MOVING TOWARD A METHOD FOR YAL IN ENGLISH TEACHER EDUCATION

by

T. HUNTER STRICKLAND

(Under the Direction of Kevin J. Burke)

ABSTRACT

In this study, I examine the various discourses that influence and inhabit the field of young adult literature in English teacher education. Data was collected from participants who with the Assembly on Literature for Adolescents of the National Council of Teachers of English (*The ALAN Review*) in 2017-2018 (Volumes 44(2)-46(1)), and were teacher educators working in language and literacy education with preservice teachers and young adult (YA) literature (YAL). Participants submitted course syllabi that were then analyzed to create an understanding of how YAL fit into teacher education now to be able to then think about the future of the field with this foundational knowledge in place. The study is organized into three manuscripts.

In the first manuscript, I draw upon the literary theories of Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin (1895-1975) to understand how authoritative and internally persuasive discourses dictate the objectives and goals of YAL and adolescent literature courses in teacher education, and how an understanding of how a pedagogy of YAL is being developed now can provide a foundation for the field to build upon in future years.

In the second manuscript, I use Bakhtin's concepts to unpack the double-voiced nature of these YAL course syllabi and related materials as they reflect both the authoritative discourses in education seeking a centripetal standard as well as where the internally persuasive discourses of

individual professors centrifugally resist and pull away from that. Suggestions are given on how teachers subscribing to an engaged dialogic pedagogy (Fecho, Falter, & Hong, 2016) can choose more student-centered practices in their YAL courses.

In the third manuscript, I analyze the syllabi of YAL methods courses in preservice English teacher education to explain the methods used to share a snapshot of the field currently. Findings are organized into sections that explain what is being done in the YAL methods courses now, what is being read, what is being created, produced, and assessed, and finally what is missing from these courses. Discussion then addresses how the knowledge gained from this study can be used as a foundation for future development of the YAL methods course in coming years.

INDEX WORDS: young adult literature, adolescent literature, English Education, Teacher Education, dialogic pedagogy theory.

MOVING TOWARD A METHOD FOR YAL IN ENGLISH TEACHER EDUCACTION

by

T. HUNTER STRICKLAND

AS, Dalton State College, 2008

BSED, The University of Georgia, 2010

MED, The University of Georgia, 2011

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2019

MOVING TOWARD A METHOD FOR YAL IN ENGLISH TEACHER EDUCATION

by

T. HUNTER STRICKLAND

Major Professor:	Kevin J. Burke
Committee:	Sara B. Kajder
	Joseph J. Tobin

DEDICATION

To Caitlin for constantly showing me that dreams can come true. To Lainey for bringing untold joy to this process. To the rest of my family and friends for believing in me and giving me their unwavering support.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

They say that it takes a village to raise a child, but I think it also takes a village to complete a dissertation. The list of who all helped make this study possible is long, but I want to specifically acknowledge the following:

Kevin Burke, my major professor and academic guide, thank you for pushing me to think, write, and read harder. Without your support and willingness to give me the feedback I needed when I needed it, I would never have made it. You were always there for me, while also giving me the space to explore on my own.

Sara Kajder, who infected me with excitement about both young adult literature and secondary English teacher education. Thank you for the many long talks about why we do what we do, and the encouragement to be the scholar I wanted to be. You never doubted me.

Joseph Tobin, thank you for showing me that Bakhtin is alive and well in educational research. You showed me that there is so much more to his theories than one path, and it has changed my thinking forever. For all the Bakhtin talks and the stretching of my mind, I am grateful.

To Bob Fecho, Trevor Stewart, and Michael Boatwright, you inspired me to pursue my doctorate years before I ever started the program. Thank you for showing me that teacher education was the path for me, and for the encouragement to be a better classroom teacher and scholar.

To Heidi, Will, Stephanie, and Brad, walking this path alongside you has been an honor. For the many hallway conversations and the celebrations of our successes, I am grateful for your friendship and to have never felt alone as we pursued this degree.

Caitlin, you did not doubt that I should or could get my doctorate. Thank you for listening to my complaints, stress, and anxieties while assuring me that we would make it.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction to Context

The purpose of this study was to examine how young adult literature (YAL) has been conceptualized and made a part of methods coursework for English teacher education. When introduced to YAL as a part of my own teacher certification experience, I was led to believe that there was a battle raging between traditionalists that believed that the literary canon was the only correct way to teach secondary English, and revolutionaries who resisted such immovable methods of text selection. It was not until later that I learned that, while the conversation of the canon and YAL existed, it was never just about the binary. Now, as a fixture of secondary English teacher education, YAL has become an accepted part of methods coursework, but it is one that is used in multiple, important ways that we would do well to better understand as a field.

There is much research examining methods in secondary English education both through the syllabus (see Smagorinsky & Whiting, 1995) and through research (see Pasternak, Caughlan, Hallman, Renzi, & Rush, 2014), but none specifically looking at how YAL is taught across teacher education contexts in the United States. Smagorinsky and Whiting (1995) opened the door for the syllabus analysis study to be a valid way of researching course design. They argue that "The syllabi give us a sense of what the overall approach and implementation of the course will look like, what students do and how they are assessed, and what theories students are exposed to in their orientation to the field" and that this gives teacher educators a way to learn new ideas from each other and improve the way they teach (Smagorinsky & Whiting, 1995, p.

101). My examination of the literature has shown me a great deal about what is being done with YAL in educational research and teacher education, but there is not a consensus on using a specific pedagogy of YAL with preservice teachers or the creation of a methods class for how to teach YAL with secondary students.

In this dissertation, my goal was to examine course materials of YAL course syllabi and their required and choice reading lists, calendars, and assessments from teacher educators working with young adult literature to analyze the various social and ideological discourses that influence instructor decisions in course creation. An understanding was sought for how the participants, who were also adding to the body of scholarly research on YAL on the national stage, conceptualized YAL in teacher education for their students and for what purposes these classes were taught. With that purpose in mind, this introduction to the dissertation is organized into this context section, then a statement of the problem where I give a brief literature review of the history of the methods class then YAL in educational research. Next, I situate the theoretical and conceptual framework upon which this study was built and how that framework influenced the research questions that I pursued. Finally, I will give an overview of the three research articles that make up the bulk of this dissertation.

Literature Review and Problem Statement

During the 20th century, young adult literature grew rapidly as both a literary genre and a field of research while teachers, scholars, and publishers continuously sought to define just what exactly YAL was in their specific contexts and what its value could be. Psychologists, educators, and researchers spent the first half of the 20th century developing a national understanding of the concept of the adolescent (Lesko, 1996), and school and library advocates developed a special need for focused reading for this new socially constructed category of Americans existing

between childhood and adulthood. This happened as a larger percentage of students between 12-19 years old stayed in school rather than becoming working adults (Cart, 2001).

In the 21st century, educational researchers (Buehler, 2016, Connors, 2013, Glaus, 2014, Glenn, King, Heintz, Klapatch, & Berg, 2009, Park, 2013) in teacher education and English education are taking young adult literature a step further by looking at and theorizing about how we are teaching preservice teachers to use and implement a pedagogy of YAL or adolescent literature. These researchers, among others, are looking at how preservice teachers engage with text selection and text complexity in their current roles as students and in their future roles as teachers when they may be meeting resistance in field-placements according to the pressures of standardization (Petrone & Lewis, 2012). Researchers like Wolk (2013), for example, add to talks of reading and standardization by arguing how middle grades and young adult literature provide an avenue for teaching preservice teachers to reach beyond basic understandings and to look at the rigorous social and civic responsibilities shared through these texts.

Currently, practicing teachers feel much pressure to conform to the standards set forth by the Common Core (Ostenson & Wadham, 2012). These standards call for rigorous texts to be used in public schools, and this can be used as an excuse not to use YAL. Ostenson and Wadham (2012), argue, however, that "[t]he Common Core supporting documents… argue that increasingly complex texts should be used in classrooms in order to help students develop literacy skills and to ultimately reach a point where they can read complex texts independently" (p. 6). YAL can fit these demands for students and these authors' research supports this conclusion. They also argue that YAL can be used alongside the traditional canon to benefit students' mastery of state and national standards.

There is now a need in teacher education to examine how certification programs in English education are addressing the gap between how YAL is proposed to preservice teachers as well as how these teacher educators are preparing students to teach in contexts that may be resistant to moving beyond traditional texts as the gold standard of preparation for standardized testing. More work can now be done to see how teacher education programs are addressing the needs of the preservice teacher dealing with the dual role and dual context of university student and practicing teacher. Continuing work can attempt to draw out how teacher education programs prepare preservice teachers to operate within the authoritative pressures of standardization and with how programs address the resistance to YAL that students might face in field-placement sites.

I examined in this study how this need is being addressed within English teacher preparation programs by gathering and analyzing YAL course syllabi from researchers recently publishing in *The ALAN Review* (the Assembly on Literature for Adolescents of the National Council of Teachers of English). The reason for conducting this study of these educational documents is because the YAL syllabus is an educational text that represents the discourses of public education, standardization, and the goals of individual programs and teacher educators in addressing the needs of teacher candidates working in secondary schools as English teachers. The many major components of course syllabi like course descriptions or purposes, objectives or goals sections, and also required reading or choice book lists that include YAL have been analyzed to show how teacher education programs use YAL to prepare students to teach English in secondary schools, as well as how they address the gaps that teacher candidates may experience between their dual roles of students and teachers.

Understanding how YAL is being used broadly in teacher education allows a conversation to start in the field about where we would like YAL to go in the future. This is important as teacher educators using YAL need to continue to develop YAL methods separate from reading methods so that YAL can be accessible to all teacher education programs in English across the country. I will first give a brief overview of how YAL has been defined in educational research and how work with YAL often focuses on the concepts of adolescence(ts) to situate this study in the literature.

Defining YAL.

Current researchers of YAL in education build off of the decades of development that have come before them in order to further the impact of YAL with secondary students and preservice teachers (Crowe, 2002, p. 101). Within the field there are numerous similar definitions for what YAL is, and how it can be used for specific purposes to add to the field.

There are many educational researchers that focus their work on the conceptualization of the adolescent or in adolescence in education in relation to the study of YAL (see Connors, 2013, Falter, 2016, Glenn & Ginsberg, 2016, Heath, 2013, Lesko, 1996, Lewis & Petrone, 2010, Lewkowich, 2014, Petrone, Sarigianides, & Lewis, 2015, Sarigianides, 2012, Sulzer & Thein, 2016). These researchers problematize educational decisions that are based on assumptions about adolescents without an examination on how those cultural and social assumptions influence student learning and pedagogy. Talley (2011) remarks that "defining 'young adult' according to what readers between the ages of twelve and eighteen (or twenty-five) would enjoy or benefit from reveals assumptions about adolescent readers that pre-date the 'beginning' of YA literature in the 1960s" (p. 229). This early definition of young adult and the correlating definition of YAL that would come from it is now thought to be limiting as many contemporary

scholars believe that the young adult should now be thought of as more like 12 to 21 years of age rather than just limiting the field to middle and high school students (Cart, 2001).

Other current researchers use a simple definition of YAL that is broad in scope. This definition is often thought of as any literature written for and about young adults (see Cappella, 2010, George, 2001, Moni, 2000, and Samuels, 1983). While the broad nature of this definition does hit the mark at least on the surface level, it does leave out the large body of literature that young adults seek out that do not feature teenage protagonists, or that would be considered adult fiction or even children's literature.

Other researchers have a slightly adapted definition of YAL that defines the genre as "a body of literature specifically published and marketed (though not necessarily written) for young adults" (Kaywell, 2001, p. 325, see also Petrone & Lewis, 2012). This definition broadens the field slightly to include literature that publishers and literary agents believe will sell specifically to a targeted adolescent audience, which adds to any discussion on the educational value of YAL with the influence of the field of publishing.

However, this influence of the market cannot be ignored as the field has grown exponentially in the 21st century (Glenn, 2008). Many researchers do not see a need to define YAL in their own scholarly work at this point as several powerhouse researchers are satisfied with this definition that YAL is any literature published and marketed for young adults. At the turn of the 21st century, many voices from the National Council of Teachers of English (*NCTE*) and the Assembly on Literature for Adolescents of NCTE (*ALAN*) were tasked with defining the genre. One such definition that became foundational was by Crowe (1998) who stated that "I consider a 'young adult' to be a person old enough to be in junior high or high school, usually grades seven through twelve. I define literature for young adults as all genres of literature

published since 1967 that are written for and marketed for young adults… YAL restricts itself to literature *intended* for teenagers" (Emphasis in original, p. 121). This definition includes both the intention of the market, publishers, and authors while broadening the definition of literature to include all genres beyond just the fiction novel.

Finally, those working with YAL want to show how YAL can be used to reflect the diverse experiences and needs of readers in classroom contexts (Haddix & Price-Dennis, 2013). This desire is reflected in a definition that "YA literature can be described as texts in which teenagers are the main characters dealing with issues to which teens can relate, outcomes usually depend on the decisions and choices of main characters" (Glaus, 2014, p. 408). The added value of definitions like this is that it shows the agency of teenage protagonists dealing with real world issues and not just relying on adults to make decisions.

Researchers operating within this real-world application of YAL seek to introduce diverse perspectives and people to their students, especially in homogeneous classrooms (see Bull, 2011, Glenn, 2014, Lewkowich, 2015, Parsons, 2016, Pytash, 2013, Schiebel, 2012, Smolkin & Young, 2011, Stallworth, Gibbons, & Fauber, 2006, and Wickens, 2011). Buehler (2016) explained that "[w]hat YA offers is the likelihood of meeting students where they are now—not just as readers, but as teens who are still figuring out their place in the world" (p. 5), and this uncertainty of identity creates a need for students to engage in works that allow them to analyze who they are as well as who are the members of the community around them.

The diverse perspectives focus of the study and research of YAL with preservice and secondary teachers is not new, although it has become again a major focus of the work. Chevalier and Houser (1997) for example, used YAL with preservice teachers to help those teachers examine their multicultural beliefs through action research finding that "preservice

teachers would identify empathetically with a broader range of people, struggle with (and sometimes against) new perspectives, critically examine their own values and beliefs, and consider actions they might take to promote social equity" (p. 429). The added value of using YAL with diverse perspectives then is the chance to use the texts students are reading to enact a pedagogy focusing on social justice.

While defining YAL has been goal of researchers and educators for decades, the unsaid part of these definitions is what YAL is not. YAL is often put at odds with the traditional literary canon as an opposite. In my experience, students recognize YAL in contrast to what they are usually required to read with simple analysis of modern language and exciting cover art allowing them to have an "I know it when I see it" mentality of independent book selection. To fully understand how I operationalize YAL conceptually, I will work off of a personal definition that YAL is any text that is written for, picked up by, or marketed to young adults that feature characters, plots, and settings that allow them to connect personally to the diverse contexts and experiences of their lives. This definition is broad enough to include traditional and contemporary texts that young adults find compelling even if these texts are found beyond the Young Adult section at local bookstores.

Creating a Pedagogy for YAL.

Teacher education takes YAL research beyond the study of a literary genre (Santoli & Wagner, 2004, p. 74). As the field has exploded in the 21st Century with many high impact series making it onto the national scene (Ames, 2013), teacher educators have grappled with where and how YAL has a place in preservice teacher education (Glenn, King, Heintz, Klapatch, & Berg, 2009). In education programs where the pedagogical potential of YAL was the focus more than the potential for literary analysis of the text, YAL had and still has difficulty being

accepted by some. Tradition still holds powerful sway as "One of the problems in initiating change is that preservice teachers may bring with them conceptions of teaching that conflict with those espoused by their professors and their course readings" (Agee, 1998, p. 86). Where the education professor might more readily argue for the inclusion of YAL alongside and in some cases instead of the canon, English majors that become preservice teachers often enter teacher education programs with their minds made up.

Connors (2013) addressed this issue by explaining that teacher educators must understand that "Left unchallenged, the perception that YAL inhabits the realm of low art can blind teachers and students to literary richness they might otherwise recognize" and he continues by explaining that "students [have] to understand that YA novels display a high degree of craftsmanship, that they are multilayered and open to myriad interpretations, and that they are sophisticated works of literature" (p. 70). Change can be difficult for preservice teachers when they have only experienced English using canonical texts, and the YAL course in teacher education can help students see how different types of texts can be used to benefit student learning beyond what they may have experienced themselves.

Theoretical Framework

The theories of Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin (1895-1975) are especially valid for studying the YAL course syllabus because of how the syllabus is integral to the educational experience while also serving to represent the ideological influences of teacher educators, programs, universities, and national education associations. To the teacher educator, the creation of the syllabus reflects the needs of both the program and the university in the course offering, but also the individual purposes and worldviews that that instructor finds important. The analysis of these course syllabi and related materials was chosen because "The syllabus is one of the few

tools available for documenting the scholarship required for integrating isolated learning activities into a coherent meaningful whole" (Albers, 2003, p. 63). Thus, the "coherent whole" that the syllabus represents is a picture of what is being done in a course, and analysis can then show what ideological influences are present while describing the specifics of what information is included or is left off.

Smagorinsky and Whiting (1995) explain in their influential English methods course syllabus study that a purpose in studying syllabi is to be able to describe how things are being done so that the potential of how these courses can better be designed can then be researched and discussed in the future (p. 4). This idea applies to the study of YAL methods course syllabi just as it did for these researchers looking at the broader field of English education. Bakhtin's concepts will allow for an understanding of the sociocultural influences that push and pull against each other as the varying discourses present in the syllabi come into contact with each other in the text. When a syllabus is created, a teacher may consider authoritative discourses that influence them like accreditation needs, college requirements, etc. while also examining the many internally persuasive discourses that push against them like the individual needs of students in the future class. How the information on the syllabus is provided for students will say much about which of these discourses are given more value.

In their (2014) study of English teacher methods research, Pasternak, Caughlan, Hallman, Renzi, and Rush explained the need for studying methods because "Much of the conversation regarding ETE [English teacher education] and its methods in the USA and in other English speaking countries comes to the discipline from a vision of what should be, not necessarily what is occurring in ETE" and that "Programmes and coursework develop in contextually dependent ways that are often driven by institutional, economic, social and political

considerations – circumstances often out of the control of the English teacher educators who design higher education programmes" (p.148). As Bakhtin's work speaks to the contact of these varying discourses in contextual spaces represented in the interplay of various voices in discourse, this syllabus analysis will exemplify how his concepts are meant to be used in textual analysis.

Conceptual Framework

A number of Bakhtin's concepts have been integral to the work done in this dissertation study. His concepts of the utterance, heteroglossia, authoritative and internally persuasive discourses, double-voiced discourses, and the centripetal and centrifugal nature of language in discourse were all used to understand the data drawn from the young adult literature course syllabi in this study. Below are brief explanations for how Bakhtin conceptualized these words and how they were then conceptualized for use in this study.

The Utterance.

Bakhtin looked at how language interacted in dialogue at the level of the individual utterance. To Bakhtin, the living dialogue, ideologies, and competing discourses of heteroglossia are centered in a "complete speech act" or "utterance" (Bakhtin, 1981a, p. 264). In the context of this study, the utterance might be a single statement such as an objective or goal for a course or a brief explanation of various course policies and descriptions. When the individual utterances of syllabi are pulled out and analyzed alongside one another to create an understanding of the instructional choices that these instructors made when designing these courses, then claims can be made about how the authoritative and internally persuasive discourses of education compete within the field as a whole. The utterance in the syllabi, whether it is a single statement or small sections explaining class expectations and procedures, can show how meaning is being shaped

by both forces, and at the site of tension between forces, meaning can be understood in a more profound way.

Heteroglossia.

Bakhtin's concept of heteroglossia is the foundation for all of the following concepts used in this study, and the heteroglossic nature of young adult literature course syllabi is one useful context to use Bakhtin in research in English teacher education. Heteroglossia, representing a competition for voices to be heard, provides an important understanding of how discourse can be reified or stratified within teacher education (Tobin, 2000, Yagata, 2017). This grandness of a living heteroglossia is described by Bakhtin (1981b) when he explains: "I imagine this whole to be something like an immense novel, multi-generic, multi-styled, mercilessly critical, soberly mocking, reflecting in all its fullness the heteroglossia and multiple voices of a given culture, people and epoch" (p. 60). It is this basic understanding of multiple voices reflecting the discourses and perspectives of many coming together at a singular point in time to interact and compete to be heard in dialogue that this study in young adult literature research examines.

Authoritative and Internally Persuasive Discourses.

The young adult literature course syllabi examined in this study showed many ideological discourses that influenced course design. Among these are both authoritative (official, and finalized) (Bakhtin, 1981a, p. 342) discourses, and internally persuasive (one's individual consciousness) (p. 345) discourses. Bakhtin explained that "Authoritative discourses may embody various contents: authority as such, or the authoritativeness of tradition, of generally acknowledged truths, of the official line and other similar authorities" (p. 344). Likewise, he describes the internally persuasive word as unfinished, and a part of "ideological

development[/becoming]" for an individual. The course syllabi studied here show sites of tension between these two discourses within the heteroglossia of the syllabi, and analysis shows which discourses are given more space in each one. When understanding how various discourses influence course design, conversation can be had in the field about what is most important for future work done in methods coursework.

The Centripetal and Centrifugal Nature of Language in Discourse.

The different, competing voices inherent in dialogue through heteroglossia shows how authoritative discourses seek to control language and push meaning towards a monologic goal while internally persuasive voices of individuals resist that control. However, Bakhtin stressed that "[e]very utterance participates in the 'unitary language' (in its centripetal forces and tendencies) and at the same time partakes of social and historical heteroglossia (the centrifugal, stratifying forces)" (p. 272). It is with this idea that Bakhtinian analysis can go forward with varied texts. When one voice is valued above others, a hierarchy of power is created, but Bakhtin "saw centrifugal forces in language eroding the centripetal, specifically weakening the seals limiting who can participate and who can produce knowledge within certain speech genres" (Stewart & Boggs, 2016, p. 144). Looking at young adult literature course syllabi for these sites of tension can explain how the intersections of authority and the individual represent a struggle for voices to be heard, and then how the centrifugal forces of language make space for themselves even with the pressures of centralization.

Double-voiced Discourses.

The last concept that was important to the work done in this study was what Bakhtin referred to as double-voiced discourses where an utterance reflects multiple discourses at the same time. He explained that double-voiced discourse in the novel serves two speakers at the

same time and expresses simultaneously two different intentions: the direct intention of the character who is speaking, and the refracted intention of the author. In such utterances there are multiple voices heard (Bakhtin, 1981a, p. 324). This concept of double-voiced discourse is important when thinking about analysis of educational documents like course syllabi. If an utterance is double-voiced and internally dialogized, then this means that "A potential dialogue is embedded in them, one as yet unfolded, a concentrated dialogue of two voices, two world views, two languages" (Bakhtin, 1981a, pp. 324-325). If two discourses are embedded within one utterance, then analysis can show how the hybrid nature of the utterance shows more than one meaning.

Research Questions

My interest in studying young adult literature courses in secondary English teacher education in the United States was built upon the desire to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the specific objectives and goals of YAL courses in secondary English teacher education programs included on course syllabi, and what social and ideological discourses are present that influence these goals?

2. How does a method of Bakhtinian textual analysis specific to course syllabi and related materials allow teachers to develop more student-centered practices? What limitations do Bakhtin's concepts create when looking at course syllabi as authoritative documents?

3. How is young adult literature being taught in English teacher education, and how can knowing that help teacher educators develop the field further in the future?

This dissertation is formatted into three separate manuscripts that each address one of the above research questions, and were organized with a specific national audience in mind. The first research question and the first article speak to the greater audience of English teacher educators in the country through the *NCTE* journal: *English Education*. The second, as it is focused on using Bakhtin's concepts as a method for syllabus analysis, is geared toward the readers of *Dialogic Pedagogy Journal* where the study of Bakhtin in educational research and how his work relates to the theory of engaged dialogic pedagogy (Fecho, Falter, & Hong, 2016) is studied in depth. Finally, the third research question and corresponding article are formatted to start a conversation in the field of young adult literature in teacher education by speaking to the audience of *The ALAN Review*, where participants were drawn from, so that those using young adult literature in English teacher education can see where YAL methods are now and then decide how to build upon that when dreaming of how the field will evolve in the future.

Method

Bakhtin's theories of language and discourse explained through the use of the concepts listed above have been foundational to how the data in this study have been analyzed. Young adult literature is a field that continues to evolve as a genre (Buehler, 2009) and in teacher education (Buehler, 2016), and this provides the problem that must be addressed in research. In order to seek out course information from teacher educators that are currently working with YAL in language and literacy teacher education programs, I turned to researchers and teacher educators publishing in *The ALAN Review* as they are the top source for young adult literature research disseminating from the National Council of Teachers of English.

Data Collection.

In 2017 and 2018 (Volume 44, Issues 2 & 3, Volume 45, Issues 1, 2, & 3, and Volume 46, Issue 1), 114 individual researchers and teachers published in *The ALAN Review*. These publications spanned a range of topics from editorials, empirical research studies, YA author interviews, and book reviews. Of the 114 individuals published in this two-year span, 48 individuals self-identified as teacher educators working with young adult or adolescent literature. After a narrowing of the list to those who were actively teaching, 44 of those individuals were contacted requesting materials for the young adult literature classes or methods classes that included young adult literature as a major focus. The materials requested were course syllabi and their included course calendars, major assessments (prompts, descriptions, rubrics), required or optional reading lists, and anything else that the teacher educators felt best represented the work that students would be doing or did in these classes.

Of the 44 teacher educators contacted, 17 submitted materials for 20 individual courses that focused on young adult literature in whole or in part. As materials were collected, initial readings of these 20 course syllabi allowed me to categorize the classes into three main groupings. These categories included 13 courses that focused entirely on young adult or adolescent literature, 4 teaching reading and reading methods courses that have young adult literature as a major focus, and, finally, 3 broad literacy across the curriculum classes of which young adult literature was a part.

Data was solicited for analysis in the following ways: instructors were initially contacted via email to find out if any would be interested in participating and submitting materials with a short description of the study including what materials I was hoping to receive as data. Those that expressed interest were then started on the consent process also via email. The IRB approval

and consent form were sent to the participants to sign and return to the researcher. Most participants submitted their course materials along with their signed consent form.

Data Analysis.

       As I received course materials from participants, syllabi and other materials were printed, and then blinded to ensure that both the participant and the university that they work for were not identifiable in the data. I then did the first reading of the course syllabi to begin to categorize the syllabi by the main focus of the course stated above. After the blinded syllabi were categorized by course focus, a second reading of the syllabi was conducted to begin to unpack the more specific aspects of what these courses were about and what methods were employed for teaching YAL. Subsequent readings focused on the research questions listed above, and data was organized to best support findings that answered those questions.

       The primary method I will employ in this study will be content analysis of the course syllabi as texts using Bakhtin's concepts as the lens. Content analysis required me to analyze and interpret the syllabi solicited from the 17 teacher educators as participants, and then find codes using a constant comparative method to create themes found within the texts and to make inferences from the analysis. The constant comparative method will be used because of the potential to refine or track codes as new data challenges assumptions in subsequent syllabi (Glaser, 2008). By continuing to look back at how examples of a code have been tracked on previous syllabi, I will be able to better categorize my codes and draw meaning from them in my analysis and discussion.

