

Book Review

**Sullivan, P., Tinberg, H., & Blau, S. (Eds.).
(2017). *Deep Reading: Teaching Reading in
the Writing Classroom*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.**

Vanessa Kraemer Sohan

Florida International University

In a recent episode of the teaching-related podcast, *Cult of Pedagogy*, host Jennifer Gonzalez interviewed literacy educator Pernille Ripp about how to counter the trend in K-12 education toward what Louise Rosenblatt (1978) termed efferent reading, a skills-based approach to reading instruction that conceives of texts as containers for information, rather than a source of aesthetic pleasure. In a write-up about the episode on the *Cult of Pedagogy* blog, Gonzalez highlights this quote from Ripp about the state of reading in today's K-12 contexts, "We're constantly reading for skill. . . . We're constantly asking kids to *do something* with their reading, and then wondering why they're choosing to leave us and never picking up another book. They can't wait to get out of school so that they don't have to read" (2017, para. 12; emphasis in original).

The conversation between Gonzalez and Ripp echoes the problem posed by *Deep Reading: Teaching Reading in the Writing Classroom*, part of the NCTE series that also

includes *What Is "College-Level" Writing?* (2006) and *What is "College-Level" Writing? Volume 2: Assignments, Readings, and Student Writing Samples* (2010), both edited by Patrick Sullivan, Howard Tinberg, and Sheridan Blau, as well as the WAC Clearinghouse eBook *What is College Reading?* (2017) edited by Alice S. Horning, Deborah-Lee Gollnitz, and Cynthia R. Haller. Not only are current approaches to reading in secondary and postsecondary contexts contributing to what Kelly Gallagher (2009) termed "'readicide'—'the systematic killing of the love of reading, often exacerbated by the inane, mind numbing practices found in schools,'" (as cited in Sullivan, Tinberg, & Blau, 2017, p. xv), but statistics from the Nation's Report Card (2016) also suggest that proficiency in reading is down among 12th graders. The editors sound the alarm, noting that the trend toward simplistic, mechanical approaches to reading has resulted in declines in reading comprehension that have serious implications for our democracy.

As the mother of a second-grader in the public school system in Florida, I have come to understand the reading problem on a more personal level. As I try to shepherd my son through his education, I have become increasingly frustrated with a standardized test-dominated system in which mindless rather than mindful reading practices (see Carillo in this volume)—including formulaic written responses to mind-numbing reading comprehension passages—have taken over from interactions with real books. Even the corporate programs that supplement such approaches with real books, e.g., *Accelerated Reader*, cost schools thousands of dollars and promote reading among well-established readers, while doing little to develop a long-term love of reading in all students, particularly young readers who are struggling. This, according to the research available that is not sponsored by the programs themselves (see Mallette, Henk, & Melnick, 2004; Biggers, 2001). In my son's elementary school, even *Accelerated Reader* is being slowly phased out in the upper-elementary grades in favor of computer programs such as *iReady*, which tracks students' progress toward state standards by exposing them to, you guessed it, more reading passages but with cute cartoon monsters to guide them on their way.

As an assistant professor in one of the largest Hispanic-Serving Institutions in the country, Florida International University, I have had numerous conversations with college students—a diverse set of largely first-generation, multilingual students—about their reading and writing experiences in the Florida public school system. These conversations have been haunted by the specter of the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test, now Florida Standards Assessments, the standardized tests that shaped so many of their literacy and learning experiences during elementary, middle, and high school. Based on these conversations, I would agree that many of today's students are in danger of becoming what Gonzalez (2017) calls collateral damage

of a highly problematic approach to reading, unfortunately characteristic of both K-12 and university contexts, which “positions readers as passive recipients of information and defines reading primarily as a kind of text-focused close reading” rather than actively engaged with constructing meaning in texts (Sullivan, Tinberg, & Blau, 2017, p. xiii).

