

# Teacher and Librarian Partnerships in Literacy Education in the 21st Century

Joron Pihl, Kristin Skinstad van der Kooij  
and Tone Cecilie Carlsten (Eds.)



*SensePublishers*

**Teacher and Librarian Partnerships in Literacy  
Education in the 21st Century**

## NEW RESEARCH – NEW VOICES

Volume 6

### **Series Editor**

Halla B. Holmarsdottir, *Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, Norway*

### **International Advisory Board**

Karen Biraimah, *University of Central Florida, USA*

Heidi Biseth, *Buskerud University College, Norway*

Joan DeJaeghere, *University of Minnesota, USA*

Zubeida Desai, *University of the Western Cape, South Africa*

Alawia Farag, *Ahfad University for Women, Sudan*

Fatma Gok, *Bogazici University, Turkey*

Lihong Huang, *Norwegian Social Research (NOVA) Institute, Norway*

Suzanne Majhanovich, *University of Western Ontario, Canada*

Diane Napier, *University of Georgia, USA*

Vuyokazi Nomlomo, *University of the Western Cape, South Africa*

Gerald Ouma, *University of Pretoria, South Africa*

Adila Pašalić-Kreso, *University of Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina*

Yusuf Sayed, *University of Sussex, UK*

**New Research – New Voices** involves two strands, leaving open the possibility of others as the series grows:

### **Strand 1: New Voices and New Knowledge in Research Methodology**

This strand in the book series is dedicated to producing cutting-edge titles focusing on Research Methodology. While it might be generally acknowledged that educational researchers often tend to import methods developed in neighboring disciplines, this is not always acknowledged in the literature on methodology. This series intends to contribute to the knowledge foundation in educational research by specifically seeking out those who work both across disciplines and inter-disciplinary in terms of their methodological approaches. The overall focus is to develop a series focusing on those methods which are appropriate in dealing with the specific research problems of the discipline.

The series provides students and scholars with state-of-the-art scholarship on methodology, methods and techniques focusing on a range of research topics. It comprises innovative and intellectually rigorous monographs and edited collections which bridge schools of thought and cross the boundaries of conventional approaches. The series covers a broad range of issues focusing on not only empirical-analytical and interpretive approaches, but moreover on micro and macro studies, and quantitative and qualitative methods.

### **Strand 2: New Voices and New Knowledge in Educational Research**

This part of the series will focus on theoretical and empirical contributions that are unique and will provide important insights into the field of educational research across a range of contexts globally. This part of the series will collectively communicate new voices, new insights and new possibilities within the field of educational research. In particular the focus will be on scholars, students and communities that have often been excluded or marginalized within educational research and practice.

# **Teacher and Librarian Partnerships in Literacy Education in the 21st Century**

*Edited by*

**Joron Pihl**

*Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, Norway*

**Kristin Skinstad van der Kooij**

*Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, Norway*

and

**Tone Cecilie Carlsten**

*Nordic Institute for Studies in Innovation, Research and Education, Norway*



SENSE PUBLISHERS  
ROTTERDAM/BOSTON/TAIPEI

A C.I.P. record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN: 978-94-6300-897-6 (paperback)  
ISBN: 978-94-6300-898-3 (hardback)  
ISBN: 978-94-6300-899-0 (e-book)

Published by: Sense Publishers,  
P.O. Box 21858,  
3001 AW Rotterdam,  
The Netherlands  
<https://www.sensepublishers.com/>

The following book chapters are reprinted here with permission from the publishers:

**Chapter 3:** Pihl, J. (2012). Can library use enhance intercultural education? *Issues in Educational Research* (Special Issue in Intercultural and Critical Education), 22(1), 79–90. Institutes for Educational Research in New South Wales, South Australia and Western Australia.

**Chapter 5:** Tonne, I., & Pihl, J. (2012). Literacy education, reading engagement, and library use in multilingual classes, *Intercultural Education*, 23(3), 183–194. Taylor & Francis Ltd.

All chapters in this book have undergone peer review.

Cover image: *La tusen blomster blomstre / Let a Thousand Flowers Bloom*, Silkscreen by Victor Lind, 1973.

