *Fresh Takes* thankful for a literary pedagogy grounded in inquiry units, at once preparing students for mass testing of "the elements of literature" *and* weaving those definitions into intellectually authentic work (Newmann, King, & Carmichael, 2007). Essential questions return the world to curriculum, reminding teachers and students that common reading provides occasions for enduring conversations that matter for private and public life. Smith and Wilhelm's approach emphasizes a competent teacher modeling and scaffolding students' appropriation of competent ways of reading texts. They emphasize practice, training, and the

gradual development of reading and interpretation skills based on a system of "I do, we do, you do" (e.g., Teachers Curriculum Institute, no date) coupled with the "gradual release of responsibility" (e.g., Fisher, 2008). Essential questions, as Whyte noted, can be a conversational straight jacket, control masked as inquiry. Sams initially lauded the text for helping students produce thoroughly planned units that would (basically) ensure students learned what teachers taught, a kind of pedagogical straight line that began bothering him.

> **Sams**: Everything they do is so carefully planned. With the preparation and the practice…the instruction is just so ordered and perfect! I guess I would just have to experience the approach as a student or a teacher, but something about the way the pedagogy is pictured in the text just seems so…it's not honest, in-the-moment work, you know what I mean? The teacher is not…unlike a writing or reading workshop maybe where the teacher/leader is struggling through a process or intellectual problem that the students are also doing. There is no teacher struggle in here. Everything is just so planned and careful. I do, we do, you do. It's all competence!
>
> **Whyte:** Well, the authors struggled undoubtedly in their intellectual framing of these issues. They have done the struggling for us.
>
> **Sams:** You can't do everything in a book, I realize, but the teacher is competent and knows where the conversation is headed and is in charge of taking the floaties off for the student. There is this picture of teaching and reading that is not fraught enough with difficulty or anything unexpected.
>
> **Whyte:** That is a really good way to put it. And our students…don't they usually want to imagine themselves as teachers taking off the floaties? That is the iconic teacher.

Sams: But there is something about study and learning that makes me think we need a suffering teacher.

Whyte: Or at least questing or struggling…

Sams: Yeah, where the teacher is puzzling through a problem or…

Whyte: Because otherwise you are educating people but always with a degree of dependency on someone else to set the conversation. I think Blau is helping us think about a different kind of modeling. Many students think that modeling means a strategy for repetition. "This is how you are going to be doing it and I'm going to show you myself doing it exactly the way you are going to be doing it." Another kind of modeling that is the writing workshop kind of modeling is letting your own process of working through a problem be visible.

Sams: I guess we have to head toward the disorienting places—

Whyte: —so maybe that is a way of being aesthetic in pedagogy that we are circling around. There are plenty of ways to do it. Even the Great Books approach, where a teacher only asks questions she doesn't understand, doesn't already have the answer to. Or Blau's idea of pointing out difficult lines that confuse you. I did that the other day in my class. We read a Diane Wakoski poem and there were some lines I didn't understand and we had an unbelievable discussion of students' ideas about those lines. Even now, after a couple days, those lines are still electrified for me. Because I didn't understand them, coupled with what they said, and how it all kind of [Whyte pauses] and I really don't know exactly who said what, but there is a luminousness to those lines. They are just [sound of awe, excitement]. So yeah, going into the places where you are disoriented.

Discussion and Implications

While we question the need to always draw straight lines between teaching and learning, it is useful to wonder about and reflect on the value of our co-labor and shared study for our scholarship and teaching. Our time of slowing down to deliberately study and talk about disciplinary texts made more possible the insights and pedagogical innovations discussed below. For Sams, a key insight from his year-long co-laboring project with Whyte was the value of re-reading and creating structures within a reading and teaching life that make *returning* possible, necessary, and valuable. Sams began to think of ways to incorporate "forgiving time" in his courses to support his students, who will inevitably experience pressure to speed up the time of learning and normalize "test-friendly" reading and literacy practices in their own classrooms.

