



<http://www.diva-portal.org>

This is the published version of a paper published in *L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature*.

Citation for the original published paper (version of record):

Löfgren, M., Erixon, P-O. (2024)

Literature manuals in times of new mediacy in Sweden

L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature, 24(2): 614

<https://doi.org/10.21248/l1esll.2024.24.2.614>

Access to the published version may require subscription.

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

Copyright (c) 2024 L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Permanent link to this version:

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:umu:diva-226450>

LITERATURE MANUALS IN TIMES OF NEW MEDIACY IN SWEDEN

MARIA LÖFGREN AND PER-OLOF ERIXON

Department of Creative Studies, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden

Abstract

The present article focuses on the role of the teaching and learning of literature in a large-scale Swedish, professional development programme for teachers called the Reading Lift. More specifically this study, using qualitative content analysis, examines the educational function of the most prominently referred to literary didactic theory and method developers in the program: Judith Langer, Aidan Chambers, Louise M. Rosenblatt, and Rita Felski, but also the relationship between literary didactics, literacy, and fiction. The results show a strong domination of Langer-inspired manual and strategy-based approaches, primarily promoting efferent reading stances. More holistic hermeneutic and dialogic approaches in support of aesthetic reading, represented by Chambers, Rosenblatt and Felski, are less common. Further, there is a strong alliance between the literacy concept and the systematic and manual-based literary didactic approaches. Also, in the literacy discourse, literary works of art have become not just texts amongst other texts, and foreign, but are also framed as hypermediacy. Based on our results we tentatively suggest that a shift in paradigms of literature education has taken place, from literature pedagogy, grounded in print culture, to literature didactics, situated in new mediacy and the digital.

Keywords: literature didactics, literacy, digitalization, hypermediacy

1. INTRODUCTION

In a YouTube clip titled “Medieval helpdesk with English subtitles”, originally featured on the Norwegian comic show *Øystein og jeg*, a medieval monk finds himself frustrated with a new form of communication (Norwegian Broadcasting, 2007). On the table in front of him lies a large unopened book. In despair, a service man from the monastery helpdesk is called upon to demonstrate its function and usage, for example, how the covers can be opened and closed, and pages can be turned back and forward. Only accustomed to parchment rolls, the monk is at first in a state of disbelief regarding the solidity of the new medium, fearing that the words might disappear when turning over a new page. And although later reassured that the text will stay in place, still, the procedure needs to be repeated several times over to reduce his worry.

For a long time, form and function of the book have been clear, almost self-explanatory. We now, however, live in a digital culture dominated by screens, images and on the whole more multimodal forms of representation (Kress, 2000). Based on this shift, a query addressed by this article is whether the technology of the book, and closely associated forms of representation, such as fiction and storytelling, have—like for the monk in the cloister—become alienated, or in Bertolt Brecht’s (1936/2002) words, caused a *Verfremdungseffekt* (distancing effect) in the new media ecology. Or framed differently, originally based in print culture, the book might have deviated, in Bolter and Grusin’s (1999) terms, from immediacy (transparent) to hypermediacy (opaque). In support of our premise, we explore a large Swedish professional development program for teachers called the Reading Lift, where we tentatively suggest that a new, systematic, manual-based, but also fragmented approach to the teaching and learning of literature has succeeded an older, more holistic, pleasure-based, and hermeneutic discourse. For this we, in our discussion, use the terms literature didactics, versus literature pedagogy.

In our previous research, we have studied the development of the Reading Lift with a particular focus on the role that is assigned to fiction. The results show that what was first, by the Swedish government, intended as a lift in teachers’ knowledge of “children’s and youth literature, as well as literary didactic methods” (Kulturdepartementet, 2012, pp. 13–14), and later, in a government bill and assignment to the state agency at hand, an investment in reading and writing development for teachers in L1, became, under the responsibility of the Swedish National Agency for Education, a massive lift in New Literacy perspectives and multimodality for all teachers (Erixon & Löfgren, 2018; Löfgren, 2023, 2024). Further, in the small amount of material assigned to literary works, emphasis is mainly placed on the development of general literacy skills, such as reading comprehension, in line with global assessment policies (Erixon & Löfgren, 2018, 2020), although for upper-secondary school some *Bildung* aspects can also be noticed (Löfgren & Erixon, 2022).

The present study focuses on the role of literature didactics (for a definition see below) in the Reading Lift, i.e., the other aspect, aside from literary texts, magnified

by the governmentally assigned preparatory work. Because, if fiction has a marginalized role in the Reading Lift, the situation is not the same for theories and methods sprung out of the field of literary education. The aim of this study is, by using qualitative content analysis, to examine the educational function of the four most prominently referred to literary didactic theory and method developers in the Reading Lift: Judith Langer, Aidan Chambers, Louise M. Rosenblatt, and Rita Felski, but also to explore the relationship between literary didactics, literacy, and fiction. The aim is broken down into the following research questions:

- 1) What is the educational function of literature didactics in the Reading Lift?
- 2) How does literature didactics and literature resonate with the literacy discourse?

1.1 Definitions

The term *didactic* stems from the German concept of *Didaktik* and refers to the theoretical reflection on subject matter in relation to the art of teaching, in order to enhance optimal learning and growth for each individual (Comenius, 1657/2008). *Didaktik* was originally part of the *Bildung* tradition, which is a holistic educational ideal stemming from Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767–1835). *Bildung* places emphasis on the development of the whole person in multiple ways, intellectually, ethically, and even aesthetically, towards personal growth and societal responsibility (Ringarp, 2013). With *literature didactics*, we mean theories and methods on the teaching and learning of literature, based on the three analytical questions central to pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) (Schulman, 1986): *What* (subject content to highlight), *How* (with which pedagogical methods) and *Why* (justification of choices) (Martinsson, 2018). Further, in this study the terms *literature*, *literary*, *fiction* and *storytelling* are used interchangeably when referring to writing as an art form. In other words, we do not use the term literature in its more general meaning as a written work.

The article starts by outlining the organisation and structuring of the Reading Lift, paradigms of literary education, and the role of literacy in the new media ecology. Subsequently theory and methodology are presented, followed by key findings and a discussion of results.

2. CONTEXT

2.1 The Reading Lift

The Reading Lift was initiated by the Swedish Government in 2013, after a considerate lapse in the PISA and PIRLS global literacy assessments, as well as a steady decline in reading habits amongst youth. The task of developing the material was handed over to the National Agency for Education, which between 2014 and 2019, and with the help of (mostly) Swedish researchers, developed the main bulk

of the program. In total, the Reading Lift consists of 60 modules for teachers in preschool (ages 1–5), compulsory school (ages 6–15) and upper secondary school (ages 16–18). Each module is made up of eight submodules. A submodule consists of an article of approximately ten to twelve pages, often supplemented with a short inspirational film, discussion questions and practical exercises. The inspirational films are episodic, consisting of short statements by teachers, experts and sometimes students, mixed with sweeping visualizations of classrooms or close-ups of learning material. In order to attend, schools can apply for a state grant, covering the cost of a mentoring supervisor. After training, the supervisor is tasked with leading a collegial learning group in the implementation of two modules.

The overall spread of the program has been extensive, reaching up to 25% of all teachers in Sweden by 2020 (Skolverket, 2020). According to both the National Agency for Education's and the Government's reporting, the Reading Lift has chiefly been a successful adventure (Regeringen, 2020; Skolverket, 2020). However, evaluations of, and research conducted on the Reading Lift partly give a different picture. A large evaluation demonstrates that only some new insights were obtained by teachers, which led to small and diminishing effects in changed instruction (Carlbaum et al., 2019). Regarding students' results, improvements were noted, although not "at par with the program's high reaching goals" (p. 86). Research on the Reading Lift reveals difficulties in acquiring content, partly due to large epistemological gaps between teachers and presented materials (Johansson & Magnusson, 2019; Randahl & Varga, 2020). Kirsten (2020) finds that the program essentially functions as a form of policy implementation. With regard to the kind of educational policy implemented, Löfgren (2023, 2024) establishes major influence from the skills and strategy-based global assessment educational discourses, especially PISA, but also from the concept of literacy as a social practice, stemming from Street (1984) and further developed by the New London Group.

