What is an ELA text set? Surveying and integrating cognitive, critical and disciplinary lenses

Dan Reynolds
Department of Education, John Carroll University,
University Heights, Ohio, USA

Abstract

Purpose – Researchers and teachers have noted the power of students reading text sets or multiple texts on the same topic, and numerous articles have been published with examples of and frameworks for text set construction. This study aims to traces the theoretical assumptions of these frameworks and explores their distinct implications and tensions for understanding disciplinary literacy in English language arts (ELA).

Design/methodology/approach – The author draws on three frameworks, using a focal article for each: cognitive (Lupo *et al.*, 2018), critical (Lechtenberg, 2018) and disciplinary (Levine *et al.*, 2018), and connect those articles to other research studies in that tradition. Separately, the author describes each of the three text set frameworks' design principles. Then, across frameworks, the author analyze the disciplinary assumptions around each framework's centering texts, epistemological goals and trajectories.

Findings – The centering text, goals and trajectories of each framework reflect its underlying epistemological lens. All frameworks include a text that serves as its epistemological center and the cognitive and disciplinary frameworks, both rely on progressions of complexity (knowledge/linguistic and literary, respectively). The author traces additional alignments and tensions between the frameworks and offer suggestions for possible hybridities in reading modality and reading volume.

Originality/value – Many articles have been written about models of text set construction, but few have compared the assumptions behind those models. Examining these assumptions may help English teachers and curriculum designers select texts and build curriculum that leverages the strengths of each model and informs researchers' understanding of disciplinary literacy in ELA.

Keywords Critical literacy, Disciplinary literacy, Text sets

Paper type Conceptual paper

Researchers and teachers alike have noted the potential power of students reading text sets, or multiple texts on a topic. Numerous articles in practitioner journals have presented text sets on diverse topics across grades – in topics as wide-ranging as social studies (Tschida, 2015), science (Ebbers, 2002; Lannin *et al.*, 2020), exploring social justice (Batchelor, 2019; Lewis and Flynn, 2017), the experiences of LGBTQ students (Dodge and Crutcher, 2015) and sports in society (Rodesiler, 2017). In fact, entire books present models for text sets with dozens of examples (Cappiello and Dawes, 2012; Dowdy and Fleischaker, 2018; Lewis and Strong, 2020).

Despite this popularity, the term "text set" has no clear theoretical foundations. As a former high school English langauge arts (ELA) teacher and current researcher and teacher

educator, I recognize the social complexity of curriculum construction and the diversity of English teachers' perspectives on ELA instruction (Luke, 1994). At times, ELA teachers view the goals of ELA as developing lifelong readers, instilling habits of critical literacy or apprenticing students into literary communities (just to name a few). This multiplicity can be powerful in supporting students in multiple ways in their development but can also be challenging for teachers to understand and reconcile multiple simultaneous goals.

The purpose of this article is to compare and contrast three common theoretical perspectives on text set construction: cognitive, critical and disciplinary. This can support teachers and curriculum designers in engaging with text sets amid multiple theoretical perspectives, all of which are likely embodied in ELA classrooms to varying degrees. Unpacking these perspectives may help educators clarify their purposes for text selection. In addition, for researchers interested in studying text selection in ELA classrooms, these comparisons reveal some underlying assumptions behind popular text set frameworks and their implications for defining disciplinary literacy in ELA classrooms. Ultimately, seeing the foundations of text set design can help educators both strengthen their rationales for text selection with clear language and illuminate new and hybrid possibilities in text set design.

The origins of the term text set
Early articles about text sets simply defined them as groups of texts around a similar topic or theme (Bishop, 1990; Hartman and Hartman, 1993; Opitz, 1998). In early text set research, the idea of intertextuality was fundamental (Bloome and Egan-Robertson, 1993; Rowe, 1986; Short, 1991), which departed from the then-current assumptions of cognitive models of reading that focused on comprehension of a single text (Kintsch, 1988). In this line of thinking, texts were not merely meant to be read sequentially, but to inform each other and challenge students to integrate knowledge and perspectives across texts. For example, Hartman and Hartman (1993) proposed frameworks for text sets such as *companion* texts written as part of a single author's serial works, *complementary* texts to expose students to the complexity of a concept, *disruptive* texts which deliberately complicate common narratives, *synoptic* texts which explore a single event from multiple narratorial perspectives or *rereading* texts which ask students to return to an initial text after exploring other texts on a topic. While these were not theoretically anchored, the piece demonstrated the possibilities of text sets and prefigured contemporary trends in text set construction.

Another common theme in the early years of the term "text set" was the idea that text sets should contain multiple modalities (Cappiello and Dawes, 2012). Hartman and Hartman (1993) referred to this as including both "linguistic and nonlinguistic" texts (p. 203) and drew on intertextuality research suggesting that even young children draw on cross-genre intertextuality in their interpretations of texts (Cairney, 1990; Rowe, 1986). From the earliest text sets, multimodality was important.

With this historical anchor, I turn to examine three text set frameworks through contemporary theoretical lenses, each with a focal article: the cognitive perspective of the Quad Text Set framework (QTS; Lupo *et al.*, 2018), the critical perspective of the collaborative curation for critical literacy framework (CCC; Lechtenberg, 2018) and the disciplinary perspective of Project READi (Levine *et al.*, 2018).