<div align="center">Structure of the Dissertation</div>

       As stated above, this dissertation is organized into five chapters with this introductory chapter, three separate articles to submit to academic journals each in their own chapter, and a

concluding chapter. The goal of this study was to use the research questions to direct my inquiry into the field of young adult literature in English teacher education so that my findings can be used much like Smagorinsky and Whiting's (1995) were when they studied the methods course as it was conceptualized in English education at the time. Their goal, much like mine in this study, was to be able to explain how things are being done now with YAL in many varied ways, and then, now that that is known, YAL teacher educators can have a conversation on where they want YAL to go in the future. Findings indicate that teacher educators using YAL as a part of preservice teacher education in language and literacy are doing so to help develop preservice teachers into teachers who are readers themselves (Kajder & Witte, 2017), and who value their future secondary students as individual readers with individual needs.

The second chapter of this dissertation, article 1, titled: *Moving Toward a Method for Secondary English Teacher Education* examines listed goals and objectives of these 20 course syllabi in order to understand how YAL is being used with preservice teachers as a part of their methods coursework during teacher certification. Findings indicate a determined view of YAL as a means to train preservice English teachers. This article was written to be submitted to the *NCTE* journal *English Education*

The third chapter of this dissertation, article 2, titled: *Dialogic Pedagogy: Using Bakhtin for a Method of Syllabus Analysis* examines the inherent tensions between authoritative and internally persuasive discourses within the YAL course syllabi as syllabi are political documents full of centripetal and centrifugal language. This article examines the double-voiced nature of many utterances in the course syllabi as both the authoritative word is pushed alongside the internally persuasive as instructors seek to have more student-centered practices. Suggestions are given for readers that seek to be dialogic teachers using YAL for how they can choose more

student-centered practices in their own classrooms. This article was written to be submitted to *Dialogic Pedagogy Journal*.

      The fourth chapter of this dissertation, article 3, titled *The Young Adult Literature Methods Course in Secondary English Teacher Education* analyzes the 20 course syllabi drawn from participants in this study in order to show how the 13 courses that could be considered YAL methods courses represent what is being done, read, assessed, and what is missing now in the YAL methods course. The findings indicate that there are many uses for YAL as a separate methods course in secondary English teacher education but there are several gaps in the courses, and now that this is known a conversation about the future of the field can begin. This article was written to be submitted to *The ALAN Review*.

References

Agee, J. (1998). Negotiating different conceptions about reading and teaching literature in a
preservice literature class. *Research in the Teaching of English, 33*(1). 85-124.

Albers, C. (2003). Using the syllabus to document the scholarship of teaching. *Teaching
Sociology, 31*(1). 60-72.

Ames, M. (2013). Engaging "apolitical" adolescents: Analyzing the popularity and educational
potential of dystopian literature post-9/11. *The High School Journal, 97*(1). 3-20.

Buehler, J. (2009). Ways to join the living conversation about young adult literature. *English
Journal, 98*(3). 26-32.

Buehler, J. (2016). *Teaching reading with ya literature: Complex texts, complex lives.* Urbana,
IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Bull, K. B. (2011). Connecting with texts: Teacher candidates reading young adult literature.
Theory Into Practice, 50(3). *223-230.*

Cappella, D. (2010). Kicking it up beyond the casual: Fresh perspectives in young adult
literature. *Studies in the Novel, 42*(1/2). 1-10.

Cart, M. (2001). From insider to outsider: The evolution of young adult literature. *Voices from
the Middle, 9*(2). 95-98.

Chevalier, M. & Houser, N. O. (1997). Preservice teachers' multicultural self-development
through adolescent fiction. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 40*(6). 426-436.

Connors, S. P. (2013). Challenging perspectives on young adult literature. *English Journal,
102*(5). 69-73.

Crowe, C. (1998). Young adult literature: What is young adult literature? *English Journal, 88*(1).
120-122.

Crowe, C. (2002). Young adult literature: "De facto" ya literature and false expectations. *English Journal, 91*(4). 100-102.

Falter, M. M. (2016). Addressing assumptions about adolescents in a preservice yal course. *The ALAN Review, 43*(2). 51-61.

Fecho, B., Falter, M., & Hong, X. (2016). *Teaching outside the box and inside the standards: Making room for dialogue*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

George, M. A. (2001). What's the big idea? Integrating young adult literature in the middle school. *English Journal, 90*(3). 74-81.

Glaus, M. (2014). Text complexity and young adult literature: Establishing its place. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 57*(5). 407-416.

Glenn, W. (2008). Gossiping girls, insider boys, a-list achievements: Examining and exposing young adult novels consumed by conspicuous consumption. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 52*(1). 34-42.

Glenn, W. (2014). To witness and to testify: Preservice teachers examine literary aesthetics to better understand diverse literature. *English Education, 46*(2). 90-116.

Glenn, W., King, D., Heintz, K., Klapatch, J., & Berg, E. (2009). Finding space and place for young adult literature: Lessons from four first-year teachers engaging in out-of-school professional induction. *The ALAN Review, 36*(2). 6-17.

Glenn, W. J., & Ginsberg, R. (2016) Resisting readers' identity (re)construction across English and young adult literature course contexts. *Research in the Teaching of English, 51*(1). 84-105.

Haddix, M., & Price-Dennis, D. (2013). Urban fiction and multicultural literature as transformative tools for preparing English teachers for diverse classrooms. *English Education, 45*(3). 247-283.

Heath, S. B. (2013). "So what's it about? Your book, I mean?". *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 56*(4). 266-270.

Kajder, S., & Witte, S. (2017). Learning from teachers who read. *Voices from the Middle, 24*(4). 6-8.

Kaywell, J. (2001). Preparing teachers to teach young adult literature. *English Education, 33*(4). 323-327.

Lesko, N. (1996). Denaturalizing adolescence: The politics of contemporary representations. *Youth & Society, 28*(2). 139-161.

Lewis, M. A., & Petrone, R. (2010). "Although adolescence need not be violent…": Preservice teachers' connections between "adolescence" and literacy curriculum. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 53*(5). 398-407.

Lewkowich, M. (2014). Fostering childish tendencies in teacher education and young adult literature: The problem of teaching ideas you love. *Changing English, 21*(3). 278-287.

Lewkowich, M. (2015). Transferences of teacher-casting and projections of redemption: teacher education, young adult literature and the psychic life of reading. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 23*(3). 349-368.

Moni, K. (2000). First contact: Preservice teachers review young adult literature. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 44*(3). 297-299.

Ostenson, R., & Wadham, R. (2012). Young adult literature and the Common Core: A surprisingly good fit. *American Secondary Education, 41*(1). 4-13.

Park, J. Y. (2013). All the ways of reading literature: Preservice English teachers' perspectives on disciplinary literacy. *English Education, 45*(4). 361-384.

Parsons, L. T. (2016). Learning from preservice teachers' responses to trans-themed young adult literature: Improving personal practice in teacher education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 37*(6). 933-947.

Pasternak, D. L., Caughlan, S., Hallman, H., Renzi, L., & Rush, L. (2014). Teaching English language arts methods in the United States: A review of the research. *Review of Education, 2*(2). 146-185.

Petrone, R., & Lewis, M. A. (2012). Deficits, therapists, and a desire to distance: Secondary English preservice teachers' reasoning about their future students. *English Education, 44*(3). 254-287.

Petrone, R., Sarigianides, S. T., Lewis, M. A. (2015). The youth lens: Analyzing adolescence/ts in literary texts. *Journal of Literacy Research, 46*(4). 506-533.

Pytash, K. E. (2013). Using ya literature to help preservice teachers deal with bullying and suicide. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 56*(6). 470-479.

Samuels, B. G. (1983). Young adult novels in the classroom? *English Journal, 72*(4). 86-88.

Santoli, S. P., & Wagner, M. E. (2004). Young adult literature: The other "real" literature. *American Secondary Education, 33*(1). 65-75.

Sarigianides, S. T. (2012). Tensions in teaching adolescence/ts: Analyzing resistances in a young adult literature course. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 56*(3). 222-230.

Schieble, M. (2012). Critical conversations on whiteness with young adult literature. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 56*(3). 212-221.

Smagorinsky, P., & Whiting, M. E. (1995). *How English teachers get taught: Methods of teaching the methods course*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Smolkin, L. B., & Young, C. A. (2011). Research directions: Missing mirrors, missing windows: Children's literature textbooks and LGBTQ topics. *Language Arts, 88*(3). 217-225.

Stallworth, B. J., Gibbons, L., & Fauber, L. (2006). It's not on the list: An exploration of teachers' perspectives on using multicultural literature. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 49*(6). 478-489.

Sulzer, M. A., & Thein, A. H. (2016). Reconsidering the hypothetical adolescent in evaluating and teaching young adult literature. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 60*(2). 163-171.

Talley, L. A. (2011). Young adult. In P. Nel & L. Paul (Eds.), *Keywords for children's literature* (pp. 228-232). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Wickens, C. M. (2011). Codes, silences, and homophobia: Challenging normative assumptions about gender and sexuality in contemporary LGBTQ young adult literature. *Children's Literature in Education, 42*(2).

Wolk, S. (2013). Reading democracy: Exploring ideas that matter with middle grade and young adult literature. *English Journal, 103*(2). 45-51.

CHAPTER 2

MOVING TOWARD A METHOD FOR YAL IN SECONDARY ENGLISH TEACHER

EDUCATION

Strickland, T. H. To Be Submitted to *English Education*

Abstract

In order to better understand how young adult literature (YAL) is used in secondary English teacher education, this study examined course syllabi submitted by researchers recently published in *The ALAN Review*. These teacher educators, as active voices in the discourse surrounding YAL in English education, provided ample support for an understanding of how YAL fits in teacher education in the 21st century. Using a theoretical and conceptual framework built off of the work of Mikhail Bakhtin, this article specifically analyzes course objectives and goals sections for inherent social discourses to understand how syllabi further establish practices as well as best seek to support individual student learning. Data was organized into four categories of focus. The first is examining the discourses of how YAL is used to teach traditional English education methods. The second is to use YAL to understand discourses of critical education, social justice, and diversity. The third examines discourses on defining YAL and/or adolescence(ts), and the fourth examines objectives and goals that represent discourses on reflective practice. Individual objectives and goals are given as evidence throughout so that an understanding of how these discourses meet at sites of tension within the syllabi allow for a discussion on how YAL is being used now, and how might that foundation be built upon in the future.

Introduction

In 2019, teachers and researchers alike hear much positive national conversation on young adult literature (YAL) in the secondary English classroom. YAL continues to break boundaries in the text selection discussion that is built upon a foundation of decades of struggle to see YAL given a position of value within traditional English teacher methods (Glenn, King, Heintz, Klapatch, & Berg, 2009). As the cultural popularity of YAL has grown with many

blockbuster movie franchises paving the way for universal acceptance, educators (George, 2001, Glenn, 2014, Moni, 2000, Pruzinsky, 2014) have spent much time showing how valuable these texts can be in teaching secondary students and preservice teachers to become or continue to be readers. On top of that, YAL has continued to be used in secondary English teacher education to create readers of teacher candidates who will then use that identity as a reader in teaching in their future classrooms (Alston & Barker, 2014).

Educational researchers (Buehler, 2016, Connors, 2013, Glaus, 2014, Glenn, King, Heintz, Klapatch, & Berg, 2009, Park, 2013) in teacher education and English education are theorizing about how they are teaching preservice teachers to use and implement a pedagogy specifically for YAL or adolescent literature. These researchers have examined preservice teachers' experiences with YAL as a part of their methods training for English teacher certification and have found great potential and a rationale for using YAL, alongside traditional texts, to help prepare teacher candidates to teach English in secondary classrooms. There is, however, a need to understand broadly how teacher educators approach the teaching of YAL with preservice English teachers so that, with the knowledge of how things have been done, the field can begin to build toward the future.

This study examined how this need was being addressed within English teacher preparation programs by analyzing YAL course syllabi from colleges and universities. YAL has been examined in the context of the secondary classroom for its ability to reach the needs of secondary readers (Roberts, et al., 2013); it has been researched for its ability to show readers the stories of perspectives that are different from their own (Stallworth, Gibbons, & Fauber, 2006); Now, it will be examined in the context of teacher education course syllabi because, like Smagorinsky and Whiting's (1995) influential English education methods course syllabus study,

much can be learned about how YAL has developed in the field since the Pope and Kaywell (2001) NCTE study where dreams of how YAL could be taught were discussed. Pope and Kaywell's research showed how English teacher educators dreamed about how YAL might be used with preservice English teachers, and, by studying current methods, best practices can be examined and teacher educators can dream all over again about what the future of YAL might look like in secondary English education.

By analyzing these syllabi for inherent educational discourses, a foundational understanding of the methods employed by English teacher educators in using YAL has been found, and an argument can now be made for what the field is focused on. The reason for conducting this study of these educational documents is because the YAL syllabus is an educational text that represents the discourses of public education, standardization, and the goals of individual programs and teacher educators in addressing the needs of teacher candidates working in secondary schools as English teachers (Riley & Crawford-Garrett, 2015). The many major components of course syllabi like course descriptions or purposes, objectives or goals sections, and also required reading or book lists that include YAL were analyzed to show how teacher education programs propose the use of YAL in secondary schools, as well as how they address the gaps (Petrone & Lewis, 2012) that teacher candidates may experience between their dual roles of students and teachers.

Historical Context of the Methods Course in English Education.

There is much research examining methods courses and methods research in secondary English education (see Smagorinsky & Whiting, 1995, and Pasternak, Caughlan, Hallman, Renzi, & Rush, 2014), but none specifically looking at how YAL is taught across teacher education contexts in the United States. Before moving on, the historical context of the methods

course within English teacher education must be examined. As the syllabi examined in this study were drawn from *The ALAN Review*, which is the special interest group on adolescent literature of the National Council of Teachers of English (*NCTE*), the history of *NCTE*'s view of the methods course over the past decades is important to situate the present study.

Smagorinsky and Whiting (1995) set the foundation for the study of course syllabi to understand methods in English education. In this study, the researchers gathered course syllabi from various institutions across the country to be able to create a portrait of the field of English education methods. They did this so that a state of the field could be understood, which would be both a resource to teachers needing ideas on what others were doing, and would also allow a conversation to start about where teacher educators would like to develop the field in the future based off of the foundation of the data in the study.

In 1996, *NCTE* co-published a position paper with the Support for the Learning and Teaching of English (*SLATE*) committee titled *Resolution on Teachers' Right to Teach* where the organization addressed a teacher's right to intellectual freedom. In this position statement, *NCTE* felt the need to affirm teachers' ability to "teach using methods which are accepted by the profession but which may not have local acceptance." They followed up this position statement two years later, in 1998, because they felt that English teacher methods were under attack. This position paper was titled *Defining and Defending Instructional Methods* where *NCTE* gave tips for how to defend the use of English methods to various stakeholders. They also argued for reading methods to be a part of English classes because:

> Reading is a fundamental part of English language arts instruction and has personal, practical, and social value. Students reading short stories, poetry, plays, and novels and

writing stories and poems of their own are building towards important lifelong literacy

habits and developing an ability to use and understand language and create meaning.

Both of these position statements, among others, by following the Smagorinsky and Whiting

(1995) study, laid the foundation for *NCTE* as an organization to develop an understanding of

what it meant to have methods courses in English teacher education.

At the same time, near the turn of the 21ˢᵗ century, *NCTE* created the Commission on the

Study of and Teaching of Young Adult Literature of the Conference on English Education (*CEE*)

to examine how the young adult literature methods course might be envisioned as separate from

what had been thought of as just English methods before then (Pope & Kaywell, 2001).

Commission members sought to define young adult literature as a genre, and then set forth to

begin to theorize how YAL might best be studied and taught. They did this by submitting course

syllabi for how they would individually teach YAL, and then the commission compared broad

focuses to be able to begin to conceptualize a separate method for YAL in English education.

In 2005, NCTE developed another position statement directly addressing the methods

course in English Education with *CEE*. It was titled "What do we know and believe about the

roles of methods courses and field experiences in English education?" Here they listed a series of

beliefs about what the ideal English education program looked like and how the roles of methods

courses and field experiences developed that idea. To situate readers' understanding of how

methods fit into teacher education programs. They wrote:

> English education programs provide a set of related professional orientation experiences
>
> including coursework, fieldwork (broadly defined), and other aspects of teacher
>
> preparation that enable extended, interrelated conversations across the multiple settings
>
> and constituencies involved in teaching and learning. English education programs foster a

sense of authority, a spirit of inquiry, and a belief in the possibility of change among

prospective and inservice teachers as well as English educators.

Such broad-reaching goals were meant to show programs of all sizes and designations that

shared purposes allowed the field to continue to develop as a profession, and gave teachers the

rationale behind decisions that were made in teacher education programs.

With this development of the methods course in the 1990s and 2000s, little consensus

was still felt in educational research in preservice English teacher education. Pasternak,

Caughlin, Hallman, Renzi, and Rush (2014) followed up on the research conducted by

Smagorinsky and Whiting (1995) by examining English education methods specifically in

research publications. They argued that one of the issues facing English educators in the 2010s

was that the findings of the abovementioned studies and position statements still held sway even

as 21st century issues in education have evolved the field and a focus on standardized instruction

through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and subsequently No Child Left

Behind (NCLB) changed the needs of the methods course in teacher education programs (p. 8).

To complicate matters further, Pasternak, Caughlin, Hallman, Renzi, and Rush (2014)

also argued that these early studies and publications about English education methods did not

consider program accreditation needs that have come about since Smagorinsky and Whiting's

(1995) study. New pressures of state and national standards caused a change in education as

"Districts varied in the extent to which they standardized instruction in their buildings, and

textbook companies marketed packages guaranteed to help teachers and students 'meet' state

standards" (p. 9). It was during this time that reading methods were integrated into secondary

English education and were not solely the responsibility of reading teachers of younger students

(p. 9). Finally, they argued that the economic downturn in 2008 also stretched the needs of

teacher education programs as new English teachers needed to be taught how to deal with financial constraints as they became teachers and also how to work with increasingly diverse student populations (p. 11). This study of English education methods in research was a timely update to the studies conducted in the 1990s as well as the position statements that organizations like *NCTE* put forward at the same time.

Research Question.

An examination of the literature has shown a great deal about what is being done with YAL in educational research, but there is not a consensus on using or creating a pedagogy of YAL specifically with preservice teachers in secondary English education or creating a methods class for how to use YAL with secondary students. This lack of consensus on how YAL should be used with preservice English teacher candidates was pursued in this study through the following research question:

1. What are the specific objectives and goals of YAL courses in secondary English teacher education programs included on course syllabi, and what social and ideological discourses are present that influence these goals?

By looking at how objectives and goals are organized within YAL methods course syllabi in English teacher education, an understanding of what English teacher educators are doing now can be built, any gaps in these objectives and goals can be examined, and this will then allow an argument for what the broad focuses of YAL courses are and how preservice teachers are coming into contact with YAL in their training.

Theoretical Framework

The work of literary theorist Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin (1895-1975) provided the foundation for the theoretical and conceptual framework for the data analysis in this study. His

sociocultural theories of language provide the basis for the understanding of education and literary texts used in this study. His concepts of heteroglossia (different and competing voices within discourse) (Bakhtin, 1981a, p. 300), the tension between the centripetal (centralizing) (p. 270) and centrifugal (individualizing or decentralizing) (p. 272) nature of heteroglossia within authoritative (established, unchangeable) (p. 342) and internally persuasive (personal, individual) (p. 345) discourses, dialogism (living and evolving dialogue including multiple voices and perspectives) (p 346), and double-voicedness (the ability of language to serve and reflect two ideological discourses at the same time) (p. 324) have continued to be foundational to the understanding of classroom spaces as well as voices and discourses within texts (Bakhtin, 1981c).

At the surface level, Bakhtin was a literary theorist; his works, theories, and concepts were explained in the context of literary analysis of epic poetry and novels. However, his work directly applies to those working in English education as English educators are often working with students in the analysis of texts much like Bakhtin was analyzing. The value of his concepts to education comes more from their roots in sociocultural understandings of language and culture. Whether we are looking at how heteroglossia interacts in the context of a class discussion (Caughlan, Juzwik, Borsheim-Black, Kelly, & Fine, 2013), the narratives of teachers (Fecho, Collier, Friese, & Wilson, 2010), or in the literary analysis of dialogue between characters in a young adult novel (Strickland, 2019), the cultural and historical influences of multiple, competing voices can be examined and meaning can be made of every utterance within dialogue.

Heteroglossia.

Bakhtin's theory of dialogue and language provides an entry into understanding the heteroglossia of discourse in educational settings. Bakhtin looked at language and discourse at the level of the individual utterance (Bakhtin, 1981c, p. 263), or a complete speech act (p. 264). The utterance in the context of this article is conceptualized as individual goals or objectives on YAL course syllabi that serve to explain to students what the expectations of the course are from both their instructor and the university or teacher education program at large.

Bakhtin believed that each utterance is made with the anticipation of a response from another person in a particular time and place; this means that words, while not changing in definition, mean something new each time they are uttered in new contexts, at different times, with different speakers (Coulter, 1999, p. 6). In the novel or in the classroom where heteroglossia is present, dialogue is a living being that is constantly evolving as new utterances are introduced and interact (Bakhtin, 1981a, p. 3). Also, texts like literature provide a heteroglossic context that reflects many social ideologies and can be a site where those ideologies can be analyzed (Medvedev, 1978, pp. 16-17). The same can be said for classroom syllabi as reflections of the social ideologies that are present in teacher education. The double-voiced nature of the course syllabus allows for the language of a course instructor to reflect not only their own internally persuasive views on course methods, which are themselves heteroglossic, but simultaneously reflect the social and ideological discourses of the university, the state it is in, and both national discourses on education and the influence of national educational organizations.

Authoritative and Internally Persuasive Discourses.

Bakhtin argued that there are two categories of ideological discourses at play within a heteroglossic context. The first are authoritative discourses where the established word of

tradition is shared with already accepted authority infused within it (Bakhtin, 1981a, p. 342). The authoritative word seeks to control meanings and understanding. In opposition to this authoritative, monological word, are internally persuasive discourses that represent the personal, historical, and social understanding of an individual (p. 345). The individual seeks to create their own meaning in discourse even as authoritative discourses seek to control it.

The Centripetal and Centrifugal Nature of Language.

Language operates as a tool of both authoritative and internally persuasive discourses. The back and forth nature of utterances in dialogue create a tension between authoritative and internally persuasive discourses. Bakhtin (1981a) explained that "Every concrete utterance of a speaking subject serves as a point where centrifugal as well as centripetal forces are brought to bear" (p. 272). This creates a site of tension where the centripetal (centralizing) forces of language seek to control meaning even as the centrifugal (personal) forces of language seek individualization.

Dialogism.

Bakhtin conceptualized dialogism as the back and forth nature of utterances within the living, evolving nature of heteroglossia (p. 276). Bakhtin's concept of dialogism, when applied to education, focuses on examining spaces or texts for the inclusion of diverse voices while also honoring all voices in a given context (Coulter, 1999, p. 9). This is in opposition to the problem in school settings where discourse is monologic, where one voice is valued, and others silenced (Caughlan, Juzwik, Borsheim-Black, Kelly, & Fine, 2013, p. 214). Bakhtin posited that meaning is in a constant state of development where it is unfinalized (Bakhtin, 1981a, p.49), and in a heteroglossic context, language is always unfinished and, as voices compete to be heard, the context continually shifts and changes as new utterances and responses are introduced (Coulter,

1999, p. 7). These competing voices can be analyzed for research using many different genres (Lin, 2014, p. 62) like course syllabi.

Dialogized language involves much more than one voice or perspective. For the educational researcher planning on using Bakhtin's work, it must be noted that "When we speak or write, we simultaneously enact the voices of others, inevitably taking into account what they might have responded to what we have uttered, in an attempt to anticipate future responses by incorporating them into our speech" (Lin, 2014, p.63). The individual speaker, therefore, is constantly anticipating the potential responses to an utterance, and this evolves the utterance before it is even spoken aloud.

When dialogue is examined for research, then, the researcher is able to analyze each utterance with the explicit meaning in mind, but also analyze the response or potential response to the utterance in the dialogue as well. Analysis of dialogue in educational settings or in texts like course syllabi can involve a search for the worldviews and perspectives inherent beyond a literal meaning and represented in the discourses present in them (Bakhtin, 1981b, p. 46). It is through analysis of the double-voiced language in course materials that the many competing discourses of education can be examined.

Double-voiced Discourse.

The final concept of Bakhtin's that is important for the present article is the concept of double-voiced discourse. When looking at an utterance, Bakhtin (1981a) explained that when one can see two or more meanings behind the utterance then it is double-voiced. He explained that "In such discourse there are two voices, two meanings, and two expressions" (p. 324). In the context of this study, and subsequently this article, individual utterances like objectives and goals within a syllabus can be examined for this double-voiced nature. It is seen through a goal that

states one purpose, but has a hidden purpose within it. Critical analysis of such utterances can tell us when authoritative discourses are seeking to control the internally persuasive and vice versa.

Bakhtin's Concepts and the YAL Course Syllabus.

Bakhtin's theories are especially valid for studying the YAL course syllabus because of how the syllabus is integral to the educational experience while also serving to represent the ideological influences of teacher educators, programs, universities, and national education associations. To the teacher educator, the creation of the syllabus reflects the needs of both the program and the university in the course offering, but also the individual purposes and worldviews that that instructor finds persuasive and important. The analysis of these syllabi was chosen because "[t]he syllabus is one of the few tools available for documenting the scholarship required for integrating isolated learning activities into a coherent meaningful whole" (Albers, 2003, p. 63). Thus, the "coherent whole" that the syllabus represents is a more complete picture of what is being done in a course, and analysis can then show what ideological influences are present while describing the specifics of what information is included or is left off.

Method

To understand how secondary English teacher educators were conceptualizing young adult literature within the larger field of English education in the United States, data was sought through course syllabi and related materials from the researchers and teacher educators that were leading the discourse on the national stage. To that end, participants were sought with *The ALAN Review* (The Assembly on Literature for Adolescents of the National Council of Teachers of English), the organization that devotes their research and practice to the study of literature for adolescents.

Participants.

In 2017 and 2018 (Volume 44, issues 2 & 3, Volume 45, issues 1, 2, & 3, and Volume 46, issue 1), 114 individual researchers and teachers published in *The ALAN Review*. Issues from the last two years were used to try to find researchers and teacher educators who were most likely actively teaching using young adult literature now. These publications spanned a range of topics from editorials, empirical research studies, YA author interviews, and book reviews. Of the 114 individuals published in this two-year span, 48 individuals self-identified as teacher educators working with young adult or adolescent literature. Of the 48 teacher educators, 44 were contacted (4 were removed as they were not actively teaching or their co-teacher would submit materials) requesting materials for the young adult literature classes or methods classes that included young adult literature as a major focus.