2.2 *Paradigms of literary education*

The development of literary education in Sweden mainly follows the order outlined by Witte and Sâmihaiian (2013). Rooted in the old Latin tradition, a *cultural paradigm*, dominates the start of the 20th century, in Sweden paired with a *Bildung* ambition of shaping individuals intellectually, morally, and aesthetically (Thavenius, 1991). After the Second World War a second, *linguistic* model, inspired by New Criticism and structuralism, emerged, primarily paying attention to the form and style of literary texts (Witte & Sâmihaiian, 2013). In the 1970s a third, *social* model, appears, introducing sociological perspectives. At this time, a group of L1 researchers based in the south of Sweden launched a literary pedagogy of experience, in direct polarization with what they perceived as an overly instrumental and form-oriented literary approach, but also in opposition to a discourse of reading for pleasure (Clark & Rumbold, 2006; Krashen, 2004) present at the time (Borsgård, 2022). According to the pedagogy of experience, partly influenced by reader-response criticism, and

partly by Marxist theory, literary education must tie in to students' own experiences and interests, but above this, it must be linked to real social issues, such as, class-conflicts.

The 1990s are characterized, partly, by a backlash, against what was perceived as an overly one-sided focus on reader-response and social perspectives, in favour of a literary competence-based pedagogy (Degerman, 2012). With influence from Lser (1978), emphasis was placed on how the structure of a fictional text to some extent determines interpretation, and with inspiration from Culler (1975), it is pointed out that familiarity with form and style is decisive for a reader's ability to understand literature. In parallel, a *personal* paradigm emerged, orienting around students' gaining a better understanding of themselves and others through literature (Witte & Sâmihaiian, 2013). For Sweden this also meant attention being directed towards the importance of the personalized reading experience and literary conversation, based on the works of Louise M. Rosenblatt and the British author and educator Aidan Chambers (Nordberg, 2020).

At the start of the millennium, a new Swedish teacher training reform accentuating the importance of teachers being trained on scientific ground, led to an explosion of educational research. Studies on the teaching and learning of literature, previously loosely gathered under the umbrella of literary pedagogy, now formatted and solidified under the term literature didactics (Degerman, 2012). In the last two decades, steadily decreasing results in the global literacy evaluations has resulted in an intense focus on strategy-based reading, an approach also heavily supported by the PISA and PIRLS' educational frameworks (Borsgård, 2022; Mullis & Martin, 2015; OECD, 2019). A number of models are at hand, but the most prominent is based on Palinscar and Brown's (1984) research on how successful readers engage with texts by stopping and summarizing, making inferences (filling in gaps), posing questions, and predicting the ending. Applied to fiction, reading strategies means a shift from literary competence and interpretation to basic reading comprehension. Whether reading strategies are to be seen as part of literature education is therefore questionable, but the fact remains that they are often applied to fiction in Swedish schools (Walldén, 2019). At this time, Judith Langer's (1995) envisionment theory and five step approach to literary texts also gained influence (for more on Langer ideas see Results).

In relation to these more strategy-based approaches, criticism has been raised during the last decade against what is perceived as an overly skill and competence-based literary education, which risks placing the aesthetic experience (Wintersparv, 2021), reading engagement and pleasure (Fatheddine, 2018; Widhe, 2018), but also interpretation, in-depth understanding and meaning (Öhman, 2015; Walldén, 2019) on the side-lines.

2.3 Literacy and the new media landscape

Distinctive for the last thirty years is an extensive shift in leading forms and modes of communication, from the analogue to the digitalized, and from print culture to an image dominated society (Kress & van Leeuwen, 1996; Tapscott, 2009). In parallel the concept of literacy has come to have an increasingly central position both within linguistics and for school subjects in general, especially L1 (Sellar & Lingard, 2013; Krogh, 2020). From once having been associated with reading and writing the term literacy, has, partly through anthropological research, but also by the evolving new digitalized mediacy, expanded to include the entire diversity of meaning-making semiotic systems and practices that surround all human life (Dąbrowska, 2019). In line with this, Street (1984), co-founder of New Literacy Studies, defines literacy as a multiple and ever developing social practice. Beside the literacy activities per se, for example, reading and writing, New Literacy Studies emphasize the importance of paying attention to the multitude of practices that surround all meaning-making before, during, and after a literacy event (Street, 1997).

Street's (1984) perspective was further developed in the 1990s by a group of linguists and semioticians called the New London Group, represented by Mary Hamilton, Allan Luke, James Paul Gee and Gunter Kress (today often labelled as the *multiliteracies* approach; Cope & Kalantzis, 2000). For the New London Group, the point of interest lies on emerging literacies in the increasingly global and digitized society (Dąbrowska, 2019). Inspired by Kress and van Leeuwen (1996), weight is also placed on how all texts, even those consisting solely of letters and words, involve the interaction and integration of several semiotic modes. Further, in accordance with the underlying poststructuralist power analysis of New Literacy Studies, the multiliteracies approach actively criticises the long-standing Western tradition of primarily prioritizing print literature (Kress, 2000, p. 184).

Global organizations with great impact on national education policy, such as the OECD (PISA), the IEA (PIRLS), and UNESCO, have partly endorsed the literacy concept (Sellar & Lingard, 2013). However, the integral power analysis, motivating New Literacy Studies to acknowledge a wide diversity of literacies and practices, even leisure activities, does not permeate the assessment discourses. Instead, attention is paid to a narrower range, meaning a set of literacy skills (reading comprehension, integrating/synthesising information across sources), practices (functionally engage with text) and text types (description, narration, and argumentative) assumed to be effective for social development and economic growth.

3. THEORY

In our understanding of the different variants of literary didactic theories and methods to be found in the Reading Lift, we draw upon Louise M. Rosenblatt's (1938/1995, 1972/1994) distinction between efferent and aesthetic reading. With an *efferent* standpoint, the reader's attention is primarily directed towards what

remains *after* the reading act, i.e., “the information to be acquired, the logical solution to the problem, actions to be carried out” (Rosenblatt, 1972/1994, p. 23). It is, thus, a more instrumental way of approaching a text, abstracting facts or ideas for further use. When a literary text is read efferently, attention is paid to style and form, such as narrative perspective, metaphors, and symbols. Reading strategies in support of basic reading comprehension, in line with Palinscar and Brown (1984)—summarizing, making inferences, posing questions, predicting the ending—are also primarily efferent. An efferent reading in extreme totally closes off concerns around expression, in order to salvage information.

An *aesthetic* stance is primarily concerned with what happens *during* the reading event, i.e., feelings, sensations, associations, and ideas awakened in the reader by the text, or in Rosenblatt’s terms by the transaction with the text (Rosenblatt, 1972/1994). With *transaction*, Rosenblatt means the organic assimilation between the environment of the text and the world of the reader. Elements awakened in the individual by a text can be of a both emotive and intellectual nature. Further, an aesthetic approach allows the reader to live through experiences or cultures, for example, to identify with a gender, generation, or psychology, other than one’s own (Rosenblatt 1938/1995). In extreme, an aesthetic reading presents as a state of total absorption with the literary work (Rosenblatt, 1972/1994).

All kinds of texts, for example, both factual and fiction can, according to Rosenblatt (1972/1994), be read either efferently or aesthetically. However, what distinguishes literary texts from other forms of communication, such as newspaper articles, information texts etc., is the inherent special character of the aesthetic stance, which allows for the literary text to be lived through. In other words, a literary work “embodies verbal stimuli towards a special kind of intense and ordered experience—sensuous, emotional, intellectual—out of which ideas and social insights may arise” (Rosenblatt, 1938/1995, 31). With factual texts, information can be summoned and retold, sometimes, even better than by the original. But, “no one can read a poem for us”, meaning a poem or story only emerges when a reader’s experiences, emotions and thoughts transacts with a literary work (p. 33).

Further, in order to understand our results, such as the domination of certain kinds of didactic theories and models over others, and the place of both literature didactics and literature in the new media culture, we draw upon the concepts of immediacy and hypermediacy, established by Bolter and Grusin (1999). *Immediacy* represents a strive within the medium itself for transparency, an attempt to ignore or even deny its own presence. *Hypermediacy* stands for a state of preoccupation with the medium itself and the process of mediation, i.e., a hyper-awareness of the medium’s own opacity. Distinctive of a hypermedia approach is the way the representation forces the viewer (or reader) to circle back to the surface—“looking *at*” rather than “looking *through*” (p. 41). Further, hypermediacy encourages the user to take pleasure in the very exposure of the medium, privileging fragmentation, heterogeneity, but also indeterminacy.