Text sets through a cognitive lens
The QTS is founded on constructs that have historically been important in cognitive reading research of the past several decades: reading volume, text difficulty, background knowledge and student motivation (Lupo *et al.*, 2018). Accordingly, the QTS authors argue that "increasing the amount of challenging texts that middle and high school students read has

the potential to improve literacy outcomes" (p. 433). With these foundations and goals, the QTS framework includes four text types: visual, accessible, informational and target. Visual texts provide entry points for students and build knowledge via visual modalities, accessible texts build background knowledge with lower complexity demands, informational texts specifically target knowledge needed to comprehend the target text and a target text presents a conceptually and linguistically challenging text that serves as the culmination of the set. Ultimately, this framework views reading as a cognitive skill and practice, nurtured over time. This approach places less emphasis on developing specific disciplinary literacy practices – indeed, Lupo *et al.* (2018) designed this framework to function across disciplines and be used by content-area as well as ELA teachers – or on critical perspectives engaging power and ideology.

Motivation: catching and holding students' motivation to read
The QTS framework's use of visual and accessible texts is based on the idea that students' motivation to engage with texts is central to their development as readers (Wigfield and Guthrie, 1997). Lupo *et al.* (2018) specifically cite work by Fulmer and Tulis (2013), which suggests that students' perception of the difficulty of texts influences their motivation to persist in reading them. This connects to broader psychological research on the intertwined relationships between student interest and comprehension (Fulmer *et al.*, 2015; Springer *et al.*, 2017). Theoretically, interested and engaged students will comprehend better.

The QTS also explicitly targets reading volume as a goal, citing reading research indicating that reading volume is strongly related to reading ability (Cunningham and Stanovich, 1997). A recent research review suggests that reading volume and achievement are reciprocally related: students who become stronger readers then read more, which then strengthens their ability (Allington and McGill-Franzen, 2021). Thus, the QTS aims to nurture students' motivation to read and their ability to handle more challenging texts, which would theoretically support increased volume of reading, which is often a major goal of ELA instruction.

The goal: knowledge and text complexity
The QTS assumes that students exposed to multiple texts on the same topic will build both a broader and more precise domain knowledge. The authors cite seminal work by Anderson (2018) which notes that a reader's prior knowledge creates a schema for acquiring new knowledge while reading. They also cite Kintsch's (2013) construction-integration model, a well-known cognitive theory of reading comprehension, to explain how reading multiple texts on the same topic would build more coherent account of the situation (i.e. the topic), which would then facilitate the comprehension of additional texts on the topic. From this cognitive perspective, knowledge acquisition, integration and refinement are critical to comprehension development (Hattan and Lupo, 2020).

The cognitive perspective of the QTS is also visible in the conceptualization of the target text as a "challenging on or above grade-level text" (Lupo *et al.*, 2018; p. 436). In this view, the target text is the apex of the text set's design. This view connects to a larger line of instructional research on defining features of complex texts and preparing students with cognitive strategies and instructional support to handle the linguistic and conceptual challenges of reading such text (Amendum *et al.*, 2018; Lupo, *et al.*, 2019; Mesmer *et al.*, 2012; Reynolds, 2021). Theoretically, text complexity as an explicit goal could help strengthen students' cognitive reading abilities and build them as lifelong readers.

The QTS was designed to be used across disciplines, prioritizing volume, complexity and motivation over ELA-specific goals. The ELA example QTS, however, in Lupo *et al.* (2018)

Lupo *et al.*'s article, incorporated routines such as Notice and Note (Beers and Probst, 2013) to identify textual patterns in service of literary analysis. It seems, then, that the primary cognitive focus of the QTS can have a secondary focus on disciplinary practices. Negotiating between content-area and disciplinary literacy goals has been a persistent topic for researchers (Dobbs *et al.*, 2016; Hinchman and O'Brien, 2019), illustrating the tensions between defining a disciplinary literacy and promoting literacy across content areas.

The QTS was also designed to build domain knowledge from multiple perspectives. The framework, though, does not use those multiple perspectives to interrogate existing structures of power and inequality or strengthen students' critical literacy. Lewis and Flynn (2017), however, adapt the QTS to also include an "extension" text, in which teachers, after selecting informational texts to build knowledge toward a complex target, also add a text to "extend student understanding of equity and social justice issues" (p. 23). Similar to counterstories (described below), this adaptation extends the cognitive perspective to engage students in critical reading. It seems, then, that the primary cognitive focus of the QTS can also have a secondary focus on disciplinary or critical literacy.

Text sets through a critical lens

The development of the critical tradition in ELA over the 20th and 21st centuries has been linked to historical processes, theoretical developments and sociopolitical contexts (for a brief history, see Luke, 2012). Many recent articles have taken up critical perspectives in the construction of text sets (Batchelor, 2019; Dyches, 2018a, 2018b; Lewis and Flynn, 2017; Moss, 2011; Souto-Manning, 2017; Tschida, 2015; Tschida *et al.*, 2014). Many of these specifically draw on Adichie's (2009) notion of disrupting single stories as a way to enrich understanding of grand cultural narratives. I chose Lechtenberg (2018) for my focal article because it applies the idea of disrupting single stories and explicitly attends to the theoretical dimensions of using a critical lens to construct text sets.