In order to support deep reading and deep readers, this collection seeks to disrupt passive, skills-based approaches to reading by offering a more thoughtful take on the connection between reading and writing—an approach grounded in theory and tested in practice by college and secondary teachers and students. Building on the work of Rosenblatt (1978; 1995) and other important, but often overlooked, theorists of reading in secondary and postsecondary education, the editors of this reflective collection have aligned themselves with Rosenblatt's belief “that a great deal is at stake when students read—for individual development and growth, for the health of our communities, and for the strength of our democracy” (Sullivan, Tinberg, & Blau, 2017, p. xxiii). We must do more, and we must do better when it comes to reading.

If reading is so high-stakes, then why hasn't rhetoric and composition as a field taken it up more often and more seriously? Disciplinary scholarship on reading spiked in the 1980s but dropped off again in the 1990s. And although the conversation has continued in recent years, reading has largely been viewed as separate from, rather than part of, composition studies. Moreover, there has been in our field what could generously be called a slow uptake—and more accurately identified as a neglect—of the work of reading scholars (see, for example, Atwell, 2007; Miller, 2009; Newkirk, 2012; Smith & Wilhelm, 2002; Wolf, 2008). The trend could be attributed to the disciplinary tensions between literature and rhetoric and composition: If we're not teaching literature, then what are we teaching? Nowadays, most

first-year writing instructors teach rhetorical approaches to reading, a trend which has filtered into the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). Compositionists need to know more about reading and “develop a theory of writing that is informed by the central role that reading plays in the production of knowledge and meaning” (Sullivan, Tinberg, & Blau, 2017, p. xix). Sullivan, Tinberg, and Blau’s collection seeks to fill that gap.

The repetition of the Nation’s Report Card (2016) statistics by multiple contributors throughout the volume might seem to perpetuate rather than disrupt the overblown crisis rhetoric of the reading problem trope. However, reading can be more fairly characterized as a problem when deep reading is defined according to college-level reading practices. Citing Kevin Kelly’s (2016) differentiation between reading and screening, Horning writes in the Afterword of this collection, “If we want, as I think we do, readers who can do ‘deep reading’—that is, readers who can stay focused and follow a narrative or argument—then yes, there really *is* a problem with reading” (emphasis in original, pp. 355-356). If we can better understand what college-level reading entails and how to engage students in such reading in the classroom, we can perhaps overcome the readiness gap that faculty and administrators in two-year and four-year institutions have observed (see Cecchini in this volume).

The contributors have thus mostly been able to move beyond overly-simplistic characterizations of the problem to offer a diverse set of useful strategies for educators, particularly in grades 6-13, to engage students in the work of deep reading. Moreover, they are careful to avoid the trap of “teach up” or “blame down” rhetoric (see Adler-Kassner in this volume), instead arguing that K-12 and college-level faculty in all disciplines and at all levels need to address the systemic problems that contribute to this problem, and that college-level writing faculty can and should

address reading more directly in their classrooms.

As the daughter of a literacy professor, educator, and public school administrator dedicated to promoting best practices for teaching English Language Learners, I have been ingrained with a healthy skepticism of the systems of power in place, but also with a profound hope in the possibility for teachers to engage in the kind of work promoted in this collection: “to help nurture skilled, passionate, habitual, critical, joyful, lifelong readers across all grade levels and especially across institutional boundaries in US high schools and colleges” (Sullivan, Tinberg, & Blau, 2017, p. xx).

Part I: The Nature of the Problem sets the stage by establishing the obstacles teachers and students face, including chapters from postsecondary (Jolliffe) and secondary (Morris) perspectives, while also addressing how technology shapes our reading and writing practices (Blake Yancey, Craig, Davis, & Spooner), and how reading is taught across the disciplines (Courtmanche).