The materials requested included course syllabi and their inherent course calendars, major assessments (prompts, descriptions, rubrics), required or optional reading lists, and anything else that the teacher educators felt best represented the work that students would be doing in these classes. For the purpose of this article, specific goals and objectives sections of the course syllabi were drawn out and examined in more depth to create an understanding of purpose for these courses.

Of the 44 teacher educators contacted, 17 submitted materials for 20 individual courses that focused on young adult literature in whole or in part. As materials were collected, initial readings of these 20 course syllabi allowed me to categorize the classes into three main groupings. These categories included 13 courses that focused entirely on young adult or adolescent literature, 4 teaching reading and reading methods courses that have young adult

literature as a major focus, and, finally, 3 broad literacy across the curriculum classes of which young adult literature was a part.

Data Collection.

Data was solicited for analysis in the following ways: instructors were initially contacted via email to find out if any would be interested in participating and submitting materials with a short description of the study including what materials the researcher was hoping to receive as data. Those that expressed interest were then started on the consent process also via email. The IRB approval and consent form were sent to the participants to sign and return. Most participants submitted their course materials along with their signed consent form.

Data Analysis.

As the researcher received course materials from participants, syllabi and related materials were printed, and then blinded to ensure that both the participant and the university that they work for were not identifiable in the data. The first reading of the course syllabi was then conducted to begin to categorize the syllabi by the main focus of the course stated above. After the blinded syllabi were categorized by course focus, a second reading of the syllabi was conducted to begin to unpack the more specific aspects of what these courses were about and what methods were employed for teaching YAL.

Initial codes were created based on researcher expectations from a review of literature on Bakhtin in education and the development of the theory of literary analysis using Bakhtin's concepts. These initial codes were formed as differing and sometimes competing discourses were encountered in the data. These initial codes were "discourses on defining YA, adolescence, or the genre," "discourses of diversity, representation, and social justice," "national and global discourses," and "authoritative" and "internally persuasive" discourses. The second reading of

the course syllabi yielded much in these broad codes, and allowed the researcher to begin to analyze more deeply what the purposes of these courses were.

In the third reading of the course syllabi, course objectives and goals were separated from the larger documents in order to understand the direct purposes of young adult literature courses in secondary English education. These course objectives and goals under further analysis, where codes were compared constantly against previous occurrences in the data, provide an in-depth look at the theoretical purposes of these courses, and provide answers to the research question listed above.

The corresponding data drawn from these 20 course syllabi provide the basis for this research article. Much like Smagorinsky and Whiting (1995) explain in their influential English education methods course syllabus study, a purpose in studying syllabi is to be able to describe how things are being done so that a discussion can be had about current methods that can then be researched and discussed further in the future (p. 4). The findings of this study will allow researchers and practitioners in secondary English education to understand what is being done in the field of YAL now and use that knowledge as a foundation for building a pedagogy of young adult literature in the future.

Limitations

While Smagorinsky and Whiting (1995) opened the door for course syllabi to be examined to understand current and future methodology in secondary English teacher education, and Pasternak, Caughlan, Hallman, Renzi, and Rush (2014) built upon that foundation by studying methods in educational research to further expand upon how English teachers are prepared and trained in the 21st century, this study does not fully examine the actual classrooms of the submitted course syllabi to see how these goals and objectives are actually implemented,

how student growth and progress are evaluated, and if students are on board or resistant to these ideas. While a snapshot of the courses was studied in this research, more evidence can later be sought and added in future research to paint a fuller picture of YAL in English teacher education.

The course syllabus is an inherently flawed document. Teacher educators are required to create these documents, and all are influenced by authoritative discourses of the greater colleges and universities in which they are taught. To that end, it must be remembered that syllabi are political documents sometimes reflecting the individual voice of the teacher educator, and other times reflecting a monological viewpoint of authoritative powers on the students in one particular semester. Sometimes courses are taught with departmental or inherited syllabi that individual instructors have no real say in, and at other times instructors may provide a politically correct syllabus for public record while sharing an individual, personal syllabus with actual students in class.

All of these limitations must be considered when discussing the findings of this study. While 17 published teacher educators in YAL and 20 course syllabi are no small number, the courses and teacher educators cannot represent all of the work being done with YAL and secondary English teacher education. This study provides data to make the claims below, with the caveat that that this is only a part of what YAL in teacher education is and can be.

Future research built upon this study can and should examine how these course syllabi match what is actually being done in the classroom, and would provide a fuller picture if the voices of the participants, the teacher educators who submitted these syllabi, were able to provide commentary on the instructional choices they made as well as provide anecdotal evidence as to their students' acceptance or denial of the stated objectives and goals.

Findings

Of the 20 course syllabi examined in this study provided by 17 YAL teacher educators, there were 111 separate objectives and goals (see appendix A) included to help teacher candidates understand what the purposes of courses using and focusing on young adult literature were about. To many students, these courses will be their first interaction with young adult literature as a field of study and not only as a literary genre, and teacher educators crafted their course syllabi to develop high expectations early in these documents through their objectives and goals.

Subsequent readings of the course syllabi further developed thematic codes off of the original codes used to categorize syllabi and organize the data. Four main codes were found while analyzing the course objectives and goals, and they are: "discourses about traditional English Education methods," "discourses of critical education/social justice/diversity," "discourses on defining YAL and/or adolescence(ts)," and "discourses on reflection/reflective practice" using YAL. As each syllabus, and subsequently each goals and objectives section, was analyzed for sites of tension in the heteroglossia of the text, both authoritative and internally persuasive discourses were found competing to be heard, and individual utterances (an objective or goal) at times served both types of discourses. Bakhtin's concepts created a lens through which this competition could be seen, and also provided a way to see how language used on the syllabus represented both centripetal and centrifugal forces of language seeking control.

Traditional English Education Methods.

While researchers are beginning to define what a pedagogy of YAL might look like (See Buehler, 2016), this study showed that the traditional strategies of teaching English are a vital part of using YAL with teacher candidates. Traditional English education strategies for teaching

literature can be "characterized by whole-class assigned readings and teacher-directed instruction" (Ivey & Johnston, 2013, p. 257), and teaching preservice teachers how to incorporate reading and writing strategies into their instruction. This focus on traditional English education strategies is not surprising as YAL courses are more often included in teacher education programs within colleges and schools of education (15 of 20 syllabi) as opposed to English departments (5 out of 20 syllabi) in this study, but this also shows that YAL has become an ingrained method for teaching traditional strategies even as adjacent methods are created to better teach YAL in secondary teacher education. Those educators still harboring a deficit perspective on YAL might be surprised to see that much of the focus of these courses are on traditional English education strategies that they would expect in a reading methods course.

English/Language arts curriculum jargon and discourse were represented throughout the objectives and goals from these 20 course syllabi. One teacher educator highlighted that the question of "What are the purposes of the English curriculum in the areas of literature, language, writing, speaking, and thinking?" was a major focus of their course. These courses reflected the discourse of the need to have students experience and then be able to plan with a number of reading strategies in mind when preparing to work with secondary readers. These traditionally focused courses most often were geared towards teaching instructional strategies, theoretical and developmental foundations of teaching, and creating positive learning environments for secondary students. First, a focus on instructional strategies will be examined.

Instructional strategies.

The largest focus of these courses (50 out of 111 total objectives/goals) found were on teaching traditional English teacher methods, and in particular teaching teacher candidates reading and writing strategies that they could use with young adult literature in secondary

classrooms placements. The five language arts (reading, writing, listening, speaking, and viewing) were often in focus when looking at these objectives and goals as is shown through the focus on planning strategies for using young adult literature, and how instructional activities can help meet the diverse needs of secondary students. These objectives and goals show that these courses are centered on the reading of young adult literature, but that it is rare that classes are formatted like a traditional literature course in an English department where literary analysis of reading is the valued goal. They are more often focused on how the reading of YAL can be expertly paired with reading and writing strategies to allow teacher candidates to build classrooms that focus on the needs of secondary readers. This shows a competition in the heteroglossia of these sections where learning pedagogy for English courses seeks to be a louder voice than the English department training that students receive in English content classes prior to certification.

A number of objectives and goals for these young adult literature courses focused on how "Students will be able to discuss strategies for implementing reading and writing activities within the context of young adult literature" using research-based practices. There are many that speak to the need for teacher candidates "To begin the practice of designing curriculum conceptually integrating Common Core Standards, differentiation, and text diversity." This is one example of objectives or goals directly reflecting the social and authoritative discourse of standardization. Another calls on teacher candidates to "Identify and explain the National Council of Teachers of English Standards for the English/Language Arts and the [State] Academic Standards for English language arts for grades 5-9" reflecting the authoritative influence of national and state bodies on curriculum for young adults. The authoritative discourses of education are present in such goals

where the implication is that preservice teachers must learn how to operate within the hierarchical context of public education.

Intrinsically, the courses reflected in these 20 syllabi made much room for the foundational need in the curriculum of teacher education to teach new teachers how to plan and instruct students while using young adult literature. Goals like "We will uncover practical elements of lesson plans and unit creation, and you will be challenged to consider the theoretical aspects of the teaching of reading and literature," students will "Develop a rationale for including the study of young adult literature as part of the school curriculum," "Implement and analyze a variety of developmentally appropriate tools for assessment for learning (formative) and assessment of learning (summative) appropriate for middle level English / language arts" and "Explain and demonstrate effective writing instructional practices (including ethical response to student writing) related to varied text types and purposes (e.g., argumentative, informational, and narrative), production and distribution of writing, and research to build and present knowledge" speak to the basics of teaching pedagogy to those that are new to it. This shows that planning, rationalizing instructional choices, assessment, and writing are all parts of a curriculum and pedagogy of young adult literature and serve authoritative discourses on the "right" way for preservice teachers to be trained.

What is important to notice, however, is how these goals above are double-voiced in that they serve both the authoritative demands of teacher education while simultaneously reflecting the authoritative needs of the instructor. More importantly, to take it a step further, such goals are also reflective of the internally persuasive discourses of students to "challenge" and "rationalize" these established practices. These YAL courses are also indicative of the larger discourse in the study of YAL in teacher education to prepare students to be able to defend their use of YAL with

their students to meet their individual needs. This internally persuasive discourse is shown through goals such as "How can we best construct activities, assignments, assessments, and units to ensure that we are meeting our objectives and the differentiated needs of our students given their diverse identities, lives, interests, and needs?" This example shows how the interests and needs of secondary students are also a part of the heteroglossia of these course syllabi and serve to help preservice teachers centrifugally resist authoritative structures.

Theoretical and developmental foundations.

Another focus of the objectives and goals of these 20 courses was to develop an understanding of the theoretical and conceptual foundations of teaching secondary students reading with both canonical literature and with young adult literature. While goals like students will "Understand and describe theoretical foundations as related to the development, processes and components of reading instruction," "Use theories and research to design and implement an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced reading program," and "Generate theoretically based rationales for including young adult literature texts in secondary curriculum" could be seen as vague to students just starting a course, but the understanding conveyed is that there is much more to teaching reading using young adult literature than just reading fun books. While the internally persuasive goals of students developing themselves as independent readers of YAL is present, goals in this section were more often listed as dry curricula infused with authoritative standards.

In contrast, teacher educators in these courses centrifugally pushed their students from the outset to think more deeply about what it means to be readers or to teach reading. This is highlighted in goals where instructors start with a "hope that we can probe issues of literacy, seek understanding in the act of reading, and talk about the ways in which texts work in the

classroom all with our students' learning at the center." They also push teacher candidates to go beyond the surface level of books to "address theory and practice of literature study in secondary schools, and appraisal of multicultural Young Adult literature appropriate to the needs, interests, and abilities of adolescents." They also push students to "Present text-based interpretations and arguments in small group and whole-class discussions" and become producers of content revolving around young adult literature where their internally persuasive discourses are given more space. These objectives and goals focusing on foundational English/Language arts methods situate YAL as a companion to traditional methods in English education not as a radical coup. Preservice teachers in these classes are expected to engage with theoretical understandings on what it means to teach reading while also pursuing their own interests within class as independent readers.

Learning environment.

Finally, objectives and goals focusing on instruction asked teacher candidates to consider how the learning environment of a reading classroom can have huge implications for student success. These goals focused on growth for secondary and teacher education students where teacher candidates learn to "Develop a learning environment that is conducive to the development of literacy and optimizes students' opportunities for development." These courses also ask students to go beyond the four walls of their classrooms while "Fostering a Collaborative Culture to Support Educator Development and Student Learning." Finally, they ask big questions like "What do we hope to achieve with our students in their academic, social, and personal development as a result of their experiences in the English Classroom?" Reflection on their internally persuasive discourses while in these classes is a key part of creating learning

environments using young adult literature as they give both student and teacher an avenue for grappling with issues and themes that are personally relevant to them.

21st Century Classrooms

The courses also often call on 21st century technologies to be used alongside learning with young adult literature to enhance the learning environments of English classes in the secondary classroom. These educational discourses strive to influence students by having them argue that students can "Use technology tools appropriately for discussing, exploring, and representing young adult literature" and this "Identifies and explains how student learning can be enhanced through collaboration with other teachers, professionals and parents." Technology, to these instructors allows teacher candidates to value collaboration and this "Communicates professional information, knowledge and resources for effective English language arts instruction with peers" and even takes it a step further by having students "Communicate effectively with [their] classmates and a global twitter audience." The development of global learning environments through YAL creates an understanding for preservice teachers that reading can connect to authentic and real-world contexts, and not just the authoritative discourses of historical and political contexts of the literary canon.

Lastly, young adult literature allows teacher candidates in these classes to understand how literacy is so much more than an individual reader's experience with a book, but that community literacy programs can be an extension of the English/Language Arts classroom. One goal states that students will "Produce a community based literacy plan that incorporates student and community needs and interests, while implementing content based literacy strategies." The key focus here is on students' centrifugal interest in literacy and the community, which implies that teacher candidates have the opportunity to come alongside the needs and interests of their

students to impact their local communities as partners and not as saviors coming to fix the community.

Critical Education, Social justice, and Diversity.

Beyond traditional English teacher methods, a large focus (22 out of 111 objectives/goals) for the use of YAL with preservice teachers reflects the social discourses of how using this genre to teach students to be critical interpreters of the world around them, how to build and be a part of social justice in educational spaces, and how to prepare preservice teachers to teach diverse students in diverse contexts can be accomplished. While these three sub focuses of the goals and objectives of these 20 course syllabi are rooted in the foundational need to prepare teachers for working in diverse classrooms, each have their own varying needs addressed in the syllabi to allow students to note how much potential there is so that they can be prepared to work in a diverse field. First, I will examine objectives and goals that establish a need for critical education.

Critical education.

Teacher educators highlighted in this study showed through the heteroglossia of their course syllabi that they place a large emphasis on preparing teacher candidates to critically evaluate a wide assortment of texts in order to prepare them to incorporate diverse materials into their instruction. Many of these course syllabi start with the premise that students must "Explore the ways in which adolescents' literature can be highly political in nature." Using YAL in the secondary classroom is not always an easy sell, and teacher educators show the value in teaching preservice teachers that they will need to be prepared to rationalize the use of these oftentimes political texts against authoritative structures in public education in order to meet the individual

needs and interests of their secondary students. This is most often handled through discussions on text selection where:

> Class participants will scrutinize the criteria used in book selection for adolescents to reflect diversity in backgrounds, learning styles, and curriculum demands. Additionally, participants will develop techniques for promoting critical reading and informed interpretation of print, non-print and multi-modal texts, and how to choose texts to meet the needs of diverse groups of students.

Critical examination of young adult texts, much like would be expected in traditional literary analysis English classes, teach these preservice teachers how to use individual lenses to analyze representation in YAL texts. When there are course goals such as "Students will read young adult literature critically to evaluate how constructs such as gender, class, race, and sexual orientation are taken up and represented in individual texts[,]" then teacher candidates are given the opportunity to use their backgrounds in English literary methods to make pedagogical decisions expressed through planning and instruction. The double-voiced nature of these goals to serve both the authoritative discourses of the tradition of accepted English methods and the internally persuasive goal of having students be critical consumers of texts to come to their own understandings about them allow for an interesting site of tension within these syllabi.

Much like in the previous section, teaching preservice teachers to be critical evaluators of texts before they are put into the hands of secondary students allows these preservice teachers to be cultivators and curators of knowledge rather than simply authoritative owners of it. Conceptually, this allows students to "Implement techniques for differentiating instruction that address student needs, interests, and learning styles, as well as academic, linguistic, and cultural diversity, through the selection of materials, lesson plans, grouping styles (heterogeneous and

homogeneous), and instructional approaches[,]" and this parallels the focus of traditional English teacher methods separate from the study of YAL. These parallels between traditional methods and methods for a pedagogy of YAL prove a shift towards an understanding that there is a place for YAL in the future of English teacher methods, and these goals allow for the internally persuasive discourses of students' reading needs and interests to be given more space within the heteroglossia of the texts.

Social justice.

While preservice teachers in these courses do not have their preparation to use YAL divorced from traditional methods, the majority of these YAL courses adopt a perspective that students can to learn how to use YAL to affect social change. When students "apply critical literary theory to print and non-print texts, develop interpretations of literature using these critical lenses, and explore ways to use these texts and approaches in effective instruction[,]" then they are afforded a chance to be a part of the larger social discourses of change in education. YAL, with such a focus, can provide much needed perspective and identity exposure to preservice teachers, and this could allow them to be better prepared to work in diverse schools with diverse student populations.

This charge to be a part of social change is most often noted through objectives where students join the national heteroglossia of discourse on social justice in education as active participants. In order to meet goals like the ability to "Demonstrate a social justice orientation toward teaching and young adult literature, including consideration of how race, class, gender, and sexual orientation relate to the school and classroom context[,]" students engage with YA authors, publishers, educators, and students in communities all over the country to learn how to be a part of the conversation. Some courses explicitly state how students will do this like when

"Students will also be required to follow a YA blog and use the conversations in that blog as a lens for understanding young adult literature, the needs of adolescents and issues of equity and social justice." Goals like these are practical, and have easy application in secondary spaces. Others engage by having students "Explore the current trends and relationships between young adult literature and media and marketing and use that knowledge to become critical consumers of media texts." This effectively relates teaching preservice teachers with how to be critical consumers of text, which, in turn, will give them the experience to teach their own middle and high school students to be able to do the same. By engaging in the heteroglossia of YAL in education beyond these courses, preservice teachers are given the opportunity to learn how to raise up the marginalized voice in their own school contexts and value the internally persuasive discourses of their own students.

Ultimately, many of these courses hope students will become active members of a critical community instead of just passive consumers of story. These teacher educators want their students "To do inquiry into the social, political, and economic environment of schools and their surrounding community and consider the impact on students' lives" so that they can come alongside the great work already being done in their school communities and become partners in building a better world. While that sounds dramatic and a little bit idealistic, the large number of these included goals focusing on areas of social justice speak to the potential ability of YAL to be a vehicle for social change and a starting point for action.

Diversity and equity.

Essentially, teacher educators working with YAL with preservice teachers cannot have their students engage in various ideological and social discourses of education as critical educators to enact social change without first having discussion on the foundational ideas of

diversity and equity. This is best explained through one goal where the course "Promotes instructional strategies that address issues of diversity and equity in the classroom and ensures that individual student learning needs remain the central focus of instruction." If teacher education programs are training traditional teacher candidates (white, middle class, female) (Sulzer & Thein, 2016, p. 168) to be able to enact change in their communities, then they must first "explore instructional, philosophical, and student diversity in the middle and secondary English classroom" with students. To critically study classrooms and communities, preservice teachers have to examine where authoritative discourses on students are in power, and also how their internally persuasive discourses are at tension with them.

Bakhtin's concept of heteroglossia is particularly valuable when speaking of goals such as when a course "Strives to create an inclusive culture where diverse perspectives are welcomed in addressing challenges." First, goals like this promote inclusiveness which values the voice of the student, and teaches preservice teachers how to give up some of their voice in order to hear from students. Second, this allows for a flattening of the hierarchy (Fecho, Collier, Friese, & Wilson, 2010, p. 432) within teacher education programs that shows that the preservice teacher is a colleague who works towards goals with classmates and their professors, and, in turn, this allows preservice teachers to learn that secondary students also want to be heard and feel like their experiences and perspectives are valued.

When foundations for inclusiveness are created through objectives and goals like these, preservice teachers learn how to plan and instruct students with that foundation always in mind. Similarly, where diversity goals are "the central focus of instruction[,]" preservice teachers have the opportunity to use YAL to better understand diversity in their own lives. If individual student needs are the main focus of such goals, then preservice teachers learn to promote

diversity and equity even within standardized spaces where curriculum is controlled by authoritative powers.

Finally, objectives and goals that promote diversity and equity in education allow students to be a greater part of their school communities. This is highlighted through goals where students use "knowledge and understanding of the different backgrounds, ethnicities, cultures, and languages in the school community to promote effective interactions among colleagues, families, and the larger community." This teaches preservice teachers that when one "Collaborates with families, communities, and colleagues to develop comprehensive strategies to address the diverse educational needs of families and the community," major change can occur. Collaboration with communities is apparent in these course syllabi as is the knowledge that partnership is key in promoting equity.

Defining YAL and/or Adolescence(ts).

While I fully expected to come across much on the defining and conceptualizing of YAL based on my review of the literature, especially in comparison and contrast to the traditional literary canon, only 11 out of 111 objectives and goals directly addressed defining or conceptualizing young adult literature or the adolescent reader, and most of these objectives, when comparing them to the corresponding course calendars and pacing guides, were only addressed by courses in the first day or week of coursework. Perhaps these social discourses are not so loud because these teacher educators feel that YAL as a field of study is now a permanent fixture in popular culture or in English teacher education, or perhaps YAL is covered in foundational education classes on which these courses are later built, and could be examined in follow up research. However, the study of the adolescent reader and its specific needs is reflected as a focus of this work as found in the heteroglossia of these syllabi.

Defining YAL.

As stated above, the heteroglossia of these course syllabi did make room for a defining of the genre of YAL especially in the first week(s) of class. Such goals ask students to "Evaluate the purpose of literature that is written explicitly for adolescents and the value of using this literature for classroom instruction" in order to "Gain an understanding of the natures of reading, writing, and related language skills, and the processes involved in adolescent literacy development." Such goals are familiar in traditional English education pedagogies here just applied to the study of YAL instead of the broader field of traditional literature. However, the need to have preservice teachers engage in an analysis of what YAL is and who it is for remains a consistent discourse in YAL in teacher education.

Some course syllabi in this study allude to a need for preservice teachers to understand the greater authoritative discourses of publishing and marketing strategies associated with the genre of YAL. One teacher educator provides a goal for understanding the genre where "Students will investigate the peritext of young adult literature and explain what it suggests about how publishers conceptualize the audience for these books." Such goals ask teacher candidates to question "the cultural values underlying the marketing of literature for children and young adults" in order to examine what "assumptions about what young adult literature should be or do." By having students address assumptions in the discourses surrounding YAL from a societal standpoint, teacher educators can then have students prepare to use YAL with individual readers. Looking beyond the texts to see how the community surrounding a YA text talks about YAL is an important addition to note in these courses.

Adolescence(ts).

A number of course objectives and goals addressed the social discourses of the individual adolescent reader and the specific needs that they have. More importantly, by having students engage with adolescence as a socially constructed concept, teacher educators in this study have preservice teachers "Examine research and theories of adolescence through a range of scholarly sources and (re)consider our own assumptions." By having students engage with authoritative discourses through research, teacher educators are showing preservice teachers where these powers seek to centripetally control understandings of the concept, and how to centrifugally resist subsequent assumptions about adolescence(ts). They do this so that students are able to come to YAL in these courses not only as readers themselves, but also as teachers who are preparing to work with secondary students with individual needs and concerns that must be addressed before handing them books. Thus, students experience YAL in these courses as readers while also potentially struggling with the heteroglossia surrounding adolescents and YAL.

By preparing preservice teachers to work with adolescent readers and not just with YAL as a genre, teacher educators are providing their students with a broader foundation upon which to build their understanding of English methods. They do this by having students "Examine and articulate historical and popular conceptions of adolescents as well as how they are positioned in society and in texts" in order to understand how they personally view their secondary students as people, and this also allows preservice teachers to centrifugally leave behind deficit discourses about adolescence(ts) they have socially ingrained in them.

These goals that focus on deconstructing false stereotypes about adolescence(ts) infuse such discussions within greater focuses of the courses. When preservice teachers know that they

"will define the concept of adolescence, discuss characteristics of young adult literature and literary criticism, and use that criticism to analyze texts for adolescents[,]" then they can "Recognize and support the unique needs and skills of the adolescent reader." Such goals meet the needs to the traditional reading methods coursework and prepare students to work with standardized curriculum under pressure from authoritative discourses in education all while engaging as individual readers of YAL.

Reflection/Reflective Practice.

Infused within all of the above thematic focuses of these 20 course syllabi was the hope that preservice teachers would be active and reflective teachers who read stories that are internally persuasive to them, and that this foundation of personal reading will serve them as secondary English educators. These courses goals and objectives show that "Students will be able to read and reflect on a varied selection of young adult literature and discuss it as a class through a variety of discussion and literacy techniques and activities." The key aspect to reflective practice when using YAL in these courses is to show preservice teachers not that YAL is the only answer, but that reflective pedagogues have their students study a wide variety of literature in many genres in order to develop their reading habits in a diversified way.

However, reflective teachers of YAL "Exhibit the abilities to select texts for middle/high school readers with regard to student interests and textual features including literary merit and text complexity." Showing that student interest and literary merit and text complexity are not mutually exclusive but can exist together in many YA texts allows preservice teachers to have an expanded view of school appropriate texts when facing text selection in their future role as classroom teachers.

Discussion

There was an expectation that these 20 course syllabi would be a celebration of all things YAL complete with a parade and banners showcasing the greatness and value of using YAL in secondary English teacher education. Furthermore, it was expected that these courses would focus entirely on reading as much YAL as possible to give preservice teachers a foundation of the genre by forcing them to read as much as they could within a semester. What was found instead was a focused, rational, and evidence-based guide to using YAL within the greater methods coursework for secondary English/Language Arts, and a determined goal of having students engage with the various social and ideological discourses that affect public and teacher education.

While there were whispers in the data of the canon vs YAL debate, and other familiar discourses on text complexity, etc. with YAL, what was more obvious was the larger purpose that these teacher educators provided for their students to do great and important things with their students and for themselves as readers. The overwhelming evidence of these YAL courses providing the traditional reading methods curriculum negate any of the old arguments that YAL does not have a valued place in English education. These teacher educators showed through their objectives and goals for these courses that teaching preservice teachers to prepare, plan, and instruct students using reading strategies is as much if not more approachable with YAL than it is with traditional literature. These discourses swirl together in the heteroglossia of the texts, and this study has shown how the centripetal and centrifugal pulls of authoritative and internally persuasive discourses meet at sites of tension within the syllabus.