He has introduced commonplace writing practices and silence and contemplation exercises to his English education students. Introducing commonplaces—often in the form of daybooks and other hand-written journals—invites students to record, return to, and value provisional thinking as the necessary starting point for curriculum design and teacher identity development. He often asks students to return to their commonplace journals and "read themselves reading" to practice metacognitive thinking and understand the value of second and third looking to inquiry processes.

Sams assigns Blau's text whenever he teaches a literature methods course and asks students to complete a literature workshop assignment. They learn through experience the value of re-reading and reflective conversation in the literature classroom and, more generally, that literary study and literary reading of any one text is halting, sometimes clumsy, and always provisional. Students are beginning to experience confusion as a starting point for learning—voicing, not admitting, that they are confused, noting how and possibly why, and seeking dialogue partners from colleagues and professors. And they are themselves re-reading the

difficult texts and textual problems that, eventually, led to significant insight. These moves, we hope, are early signs that our students, future English teachers, will be able to negotiate the demands of accountability and testing culture in their own classrooms. We hope our students, when given their own classrooms, will help their students practice reading in ways that value gradual understanding, practice, and the inevitable failures and revisions that follow when engaging difficult and meaningful text.

Because of his co-laboring with Whyte—particularly Whyte's insight that Blau models ways of publicly working through textual problems—and his learning from others in the field of English education, such as Kelly Gallagher (2009), Sams is modeling for his students ways of engaging textual problems and making thinking visible. In a "cold reading" exercise, he asks students to bring poems he has not read before and performs cold reading with them, talking through his emerging understanding, naming his questions, and seeking interpretive guidance from his co-readers.

While he has not assigned Smith and Wilhelm's text as a required reading as of this writing (and that may change, depending on what his students may need), he does recommend the text when student teachers express a need for inquiry-based units or inventive pre-reading and frontloading activities. Following Blau's lead, his students are beginning to think about literature pedagogy as genres of instruction—an array of approaches to teaching literature that can be used, adapted, and remixed to meet the needs of students and teaching context. They are beginning to understand that literature pedagogy is context-dependent and they must respond to the needs of their students and their instructional aims with improvisation, reflection, and, in due time, the inevitable revisions that compose good teaching. We find that our students' learning retraces some of the winding path of our own, especially our wrestling with the "pedagogical

straight jacket" of the Smith and Wilhelm text. While inquiry units may be appropriate for some teaching situations, the potentially narrow conversational focus of essential questions may, over time, begin to feel too small for the people in the room. Our students are beginning to understand the art of literature teaching—that their approach needs to be attuned to the needs of students and context. While they value Blau's workshop structure and habits of mind, they know that the workshop model may not be uniformly best in all situations and that teaching, like reading and writing, needs consistent revision.

Conclusion

In theorizing the role of failure in composition pedagogy, Carr (2013) reminds that

> Failure reverberates. It expands. And it makes visible what we often take for granted. In causing notice, it helps us see that there are other ways of moving through the world, alternative ways of coming to know lived experience.

Our shared reading and co-labor helped us take seriously failure and revision as productive optics to frame the literacy practices and processes we teach and how we frame for our students the journey to become a teacher. In other words, our time of co-labor—a gradual and ongoing process of learning and becoming—helped us reconceptualize what and how we teach future teachers. Many pre-service teachers want to know "how to do it"—thinking, perhaps understandably, that teaching is more of a recipe and less of an unpredictable ensemble. In our experience, many pre-service teachers view school reading and interpretation as being told what a text is about, what Blau calls a "culture of telling" (p. 34). Our students are also smart and creative. If we establish a reading culture where difficulty and revision are normative, and if we serve as literacy sponsors (Brandt, 2002) who value revision and make failure visible, then reading cultures in our teacher education programs and future classrooms can potentially change.