Lechtenberg (2018) refers to her framework as "collaborative curation for critical literacy" (p. 1), which for brevity I will abbreviate as CCC. Informed by the concept of curation (rather than selection) from school librarianship, this framework explicitly positions teachers as intentional curators of what to include – and exclude – in their curriculum. The framework draws on the "text circles" framework from Wessling (2011) and includes a fulcrum text, which is the epistemological center of the set; context texts and texture texts, which "introduce layers of contrast, new angles, or reconsiderations of the conceptual focus" (p. 3); and at least one counterstory which explicitly invites readers to interrogate "normative discourses and dominant ideologies" (p. 5).

Building knowledge: conceptual learning

As in the QTS, a reader's domain knowledge is important to the CCC. Lechtenberg (2018), though, does not ground her definition of knowledge as a schema of mental representations, nor as a discipline-specific set of interpretive skills, but instead as:

> "[...] a three-dimensional curriculum that intentionally builds conceptual understandings. (Erickson, 2006). For example, the topic of literary devices becomes a conceptual inquiry into the topic of *representation*, knowledge of Harlem Renaissance authors gives way to inquiry into *tradition* and *modernity* and a narrow focus on the literary type of unreliable narrators becomes a broader inquiry into *reputation* or *truth* (p. 3, italics in the original)."

In this way, the CCC approach differs from the topic- and background-knowledge-focused dimensions of the QTS. This conceptualization is ambitious in its aims for students to apply knowledge of specific ELA disciplinary concepts (e.g. literary devices) to broader domains of

knowledge (e.g. representation), though Lechtenberg does not specify precisely how that might happen.

In the CCC approach, building conceptual knowledge is enriched through the inclusion of "context" texts, similar to the background knowledge building in the accessible and visual texts of the QTS framework. The difference, though, is the focus on perspectives challenging dominant ideologies: the CCC framework explicitly requires a counterstory, curated in relation to the fulcrum text's perspectives, to scaffold students' critical literacy. The assumption is that interrogating power and ideology are central to students' development of conceptual complexity.

The goal: fulcrum texts and conceptual richness

Unlike the QTS, the CCC model's assumption of complexity does not necessarily begin with simple texts and reach to complex texts. That is, a CCC text set might begin with a fulcrum text which illustrates dominant ideologies, then follow up with counterstories and texture texts which illustrate different facets of the concepts first demonstrated in the fulcrum text (for another example, see Dyches, 2018b, who calls this "prismatic" text selection). Thus, the end goal is not in the last text, but distributed throughout the students' examination of the texts.

Ultimately, the CCC approach places less emphasis on motivating students to develop lifelong reading habits or building facility with linguistic complexity (hallmarks of the QTS), or on developing specific practices of literary interpretation (hallmarks of a disciplinary literacy approach). Rather, the CCC's ultimate goals are what Lechtenberg (2018) calls making multifaceted connections across texts and serving as starting points for additional conceptual exploration and inquiry. While the QTS goal is comprehension of a specific target text, the CCC's goal does not specify a concrete goal for the exploration. In fact, Lechtenberg draws on Beach *et al.* (2015) and argues that the CCC text explorations serve the ultimate goal of "social change" (2009, p. 4), which seems to resist material ends such as assessment products that would suggest the learning is finished or achieved, when the project of social change, from a critical perspective, is always ongoing and never "comprehended", as a target text might be, or sufficiently "argued" by evidentiary and disciplinary standards.

Text set through a disciplinary literacy lens

The expansion of the disciplinary literacy tradition in the early 2000s (Moje, 2007; Shanahan and Shanahan, 2008) theorized that academic disciplines have unique literacies. Goldman (2004) argued that early research in disciplinary literacy realized that experts' disciplinary literacy was fundamentally intertextual, an argument that challenged much of the single-text cognitive paradigm at the time (Kintsch, 1988), with a generalized role for background knowledge schema (Anderson, 2018). Recently, literacy research has demonstrated unique literary reading practices (Lee *et al.*, 2016; Rainey, 2017; Reynolds and Rush, 2017),

This disciplinary tradition, as exemplified by Levine *et al.* (2018), describes the instructional design architecture of Project Reading, Evidence and Argumentation in Disciplinary Instruction (READi), a six-year project documenting the nature of disciplinary literacy in ELA, social studies and science (Goldman *et al.*, 2016; Lee *et al.*, 2016), which also traces some of its intellectual antecedents to Lee (1995, 2001) and Hillocks (2011). The goal of this design architecture is to support students in engaging in literary reasoning – an explicitly disciplinary focus, unlike the interdisciplinary QTS framework or the broader conceptual goals of the CCC framework. The Project READi model is conceptualized in four parts: gateway activities, cultural modeling, heuristics and scaffolds and background

knowledge activities. It should be noted that Levine *et al.* (2018) focus less on the background knowledge dimensions in that particular article (Goldman *et al.*, 2016, for a richer discussion of knowledge demands in Project READi).