Although historically, examples of a preoccupation with hypermediacy can be retrieved, for example, in the illustrious decorations of capital letters in medieval manuscripts, most mediums have traditionally attempted for invisibility. Within our present technologist and digital society, however—where forms of communication steadily multiply in the form of screens, windows, apps and toolbars, repetitively calling for attention, in multiple modes (graphics, sound, letters, etc.)—hypermediacy, has, according to Bolter and Grusin, become the dominant logic.

4. METHODS

The study is conducted using content analysis, which focuses on the description and interpretation of textual data, by the systematic process of coding, in order to identify and analyse categories, themes, and patterns (Weber, 1990). Both quantitative and qualitative approaches can be applied, separately or together. Cohen et al. (2007) outline the process of content analysis in four steps: coding, categorising, comparing, and concluding. This procedure is, however, seldom completed in one single stance; instead, codes and categories are first tried out on a smaller portion of the material, in order to assess accuracy and consistency, and are then revised and repeated for as many steps as it takes to achieve high reliability. Further, Assarroudi et al. (2018) divide the process of qualitative content analysis into three phases: (1) preparation, (2) organisation, and (3) reporting. The *preparation* phase involves the formulation of research questions, gathering of data and immersing with the data, often inductively and in the form of a preliminary coding. In line with Assarroudi and colleagues, all Reading Lift submodules were initially read using an inductive approach to obtain an overall understanding. During this process we especially took note of when and how theories or methods on the teaching and learning of literature were applied.

In the *organisation* phase, a formative categorisation matrix, in this study referred to as an *analytical framework*, based on theory, previous research, and to some extent the preliminary inductive reading, is constructed to systematically explore content (Assarroudi et al., 2018). Studied material is thereafter coded according to the defined rules for each established category. For this study, an analytical framework was created based on the three fundamental analytical questions of PCK (Schulman 1986), Rosenblatt's (1938/1995, 1972/1994) theory on the efferent and aesthetic, and a definition of literacy (Street, 1984). The framework was refined in several rounds of organising and amassing of codes into categories, reformulating categories and comparing categories, as well as in the form of a pilot. Validity is based on this process, combined with domain-specific knowledge from the educational, literary and literacy field (Assarroudi et al., 2018, pp. 50-51).

4.1 Material and analysis process

All professional development modules were downloaded from the National Agency's digital learning platform (<https://larportalen.skolverket.se/#/>). Because materials on the platform are sometimes revised, an end date was set to 31 December 2020. This means that the latest module versions up to this date are the ones that have been examined for this study. The process of analysis started by identifying submodules where theories or methods originally developed within the context of the teaching and learning of literature were referenced in submodule articles (Appendix, protocol 1). In total, 60 submodules, out of 284, corresponded to this definition. Of these, only 34 (12%) focus on literary texts (Appendix, protocol 2). A clear tendency can, in other words, be observed in the Reading Lift of applying theories and methods, that are specifically developed within the field of literary education, to other texts, i.e. non-fiction.

We thereafter proceeded to—on submodule level—explore the educational function of four of the most common literature didactic theory and method developers identified in the Reading Lift (Langer, Chambers, Rosenblatt, and Felski), both in the context of fiction and non-fiction. By educational function we mean: what content, with which approach to learning and for what purpose (Appendix, protocol 2). Regarding the last question of PCK, why, we draw upon motivational aspects already outlined within the four paradigms of literature education (Witte & Sâmihaiian, 2013): the cultural, the linguistic, the social, and the personal. By support of Green (2002), a fifth motivational paradigm was added, the *operational*, which is a skills-based approach aiming for general literacy development, such as decoding, reading comprehension, and writing. In addition, an approximation was also made as to whether the suggested literary didactic theories and methods allow for a primarily efferent or aesthetic reading stance (Appendix, protocol 3). Weight should here be placed on the word *primarily*, because, as Rosenblatt (1972/1994) specifies, efferent and aesthetic readings exist on a continuum, and may vary in multiple ways between the extremities. We lastly explore alignment of the literacy concept, stemming from Street (1984), with our four theorists and model developer's relevant for this study (Appendix, protocol 4).

5. RESULTS

Of the theorists and model developers most prominently drawn upon in the Reading Lift, Judith Langer is by far the most prevalent (50%), followed by Aidan Chambers (18%), Louise M. Rosenblatt (15%) and Rita Felski (5%) (see Table 1).

Table 1. Literature didactic theorists and/or model developers (percentages)

Theorist	Langer	Chambers	Rosenblatt	Felski
Prevalence	50	18	15	5

Table 1 shows the most commonly referred to literary didactic theorists and model developers in the Reading Lift, out of the total number of submodules with literary didactic content (i.e. the 60 submodules). We now move on to explore educational function of these four theorists and model developers in the Reading Lift. The account begins with a presentation of each theorist, followed by an analysis of educational function and reading stances as played out in the Reading Lift.

5.1 Judith Langer

Judith Langer's (1995) envisionment theory and five stage model for approaching literary texts consists of five phases: the *orientation* phase, contextualising, and, as such, preparing for what is to come; the *understanding* phase, stepping into, meaning gathering information by the use of various reading comprehension strategies (summarize, ask questions and predict) and moving through an imaginary world; the *feedback* phase, pondering upon the relevance of thoughts awakened in the reader by the text; the *overview* phase, objectifying the reading experience by, for example, critical reflexion upon style, form and ideas, or by reconnecting what is read to other texts, concepts and contexts, and, lastly, the *creativity* phase, use of knowledge gained in new contexts. As Langer (1995) specifies, readers do not always approach this process in a linear way, but instead move back and forth between steps.

As regards, what kind of reading Langer's model allows for, noticeable is a mix between efferent and aesthetic stances. By placing emphasis on foregrounding the literary work before entrance to the literary world can take place, its starting point (orientation phase) is primarily efferent. The second phase (understanding) consists of a mix of efferent and aesthetic practices. The "stepping in" part (gathering information with the use of reading comprehension skills) is certainly more efferent, but the "moving through" leans somewhat more towards the aesthetic. The third position (feedback), connecting what is read to own experiences, is more aesthetic. The last two steps rest solely on the efferent: overview, by underscoring analysis and abstractions, and, creativity, by highlighting use of knowledge in new contexts.

In the Reading Lift Langer is more often drawn upon in relation to non-fiction (i.e. information/other texts) (60%) than fiction (40%). The reading stance more allowed for is the efferent (58–94%) (see Table 2).

Table 2. Usage of Judith Langer's theories and methods in the Reading Lift (percentages)

Judith Langer		Fiction	Non-fiction
Text type		40	60
Reading stance	Efferent	58	94
	Aesthetic	42	6

Table 2 shows in what context Langer is referenced in the Reading Lift regarding text type and reading stances.

When Langer is set to use on fiction (12 submodules), educational aims on five occasions centre around reading comprehension, under the motivational paradigm of the operational, i.e., an instrumental and skill-based educational discourse where literary works of art, both traditional and more multimodal, are activated in service of the training of generalized literacy skills. Often Langer's five step model is combined with various reading strategies, out of which the most common is Palincsar and Brown's (1984) reciprocal approach. An example is a submodule for compulsory school stages F-3 (ages 6-9), emphasizing the importance of regularly pausing in order to summarize, pose questions, and predict what is to come:

Good readers occasionally stop their reading. They might clarify something, ask another question to the text or predict something (Palincsar & Brown, 1984). In teaching, students need to learn to think about what has been read. Strategies for this can be shown, but the students also need to be encouraged to apply the same strategies and approaches in their own reading. (Schmidt & Jönsson, 2018, p. 6)

Emphasis is here placed on the acquirement of the correct reading comprehension strategies, i.e. more efferent practices, rather than on the living through or emotive elements awakened by a literary work of art (i.e. aesthetic). Further, instead of immersing with a story, readers are asked to engage in regular stops almost as a means for control of both comprehension (clarify, understand) and of plot (predict what will follow).