David Jolliffe’s chapter identifies the reading problem as “the failure of the field in general to interrogate the roles that reading plays in high school and college writing and to recognize the paucity of theories, methods, and materials teachers have in both settings to develop more informed perspectives about themselves as teachers of reading” (p. 3). This chapter situates the reading problem in the context of the CCSS and the Council of Writing Program Administrators’ (CWPA) “Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition.” Notably, the 2014 CWPA revision of the outcomes statement paid greater attention to the expectations readers have related to their disciplines and to the importance of exposing writers to a diverse set of texts who do different kinds of rhetorical and generic work than previous versions. Jolliffe points to the work of scholars who have helped the field update its understanding of reading as integral to writing

practice and offers fourteen propositions related to the problem of defining reading. He ends the chapter with a number of useful questions about how to define, implement, and establish the study of reading in college contexts, and how to work with and against the definitions of reading established by standardized approaches in K-12 contexts. Jolliffe also wonders whether reading and writing should always be connected, and whether a college course devoted to reading alone may need to be established in order to deal with the reading problem.

Sam Morris's chapter reflects on his experience as a new high school English teacher, offering useful context for understanding the very real challenges faced by high school teachers, including the lack of material resources and the pushback they get from administration when trying to work within/against the limitations of their particular material contexts. In spite of these challenges, Morris argues he and other teachers have found ways to teach reading in innovative ways that engage their students. In Morris's case, reading Stephanie Meyer's novel *Twilight* enabled him to connect with students and find short-term solutions to the reading problem in high school. His essay highlights the lack of long-term solutions to the very real and immediate problem of the ways reading and writing are understood and taught in K-12 contexts.

Given the multiplicity of different texts and reading experiences, Kathleen Blake Yancey, Jacob W. Craig, Matthew Davis, and Michael Spooner's chapter calls for a more thorough examination of how we read digital materials, offering particularly useful data about the reading habits of students. The authors offer useful suggestions for how we can engage students in discussions of how readers experience texts differently, depending on the device being used, and the limits and possibilities of the particular display. They argue that we need to equip students to analyze and understand the visual narratives

and design principles of the documents students read and produce, and how their choice of device allows for particular kinds of interactions with the text. Most usefully, they offer three assignments "to engage [students] in considering how we tap each of these texts to make meaning—for ourselves and for others, now and in the future" (pp. 54-55). Interestingly, these assignments, though slightly different in approach, echo the careful take on reading, particularly annotation, promoted by Rebecca S. Nowacek and Heather G. James in their chapter on working with STEM students and also Salvatori and Donahue in their discussion of summary, paraphrase, and annotation.

Part I concludes with a chapter by Jason Courtmanche, the director of the Connecticut Writing Project, who reports on a 1-credit honors course he developed titled, "Why Read? A Defense of Reading and the Humanities in a STEM-Centric Era." Courtmanche describes the evolution of the course as well as the reactions of students across the disciplines to the work of the course, which involved students in meaningful discussions about the purpose and power of literature with one another, Courtmanche, and two sophomore mentors. In their discussions, students describe the effects of the readicide identified by Gallagher (2009): though students enjoyed reading in elementary school, they lost that love of reading as a result of middle and high-school curricula that were both too fast-paced and testing-oriented. However, during the course Courtmanche saw students experience a kind of reawakening to the aesthetic pleasures of reading. Ultimately, Courtmanche found that the course, admittedly unintentionally, enabled "a bunch of future scientists, engineers, businesspeople, actuaries, pharmacists, and dentists [to come] to the conclusion that reading literary fiction not only could offer them pleasure, recreation, and escape, but could actually improve their critical understanding of the world, deepen

the emotional experience of their relationships, and foster empathy with other human being” (p. 77). Courtmanche’s use of literary texts could potentially work to support the argument for the use of literary texts in the composition classroom made by Sheridan Blau in his later chapter in this volume.

Notably, Part II: Listening to Students includes the perspectives of three students (Ross, Pretzlaff, and Walls), who explore their reading and writing experiences in K-12 and college contexts. Their essays and the responses by their teachers/mentors (Pekins, Adler-Kassner, and Lunsford) reaffirm the inability of state tests to develop the love of reading that we want to nurture in our students. The students’ representations of the complexity of their literacy development and their reflection on the classroom practices they have encountered provides invaluable feedback for composition teachers and would be useful to share with students when asking them to engage in the same kind of critical thinking about how their reading and writing practices connect.