*Printed on acid-free paper*

All Rights Reserved © 2017 Sense Publishers

No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	vii
1. Why Teacher and Librarian Partnerships in Literacy Education in the 21st Century? <i>Joron Pihl, Tone Cecilie Carlsten and Kristin Skinstad van der Kooij</i>	1
2. New Literacy Studies in Educational Contexts <i>Brian V. Street</i>	23
3. Can Library Use Enhance Intercultural Education? <i>Joron Pihl</i>	33
4. A Library and School Network in Sweden: Social Literacies and Popular Education <i>Helen Avery</i>	45
5. Literacy Education, Reading Engagement and Library Use in Multilingual Classes <i>Ingebjørg Tonne and Jonon Pihl</i>	63
6. Librarian and Teacher Collaboration: Enhancing Second-Language Learners' Literacy Development <i>Ulla Damber</i>	75
7. A State-Run School Library Programme in Norway: Political Contradictions <i>Tone Cecilie Carlsten and Jørgen Sjaastad</i>	89
8. A Multilingual Book Café at the School Library: Contradictions between Literacy Discourses <i>Thomas Eri</i>	103
9. School Librarians as Leaders of Extracurricular Reading Groups <i>Teresa Cremin and Joan Swann</i>	119
About the Contributors	139



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This volume is the result of the collaborative efforts of educational and literacy researchers and teacher educators who share an interest in literacy education, teacher professionalism and social justice through education in the 21st century. We express our deep gratitude to the authors for their scholarly contributions, dedication and perseverance in the development of this volume. The editors are honoured that Brian V. Street presents *New Literacy Studies* as a theoretical framework in educational contexts in this volume.

In 2009, Professor Joron Pihl and her co-researchers presented their research project *Multiplicity, Empowerment and Citizenship: Inclusion through the Use of the Library as an Arena for Learning* at the annual Nordic Educational Research Association (NERA) conference. At NERA, Joron Pihl learned about Ulla Damber's research on public librarian and teacher partnership in work with reading and multimodal literacy among multilingual pupils in Sweden. Three years later, Joron Pihl discovered Helen Avery's research on school and library partnership, which was presented at the 2012 European Educational Research Association conference. In 2013, at the *Researching the Reading Experience* conference in Oslo, Joron Pihl and Kristin Skinstad van der Kooij gained knowledge of the research of Teresa Cremin and Joan Swann on teachers' work with pupils reading for pleasure in school reading groups. At the NERA conference in 2014, Joron Pihl and Kristin Skinstad van der Kooij organized a symposium entitled *School and Library Partnership: Challenges within Literacy Education*, which was supported by the Nordic Centre of Excellence: Justice through Education in the Nordic Countries (JustEd). The symposium brought together the Nordic researchers who had connected in this field: Helen Avery, Ulla Damber, Thomas Eri, Ingebjørg Tonne, Joron Pihl, Kristin Skinstad van der Kooij, Tone Cecilie Carlsten and Jørgen Sjaastad. We are greatly indebted to the Nordic Centre of Excellence for providing important and stimulating fora for discussing our research, and the many opportunities to meet Nordic and international scholars working on social justice issues in education.

All the researchers mentioned have collaborated and refined their papers for this publication. Each manuscript has been peer reviewed by two (peer-reviewers). We extend our appreciation to the reviewers for their valuable comments, which together with the authors' thorough responses have contributed significantly to the quality of this publication. Furthermore, we extend our thanks to the many research colleagues who have discussed and commented on our research and papers over the years.

We are grateful to Sense's publishing director Michel Lokhorst, the staff at Sense Publishers and to our series editor Halla B. Holmarsdottir for their support of this volume. Their encouragement and wise advice through the publication process have



#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

been invaluable. We extend special thanks to our research assistant, Galina Shavard, who has provided invaluable editorial support throughout the entire editing process.

We thank the educational authorities for granting us access to schools and classrooms. The Faculty of Education and International Studies at Oslo and Akershus University College has provided generous financial and administrative support for the publication, for which we are very grateful.

We extend our deep gratitude to all the participants at schools, school libraries and public libraries. We thank the teachers, headteachers, school librarians, public librarians, library directors, pupils and students for their collaboration, and for letting the researchers in. Without their innovative literacy practices, extensive collaboration and partnerships, this volume would not have been possible.

JORON PIHL, TONE CECILIE CARLSTEN AND  
KRISTIN SKINSTAD VAN DER KOOIJ

## 1. WHY TEACHER AND LIBRARIAN PARTNERSHIPS IN LITERACY EDUCATION IN THE 21ST CENTURY?

### INTRODUCTION

Why do we consider teacher and librarian partnerships to be essential to literacy education in the 21st century? An unprecedented pace of knowledge development, digitalization, globalization and extensive transnational migration characterizes the 21st century (Bottery, 2006; Daun, 2011; Delgado & Norman, 2008; Sassen, 1998). These phenomena, the subsequent social inequalities through education and the multiplicity in schools, challenge us to reconsider the purpose, pedagogy, theory and practices within literacy education. Based on the contributors' educational and interdisciplinary research, *New Literacy Studies* (Street, chapter two in this volume) and international research in the field, we find that teacher and librarian partnerships provide fundamental contributions to literacy education in the 21st century.

