In 1995, I published a book called *If Not Now: Developmental Reading in the College Classroom*, which documented my adoption of a reading workshop approach, styled after the one described by Nancie Atwell in *In the Middle: New Understanding About Writing, Reading, and Learning*, for use with my college developmental reading students. My goal in using an Atwell-inspired workshop was to put into practice a pedagogical approach that was congruent with the transactive socio-psycholinguistic model of reading described by researchers like Kenneth Goodman in *On Reading* and the late Louise Rosenblatt in *The Reader, The Text, and the Poem: The Transactional Theory of the Literary Work*, and explained by writers like Frank Smith in *Understanding Reading: A Psycholinguistic Analysis of Reading and Learning to Read*. This theoretical understanding of reading convinced me that the only way to improve reading was by purposeful, authentic, and engaged reading. However, that rarely happened in my pre-workshop college reading classroom, where I first failed with skills-based reading textbooks and later with anthologies of earnest, short, non-fiction that I enjoyed but my students found impossible and uninteresting. I realized that my students were not going to engage with their reading if I kept selecting it for them and that they were not going to chose texts on their own time, either, since they reported that they hated to read and rarely did. If I wanted to motivate the kinds of high volume reading they needed to further develop their ability, I knew that I had to provide them with opportunities to experience pleasure and success as readers.

In the Atwell-inspired reading workshop I developed, my students were able to read any book of their choice, as long as they made steady progress with it and began a new book as soon as they finished one. The students wrote literary letters to me and to each other in which they discussed the books they were reading, and their classmates and I responded to these letters with letters of our own. In *If Not Now*, I described how students became eager readers, once they began to have authentic and engaging reading experiences with books of their own choosing. These are the kinds of reading experiences those of us who love to read already have had—we raced through Khaled Hosseini's *The Kite Runner*, for example, before passing it on to friends we knew who would also take pleasure in a good story so well told—but many of our students simply have not had positive reading experiences and, as a result,
they cannot quite imagine what the rest of us see in books. Workshop changed that for my readers in 1990, when I first began using the approach at Northern Kentucky University, and seventeen years later, it continues to enrich the literacy of students in the college reading program I now direct at Hofstra University,1 in New York, where our undergraduate reading course, LYST 12: College Reading, is taught as a reading workshop.

Through the years, a number of individuals have contacted me to let me know they were implementing a workshop approach, as well as to ask for advice, and a number of colleges, a cluster of them in Minnesota, have also developed workshop-styled reading courses. I would not call this a revolution (although I am sure my younger self must have hoped it would be); still, reading workshop does represent a pedagogical alternative to the traditional college reading skills/study strategies approach, as well as a theoretically sound alternative to the part-to-whole view of reading from which sub-skills approaches are drawn. It is the result of tightly theorized and well researched practice,2 and it represents a pedagogical approach that is in step with the broader field of literacy theory and research, rather than a step behind.

When asked to talk about reading workshop at the college level, I make a point of focusing on new aspects the workshop, as it has taken shape at my university in New York—which is the focus of the remainder of this work as well—because I think it is important to continuously fold newer theoretical perspectives into existing pedagogy. Many provocative new layers of understanding about the nature of reading and readers themselves have emerged in the past fifteen years, not to mention that literacy went digital, practically overnight, and these developments need to inform any pedagogical approach to teaching reading.

1. Hofstra University is a private, non-sectarian, four-year institution located on Long Island, New York. Total enrollment, including full and part-time undergraduate and undergraduate students, is 12,700. LYST 12: College Reading is located in the Literacy Studies Department, which offers masters degrees in literacy teacher-education and doctoral degrees in Literacy Studies. LYST 12 is a 3 semester hour course that counts as elective credit toward students’ degree requirements. The course is not mandatory, and it is graded.