Gateways introducing cultural models
Levine *et al.* (2018) suggest that texts are only one part of a unit organized around essential questions and tensions in human life, a perspective shared by other scholars of literary argumentation in secondary classrooms (Hillocks, 2011; Bloome *et al.*, 2019). The gateway activities are "brief scenarios, surveys, or other engaging questions that use everyday settings and language to represent a simplified version of those tensions or conflicts" (Levine *et al.*, 2018, p. 113). Similar to the hook texts in the QTS, the gateway activities' texts are designed to connect topics to students' lives, though the QTS takes a more individual-psychological approach to hooking "interest" while the READi approach focuses on how the gateway activities connect to students' social worlds. Gateway activities are also designed to align with the literary heuristics used later in the unit and so they can also be seen as more disciplinary versions of the QTS's hook texts.

The gateway activities then lead into cultural modeling, which is implemented through "cultural data sets" (Lee, 1995), which use:

> Everyday texts (e.g. music, lyrics, clips from movies, TV shows, advertisements, etc.) that are drawn from popular cultural or current contexts, are familiar to and valued by students and invite interpretive challenges (e.g. exploration of symbolism, irony, or unreliable narration) similar to those which students will encounter in more complex focal texts of an instructional unit (Levine *et al.*, 2018, pp. 113–114).

In many ways these texts are akin to the accessible and visual texts in the QTS and the texture texts of the CCC, but with the focus on the particular problems of literary interpretation and less on domain or conceptual knowledge development. This may be because the essential questions of literature – such as questions about coming of age, family dynamics and social conformity – are often assumed to be accessible to all students regardless of background knowledge. By contrast, the QTS frame's interdisciplinary approach must account for how essential questions in, say, history and science – such as "What moral culpability does the US bear in dropping atomic bombs?" or "How should we address climate change?" may require more disciplinary declarative knowledge than ELA essential questions.

Both the QTS and READi frameworks prize accessibility: students read accessible texts and then are guided through increasingly complex texts. However, the frameworks' visions of knowledge and the ties between texts are different. The QTS focuses on knowledge and schema development and the READi model focuses on increasingly sophisticated literary interpretation. Levine *et al.* (2018) show an example of students first working with "Titanium", a popular song at the time of the study, before applying the same heuristics to Sandra Cisneros' vignette "Linoleum Roses" from *The House on Mango Street*. The pop song's relatively simple central metaphor, illustrated by the repeated line "I am titanium", is extended to Cisneros' text, ostensibly richer in its figurative language and literary construction. Then, the students extended their use of heuristics through what Levine *et al.* (2018) call "focal" texts: "Marigolds", a short story by Eugenia Collier and "Two Kinds" and excerpt from Amy Tan's *The Joy Luck Club*. Thus, the gateway texts act as introductions to the more complex cultural models in literature.

The goal: literary heuristics and interpretation
Both the QTS and the READi framework see texts as spiraling from simple to complex. The ultimate goal, however, of the READi model is not the building of domain knowledge and comprehension of a target text (as the QTS has it), but the practice of using of literary heuristics with increasingly complex literary texts. Examples of these heuristics include looking for affect-laden language (Levine, 2014) or attending to literary rules of notice (Beers and Probst, 2013; Rabinowitz, 1987). As students progress through gateway activity texts and increasingly complex literary texts, they develop expertise in the practices of literary interpretation.

Ultimately, Project READi's discipline-specific goals also target students' argumentative writing. While the reading-focused QTS does not attend to expressive products students might create with their knowledge and the concept-focused CCC focuses on broader ideas of social change, the Project READi approach directly theorizes written literary interpretation as the final goal and developing reading for argumentation both within and across disciplines was a core aspect of Project READi (Goldman *et al.*, 2016). Consequently, Levine *et al.* (2018) also describe methods for scaffolding students from using the heuristics in thinking and discussing toward using them in written explanations. In this way, the contrasting ultimate goals of the QTS and the READi approaches illustrate the differences between the cognitive and disciplinary approaches to text set construction.

Discussion
From these examples, it is clear that what researchers and teachers have called "text sets" may have quite different theoretical foundations and assumptions about the nature of ELA teaching and learning. To synthesize across the frameworks, below I discuss how the centering texts, goals and progressions of the text set. For teachers, this synthesis could help clarify curriculum construction and provide a common language across frameworks to support collaboration and instructional decision-making even when teachers in the same school have different priorities. For researchers, this synthesis could help surface the underlying assumptions of disciplinary literacy in relation to those of cognitive reading research and the critical literacy tradition. Seeing the tensions and intersections of the priorities across these perspectives can help teacher educators widen preservice teachers' conceptions of text sets and advance theories of text use in ELA classrooms.

The centering text of the text set
Each model includes some text that serves as an epistemological center: the QTS calls it a "target text", the CCC calls it a "fulcrum text" and Project READi calls it a "focal text". These texts give a sense of epistemological coherence and identity to the text set and the characteristics of that centering text reflect the epistemological commitments of the text set: linguistic and conceptual complexity in the QTS, ideological complexity in the CCC and literary complexity in Project READi. In many ways these centering texts are anchors of ELA instruction, serving as shared resources for teachers and students and offering coherence to ELA curriculum.