By reconceptualizing literacy education based on teacher and librarian partnerships, including partnerships between schools, public libraries and school libraries, we introduce a paradigmatic shift in literacy education. This has philosophical, pedagogical and structural foundations and implications. We reconceptualize literacy education by treating literacies as forms of social practices rather than autonomous skills. We reconceptualize teacher professionalism based on interprofessional collaboration. Teacher and librarian partnerships facilitate reading for pleasure and reading engagement in work with school subjects and curriculum goals. The partnerships facilitate work with multimodal literacies and inquiry-based learning, which are essential in the present era of digitalization and worldwide knowledge development. Furthermore, teacher and librarian partnerships facilitate work with students' and communities' multiple literacies, intercultural education and community building in multicultural communities.

We propose to reiterate the purpose of literacy education as democratic education. Democratic literacy education develops literacies and empowerment among *all* pupils and students (Andreotti, Biesta, & Ahenakew, 2015; Biesta, 2007, 2014). We suggest that literacy education based on teacher and librarian partnerships can make a major contribution to literacy development for all, and contribute to democratic agency and citizenship (Pihl, 2009b, 2012a). We define the purpose of literacy education against a social background in which inequalities through education are persistent and even increasing in several countries. Systematic differences in literacy achievements persist, depending on gender and

the social, linguistic and cultural background of pupils (OECD, 2009, 2010). Neo-liberal policies prioritize literacy education in terms of high-stakes international standardized assessments and competition, the teaching of individual literacy skills, outcome-based education (Davies & Bansel, 2007). However, rather than reducing social inequalities, research indicates that these policies, in fact, strengthen the reproduction of social inequalities through education (Au, 2009; Davies & Bansel, 2007; Fibkins, 2013; Méhaut & Winch, 2012; Mulinari & Neergaard, 2010; Pihl, 2015; Walford, 2013). The case studies we present from Sweden, Norway and the U.K. highlight partnerships in work with reading literacies, multimodal literacies and learning, and community building. Common to the contributors is that they apply sociocultural and intercultural theory and treat literacies as forms of social practice, in line with New Literacy Studies (NLS) (Barton, Hamilton, & Ivanic, 2000; Martin-Jones & Jones, 2000; Street, 1995, 2003). In chapter two, Street presents theoretical perspectives within NLS, focusing on Literacy as Social Practice (LSP). According to Street, the sternest test of NLS is to apply NLS/LSP perspectives to mainstream education. We present case studies that do just that. Moreover, they integrate other theoretical perspectives, such as the cultural-historical activity theory (Engeström & Sannino, 2010, 2011), to analyse conflicts and contradictions within literacy education (Eri, chapter eight in this volume).

The case studies adopt a bottom-up approach, in which teachers implement a paradigmatic shift in their professional work from the implementation of top-down concepts of literacy education and teacher professionalism promoted by the state (Evetts, 2006; Fournier, 1999) to the implementation of bottom-up concepts of literacy education and teacher professionalism developed by researchers and teachers themselves, thereby involving interprofessional partnerships. With respect to the theory of professionalism, teacher professionalism is reconceptualized in terms of specialization in combination with interprofessional collaboration and partnerships (Pihl, 2009b). This is highly appropriate in relation to the challenges that multiplicity and digitalization represent to education in the 21st century.

The contributors build on research that documents the powerful impact of reading (Krashen, 2004; Krashen, Lee, & McQuillan, 2012) on learning and language development (Dickinson, A, Golinkoff, & Hirsh-Pasek, 2012; Small & Snyder, 2009) and democratic agency (Freire & Macedo, 2005). We address a gap in educational research related to the development of reading engagement (Guthrie, 2016) and inclusion of the school library and librarians in the very concept of literacy education and practice in the 21st century (Pihl, 2012a), drawing on studies in library and information science.

#### PARTNERSHIPS AND LITERACIES AS SOCIAL PRACTICES

NLS defines literacies as forms of social practices. Literacies are socially and culturally specific (Street, 2003, 2005). In line with sociocultural educational theory (Vygotsky, 1978), NLS assumes that literacy education should build on the literacy resources among pupils and communities. We define public libraries and school libraries as literacy resources in the communities that are invaluable to

literacy education. We conceptualize pupils' extensive voluntary reading and the sharing of reading experiences and multimodal literacy activities as social practices that are fundamental to literacy education. Partnerships between teachers and librarians facilitate such literacy education.