2. While providing a detailed discussion of how to implement a reading workshop approach is outside the scope of this paper, I recommend Nancie Atwell’s In the Middle for both guidance and inspiration and Carole Avery’s And With a Light Touch, which details her use of a reading and writing workshop with first graders. Avery’s work demonstrates the ways in which the approach can be adapted (rather than “replicated”). While, in my view, the goal of a reading teacher is the development of readers, rather than the teaching of texts, I see the work of my colleagues in English as being much more focused—not always in ways they would prefer—on the need to “teach” specific texts to specific readers. This has been a frequently-voiced reservation about workshop on the part of the in-service secondary English teachers with whom I work. For them, I recommend Sheridan Blau’s The Literature Workshop. While Blau’s use of the term “workshop” is one I regard as more synonymous with “seminar,” the way his approach to teaching literature is informed by reader response theory resonates with the way workshop is premised on a transactive, socio-psycholinguistic understanding of reading: both put readers, and their needs, at the very center of the meaning-making process.
My first shift in thinking about reading workshop came in the late 1990s when I came across Kenneth Goodman’s perspective on the need to “revalue” struggling readers. Goodman believes that we must help readers “revalue themselves as language users and learners, and revalue the reading process as an interactive, constructivist language process” (421). My department colleagues were unified in the belief that focusing on readers’ strengths, rather than their “deficiencies,” created the kind of strengths-based environment in which struggling readers could flourish, and we believed that helping students rebuild their relationship to reading was a crucial aspect of helping them to develop further. The concept of “revaluing readers,” as well as the need for it, made immediate sense to us. Many of our freshmen had been labeled in the ego-bruising and unproductive way we often describe children in American schools: remedial, at risk, learning disabled, reading disabled, weak, or low functioning. These students believed they were destined to be, by nature, “poor” readers for the rest of their lives. I came to see this as an important obstacle for them to overcome, but first I needed to start with the way I described my students.

In my earlier writings, I referred to my students as “non-readers” and “reluctant readers.” Certainly these terms described their behavior and attitude toward reading, but they also placed the blame on the students, even though I had long been convinced that their reluctance to read had been instructionally-induced by skills-based remedial reading classes and/or high school English courses that required reading that was too difficult and too distant for the vast majority of students to experience any success with, or pleasure in. Yet the term Alan Flurkey tended to use to describe young readers who were in trouble, “struggling readers,” did not quite describe my college students. My freshmen were very much able to read; they were simply disinclined to read. As a result, they lacked experience with different genres, writing styles, and degrees of difficulty.

3. It would be burdensome for readers if I were to individually name and credit—in the body of this paper—each member of my department for his or her particular contributions to the overall conceptualization that has become our reading workshop. However, I do want to list each of them—Barbara Cohen, Alan Flurkey, Andrea García, Debra Goodman, Teresa McGinnis, Denny Taylor, and Joan Zaleski—and to make the observation that having LYST 12 housed in a literacy department has ensured that the course is shaped by an array of ever-evolving theoretical and pedagogical perspectives, as well as diverse teaching experiences.

4. For more information about the concept of revaluing, as well as revaluing-related assessment and pedagogical practices, see Flurkey and Goodman, Y.M, pp. 129-150; Goodman, Y.M., pp. 600-609, and Goodman, Y.M. and Marek.
The eventual term I settled on was due in large part to Elvira Sousa Lima, a Brazilian educator who joined our department as a visiting professor. For an amazing two years, Elvira commuted between Paris, Sao Paulo, and New York, and she brought a sophisticated, global perspective to our discussions about literacy. We talked about the late Paulo Friere’s work in Brazil and his belief that literacy is both a fundamental right and an emancipatory tool. Elvira invited me, along with several of our doctoral students, to visit community literacy and dance projects in one of Sao Paulo’s notorious "favellas," and I could see for myself the determination with which these people were educating themselves and their children in the face of the world community’s failure to do so. And while it would have been ridiculous to say my students had been denied their rights as readers, or to in any way compare their struggles to those of the people I met in Brazil, thinking about literacy as a right did make me think about how sad it was that so many of my students had spent most of their young lives without the pleasure, or the power, of extensive reading. It was fair to say that, for whatever reason, my students had not been fully enfranchised as readers. It occurred to me that even though my students had had a dozen years of schooling, somehow—in spite (or because) of all that educational effort—the fundamental pleasure that so many people find in reading had not been successfully cultivated in them. I began describing them as “disenfranchised” readers.