What, though, would a text set look like without a text explicitly marked as the epistemological center? Would this be a text set where all texts are assumed to have equal contributions to the text set? This would redefine the types of complexity suggested by the QTS and Project READi models and resist the centering of a "fulcrum" in the CCC model. Such a text set would have to consider prevailing notions of linguistic complexity, literary canonicity and sociopolitical ideology. Both teachers and students bring enormous cultural and social assumptions about what makes a "valuable" text in an ELA classroom – and

those assumptions could easily be reinscribed during instruction as certain texts might appear more valuable than others. Still, if teachers and students were collectively considering the impact of a "centering" text in a text set, they might be more aware of the assumptions of their collective work.

An example of this might be seen in Storm and Rainey (2018), who present an example of #LitAnalysis4Life routine, in which students brought in their own texts (broadly defined) and subject them to collective interpretation using disciplinary practices. Students engaged in the literary analysis characteristic of the disciplinary literacy perspective were engaged with and motivated by texts that were meaningful to them and interrogated the assumptions about class, race, gender and language they found in those texts. Yet, they were not explicitly engaged in text set construction. Perhaps, the students could be guided to see their contributions as a text set construction, with ongoing discussion about the set's conceptual coherence. Little research from any of the three perspectives, however, has explicitly theorized about how students can participate in the construction of text sets. Because research has also noted that text selection to help construct a literary problem is a crucial practice of literary experts (Rainey, 2017), this could be a powerful area to extend text set research.

The goals of the text set

While only Project READi specifies a final product of students' reading (a written literary interpretation), it's also clear that the text sets' goals are related to their epistemologies. Teachers looking for a model for text selection, then, might consider how the goals they select for their students align with the goals of the text set.

Is it possible, though, to achieve all the goals in an English course? It could be argued that an ideal English class does just that: builds students into lifelong readers capable of navigating linguistic complexity, leads students toward a critical capacity to interrogate dominant ideologies and develops students with repertoires of interpretive capacities specific to literary texts both everyday and canonical.

While the epistemologies are potentially synergistic, no doubt tensions arise as teachers try to accomplish these goals. The QTS focus on reading volume is not echoed in the other models, so teachers may wonder: Is it more important to raise my students' volume of text consumed at the expense of developing literary or critical habits? Perhaps not. Yet if students' reading volume is relegated to a lower priority, are students being prepared to engage with longer, more complex arguments that dive into the complexity of real-world identities, concepts and tensions in literature, politics, history and science? Trading off between these tensions is a central challenge for English teachers.

The progression of the text set

Both the QTS and the Project READi models are based on a spiraling complexity of texts, though the QTS model focuses on linguistic complexity and READi on literary complexity. This begs the question: What are the criteria for such complexity? For the QTS, tensions are certainly evident in defining qualitative and quantitative measures of text complexity, especially as proposed in the US Common Core's Appendix A in the USA. Equally evident for Project READi are tensions in what counts as literary complexity, such as whether YA novels or popular culture texts are less literarily complex than literature written for adults.

The CCC approach, by contrast, locates complexity not in the texts themselves but in students' increasingly multifaceted conceptual understandings at the center of the unit. In this respect, the approach is more constructivist than textual. This invites teachers to wonder: What would assessment look like at the end of a CCC-inspired unit? How would any

assessment align with the assumptions of the CCC inquiry? Perhaps the field would benefit from a deeper understanding of how teachers, students (and potentially parents and others interested in understanding student growth) develop a shared understanding of how students' critical inquiry develops over time. Aukerman (2015) offers a potential set of questions to guide this work.

It is also worth noting that the progression of all text sets lasts for one unit of instruction. What, though, would this look like across units of instruction? The "unit of instruction" serves as the unspecified unit of analysis in each of the focal articles and nearly every article proposing a text set for teachers. Yet these units do not exist independently: they are woven into the fabric of a yearlong curriculum. How might text sets interact with other aspects of curriculum including daily routines, interdisciplinary instruction in content area classes, extracurricular literacy offerings or community partnerships? While the "text set" offers the clarity of a focused instructional unit, future articles might examine how the epistemological assumptions in text sets intersect with larger visions of curriculum across units, classrooms, schools, districts and communities.

Implications and possibilities

This article is neither a comprehensive survey of all types of text set construction nor a discussion of the larger topic of text selection in ELA classrooms. Consequently, variations within these perspectives and other perspectives entirely, likely exist. No doubt teachers are already productively hybridizing these perspectives in their classroom – and these hybridities reflect the complexity of defining "disciplinary literacy" in English classrooms and developing shared purposes and goals of ELA curriculum (Luke, 1994).

To apply the ideas in this article, teachers might begin with their existing students and curriculum. For example, one teacher might have students who are avid readers and discussers of different types of complex literature, but might consider employing aspects of the CCC text set framework to support them in developing critical literacy. Conversely, another teacher's school might already have a cross-curricular focus on activism and justice – that teacher might want to integrate the QTS's ideas about reading volume or text complexity. Adapting theoretical ideas to serve the needs of students, while working within existing curricular constraints and resources, is a central work of ELA teaching.