Although Meredith Ross’s chapter might share some characteristics with the literacy narratives we often assign in first-year composition classes, her writing style and her particular secondary and postsecondary experiences stretch—in a good way—the conventions of such narratives, in part because her educational history has been so unconventional. Ross explains how and why her parents chose to homeschool—or rather, unschool—her. This decision, she argues, enabled her to explore her interests and develop an ability to read, write, feel, and repeat. In response, John Pekins, her former community college teacher and, as it happens, homeschool advocate, writes that the traditional school system can learn much from Ross and other homeschoolers’ positive experiences when given more freedom during the process of learning to read, write, and practice (Pekins, p. 98).

Whereas Ross was thoroughly unschooled and, therefore, nearly untouched by more formal and formulaic approaches to writing and education, Evan Pretzlaff’s chapter describes one student’s process of academic becoming, particularly how he came to realize how and why writing is different in high school and college. He narrates how he came to understand and apply threshold concepts as they relate to his discipline, history, and how that work enabled him to grow as a reader and writer. He writes, “Through formative high school experiences, significant ‘aha’ moments, and the foundation that threshold concepts provide, I sought to situate history as a unique discipline, one in which threshold concepts define much of the writing I’ve done throughout undergrad and graduate school” (p. 116). In her response, Linda Adler-Kassner argues that we need to rethink the “blame down/teach up” model in favor of the model Pretzlaff exemplifies: one in which “learners must find ways to connect with the epistemologies of the contexts where they are learning” (p. 119).

Like Pretzlaff, Taryn “Summer” Walls reflects on how her cross-disciplinary writing and reading experiences have shaped her development as a writer. She includes excerpts from her own writing at different stages in her career—as an International Baccalaureate high school student and then as a college student—analyzing what the writing reveals about how she has improved in her thinking, reading, and writing. She enjoys the freedom of college-level writing and encourages high school and college teachers to open up their curricula—at least to a certain extent—to motivate students like her, who are willing to read and write about the things they care about. Drawing on her experience studying abroad in the U.K., she also recommends taking a page from the British system by arguing that “trying a variety of assignments, no matter how long or short, is one of the best ways for a writer to grow” (p. 131). Her mentor, Ronald F. Lunsford, reflects on the

process of working with Walls, underscoring Walls' claim that "The delicate balance between advice and a writer's autonomy requires tact and discernment, acquired from trial and error in the practice of writing" (p. 132-133): advice all teachers and students should live by when giving and receiving feedback.

The largest section of the book, Part III: Practical Strategies for Teaching Deep Reading in the Writing Classroom provides pedagogical approaches that stem from and apply to a variety of institutional contexts. The contributors are most interested in addressing approaches to reading that can be employed by teachers in grades 6-13, whom the editors see as the key agents for preparing students for college reading and writing. In the section, scholars address deep reading as a threshold concept (Sullivan); mindful reading (Carillo) and unruly reading (Salvatori & Donahue); the writing center as a reading-writing center (Harris); the best curricular, placement, and pedagogical practices for promoting student retention and success in two-year college-contexts (Hern; Tinberg); the place of literature in the discussions of deep reading (Blau); and a model intra-university collaboration on STEM-focused reading initiatives (Nowacek & James).

For Patrick Sullivan (2017), deep reading and learning should be theorized as active, generative, and problem-oriented; deep reading is a meaning-making process that allows students to wallow in complexity, confusion, and uncertainty through an engagement with "troublesome knowledge" (p. 145). Through deep reading activities, students and teachers develop a humble, cautious, and open-minded disposition that understands diverse perspectives (p. 146). Sullivan makes a connection between deep reading and the discussion of threshold concepts, which also encourages students to develop a metacognitive understanding of their processes of learning and seeing the world (2017, 147). The problem-exploring

disposition Sullivan promotes thus seeks to counter the answer-oriented culture common in both K-12 and college curricula, by giving students guidance and, most importantly, time to work against the habits of surface learning they may have developed previously (see Roberts and Roberts, 2008). Sullivan concludes with a narrative of a course he designed around "big questions," a move he argues allows him to engage students in the kind of deep learning and deep reading required to "think productively about a complex subject" (p. 157). Concluding with an argument for framing, defining, theorizing, and applying deep reading as a practice, Sullivan's essay suggests cultivating deep reading practices must be a priority of the grade 6-13 language, reading, and writing classroom.