In the information age, inquiry-based learning is becoming increasingly important. Children and young people learn how to investigate a topic or problem and make use of multiple communication channels in exploring the phenomenon. The use of research-based methods is one form of inquiry-based learning. In inquiry-based teaching and learning, school librarians are vital partners for teachers. Guided inquiry means that a team of teachers and school librarian guides pupils in the use of a wide range of information resources, to provide in-depth understanding and a personal perspective of the problem (Kuhlthau, 2010). Guided inquiry is responsive to educational challenges in the information age in the 21st century. It equips pupils with the abilities required to address an uncertain and very rapidly changing the world (Kuhlthau, 2010). School librarians are experts in guided inquiry.

School librarians are vital partners in creating schools that enable students to learn through vast resources and multiple communication channels. School libraries are dynamic learning centres in information age schools with school librarians as primary agents for designing schools for 21st century learners. (Kuhlthau, 2010, p. 17)

In the following, we expand on what we mean by teacher and librarian partnerships, the rationale for such partnerships, and discuss some of the challenges. The contributors to this volume examine teacher and librarian partnerships in the contexts of sociocultural and intercultural practices (Pihl, chapter three) and community building (Avery, chapter four). We also explore challenges to such partnerships.

We define partnerships as professional *and* institutional collaboration. Partnerships imply professional and institutional agreements to collaborate within literacy education. We shall see that such partnerships can take many forms. One interesting example is a partnership in a library network in Sweden, in which a public library branch, five school libraries and two preschool libraries pooled institutional and professional resources (Avery, chapter four). Another example is the research and development project *Multiplicity, Empowerment, Citizenship: Inclusion through the Use of the Library as an Arena for Learning* (Pihl, 2011, 2012c), which involved partnerships between teachers, school librarians, public librarians and educational researchers, as well as headteachers and a library director. At the institutional level, the partnership included a municipal public library and a public library branch, two public schools and two teacher education institutions. These institutions collaborated on the development of literature-based literacy education (Tonne & Pihl, chapter five).

A prominent characteristic of partnerships is that the professions and collaborating institutions formalize their partnership agreement and their plans for collaboration. This is an important precondition for sustainable partnerships

(Edwards, Daniels, Gallagher, Leadbetter, & Warmington, 2009; Eri & Pihl, 2016; Kuhlthau, 2010). At the level of school leadership, this implies that teacher and librarian partnerships are included in the strategic plans of the school, and are formalized in the teaching plans at every grade level, in preschool, primary school and secondary school (Pihl, 2012b).

Our concept of “teacher and librarian partnerships” implies interprofessional collaboration, but transcends Montiel-Overall’s concept of teacher and librarian collaboration (Montiel-Overall, 2007, 2008), in that “partnerships” imply *formalized* professional and *institutional* collaboration. The use of “partnerships” in the plural communicates that there are many possible types of partnership. At the professional level, partnerships involve collaboration between teachers, public librarians and school librarians, as well as partnerships between public librarians and school librarians<sup>1</sup> and even researchers. The contributions show that for successful partnerships to evolve there needs to be an available partner at each school; that is, a qualified school librarian and a well-developed school library that is staffed and open during all school hours (Carlsten & Sjaastad, 2014).

In this volume, we present innovative case studies of different forms of partnerships between teachers and librarians and libraries and schools. We also focus on policies for the development of school libraries (Carlsten & Sjaastad, chapter seven). The contributors document how partnerships enhance reading engagement, high educational achievement, empowerment and democratic agency and community building, and they discuss some of the challenges of teacher and librarian partnerships.

#### MULTIPLICITY AND TEACHER AND LIBRARIAN PARTNERSHIPS

Teachers and librarians share a democratic mandate, namely to contribute to literacy education, democratic inclusion and agency in multicultural societies (Aabø, 2005; Audunson, 2005; Pihl, 2009b).<sup>2</sup> The Multicultural Library Manifesto outlines the library profession’s interpretation of their democratic and professional mandate in multicultural societies:

- Each individual in our global society has the right to a full range of library and information services. In addressing cultural and linguistic diversity, libraries should:
- serve all members of the community without discrimination based on cultural and linguistic heritage;
  - provide information in appropriate languages and scripts;
  - give access to a broad range of materials and services reflecting all communities and needs;
  - employ staff to reflect the diversity of the community, who are trained to work with and serve diverse communities. (IFLA/UNESCO, 2009)

In her contribution, Helen Avery shows how librarians implement this democratic mandate in a multicultural suburb in Sweden (Avery, chapter four).