These classes also take a political and unapologetic stance that teaching is a profession on the front lines of social justice, and it is through education and educators that social change can take place when students engage with perspectives different than their own through reading YAL. YAL provides preservice and secondary students with a safe space to grapple with difficult discussions, to learn from the experiences of others, and to listen to the voices of those that are different from themselves. This noble focus of YAL shows preservice teachers that one does not have to travel far to meet those that are different from themselves and their students, and that YAL might be a better vehicle to do this than Eurocentric literature traditionally taught. The discourses of diversity and social justice found in these syllabi are evidence that YAL has the potential to impact much more than the individual in its study.

Lastly, by teaching preservice teachers to be reflective practitioners who grapple with social constructs of who their students are allows new teachers to come alongside the individual reader, see past assumptions, and defeat deficit views on students' abilities as readers. By looking at the larger genre of YAL, how it is marketed, and how adolescent readers come to books, preservice teachers can better be prepared to support the needs and interests of their secondary students.

Conclusion

The findings of this study show how effectively YAL pedagogy can be brought alongside traditional English teacher pedagogies to diversify and evolve preservice teacher education. Teacher educators participating in this study had a range of methods and focuses of their courses, but ultimately were built upon a foundation of student interest in reading materials, and that reading more had direct benefits to students in both teacher education and secondary schools.

The hidden reality behind the design of these courses is that preservice teachers do not have the years of classroom teaching experience to gauge how students read, how much students read, and what they read. It was apparent that these teacher educators felt that preservice teachers must examine themselves as readers in order to be able to support the reading needs of secondary students. The answer to this lack of experience in classrooms full of readers is to have preservice teachers read much themselves.

It says much about YAL in education that teacher educators have a varied yet focused view of the work that can be done with YAL and preservice teachers. The presentation of this range of data in this article only begins to hint at how the included goals and objectives are reached with specific YAL titles, and how those titles reflect the needs of both the teacher certification program and secondary readers. Follow up research should examine how the YAL included on these syllabi match the goals and objectives and the purposes of YAL courses described in this article.

As teacher educators begin to conceptualize what a pedagogy of YAL looks like, and as we move towards accepted methods for working with YAL in teacher education, more work can be built off of the foundation of these results to dream of the future. Looking back at Pope and Kaywell's (2001) conversations from the commissions of NCTE article titled *Preparing Teachers to Teach Young Adult Literature*, where commission members submitted course syllabi of their ideal YAL course if they were given the opportunity to teach such a class, YAL has become a fixture of English teacher education and has come a long way. Even after listing focuses like defining YAL, genre studies, suitability, etc., Pope and Kaywell explain that "it is impossible to place a rigid box around the study and teaching of young adult literature, although we are continuing our dialogue and searching for a way to support our constituents" (p. 326).

The results of the present study corroborate the impossibility of saying that YAL is taught in just one way, but does show the diverse potential of YAL in teacher education.

References

Albers, C. (2003). Using the syllabus to document the scholarship of teaching. *Teaching Sociology, 31*(1). 60-72.

Alston, C. L., & Barker, L. M. (2014). Reading for teaching: What we notice when we look at literature. *English Journal, 103*(4). 62-67.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981a). Epic and novel. (M. Holquist & C. Emerson, Trans.). In M. Holquist (Ed.), *Dialogic Imagination: Four essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981b). From the prehistory of novelistic discourse (M. Holquist & C. Emerson, Trans.). In M. Holquist (Ed.), *Dialogic Imagination: Four essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981c). Discourse in the novel (M. Holquist & C. Emerson, Trans.). In M. Holquist (Ed.), *Dialogic Imagination: Four essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Buehler, J. (2016). *Teaching reading with ya literature: Complex texts, complex lives.* Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Caughlan, S., Juzwik, M. M., Borsheim-Black, C., Kelly, S., & Fine, J. G. (2013). English teacher candidates developing dialogically organized instructional practices. *Research in the Teaching of English, 47*(3). 212-246.

Connors, S. P. (2013). Challenging perspectives on young adult literature. *English Journal, 102*(5). 69-73.

Coulter, D. (1999). The epic and the novel: Dialogism and teacher research. *Educational Researcher*, 28(3). 4-13

Fecho, B., Collier, N.D., Friese, E. E. G., & Wilson, A. A. (2010). Critical conversations: Tensions and opportunities of the dialogical classroom. *English Education, 42*(4). 427-447.

Glaus, M. (2014). Text complexity and young adult literature: Establishing its place. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 57*(5). 407-416.

George, M. A. (2001). What's the big idea? Integrating young adult literature in the middle school. *English Journal, 90*(3). 74-81.

Glenn, W. (2014). To witness and to testify: Preservice teachers examine literary aesthetics to better understand diverse literature. *English Education, 46*(2). 90-116.

Glenn, W., King, D., Heintz, K., Klapatch, J., & Berg, E. (2009). Finding space and place for young adult literature: Lessons from four first-year teachers engaging in out-of-school professional induction. *The ALAN Review, 36*(2). 6-17.

Ivey, G., & Johnston, P. H. (2013). Engagement with young adult literature: Outcomes and processes. *Reading Research Quarterly, 48*(3). 255-275.

Lin, C. C. (2014). Storytelling as academic discourse: Bridging the cultural-linguistic divide in the era of the common core. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 33(1). 52-73.

Medvedev, P. N. (1978). *The formal method in literary scholarship: A critical introduction to sociological poetics* (A. J. Wehrle, Trans.). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Moni, K. (2000). Preservice English teachers review young adult literature. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 44*(3). 297-299.

National Council of Teachers of English (1996). *Resolution on teachers' right to teach.* Retrieved from https://www2.ncte.org/statement/righttoteach/

National Council of Teachers of English (1998). *Defining and defending instructional methods.*

Retrieved from https://www2.ncte.org/statement/defendinginstrmethod/

National Council of Teachers of English (2005). *What do we know and believe about the roles of methods courses and field experience in English education?* Retrieved from:

https://www2.ncte.org/statement/roleofmethodsinee/

Ostenson, R., & Wadham, R. (2012). Young adult literature and the Common Core: A surprisingly good fit. *American Secondary Education, 41*(1). 4-13.

Park, J. Y. (2013). All the ways of reading literature: Preservice English teachers' perspectives on disciplinary literacy. *English Education, 45*(4). 361-384.

Pasternak, D. L., Caughlan, S., Hallman, H., Renzi, L., & Rush, L. (2014). Teaching English language arts methods in the United States: a review of the research. *Review of Education, 2*(2). 146-185.

Petrone, R., & Lewis, M. A. (2012). Deficits, therapists, and a desire to distance: Secondary English preservice teachers' reasoning about their future students. *English Education, 44*(3). 254-287.

Pope, C. A., & Kaywell, J. F. (2001). Conversations from the commissions: Preparing teachers to teach young adult literature. *English Education, 33*(4). 323-327.

Pruzinsky, T. (2014). Read books. Every day. Mostly for pleasure. *English Journal, 103*(4). 25-30.

Riley, K., & Crawford-Garrett, K. (2015). Reading the world while learning to teach: Critical perspectives on literacy methods. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 42*(3). 59-79.

Roberts, M., Bull, K. B., Dulaney, M., North-Coleman, C., Kaplan, J., & Stover, L. (2013). Teaching young adult literature: "Change" as an interdisciplinary theme: Ya literature in the content areas. *English Journal, 102*(3). 121-125.

Smagorinsky, P., & Whiting, M. E. (1995). *How English teachers get taught: Methods of teaching the methods course*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Stallworth, B. J., Gibbons, L., & Fauber, L. (2006). It's not on the list: An exploration of teachers' perspectives on using multicultural literature. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 49*(6). 478-489.

Strickland, T. H. (2019). What yal tells us about learning, schooling, and teaching. *Signal Journal*, 43*(1). 18-23*.

Sulzer, M., & Thein, A. H. (2016). Reconsidering the hypothetical adolescent in evaluating and teaching young adult literature. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 60*(2). 163-171.

Wolk, S. (2013). Reading democracy: Exploring ideas that matter with middle grade and young adult literature. *English Journal, 103*(2). 45-51.

Appendix A

Objectives and Goals as Listed on YAL Syllabi

1. What are the purposes of the English curriculum in the areas of literature, language, writing, speaking, and thinking? What do we hope to achieve with our students in their academic, social, and personal development as a result of their experiences in the English Classroom?
2. What instructional strategies can be utilized to optimize student learning, interest, and motivation in the teaching of literature, language, writing, speaking, and thinking in the English classroom?
3. How can we best construct activities, assignments, assessments, and units to ensure that we are meeting our objectives and the differentiated needs of our students given their diverse identities, lives, interests, and needs?
4. How do we develop a reflective stance that serves to guide and support our continued growth as professional educators?
5. Understand and describe theoretical foundations as related to the development, processes and components of reading instruction.
6. Use theories and research to design and implement an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced reading program.
7. Understand, develop, differentiate, and implement various instructional approaches, routines, and assessment techniques in response to students' needs.
8. Develop a learning environment that is conducive to the development of literacy and optimizes students' opportunities for development.
9. Display positive reading behaviors to serve as models of the value of reading.
10. Analyze and critique a wide range of adolescents' literature across genre and form.
11. Examine research and theories of adolescence through a range of scholarly sources and (re)consider our own assumptions.
12. Evaluate the purpose of literature that is written explicitly for adolescents and the value of using this literature for classroom instruction.
13. Explore the ways in which adolescents' literature can be highly political in nature.
14. Evaluate, select and use young adult literature in the classroom.
15. Help adolescent students develop critical-thinking and literacy skills, especially through deep discussion of literature.
16. Encourage adolescent students to become lifelong readers by offering much choice around genre and content.
17. Become more creative writers as a response to literature.
18. Understand and imitate the stylistic features that young adult fiction writers employ.
19. Reflective Practitioner: Class participants will scrutinize the criteria used in book selection for adolescents to reflect diversity in backgrounds, learning styles, and curriculum demands. Additionally, participants will develop techniques for promoting

critical reading and informed interpretation of print, non-print and multi-modal texts, and how to choose texts to meet the needs of diverse groups of students.

20. Scholar: Besides reading 9 YA books in focused study and selected readings in the course textbook class participants will also read and respond to journal and newspaper articles by those prominent in the field, and to participate in our own classroom forum on Canvas. Additionally, students will apply critical literary theory to print and non-print texts, develop interpretations of literature using these critical lenses, and explore ways to use these texts and approaches in effective instruction. Students will also be required to follow a YA blog and use the conversations in that blog as a lens for understanding young adult literature, the needs of adolescents and issues of equity and social justice.

21. Problem Solver: While research shows a direct correlation between reading and achievement, many teens choose not to read. Therefore, participants will explore ways to entice young people to read—acknowledging their wide range of abilities, funds of knowledge and broad interests...including interest in non-traditional and multi-modal texts. Additionally, participants will explore ways to become knowledgeable about the latest books and media appropriate to their subject matter, and encourage incorporation of the contemporary books into their teaching and their own reading life.

22. Students will be able to read and reflect on a varied selection of young adult literature and discuss it as a class through a variety of discussion and literacy techniques and activities.

23. Students will be able to discuss strategies for implementing reading and writing activities within the context of young adult literature.

24. Students will be able to build a database of young adult literature through Goodreads.

25. Students will be able to investigate the ways in which research-based adolescent literacy strategies can be implemented in the secondary classroom.

26. Thoughtfully and critically engage with young adult literature of various genres.

27. Generate theoretically based rationales for including young adult literature texts in secondary curriculum.

28. Investigate issues in the field of young adult literature such as the canon debate, censorship, and literary quality.

29. Examine and articulate historical and popular conceptions of adolescents as well as how they are positioned in society and in texts.

30. Demonstrate a social justice orientation toward teaching and young adult literature, including consideration of how race, class, gender, and sexual orientation relate to the school and classroom context.

31. Model a classroom community of critical colleagues.

32. Collaboratively and individually plan, lead, and reflect a class discussion and task.

33. Exhibit the abilities to select texts for middle/high school readers with regard to student interests and textual features including literary merit and text complexity.

34. Design engaging learning experiences with young adult literature.

35. Explore the current trends and relationships between young adult literature and media and marketing and use that knowledge to become critical consumers of media texts.
36. In this class we will define the concept of adolescence, discuss characteristics of young adult literature and literary criticism, and use that criticism to analyze texts for adolescents.
37. To explore instructional, philosophical, and student diversity in the middle and secondary English classroom.
38. To do inquiry into the social, political, and economic environment of schools and their surrounding community and consider the impact on students' lives.
39. To begin the practice of designing curriculum conceptually integrating Common Core Standards, differentiation, and text diversity.
40. To practice co-teaching by designing and delivering instruction on an assigned text.
41. To integrate course topics with classroom observations.
42. To develop the practice of professional reflection.
43. We will examine our own reading histories and consider how it affects the way we approach curriculum and students.
44. I hope that we can probe issues of literacy, seek understanding in the act of reading, and talk about the ways in which texts work in the classroom with our students' learning at the center.
45. We will consider how to create, configure and implement a curriculum that facilitates active learning with diverse learners.
46. We will uncover practical elements of lesson plans and unit creation, and you will be challenged to consider the theoretical aspects of the teaching of reading and literature.
47. Fostering a Collaborative Culture to Support Educator Development and Student Learning
    a. Utilizes group processes to help colleagues1 work collaboratively to solve problems, make decisions, manage conflict, and promote meaningful change.
    b. Strives to create an inclusive culture where diverse perspectives are welcomed in addressing challenges.
48. Facilitating Improvements in Instruction and Student Learning.
    a. Engages in reflective dialog with colleagues based on observation of instruction, student work, and assessment data and helps make connections to research-based effective practices.
    b. Promotes instructional strategies that address issues of diversity and equity in the classroom and ensures that individual student learning needs remain the central focus of instruction.
49. Improving Outreach and Collaboration with Families and Community.
    a. Uses knowledge and understanding of the different backgrounds, ethnicities, cultures, and languages in the school community to promote effective interactions among colleagues, families, and the larger community.

    b. Models and teaches effective communication and collaboration skills with families and other stakeholders focused on attaining equitable achievement for students of all backgrounds and circumstances.

    c. Facilitates colleagues' self-examination of their own understandings of community culture and diversity and how they can develop culturally responsive strategies to enrich the educational experiences of students and achieve high levels of learning for all students.

    d. Develops a shared understanding among colleagues of the diverse educational needs of families and the community.

    e. Collaborates with families, communities, and colleagues to develop comprehensive strategies to address the diverse educational needs of families and the community.

50. Advocating for Student Learning and the Profession.

    a. Collaborates with colleagues to select appropriate opportunities to advocate for the rights and/or needs of students, to secure additional resources within the building or district that support student learning, and to communicate effectively with targeted audiences such as parents and community members.

    b. Represents and advocates for the profession in contexts outside of the classroom.

51. Research and evaluate effective content-based literacy strategies and adapt them to their individual classroom needs.

52. Gain an understanding of the natures of reading, writing, and related language skills, and the processes involved in adolescent literacy development.

53. Provide systematic and explicit differentiated instruction in the content area to meet the needs of the full range of learners in the classroom (struggling and underperforming learners, ELLs, GATE, Special Education students).

54. Assess the literacy development of adolescents using structured, qualitative tools.

55. Produce a community-based literacy plan that incorporates student and community needs and interests, while implementing content-based literacy strategies.

56. Implement literacy strategies discussed in class in order to facilitate adolescents' literacy development.

57. Read extensively from a list of representative YA and middle grades novels.

58. Evaluate, review and share responses to YA and middle grades texts.

59. Evaluate and experiment with multiple strategies and a range of content materials and texts, both traditional and alternative, and both explicitly and in the context of literature instruction, in order to move toward the goal of reaching all students.

60. Recognize and support the unique needs and skills of the adolescent reader.

61. Use multimodal composition and communication technologies to facilitate reflection and instruction.

62. Develop and verbalize a philosophy in the teaching of literature in order to reflect on and defend their practice.

63. Students will read young adult literature critically to evaluate how constructs such as gender, class, race, and sexual orientation are taken up and represented in individual texts.
64. Students will become familiar with topics and issues that are of concern to scholars and educators who work with young adult literature.
65. Students will investigate the peritext of young adult literature and explain what it suggests about how publishers conceptualize the audience for these books.
66. Students will read a range of young adult novels across an array of genres.
67. Read widely in the field of young adult literature--including multiple genres as well as diverse cultures, settings, authors, and topics.
68. Study the historical perspective and background of literature read by young adults and written for and/or about young adults including current problems, issues, and trends.
69. Develop skill in reflecting, close reading, analyzing, discussing, and writing individually and within groups about literature for young adults.
70. Develop a rationale for including the study of young adult literature as part of the school curriculum.
71. Develop an understanding of pertinent ways to guide young adults in their literature choice and to integrate this literature into the curriculum.
72. Demonstrate an ability to create and use varied teaching applications/strategies with young adult literature with students.
73. Use technology tools appropriately for discussing, exploring, and representing young adult literature.
74. Develop an understanding of the teacher's role in developing a love of reading in school and out of school contexts.
75. Develop a middle grades literature-based English / language arts unit plan and develop and implement at least one lesson in a middle grades classroom and reflect on the lesson.
76. Describe the interrelatedness of the six areas of middle level language arts (reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing, visually representing).
77. Identify and explain the National Council of Teachers of English Standards for the English/Language Arts and the Kentucky Academic Standards for English language arts for grades 5-9.
78. Implement and analyze a variety of developmentally appropriate tools for assessment for learning (formative) and assessment of learning (summative) appropriate for middle level English / language arts.
79. Explain and demonstrate effective and developmentally appropriate reading instructional practices related to varied text types and purposes (e.g., fiction, non-fiction, poetry, and drama).
80. Identify instructional strategies and/or approaches for all components of English/language arts in the middle grades classroom.

81. Explain and demonstrate effective writing instructional practices (including ethical response to student writing) related to varied text types and purposes (e.g., argumentative, informational, and narrative), production and distribution of writing, and research to build and present knowledge.
82. Analyze and apply the processes for lesson planning and instructional design.
83. Implement techniques for differentiating instruction that address student needs, interests, and learning styles, as well as academic, linguistic, and cultural diversity, through the selection of materials, lesson plans, grouping styles (heterogeneous and homogeneous), and instructional approaches.
84. Utilize a variety of technology and media for the planning and presentation of instruction of middle level language arts.
85. Use critical thinking to explore and evaluate instructional practices and materials for teaching the language arts.
86. Identifies and explains how student learning can be enhanced through collaboration with other teachers, professionals and parents.
87. Analyze and evaluate teaching through reflective practice and pursue continued professional growth and collaboration with colleagues.
88. Demonstrate effective instructional communication skills and a broad knowledge of classical and contemporary fiction, poetry, drama, and non-fiction appropriate for middle school students.
89. Demonstrate the writing process and to produce effective documents appropriate to the teaching profession and course level.
90. Use critical thinking to expand, express, explore, and evaluate course content through written communication.
91. Communicates professional information, knowledge and resources for effective English language arts instruction with peers
92. This course will address theory and practice of literature study in secondary schools, and appraisal of multicultural Young Adult literature appropriate to the needs, interests, and abilities of adolescents.
93. QUESTION the cultural values underlying the marketing of literature for children and young adults.
94. ANALYZE literary theories that attempt to explain how readers approach texts they encounter.
95. PRESENT text-based interpretations and arguments in small group and whole-class discussions.
96. PRODUCE an informational digital book talk of a contemporary young adult novel that addresses course themes.
97. REFLECT on the ways in which at least two literary theories color the meaning readers make of any given text.
98. Critically engage with young adult literature.

99. Question assumptions about what young adult literature should be or do.
100. Confront questions about diversity and representation in literature for young audiences.
101. Engage in individual research on young adult literature and scholarship.
102. Communicate effectively with your classmates and a global twitter audience.
103. To demonstrate knowledge of literature for youth/adolescents and works by diverse authors.
104. To respond freely to literature themselves and to invite and extend the honest responses of their students to their reading.
105. To select appropriate reading materials for students based on interests, abilities, and grade level and encourage student interest in reading for knowledge and pleasure.
106. To assess the potential appeal and usefulness of reading materials.
107. To recommend appropriate and appealing fiction and nonfiction to individuals and groups of students with diverse backgrounds and reading skills.
108. To use current annotated book lists and review columns in selecting reading materials for classroom libraries and for recommending books to groups and to individuals.
109. To use young adult literature as the basis for teaching skills and strategies necessary for reading texts.
110. To offer alternatives to traditional book report formats, alternatives that encourage thoughtful response and self expression.
111. To deal wisely and ethically with potential and real problems of censorship related to assigned and voluntary reading of adolescents.

CHAPTER 3

DIALOGIC PEDAGOGY: USING BAKHTIN FOR A METHOD OF SYLLABUS ANALYSIS

Strickland, T. H. To Be Submitted to *Dialogic Pedagogy Journal*

Abstract

Through a Bakhtinian textual analysis of young adult literature (YAL) course syllabi and related materials in secondary English teacher education programs, this study examines how the syllabus in teacher preparation programs are sites of tension for the heteroglossia of educational discourses (Hong, Falter, & Fecho, 2016). In particular, the study unpacks the double-voiced nature of course syllabi and related materials as they reflect both the authoritative discourses in education seeking a centripetal standard as well as where the internally persuasive discourses of individual professors centrifugally resist and pull away from that standard to choose more student-centered practices. Course syllabi are sites of this heteroglossic tension, and this study will show what the most common influences are of both the push of authoritative discourses as well as in what ways instructors pull away from them to choose more student-centered engagement (Nystrand & Gamoran, 1991). However, as instructors are authorities in these courses themselves and syllabi are inherently authoritative texts (Depalma, 2010), it is also important to note when they choose to raise up the voices of their own students dialogically to avoid their monological voice being the only one that is valued. Likewise, it is important to see when their authoritative voice remains fully in control in the classroom.

Introduction

Authoritative pressures within educational contexts make dialogic teaching difficult to create (Stewart, 2010, p. 10). There is a fear among dialogic teachers that outsiders (like administrators or other teachers) merely view their classrooms as loud and mismanaged spaces where student voices are in power rather than the expected monological voice of the teacher (Fecho & Amatucci, 2008, p. 6). How can those on the outside of a dialogic pedagogy looking in understand what is truly going on in these classrooms without training in what to expect from a

dialogical classroom? If educators who practice dialogic pedagogy want to use Bakhtin's concepts in the creation of their classes and with students in both secondary classrooms and in teacher education, then methods for practical use must continue to be developed (Fecho, Falter, & Hong, 2016). One way that this can be done is to use Bakhtin's concepts to critically examine educational documents, other texts, and spaces for the push and pull of heteroglossic competition (Eigler, 1995, p. 197).

The literary theories and concepts of written and spoken language of Mikhail Bakhtin (1895-1975) have been particularly useful in creating a framework for teaching through dialogic pedagogy (Bingham, 2000, Depalma, 2010, Fecho, Coombs, & McAuley, 2012, Miles, 2010). In particular, Bakhtin's concepts of heteroglossia (different, competing voices) (Bakhtin, 1981a, p. 300) and the spectrum of authoritative and internally persuasive discourses (pp. 342-345) have been applied to teachers' understanding of classroom discourse (see Fecho & Botzakis, 2007, Fecho & Amatucci, 2008, Fecho, Falter, & Hong, 2016, & Stewart, 2010) and the opportunities that dialogic teaching can open up for classroom teachers. For those that are unfamiliar with the concept:

> Dialogically organized instruction, or instruction designed to provide students with frequent opportunities to engage with core disciplinary concepts through sustained, substantive dialogue..., is typically overshadowed by lecture, recitation, and seatwork—forms of interaction privileging the authoritative voice of the teacher in tight control of classroom interaction" (Caughlan, Juzwik, Borsheim-Black, Kelly, & Fine, 2013, p. 213).

It is difficult even for the teacher who believes in a dialogic teaching to give up this authoritative and monological voice to raise up the voices of students (Juzwik, 2004, p. 546), but "none of us

who choose to call ourselves dialogic teachers get it right all of the time. None of us have perfect dialogic classrooms, but we choose to go for it anyway" because that is the best thing for students (Strickland, 2019, p. 2). This realization that dialogic pedagogy is an imperfect theory but that it is one that can open up classrooms to the living heteroglossia within them, can allow educators to tap into the many different ideological discourses that are part of their classrooms.

This data drawn from this study will look into this idea by answering the following research question:

1. How does a method of Bakhtinian textual analysis specific to course syllabi and related materials allow teachers to develop more student-centered practices? What limitations do Bakhtin's concepts create when looking at course syllabi as authoritative documents?

While the focus of this study was on young adult literature courses within the greater field of secondary English teacher education, the methodology used for this study has application beyond the English education classroom. If we look at a course syllabus, however potentially flawed they might be as documents (Albers, 2003), as representative of the tension between where authoritative discourses in education meet with the internally persuasive voices of teachers and teacher educators in course design, then having a proven method for how to analyze these texts can have huge implications for using Bakhtin's work in education.

Teachers at all levels must make intentional choices about how courses are designed (Stallworth, Gibbons, & Fauber, 2006) and planned with active room for student voice to thrive. If this is important, then "We must be engaged in reflective thinking in the classroom, in front of our students (doubting, assessing the validity of argument, etc.)" (Vasiliev, 2018, p. 5). Using the method explained in this study, instructors can, individually or with their departments, examine

these authoritative texts given to students for the discourses and ideologies that are inherent in them, then develop them further to start their classes with a student-centered space that is more inviting and less authoritative where a monological viewpoint of the instructor is not the only one that is valued.

Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

To examine how the course syllabus is a heteroglossic text (Depalma, 2010, p. 438), the data from this study will be used to discuss inherent authoritative discourses that influence course design, then examples will be shared of the internally persuasive discourses that are also present and where utterances are inherently double-voiced. In this section Bakhtin's concepts of the utterance, heteroglossia, authoritative and internally persuasive discourses, the centripetal and centrifugal forces of language, and double-voicedness are conceptualized and explained for how they were used in the analysis of data in this study. In the following section, much more detail will be provided explaining the methods used to analyze these course syllabi, after further explaining the theoretical and conceptual framework drawn upon from Bakhtin's greater body of work.

The Utterance

These concepts, while familiar to readers of *Dialogic Pedagogy Journal*, are being applied to documents where the living dialogue, ideologies, and competing discourses within them are centered in the "complete speech act" or "utterance" (Bakhtin, 1981a, p. 264). In the context of this study, the utterance might be a single statement such as an objective or goal for the course or a brief explanation of various course policies and descriptions. When the individual utterances of these syllabi are pulled out and analyzed alongside one another to create an understanding of the instructional choices that these instructors made when designing these

courses, then claims can be made about how the authoritative and internally persuasive discourses of education compete within the field as a whole. By doing this type of analysis, an understanding of much more of instructors' decisions in crafting course documents was found, and this also creates a better understanding of how to craft syllabi so that student voices are as valuable (Lin, 2014, p.66) as professors' voices in classrooms that are built upon "engaged dialogic practice" in teacher education (Fecho, Falter, & Hong, 2016).

Heteroglossia.