The idea of “revaluing” readers meant more than finding something tactful to call them, however. My students had to revalue themselves as readers, and revaluing really got legs as a pedagogical practice when I began to see it in relation to some of the newer research that was exploring the ways in which literacy is a social practice. I had always seen literacy as primarily a linguistic process, but after reading David Barton and Mary Hamilton’s Local Literacies: Reading and Writing in One Community, my thinking shifted. Local Literacies was an ethnographic study of the everyday literacy practices of several people living in Lancaster, England, in the 1990s, and the study examined what Barton and Hamilton call “vernacular literacies practices” (10-11), which they define as “literacy practices that are essentially ones which are not regulated by the formal rules and procedures of dominant social institutions and which have their origins in everyday life” (247). These “everyday” literacies, such as reading and signing petitions, for example, or reading religious texts, community newsletters, or fliers for lost kittens, fill our lives and are areas in which we are linguistically (and socially)

5. For more theoretical information on the subject of social and/or situated literacies, see Barton, Hamilton, and Ivanic’s Situated Literacies and Brian V. Street’s Social Literacies. For pedagogical practices that make use of these sociolinguistic perspectives, see Egan-Robertson and Bloome’s Students as Researchers of Culture and Language in Their Own Communities. Catherine Wallace, pp. 101-114, provides a thoughtful reflection for the need to balance an appreciation of local literacies with an awareness of the pressure globalization is exerting on individuals to expand and to internationalize their linguistic capabilities.
competent. However, they are taken for granted. I realized that if I took my students' everyday, vernacular literacies for granted, they probably did, too. Yet, these were literacy practices in which they not only engaged but also excelled. Instant messaging, for example, requires a facility for instantly transposing oral language into a written register that still sounds like speech. I lack this skill and, by and large, so does my entire generation, but our students are experts, and this linguistic skill, evidence of verbal strength that it is, gets overlooked in academic contexts.

I decided to add classroom activities to the reading workshop that would help students identify their everyday, home and community, non-academic literacy practices, because I saw this as a way of helping banged-around readers explore the huge role reading plays in their lives outside of school and notice for themselves how successfully they managed these literacy demands and pursuits. One of the first activities we developed was borrowed from one of our graduate teacher-education courses, “Introduction to Literacy Studies.” In the class, we ask our new teachers to record all of their literacy practices for a 24-hour period. The goal was to help our graduate students to broaden their definitions of literacy to include non-academic reading and writing. To introduce the logs, I typically would ask students to tell me, off the cuff, all the reading and writing they could remember having done in the past 24-hour period. Usually my freshmen mentioned the book they were reading in the workshop and other academic assignments, but they rarely mentioned their instant messaging, reading the scrawl on news channels, or texting, or live journaling, or blogging, or any of the other dozens of ways they regularly use reading and writing in their daily lives.

After the discussion, I assigned students to keep a log for a 24-hour period, beginning at the end of our class meeting, and to bring it with them to the following class, along with a one-page reflection paper. For the paper, I asked them to write about what they had learned about their own reading, from their log entries, and to discuss their attitude toward the different reading activities in which they engaged, in terms of the different settings in which it occurred or the different purposes it served. In the fall of 2006, my most recent class of freshmen readers recorded dozens of different literate activities in their reading logs. They wrote about the writing they posted to their social networking website of choice, as well as all the different postings they read there. Troy and Tina turned out to be regular readers of a particular TV blog that is also a (guilty) pleasure of mine. The very cerebral Clay’s log documented that he read different political, anti-war, and anti-Bush blogs. Every student read material

6. I obtained students' written consent to make use of their classroom discussions, as well as their assignments for the class. All names are pseudonyms. While the material included in this article does not represent formal research, I did take fieldnotes when I could, and often recorded notes later, when the students had had a discussion I wanted to remember. All conversations included here are heavily edited to avoid typical digression (frequently, my own).
available on the internet during the 24-hour period, whether they were looking up information for a class, cheat codes for a video game, or getting information about campus events. Offline, they read washing instructions, greeting cards, signs in their residence halls, as well as menus from the various restaurants and cafes located on campus. Clara's log showed that she had been up late reading Jeffrey Eugenides' *Middlesex* (and I had to wonder, not for the first time, why she was in a reading class). And, to a student, they sent and received dozens of text messages during the twenty-four hours they recorded their uses of literacy.