Characteristic of this kind of material, and, as such, repeated almost as a mantra, is also an emphasis on approaching the act of reading in three distinct stages (i.e. besides Langer's five steps)—before, during and after—with various strategies and practices tied to each stage, of which some are teacher led and others more student-oriented. The form of instruction is, in other words, systematic and strategy-based, with the teacher modelling reading strategies and leading the students through the outlined stages and steps. Set in this context, the manual-based aspects of Langer's model, i.e., in already being based on steps placed in a systematic order to each other, is amplified.

With fiction, Langer is also applied within the context of primarily supporting an aesthetic stance. In two instances, Langer is more thoroughly set to use in submodules with educational aims focusing on literary interpretation, within the paradigm of the personal and the social. One of these submodules especially accentuates the ability to hermeneutically interpret literary texts (deep reading), and parallels are drawn between Langer's thoughts on envisioning and Rosenblatt's transactional theory.

Five other literary submodules also reference Langer, either pointing to one part of her model or by quickly going over the steps, two efferent within the linguistic paradigm, and three aesthetic operating under a combination of the social and personal paradigm.

With non-fiction Langer is primarily drawn upon within two motivational paradigms, the operational (eight instances) and the social (seven instances). When operational, educational outcomes orient around reading comprehension, including

the acquirement of reading strategies, school subject literacies (for example, scientific literacy) and understanding of text form and function. Commonly referred to text types are narration, description, and argumentation, but also various forms of digital and multimodal representation. Reading stance allowed for is primarily the efferent, and pedagogy is strategy and manual-based, combined with some more student-oriented practices. An example is a submodule on multimodal texts for compulsory school stages F–9 (ages 6 to 15) outlining how readers build understanding—envision texts—by moving through stages, before, during and after a reading event:

Before students tackle the text, they may need to build up prior knowledge that will support them in their encounters with the text. When they tackle the text, they may need to be supported to move around in the text in different ways depending on the purpose of the activity. For example, they may need to stop to check their pre-understanding, or to reflect on what may have taken for granted [...]. A text conversation that follows up how students perceive content, gives the students use of the text's content. A follow-up can also involve the students needing to return to the text and to use it in order to solve some kind of task. (Visén & Danielsson, 2018, pp. 11-12)

Noticeable is how for each stage, efferent reading stances, such as contextualizing, i.e. foregrounding with facts (before), reflecting on pre-understanding (during), text conversation in order to assess reading comprehension, but also use of content to solve a problem (after), is highlighted.

When Langer is drawn upon within the social paradigm, educational outcomes centre on the ability to, through various literacy activities, understand, analyse, and ultimately challenge societal power-structures. These submodules are influenced by Freire (1993) inspired critical literacy, which is a theoretical orientation closely related to New Literacy Studies, but with more emphasis on social change, justice, and equality (Dąbrowska, 2019). Reading stance in this material also leans more towards the efferent, by placing emphasis on critical analysis and use of knowledge and skills for societal life. Some more aesthetic approaches, such as building engagement by drawing on experiences—own and others—can also be noticed. One example is a submodule on text selection where Langer's five step model for literary envisionment is set to use on all kinds of texts, for example "advertisements, newspapers and flyers":

The purpose of reading differs, of course, depending on context, and this influences text selection, but overall it can be stated that it is, in varying ways, about students, while reading, are given the opportunity to question the familiar, explore different perspectives, focus on societal issues and take a stand and promote social justice. (Lewinson et al., 2002). When we examine everyday texts, we can work with the same questions as with fiction and non-fiction texts. (Jönsson & Jennfors, 2017, p. 6)

In the passage, a mix between the efferent, and, as such, action driven stances, such as—questioning the familiar, engaging in the social, take a stand and promote social justice, and partly the more aesthetic—exploring different perspectives (living through)—can be observed. Forms of instruction are student-oriented and, in part, manual-based. Aside from this, Langer is also drawn upon within the context of

reading promotion, in two submodules addressing how an interest in reading can be enforced by using various digital tools. Forms of instruction heavily emphasize manual-based approaches and reading stance is primarily efferent.

To summarize, with literary texts, a pattern can, thus, be seen with Langer of primarily promoting efferent stances in service of reading comprehension, under the operational paradigm. Pedagogy is strategy and manual based, allowing for some peer-discussion. Although less common, Langer is also set to use in two submodules on literary interpretation, primarily supporting aesthetic stances and more student oriented pedagogical activities, under the social and personal paradigm. In the context of non-fiction, educational outcomes centre around reading comprehension and text form and function, i.e. generalized literacy skills. Reading style is almost exclusively efferent and pedagogy is manual and strategy based. Freire-inspired critical literacy, operating under the social paradigm, also make use of Langer's five step model. Reading stance is primarily efferent and pedagogy is student-oriented, although in part manual-based.

5.2 Aidan Chambers

Children's author and literary pedagogue Aidan Chambers (1993/2011) is best known for his work on the vital aspects of literary conversation. His model for book talk starts by readers sharing their personal experiences of texts, both their likes and dislikes. Thereafter elements in the story readers are uncertain about, can be gradually approached. Lastly, if not brought on by earlier conversation, forms, connections, and patterns can be explored, meaning both literary style and form, intertextual relationships, and connections between the text and the world. As regards pedagogy, Chambers accentuates the importance of dialogue, open-ended questions, but also of starting in what is known, based on readers' perception of the story, before moving on to other areas.

Chambers' approach to book talk very much draws upon an aesthetic reading stance, starting in the literary experience and by the use of a pedagogy allowing for open-ended questions and dialogue. But his model, also, slowly, and by use of participants own thoughts and observations, allows for a passage towards the efferent, i.e., forms, patterns, and themes. Aside from his model on book talk, Chambers (1993/2011) has also written extensively on the central pillars of reading promotion.

With Chambers, a slight preference for literary texts (54%) can be noticed, compared to non-fiction (46%). Reading stance allowed for is predominantly aesthetic; 83% for fiction and 60% for non-fiction (see Table 3).

Table 3. Usage of Aidan Chambers' theories and methods in the Reading Lift (percentages)

Aidan Chambers		Fiction	Non-fiction
Text type		54	46
Reading stance	Efferent	17	40
	Aesthetic	83	60

Table 3 gives an overview in what context Chambers is referenced in the Reading Lift regarding text type and reading stance.

In the context of fiction, only two submodules out of six more substantially draw on Chambers. Educational outcomes centre around literary interpretation and reading promotion, operating under a combination of the personal and social motivational paradigms. In the submodule on literary interpretation, a full account of Chambers model for book talk, complete with a pedagogy advocating for peer-discussion and open-ended questions, is given. Equally, the submodule on reading promotion makes use of Chambers ideas of how to create a stimulating reading environment by, for example, a display of a wide variety of literary texts:

‘Books on display speak for themselves’, writes Chambers (2011) and demonstrates how reading can be highlighted as interesting by relatively simple means. Display of books has, as he sees it, two advantages. First, the child stops, looks and possibly talks about the book. Second the book communicates directly to the child without another intermediary. (Hultgren & Johansson, 2018, p. 3)

Noticeable, are the more pleasure-based, and, as such aesthetic, aspects of this model, by emphasizing how book covers can draw students in, as well as the direct, and uninterrupted, relationship between the book and the experience of the child. Aside from this, only brief references to Chambers are made in four submodules, three primarily promoting an aesthetic reading stance, and one centring on the efferent. For example, Chambers model on book talk is shortly described in an aesthetic submodule outlining how storytelling can be used for a broad set of purposes, operating simultaneously under the social, personal, and linguistic paradigm. Further, in an efferent submodule on reading comprehension, Chambers is mentioned in relation to Langer’s third step, the feedback phase.

With non-fiction, only two submodules (out of five), in the context of reading promotion, more thoroughly make use of Chambers, both primarily supporting aesthetic stances. In the first, Chambers’ thoughts on the importance of role models for reading is drawn upon. In the second, a pedagogy of reading for pleasure is laid out, with the support of, amongst others, Chambers method for book talk. Otherwise, the pattern with brief references continues. For example, in a submodule on digital tools for reading, primarily promoting an efferent stance, a quote from Chambers emphasizing the importance of children developing abilities to question, conclude, compare and critically reflect (i.e. efferent stances) is cited. As such, Chambers is actively drawn upon in order to further underscore the efferent.