Bakhtin referred to a "living heteroglossia" (1981a, p. 272), which is the basis for these other concepts. Bakhtin's theory on language involves the root element of the utterance spoken or written and given with the expectation of a response (Juzwik, 2004, p. 545). To Bakhtin, language is always in a state of tug-o-war. He wrote that in

> The processes of centralization and decentralization, of unification and disunification, intersect in the utterance; the utterance not only answers the requirements of its own language as an individualized embodiment of a speech act, but it answers the requirements of heteroglossia as well; it is in fact an active participant in such speech diversity (Bakhtin, 1981a, p. 272).

This active participation (Bakhtin, 1984) implies that language cannot be controlled and is not static, but rather it is in a constant state of tension to move away from centralization. Active participation of language in heteroglossia means that there are always more utterances potentially embedded within dialogue. It is this never-ending back and forth that creates living dialogue.

When thinking about seemingly static textual documents like course syllabi, however, analysis must also look for instances of hybridity to see how the various competing voices of heteroglossia meet at sites of tension within the document. If "a hybrid construction is an

utterance that belongs...to a single speaker, but that actually contains mixed within it two utterances, two speech manners, two styles, two 'languages,' two semantic and axiological belief systems" (Bakhtin, 1981c, p. 304), then analysis can show how one utterance reflects both of these competing discourses at the same time. As an utterance, one objective or goal in a syllabus might reflect the tension of two competing discourses of education like the voice of the teacher and the voice of the standards. By examining this tension, instructors can make sure that information is not authoritatively closed off even before students come into contact with it.

Authoritative and Internally Persuasive Discourses.

The different, competing voices of heteroglossia, represented in the interplay between various utterances, are constantly acted upon by both authoritative and internally persuasive discourses (Stewart, 2012). Authoritative discourses, or discourses imbued with authority and privilege, to Bakhtin, are the official words, finalized and complete without space for other voices (Bakhtin, 1981b, p. 20). The internally persuasive discourse, or discourse reflecting the personal context, experience, and desires of the individual, (Bakhtin, 1981a, p. 345) are always striving against the closed-off and final nature of the authoritative word.

An important start to understanding Bakhtin's concepts of authoritative and internally persuasive discourses is to think of them on a continuum. Language is constantly moving on this continuum as authorities seek to control meaning while the individual seeks to make meaning for themselves based on context, experience, and history (Coulter, 1999, p. 7). In a syllabus that represents a classroom context, the authoritative and final word of the teacher is often the one most prized, which creates a monological point of view; but the dialogic minded instructor, on the other hand, seeks to not only recognize the other voices present within the heteroglossia but see that they are given more space (p. 9). The syllabus, as a representation of this hypothetical

classroom, can be viewed the same way as utterances on the syllabus serve either the authority of the instructor, or show where the instructor is seeking to allow the internally persuasive discourses of their students to guide learning. The pressures of educational authorities often make this difficult as "too many classrooms--constricted by imposed testing, standards, and instruction--skew in a monological direction, even though the teachers inside those classrooms, if given informed choice, would choose otherwise" (Fecho, Coombs, & McAuley, 2012, p. 478).

   Centripetal and centrifugal forces of language and discourse.

   When looking at how the authoritative and internally persuasive discourses in a heteroglossic context interact (Matusov, 2007, p. 230), one must understand that the tensions of these discourses are "continuously shaped and pulled in different directions by interacting forces of stability and change (Nystrand, 1997, p. 12). The forces of stability and centrality, Bakhtin referred to as centripetal forces, and the free-thinking forces of change he referred to as centrifugal forces (Bakhtin, 1981a, 270-272). Internally persuasive discourses of an individual centrifugally pull away from standardization as the centripetal pull of authoritative discourses seek to centripetally control them.

   Educational documents like course syllabi are a prime site to unpack and explore these conflicting concepts because all educational contexts operate within local, state, and national hierarchies of power (Day, 2010, p. 81). Teacher educators and educational researchers operate within a bureaucratic system often focusing on standardization and conformity of teaching and learning in a quest for data, but, as individuals, face tension as internally persuasive discourses interact with educational demands that are out of their control even as students operate with a similar dichotomy of power with those teachers (Farmer, 1998, p. 203). If syllabi are inherently authoritative documents reflecting both the authority of the instructor and the influence of the

authoritative discourses of education that make demands of students, then creators of syllabi have to actively choose to stifle that authority during course design so that the many students' voices already present (Coulter, 1999, p. 9) will have a chance to be heard when the class represented by the syllabus begins.

Tensions within Dialogue

When looking at educational documents or recorded dialogue from classrooms, researchers can examine when the authoritative word is pushed, and when the internally persuasive word pushes back. Matusov and Lemke (2015) explained that Bakhtin spoke of internally persuasive discourse in opposition to authoritative discourse to "contrast a discursive process of free persuasion versus a discourse process of imposition and coercion" (p. 7). Matusov and Lemke's analysis emphasizes the negative implications of the authoritative word in comparison to the free-thinking, internally persuasive voice within heteroglossia. By analyzing classroom documents like course syllabi for their dialogic potential, researchers can deconstruct authoritative voices inherent in classroom discourse, and seek solutions (p. 8). Teachers that value the voices of their students within their classrooms must be willing to engage in analysis of the discourses they both intentionally and unintentionally (Stewart, 2012, p. 379) share with students through authoritative documents like course syllabi. Thoughtful construction of class materials begins to do such work, and is the aim of the discussion of this study's findings.

The different, competing voices inherent in dialogue through heteroglossia shows how authoritative discourse seeks to control language and push meaning towards a monologic, goal (Bingham, 2000, p. 27). However, Bakhtin stressed that "[e]very utterance participates in the 'unitary language' (in its centripetal forces and tendencies) and at the same time partakes of social and historical heteroglossia (the centrifugal, stratifying forces)" and this shows that utterances

are not wholly authoritative or internally persuasive but reflect many of each in the dialogism of the utterance (p. 272). It is with this idea that Bakhtinian analysis can go forward with varied texts.

At the level of the individual utterance, which again is conceptualized in this study as single statements or small sections explaining class expectations and procedures, analysis can show how meaning is being shaped by both forces, and at the site of tension between forces, meaning can be understood in a more profound way. When one voice is valued above others, a hierarchy of power is created, but Bakhtin "saw centrifugal forces in language eroding the centripetal, specifically weakening the seals limiting who can participate and who can produce knowledge within certain speech genres" (Stewart & Boggs, 2016, p. 144). Looking at young adult literature course syllabi for these sites of tension explains how the intersections of authority and the individual represent a struggle for voices to be heard even before syllabi are given to students, and then how the centrifugal forces of language make space for themselves even with the pressures of centralization.

Double-voiced Discourse.

The last concept that was important to the work done in this study was what Bakhtin referred to as double-voiced discourses where the hybrid utterance reflects multiple discourses at the same time. He explained that double-voiced discourse serves two speakers at the same time and expresses simultaneously two different intentions: the direct intention of the character who is speaking, and the refracted intention of the author. In such utterances there are multiple voices heard (Bakhtin, 1981a, p. 324). This concept of double-voiced discourse is important when thinking about analysis of educational documents like course syllabi. If an utterance is double-voiced and internally dialogized, then this means that "A potential dialogue is embedded in them,

one as yet unfolded, a concentrated dialogue of two voices, two world views, two languages"
(Bakhtin, 1981a, pp. 324-325). If two discourses are embedded within one utterance, then
analysis can show how the hybrid nature of the utterance gives more than one meaning.

When thinking of teacher educators, as is the case in this study, double-voiced discourse
can be understood when looking at individual utterances (Bakhtin & Sollner, 1983) in their
teaching materials. An example of double-voiced discourse from one of the course syllabi
studied is when an teacher educator describes an assignment where "Each student will write a
term paper analyzing 3-5 works of one author of young adult novels[,]" and follows this
statement with 'YOU MUST GET PERMISSION FROM ME BEFORE YOU CHOOSE YOUR
AUTHOR!" The internally persuasive discourse embedded within the authoritative discourse of
directions is that the instructor hopes to give students choice in the YA author that they are
interested in studying, while at the same time infusing the words with the authoritative and
monological viewpoint that the instructor's permission makes a choice valid and that students
must comply with instructor demands. The teacher educator uses all capital letters to add
authoritative weight to the utterance, and at the same time reflects a hope for students to be able
to choose.

The attempt to allow students to choose 3-5 works by one YAL author is an endeavor of
the teacher educator to have students follow their own paths based on their own interests and
experiences, which makes the discourse internally persuasive as well. As the permission is
required by the educator and is a demand on the students without their ability to question the
instructor's authority, it is representative of an authoritative discourse at the same time. Here it
can be seen how one statement constitutes a hybrid construction (Eigler, 1995) of both free
choice and authoritative power. Using Bakhtin's concepts to analyze dialogue for double-voiced

discourse provides a fuller picture of meaning (Holquist, 1983). Looking at how various discourses interact within an educational document will allow researchers to unpack what is valued and encouraged within a given space. Once this analysis is complete, instructors can build upon their results to develop future course materials that are reflective of all competing voices within their classrooms.

Understanding Hierarchies of Power in Course Syllabi.

In secondary educational contexts, the voice of the individual student is often not heard when overwhelmed by the authoritative word of other stakeholders like teachers, administrators, parents, or school boards (Stewart, 2010, p. 16). The syllabus is inherently dialogic by nature, and does not include student voices as it is created before the instructor comes into contact with the hypothetical class on the first day. However, analysis can show how instructors anticipate the voices and needs of their future students when creating the course syllabus.

Bakhtin's concepts show a way for this hierarchy of power between teacher and student (Stewart & McClure, 2013) to be examined by looking at the influence of authority on the utterances of an individual. Bakhtin (1981a) explained that "the authoritative word (religious, political, moral, the world of a father, of adults and of teachers, etc.) [...] does not know internal persuasiveness" and its opposite the "internally persuasive word [...] is denied all privilege, backed up by no authority at all, and is frequently not even acknowledged in society" (p. 342). It is important for researchers to be able to analyze the discourses present in education to make room for the voice of others present in heteroglossia so that the voice of the instructor is not finalized and closed off to students and pedagogical practice can become more student-centered. An issue is that:

The authoritative word demands that we acknowledge it, that we make it our own; it

binds us, quite independent of any power it might have to persuade us internally; we

encounter it with its authority already fused to it. The authoritative word is located in a

distanced zone, organically connected with a past that is felt to be hierarchically higher. It

is, so to speak, the world of the fathers. Its authority was already *acknowledged* in the

past" (Emphasis in original, p. 342)

Ultimately, there is a struggle for the marginalized, internally persuasive voice of the student and

sometimes the teacher to be heard in educational contexts where the authoritative word is

accepted as finalized (Bakhtin, 1984).

This tension, which will be shown through this study's findings, causes teachers to craft

teaching materials in a certain way because they feel as if the authoritative word of local, state,

and national standards as well as social expectations of the school context, supersede what they

may feel about the best course of action for their students and for themselves. It is important to

note, though, that these influences cause instructors to craft syllabi in certain ways that are

authoritative by nature and reflect the authoritative pressures of education. The student inherits

this authoritative hierarchy from the instructor through the syllabus, and it is not until the

syllabus is put into practice in a classroom that the internally persuasive discourses of the student

can begin to resist them.

In the face of the "unconditional allegiance" (Bakhtin, 1981a, p. 343) demanded by the

authoritative word, the internally persuasive word is stifled, but it is impossible to remove

internally persuasive voices from heteroglossia. Bakhtin argued that independent thought pushes

away and separates itself from the authoritative word and in some cases completely rejects it (p.

345). Heteroglossia continues to push for varied voices and perspectives to interact (Bakhtin,

1984) in a way that creates dialogue even where monologic voices are valued. This means that "Internally persuasive discourse... draws participants into contact zones that allow transactions to occur because more than one perspective is available for consideration by the larger group" (Stewart, 2010, p. 11). The course syllabus is created with the intention of a transaction to occur between instructors and students often in the first day(s) of class.

Consequently, heteroglossia, along with authoritative and internally persuasive discourses are prime concepts to use while examining educational texts like course syllabi. Bakhtin may have applied his work mostly to literary analysis, but, especially in a closely related field like English Education, educational researchers can find huge value in using his work. He believed that

> Our ideological development is just such an intense struggle within us for hegemony among various available verbal and ideological points of view, approaches, directions and values. The semantic structure of an internally persuasive discourse is not *finite*, it is *open*; in each of the new contexts that dialogize it, this discourse is able to reveal even newer *ways* to mean (Emphasis in original, p. 346)

This openness of internally persuasive discourse and its resistance to an authoritative final word has implications in education (Fecho, Collier, Friese, & Wilson, 2010, p. 428). Teachers and researchers can make room for marginalized voices by recognizing when the authoritative voice of schooling seeks a monological point of view—and then resist it. In teaching, historically, the teacher's language has been the one voice of value in a classroom (Depalma, 2010, p. 440). This article will address this issue by analyzing young adult literature course syllabi for sites of tension within the heteroglossia and inherent dialogism of the documents.

Method

In order to analyze young adult literature courses in secondary English teacher education, first, an understanding of how Bakhtin's concepts could be used as a lens for looking at course materials as textual representations of instructional design was explored. The goal then was to be able to take course materials like the course syllabus, analyze the documents for how they represent various, competing educational discourses within the heteroglossia of the documents, and then be able to see where the tensions between authoritative ideologies came into contact with the centrifugal forces of instructors seeking out internally persuasive goals for themselves and their students in double-voiced utterances. Findings indicate that such analysis can allow instructors to understand the tensions of various discourses within their course materials in order to actively choose more student-centered methods of instruction.

Smagorinsky and Whiting (1995) set the stage for analyzing the syllabus in English teacher methods coursework as they argued that knowing how methods are used in the field broadly can allow teacher educators to build upon that foundation for the future (p. 4). The YAL course syllabus was chosen for this study because of this potential. It is important to understand how courses are designed in a broad way in the field if there is hope to develop them better for students in the future. This allows an examination of inherent discourses within syllabi to provide an understanding of what discourses influence course design in YAL in English teacher education, and then can suggest ways in which student-centered practices can continue to be used in the field in the future.

Participants and Data Collection.

Data was drawn from 17 of 48 secondary teacher educators that published with *The ALAN Review* during 2017-2018 (Volumes 44(2)-46(1)). Volumes from these two years were

chosen to find teacher educators who were actively using YAL in teacher education. Authors published in *The ALAN Review* were chosen as this journal is the special interest group of the National Council of Teachers of English that focuses particularly on literature for adolescents. These 17 educators submitted 20 course syllabi and included materials like reading lists, course calendars, and assessments.

The first read through of the course syllabi was done in order to categorize the materials into major focuses. Three categories emerged as materials were examined: those courses that focused entirely on young adult literature methods, those that were broadly reading pedagogy courses that largely focused on young adult literature, and, finally, literacy or reading across the curriculum courses that had young adult literature as at least a part. This categorization was done in anticipation for related authoritative discourses to be highlighted depending on the major focus of the course. For example, the courses entirely focused on young adult literature showed more authoritative discourses of the instructors themselves where the reading across the curriculum courses showed much more pressure from state and national standards and educational governing bodies.

Data Analysis.

Subsequent read throughs of the data were conducted focusing entirely on course goals and objectives to understand the particular purpose of the course design, the major discourses at play within young adult literature classes, and then finally how double-voiced discourses were represented across the course syllabi. Codes were created to better represent the tension between the greater authoritative and internally persuasive discourses and ideologies present in the heteroglossia of young adult literature courses within the field of Secondary English Education, and a constant comparative method was used to refine these codes as new data was analyzed.

"Authoritative discourses," "internally persuasive discourses," "hybrid constructions," and "global discourses" were all used to sort and understand data drawn from the course syllabi.

What was particularly compelling about searching for these codes was how sites of tension between various discourses could be found. The double-voicedness of the course syllabi in this study suggested a hybrid nature of the genre as both an agent of authority and one of individuality on the part of the teacher educator. For example, a syllabus could show its main focus to be on teaching preservice teacher candidates to be engaged in critical education where they work towards goals of social justice with their students while, simultaneously, that same syllabus could show a focus on strict adherence to standardized practice and curriculum. Thus, one document could reflect discourses of free thinking and action while also insisting that preservice teachers follow predetermined curriculum.

As data was organized and analysis began, sections of the course syllabi where multiple discourses were represented drew further analysis. These sections showed the heteroglossic nature of the document as a living educational text. To use Bakhtin's concepts as a method for analyzing course syllabi, each document had to be treated as both a finalized representation of the teacher educator's intention for the course, and as an unfinalized, flawed document representing both the wishes of that educator and the authoritative pressures that influence them. Syllabi, as a genre, are inherently lacking in that they are created with hypothetical students in mind. However, most instructors included caveats in their materials that showed students that plans may change depending on the needs of both the instructor and the students. While authoritative texts, course syllabi also have the potential to focus on student-centered learning where instructors flatten the hierarchy between themselves and their students in order to open the class to its heteroglossic potential.

Findings and Discussion

Through the analysis of the 20 syllabi submitted by participants, an understanding that most classes involving young adult literature did not, in fact, focus on merely one aspect of the greater discourses surrounding the pedagogy of young adult literature was found (Glenn, King, Heintz, Klapatch, & Berg, 2009). More often, they had glaring tensions of authoritative and internally persuasive discourses apparent in their course design. The nature of education showcased in these course syllabi reflected the pressures of greater national bodies while sometimes in direct opposition to centrifugal (individualizing) hopes of the course instructors for their students. While some course syllabi positioned the instructor as the only authority in the classroom, others showed a more student-centered approach to learning.

The double-voiced nature of these course syllabi is presented for students when course materials are covered at the beginning of a new semester. To best explain how Bakhtin's concepts were used in conducting a literary analysis on these syllabi, examples from the 20 course syllabi will be highlighted to show how a flawed, yet required document can be analyzed for a greater understanding of how the various discourses in education brush up against each other in the living heteroglossia of teacher education.

To read across these 20 course syllabi, findings will show what the major authoritative and internally persuasive discourses in the syllabi are, and how those discourses compete to be heard within the text. Examples of double-voiced utterances will be used to show how the syllabus as a document often represents the tension between various educational ideologies. Finally, suggestions will be made for how instructors can develop their course materials in the future so that the centrifugal pull of the individual can be highlighted even in courses where authorities seek to control knowledge.

The Tensions Within YAL Course Syllabi

Many of the courses in this study focused on preservice teachers reading much young adult literature while learning pedagogical methods for English education. These courses often adopted a tone that set preservice teachers to understand that they must be readers themselves in order to best teach secondary students how to be active and independent readers (Alston & Barker, 2014, L'Allier & Elish-Piper, 2007, Moni, 2000, Powell-Brown, 2004, Stallworth, Gibbons, & Fauber, 2006, Winograd & Rosen, 1994). While many of these courses started with conceptual work around defining YAL as a literary genre or with the concept of adolescence (Falter, 2016, Lesko, 1996, Sulzer & Thein, 2016) or the youth lens (Petrone, Lewis, & Sarigianides, 2015, Sarigianides, 2012), these classes also were full of the tension between both the internally persuasive pull of instructor and student to be independent and interest driven readers while beset by the push of authoritative discourses that seek to control what students should be reading in secondary classrooms. The centrifugal forces of internally persuasive discourses cannot do away with the authoritative discourses that oppose them, but they can erode the control that those authorities have on them.

Authoritative discourses in young adult literature courses.

There were two distinct paths that the authoritative discourses took while looking at these 20 course syllabi. One is where the instructor, as the voice of authority in the classroom, laid out demands of students in the course materials or set themselves up to be the monological "sage-on-the-stage" from which students would learn. The second is where the authoritative discourses of national bodies, standards, and other external voices could be seen as having demands on the information being shared between instructor and student.

It is impossible, even for teachers who subscribe to a dialogical pedagogy model, to completely give up their authority in their classrooms (Fecho, Falter, & Hong, 2016). The natural hierarchy created by the teacher and student relationship within an educational context is easier for some to get past, but colleges and universities and local school boards, parents, and administrators expect that instructors at all levels be in "control" and be the authority in the classroom. However, many teachers see a way to flatten that hierarchy (Fecho, Collier, Friese, & Wilson, 2010) and do so through student-centered practices.

The most often noticed utterances of authoritative discourses in the 13 course syllabi focusing entirely on YAL, were where instructors set forth strict expectations for student behavior and work ethic. At first glance, such utterances seem completely necessary, but it is how the instructor provided information to students that set the foundation for if the heteroglossia of the classroom would be stifled or if it would be allowed to flourish. In contrast, the attempt to make space for the internally persuasive discourses of students can be seen when instructors make room in their syllabus for student interests and needs to direct learning.

One example of the double-voiced nature of these documents comes from one syllabus where a "love of reading" is valued above all else. In this course students will read "over 10 Young Adult Novels" but this individual focus is followed by another course outcome where students will "Write coherent and persuasive justifications of YA literature based on scholarship, ELA standards, NCTE position statements, and other resources." This statement is reflective of many discourses meeting at a site of tension within the heteroglossia of this syllabus. We see the authoritative discourse of state standards seeking to control the dialogue and create "good" practice, the adherence to a national body, the National Council of Teachers of English, as well as the instructor's intention that students will be scholars who can justify the texts they are

choosing to present to students in a way that will satisfy the subsequent authorities that are stakeholders in their secondary classrooms. This course provides students with 16 separate course objectives and outcomes, and the heteroglossia of the context is loud and clear in this section. One objective is focused on the internally persuasive nature of students becoming interest-lead readers themselves, and is followed by others that reflect the needs of the instructor to control the learning outcomes for students in this class even while reflecting the internally persuasive discourses of the students. These two short sections within multiple pages of one syllabus show that it is not just the voice of the instructor that is heard, but that multiple, competing discourses (heteroglossia) are present at once.

Another example comes from a different syllabus where the many voices of heteroglossia and the authoritative and internally persuasive discourses meet. Also found within a list of 10 course outcomes, this instructor tells students that they will "Investigate issues in the field of young adult literature such as the canon debate, censorship, and literary quality," then that they will "Examine and articulate historical and popular conceptions of adolescents as well as how they are positioned in society and in texts," and also that students will "Demonstrate a social justice orientation toward teaching and young adult literature, including consideration of how race, class, gender, and sexual orientation relate to the school and classroom context." While the course description describes this class as one that "is a rigorous, reading intensive course designed to introduce pre-service teachers and interested students to young adult literature[,]" these three outcomes show many different tensions within the greater study of YAL.

The discourses obvious to analysis are the concept of the adolescent, the argument of the use of the literary canon versus modern and contemporary literature like YAL, and then finally how YAL and English education can be used to create a classroom with a social justice

orientation (Alsup & Miller, 2014, Glasgow, 2001, Glenn, 2014). The double-voiced nature of one short section on these syllabi can show how one utterance follows and competes with others, and can reflect the authoritative discourses of the instructor as well as the global discourses surrounding the study of YAL.

The 20 course syllabi analyzed in this study were full of various, competing authoritative discourses that influenced course design. Reading across the data, beyond the examples shown previously, other authoritative discourses present in the data were: college and university vision and mission statements, a number of separate state standards along with the Common Core, and the NCTE Standards, state teacher candidate dispositions, the Teacher Leader Model Standards (TLMS), the American Psychological Association (APA), the InTASC standards, and CAEP Standards. These discourses all sought to control the language of the instructor and the outcomes for students in course materials. The hybrid nature of so many of the utterances show how the push of these authorities are met by the pull of teacher educators as they design their courses.

The examples above from two course syllabi show how the double-voiced nature of utterances within these documents reflect the needs and pressures of many authoritative voices even within classes that might actually be much more student-centered than others. It is hard to escape the monological and authoritative nature of the course syllabus, but, as evidenced below, many instructors made decisions to flatten that hierarchy and raise up the voice of the student to a more equal stature.

Internally persuasive discourses in young adult literature courses.

Student choice was the vehicle that instructors most often used to help flatten the hierarchy between themselves and their students (Comer, 2011, p. 241), and this was done to show that even where it is the instructor's prerogative to create the course and "control" the

learning that takes place, it is still possible to put the learning into the hands and interests of the students. Instructors in these YAL classes sought to help preservice teachers realize that, as shown in the objectives on one syllabus, "While research shows a direct correlation between reading and achievement, many teens choose not to read. Therefore, participants [preservice teachers] will explore the ways to entice young people to read—acknowledging their wide range of abilities, funds of knowledge, and broad interests… including interest in non-traditional and multi-modal texts." An opening up of knowledge and learning beyond what students might expect like this was one way that many of these instructors chose to teach their preservice teachers how to recognize the value of students pursuing texts that were internally persuasive to them.

An example of how a course met both the internally persuasive needs of its students while also being double-voiced with many discourses of education can be shown through a portion of one syllabus course description. The teacher educator writes, "A wealth of titles in all genres will be read, discussed, interpreted, and examined for quality of writing, interest and importance to adolescents, cultural relevance and relationship to curriculum standards." This utterance is decidedly double-voiced as analysis shows the tension between the discourses of the quality of YAL, student interest and relevance of YAL, cultural relevance and the subsequent echoes of diverse perspectives in literature, and then it ends with the authoritative nod toward curriculum standards. Students in this course will quickly know that the class goes beyond just reading of YAL, and they will understand that the genre is in a state of "becoming" (Bakhtin, 1981a, p. 393).

The double-voiced nature of course syllabi is not just present in course descriptions and course goals, objectives, or outcomes; it can also be seen in course assessments. In one of the

classes, the instructor assigned a "Free Choice Reading Portfolio" where students only stipulation for the assignment is that they must read "3,000 pages of texts written for and about adolescents." In the corresponding section where advice is given to students, the instructor writes that students will "Select texts from a variety of authors, forms, genres, subjects, and marketed age levels. [but that they] Do not read over 1,000 pages of the same author, genre, or form." The heteroglossia found within this assignment is varied. Even with the free choice nature of the assignment, the authoritative discourse of the instructor is still present in the direction to "not read over 1,000 pages of the same author, genre, or form[,]" but the freedom for students to choose a variety of texts for young adults is the loudest voice. Another discourse embedded within this single utterance is students choosing texts from "marketed age levels" where the larger discourses of publishing and marketing of YAL comes through. In this assignment, students are given the power to seek out what interests them, what stories and authors are internally persuasive to them, and are bound only by the most loose of guidelines.

Professors of these YAL courses made many instructional decisions like the "Free Choice Reading Portfolio" that put the power back into the hands of students. These student-centered assignments, goals, and outcomes begin to flatten the hierarchy between student and teacher, even if it cannot ever be completely equal. What is interesting is to see how there is a tension within teacher educators' decisions as they choose to have students read YAL independently versus having them read a YA text together as a class or read canonical literature at all. If instructors examine their own choices represented in course materials for the double-voiced nature of utterances, then the authoritative nature of course design can make way for the internally persuasive discourses that drive students to learn.