Kelly Cecchini offers her experience as an English Language Arts high school teacher who worked closely with fellow high school and college instructors to develop a program aimed at closing the college readiness gap seen in the high percentage of her students who failed to test into credit-bearing classes at the local community college. Cecchini and her colleagues' efforts resulted in a move from only 44% of students testing out of credit-bearing courses to almost 68% testing out.

Like Cecchini, Ellen Carillo reminds readers that the work of teaching reading is not the job of a single subject area or, in college, a single discipline or field. Carillo defines mindful reading as "a *framework* that contains the range of reading strategies that students might be taught, including—but not limited to—annotation, rhetorical reading, close reading, the says/does approach, and reading like a writer" (emphasis in original, p. 190). Her aim is on mindful readers, not mindful reading, which she achieves by asking students to try out, test, and experiment, rather than master the texts they engage with in the course (p. 191). Carillo's helpful appendix offers specific prompts she has used to engage students in metacognitive, mindful

reflection on the interaction between their reading and writing practices, and how those practices transfer to other contexts.

Katie Hern—a two-year college professor with experience teaching in an accelerated, integrated reading and writing course—argues that so-called remedial courses must “provide meaningful content for students to engage with,” including an engagement with difficult texts and conversations with students about what working with such texts means, as well as lots of reading and writing practice (p. 214). Hern’s piece speaks to the important connection between reading and retention and success initiatives. Her work with the California Acceleration Project points to how such courses serve as gatekeepers often preventing students from completing their degrees. In addition to calling for more meaningful content, she calls for other curricular changes, including the reduction of the number of required remedial courses. Such courses can also teach the skills essential to being a student, and teachers can easily structure courses to overcome students’ fears that they don’t belong.

Muriel Harris’s discussion of the importance of the reading-writing connection as part of the processes of writing addressed in writing center scholarship and practice calls for tutor training and further research on “(1) reading to write, (2) reading while composing, and (3) reading while revising” (p. 229). Students in the writing center demonstrate a need to engage more closely with print-based and online materials, as well as reading assignments and genres. Interestingly, Harris offers one of the only mentions in the book of multilingual writers, referencing Gillespie’s (2007) work at my institution, Florida International University, with multilingual students who engage in multilingual conversations with writing tutors about the texts they are being asked to read and write about. The composing processes of writing, as demonstrated in the center, are related to reading, and the revision students engage in

depends on “reading and re-reading-re-seeing—the writing they produce themselves, both during composing drafts and when reading to revise” (p. 237). While tutors are trained in a few strategies that promote reading (reading aloud and helping students interpret instructor feedback), more work needs to be done “to reunite reading and writing instruction in the writing center” (p. 241).

Howard Tinberg reflects on his own pedagogical practice in the two-year college, historicizing both current reading trends and controversies. Tinberg also reflects on the limits and possibilities of his current approaches to teaching reading as it relates to writing and offers recommendations for teaching, including sharing our experiences as both novice and more advanced readers, giving students a road map for reading—here, Hern’s reading cycle chart would also come in handy. Tinberg also makes a case for the pleasures of difficult, slow, re-reading, and the importance of collaboration with colleagues.