By joining forces and professional expertise, we argue that both the teaching and library professions strengthen their potential for the realization of their professional mandate. Librarians are knowledgeable about children's literature and information literacy, and this is complementary to teachers' knowledge about pedagogy within literacy education. Librarians are media experts, knowledgeable in guided inquiry, literature dissemination and the use of library resources for the benefit of the user.

Heterogeneity and hybridity in school populations today cut across the "majority"/"minority" divide. The traditional concept of "difference" – usually reserved for "the other" – does not adequately capture the complexities and diversity that transcend the "majority"/"minority" divide. These complexities pertain to social, linguistic, cultural, religious and gender variations as well as to variations in abilities, interests and individual and collective histories. Such variations unfold even within the "majority" and "minority" populations in schools.

Against this background, we introduce the multiplicity concept as a foundation for dealing with difference. Multiplicity is an ontological concept meaning "difference in itself" (Deleuze, 2004). Deleuze introduced this concept in contrast to the traditional concept of "difference", which defines "difference" as the opposite of "identity". In the traditional conceptual framework, identity and difference are binary concepts, with identity being the norm and difference being subordinated to identity. Difference is constructed as inferior and subordinate to identity.

In contrast, the multiplicity concept assumes that all things, people and phenomena are multiplicities, that is, differences "in themselves". Multiplicity (difference) is even a characteristic of identity. Multiplicities are continuously in processes of becoming, in other words, continuously in processes of change. This ontological assumption has important implications for education with respect to how we theorize about the content of education, pedagogy and the school population in the 21st century.

Historically, the development of a national identity has been a priority in public education (Pihl, 2009a). Today, the development of a European identity is the purpose of education in many European Union countries. However, from an ontological perspective, it becomes problematic to define the development of a national or European identity as the purpose of education. Any attempt to define "identity" as a primary analytical concept will reify a dominant "identity", which is then applied across a diverse population. Similar arguments can be made in relation to knowledge. Multiplicity is also a fundamental characteristic of knowledge. Thus, we argue that work with multiplicity in content, rather than standardized content, ought to be the purpose of education, especially in the present era of globalization, digitalization and migration.

Taking the multiplicity concept as a point of departure for dealing with "difference", the most interesting question concerns which multiplicities may be put into interaction to promote democratic literacy education in the 21st century. This is the issue that we address here, faced with today's educational challenges and the continuous reproduction of social inequalities in education. Starting with

the democratic purpose of education, and literacy education, in particular, we find that the teaching profession (teachers) and the library profession (librarians) share a democratic mandate. Accordingly, we propose that when teachers and librarians join their expertise and engage in partnerships, they may generate new literacy practices and experiences that benefit all children. Multiplicity in the content of public and school libraries is conducive to the school population in the 21st century. These philosophical reflections were at the foundation of the research and development project *Multiplicity, Empowerment, Citizenship: Inclusion through the Use of the Library as an Arena for Learning* (Pihl, 2011, 2012c). Education that includes library resources in teaching and learning is potentially more relevant to the multiplicity in schools than education that relies heavily on standardized text-books and literacy materials. Libraries are recognized as essential to teaching and learning in higher education. Likewise, in the information age, access to good school libraries and good public libraries with multimedia resources and the expertise of librarians is equally essential to teaching and learning in schools (Kuhlthau, 2010).

#### THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

NLS document that people engage in reading and other literacy practices that are meaningful to them (Barton, 2007; Barton et al., 2000; Martin-Jones & Jones, 2000). How can schools facilitate reading that is meaningful to the pupils? Research indicates that extensive access to and time to read high-interest books of one's own choice are powerful incitements to further reading and the development of a passion for reading (Guthrie, 2016; Krashen, 2004). Consistent with NLS, the contributors in this volume show that the sharing of reading experiences and other literacy events is equally important. Sharing is a type of social practice that can take many forms; from dialogue about reading experiences at school libraries and public libraries to work with aesthetic and multimedia literacies and the sharing of this work with fellow pupils/students. Schools can make a fundamental difference in children's lives by providing *all* children with such reading and literacy experiences. We propose that teacher and librarian partnerships within literacy education and the use of public and school libraries are essential to the development of inclusive literacy education in the 21st century.

Librarians work with situated literacies (Street, 1995) and take people's multiple literacies and interests as a point of departure. These characteristics of librarianship are important from an educational and democratic perspective. Teacher and librarian partnerships stimulate young people to pursue their knowledge interests and social interests through the use of library resources (Hedemark, 2012; Rafste, 2005). Helen Avery (chapter four) shows that teacher and librarian partnerships make important contributions to empowerment among young people, democratic agency and community building. Many children and youth who use the public and school libraries frequently in school become devoted library users.