The examples above highlight only a couple of the ways that the internally persuasive discourses of instructors sought to put student learning first and resist a monological viewpoint. One way that instructors added a diversity of voices into the heteroglossia of their classes was by having students interact with external voices talking about YAL. Some of these voices were through the Assembly on Literature for Adolescents of NCTE, journals like *The ALAN Review*, the *Journal of Children's Literature*, *Study and Scrutiny: Research in Young Adult Literature*, *English Journal*, *English Education*, *Journal of Literacy Research*, *Language Arts*, *Research in the Teaching of English*, *Voices from the Middle*, and the *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*. Students participated in twitter chats with others about YAL, they read from awards lists like the Michael L. Printz Award, the Newbery Medal, the National Book Award, the Coretta Scott King Award, the Scott O'Dell Award; they read NCTE position statements; they engaged in discussion on the youth lens; they sought out information on the YA Literature Symposium; they read blogs like Dr. Bickmore's YA Wednesday (www.yawednesday.com), Guys Lit Wire (http://guyslitwire.blogspot.com), Guys Read (www.guysread.com), Teen Reads (https://www.teenreads.com), and We Need Diverse Books (https://diversebooks.org). Most importantly, students were given the freedom to choose what to read, who to read, how to read, and then how to showcase their learning in a variety of choice-based assessments and assignments.

Suggestions for Student-Centered Instruction

Readers of *Dialogic Pedagogy Journal* are often looking for a how-to guide on how to implement dialogic instruction in their classrooms (Strickland, 2019). Researchers in teacher education (see Fecho, Falter, & Hong, 2016) have begun to provide an approximate guide to show how taking little steps towards dialogic engagement in the classroom can have an impact

even while arguing that it is impossible to have a "correct" way of dialogic instruction. This study highlighted many strategies that teacher educators in young adult literature in secondary English teacher education have used to create a more student-centered, dialogic learning space. Whether these steps were taken to be overtly invested in dialogic practice or whether these teachers were naturally choosing student-centered practices remains to be seen. However, the following instructional decisions highlight how these teacher educators flattened the hierarchy between themselves and their students to foster the heteroglossia of their classrooms.

Choice reading.

While all of the 20 course syllabi analyzed in this study had required elements to them like textbooks or other readings, those that adopted more student-centered practices often limited the whole-class or required readings to those that covered necessary content while leaving open much of students' reading of YAL to either guided choice reading lists and categories, or they were fully open to students reading any YA author or book as long as they continued to read for the entirety of the course. While the authority of the instructor could not be completely dissolved as they created and ran these classes, many chose to allow students to direct much of the learning for the semester.

Choice reading was the most often used strategy to foster student-centered learning and to cultivate the growth of the heteroglossia in these YAL courses. Teacher educators did this by allowing students to independently choose books that they wanted to read. With encouragement, instructors promoted this reading by attaching low-stakes assessments to their readings like:

- Keeping up with a GoodReads (https://www.goodreads.com) log of their reading or reviews of books.
- Writing personal reflections papers or Flipgrid videos to prepare for class discussion on their choice reading.
- Creating social action projects based on the perspectives and issues found in the books that students chose to read.

- Creating book trailers and talks to help expose secondary students to new authors or books they might be interested in.
- Paired watching of student-selected YA and their movie adaptations.
- Had both whole-class readings of YA and student-directed independent reading.
- Had students work with after-school reading programs where they mentored secondary students on reading YAL and read alongside them.
- Used book clubs and literature circles to build a community of readers in their classrooms.

These reading strategies and associated assessments helped students direct the learning they experienced while getting the support of teacher educators teaching the courses. These practices allowed student voice in the heteroglossia of the classroom be one of more equal value with instructors, and this helped develop dialogic instruction.

Most course materials analyzed in this study had a directive that students would read somewhere between 1-2 YA books each week in addition to required course materials that the instructor chose to help develop students' pedagogical knowledge. While this course requirement is, by nature, authoritative direction on the part of the instructor, the openness that most instructors explained course policies would help students understand their professors sought as much freedom as they could for students while keeping up with the expectations of the rigor of a college or graduate school class. More importantly, these course syllabi showed that instructors made room for student discussion often and that many took on the role of facilitator much more often than they sought to be "the sage-on-the-stage." The purposeful decision to let students read what they wished and to help them build a community of readers within these courses show that course materials, with the tensions of authoritative and internally persuasive discourses coming into contact within heteroglossia, create the foundation for student-centered learning.

Choice assessments.

The 20 courses examined in this study were most often reading-centered classes. However, as one could expect, each course and teacher educator had a number of assessments

planned for their classes to best be able to understand student development and learning. Many classes included term papers that might be expected in college and graduate school classes, but more often than not instructors used assessment as a means for allowing student-centered learning to take place. These assignments were more often focused on how students might want to take their learning and experience with YAL in internally persuasive directions rather than just completing work as assigned.

A number of assignments on these 20 course syllabi, like the reading strategies listed above, involved student choice as a determining factor. While the direction to complete assignments is authoritative (assignments will be assigned grades by the instructor who has the power), the student-centered instructors most often helped students choose what best represents their learning. Some examples of student-centered assignments from these course syllabi are:

- YA research papers where students "Choose a research topic of interest directly related to YAL)."
- Create a piece of creative writing or a creative project to represent learning.
- Multigenre projects that follow an author or book and their major themes.
- Crafting lesson or unit plans for books and YA classes that students dream of teaching.
- Creation of bibliographies of diverse YAL as a resource for students.
- Research essays in the style of *Keywords for Children's Literature* (Nel & Paul, 2011).
- Observation of how YAL is identified in Libraries and Bookstores.
- Critical Remix Projects where students remix "the cover art of one of the YA novels" read.
- Social action project portfolios surrounding the reading of one YA author or novel.
- Creation of "Reading Ecosystems" where students plan for the reading learning environments in their future classrooms.
- Personal and reflective literacy narratives.
- Dialogue journaling with instructors and classmates.

The above assessments show how student-centered instruction can help raise the voice of the student in the syllabus so that the monological voice of the teacher is not the only one valued in the heteroglossic context of the represented class. Choice remains undercurrent as materials in this study were analyzed. The pairing of choice reading and choice writing for these YAL

courses provide a model for how instructors can make decisions and create space for students in their classrooms. A number of syllabi in this study showed that student interest and internally persuasive needs were highlighted and nurtured.

Implications and Limitations

This study highlights the potential for dialogic analysis of course materials like the course syllabus as a way for college professors to purposefully choose more student-centered practices. If the syllabus and related course materials are looked at as heteroglossic documents where various discourses intersect at sites of tension and compete, then intentional care can be given to how course materials are created and whose voice is valued. It is rare that a teacher would craft instructional materials with themselves as the total, unquestionable authority, but unintentional authoritative discourses are shared with students in education when external pressures find their way into those materials.

Bakhtin's concepts provide a lens for looking at how various discourses appear in educational documents and where the subsequent tensions of those discourses meet with others. However, the course syllabus is, by nature, an authoritative contract that instructors create for their students to abide by. There is no way for teachers to fully separate themselves from their authority in the classroom and remain in the classroom, but dialogic pedagogy is not about replacing authoritative voices with chaos but with helping to lessen the impact and pressure of authority on other voices. Did any of these teacher educators in this study succeed in giving up their monological voice entirely? No, but many made deliberate choices to give power to their students when crafting these materials. Future research might use the findings of this study as the foundation for examining how the syllabus reflects actual dialogic practice in classrooms. A

question worth examining in follow up research might be: Do syllabi that flatten the hierarchy between teacher and student actually represent classrooms where that idea is put into practice?

Bakhtin did not necessarily intend his concepts to be used in a revolutionary way; he wrote them to help understand the interplay of voices in the heteroglossic context of written and spoken utterances. Course materials like the syllabus inherently possess many different and varied educational discourses. It is revolutionary, however, to expose the banking model of teaching (Freire, 1970) as lacking and choose engaged dialogic practice instead. The mission of dialogic engagement is to ensure that sustained dialogue takes place in educational contexts and more. This mission, backed by Bakhtin's theories, seeks to raise up the marginalized voice in heteroglossia and see it given equal standing with others.

While the syllabus and related course materials show a picture of the heteroglossic context of these 20 courses, further research would need to investigate how these teacher educators present this information to students, and also see how dialogue is fostered or silenced in actual classroom instruction. Bakhtin's concepts, used here, help to understand the push and pull of the centralizing and individualizing forces of language in dialogue, but do not show how far those forces push and pull at one another or which ultimately gains more power.

Effectively, the course materials analyzed in this study showed how teacher educators in young adult literature and English education chose student-centered practices to foster the voice of the student and flatten the hierarchy between teacher and student. The syllabi and other materials were full of various educational and social discourses that might be expected but are rarely given much thought as to how they influence students coming into a new class. Bakhtinian textual analysis of course syllabi and related materials, like what was done in this study, gives the power to the teacher to allow authoritative or internally persuasive discourses to have more

room. When choosing the internally persuasive, teachers can help students see that they too have

a voice that is valued in education.

References

Albers, C. (2003). Using the syllabus to document the scholarship of teaching. *Teaching Sociology, 31*(1). 60-72.

Alston, C. L. & Barker, L. M. (2014). Reading for teaching: What we notice when we look at literature. *English Journal, 103*(4). 62-67.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981a). Discourse in the novel (M. Holquist & C. Emerson, Trans.). In M. Holquist (Ed.), *Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981b). Epic and novel (M. Holquist & C. Emerson, Trans.). In M. Holquist (Ed.), *Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics. In C. Emerson (Ed.), *Theory and History of Literature*, Volume 8 (C. Emerson, Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Bakhtin, M. M., & Sollner, P. (1983). Rabelais and Gogol: The art of discourse and the popular culture of laughter. *Mississippi Review, 11*(3). 34-50.

Bingham, C. (2000). Toward dialogic education. *Journal of Thought, 35*(4). 19-30.

Cart, M. (2001). From insider to outsider: The evolution of young adult literature. *Voices from the Middle, 9*(2). 95-98.

Caughlin, S., Juzwik, M. M., Borsheim-Black, C., Kelly, S., & Fine, J. G. (2013). English teacher candidates developing dialogically organized instructional practices. *Research in the Teaching of English, 47*(3). 212-246.

Comer, M. (2011). Young adult literature and alternative assessment measures. *Theory Into Practice, 50*. 239-246.

Coulter, D. (1999). The epic and the novel: Dialogism and teacher research. *Educational Researcher, 28*(3). 4-13.

Day, S. K. (2010). Power and polyphony in young adult literature: Rob Thomas's "slave day." *Studies in the Novel, 42*(1/2). 66-83.

Depalma, R. (2010). Toward a practice of polyphonic dialogue in multicultural teacher education. *Curriculum Inquiry, 40*(3). 436-453.

Eigler, F. (1995). Feminist criticism and Bakhtin's dialogic principal: Making the transition from theory to textual analysis. *Women in German Yearbook, 11*(1995). 189-203.

Farmer, F. (1998). Dialogue and critique: Bakhtin and the cultural studies classroom. *College Composition and Communication, 49*(2). 186-207.

Fecho, B., & Amatucci, K.B. (2008). Spinning out of control: Dialogical transactions in an English classroom. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique. 7*(1). 5-21.

Fecho, B., & Botzakis, S., (2007). Feasts of becoming: imagining a literacy classroom based on dialogic beliefs. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy. 50*(7). 548-558.

Fecho, B., Collier, N. D., Friese, E. E. G., & Wilson, A. A. (2010). Critical conversations: Tensions and opportunities of the dialogical classroom. *English Education, 42*(4). 427-447.

Fecho, B., Coombs, D., & McAuley S. (2012). Reclaiming literacy classrooms through critical dialogue. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 55*(6). 476-482.

Fecho, B., Falter, M., & Hong, X. (2016). *Teaching outside the box and inside the standards: Making room for dialogue*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Glenn, W., King, D., Heintz, K., Klapatch, J., & Berg, E. (2009). Finding space and place for young adult literature: Lessons from four first-year teachers engaging in out-of-school professional induction. *The ALAN Review, 36*(2). 6-17.

Holquist, M. (1983). Bakhtin and Rabelais: Theory as praxis. *Boundary, 11*(1/2). 5-19.

Hong, X., Falter, M. M., & Fecho, B. (2016). Embracing tension: Using Bakhtinian theory as a means for data analysis. *Qualitative Research, 17*(1). 20-36.

Juzwik, M. (2004). Towards an ethics of answerability: Reconsidering dialogism in sociocultural literacy research. *College Composition and Communication, 55*(3). 536-567.

L'Allier, S. K., & Elish-Piper, L. (2007). "Walking the walk" with teacher education candidates: Strategies for promoting active engagement with assigned readings. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 50*(5). 338-353.

Lin, C. C. (2014). Storytelling as academic discourse: Bridging the cultural-linguistic divide in the era of the common core. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 33(1). 52-73.

Matusov, E. (2007). Applying Bakhtinian scholarship on discourse in education: A critical review essay. *Educational Theory, 57*(2). 215-238.

Matusov, E. & Lemke, J. (2015). Values in dialogic pedagogy. *Dialogic Pedagogy, 3*(2015). 1-20.

Miles, A. P. (2010). Dialogic encounters in art education. *Studies in Art Education, 51*(4). 375-379.

Moni, K. (2000). First contact: Preservice teachers review young adult literature. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 44*(3). 297-299.

Nel, P. & Paul, L. (Eds.). (2011). *Keywords for children's literature*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Nystrand, M. (1997). *Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of learning in the English classroom*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Nystrand, M. & Gamoran, A. (1991). Instructional discourse, student engagement, and literature achievement. *Research in the Teaching of English, 25*(3). 261-290.

Powell-Brown, A. (2004). Can you be a teacher of literacy if you don't love to read? *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 47*(4). 284-288.

Smagorinsky, P., & Whiting, M. E. (1995). *How English teachers get taught: Methods of teaching the methods course*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Stallworth, B. J., Gibbons, L., & Fauber, L. (2006). It's not on the list: An exploration of teachers' perspectives on using multicultural literature. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 49*(6). 478-489.

Stewart, T.T. (2010). A dialogic pedagogy: Looking to Mikhail Bakhtin for alternatives to standards period teaching practices. *Critical Education*, 1(6), 1-21.

Stewart, T. T. (2012). English teachers, administrators, and dialogue: Transcending the asymmetry of power in the discourse of educational power. *English Education, 44*(4). 375-393.

Stewart, T. T., & Boggs, G. L. (2016). Emerging dialogic structures in education reform: An analysis of urban teachers' online compositions. *Dialogic Pedagogy Journal, 4*(2016). 142-161.

Stewart, T.T., & McClure, G. (2013). Freire, Bakhtin, and collaborative pedagogy: A dialogue with students and mentors. *International Journal for Dialogic Science*. 7(1). 91-108.

Strickland, T. H. (2019). Engaged dialogic pedagogy and the tensions teachers face. *Dialogic Pedagogy Journal, 7*(2019). 1-7.

Vasiliev, N. L. (2018). M. M. Bakhtin as a university professor. *Dialogic Pedagogy Journal, 6*(2018). 1-7.

Vološinov, V. N. (1976). Discourse in life and discourse in art. In N. Bruss (Ed.), *Freudianism: A Marxist Critique* (I. R. Titunik, Trans.). New York, New York: Academic Press.

Winograd, K., & Rosen, S. (1994). Preservice teachers study themselves as readers: One component in the education of reading teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 21*(3). 69-76.

CHAPTER 4

THE YOUNG ADULT LITERATURE METHODS COURSE IN SECONDARY ENGLISH

TEACHER EDUCATION

Abstract

Through an examination of 20 young adult (YA) literature (YAL) and adolescent literature course syllabi submitted by researchers and teacher educators recently published in *The ALAN Review*, this article analyzes the syllabi of YAL methods courses found in preservice English teacher education to explain the methods used with preservice teachers to share a snapshot of the field currently. The syllabi, submitted by English teacher educators, showed a determined use of YAL in language and literacy education methods coursework. Findings indicate that these courses use YAL to provide diverse and nuanced ways of reaching the needs of college and graduate students seeking teaching certification in English. Findings are organized into sections that explain what is being done in the YAL methods courses now, what is being read, what is being created, produced, and assessed, and finally what is missing from these courses. Discussion then addresses how the knowledge gained from this study can be used as a foundation for future development of the YAL methods course in coming years.

Introduction

While the common canonical texts used with public middle and high school students in English classes today like "Beowulf" (Heaney, 2000), Shakespeare's plays, Chaucer and other medieval texts, and a handful of novels like *Lord of the Flies* (Golding, 1954), *The Great Gatsby* (Fitzgerald, 1925), *Frankenstein* (Shelley, 1818), *Night* (Wiesel, 1960), *A Tale of Two Cities* (Dickens, 1859) among others hasn't changed much in the last century (Santoli & Wagner, 2004), it is ever more the reality that middle and secondary teachers are enriching and differentiating their curriculum with young adult literature (YAL). Experts (Agee, 1998, Buehler, 2009, 2016, Bushman, 1997, Bull, 2011, Daisey, 2010, Glenn, 2014, Glenn & Ginsberg, 2016, Marshall, 2001, Samuels, 1983) have come alongside practicing teachers to help support

preservice teachers in understanding how to infuse YAL into their curriculum, and this is creating a new generation of teachers that see both canonical and adolescent literature as a necessary part of their students' reading educations.

However, this understanding of how to choose texts to enrich traditional curriculum does not happen naturally. Teacher educators (Glenn, 2014, Glenn & Ginsberg, 2016, Kajder & Witte, 2017, Kaywell, 2001, Moni, 2000, Parsons, 2016, Pytash, 2016, Sulzer & Thein, 2016) are designing courses in preservice English teacher education programs to show students more than just great books to read with middle and high school students, but how to choose texts with a pedagogy of YAL in mind. Buehler (2016) defined YA pedagogy as:

> An approach to teaching YA lit that promotes love of reading, improving skills in reading, and connecting reading to real world contexts. Designed to provide reading experiences with YA lit that are personally, socially, and academically relevant to teens of all kinds. Foregrounds valuing adolescence and cultivating complex experiences with YA texts (p. 9).

By developing preservice teachers into critical readers of YAL, teacher educators in YAL methods courses are going beyond traditional texts to help students see an opportunity for more. However, there is no consensus currently available about what the field as a whole is doing now, and this article aims to share a sample of the strategies used by practicing teacher educators as they begin to develop young adult literature methods courses in English education programs.

In this study, 20 course syllabi submitted by 17 English teacher educators that recently published with *The ALAN Review* were analyzed in order to understand what is being done in young adult literature methods courses today, what is being read, what is getting created, produced, and assessed with preservice teachers, and finally what gaps there are that can show

what is not being done. The findings discussed in this article are the result of the search to answer the following research question:

1. How is young adult literature being taught in English teacher education, and how can knowing that help teacher educators develop the field further in the future?

For the purposes of this study, course syllabi were dissected and component parts were analyzed to examine how the course syllabi could show how young adult literature is packaged and presented to students. Analysis of the data drawn from these syllabi shows how YAL is being used to prepare preservice teachers for work in middle and secondary English/language arts classrooms. When looking at what these courses hope to do, teacher educators can begin to formulate an understanding of a YA pedagogy in YAL methods courses in order to see where the field is now, and also begin to dream about where and how YAL will fit in secondary English education in the future.

Method

In order to understand what is being done with YAL in secondary English teacher education in the United States, participants were sought out that had recently been a part of the national discourse on young adult literature in secondary education. To find these participants, authors recently published with *The ALAN Review* were pursued. These authors, who had published in 2017-2018 (Volumes 44(2)-46(1)) of *The ALAN Review*, were contacted to gauge interest in submitting materials for this study because they were most likely actively teaching YAL in English teacher education programs currently. In these two years, 114 individuals were published in the journal, and of that 114, 48 authors identified as teacher educators working with YAL or adolescent literature.

Data Gathering and Analysis.

43 of these active teacher educators were initially contacted to see who would be interested in submitting materials for this study. Potential participants were emailed a summary of the study, a copy of the IRB approval, and a list of requested materials for them to consider submitting for analysis. These materials included course syllabi with their reading lists, assessments, rubrics, and any other materials that would help create a fuller picture of how these courses included YAL in their curriculum. For the purpose of this article, the course syllabi will be compared to understand broadly how teacher educators designed their classes to prepare preservice English teachers to work with young adult literature in their future classrooms.

Of the 43 teacher educators working with YAL in whole or in part in secondary English teacher education, 17 submitted course syllabi for 20 individual classes. After the initial reading of the 20 course syllabi, syllabi were categorized into three major groups. 13 of the 20 courses were entirely focused on young adult or adolescent literature and could be considered YAL methods courses, 4 courses were reading or reading methods courses that included YAL as a major part, and 3 courses were broad literacy or curriculum courses of which YAL was at least a part. These categories allowed the syllabi to be separated by focus so that the 13 young adult literature methods courses could be distinguished from those courses that only used YAL in a cursory manner. These 13 YAL methods courses are the focus of the present article.

Limitations

The course syllabus is one way of looking at how methods courses in teacher education are designed, and, by understanding this design, future courses can be built upon a foundation of knowing how and why things are being done in a certain way (Smagorinsky & Whiting, 1995). The 20 course syllabi examined in this study provide the data to understand broad ways in which

YAL is being used in language and literacy teacher education programs. However, without looking specifically at the teacher educators and how they put their paper course into practice with live students, determinations on the how and why of instructional decisions are incomplete.

The course syllabus can be a politically charged, personal document but they can also be overlooked, passed from one instructor to the other, or lack attention. Further research would need to include interview data with the 17 instructors who were participants in this study to add weight to why they designed their syllabus the way that they did. Much information could be added to this data to show how teacher educators view their role in various educational discourses to their students or if they are even aware that that is what they are doing.

While this study is focused on how YAL has been conceptualized as a part of secondary English teacher education coursework, it does not directly address the depth of the actual YA titles that these 17 instructors chose to use with their students to meet the purposes outlined in this article. This study also did not examine in depth the books and research articles that were also included on these course syllabi. As the goal was to show merely what texts were and were not being used and not content analyses of those books and what they provide, looking further at the teacher educators and researchers who were backing up these instructional choices will provide more potential to understand even further why decisions were made and how the YAL methods courses were grounded in research and practice.

Literature Review

Smagorinsky and Whiting (1995) set the stage for teacher education researchers to examine course syllabi in order to understand how a broad field, for them English education, used methods courses for student learning. They then used this broad knowledge as the foundation to start a conversation in the field and to build and dream about how methods will

develop in English education in the future. They argue that "In spite of the limitations of studying course syllabi to gain information about the methods class, the documents do have a story to tell, even if that story requires some inference on our part" (p. 101). What is gained from studying course syllabi is an understanding of approach, what students are expected to do as a part of the class, how instructors assess student learning, and many other things that allow teacher educators to further develop their craft. There is a similar hope in this study of YAL course syllabi. That hope is that the field can have a conversation about these findings in order to know what is being done now so that teacher educators can look toward future iterations of their courses.

Pasternak, Caughlan, Hallman, Renzi, and Rush (2014) followed a similar path by studying research publications on English teacher methods since Smagorinsky and Whiting's study. They felt that such a study of methods courses and research in teacher education must be done because "the field must move forward to consider how methods courses need to evolve as a way to respond to new forms of literacy, new technologies, more diverse student populations, an increased state of accountability for schools, and increased emphasis on field/university connections" (p. 174). It is with this call that research and course design can move forward with YAL methods courses.

Pasternak, Caughlan, Hallman, Renzi, and Rush defined the methods course in their study of English education methods to situate the reader's understanding of what a methods course was because they felt that there was not consensus on the term in their study of research articles. They explained:

> the *English language arts (ELA) methods course* is defined in alignment with the
> definition proposed by NCTE's CEE: ELA *methods* focus on the representation and

teaching of ELA content and involve the inquiry into the beliefs or opinions of its

participants regarding concepts of ELA at the secondary and middle school levels, the

planning of lessons or courses of study, and classroom management related to the

subject-area methods" (Emphasis in original, pp. 4-5).

When examining the young adult literature methods course in English teacher education in this

study, a similar view is held. Subject specific beliefs about the methods of young adult literature

within English education have been drawn out below to provide a portrait of the field so that

conversations can be had about how YA methods might evolve in the future.

<div align="center">**Findings**</div>

After the analysis of the 13 course syllabi specific to a young adult literature methods

course out of the 20 studied overall, four sections below highlight the snapshot of what is being

done with young adult literature methods courses in secondary English teacher education. These

sections are: what teacher educators have students do in YAL methods courses, what preservice

teachers read in YAL methods courses, what gets created, produced, and assessed, and, finally,

what is not being done in YAL methods courses.

What Teacher Educators have Students Do in YAL Methods Courses

Analysis of data led to an understanding that there are four main focuses of young adult

literature methods courses currently in practice in teacher education programs in the United

States. To best capture what the broad focuses and purposes of these courses, brief descriptions

of overall purposes are listed below. The findings of this study will allow YAL teacher educators

and researchers a way to understand how the field views YAL methods courses and their

purposes in English teacher education. These broad categories, explained further below, are 1.

traditional reading and writing methods using YAL, 2. creating a social justice pedagogy,

valuing diverse perspectives, and becoming critical readers of YAL, 3. unpacking the concepts of young adult literature and adolescence(ts)**,** and 4. reflective practice using YAL. First, how the YAL methods course can focus on traditional reading and writing methods will be examined.

Traditional reading and writing methods.

A number of goals of the YAL methods courses, as shown through these 13 course syllabi, have to do with curriculum building in middle school language arts and high school English classes. Where many focus on the teaching of literature, all the related needs of English pedagogy as it relates to the five language arts (reading, writing, speaking, listening, and viewing) are well represented in the data. Planning and instruction of English/language arts to secondary and middle school students using YAL is of paramount importance to courses that focus on traditional methods. The discourses of state and national standards, including the Common Core, were clearly visible to purposes of teaching English pedagogy using YAL as reflected on these syllabi, and have a loud voice in such purposes. Where these discourses of the standards, even the NCTE standards, were heavily a part of the course design, an underlying urgency for preservice teachers to learn reading methods while having too little time was also present. Thus, little time was spent explaining how the standards influence teaching. Preservice teachers are brought into the world of YAL methods with an understanding in place that the opinion of teaching English is one where an urgency to cover required curriculum is a major concern.

Creating social justice pedagogy, valuing diverse perspectives, and becoming critical readers of YAL.

Many of the courses represented in these 13 syllabi had a goal of using YAL to help preservice teachers seek out perspectives that were unfamiliar to them in order to be best

prepared to work with diverse student populations in their school placements. It would also allow them to be able to participate and encourage a pedagogy of social justice in their future classrooms. Students were asked to seek out aspects of social justice that were important to them to form their own opinions and not just agree to authoritative discourses for how reading should be taught or what texts should be read with students. This category of YAL methods courses showed that courses were meant to have students use YAL to become familiar with a wide range of perspectives so that they could understand the potential of using these books with students. Courses that showed this orientation toward active participation on social issues were led by instructors who made student inquiry a major part of their students' experiences with YAL while in their teacher education program.

Unpacking the concepts of young adult literature and adolescence(ts).