To summarize, when Chambers is thoroughly drawn upon in relation to literary texts, only aesthetic reading stances are advanced, partly in the context of literary interpretation, and partly for the purpose of reading promotion. Pedagogy is student-oriented and based on dialogue. Regarding non-fiction, Chambers is primarily set to use in the context of reading promotion, with material emphasizing the importance of reading for pleasure, book talk, and role-models for reading. Reading stances are primarily aesthetic, and pedagogy is student oriented. Further,

although based in an aesthetic reading stance, Chambers is on one occasion, used to further underscore the efferent, i.e. is taken somewhat out of context.

5.3 Louise M. Rosenblatt

In addition to Rosenblatt's concepts of efferent, aesthetic, and transaction, already discussed in the above, it may be added that Rosenblatt (1938/1995; 1972/1994) does not in any way oppose, but rather welcomes, efferent practices. Her point, however, is that an understanding of a literary text must start in an aesthetic stance, i.e. in the personalized experience and the living through. Thereafter "ever-widening circles" relating to, for example, cultural context, form and style, or ethical and social issues, can be brought forth in literary conversation, under the guide of a receptive teacher (Rosenblatt, 1938/1995, p. 111).

With Rosenblatt, a slight preference for literary texts (56%) and aesthetic reading stances (50–60%), compared to efferent stances (40–50%), can be observed (see Table 4).

Table 4. Usage of Louise Rosenblatt's theories and methods in the Reading Lift (percentages)

Luise M. Rosenblatt		Fiction	Non-fiction
Text type		56	44
Reading stance	Efferent	40	50
	Aesthetic	60	50

Table 4 gives an overview of in what context Rosenblatt is referenced in the Reading Lift regarding text type and reading stance.

Within the context of literary texts, Rosenblatt is only drawn upon more fully in two submodules, although referenced in five. When applied more thoroughly, educational aims centre around literary interpretation, under the linguistic and (in the other case) social paradigm. Both submodules, however, emphasize the ability to hermeneutically interpret literary texts. For example, the submodule within the social paradigm, especially emphasize the importance of ability to "deep read":

Deep reading means achieving an in-depth understanding of a text, which happens most effectively with discussions and text conversations in combination with rereading and book talk. The reader must be able to discuss the text in order to reformulate content in their own words and only then can the text become the property of the reader. (Ingemansson, 2015, p. 8)

Noticeable is the intonation of layering understanding by hermeneutic rereading, as well as reformulating content in dialogue with others, in order to personally, and, as such, aesthetically, incorporate content. Pedagogy, in both cases, is student-oriented, although in one case partly combined with a manual based approach grounded in Langer. References to Rosenblatt are otherwise brief. For example, Rosenblatt is touched upon in a submodule on poetry analysis, primarily allowing for

an efferent stance. Here, however Rosenblatt is partly drawn upon in order to inform that poetry can also be approached aesthetically.

Regarding non-fiction only brief references to Rosenblatt are made (in four instances), one in the context of critical literacy, highlighting the importance of documenting reading experiences, and one in a submodule on Socratic dialog, shortly informing on the two stances—efferent and aesthetic. Both operate under the social paradigm and primarily promote an aesthetic reading stance. Further, two efferent submodules on reading comprehension, briefly draw upon Rosenblatt's transactional theory, again for more informative purposes.

To summarize, when drawn upon in a substantial way, Rosenblatt only supports aesthetic reading in relation to literary texts. Educational outcomes centre around literary interpretation, although in one instance with the support of a more manual-based approach. Further, brief references to Rosenblatt for informative purposes are common, both in relation to fiction and non-fiction.

5.4 Rita Felski

Literary theorist Rita Felski has written extensively on the role of fiction for human life and understanding. Her most referenced work, *The Uses of Literature* (Felski, 2008), elaborates on four central functions of literary texts: recognition, knowledge, shock, and enchantment. *Recognition* refers to literary experiences that readers fully or partially can recognize, and *knowledge* to insights of new cultures, perspectives, and places gained by literary texts. The category of *shock*, relates to how elements that are perceived as genuinely uncomfortable, still can be fruitful in the context of learning. Lastly, *enchantment*, refers to the kind of all-encompassing, often pleasure-based reading experience that fully captivates its audience. According to Felski, this more pleasure-based stance, closely related to Rosenblatt's (1972/1994) aesthetic extreme, is central to understanding, since pleasure, or joy, is a prerequisite for learning.

Most noticeable is how Felski, in the Reading Lift, is only referenced in the context of literary texts (100%), and primarily with submodules promoting aesthetic stances (67%) (see Table 5).

Table 5. Usage of Rita Felski's theories and methods in the Reading Lift (percentages)

Rita Felski		Fiction	Non-fiction
Text type		100	0
Reading stance	Efferent	33	0
	Aesthetic	67	0

Table 5 gives an overview of in what context Felski is referenced in the Reading Lift regarding text type and reading stance.

In submodules primarily advancing aesthetic reading stances (two instances), Felski is drawn upon in relation to literary interpretation, in both cases operating

under a combination of the social and personal paradigms. The favoured form of instruction is student-oriented, although in one case partly manual based. In the first instance, principles for text selection are discussed based on Felski's four categories. In the second, special emphasis is placed on enchantment as a means for learning. It is argued that a pleasure-based approach, instead of standing in the way of literary interpretation, actually can enforce understanding:

Enchantment is a state in which the reader surrenders and enters the world of fiction. This aspect of reading has long been rejected, because it can lead to an uncritical approach, but precisely in the rapture there is an important didactic potential as desire is crucial for learning. Only when we are emotionally touched can we be influenced intellectually and assimilate knowledge. (Boglund & Olofsson, 2018, p. 5)

In the passage, elements related to the aesthetic stance, such as the sensuous (rapture) and emotions are highlighted as a means to intellectual development and learning. In addition, a submodule on poetry analysis, operating under the linguistic paradigm, briefly references Felski. Interestingly, here Felski is not, as in the previous two submodules, drawn upon in order to underscore how the aesthetic can further strengthen the efferent, but in an argumentation for how the ability to analyse form and style (the efferent), can enhance experience (the aesthetic).

To summarize, as in the case of Rosenblatt, Felski is only drawn upon in a substantial way in relation to fiction, primarily promoting aesthetic stances and with educational outcomes centring on literary interpretation under the social and personal paradigm. Pedagogy underscores student-oriented activities and the role of more pleasure based all-encompassing reading for understanding. Further, when applied within an efferent framework, Felski is taken slightly out of context.

5.5 Resonance with literacy

We now move on to explore how the literacy concept, i.e. a focus on literacy as a multiple and continually developing social practice (Street 1984, 1987), influences the literary didactic material in the Reading Lift.

Table 6. Literacy influence on theorists and model developer's (percentages)

Theorist	Langer	Chambers	Rosenblatt	Felski
Literacy	83	45	67	0

Table 6 shows alignment with the literacy concept regarding the four most commonly referred to theorists and model developers in the program.

Compatibility with the literacy concept is highest for Langer (83%), fairly high for Rosenblatt (67%), moderate for Chambers (45%) and non-existing with Felski. However, when Chambers and Rosenblatt are substantially drawn upon in submodules, i.e. not just briefly referenced (see previous section), adherence to the literacy concept is lower (25% respectively 50%, not in table). In the Reading Lift a

strong alignment between the concept of literacy, and various Langer-inspired manual and strategy-oriented educational approaches, can, in other words, be found.

Further, as regards the place that both literature didactics and literature take in the literacy discourse, we notice three interesting tendencies. The first we label *the paradox of the imagination*. In the Reading Lift we find an interesting discrepancy regarding presumed potential for the imaginative between age groups, but also between submodules influenced by the literacy concept and those who are not. In material for preschool (ages 1–5), not influenced by the literacy concept, children are assumed to have an inherent capacity for imaginative practices, whether the narrative is read aloud, communicated via oral storytelling or by images. On the other hand, material impacted by the literacy concept for children aged 6 and above, strongly emphasize the importance of support structures, such as reading strategies and manual based approaches, in order to engage with the imaginary.