Chapters on bringing literature back into first-year writing (Blau) and reading in STEM disciplines (Nowacek & James) suggest the value of carefully considering what other disciplines—closely related and less closely related to our work in the humanities—can contribute to rhetoric and composition’s approaches. For example, Sheridan Blau’s chapter aims to revisit the debate about whether literature can be useful to writing courses. Although his chapter could be seen as fanning the dying embers of a controversy begun and, seemingly, ended long ago, he offers a broader understanding of literature, emphasizing culturally significant texts from within/across disciplines, and suggests an active approach to reading literary texts à la Rosenblatt (1995). His description of the willful ignorance of Rosenblatt’s brilliant work on the part of academics in and beyond English education points to one of the reasons why his argument for returning literature to our composition textbooks merits

a listen: if we were to truly follow in Rosenblatt's footsteps, we would focus "on the emerging and continually self-correcting, text-attentive, and response-attentive character of the reader's process in a 'transactional,' mutually informing relationship with a text, as the reader, guided by the text and by the reader's emotional and cognitive experience of the text, construed, constructed, and experienced the text as a literary work of art" (p. 272). Thus, writing and reading are both viewed as processes of constituting meaning.

Rebecca Nowacek and Heather James speak from the perspective of writing center director and instructional librarian, respectively, offering a challenging and inspirational approach to better understanding the so-called novice habits of student readers/writers in STEM fields. The authors look for examples of "writing over reading" behaviors, which they argue help to explain the behaviors of college-level readers that we might otherwise view as "novice," such as cherry-picking quotations, jumping around in the text, and making personal connections (p. 304). In fact, expert STEM readers engage in these practices as well; however, novice readers lack a refined mental map of the field, and so engage in lower-level versions of these expert writing over reading practices. Nowacek and James briefly describe a course for honors STEM students in which they engage students in some of this important work, and they call for more work integrating reading and writing processes in ways that view those processes as contextual and developmental. If we can help students map their disciplinary research communities through research and mentorship, we can better help them develop into the kinds of writers that understand the particular rhetorical situations in which they are asked to make reading-writing connections.

In their discussion of unruly reading, Mariolina R. Salvatori and Patricia Donahue offer a critique of characterizations of the

reading problem that offer deficit-approaches to the problem. If we look at the resources students bring to the classroom and make the most of those resources, they argue, we can work to bust the myths that have established the seeming impossibility of the reading practices we value, e.g., that deep reading is impossible in today's fast-paced technological era; that writers are born, rather than made; and that interpretation has been (de)valued. The authors then offer a number of strategies and close readings of student examples that point to the ways students can engage in such unruly reading practices, including translation, even when engaged in seemingly straightforward, and thus often overlooked, forms of writing, such as annotation, summary, paraphrase. Both teachers and students should view reading-writing-thinking as recuperative and reflexive acts of invention, and interpretation as less authoritative and more open to readers' challenges (p. 333).

The book concludes, in Part IV: Letters to Students About Reading, with two letters (Sullivan, Luján) offering advice directly to students. If you want to provide your students with a brief precis of the arguments of this collection, I would recommend Sullivan's letter. In it, Sullivan explains to students why he has come to the conclusion, based on his research, "that 'deep' reading and reading for pleasure may be the most important things you can do to prepare for college" (p. 340). If you want to make a case to students for writing and reading as linked to a particular time, place, and space, and as linked to more than one language and identity, then share with them Luján's chapter, which makes the case for slow reading. In his letter, Luján seeks to demystify the reading process: "Slow reading is like low riding. You slide into the driver's seat, get hold of the steering wheel, slide down, kick back, and cruise down the main drag. No hurry. Take your time ... look out the windows at the scenery. *Oralé*. Enjoy the rhythms of the ride" (p. 345). As Horning writes in the Afterword, "It pays to read" (p.

260). She argues that this collection and the accompanying volume co-edited with Gollnitz and Haller, *What is College Reading?*, have made the case that writing scholars need to pay it forward by participating in the re-turn of reading to our classrooms and to our research.