We spent the rest of the class discussing the revelation each student came to that he or she was reading and writing all the time and that most of this reading and writing was completely untroubled, efficient, and easy. Gaby said, “You know how I said the first day that I hated to read? Well I realized that I don't hate everything I read. I like reading for this class, and I like what we're reading in my seminar.” I asked her what she thought made the difference, and she replied, “Well, I pick the books for your class, and my seminar teachers picked books I'm interested in. The stuff I don't like to read...”

“Like *Crossroads of the Warrior,* by Alex Edwards,” Jason interrupted, and the six members of the class who had also been assigned this very difficult and very long book, laughed.

“You guys have got to get your head around that book,” I said. “Think about how much faith your instructor has in you since he assigned you such a tough book.”

“He may have faith in me,” Jason said, “but I'm the one praying I'll pass.”


“If it's boring, or too hard, or somebody told me I had to read it.”

“So, you like reading when you're interested in the topic, or when you chose the book yourself, and if it's not too difficult.”

“Yes.”

“And five weeks ago you told me you hated to read more than almost anything else?” Gaby smiled. So did I.

With the exception of the three students who began the class as avid readers, Clara, Donna, and Clay, all of the others made admissions similar to Gaby's. I considered it progress to see the students begin to redefine themselves as people who liked to read some things, but not other things, because this made them like every other reader on the planet, rather than “poor” or “reluctant” readers. As we further discussed their log entries, I was struck by their prolific dispatch of text messages. Honestly, I just did not “get” the appeal of this form of communication. I decided to ask the students to teach me to text. For a minute, they looked so

---

7. Neither the title of the book nor the name of the author is actual. I needed to protect the anonymity of the professor who assigned it, as well as the reputation of the author.
embarrassed for me that I quickly explained that I knew the mechanics of working my phone, but what I did not understand was the “why” part of communicating in this way. “It's... I don't know. Why do we do it all the time?” Clara asked.

“It's fun. You know people are thinking about you, or you're thinking about them,” Clay said.

“Sometimes it's just quicker,” Troy said. “People can talk too long on the phone.”

“And texting's good if you don't want to get involved,” Clay said.

“One time I sent this guy a text message to break up with him,” Angie said. “That's harsh,” Jason scolded. “Hey, it beat having to tell him to ‘man up’ when he started crying, didn't it?” Angie replied. Who could quarrel with that logic?

“It's gotta be funny,” Peter said. “You know you want to picture the person reading the message and just cracking up.”

Gaby added, “My mom sends me really sweet messages.”

“My mom texts me inspirational stuff,” Tina said, “like just one word, stuff like ‘soar.' She spells out the entire word though. She doesn't really know how to do it.”

“Tell me about that,” I said, “what you leave out.”

“I was thinking about that when you did the lesson where you showed us the paragraph that left out all the vowels, and we could read it anyway,” Clay said. “It's like that with texting. You leave out a lot of the vowels.”

“You use numbers for words that are... what do you call two words that sound the same?” Gaby asked.

“Homonyms?”

“Yeah. ‘See you' is ‘CU.'”

“There's something else I don't understand,” I said. “With all the unlimited messaging pricing plans available now, how come people still keep the messages short?”

“It's just how it is. It's the style,” Angie said and shrugged.

“I think it's part of what's fun about texting. You see an abbreviation that's cool, or funny, and you start using it too,” Troy said.

“Weren't you reading a book about the Marconi device?” Clay asked me. Clay and I shared an interest in early 20th century history that the other students had learned to tune out.
I nodded and said, “Thunderstruck, by Erik Larsen.”

“And they used telegraphese for those messages back then too, right?” Clay said.

I nodded. “You’re right. I read that entire book and never made the connection to any other type of wireless messaging until now.”

“That’s because you don’t text,” Clay said.

“Right again.”

“But what I was thinking,” Clay said, “is that even rich people back then probably used telegraphese in their messages, because that’s what a wireless message was supposed to sound like, even if you could pay hundreds of dollars.”

“So what you’re saying is that there are social and linguistic conventions to text messaging now that persist beyond their original need?”

“Not in so many words,” Clay said, “but yeah.”

Peter looked at Clay. “Marconi device? How do you know this stuff? Are you going to tell us the history of smoke signals next?”

“As a matter of fact . . . .” Clay said, and laughed.