The second tendency we label *the dangers of immersive reading*. In the literacy inspired material, we find that the kind of all-encompassing reading approach, i.e., what Rosenblatt labels aesthetic extreme, or Felski enchantment, is framed as problematic, and even questionable. In fact, on several occasions, a direct warning is issued around *reading rest*, meaning children immersing with a story in a relaxed state. It is, for example, stated:

Although reading can have a calming effect on many children, the idea of reading for relaxation is a false starting point. Reading aloud can and should instead fulfil many other functions—to be a support for language development, for social interaction and for shared experiences [...]. (Pihlgren, 2017, p. 3)

Very common in material advocating for this view is a systematic approach to reading with practices resulting in a constant push and pull, in and out, of the imaginative world, such as with reading strategies (summarize, pose questions, and predict). In contrast, submodules (although rare) embracing the more uninterrupted and pleasure-based reading experience, following, for example, Felski, never aligns with the literacy concept.

The third tendency we label *literature as a text*. In the Reading Lift we see a strong tendency in the literacy-influenced material to perceive literary works, not as with Rosenblatt (1938/1995, 1972) as unique in their aesthetic call for the reader and therefore requiring a different approach than, for example, with information texts. Instead literature is viewed as texts amongst other texts, that can be dealt with in the same way, with the use of the same strategies or manuals (i.e. literacy practices) as “films, images, catalogs (toy catalogs and other kinds of advertisements), web texts etc.” (Jönsson & Jennfors, 2017, p. 1). Or, as stated in the same submodule: “When we examine everyday texts, we can work with the same questions as with fiction and non-fiction texts” (p. 6). Submodules that, on the other hand, give an in-depth account of how, for example, literary texts are to be analysed as art, whether efferently (only style and form), or in a more holistic way (hermeneutic

interpretation), do not align with the literacy concept. In essence, in the literacy discourse, artistic expression is somewhat diminished and simplified.

5.6 Limits of the study

A limit of the study is unexamined accompanying inspirational film materials. This material might have revealed other perspectives, perhaps even partly contradictory, to this article's messages. Also, results primarily apply to the Reading Lift, although they may give some indication as to changing paradigms of literary education in other contexts.

6. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

6.1 Conclusion

Regarding our first research question, what is the educational function of literature didactics in the Reading Lift, we find a strong domination of manual and strategy-based approaches, primarily promoting efferent reading stances under the operational paradigm. Pedagogy is systematic, placing the teacher as an expert modeler of strategies or as a guide between steps, paired with some student-oriented activity. More holistic, hermeneutic, and dialogic approaches, represented by Chambers and Rosenblatt, are only substantially set to use in a handful of submodules, primarily on fiction and in support of the aesthetic. Least represented is a call for the more unreservedly all-encompassing reading experience, outlined by Felski. Also, when briefly referenced, Chambers and Felski are occasionally taken out of context, i.e., placed in the service of the efferent, rather than the aesthetic.

Regarding our second research question, how does literature didactics and literature resonate with the literacy discourse, we find a strong alliance between submodules aligning with the literacy concept and the systematic and manual-based literary didactic approaches represented by Langer. Further, for students aged 6 and above, literacy inspired Reading Lift material strongly accentuates the need for support structures in the form of reading strategies and manual based approaches, in order to immerse with the imaginary. Also, in the literacy-based discourse, warnings are issued around more pleasure-based and all-encompassing reading practices, and literary texts are seen, not as art, but, as texts amongst others, i.e., applicable to the same strategies and manuals as information texts, web texts, advertisements, etc.

6.2 Discussion

We now return to the disheartened monk in the cloister, hesitant to fold open the covers, and, as such, in a desperate need for a helpdesk serviceman. In the Reading Lift we are faced with the same need for systematic instruction. In submodule after

submodule, we are presented with a suggested practice where the front and back of book covers are to be studied—before the reading. And, after turning over a few pages—during reading—the reader is asked to make halt, and exit the fictional world, in order to summarize, pose questions, or predict. After the reading, various structured practices are exemplified, such as, the logging down of thoughts, discussion around predetermined topics or relating what is read to other texts.

In order to understand the dominance of the systematic, strategy and manual-based literary didactic approaches, we turn to Bolter and Grusin's (1999) account of how hypermediacy, in the new media society, has become the new norm. In a culture, no longer dominated by print (Kress, 2000), but by screens, images, apps, and sounds, old media, such as a printed work of fiction, has, we suggest, become something foreign. We are, thus, in need of a handout, and in our exploration of the Reading Lift, that is predominantly what we find. Literature didactics becomes a manual, and the teacher a service man. In part, this could also explain the paradox of the imagination. When narration, for centuries traditionally tied to print culture, is seen as estranged, the ability to imagine at least from printed texts—although perhaps not to the same extent from films and images—must be retrained.

It is also worth pondering upon if the contemporary media ecology, spurs an imagination of a partly different kind. As shown by Elmfeldt and Erixon (2007), in a study of children's and youth's experiences of the multimodal media realm, medialisation of images, sound and movement affect student's narration. In their research on students' writing, traits of a more fragmented, visual and collage style type of representation, typical of (post)modern culture, can be observed, and as partly replacing a more traditional chronological account of events.

In previous studies (Erixon & Löfgren, 2018, 2020; Löfgren & Erixon, 2022), we have framed the marginalization of literature and the predominantly skills-based and instrumental discourse in the Reading Lift, as a result of an adaption to the global educational assessment discourses. But, as we argue in this article, the new (hyper)media culture could be an equally important horizon for the understanding of both the downplaying of literature, now somewhat foreign instead of a central part of L1, and the domination of the systematic and strategy-oriented approach. In the literacy discourse, literary works have become not just texts amongst other texts, and alien, but are also framed as hypermediacy. In the kind of literature didactics that is dominant, we find a pronounced tendency for separateness and fragmentation. The focus, in other words, lies on form and function of isolated text elements—narration, description, and argumentation—rather than on whole texts (for example a newspaper article). Equally, fiction is approached with a pedagogy emphasizing regular stops and analysis of segments, but also a push and pull in and out of the fictional world (with near resemblance to Bertolt Brecht's *Verfremdung*). The various parts of the representation, are, in other words, always in view, rather than the whole expression. And with Bolter and Grusin's (1999) terminology, the result is a constant return to the surface of texts, to parts, form, and facts, rather

than to narration, interpretation, and meaning. It is a looking *at* rather than looking *through*.

The rationale of the Swedish National Agency for Education can, thus, be understood as follows: in order to create a “reading lift” (i.e., strengthen reading engagement and ability) in a culture dominated by digital screens, images and film, the “foreign” (storytelling in print), needs to be made non-foreign.

In Table 7, we have summarized the tendencies described above under the headings of literature didactics (education) versus literature pedagogy (*Bildung*).

Table 7. Literature didactics and Literature pedagogy

Literature didactics (Education)	Literature pedagogy (<i>Bildung</i>)
Efferent	Aesthetic
Literacy (text)	Art
Hypermediacy	Immediacy
Fragmentation	Narration
Abstractions (Separateness, picking apart)	Hermeneutic interpretation (Holistic)
Alienation	Immerse in fiction

With the Reading Lift, we tentatively suggest that a shift in paradigms of literature education has taken place. Langer, as applied in the Reading Lift, stands for the new paradigm—literature didactics (more efferent) –, situated in a postmodern blurring of boundaries between art and other forms of representation (literacy), the digital multiplicity of mediation (hypermediacy), fragmented storylines, analytical abstraction and alienation (*Verfremdung*). Rosenblatt, Chambers, and Felski represent an older paradigm—literature pedagogy (more aesthetic) –, originating from a place where clear distinctions between art and other forms of representation are made (art), but also rooted in print culture (immediacy), traditional narration type structures, hermeneutics, and a dream of a communication unsoiled (immerse in fiction).