Where the concept of the young adult or young adult literature might seem obvious in a course on YAL methods, many of the participants' syllabi showed that it was important to have preservice teachers grapple with their authoritative and socially constructed views on who adolescents were, what their needs are in the English classroom, and what young adult literature means as a genre or if it was even a genre. Syllabi that fell into this category also exhibited a need for students to critically analyze both required and choice books and research and practitioner texts to help them build their own individual understanding of YAL. They did this so that students could rationalize the use of YAL in English classes when facing the authoritative demands of standards, traditional practices, and negative social discourses about YAL.

Reflective practice using yal.

While all of the above purposes of the YAL courses represented in these 13 course syllabi had YAL as an important and necessary part of secondary English teacher education,

many also focused on preservice teachers as readers of YAL themselves. The idea that these preservice teachers needed to be "teachers who read" (Kajder & Witte, 2017) was evidenced through course goals. Where reflective practice was, at least in a small way, a part of every syllabus examined, there were several that showed a special need for preservice teachers to use reflective pedagogy with YAL in order to build a curriculum using YAL for their future English or language arts classrooms. These courses encouraged students to lean into wobble (Fecho, 2011) where students examine when their own beliefs about teaching are shaken. Then they had students develop their own understandings on how to best read and teach YAL in secondary classrooms.

What Preservice Teachers Read in YA Methods Courses

Within the four categories of YAL methods courses explained above, there were three genres of readings that students were asked to do as a part of these YAL methods courses. First, they were asked to read methods books and articles, practitioner pieces, and research articles that focused on the study of English education and young adult literature in education. Second, they were asked to read young adult novels both as a whole class and as independent readers. Third, students were asked to read blogs, social media accounts, and other online spaces to participate in the online discourse surrounding YAL. For the purpose of this article, the first and second types of readings will be explained in more detail below.

Methods readings.

Much like Smagorinsky and Whiting (1995) focused on in their influential English education methods course syllabus study, books and research articles are a major part of these 13 young adult literature methods courses. The following books, articles, and chapters were cited by these teacher educators in their courses. A number of courses alluded to other chapters and

articles that would be given to students through digital course reserves, but were otherwise

unnamed and could not be listed here.

Books

Appleman, D. (2014). *Critical encounters in secondary English: Teaching literary theory to adolescents* (3rd edition). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Anderson, E. K., & Kenneally, M. (2012). *Dear teen me: Authors write letters to their teen selves*. Zest Books. Minneapolis, MN: Lerner Publishing Group.

Darvin, J. (2015). *Teaching the tough issues: Problem solving from multiple perspectives in middle and high school humanities classes. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.*

Epstein (2010). *Teen 2.0: Saving our children and families the torment of adolescence.* Fresno, CA: Quill Driver Books.

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

Kittle, P. (2013). *Book love*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Nilsen, A. P. & Donelson, K. L. (2009). Literature for today's young adults. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Pomerantz, P., & Raby, R. (2017). *Smart girls: Success, school, and the myth of post-feminism.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Wadham, R., & Ostenson, J. (2013). *Integrating young adult literature through the common core standards.* Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited.

Research Articles and Chapters

Bailey, N. J. (2005). Let us not forget to support lgbt youth in the middle school years. *Middle School Journal, 37*(2). 31-36.

Barkdoll, J. K. & Scherff, L. (2008). 'Literature is not a cold dead place': An interview with John Green. *English Journal*, 97 (3), 67-71.

Bishop, R. S. (1990). Mirrors, windows, and sliding glass doors. *Perspectives, 1*(3). Ix-xi.

Bortolotti, G. R., & Hutcheon, L. (2007). On the origin of adaptations: Rethinking fidelity discourse and "success"—Biologically. *New Literary History, 38*(3). 443-458.

Bushman, J. H. (1997). Young adult literature in the classroom--or is it? *English Journal, 86*(3). 35-40.

Cadden, M. (2000). The irony of narration in the young adult novel. *Children's Literature Association Quarterly, 25*(3). 146-154.

Cadden, M. (2005). Simultaneous emotions: Entwining modes in children's books. *Children's Literature in Education, 36*(3). 285-298.

Ching, S. H. D. (2005). Multicultural children's literature as an instrument of power. *Language Arts*, 83(2), 128-136.

Coats, K. (2010). Young adult literature: Growing up in theory. In S. Wolf, K. Coats, P. Enciso, & C. Jenkins (Eds.) *Handbook of Research on Children's and Young Adult Literature. (pp.* 315-329). London, UK: Routledge.

Connors, S. P. (2014). "I Try to Remember Who I Am and Who I Am Not": The Subjugation of Nature and Women in the Hunger Games. In S. P. Connors (Ed.), *The Politics of Panem*. Sense Publishers, Rotterdam.

Connors, S. P. (2017). Designing meaning: A multimodal perspective on comics reading. In C.

Hill (Ed.), *Teaching Comics Through Multiple Lenses: Critical Perspectives*. London, UK: Routledge.

Connors, S. P. (2019). Disturbing the universe: Examining the stranger through a lens of philosophical criticism. In C. Hill & V. Malo-Juvera (Eds.), Critical Approaches to Teaching the High School Novel: Reinterpreting Canonical Literature (pp. 104-120). New York, NY: Routledge.

Connors, S. P., & Trites, R. S. (2018). Legend, exceptionalism, and genocidal logic: A framework for reading neoliberalism in YA dystopias. *The ALAN Review, 45*(3). 31-41.

Dobbins, M. L. (2017). Disabled ≠ Disempowered: A Critical Framework for Analyzing the Representation of Mental Disabilities in Young Adult Literature. *English Undergraduate Honors Theses, 8*. University of Arkansas.

Evans-Winters, V. E., & Esposito, J. (2010). Other people's daughters: Critical race feminism and Black girl's education. *Educational Foundations, 24*(1). 11-24.

Gallo, D. (2001). How classics create an alliterate society. *English Journal*, 90(3), 33-39.

Gibbons, L. C., Dail, J. S., & Stallworth, B. J. (2006). Young adult literature in the English curriculum today. *The ALAN Review, 33*(3). 53-61.

Glaus, M. (2014). Text complexity and young adult literature: Establishing its place. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 57*(5). 407-416.

Goering, C. Z. & Connors, S. P. (2014). Exemplars and epitaphs: Defending young adult literature. *Talking Points*, 25(2), 15-21.

Gooderham, D. (1995). Children's fantasy literature: Toward an anatomy. *Children's Literature in Education, 26*(3). 171-183.

Greenbaum, V. (1997). Censorship and the myth of appropriateness: Reflections on teaching reading in high school. *English Journal*, 16-20.

Herman-Wilmarth, J., & Ryan, C. L. (2015). Doing what you can: Considering ways to address LGBT topics in language arts curricula. *Language Arts, 92*(6). 436-443.

Hughes-Hassell, S. (2013). Multicultural young adult literature as a form of counter-storytelling. *The Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy, 83*(3). 212-228.

Kelley, B. (2010). Sequential art, graphic novels, and comics. *SANE Journal: Sequential Art Narrative in Education, 1*(1). 2-21.

Kennon, P. (2005). 'Belonging' in young adult dystopian fiction: New communities created by children. *Papers: Explorations into Children's Literature*, 15. 40-49.

Kornfield, E., & Jackson, S. (1987). The female bildungsroman in nineteenth-century America: Parameters of a vision. *The Journal of American Culture, 10*(4). 69-75.

Landt, S. M. (2006). Multicultural literature and young adolescents: A kaleidoscope of opportunity. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 49(8), 690-697.

Lesko, N. (1996). Past, present, and future conceptions of adolescence. *Educational Theory* 46(4), 453-472.

Macaluso, M., & McKenzie, C. (2014). Exploiting the Gaps in the Fence. In: S. P. Connors (Ed). *The Politics of Panem*. Sense Publishers, Rotterdam.

Petrone, R., Sarigianides, S. T., & Lewis, M. A. (2015). The youth lens: Analyzing adolescence(ts) in literary texts. *Journal of Literacy Research, 46*(4). 506-533.

Schieble, M. (2014). Reading images in American Born Chinese through critical visual literacy. *English Journal*,103(5), 47-52.

Smith, D. L. (1992). Huck, Jim, and American racial discourse. In J. S. Leonard, T. Tenney, & T. M. Davis (Eds), *Satire or Evasion?: Black Perspectives on Huckleberry Finn*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Spanke, J. (2018). Magnificent things and terrible men: Teaching Sherman Alexie in the age of #metoo. *English Education, 51*(1). 101-108.

Stairs, A. J., & Burgos, S. S. (2010). "The power of independent, self-selected reading in the middle grades. *Middle School Journal, 41*(3). 41-48.

Stallworth, B. J., Gibbons, L., & Fauber, L. (2006). It's not on the list: An exploration of teachers' perspectives on using multicultural literature. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 49*(6). 478-489.

Trites, R. S. (2000). Maybe that is writing, changing things around and disguising the for-real. The paradox of authority in adolescent literature. In R. S. Trites (Ed). *Disturbing the Universe: Power and Repression in Adolescent Literature*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Press.

Wolk, S. (2009). Reading for a better world: Teaching social responsibility with young adult literature. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 52*(8). 664-673.

Zipes, J. (1992). Recent trends in the contemporary American fairy tale. *Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts, 5*(1). 13-41.

There are several trends in the whole class readings featured above, and they map onto the engagement that these teacher educators expected their students do with participation in the professional discourses surrounding young adult literature as part of their experience in their YAL methods course. Students were often asked to critically examine professional journals like *English Journal*, *English Education, Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *The ALAN Review*, *Study and Scrutiny: Research in Young Adult Literature*, *SIGNAL Journal* among others to further their understanding of how YAL is being used in teacher education and not just accept them as authorities without engaging individually with them first.

Several of the readings above identify a need to have preservice teachers examine the concept of adolescence(ts) as part of their YAL methods coursework. Many books and articles deal with the subject of using YAL to have students explore diverse perspectives. Many of these required readings match the study of YAL with current issues in America. A couple of the books used with the students are decidedly practitioner books and not method or theory books, but it

must be recognized that these courses include both practitioner and researcher voices through texts shared with preservice teachers.

What is interesting out of this list of readings is that only 22 out of 47 of them were published since 2010. This shows a favoring of established work and research that is only nominally supported with current publications. Only 9 of the 38 research articles or chapters were from NCTE sponsored journals, and it is interesting to note that only 2 articles published in *The ALAN Review* were included considering that these courses were all created by teacher educators themselves publishing with *ALAN*.

These teacher educators also had students read and interact with national and international communities on YAL through Twitter, blogs, literary awards, and through hashtags. Students learned how young adult literature was defined, how adolescence was conceptualized, and also how YAL fit in with current social issues and trends in education in order to not only understand what is being talked about in the field, but also as active participants themselves.

YA Novels.

In addition to the books, articles, and chapters listed above, there were 319 separate YA titles included on choice and required reading lists on the 20 syllabi of the larger study. What is most important to look at for the purpose of this article is to share what the most often included YA novels are in these YAL courses so that an understanding can be made on whose voices are being valued, and whose are missing. After tracking the individual occurrences of these 319 separate titles on these 20 course syllabi, the top 14 most included texts are shown below to highlight what the most prized texts are for preservice English teachers to read currently. These 14 titles were ultimately included on at least 3 separate syllabi out of the 20 included in the study.

Title	Author(s)	Year Published	Times Included
All American Boys	Jason Reynolds & Brendan Kiely	2015	6
The Hate U Give	Angie Thomas	2017	5
The Serpent King	Jeff Zentner	2016	5
American Born Chinese	Gene Luen Yang	2006	4
Looking for Alaska	John Green	2005	4
The Outsiders	S.E. Hinton	1967	4
Gabi, Girl in Pieces	Isabel Quintero	2015	4
Scythe	Neal Shusterman	2016	3
Between Shades of Gray	Ruta Sepetys	2011	3
The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian	Sherman Alexie	2007	3
The Chocolate War	Robert Cormier	1974	3

Speak	Laurie Halse Anderson	1999	3
Salt to the Sea	Ruta Sepetys	2016	3
We Were Liars	E. Lockhart	2014	3

These 14 novels span many decades of YAL publishing, but also have interesting trends. A couple of the novels are familiar as almost canonized YAL like Cormier's (1974) *The Chocolate War*. A number of these titles are reflective of authors that have won awards or been a major presence at The *ALAN* conference. Many are award winners or honorable mentions. But the two biggest surprises would be *Scythe* by Neal Shusterman (2016), a science fiction novel, and Ruta Sepetys' (2011, 2016) two historical fiction novels *Between Shades of Gray* and *Salt to the Sea*.

The inclusion of *Scythe* on the list is not likely a surprise to readers of *The ALAN Review* as the author, Neal Shusterman, is a recurring presence at the national conference. However, it is worth noting that a science fiction novel like *Scythe* has made it into so many YAL courses as science fiction has historically been seen as a genre of independent or outside of school reading and not given a place of prominence in discussions on text selection. Sepetys two novels are also not a huge surprise as historical fiction is often used in middle and high schools, but the fact that Sepetys is the only author of historical fiction novels on the list and that two of her novels are included is an interesting point. It causes wonder at why other historical fiction novelists were also not included as often.

The final trend in young adult novels, which matches a major focus of these YA methods courses, is the use of novels depicting diverse perspectives dealing with modern social issues. This reflects the fact that many of these YA methods courses were focused on helping preservice teachers become teachers who enact social justice pedagogies. The novels that made it onto this top 14 list might be the same that readers might guess as the books or their authors have been in the national spotlight in the year(s) before these courses were enacted with students.

What Gets Created, Produced, and Assessed in YA Methods Courses

As expected, students read and reflected in a variety of ways in their YAL methods courses. Some courses had students keep up with their readings and reactions to YAL through social media accounts like GoodReads (goodreads.com) and Twitter (twitter.com). Others had students blogging, writing reflection papers, and using video journaling and dialogue journaling to constantly reflect on their experiences with YAL in these classes. Students built communities of readers within these courses where they were in constant dialogue with each other and reflecting on the texts that they are reading and this is a major purpose of these classes. Book talks, book trailers, and other means of talking about books were used to model for preservice teachers how they can package YAL to secondary students in a way that will help them choose their own independent reading books.

The idea that these preservice teachers needed to be "teachers who read" (Kajder & Witte, 2017) was evidenced in many of these YAL methods courses. This was done by having students individualize their study of YAL and find personal reasons for using YAL with their future students. Through individual engagement with the YA novels above, preservice teachers were to develop their own reading habits so that they could become model readers to their future middle and high school students in their own classrooms.

Students also spent time writing rationales for using YAL in their future classrooms, unpacking the concepts of adolescence and adolescent readers, and engaging with the idea that young adult literature was a genre of literature for marketing purposes. This all served a desire to help preservice teachers understand what it meant to enact a pedagogy of YAL in their future classrooms. These purposes hoped to prepare students to be able to show how valuable YAL could be even when facing discourses like traditional reading choices (canon) over YAL in field placements.

These courses also had students use YAL with groups of adolescent readers to hear first-hand how students viewed literature that was supposed to be representative of them but also written for them. They had students create social justice projects where they partnered with middle and high school students and other community members to match middle and secondary students with books that reflected their diverse identities and the needs of their communities. This gave students experiences with local readers and helped them develop an understanding for how to use YAL to enact social and community change.

Traditional assessments like response papers, research or journal articles, and presentations were all a part of the YAL methods course as well. Multigenre projects, creative projects, case studies of readers, and lesson and unit plans were also infused into student learning. Some classes also had students create author bibliographies or author studies as part of their coursework.

Discussion

While the course syllabus does not fully explain all of the details of course readings, assignments, and assessments, it does give a picture of what students will be expected to do in these courses. A number of trends were shared above in both the readings given to students as

well as the assignments and assessments that were common across these course syllabi. Ultimately, the data shows readers of *The ALAN Review* what is being done, read, and assessed with preservice teachers in secondary English education. However, it is what is missing from these courses that can spark further discussion.

What is Not Being Done in YA Methods Courses.

A number of gaps in the data were found during analysis of these course syllabi and are relevant and worthy of noting for discussion. By discussing and addressing these gaps, teacher educators can consider what needs to be added to their future courses, or they might rest in the satisfaction that they do already cover these needs in their own courses.

Adherence to state and national standards, while a part of each syllabus studied, were often alluded to but not often explicitly tied to student objectives and goals. What is missing is the why behind teacher adherence to certain standards over others rather than just an inheritance of the standards in place by new teachers. Few courses directly tied standards (state, Common Core, or NCTE) to the assessments of student learning that were shared through the course syllabi. Doing this work shows students how teacher educators operate within standardized places as well, and that teaching English using YAL is not antithetical to teaching in a middle or high school using required standards.

Few syllabi situate the YAL methods course within the larger teacher education programs in which they are a part. The reason this needs to be done is to show students how YAL methods, just like reading and writing methods courses, are a part of the greater whole of English education and are not just a sideshow. While the YAL methods course does want to focus, in part, on preservice teachers as readers, for it to be considered a methods course, per the Pasternak, Caughlan, Hallman, Renzi, and Rush (2014) definition earlier cited with its own

beliefs and opinions about pedagogy, distinct methods of instruction using YAL must be continuously developed.

In course required readings, teacher educators did not lean heavily on the NCTE journals, authors, and books that they otherwise had students engage with as professionals during their coursework. For example, Buehler's (2016) book titled *Teaching Reading with YA Literature: Complex Texts, Complex Lives* was not included as a whole text on any of the course syllabi even though it directly speaks to the creation of a pedagogy specific to YAL. It would also do students well to be reading updated research and practitioner articles that are speaking to the climate of English education now, in 2019, and the myriad difficulties that new teachers might face.

While this article does not delve deeper into the whole list of 319 YAL titles included on these course syllabi reading lists, what the top 14 does show is that there are many authors currently adding to the broad subgenres discussed that can also be shown to students now to add to the great body of work shown here. Samira Ahmed's (2019) *Internment*, Ibi Zoboi's (2018) *Pride*, and Jason Reynold's (2017) *Long Way Down* would all be great additions to these reading lists for students.

Only one of the courses gave students absolute freedom of choice when it came to the YAL they read. All other courses gave students either guided-choice from pre-approved reading lists or genre lists or they were given a whole class list of YAL that students would all read together. If real choice in text selection is valued by teacher educators teaching the YAL methods course and associated with *ALAN*, then the concept of choice and what it means must be examined as a field.

21st Century literacy skills were alluded to in many syllabi, but explicit attention to reading YAL in digital form was not addressed. Where most courses had technology or

instructional technology strategies as a part of students' work, more attention needs to be paid to how preservice teachers teach reading and YAL to middle and high school students using technology. Also, how preservice teachers can plan for teaching YAL using technology in the classroom needs to be given direct attention.

Finally, the explicit identity of preservice teachers as writers was largely missing from these syllabi. All courses required student writing in assessments, but, while their identity as readers was often in focus, rarely was an identity as a writer explored. One course focused student learning on the writing of creating pieces alongside their reading of YAL, and more than one course offered a creative writing option in choice assessments or final projects, but it was rare that the identity of being a writer was paired with the identity of being a reader. If English teacher education has a goal of training new teachers how to model student work, then space must be made in courses for preservice teachers to develop or become writers themselves even as they develop as readers of YAL as these identities are not mutually exclusive.

Conclusion

Where the YAL methods course is still being developed as a separate entity from reading and writing methods courses already a part of English teacher education programs, the YAL methods courses examined in this study show a determined effort on the part of teacher educators to create something new and self-sustaining. Future research should examine how the teacher educators who submitted the syllabi enact these courses with actual students so that a fuller picture of these courses can be understood. The courses should also be examined in the context of the larger programs in which they are a part to understand how college and universities view the YAL methods course as a tool for English teacher training.

It is important that *ALAN*, as an organization, begin to speak more about how YAL methods are being developed and how a pedagogy specific to YAL is in practice. It is only through such discussion, research, and teaching that the YAL methods courses can separate from broad methods coursework or reading methods coursework and become common across teacher education programs nationally. A goal can be shared broadly that YAL needs its own specific pedagogy and methods separate from reading and writing methods to be able to help preservice teachers see that its use in secondary classrooms is necessary.

The 20 course syllabi examined in this study, and in turn the analysis of the 13 courses that were explicitly YAL methods courses for this article, show what is being done in the field broadly. Now, researchers and teacher educators that are a part of *ALAN* and the *National Council of Teachers of English* can use the foundation of this analysis to discuss how the field can be developed further in coming years. If a determined effort is given to raise up the YAL methods course as an integral part of English education, then it can be expected to be given more voice in discussions in English teacher education.

References

Agee, J. (1998). Negotiating different conceptions about reading and teaching literature in a preservice literature class. *Research in the Teaching of English, 33*(1). 85-124.

Ahmed, S. (2019). *Internment*. New York, NY: Little, Brown Books for Young Readers.

Alexie, S. (2007). *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian.* New York, NY: Little, Brown and Company.

Anderson, L. H. (1999). *Speak*. New York, NY: Square Fish.

Buehler, J. (2009). Ways to join the living conversation about young adult literature. *English Journal, 98*(3). 26-32.

Buehler, J. (2016). *Teaching reading with ya literature: Complex texts, complex lives.* Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Bushman, J. H. (1997). Young adult literature in the classroom--or is it? *English Journal, 86*(3). 35-40.

Bull, K. B. (2011). Connecting with texts: Teacher candidates reading young adult literature. *Theory Into Practice, 50*(3). *223-230.*

Cormier, R. (1974). *The Chocolate War*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Daisey, P. (2010). Secondary preservice teachers remember their favorite reading experiences: Insights and implications for content area instruction. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 53*(8). 678-687.

Dickens, C. (1859). *A tale of two cities.* London, UK: Chapman & Hall.

Fecho, B. (2011). *Teaching for the students: Habits of heart, mind, and practice in the engaged classroom*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Fitzgerald, F. S. (1925). *The great Gatsby*. New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Glenn, W. (2014). To witness and to testify: Preservice teachers examine literary aesthetics to better understand diverse literature. *English Education, 46*(2). 90-116.

Glenn, W. J., & Ginsberg, R. (2016) Resisting readers' identity (re)construction across English and young adult literature course contexts. *Research in the Teaching of English, 51*(1). 84-105.

Golding, W. (1954). *Lord of the flies*. New York, NY: The Berkley Publishing Group.

Green, J. (2005). *looking for Alaska*. New York, NY: The Penguin Group.

Heaney, S. (2000). *Beowulf*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.

Hinton, S. E. (1967). *the outsiders*. New York, NY: The Penguin Group.

Kajder, S., & Witte, S. (2017). Learning from teachers who read. *Voices from the Middle, 24*(4). 6-8.

Kaywell, J. (2001). Preparing teachers to teach young adult literature. *English Education, 33*(4). 323-327.

lockhart, e. (2014). *We Were Liars*. New York, NY: Delacorte Press.

Marshall, G. A. (2001). What's the big idea? Integrating young adult literature in the middle school. *English Journal, 90*(3). 74-81.

Moni, K. (2000). First contact: Preservice teachers review young adult literature. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 44*(3). 297-299.

Parsons, L. T. (2016). Learning from preservice teachers' responses to trans-themed young adult literature: Improving personal practice in teacher education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 37*(6). 933-947.

Pasternak, D. L., Caughlan, S., Hallman, H., Renzi, L., & Rush, L. (2014). Teaching English language arts methods in the United States: a review of the research. *Review of Education, 2*(2). 146-185.

Pytash, K. E. (2013). Using ya literature to help preservice teachers deal with bullying and suicide. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 56*(6). 470-479.

Quintero, I. (2014). *Gabi, A Girl in Pieces*. El Paso, TX: Cinco Puntos Press.

Reynolds, J. (2017). *Long Way Down*. New York, NY: Atheneum Books for Young Readers.

Reynolds, J., & Kiely, B. (2015). *All American Boys*. New York, NY: Atheneum Books for Young Readers.

Samuels, B. G. (1983). Young adult novels in the classroom? *English Journal, 72*(4). 86-88.

Santoli, S. P., & Wagner, M. E. (2004). Young adult literature: The other "real" literature. *American Secondary Education, 33*(1). 65-75.

Shelley, M. (1818). *Frankenstein.* London, UK: Lackington, Hughes, Harding, Mavor, & Jones.

Shusterman, N. (2016). *Scythe*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster Books for Young Readers.

Sepetys, R. (2011). *between shades of gray*. New York, NY: Philomel Books.

Sepetys, R. (2016). *salt to the sea*. New York, NY: Philomel Books.

Smagorinsky, P., & Whiting, M. E. (1995). *How English teachers get taught: Methods of teaching the methods course*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Sulzer, M. A., & Thein, A. H. (2016). Reconsidering the hypothetical adolescent in evaluating and teaching young adult literature. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 60*(2). 163-171.

Thomas, A. (2017). *The Hate You Give*. New York, NY: Balzer + Bray.

Wiesel, E. (1960). *Night*. New York, NY: The Noonday Press.

Yang, G. L. (2006). *American Born Chinese.* New York, NY: First Second Books.

Zentner, J. (2016). *The Serpent King*. New York, NY: Ember.

Zoboi, I. (2018). *Pride*. New York, NY: Balzer + Bray.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

Revisiting Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine course syllabi of young adult literature courses in secondary English teacher education programs in the United States. This was done so that claims could be made about how YAL is used in the field of English education now, and then conversations could be started on that foundation about where YAL is going to go in the future. The findings in this study show that teacher educators are using YAL in varied ways in order to create best practices for what a pedagogy of YAL (Buehler, 2016) might look like in coming years. This dissertation was written in a three-article format in order to best be able to disseminate findings into the national conversation around YAL.

This final, concluding chapter will give a brief look back at each article and the research question that they addressed so that I can then reflect on how these argument impacts the larger field of English education. Then, I will look specifically at how this study, as a whole, has implications for the study of YAL as a literary genre, and then, separately, what implications this study has for research in the field of YAL in education. As I look to follow-up research on this study, I show how the findings contained herein provide a foundation for my future scholarship in the field of secondary English teacher education and young adult literature.

Chapter 2/Article 1: Moving Toward a Method for YAL in Secondary English Teacher Education.

In chapter 2, article 1, I examine how course goals and objectives, as listed on course syllabi, reflect the many competing authoritative and internally persuasive discourses surrounding both the broad field of public education and the more focused field of young adult literature as a part of English teacher education. This was done to answer the research question:

1. What are the specific objectives and goals of YAL courses in secondary English teacher education programs included on course syllabi, and what social and ideological discourses are present that influence these goals?

Findings show how there is a focused use of YAL to teach traditional English education methods like reading and writing strategies to preservice teachers; there was a decided focus of these courses to help preservice teachers pursue and enact a social justice pedagogy in their future classrooms; The courses also used the reading of YAL in them to help preservice teachers be reflective practitioners who examined their own understandings of their adolescent students and the literature that was written for and about them.

Reflection.

While all of the focuses found in the data enable teacher educators to do great things with YAL with their students, essentially, they spend much time addressing assumptions and preconceived notions that preservice teachers bring with them into their study of literature in English education. These assumptions (Sulzer & Thein, 2016) can be detrimental to the teaching of adolescent readers, and this must be addressed in teacher education.