What was born from this conversation with my students was a new revaluing mini-lesson in which I will explore with students the social and linguistic conventions of text-messaging, as a means of helping them recognize the linguistic strengths they display in this form of communication. For example, language has to be pared down to its least redundant but still comprehensible elements, and texters have to be very aware of graphophone-mic relations. Texting requires a linguistic adroitness, and my students have these particular skills well in abundance of most members of my generation. Praising teenagers for their texting skills may seem to some like praising someone who can write backward—a bit useless in real world terms—but I think we have very little idea of what our students will need to know in the future and what talents will best serve them. I know my high school teachers in the 1970s never guessed that I would someday need to know that to access encrypted files on my USB drive using either a Mac or a PC I would need a cross-platform encryption utility.

I have been slow to produce pedagogical practices that reflect relatively recent thinking of theorists and researchers like Gunther Kress, who are examining the ways in which literacy is multimodal in nature.8 In Before Writing: Rethinking the Paths to Literacy, Kress offers the view that the future of meaning-making will be less dependent on written expression and more infused with other symbolic systems, such as imagery, music, and movement. Young

---

8. For further reading about the multimodal nature/future of literacy see Kress’ Writing the Future; Gregory, Long, and Volk’s Many Pathways to Literacy, and Alvermann, Hagwood, and Williams’ article, “Images, Language, and Sound: Making Meaning with Popular Culture Texts.”
people have already incorporated these modalities into their social lives. Visit the social networking site of just about anyone, from tweens to twenties, and you will see an all-about-me profile that includes, at the very least, videos, music, writing, and photographs, and there is a likelihood that many of these materials were original compositions. In an irresistibly titled article, “Khmer Rap Boys, X-Men, Asia’s Fruits, and Dragonball Z: Creating Multilingual and Multimodal Classroom Contexts,” Theresa McGinnis argues that contemporary educational practices “do not address the diversity or complexities of our students’ literacy and language practices” (570). One consequence of our continued emphasis, perhaps over-emphasis, on teaching and regarding meaning-making as primarily a written process is that we are not harnessing the intense energy students direct toward multimodal expression. McGinnis persuasively points out that “when we allow... students to bring in the literacy practices they engage in naturally in their social worlds, we are given broader perspectives of our students. We will see them as talented and capable learners, and we will want to create more learning opportunities that tap into these abilities and talents” (578). I agreed whole-heartedly, but I struggled with how to incorporate multimodal expression into my teaching, because it was a kind of creativity I had not experience on a visceral level myself, and therefore had not fully embraced. It was a former doctoral student in our program, Aga Krauze, who finally got me across this digital and creative divide.

Aga’s dissertation was a study of the way her college reading students responded to an assignment to produce a multimodal interpretation of a book they had read in her reading workshop. One of the first interpretation projects Aga told me about was one in which a student had burned all the songs mentioned in Stephen Chbosky’s novel, The Perks of Being a Wallflower, onto a CD to create a soundtrack for the novel. What struck me about this response to the novel was how it was entirely obvious, yet it had never occurred to me to listen to a single song mentioned in the book, not even an important one mentioned more than once, The Smiths’ “Asleep.” The main character, Charlie, tries to describe for readers how beautiful the photograph of a girl he loves is by saying, “If you listen to the song ‘Asleep,’ and you think about those pretty weather days that make you remember things, and you think about the prettiest eyes you’ve known, and you cry, and the person holds you back, then I think you will see the photograph” (48). Clearly it was an invitation to the MTV generation to go and listen to the song. I had missed an entire layer of meaning in the book and had, apparently, failed to notice that most of my students had sprouted white earbuds, had instant access to virtually everything ever recorded, and were enthralled by music. Could there be any more welcoming an invitation to the interpretation of literature—for this generation—than music? I was sold on the literature interpretation project after hearing how Aga’s student had responded to Perks.
I tried Aga's literature interpretation project for the first time in the fall of 2006, and to introduce it to my students I borrowed an example of a literature interpretation project created by one of our undergraduate teacher education students. He had used iMovie, and numerous video clips downloaded from the Internet, to create a short film depicting his interpretation of the future described in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*. The student had also used Garage Band, an Apple application for composing music, to create the soundtrack for his video. My reading students that fall were speechless for a moment when I showed them the movie because they were so impressed, and a number of them decided to try making movies of their own.