International assessments, however, indicate that there is a decline in reading literacy among children (Hedemark, 2012). According to the Progress in

International Reading Study (PIRLS), in 2007 the proportion of 10-year-old children qualified as readers had fallen over the previous five years (Hedemark, 2012); further research confirms this situation in the U.K. (Cremin & Swann, chapter nine). An achievement gap between children with an immigrant background and first-language learners has been widely documented (Carlile, 2011; Mulinari & Neergaard, 2010; Thompson & Allen, 2012). Children who are exposed to books in the home often have extensive reading experiences and a positive attitude towards books before they enter preschool and school. A recent extensive literature review documents the decisive and persistent positive impact of book reading worldwide on children's cognitive and emotional development (Dickinson et al., 2012). Children with few books in the home tend not to be as familiar with reading as children from homes with many books, which contributes to inequalities through education (OECD, 2010, 2013). Schools can make a decisive difference by providing all children with positive and extensive reading experiences.

A major focus in the studies we present is children's reading in and out of school. We address their use of public and school libraries and the role of teacher and librarian partnerships in facilitating reading engagement (Eri, chapter eight; Cremin & Swann, chapter nine). Several of the case studies investigate "literature-based" literacy education in which the pupils read fiction at school. They read fiction in language classes, they read fiction for pleasure, and they even read fiction for their school subject work (Tonne & Pihl, chapter five; Damber, chapter six). In the present era of digitalization and globalization, reading facilitates reading the world and self, and facilitates intercultural education (Dressman, 1997; Limberg, 2003; Montiel-Overall, 2007; Pihl, 2009b, 2011, 2012a; Rafste, 2005). However, we are aware that teacher and librarian partnerships challenge dominant conceptions of teacher professionalism and trends in literacy education that prioritize basic skills. Eri specifically addresses the tensions and contradictions that occur in literacy education based on school librarian and teacher partnerships (Eri, chapter eight).

#### RECONCEPTUALIZING THE LITERACY AGENDA

We reconceptualize the literacy agenda by including teacher and librarian partnerships and literacies as social practices in the very concept of literacy education and teacher professionalism in the 21st century. For sustainable partnerships to take place in primary and secondary education in general, a paradigmatic shift is needed that would recognize the educational, social and democratic value and contributions of partnerships for quality education for all.

Reading and writing are bound up with sociocultural processes and power relations (Barton et al., 2000; Street, 1995). Debates about literacy education centres on what counts as literacy, the content of literacy education and how to teach and learn reading and writing (Street, chapter two). Street points to the significance of social context in the development of literacy programmes and education. Meanings associated with literacy practices are located at deep



epistemological levels, raising questions about truth, knowledge and legitimate sources of authority. This often goes unnoticed within a framework that primarily focuses on accountability and reading and writing as technical skills (Davies & Bansel, 2007). The current Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) definition of reading literacy is as follows:

Reading literacy is understanding, using and reflecting on written texts, in order to achieve one's goals, to develop one's knowledge and potential and to participate in society. (OECD, 2006, p. 46)

According to PISA, reading literacy covers the domain of reading, "not so much in terms of mastery of the curriculum, but in terms of knowledge and *skills needed in adult life*" (OECD, 2006, p. 12, emphasis added). We will see that this has major implications for literacy education.

In contrast to the PISA definition, which emphasizes skills that are required in the future workforce, the PIRLS defines reading literacy more broadly:

The ability to understand and use those written language forms required by society and/or valued by the individual. Young readers can construct meaning from a variety of texts. They read to learn, to participate in communities of readers in school and everyday life, and for enjoyment.<sup>3</sup>

Both definitions are historically, politically and culturally specific. They capture important dimensions of literacy. However, international and national assessments by PISA and PIRLS are more influential than literacy definitions in terms of structuring literacy education today. Governments hold teachers accountable for pupils' performance on high-stakes standardized international and national assessments. This generates extensive competition between children and between teachers, headteachers and schools. It places competition at the forefront of literacy education. We argue that this is at the expense of teachers' professional work with multiple literacies. In many schools, teachers respond to pressure from international and national assessments by "teaching to the test", which in turn leads to increased inequality and marginalization in schools (Au, 2009; Lipman, 2004).

Schools constitute a specific domain for literacy practices. Teachers are obliged to assess literacy practices and rank and sort pupils based on standardized tests. Thus, schools frame literacy work within a top-down, mandatory, instrumental, competitive and disciplining context. This context shapes the children's conceptions of reading. Children are crucially aware that their reading is subjected to assessment: excellent, average or poor. Embedded in the assessment process is the identification of deficiencies and deviance, which in education are often linked to incapacity, deprivation and ignorance (Barton, 2007). Furthermore, schools ascribe language and learning disabilities to pupils from linguistic and cultural minorities in disproportionate numbers (Beratan, 2008; DiBello, Harlin, & Carlyle, 2007; Dyson & Gallannaugh, 2008; Oswald, Coutinho, & Best, 2001; Pihl, 2009a; Trainor, 2008).