As a reviewer, my reading of this text is necessarily co-constructed, an interpretation based on my particular experiences and point of view, including my training within the discipline and my experiences teaching at particular institutions. To that end, I personally wish that the text had more explicitly addressed how the reading-writing connection can more closely attend to and make use of the diversity of our students' experiences. Luján's brief chapter stands out as one of the few contributions to make connections between diverse texts, contexts, students, and teachers—a missed opportunity in a collection that otherwise seeks to represent the diverse voices of teachers and students across K-16 contexts.

After all, as John Trimbur (2016) has pointed out, recent scholarly conversations about developing a translingual approach to composition developed out of early conversations in the era of Open Admissions and out of the Pittsburgh School. These conversations have helped scholars argue for a more generous and intentional understanding of how texts—and the languages, vernaculars, and Englishes found in texts—are negotiated by readers and writers. Thus, while the editors and contributors don't explicitly make the connection to current conversations about language and language difference, their work could be seen as engaging with the kinds of dispositions toward writing and reading that honor, rather than erase, difference. It would have been nice to see the chapters engage more explicitly with the linguistic diversity in our writing classrooms, and the editors seem to have missed an opportunity to publish reading-related research written by scholars who reflect our students' own diverse identities.

Moreover, it is important to acknowledge how conversations about the reading problem are always already situated within larger systems of unequal power relations—structures which systematically deny students' right to their own languages, literacies, and cultures. As Carmen Kynard (2002) argues, "I am not interested in proving my and my students' literacy and intelligence but in examining the political dynamics that deny it" (p. 33). While I see the work of this collection as exceedingly valuable, all discussions of the decline in reading in K-16 contexts need to address how representations of the reading problem potentially perpetuate deficit-model representations of students' literate abilities. If the collection included more representation by teachers, scholars, and students from underrepresented groups, it might offer an even more situated understanding of the challenges, problems, and strategies teacher-scholars and their students in K-16 contexts have addressed and overcome.

Overall, however, this collection offers a welcome discussion of deep reading that will be of great help for teachers, researchers, and administrators who need to make the case to themselves and others that they can and should do something about the trends they see in their classrooms: the lack of deep engagement with texts and the need to complicate and counter the "screening" activities of students who—without a doubt—read a great deal, but not necessarily in the ways that are valued in the academy. By including writing by and for students, and by offering theoretical and practical approaches to integrating deep reading practices in the writing classroom, the book provides composition scholars who are both familiar and unfamiliar with scholarship on reading with multiple entry points into this important, not-new but renewed, conversation. Perhaps, then, we are moving both forward—and backward—by arguing that we should think of writers as composers, composing themselves and co-constructing their

understandings of the world in their reading, writing, and thinking practices. For we are never just readers or just writers, but are

always being composed in and by the world around us.

References

- Atwell, N. (2007). *The reading zone: How to help kids become skilled, passionate, habitual, critical readers*. New York, NY: Scholastic.
- Biggers, D. (2001). The argument against accelerated reader. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 45, 72-75.
- Council of Writing Program Administrators, National Council of Teachers of English, and the National Writing Project. (2011). Framework for success in postsecondary writing. Council of Writing Program Administrators. Retrieved from <http://wpacouncil.org/files/framework-for-success-postsecondary-writing.pdf>.
- Gallagher, K. (2009). *Readicide: How schools are killing reading and what you can do about it*. Portland, OR: Stenhouse.
- Gillespie, P., & Lerner, N. (2007). *The Longman guide to peer tutoring*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Gonzalez, J. (2017, December 3). How to stop killing the love of reading [blog post]. *Cult of Pedagogy*. Podcast retrieved from <https://www.cultofpedagogy.com/stop-killing-reading/>.
- Horning, A. S., Gollnitz, D., & Haller, C. R. (Eds.). (2017). *What is college reading?* Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse and University Press of Colorado. Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/books/atd/collegereading/>.
- Kelly, K. (2016). *The inevitable: Understanding the 12 technological forces that will shape our future*. New York, NY: Viking.
- Kynard, C. (2002). "New life in this dormant creature": Notes on social consciousness, language, and learning in a college classroom. In C. Schroeder, H. Fox, & P. Bizzell (Eds.), *ALT DiS: Alternative discourses and the academy* (pp. 31-44). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Heinemann.
- Mallette, M. H., Henk, W. A., & Melnick, S. A. (2004). The influence of *Accelerated Reader* on the affective literacy orientations of intermediate grade students. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 36, 73-84.
- Miller, D. (2009). *The book whisperer: Awakening the inner reader in every child*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Newkirk, T. (2012). *The art of slow reading*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