Literature didactics, we suggest, is, as such, more aligned with what Bernstein (1999) recognizes as a *vertical* educational paradigm, i.e., an instrumental school, and skill-based discourse, compared to the *horizontal* educational paradigm, grounded in interest, leisure-time, and pleasure. Literature pedagogy, on the other hand, is more closely affiliated with the horizontal paradigm, and, thereby with reading promotion, reading for pleasure and *Bildung*. Further, the systematic split into three analytical questions (what, how and why), i.e. the PCK dimension of literature didactics, is bearer of a potential to further accentuate the vertical, and can, as such, calibrated accordingly, effectively serve in support of current global assessment policies. Open conversation around experiences of art, such as suggested by Chambers, or a pedagogy of reading for pleasure, offers, on the other hand, a potential obstruction to the vertical. With declining results in the global literacy evaluations, perhaps, this is not a risk (Biesta, 2014) a National Agency is willing to take.

And then there is the problem with the imagination and art. One last time, returning to our monk, in despair staring at the unopened book. If we cannot imagine from print, or we have lost that ability to do so, the approaches suggested by Rosenblatt, Chambers, and Felski, of immersing with texts, and starting with the aesthetic, might be a bar too high. And, if lines between art and other forms of representation are blurred, such as, in the literacy discourse, where are we to find the inherent “special character of the aesthetic stance” (Rosenblatt, 1972/1994, p. 26)?

REFERENCES

- Assarroudi, A., Heshmati Nabavi, F., Armat, M. R., Ebadi, A., & Vaismoradi, M. (2018). Directed qualitative content analysis: the description and elaboration of its underpinning methods and data analysis process. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 23(1), 42–55. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987117741667>
- Bernstein, B. (1999). Horizontal and vertical discourse: An essay. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20(2), 157–172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425699995380>
- Biesta, G. (2014). *The beautiful risk of education*. Paradigm Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315635866>
- Boglund, A., & Olofsson, M. (2018). Nyanlända elever och skönlitteratur [Newly arrived students and fiction]. Skolverket [the Swedish National Agency for Education]: Part of Language-, reading and writing development (the Reading Lift). *Nyanländas språkutveckling* [Newcomers' language development], compulsory school 7–9. <https://larportalen.skolverket.se/#/>.
- Bolter, J. D., & Grusin, R. A. (1999). *Remediation: understanding new media*. MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ccij.1999.4.4.208.1>
- Borsgård, G. (2021). *Litteraturens mått: politiska implikationer av litteraturundervisning som demokrati- och värdegrundsarbete* [The measurement of literature. political implications of teaching literature as a Means of democratic fostering]. [Doctoral dissertation, Umeå universitet]. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532690xci0102_1
- Brecht, B. (2002). From alienation effects in Chinese acting (1936). In *Twentieth century theatre: a sourcebook* (pp. 321-323). Routledge. (Originally published 1936).
- Carlbaum, S., Hanberger, A., Andersson, E., Roe, A., Tengberg, M., & Kärnebro, K. (2019). Utvärdering av Läsluft: Slutrapport från den nationella utvärderingen av Läsluftets genomförande och effekter i olika skolformer [Evaluation of the Reading Lift: Final report from the national evaluation of implementation and effects of the Reading LIFT in different school forms].
- Chambers, A. (2011) *Tell me: children, reading & talk*. Thimble Press. (Original work published 1993)
- Clark, C., & Rumbold, K. (2006). Reading for pleasure: a research overview. *National Literacy Trust*.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203029053>
- Comenius, J. (1657/2008). *Didactica Magna: stora undervisningsläran* [The great didactic]. Studentlitteratur.
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2000). *Multiliteracies: literacy learning and the design of social futures*. Routledge.
- Culler, J. (1975). *Structuralist poetics. structuralism, linguistics and the study of literature*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203449769>
- Dąbrowska, I. (2019). Diverse nature of literacy: the sociocultural perspective. *Lublin Studies in Modern Languages and Literature*, 43(3), 33–43. <https://doi.org/10.17951/lsmll.2019.43.3.33-43>
- Degerman. (2012). “Litteraturen, det är vad man undervisar om”: det svenska litteraturdidaktiska fältet i förvandling [“Literature, that’s what you teach”: the field of Swedish literature didactics in transition]. Åbo Akademis förlag.

- Elmfeldt, J., & Erixon, P.-O. (2007). *Skrift i rörelse: om genrer och kommunikativ förmåga i skola och medielandskap* [Writing in transition: on genre and communicative ability in the school and media landscape]. Brutus Östlings bokförlag Symposion.
- Erixon, P.-O., & Löfgren, M. (2018). Ett demokratilyft för Sverige. Om relationen mellan literacy, skönlitteratur och demokrati i Läslifftet [A democracy lift for Sweden. About the relationship between literacy, fiction and democracy in the Reading Lift]. *Utbildning och demokrati*, 27(3), pp. 7–33. <https://doi.org/10.48059/uod.v27i3.1106>
- Erixon, P.-O., & Löfgren, M. (2020). The marginalisation of literature in Swedish L1: A victim of socio-political forces and paradigmatic changes. In B. Green & P.-O. Erixon (Eds.), *Rethinking L1 education in a global era* (pp. 133–155). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-55997-7_7
- Fatheddine, D. (2018). *Den kroppsliga läsningen: bildningsperspektiv på litteraturundervisning* [Embodied Reading: formative Perspectives on Literature Education] (Doctoral dissertation, Karlstads universitet).
- Felski, R. (2008). *Uses of literature*. Blackwell Pub. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444302790>
- Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Penguin.
- Green, B. (2002). A literacy project of our own. *English in Australia*, No 134, July, 25–32.
- Hultgren, F., & Johansson, M. (2018). Läsmiljö och läsande förebilder i förskolan [Reading environment and role models for reading in preschool]. Skolverket [the Swedish National Agency for Education]: Part of Language-, reading and writing development (the Reading Lift). *Läsa och berätta* [Reading and narrating], Preschool. <https://larportalen.skolverket.se/#/>.
- Ingemansson, M. (2015). Naturvetenskaplig lärande genom djupläsning av skönlitteratur [Scientific learning through deep-reading of fiction]. Skolverket [the Swedish National Agency for Education]: Part of Language-, reading and writing development (the Reading Lift). *Att stödja elevers lärande i NO* [Supporting students learning in the natural sciences 2], compulsory school 4–9. <https://larportalen.skolverket.se/#/>.
- Iser, W. (1978). *The act of reading: a theory of aesthetic response*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.56021/9780801821011>
- Johansson, M., & Magnusson, P. (2019). Läslifftet i praktiken. Analys av ett textmaterial och ett lärarlags samtal [Reading promotion in practice. Analysis of a text material and a teaching team conversation]. *Acta didactica Norge*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.5617/adno.5632>
- Jönsson, K., & Jennfors, E. (2017). Krittiskt textarbete – att läsa och välja text [Critical textwork – reading and selecting texts]. Skolverket [the Swedish National Agency for Education]: Part of Language-, reading and writing development (the Reading Lift). *Krittiskt textarbete* [Critical textwork], Compulsory School F–6. <https://larportalen.skolverket.se/#/>.
- Kirsten, N. (2020). A research review of teachers' professional development as a policy instrument. *Educational Research Review*, 100366. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100366>
- Krashen, S. D. (2004). *The power of reading: insights from the research* (2nd ed). Libraries Unlimited.
- Kress, G. (2000). Multimodality. In B. Cope & M. Kalantzis (Eds.), *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures* (pp. 182–202). Routledge.
- Kress, G. R., & van Leeuwen, T. (1996). *Reading images: the grammar of visual design*. Routledge.
- Krogh, E. (2020). Bildung and literacy in subject Danish: Changing L1 education. In B. Green & P.-O. Erixon (Eds.), *Rethinking L1 education in a global era* (pp. 157–176). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-55997-7_8
- Kulturdepartementet. (2012). *Läsandets kultur – Slutbetänkande av Litteraturutredningen* [The Culture of Reading - The final report of the Literature Survey] (SOU 2012: 65). <https://www.regeringen.se/rattsliga-dokument/statens-offentliga-utredningar/2012/09/sou-201265/>.
- Langer, J. A. (1995). *Envisioning literature: literary understanding and literature instruction*. Language and Literacy Series. Teachers' College Press.
- Löfgren, M. (2023). Literacy as epistemology and educational policy: An exploration of a large Swedish professional development programme for teachers. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 9(2) 191–209. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2023.2229020>