NLS is an alternative theoretical framework that recognizes the linguistic and cultural resources among pupils and local communities regardless of their social,

cultural or linguistic background (Avery, chapter four). NLS informs the studies we present. Several of the case studies focus on literacy education that facilitates students' extensive reading of fiction and democratic agency in local multicultural communities. These forms of literacy education are in contrast to compensatory pedagogy and literacy education, which has the identification of linguistic deficiencies and remedial measures as an important target.

When schools treat the literacy practices of powerful groups as correct at all times and in all places – as autonomous of social context – “students from marginalized communities tend to have difficulty with learning to read and write in institutionally approved ways” (Collin & Street, 2014, p. 352). If teachers and headteachers want to apply other literacy concepts, models and pedagogy than those that educational directors or the Ministry of Education prescribe or approve of, they experience that politicians intervene and take control over the literacy agenda and practices in school (Eri & Pihl, 2016). Moreover, even though government White Papers may recognize the educational value of school libraries, policy implementation may fail to do so (Barstad, Audunson, Hjortsæter, & Østlie, 2007; Carlsten & Sjaastad, chapter seven).

Collin and Street's new synthetic model of literacy emphasizes that the interaction between sociocultural, ideological and institutional relations and artefacts constitutes literacy practices:

[T]he new synthetic model defines literacy as the outcome of *interacting processes in different spheres* (i.e., technologies, social relations, institutional arrangements, labour processes, relations to nature, the reproduction of daily life, mental conceptions of the world. (Collin & Street, 2014, p. 358, emphasis added)

Their model is particularly interesting in that it emphasizes the interaction between material and ideological forces. Interaction between material forces, social relations, institutional arrangements and labour processes generate literacies. In line with Collin and Street's synthetic literacy model, we expand literacy education in schools to include interaction with other spheres and institutions, namely libraries and the library profession.

#### THE LIBRARY: A COMPLEX, DIFFERENTIATED LEARNING ARENA

Libraries are differentiated learning arenas, characterized by multiplicity in content. From an educational perspective, libraries are treasures. Good libraries contain books, music, newspapers, internet resources, games and most importantly, the professional expertise of librarians serving the library user, all free of charge. Libraries constitute the collective memories and knowledges of peoples and civilizations. Complex and multiple library resources can potentially engage pupils with very diverse abilities and social, linguistic, historical, cultural and gender backgrounds.

With their professional expertise, librarians can engage with teachers in their educational planning, which includes the use of fiction and prose in literacy

education and work with multimedia resources, to provide all children with reading experiences and learning that is meaningful to them (Kuhlthau, 2010; Pihl, 2012c). The public and school libraries are different from the classroom. Libraries are places for dialogue, social interaction and the sharing of literacy events. The public library has great potential as a low-intensive meeting place in multicultural societies (Audunson, 2005). Being a place for dialogue and social interaction, the school library is a unique learning arena that pupils and students cherish (Cremin & Swann, chapter nine).

When teachers and librarians plan literacy education together, they coordinate their plans for literacy events in and across classrooms and at the school library (Kuhlthau, 2010; Pihl, 2012c). They discuss curriculum goals and the teacher provides the school librarian with information about topics they are working on in class, the pupils' proficiency in the language of instruction and their mother tongue and the pupils' abilities and interests. The librarian recommends literature at different levels of complexity, relevant to the specific class and pupils. The school librarians guide children at the school library in their work with particular subjects or topics.

Van der Kooij and Pihl (2009) explore negotiations between teachers, educational researchers and librarians within the research and development project *Multiplicity, Empowerment, Citizenship: Inclusion through the Use of the Library as an Arena for Learning* (Pihl, 2012c). The teachers disagreed with the researchers and the public librarian about how to use the public library. The teachers planned to implement "tracked reading" (where good and poor readers are placed in different groups). They used the public library as a compensatory pedagogical measure for "low achievers". However, based on discussions and the positive results from collaboration with librarians and researchers in terms of pupils' reading engagement, the teachers eventually changed their practice and included all children in the use of the public library (van der Kooij & Pihl, 2009). The introduction of theoretical concepts about the reading experience and literacy as a form of social practice was important in the partnership between researchers, teachers and librarians. Discussions about these concepts in relation to the literacy work in classrooms and libraries facilitated expansive learning and changes in literacy and professional practices.