Even as I finish this dissertation, I have started a YAL course in our undergraduate English teacher education program at the University of Georgia. While the passion and

excitement for reading has been palpable in the first few days of class, I have begun to hear, already, deficit discourses about adolescent students, stereotypes of adolescence, and negative views of YAL as cheap love stories made for movies. These cultural assumptions have to be addressed (Falter, 2016) in the teaching of YAL to preservice teachers not because the assumptions do not have any merit at all, but because students are often unaware of how these social and ideological discourses have been ingrained in them from before they ever decided to become teachers. By preparing preservice teachers to be critical examiners of YAL in education, teacher educators can help their students understand that it is important to analyze educational texts and spaces for both the positive and negative discourses within them.

Conducting this study has shown me a need to remember to check my own assumptions as a teacher and researcher as well to make sure that I am not viewing my own students with a deficit lens. The data examined in this study showed how important it is for preservice teachers to have their perspectives stretched on what books should be given space in their secondary classrooms and what the needs of their students might be as readers. YAL is one important way for teacher educators to help them do such critical perspective work. The potential of YAL to be studied and then used to enact social justice pedagogy, as shown through this study's findings, is a way that English education can be used to impact the community and not just the context of one classroom.

Chapter 3/Article 2: Dialogic Pedagogy: Using Bakhtin for a Method of Syllabus Analysis.

In chapter 3, article 2, I took a deeper dive into using Bakhtin's concepts as tools for textual analysis of course syllabi as a part of engaged dialogic practice. I did this analysis to be able to answer the second research question of the study:

1. How does a method of Bakhtinian textual analysis specific to course syllabi and related materials allow teachers to develop more student-centered practices? What limitations do Bakhtin's concepts create when looking at course syllabi as authoritative documents?

By examining the double-voiced nature of the YAL course syllabi in this study, I was able to show how the syllabus reflects both authoritative discourses in education even while instructors may seek more student-centered practices with their preservice teachers. I gave suggestions based on my findings on how practitioners of dialogic pedagogy could organize their classrooms through their course syllabi to make sure that they are choosing student-centered practices. While student-centered practices is a loaded concept (Smagorinsky & Whiting, 1995, p. 102) that has many meanings depending on who is asked, Bakhtin's concept of heteroglossia as analyzed in this article makes student-centered practices those that raise up the voice of the student in traditionally monologic classroom spaces.

Reflection.

I have experienced two different paths for using Bakhtin in educational research and both influenced this study in different ways. The first is using his theories on discourse to create a dialogic pedagogy or to enact engaged dialogic practice (Fecho, Falter, & Hong, 2016) where the voice of the student in any class context is, as much as possible, an equal one to the teacher's. I found this valuable as a teacher where I could be mindful of the heteroglossia of my classroom and make sure that my monological voice was limited so that students had a say in their own learning. The ability to analyze syllabi for how teachers might be setting up their classes to value all voices has been a way to further understand how course design can create or hinder dialogic spaces.

The second path (shown to me through Tobin, 2000, and Tobin's Bakhtin seminar at The University of Georgia in spring of 2018) was to use Bakhtin's concepts as tools for literary analysis of dialogue in texts whether they be transcriptions of student/teacher interactions in focus groups or voices within a novel. I have found this useful as a critical examiner of YAL as well as how I came to analyze the syllabi in this study. Both of these paths of using Bakhtin's work in educational research have merit in different ways, but I find that English education and in turn secondary English classrooms are perfect contexts to use both. The dialogic nature of classroom spaces makes for rich analysis of how heteroglossia is a living and evolving entity, while the study of literature either through the literary canon or YAL with students makes for rich analysis at how various ideological discourses can be found within texts. This mode of textual analysis using Bakhtin's concepts as a lens will forever be a part of my research.

Chapter 4/Article 3: The Young Adult Literature Methods Course in Secondary English Teacher Education

In chapter 4, article 3, I looked across the 20 syllabi examined in this study to provide a snapshot of what is being done in the field of YAL in English teacher education. I analyzed the syllabi in this way to answer the final research question of this study:

1. How is young adult literature being taught in English teacher education, and how can knowing that help teacher educators develop the field further in the future?

The findings discussed in this article show what is being done in the YAL methods course currently, what is being read, and what is being created, produced, and assessed. More importantly, I provide an overview of the gaps that I found in the data that can be addressed as the findings of this study are discussed in the field.

Reflection.

At its root, I wanted to know how YAL is being used in English teacher education by conducting this study. My assumptions on what I would see were based off of my experiences as an undergraduate at The University of Georgia in 2009. I assumed that all YAL courses would be taught much like any English class where the study of the genre through reading many books in a semester was key. Our program has had many iterations of the YAL course over the years as I have viewed it as a student, a mentor teacher, and now as a teacher educator, so, I shouldn't have been surprised to see how diverse the field has become since my earliest memories.

My question now becomes: if there are so many great ways of creating YAL methods courses in English teacher education, then how do I choose where to focus my future classes? The data from article three showed that no YAL course was one dimensional. No class only focused on social justice issues without also being contextualized in the learning of English education methods or of reflective practice. However, to circle back to Smagorinsky and Whiting's (1995) study, the great benefit of syllabus analysis in research is that practicing teachers can come to such studies to gain ideas on how other people approach a subject, and then consider how to develop their own methods further. I know now how to develop YAL coursework in a way that preservice teachers are a part of the work being done in education on the national scale and not just receivers of information from authoritative sources.

Implications for the Study of YAL

No dissertation on YAL in any form should be complete without talking about the actual YA titles that were the subtext of the teacher educators' courses as shown through these syllabi. My role as a teacher educator and my hope to continue my career post-graduation as a professor of English education led me to study YAL in the context of preservice teacher certification

programs. I needed to study how the field of English education uses YAL to be able to understand a foundation of praxis so that I could contribute and help grow the field as an engaged scholar. However, this need is situated on my experiences as both a reader of YAL and as a teacher who read YAL while in a high school classroom. I also had an aching desire to dive deeply into the YAL that I found on these syllabi to discover what the exemplars might be and why they were chosen by these teacher educators to use with preservice teachers. This desire will be one path that I can take in future research on YAL.

When I started my own English teacher certification program, I was introduced to YAL as a rebellion against tradition. It felt subversive to be a teacher who read noncanonical literature for pleasure, and to consider using it in a traditional classroom. My own mentor teacher was traditional and saw no place for YAL as a part of classroom instruction beyond encouraging students to read outside of class. I was becoming an English teacher, however, because I loved to read and considered myself a wild reader (Miller & Kelly, 2014). I felt that my goal as a new English teacher was to do everything that I could to help foster a love of reading in each individual student. I knew that this meant that all I had to do was take the time to learn and support students as readers to help make that happen.

What I discovered in my years as a high school teacher, though, was that it was not so easy to use YAL in my school as I thought it would be. I felt that it was common-sense to use the novels that students wanted to read to teach traditional reading and writing strategies in an English class, but I was fought at every turn, not by county demands and administrators (although these were weaponized against me), but by fellow teachers in the English department. Tradition held powerful sway in the minds of experienced teachers in my county and school, and I was just a young, upstart trying to rock the boat. I was constantly told that YAL was not

rigorous enough (Ostenson & Wadham, 2012) for academic study, and that I was breaking away from required standardized curriculum by teachers who spent most of their time complaining about the demands of the standards and the testing culture in which we taught. This hypocrisy always bothered me as the solution seemed simple.

This study served an additional, personal purpose for me to be able to make my own claims about how the rigorous study of YAL in preservice English teacher education proved its academic merit in both secondary and university contexts. While this study was on YAL course syllabi in English teacher education, it is important to explain the additional research that I conducted in this study that I will continue in future research by looking at what YA titles were used to help these teacher educators reach their goals with preservice teachers.

A staggering 319 YA titles were included on these 20 course syllabi and their inherent required and choice reading lists. When I conducted content analyses of the top 14 most often included titles (see Appendix B), preliminary results show that these titles also map onto the categories of major focus for these YAL classes, briefly outlined in chapter 4, and serve much more rigorous purposes than just being good reads. I used Bakhtin's concepts of the centripetal and centrifugal nature of language within the heteroglossia of the novels to examine how the inherent ideological discourses within these novels compete with one another to be heard. Showing preservice teachers that traditional content analyses of YAL (see Strickland, 2019) can be conducted with similar purpose to how the literary canon is traditionally used might be able to begin to change deficit assumptions about YAL.

My analysis allowed me to organize these 14 most included titles into three main categories with one outlier. These three categories are books that include diverse perspectives (6 titles), books that could be classified as realistic fiction (5 titles) and books that are historical

fiction (2 titles). There was one title that I was surprised to find as the outlier, and that was a speculative fiction novel. My preliminary results of these content analyses show me that these broad categories of included YAL map onto the major purposes, objectives, and goals of the YAL courses of which they are a part. More importantly, future research can be conducted to further match these titles with the specific objectives and goals of the syllabi on which they appear and with teacher educator interviews to fully grasp why these novels were used instead of others.

Implications for YAL in Educational Research

So much of the inspiration to conduct this study on YAL methods syllabi in teacher education is owed to Smagorinsky and Whiting's (1995) foundational study of English education methods syllabi. They felt the need to have a broad understanding of what is being done in English education in order for the field to be able to evolve. They spent much of their analysis on reading the pedagogical literature that was part of how teacher educators taught preservice teachers how to teach English to categorize the focus of the courses. Follow-up research to this study on YAL methods syllabi can also look at how the pedagogical literature used in these 20 courses match up with the goals and objectives of these courses, if they too enable teachers to enact more student-centered practices, and if they match with the overall purposes and products of the courses of which they are a part. By studying both the courses and the literature used with preservice teachers, I can then pursue inquiry into the experience of preservice teachers reading YAL and how YAL helps or hinders their identity development as new teachers and their dual role of student and teacher.

Furthermore, the syllabus only shows a starting picture of an instructor's hope for how their class will be organized. More work must be done to understand the motives behind

instructional design (or if there are motives). Research built upon the foundation of this dissertation will need to examine how these 20 courses are actually enacted with students. For example, it is possible that the course syllabi that seem to so strictly adhere to authoritative discourses are, in practice, rebelling against the structures of standardized education. The opposite might be true as well, and such inquiry could make waves in the field.

The teacher educators who were participants in this study should be allowed to add their voices to this analysis and should therefore be interviewed so that a more developed picture of the why behind their instructional decisions can be understood. Field observations and notes on how class is taught and what the experiences of students are like in the class as well as how students view their YAL classes as part of their teacher education would also paint a more vibrant picture. As active voices in the heteroglossia of these classrooms, much can be added to the inferences made here.

Conclusion

The YAL courses examined in this study show that great things are being done with YAL in English teacher education. YAL is not one dimensional, and the varied uses explained in this study show the potential for teacher educators to do many things with their preservice teachers. At the root of all of these syllabi was a need for preservice teachers to read and develop into "teachers who read" both for themselves and for their students' learning. This pursuit to make readers of preservice teachers will allow them to, in turn, to model to their own secondary students in field placements and future classrooms as readers to be nurtured in the same way.

If YAL teacher educators can continue to show how a rigorous study of YAL with preservice teachers helps them become ready and enabled professional teachers, then the field can continue to look forward to sustained growth as an integral part of English teacher education.

Through the reading of YAL, preservice and practicing teachers and teacher educators can

prepare themselves to reach the reading needs of all of their students while continuing to meet

the authoritative needs of public education and student preparation in English and language arts.

References

Buehler, J. (2016). *Teaching reading with ya literature: Complex texts, complex lives.* Urbana,

    IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Falter, M. M. (2016). Addressing assumptions about adolescents in a preservice yal course. *The*

    ALAN Review, 43(2). 51-61.

Fecho, B., Falter, M., & Hong, X. (2016). *Teaching outside the box and inside the standards:*

    Making room for dialogue. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Miller, D., & Kelley, S. (2014). *Reading in the wild: The Book Whisperer's keys to cultivating*

    lifelong reading habits. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ostenson, R., & Wadham, R. (2012). Young adult literature and the Common Core: A

    surprisingly good fit. *American Secondary Education, 41*(1). 4-13.

Smagorinsky, P., & Whiting, M. E. (1995). *How English teachers get taught: Methods of*

    teaching the methods course. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Strickland, T. H. (2019). What yal tells us about learning, schooling, and teaching. *SIGNAL*

    Journal, 43(1). 18-23.

Sulzer, M. A., & Thein, A. H. (2016). Reconsidering the hypothetical adolescent in evaluating

    and teaching young adult literature. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 60*(2). 163-

    171.

Tobin, J. (2000). *"Good guys don't wear hats": Children's talk about the media.* New York,

    NY: Teacher's College Press.

APPENDIX B

The 14 Most Often Included YAL Titles on Course Syllabi

Title	Author(s)	Year Published	Times Included
All American Boys	Jason Reynolds & Brendan Kiely	2015	6
The Hate U Give	Angie Thomas	2017	5
The Serpent King	Jeff Zentner	2016	5
American Born Chinese	Gene Luen Yang	2006	4
Looking for Alaska	John Green	2005	4
The Outsiders	S.E. Hinton	1967	4
Gabi, Girl in Pieces	Isabel Quintero	2015	4
Scythe	Neal Shusterman	2016	3
Between Shades of Gray	Ruta Sepetys	2011	3
The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian	Sherman Alexie	2007	3
The Chocolate War	Robert Cormier	1974	3
Speak	Laurie Halse Anderson	1999	3
Salt to the Sea	Ruta Sepetys	2016	3
We Were Liars	E. Lockhart	2014	3

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Objectives and Goals Listed on YAL Syllabi

1. What are the purposes of the English curriculum in the areas of literature, language, writing, speaking, and thinking? What do we hope to achieve with our students in their academic, social, and personal development as a result of their experiences in the English Classroom?
2. What instructional strategies can be utilized to optimize student learning, interest, and motivation in the teaching of literature, language, writing, speaking, and thinking in the English classroom?
3. How can we best construct activities, assignments, assessments, and units to ensure that we are meeting our objectives and the differentiated needs of our students given their diverse identities, lives, interests, and needs?
4. How do we develop a reflective stance that serves to guide and support our continued growth as professional educators?
5. Understand and describe theoretical foundations as related to the development, processes and components of reading instruction.
6. Use theories and research to design and implement an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced reading program.
7. Understand, develop, differentiate, and implement various instructional approaches, routines, and assessment techniques in response to students' needs.
8. Develop a learning environment that is conducive to the development of literacy and optimizes students' opportunities for development.
9. Display positive reading behaviors to serve as models of the value of reading.
10. Analyze and critique a wide range of adolescents' literature across genre and form.
11. Examine research and theories of adolescence through a range of scholarly sources and (re)consider our own assumptions.
12. Evaluate the purpose of literature that is written explicitly for adolescents and the value of using this literature for classroom instruction.
13. Explore the ways in which adolescents' literature can be highly political in nature.
14. Evaluate, select and use young adult literature in the classroom.
15. Help adolescent students develop critical-thinking and literacy skills, especially through deep discussion of literature.
16. Encourage adolescent students to become lifelong readers by offering much choice around genre and content.

17. Become more creative writers as a response to literature.
18. Understand and imitate the stylistic features that young adult fiction writers employ.
19. Reflective Practitioner: Class participants will scrutinize the criteria used in book selection for adolescents to reflect diversity in backgrounds, learning styles, and curriculum demands. Additionally, participants will develop techniques for promoting critical reading and informed interpretation of print, non-print and multi-modal texts, and how to choose texts to meet the needs of diverse groups of students.
20. Scholar: Besides reading 9 YA books in focused study and selected readings in the course textbook class participants will also read and respond to journal and newspaper articles by those prominent in the field, and to participate in our own classroom forum on Canvas. Additionally, students will apply critical literary theory to print and non-print texts, develop interpretations of literature using these critical lenses, and explore ways to use these texts and approaches in effective instruction. Students will also be required to follow a YA blog and use the conversations in that blog as a lens for understanding young adult literature, the needs of adolescents and issues of equity and social justice.
21. Problem Solver: While research shows a direct correlation between reading and achievement, many teens choose not to read. Therefore, participants will explore ways to entice young people to read—acknowledging their wide range of abilities, funds of knowledge and broad interests...including interest in non-traditional and multi-modal texts. Additionally, participants will explore ways to become knowledgeable about the latest books and media appropriate to their subject matter, and encourage incorporation of the contemporary books into their teaching and their own reading life.
22. Students will be able to read and reflect on a varied selection of young adult literature and discuss it as a class through a variety of discussion and literacy techniques and activities.
23. Students will be able to discuss strategies for implementing reading and writing activities within the context of young adult literature.
24. Students will be able to build a database of young adult literature through Goodreads.
25. Students will be able to investigate the ways in which research-based adolescent literacy strategies can be implemented in the secondary classroom.
26. Thoughtfully and critically engage with young adult literature of various genres.
27. Generate theoretically based rationales for including young adult literature texts in secondary curriculum.
28. Investigate issues in the field of young adult literature such as the canon debate, censorship, and literary quality.
29. Examine and articulate historical and popular conceptions of adolescents as well as how they are positioned in society and in texts.
30. Demonstrate a social justice orientation toward teaching and young adult literature, including consideration of how race, class, gender, and sexual orientation relate to the school and classroom context.
31. Model a classroom community of critical colleagues.

32. Collaboratively and individually plan, lead, and reflect a class discussion and task.
33. Exhibit the abilities to select texts for middle/high school readers with regard to student interests and textual features including literary merit and text complexity.
34. Design engaging learning experiences with young adult literature.
35. Explore the current trends and relationships between young adult literature and media and marketing and use that knowledge to become critical consumers of media texts.
36. In this class we will define the concept of adolescence, discuss characteristics of young adult literature and literary criticism, and use that criticism to analyze texts for adolescents.
37. To explore instructional, philosophical, and student diversity in the middle and secondary English classroom.
38. To do inquiry into the social, political, and economic environment of schools and their surrounding community and consider the impact on students' lives.
39. To begin the practice of designing curriculum conceptually integrating Common Core Standards , differentiation, and text diversity.
40. To practice co-teaching by designing and delivering instruction on an assigned text.
41. To integrate course topics with classroom observations.
42. To develop the practice of professional reflection.
43. We will examine our own reading histories and consider how it affects the way we approach curriculum and students.
44. I hope that we can probe issues of literacy, seek understanding in the act of reading, and talk about the ways in which texts work in the classroom with our students' learning at the center.
45. We will consider how to create, configure and implement a curriculum that facilitates active learning with diverse learners.
46. We will uncover practical elements of lesson plans and unit creation, and you will be challenged to consider the theoretical aspects of the teaching of reading and literature.
47. Fostering a Collaborative Culture to Support Educator Development and Student Learning
    a. Utilizes group processes to help colleagues1 work collaboratively to solve problems, make decisions, manage conflict, and promote meaningful change.
    b. Strives to create an inclusive culture where diverse perspectives are welcomed in addressing challenges.
48. Facilitating Improvements in Instruction and Student Learning.
    a. Engages in reflective dialog with colleagues based on observation of instruction, student work, and assessment data and helps make connections to research-based effective practices.
    b. Promotes instructional strategies that address issues of diversity and equity in the classroom and ensures that individual student learning needs remain the central focus of instruction.

49. Improving Outreach and Collaboration with Families and Community.
    a. Uses knowledge and understanding of the different backgrounds, ethnicities, cultures, and languages in the school community to promote effective interactions among colleagues,families, and the larger community.
    b. Models and teaches effective communication and collaboration skills with families and other stakeholders focused on attaining equitable achievement for students of all backgrounds and circumstances.
    c. Facilitates colleagues' self-examination of their own understandings of community culture and diversity and how they can develop culturally responsive strategies to enrich the educational experiences of students and achieve high levels of learning for all students.
    d. Develops a shared understanding among colleagues of the diverse educational needs of families and the community.
    e. Collaborates with families, communities, and colleagues to develop comprehensive strategies to address the diverse educational needs of families and the community.
50. Advocating for Student Learning and the Profession.
    a. Collaborates with colleagues to select appropriate opportunities to advocate for the rights and/or needs of students, to secure additional resources within the building or district that support student learning, and to communicate effectively with targeted audiences such as parents and community members.
    b. Represents and advocates for the profession in contexts outside of the classroom.
51. Research and evaluate effective content-based literacy strategies and adapt them to their individual classroom needs.
52. Gain an understanding of the natures of reading, writing, and related language skills, and the processes involved in adolescent literacy development.
53. Provide systematic and explicit differentiated instruction in the content area to meet the needs of the full range of learners in the classroom (struggling and underperforming learners, ELLs, GATE, Special Education students).
54. Assess the literacy development of adolescents using structured, qualitative tools.
55. Produce a community based literacy plan that incorporates student and community needs and interests, while implementing content based literacy strategies.
56. Implement literacy strategies discussed in class in order to facilitate adolescents' literacy development.
57. Read extensively from a list of representative YA and middle grades novels.
58. Evaluate, review and share responses to YA and middle grades texts.
59. Evaluate and experiment with multiple strategies and a range of content materials and texts, both traditional and alternative, and both explicitly and in the context of literature instruction, in order to move toward the goal of reaching all students.
60. Recognize and support the unique needs and skills of the adolescent reader.

61. Use multimodal composition and communication technologies to facilitate reflection and instruction.
62. Develop and verbalize a philosophy in the teaching of literature in order to reflect on and defend their practice.
63. Students will read young adult literature critically to evaluate how constructs such as gender, class, race, and sexual orientation are taken up and represented in individual texts.
64. Students will become familiar with topics and issues that are of concern to scholars and educators who work with young adult literature.
65. Students will investigate the peritext of young adult literature and explain what it suggests about how publishers conceptualize the audience for these books.
66. Students will read a range of young adult novels across an array of genres.
67. Read widely in the field of young adult literature--including multiple genres as well as diverse cultures, settings, authors, and topics.
68. Study the historical perspective and background of literature read by young adults and written for and/or about young adults including current problems, issues, and trends.
69. Develop skill in reflecting, close reading, analyzing, discussing, and writing individually and within groups about literature for young adults.
70. Develop a rationale for including the study of young adult literature as part of the school curriculum.
71. Develop an understanding of pertinent ways to guide young adults in their literature choice and to integrate this literature into the curriculum.
72. Demonstrate an ability to create and use varied teaching applications/strategies with young adult literature with students.
73. Use technology tools appropriately for discussing, exploring, and representing young adult literature.
74. Develop an understanding of the teacher's role in developing a love of reading in school and out of school contexts.
75. Develop a middle grades literature-based English / language arts unit plan and develop and implement at least one lesson in a middle grades classroom and reflect on the lesson.
76. Describe the interrelatedness of the six areas of middle level language arts (reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing, visually representing).
77. Identify and explain the National Council of Teachers of English Standards for the English/Language Arts and the Kentucky Academic Standards for English language arts for grades 5-9.
78. Implement and analyze a variety of developmentally appropriate tools for assessment for learning (formative) and assessment of learning (summative) appropriate for middle level English / language arts.

79. Explain and demonstrate effective and developmentally appropriate reading instructional practices related to varied text types and purposes (e.g., fiction, non-fiction, poetry, and drama).
80. Identify instructional strategies and/or approaches for all components of English/language arts in the middle grades classroom.
81. Explain and demonstrate effective writing instructional practices (including ethical response to student writing) related to varied text types and purposes (e.g., argumentative, informational, and narrative), production and distribution of writing, and research to build and present knowledge.
82. Analyze and apply the processes for lesson planning and instructional design.
83. Implement techniques for differentiating instruction that address student needs, interests, and learning styles, as well as academic, linguistic, and cultural diversity, through the selection of materials, lesson plans, grouping styles (heterogeneous and homogeneous), and instructional approaches.
84. Utilize a variety of technology and media for the planning and presentation of instruction of middle level language arts.
85. Use critical thinking to explore and evaluate instructional practices and materials for teaching the language arts.
86. Identifies and explains how student learning can be enhanced through collaboration with other teachers, professionals and parents.
87. Analyze and evaluate teaching through reflective practice and pursue continued professional growth and collaboration with colleagues.
88. Demonstrate effective instructional communication skills and a broad knowledge of classical and contemporary fiction, poetry, drama, and non-fiction appropriate for middle school students.
89. Demonstrate the writing process and to produce effective documents appropriate to the teaching profession and course level.
90. Use critical thinking to expand, express, explore, and evaluate course content through written communication.
91. Communicates professional information, knowledge and resources for effective English language arts instruction with peers
92. This course will address theory and practice of literature study in secondary schools, and appraisal of multicultural Young Adult literature appropriate to the needs, interests, and abilities of adolescents.
93. QUESTION the cultural values underlying the marketing of literature for children and young adults.
94. ANALYZE literary theories that attempt to explain how readers approach texts they encounter.
95. PRESENT text-based interpretations and arguments in small group and whole-class discussions.

96. PRODUCE an informational digital book talk of a contemporary young adult novel that addresses course themes.
97. REFLECT on the ways in which at least two literary theories color the meaning readers make of any given text.
98. Critically engage with young adult literature.
99. Question assumptions about what young adult literature should be or do.
100. Confront questions about diversity and representation in literature for young audiences.
101. Engage in individual research on young adult literature and scholarship.
102. Communicate effectively with your classmates and a global twitter audience.
103. To demonstrate knowledge of literature for youth/adolescents and works by diverse authors.
104. To respond freely to literature themselves and to invite and extend the honest responses of their students to their reading.
105. To select appropriate reading materials for students based on interests, abilities, and grade level and encourage student interest in reading for knowledge and pleasure.
106. To assess the potential appeal and usefulness of reading materials.
107. To recommend appropriate and appealing fiction and nonfiction to individuals and groups of students with diverse backgrounds and reading skills.
108. To use current annotated book lists and review columns in selecting reading materials for classroom libraries and for recommending books to groups and to individuals.
109. To use young adult literature as the basis for teaching skills and strategies necessary for reading texts.
110. To offer alternatives to traditional book report formats, alternatives that encourage thoughtful response and self expression.
111. To deal wisely and ethically with potential and real problems of censorship related to assigned and voluntary reading of adolescents.

APPENDIX B

The 14 Most Often Included YAL Titles on Course Syllabi

Title	Author(s)	Year Published	Times Included
All American Boys	Jason Reynolds & Brendan Kiely	2015	6
The Hate U Give	Angie Thomas	2017	5
The Serpent King	Jeff Zentner	2016	5
American Born Chinese	Gene Luen Yang	2006	4
Looking for Alaska	John Green	2005	4
The Outsiders	S.E. Hinton	1967	4
Gabi, Girl in Pieces	Isabel Quintero	2015	4
Scythe	Neal Shusterman	2016	3
Between Shades of Gray	Ruta Sepetys	2011	3
The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian	Sherman Alexie	2007	3
The Chocolate War	Robert Cormier	1974	3
Speak	Laurie Halse Anderson	1999	3
Salt to the Sea	Ruta Sepetys	2016	3
We Were Liars	E. Lockhart	2014	3