- Löfgren, M. (2024). Literature and multimodality for all. Swedish teachers' professional development in the age of global assessments [Manuscript under review]. Department of Culture and Media Studies, Umea university.
- Löfgren, M., & Erixon, P. O. (2022). Literature – a high risk implementation route to literacy? *L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, 22, 1–27.
<https://doi.org/10.21248/l1esll.2022.22.1.409>
- Martinsson, B.-G. (2018). *Litteratur i skola och samhälle* [Literature in school and society]. Studentlitteratur.
- Mullis, I. V. S., & Martin, M. O. (Eds.). (2015). *PIRLS 2016 assessment framework* (2nd ed.). TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, Boston College
- Nordberg, O. (2020). *Litteraturdidaktik: teori, praktik, relevans, potential* [Literature didactics: theory, practice, relevance and potential]. Liber.
- Norwegian Broadcasting [NRK]. (2007, February 26). *Medieval helpdesk with English subtitles* [Video]. (Originally broadcasted 2001). YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pQHx-SjgQvQ>
- OECD. (2019). *PISA 2018 Assessment and analytical Framework*. PISA, OECD Publishing, Paris.
<https://doi.org/10.1787/b25efab8-en>
- Öhman, A. (2015). *Litteraturdidaktik, fiktioner och didaktik* [Literature didactics, fictions and didactics]. Gleerup.
- Palinscar, A. S., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction*. 1(2), 117–175.
https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532690xci0102_1
- Pihlgren, A. S. (2017). Högläsning [Reading aloud]. Skolverket [the Swedish National Agency for Education]: Part of Language-, reading and writing development (the Reading Lift. *Läsa och berätta* [Reading and narrating], Preschool. <https://larportalen.skolverket.se/#/>.
- Randahl, A. C., & Varga, P. A. (2020). Kollegiala samtal som kontext för utveckling av lärares literacyförståelse [Collegial conversations as a context for the development of teachers' understanding of literacy]. *Nordic Journal of Literacy Research*, 6(4), 18–38.
<https://doi.org/10.23865/njlr.v6.2031>
- Regeringen. (2020). *Barns och ungas läsning* [Children's and young people's reading] (2020/21:95), Swedish government.
<https://www.regeringen.se/contentassets/83baa2be54344a508317cbd4738c1058/barns-och-ungas-lasning-skr.-20202195.pdf>
- Ringarp, J. (2013). From Bildung to entrepreneurship: Trends in education policy in Sweden. *Policy Futures in Education*, 11(4), 456–464. <https://doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2013.11.4.456>
- Rosenblatt. (1994). *The reader, the text, the poem: the transactional theory of the literary work*. Southern Illinois University Press. (Original work published 1972)
- Rosenblatt. (1995). *Literature as exploration* (5th ed.). The Modern Language Association of America. (Original work published 1938)
- Schmidt, C., & Jönsson, K. (2018). Läsförståelse [Reading comprehension]. Skolverket [the Swedish National Agency for Education]: part of Language-, reading and writing development (the Reading Lift), *Läsa och skriva i alla ämnen* [Reading and writing in all subjects], compulsory school F-3. <https://larportalen.skolverket.se/#/>.
- Sellar, S., & Lingard, B. (2013). PISA and the expanding role of the OECD in global educational governance. In H. D. Meyer & A. Benavot (Eds.), *PISA, Power, and Policy: The emergence of global educational governance* (pp. 185–206). Symposium Books Ltd.
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15, 4–14. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X015002004>
- Skolverket. (2020). *Redovisning av uppdrag om fortbildning i läs- och skrivutveckling – Läslifvet* [Report on Assignment on professional development in reading and writing – The Reading Lift] (Dnr 2020:351). The Swedish National Agency for Education. <https://www.skolverket.se/getFile?file=8942>
- Street, B. V. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice* (Vol. 9). Cambridge University Press.
- Street, B. V. (1997). The implications of the 'new literacy studies' for literacy education. *English in education*, 31(3), 45–59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-8845.1997.tb00133.x>

- Tapscott, D. (2009). *Grown up digital: How the next generation is changing your world*, McGraw Hill, New York, 2009. *Norma*, 14(3), 345–348.
- Thavenius, J. (1991). *Klassbildning och folkuppfostran: om litteraturundervisningens traditioner* [Class bildung and public education: about the traditions of literature education]. Symposium.
- Visén, P., & Danielsson, K. (2018). Språk- och kunskapsutvecklande samtal om multimodala texter [Language and knowledge developing conversations about multimodal texts]. Skolverket [the Swedish National Agency for Education]: Part of Language-, reading and writing development (the Reading Lift). *Muntlig kommunikation* [Oral communication], Compulsory school F–9. <https://larportalen.skolverket.se/#/>.
- Walldén, R. (2019). *Genom genrens lins: pedagogisk kommunikation i tidigare skolår* [Through the lens of genre: pedagogic communication in primary education] (Doctoral dissertation, Malmö högskola, Fakulteten för lärande och samhälle).
- Weber, R. P. (1990). *Basic content analysis* (Vol. 49). Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412983488>
- Widhe, O. (2018). Estetisering och avestetisering. Nedslag i de svenska läroplanernas tal om läslust från 1906 till 2011. [Aestheticisation and de-aestheticisation. Impact of the Swedish curricula on reading for pleasure from 1906 to 2011]. In C. Andersson-Busch, S. Duek, B. Ljung-Egeland, C. Olin-Scheller, M. Tanner och M. Tengberg (Eds.), *SMDI 12 Textkulturer* [SMDI 12 text cultures] (pp. 85–106). Twelfth National Conference in Swedish with Didactic focus. Karlstad 24–25 November 2016.
- Wintersparv, S. (2021). *Teaching the reading experience: upper secondary teachers' perspectives on aesthetic aspects of literature teaching*. (Doctoral dissertation, Umeå universitet). Department of Language Studies, Umeå University.
- Witte, T. C. H., & Sâmihiãian, S. (2013). Is Europe open to a student-oriented framework for literature? A comparative analysis of the formal literature curriculum in six European countries. *L1 Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, 3, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.17239/L1ESLL-2013.01.02>

APPENDIX

*Framework for analysis**Protocol 1: Criterium for literature didactics in order to identify submodules relevant for this study*

General standpoint	Approximation based on:
Literature didactic submodule	Written article must contain theories or methods from the field of literature didactics and/or have a focus on the teaching and learning related to literary texts.

Protocol 2: Educational function based on PCK (Schulman, 1986)

General standpoints	Approximation based on:
What	What subject content, including text type is highlighted? Regarding text-type, in order for a submodule to be defined as literary (fiction) at least 50% of submodule article must be devoted to literary representation.
How	Which pedagogical methods and forms of instruction are suggested?
Why	Justification of choices as regards both what and how. Assessment is based on the four motivational paradigms identified by Witte and Sâmihiãian (2013): - The cultural (aim cultural literacy) - The linguistic (aim awareness of literary style and form)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Social (aim social awareness) - The Personal (aim personal development, understanding of self and others). <p>In addition, by support of Green (2002) a fifth motivational paradigm is added: the operational, (aim general development of literacy skills, such as, reading and writing).</p>
--	---

Protocol 3: Efferent and aesthetic (Rosenblatt 1938/1995; 1972/1994)

General standpoints	Approximation based on:
Efferent	Whether the submodule primarily supports or allows for a reading stance where attention is directed towards what remains after the reading act, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - abstracting facts or ideas for further use, - summarizing, making inferences, posing questions or predict the ending in service of reading comprehension, - knowledge of style and form in literary texts.
Aesthetic	Whether the submodule primarily supports or allows for a reading stance where attention is directed towards what happens during the reading event, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - feelings, sensations, associations and ideas awakened in the reader by the text, - a living through of experiences or cultures, - immerse with the imaginative world, - reading for pleasure (Krashen, 2004).

Protocol 4: Alignment with the literacy concept

General standpoints	Approximation based on:
Literacy as a social practice; <u>and</u>	Focus on literacy as a multiple and continually developing social practice (Dąbrowska, 2019; Street 1984; 1997).
Plural, multiliteracies	Acknowledging literacies in multiple forms (Dąbrowska, 2019).