What, more specifically, might these hybrid ideas bring to ELA text set work? I conclude with two final hybridities: multimodality and volume. Multimodality, a part of text sets from the term's origin, can be a consistent theme across perspectives. The QTS already prioritizes visual texts. Project READi model's gateway texts include songs, videos and advertisements. While the CCC is silent about modality, much other scholarship has examined the intersection of critical literacy and pop culture texts such as songs and videos (Morrell, 2015). Given this commonality, perspectives on modality could be hybridized. For example, how might memes in which text and image are juxtaposed, often in the ironic context of social media remixing (Elmore and Coleman, 2019), have the potential to serve as hooks, gateways, literary arguments and counterstories? How might the use of a map such as the Racial Dot Map published by the Demographics Research Group at the University of Virginia (https://demographics.coopercenter.org/racial-dot-map) serve as a gateway text to understanding residential segregation, a visual text to see how racially segregated US neighborhoods are, or a counterstory to challenge myths about residential segregation? Using memes and maps might help teachers layer cognitive, critical and disciplinary goals.

The concept of reading volume might also be productively seen in a hybrid way across these lenses. Reading volume is traditionally defined as engaging in the act of reading printed text (Allington and McGill-Franzen, 2021). For example, an explicit goal of the QTS

is to build knowledge and skills so students engage in more reading. But viewed in the Project READi lens, a student might be inspired by a song by a previously unheard artist that was used as a gateway text and seek out that artist, or genre. A gateway song might invite students to find a Spotify playlist that extends the initial song's content or genre. Or perhaps, during a CCC-inspired text set, a student might listen to an episode of a podcast such as Rebecca Nagle's *This Land*, which tells counterstories exploding stereotypes of Native American life, or *The Promise*, which includes both stories and counterstories of gentrification and rebuilding of public housing in Nashville, TN. Would these students then be primed to increase their *listening* volume? ELA teachers could use these potentially complementary lenses to reexamine how instruction could increase students' volume of engaged reading, listening and critical interpreting of all kinds of texts.

Ultimately, exploring the tensions and potential hybridities in different models of text set construction may generate productive insights for researchers who theorize text selection as well as for teachers looking to invigorate their curriculum and clarify the ultimate goals of their ELA classroom. Understanding the deep assumptions embodied in text sets and their theoretical perspectives is a step toward creating and recreating the ELA curriculum our students deserve.

References

Adichie, C.N. (2009), "The danger of a single story", TED, available at: www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda_ngozi_adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story?language=en

Allington, R.L. and McGill-Franzen, A.M. (2021), "Reading volume and reading achievement: a review of recent research", *Reading Research Quarterly*, Vol. 56, pp. S231-S238.

Amendum, S.J., Conradi, K. and Hiebert, E. (2018), "Does text complexity matter in the elementary grades? A research synthesis of text difficulty and elementary students' reading fluency and comprehension", *Educational Psychology Review*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 121-151.

Anderson, R.C. (2018), "Role of the reader's schema in comprehension, learning and Memory", in Alvermann, D.E., Unrau, N.J., Sailors, M. and Ruddell, R.B. (Eds), *Theoretical Models and Processes of Literacy*, Routledge, Oxfordshire, pp. 136-145.

Aukerman, M. (2015), "How should readers develop across time? Mapping change without a deficit perspective", *Language Arts*, Vol. 93 No. 1, pp. 55-62.

Batchelor, K.E. (2019), "Using linked text sets to promote advocacy and agency through a critical lens", *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, Vol. 62 No. 4, pp. 379-386.

Beach, R., Thein, A. and Webb, A. (2015), *Teaching to Exceed the English Language Arts Common Core State Standards: A Literacy Practices Approach for 6-12 Classrooms*, Routledge, Oxfordshire.

Beers, G.K. and Probst, R.E. (2013), *Notice and Note: Strategies for Close Reading*, Heinemann, Portsmouth, NH.

Bishop, R.S. (1990), "Walk tall in the world: African American literature for today's children", *The Journal of Negro Education*, Vol. 59 No. 4, pp. 556-565.

Bloome, D. and Egan-Robertson, A. (1993), "The social construction of intertextuality in classroom reading and writing lessons", *Reading Research Quarterly*, Vol. 28 No. 4, pp. 305-333.

Bloome, D., Newell, G., Hirvela, A., Lin, T.J. (2019), *Dialogic Literary Argumentation in High School Language Arts Classrooms: A Social Perspective for Teaching, Learning and Reading Literature*, Routledge, Oxfordshire.

Cairney, T. (1990), "Intertextuality: infectious echoes from the past", *The Reading Teacher*, Vol. 43 No. 7, pp. 478-484.

Cappiello, M.A. and Dawes, E.T. (2012), *Teaching with Text Sets*, Shell Education, Huntington Beach, CA.

Cunningham, A.E. and Stanovich, K.E. (1997), "Early reading acquisition and its relation to reading experience and ability 10 years later", *Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 33 No. 6, pp. 934-945.

Dobbs, C.L., Ippolito, J. and Charner-Laird, M. (2016), "Layering intermediate and disciplinary literacy work: lessons learned from a secondary social studies teacher team", *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, Vol. 60 No. 2, pp. 131-139.