- Roberts, J. C., and Roberts, K. A. (2008). Deep reading, cost/benefit, and the construction of meaning: Enhancing reading comprehension and deep learning in sociology courses. *Teaching Sociology*, 36, 125-40.
- Rosenblatt, L. (1978). *The reader, the text, and the poem: Transactional theory of the literary work*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Rosenblatt, L. (1995). *Literature as exploration*. (5th ed.). New York, NY: MLA.
- Smith, M. W., & Wilhelm, J. D. (2002). "Reading don't fix no Chevys": *Literacy in the lives of young men*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Trimbur, J. (2016). Translingualism and close reading. *College English*, 78, 219-227.
- Wolf, M. (2008). *Proust and the squid: The story and science of the reading brain*. New York, NY: Harper.

Appendix

List of Chapters

Introduction

Patrick Sullivan
Howard Tinberg
Sheridan Blau

Part I: The Nature of the Problem

Chapter 1: “Learning to Read as Continuing Education” Revisited: An Active Decade, but Much Remains to Be Done.

David A. Jolliffe

Chapter 2: From *Twilight* to *The Satanic Verses*: Unexpected Discoveries about Reading and Writing in the High School Classroom

Sam Morris

Chapter 3: Device. Display. Read: The Design of Reading and Writing and the Difference Display Makes

Kathleen Blake Yancey

Jacob W. Craig

Matthew Davis

Michael Spooner

Chapter 4: Why Read? A Defense of Reading and the Humanities in a STEM-Centric Era

Jason Courtmanche

Part II: Listening to Students

Chapter Five: The Unschooled Writer

Meredith Ross

“Faithfully Clinched”: A Response to “The Unschooled Writer”

John Pekins

Chapter Six: Seeing the Differences: Writing in History (and Elsewhere)

Evan Pretzlaff

Shaping the Lenses: A Response to “Seeing the Differences: Writing in History (and Elsewhere)”

Linda Adler-Kassner

Chapter 7: Development and Duality

Taryn “Summer” Walls

Writing with Courage: A Response to “Development and Duality”
Ronald F. Lunsford

Part III: Practical Strategies for Teaching Deep Reading in the Writing Classroom

Chapter 8: “Deep Reading” as a Threshold Concept in Composition Studies
Patrick Sullivan

Chapter 9: Getting Our Students Ready for College and Career: It Doesn’t Have to Be Greek to Us
Kelly Cecchini

Chapter 10: Preparing College-Level Readers to Define Reading as More than Mastery
Ellen C. Carillo

Chapter 11: Unleashing Students’ Capacity through Acceleration
Katie Hern

Chapter 12: Writing Centers Are Also Reading Centers: How Could They Not Be?
Muriel Harris

Chapter 13: When Writers Encounter Reading in a Community College First-Year Composition Course
Howard Tinberg

Chapter 14: How the Teaching of Literature in College Writing Classes Might Rescue Reading as It Never Has Before
Sheridan Blau

Chapter 15: Building Mental Maps: Implications from Research on Reading in the STEM Disciplines
Rebecca S. Nowacek and Heather G. James

Chapter 16: Unruly Reading
Mariolina Rizzi Salvatori and Patricia Donahue

Part IV: Letters to Students about Reading

Chapter 17: An Open Letter to High School Students About Reading
Patrick Sullivan

Chapter 18: Kick Back, Slide Down, and Enjoy the Cruise, or Slow Reading Is Like Low Riding
Alfredo Celedón Luján

Afterword
Alice S. Horning