As Gee (2015) notes, "a way of reading […] a text […] is only acquired by one's being embedded (apprenticed) as a member of a social practice wherein people not only read texts of this type in this way, but also talk about such texts in certain ways, hold certain attitudes and values about them" (p. 40-41). As teacher educators, we would be wise to consider Blau's (2003) hyperbole "the only texts worth reading are texts you don't understand" as potentially transformative of our literature classrooms (p. 24). If teachers and students seek and stay with "disorienting places," they can learn from working through textual problems together. Both teacher educators and pre-service teachers, however, must first give up the iconic image of teacher as all-knowing and controlling authority. Rather than telling students what a text is about, a teacher uses their own interpretive processes of engaging difficult texts as a sponsor for more meaningful literary engagement.

References

Alexander, B. K. (2006). Performance and pedagogy. In D. Soyini Madison & J. Hamera (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Performance Studies* (pp. 253-260). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Berg, M. & Seeber, B. (2016). *The slow professor: Challenging the culture of speed in the academy*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Blau, S. (2003). *The literature workshop: Teaching texts and their readers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Carr, A. (2013). In support of failure. *Composition Forum*, *27*. Retrieved http://compositionforum.com/issue/27/failure.php[1]

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S. L. (1993). *Inside/outside: Teacher research and knowledge.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

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

Connelly, F. M., & D. J. Clandinin. (2006). Narrative inquiry. In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, & P. Elmore (Eds.), *Complementary Methods for Research in Education* (pp. 477–488). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Dunne, F., Nave, B., & Lewis, A. (2000). CFGs: Teachers helping teachers to improve student learning. *Research Bulletin, 28*, 9-12.

Eisner, E. W. (1991). *The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice.* New York, NY: Macmillan.

Ewing, R., & Hughes, J. (2008). Arts-informed inquiry in teacher education: Contesting the myths. *European Educational Research Journal*, *7*(4), 512 – 522.

Fisher, D. (2008). Effective use of the gradual release of responsibility model. Author monograph. Retrieved April 5, 2013, from http://www.epd-mh.com/mhpd_assets/Effective_Use_Douglas_Fisher.pdf[2]

Franzak, J. (2002). Developing a teacher identity: The impact of critical friends practice on the student teacher. *English Education, 34*(4), 258-279.

Gallagher, C., Gray, P., & Stenberg, S. (2002). Teacher narratives as interruptive: Toward critical colleagueship. *Symplokē*, *10*(1-2), 32-51.

Gallagher, K. (2009). *Readicide*: *How schools are killing reading and what you can do about it*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.

Gee, J. P. (2015). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Hyde, L. (1979). *The gift: Creativity and the artist in the modern world*. New York, NY: Vintage.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991/1999). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* New York, NY and Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Leavy, P. (2015). *Method meets art: Arts-based research practice*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Lord, B. (1994). Teachers' professional development: Critical colleagueship and the role of professional communities. In N. Cobb, (Ed.) *The future of education: Perspectives on national standards in America*. (pp. 175-204). New York, NY: College Entrance Examination Board.

Newmann, F. M., King, M. B., & Carmichael, D. L. (2007). *Authentic instruction and*

assessment: Common standards for rigor and relevance in teaching academic subjects. Des Moines, IA: State of Iowa Department of Education.

Scheetz, M. & Benson, T. (1994). *Structuring schools for success: A view from the inside.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Senge, P. M. (1990/1994). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization.* New York, NY: Doubleday.

Senge, P. M., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Ross, B. R., & Smith, B. (1994). *The fifth discipline fieldbook: Strategies and tools for building a learning organization.* New York, NY: Doubleday.

Smith, M. W. & Wilhelm, J. D. (2010). *Fresh takes on teaching literary elements: How to teach what really matters about character, setting, point of view, and theme*. New York, NY: Scholastic and National Council of Teachers of English.

Solnit, R. (2007). Finding time. Retrieved from https://orionmagazine.org/article/a-fistful-of-time/[3]

Sumara, D. J. & Luce-Kapler, R. (1993). Action research as writerly text: Locating co-

Sumara, D. (2002). *Why reading literature in school still matters: Imagination, interpretation, insight.* Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

labouring in collaboration. *Educational Action Research, 1*(3), 387-395.