Dodge, A.M. and Crutcher, P.A. (2015), "Inclusive classrooms for LGBTQ students: using linked text sets to challenge the hegemonic 'single story'", *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, Vol. 59 No. 1, pp. 95-105.

Dowdy, J.K. and Fleischaker, R. (2018), *Text Sets: Multimodal Learning for Multicultural Students*, Brill, Boston, MA.

Dyches, J. (2018a), "Critical canon pedagogy: applying disciplinary inquiry to cultivate canonical critical consciousness", *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 88 No. 4, pp. 538-564.

Dyches, J. (2018b), "Shattering literary windows and mirrors: creating prismatic canonical experiences for (and with) British literature students", in Macaluso, M. and Macaluso, K. (Eds), *Teaching the Canon in 21st Century Classrooms*, Brill Sense, Boston, MA, pp. 35-49.

Ebbers, M. (2002), "Science text sets: using various genres to promote literacy and inquiry", *Language Arts*, Vol. 80 No. 1, pp. 40-50.

Elmore, P.G. and Coleman, J.M. (2019), "Middle school students' analysis of political memes to support critical media literacy", *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, Vol. 63 No. 1, pp. 29-40.

Erickson, H.L. (2006), *Concept-Based Curriculum and Instruction for the Thinking Classroom*, Corwin, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Fulmer, S.M. and Tulis, M. (2013), "Changes in interest and affect during a difficult reading task: relationships with perceived difficulty and reading fluency", *Learning and Instruction*, Vol. 27, pp. 11-20.

Fulmer, S.M., D'Mello, S.K., Strain, A. and Graesser, A.C. (2015), "Interest-based text preference moderates the effect of text difficulty on engagement and learning", *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, Vol. 41, pp. 98-110.

Goldman, S.R. (2004), "Cognitive aspects of constructing meaning through and across multiple texts", in Shuart, N.W. and Bloome, D. (Eds), *Intertexuality and Research on Classroom Education*, Information Age Press, Charlotte, NC, pp. 317-351.

Goldman, S.R., Britt, M.A., Brown, W., Cribb, G., George, M., Greenleaf, C., . . . Project, R. (2016), "Disciplinary literacies and learning to read for understanding: a conceptual framework for disciplinary literacy", *Educational Psychologist*, Vol. 51 No. 2, pp. 219-246.

Hartman, D.K. and Hartman, J.A. (1993), "Reading across texts: expanding the role of the reader", *The Reading Teacher*, Vol. 47 No. 3, pp. 202-211.

Hattan, C. and Lupo, S.M. (2020), "Rethinking the role of knowledge in the literacy classroom", *Reading Research Quarterly*, Vol. 55, pp. S283-S298.

Hillocks, G. (2011), *Teaching Argument Writing, Grades 6–12*, Heinemann, Portsmouth, NH.

Hinchman, K.A. and O'Brien, D.G. (2019), "Disciplinary literacy: from infusion to hybridity", *Journal of Literacy Research*, Vol. 51 No. 4, pp. 525-536.

Kintsch, W. (1988), "The role of knowledge in discourse comprehension: a construction-integration model", *Psychological Review*, Vol. 95 No. 2, pp. 163-182.

Kintsch, W. (2013), "Revisiting the construction–integration model of text comprehension and its implications for instruction", in Alvermann, D.E., Unrau, N.J. and Ruddell, R.B. (Eds), *Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading*, 6th ed., International Reading Association, Newark, DE, pp. 807-839.

Lannin, A., Juergensen, R., Smith, C., Abdelnaby, H., Van Garderen, D., Folk, W., Palmer, T. and Pinkston, L. (2020), "Multimodal text sets to use literature and engage all learners in the science classroom", *Science Scope (Washington, D.C.)*, Vol. 44 No. 2, pp. 20-28.

Lechtenberg, K. (2018), "Curating against the canon: collaborative curation for critical literacy", in Macaluso, M. and Macaluso, K. (Eds), *Teaching the Canon in 21st Century Classrooms*, Brill Sense, Boston, MA, pp. 3-17.

Lee, C.D. (1995), "A culturally based cognitive apprenticeship: teaching African American high school students skills in literary interpretation", *Reading Research Quarterly*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 608-630.

Lee, C.D. (2001), "Is October brown Chinese? A cultural modeling activity system for underachieving students", *American Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 38 No. 1, pp. 97-141.

Lee, C.D., Goldman, S.R.S. and Magliano, J. (2016), "Epistemic cognition in literary reasoning", in Greene, J.A., Sandoval, W.A. and Braten, I. (Eds), *Handbook of Epistemic Cognition*, Routledge, Oxfordshire, pp. 165-183.

Levine, S. (2014), "Making interpretation visible with an affect-based strategy", *Reading Research Quarterly*, Vol. 49 No. 3, pp. 283-303.

Levine, S., Hall, A.H., Goldman, S.R. and Lee, C.D. (2018), "A design architecture for engaging middle and high school students in epistemic practices of literary Interpretation", in Wilcox, K. and Nachowitz, M. (Eds), *High Literacy in Secondary English Language Arts: Bridging the Gap to College and Career*, Lexington Books, Lanham, MD, pp. 105-132.