Using RealPlayer, QuickTime, or iMovies, students like Donna created videos that reflected either plot elements or themes of their books, and I was most impressed by Donna and Clay's projects. Donna enjoyed the Sophie Kinsella novel, *Confessions of a Shopaholic*, and the images in her movie included Park Avenue storefronts, twirling credit cards, a montage of fine furs, and other luxury items either being worn or purchased. She downloaded these images from the Internet, and she used Gwen Stefani's song "Rich Girl" as the soundtrack for her movie. I was not surprised that her classmates sang along when we watched the movie in our classroom. I had ordered pizzas to celebrate their presentations of their literature response projects, and the students were in a terrific mood. I joined them in singing along to the soundtrack for Clay's movie, rapper Yung Joc's "It's Going Down," and they were laughing so hard they cried.

Clay's movie was the most ambitious. He created a visual exploration of the setting of Darcy Frey's investigative book, *The Last Shot: City Streets, Basketball Dreams*. Frey had followed the short basketball careers of several high school players in the Brooklyn neighborhood of Coney Island. The book chronicled the hopes and, in many cases, the disappointments of these urban youths whose dreams were tied to the NBA. Clay was moved by Frey's description of the poor community in which he had focused his research, and his

9. While the various classroom activities described in this paper are intended to support students' reading in the sense of helping them to revalue themselves as capable readers—as evidenced in their everyday uses of literacy—as well as to make connections between their highly energized and completely voluntary personal and social literacy practices and the world of academic literacy, I still expect that readers will want to know how all this helps students read textbooks, as well as distant or difficult primary sources. My answer is that there are no shortcuts from here to there. Students have to become confident and willing readers before they can tolerate—let alone master—any reading that, for them, might be irrelevant, uninteresting, or so difficult that stress (and possibly resentment) compete with comprehension. As long as we exclusively focus reading instruction, in K-12 as well as in post-secondary literacy classrooms, on what students cannot yet read, we fail to help them discover the readers they already are...and the readers they can become.

10. Aga Krauze's dissertation is available through Dissertation Abstracts International and provides details about implementing her multimodal literature interpretation project.
movie included images of Abraham Lincoln High School and its gym, along with the housing projects the players lived in. One of Frey's subjects, Stephon Marbury, did make it to the NBA, where he still plays for the Knicks, and Clay included a picture of him. I was pleased that for this project, and another one he had done earlier in the semester, Clay had taken advantage of Hofstra's proximity to New York City to take photographs for his work. Ironically, the out-of-state students were more likely to venture into Manhattan than were their local, suburban classmates. These weekend excursions always provided good stories in class on Monday, not a few of which involved “Prada” bags sold from basements in Chinatown.

There are people who knew me ten years ago who would be surprised by how many changes or additions I have made to my practice of reading workshop. When I read a draft of my former doctoral student Barbara Green’s dissertation, “Making Progress: Implementing Innovative Pedagogy in a College Literacy Program,” which was a qualitative study of a community college's adoption of reading workshop, I was incredulous and outraged that this community college had a required minimum number of pages students had to read in order to pass the course. Now, my reading workshop also has a minimum page requirement. This makes administrators much more relaxed than the way I had previously phrased the reading requirement for workshop: “Read as much as you can, as often as you can.”

My earlier orthodoxy was a result of my determination that the workshop not be compromised by efforts to please those with a different, or non-existent, theoretical understanding of reading, as well as those who wanted short-cuts and quick fixes. I am still wary, but the fact is that I am in a department in which there is the security that comes from shared thinking about the nature of literacy and how best to teach it. I have more help, and all of it is expert and passionate—when I need to explain or to defend workshop, or to, once again, resist the kinds of assessment practices that reassure administrators but then become the tail that wags the dog, as worried teachers start teaching to the test and worried students start asking them to. But it is the exchange of ideas within my department—both with my colleagues and our doctoral students—that easily allows us to cultivate our knowledge of literacy and to refine our teaching practices. I welcome whatever comes next, as we fold new theories, new teaching practices, and new blood into what has become—at Hofstra—a collective, collaborative, and on-going implementation of the reading workshop approach Nancie Atwell imagined for us twenty years ago.
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