Taubman, P. (2009). *Teaching by numbers: Deconstructing the discourse of standards and accountability in education*. New York, NY: Taylor and Francis.

Teachers Curriculum Institute. (No date). "I do-We do-You do." Retrieved April 8, 2013, from http://teachergenius.teachtci.com/i-do-we-do-you-do[4]

Wakoski, D. (1986). *The rings of Saturn*. Santa Rosa, CA: Black Sparrow Press.

Appendix

Supplementary Readings of Shared Study and Co-Laboring

Davis, O. L. (1997). Beyond best practices, towards "wise" practices. *Journal of Curriculum & Supervision*. *13*(1), 92-113.

Davis approaches teaching as artful improvisation and experienced decision making – less as a set of practices determined by outside others.

Hyde, L. (1979). *The gift: Creativity and the artist in the modern world*. New York: Vintage.

Hyde's concepts of work and labor were infinitely useful for us, particularly as we thought about reading and teaching as a kind of labor.

Gallagher, K. (2009). *Readicide*: *How schools are killing reading and what you can do about it*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.

Gallagher documents how schools are unfortunately undermining the pleasure of reading through test-friendly practices and advocates for a different set of approaches that privilege reading pleasure and joy.

Gallop, J. (2000). The ethics of reading: Close encounters. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, *16*(3), 7-17.

Gallop, J. (2010). Close reading in 2009. *ADE Bulletin 149*, 15-19.

Gallop challenges readers to focus on the 'words on the page' rather than any interpretive schema they bring to the text. Her work served as an interesting and provocative take on "close reading" that differed from the version of close reading as described in CCSS.

Hinchmann, K. A., & Moore, D. W. (2013). Close reading: A cautionary interpretation. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 56*(6), 441-450.

The authors provide context from the field of literary theory to support how "close reading" might be interpreted and inform and improve classroom practice.

Newkirk, T. (2012). *The art of slow reading: Six time-honored practices for engagement*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Newkirk remembers how teachers and students might thoughtfully engage texts in a time when learning is hastened, measured, etc.

Pinar, W. F. (2012). *What is curriculum theory* [2nd edition]. New York, NY: Routledge.

Pinar questions an educational reform agenda that de-professionalizes teachers; centers conversation on "what knowledge is of most worth" as the central question for teachers and students.

Solnit, R. (2007). Finding time. Retrieved from https://orionmagazine.org/article/a-fistful-of-time/[3]

Solnit raises questions about the usefulness and possibilities of slowing down and changing our relationship to time.

Taubman, P. (2009). *Teaching by numbers: Deconstructing the discourse of standards and accountability in education*. New York, NY: Taylor and Francis.

Taubman details how discourses of accountability and professionalism actually damage teachers, the curriculum, and the profession of teaching.

Wilhelm, J. D. (2008). "*You gotta BE the book": Teaching engaged and reflective reading with adolescents.* New York, NY: Teachers' College Press.

Whitehead, A. N. (1967). *The aims of education and other essays*. New York, NY: The

Free Press.

Whitehead articulates the importance of aims and how aims are distinct from yet inform the principles of teaching practice and teaching itself.

Author Bio: Brandon L. Sams is an assistant professor of English at Iowa State. His research interests include reading and writing pedagogy, critical reflection, and teacher identity development. His work has appeared in such venues as *The ALAN Review* and *English Teaching: Practice & Critique*. He is currently focused on the potential of aesthetic and contemplative reading practices to interrupt and renew "schooled" reading practices shaped by the epistemologies of audit culture.

Author Bio: Alyson Whyte has taught English literature, creative writing, and academic writing in urban, suburban, public, independent, and international schools. She has led professional development programs on the teaching of writing for teachers of grades K-12, teachers in higher education, teacher leaders, and school administrators. With William L. Rivers, Stanford University, she is co-author of textbooks on writing for the media, writing feature articles, writing opinion, and grammar and style.