Lewis, W. and Flynn, J.E. (2017), "Below the surface level of social justice: using quad text sets to plan equity-oriented instruction", *ALAN Review*, Vol. 45 No. 1, pp. 22-31.

Lewis, W. and Strong, J. (2020), *Literacy Instruction with Disciplinary Texts: Strategies for Grades 6-12*, Guildford Press, New York, NY.

Luke, A. (1994), *The Social Construction of Literacy in the Primary School*, Macmillan Education AU, South Yarra, VIC.

Luke, A. (2012), "Critical literacy: foundational notes", *Theory into Practice*, Vol. 51 No. 1, pp. 4-11.

Lupo, S.M., Strong, J.Z., Lewis, W., Walpole, S. and McKenna, M.C. (2018), "Building background knowledge through reading: rethinking text sets", *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, Vol. 61 No. 4, pp. 433-444.

Lupo, S.M., Tortorelli, L., Invernizzi, M., Ryoo, J.H. and Strong, J.Z. (2019), "An exploration of text difficulty and knowledge support on adolescents' comprehension", *Reading Research Quarterly*, Vol. 54 No. 4, pp. 457-479.

Mesmer, H.A., Cunningham, J.W. and Hiebert, E.H. (2012), "Toward a theoretical model of text complexity for the early grades: learning from the past, anticipating the future", *Reading Research Quarterly*, Vol. 47 No. 3, pp. 235-258.

Moje, E.B. (2007), "Developing socially just subject-matter instruction: a review of the literature on disciplinary literacy teaching", *Review of Research in Education*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 1-44.

Morrell, E. (2015), "Critical literacy and urban youth: pedagogies of access", *Dissent and Liberation*, Routledge, Oxfordshire.

Moss, B. (2011), "Boost critical thinking: new titles for thematically based text sets", *Voices from the Middle*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 46-48.

Opitz, M.F. (1998), "Text sets: one way to flex your grouping – in first grade, too!", *The Reading Teacher*, Vol. 51 No. 7, pp. 622-624.

Rabinowitz, P.J. (1987), *Before Reading: Narrative Conventions and the Politics of Interpretation*, The OH State University Press, Columbus, OH.

Rainey, E.C. (2017), "Disciplinary literacy in English language arts: exploring the social and problem-based nature of literary reading and reasoning", *Reading Research Quarterly*, Vol. 52 No. 1, pp. 53-71.

Reynolds, D. (2021), "Scaffolding the academic language of complex text: an intervention for late secondary students", *Journal of Research in Reading*, Vol. 44 No. 3, pp. 508-528.

Reynolds, T. and Rush, L.S. (2017), "Experts and novices reading literature: an analysis of disciplinary literacy in English language arts", *Literacy Research and Instruction*, Vol. 56 No. 3, pp. 199-216.

Rodesiler, L. (2017), "Sports-based text sets: fostering critical literacy at the intersections of sport and society", *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, Vol. 90 No. 2, pp. 35-40.

Rowe, D.W. (1986), "Literacy learning as an intertextual process", Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, available at: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED283124.pdf (accessed 28 December 2021).

Shanahan, T. and Shanahan, C. (2008), "Teaching disciplinary literacy to adolescents: rethinking content-area literacy", *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 78 No. 1, pp. 40-59.

Short, K. (1991), "Intertextuality: making connections across literature and life", Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Seattle, WA, available at: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED342001.pdf (accessed 28 December 2021).

Souto-Manning, M. (2017), "Generative text sets: tools for negotiating critically inclusive early childhood teacher education pedagogical practices", *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education*, Vol. 38 No. 1, pp. 79-101.

Springer, S.E., Dole, J.A. and Hacker, D.J. (2017), "The role of interest in reading comprehension", in Israel, S.E. (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Reading Comprehension*, Guildford Press, New York, NY, pp. 519-542.

Storm, S. and Rainey, E.C. (2018), "Striving toward woke English teaching and learning", *English Journal*, Vol. 107 No. 6, pp. 95-101.

Tschida, C.M. (2015), "Tackling controversial topics: developing thematic text sets for elementary social studies", *Social Studies Research and Practice*, Vol. 10 No. 3, pp. 40-56.

Tschida, C.M., Ryan, C.L. and Ticknor, A.S. (2014), "Building on windows and mirrors: encouraging the disruption of 'single stories' through children's literature", *Journal of Children's Literature*, Vol. 40 No. 1, pp. 28-39.

Wessling, S.B. (2011), *Supporting Students in a Time of Common Core Standards: English Language Arts Grades 9-12*, National Council of Teachers of English, Urbana, IL.

Wigfield, A. and Guthrie, J.T. (1997), "Relations of children's motivation for reading to the amount and breadth or their reading", *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 89 No. 3, pp. 420-432.

Further reading

Scales, R.Q. and Tracy, K.N. (2017), "Using text sets to facilitate critical thinking in sixth graders", *Literacy Research and Instruction*, Vol. 56 No. 2, pp. 132-157.

About the author

Dan Reynolds is an assistant professor of literacy education at John Carroll University. A former high school English teacher, his research focuses on various dimensions of adolescent literacy instruction and policy. Dan Reynolds can be contacted at: dreynolds@jcu.edu