The use of public and school libraries in literacy education makes non-segregated literacy education possible. This differs from organizational differentiation, in which the children's presupposed proficiency level in the language of instruction is decisive (often based on standardized assessment). When pupils get to read library books of their own choice in school subjects, all children can be included in the same literacy events, regardless of linguistic background or special needs. Segregated teaching (i.e., "tracked reading groups") can be avoided. Based on our theoretical and democratic perspective, we argue that non-segregated literacy education is very important. Segregated educational provisions have many negative consequences, particularly for children with linguistic minority background and pupils with learning disabilities (Mulinari & Neergaard, 2010; Pihl, 2009a; Vaught, 2011). In contrast, non-segregated teaching has positive

effects on children's reading and learning (Pihl & van der Kooij, 2016; van der Kooij & Pihl, 2009). Teacher and librarian partnerships and the use of the school and public libraries in literacy education constitute a *structural* measure that facilitates socially and pedagogically inclusive literacy education.

Several studies report the importance of school librarians in work with reading and learning. Dressman (1997) notes the important role of school librarians in stimulating reading for pleasure. Hedemark (2012) documents Swedish children's attitudes to reading and public library services, where reading promotion activities increase children's reading interest. However, to reach reluctant readers, reading promotion activities need to recognize the "multiliteracies" with which children enter the library. Small and Snyder report the positive impact of school libraries on student achievement (Small & Snyder, 2009). A number of studies explore the transformation of professional roles and institutional practices related to teacher and librarian collaboration (Oberg & Henri, 2002; Oberg, 2008; Small, 2002). Montiel-Overall has published extensively on the collaboration between teacher-librarians and teachers, outlining the professional preconditions for successful collaboration (Montiel-Overall, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009). Montiel-Overall concludes that when teacher-librarians become an integral part of instruction, student learning improves.

In educational research, relatively few studies have addressed teacher and librarian collaboration (Pihl, chapter three). One noteworthy study is Limberg's investigation of the pedagogical role of school libraries in teaching and learning (Limberg, 2003). In addition, Rafste discusses the role of the school library for the purpose of learning and draws a distinction between the school library as a place to learn and as a place for pleasure (Rafste, 2005). The contributors to this volume argue that the school library is both. Their studies show that when children learn to use public and school libraries, they also learn to take charge of their own reading agenda – for pleasure as well as for learning. Any attempt to make the school library a mere extension of the classroom is problematic and may cause the school library to lose its attractiveness (Eri, chapter eight). The library as a "low-intensive" space (Audunson, 2005) – what Rafste calls "backstage" compared with the classroom, which is "frontstage" (Rafste, 2005) – is fundamental to children's attachment to the school library and the public library, and their engagement in literacy events and social activities therein. Avery (2014) studies the role of school libraries within intercultural education and concludes that teacher collaboration with school librarians can make an important contribution to intercultural education based on the inclusion of diverse library resources. For this to happen, teachers need to engage as "co-learners", "reformers" and reflective practitioners.

From an educational point of view, Pihl has explored the professional roles of teachers and librarians, as well as the challenges and the educational benefits of interprofessional collaboration (Pihl, 2011). In several studies, she has explored the potential for empowerment, intercultural education and the development of social justice on the basis of teacher and librarian collaboration within literacy education (Pihl, 2009b, 2012c, 2014, see also Tonne & Pihl, chapter seven). Pihl argues that successful collaboration between teachers and librarians requires the development

of a shared object of activity; that is, agreement on what to collaborate about and how (Pihl, 2011). This also implies a distribution of labour between professionals concerning who does what. Such deliberations are important, particularly in relation to educational planning, literature dissemination and guided inquiry, because teachers and librarians come from different fields with different literacy traditions and discourses (Pihl, 2009b). Genuine collaboration involves the co-planning, co-implementation and co-evaluation of literacy events (Montiel-Overall, 2009), which in turn requires reflection by teachers and librarians concerning their respective professional mandates, their own professional expertise and the expertise of the other profession. It also requires reflection on the limits of one's own expertise, and how collaboration can enhance the professional and democratic mandate of the respective professions (Pihl, 2011). Teachers and librarians need to collaborate and learn to establish partnerships in their professional training.

The development of sustainable teacher and librarian partnerships involves considerable challenges (Eri & Pihl, 2016; Pihl, 2012c) that relate primarily to relatively weak support for school and library partnerships at the policy level, in educational research and in teacher training. Subsequently, there is weak support for partnerships at school level (Carlsten & Sjaastad, chapter seven). Up-to-date school libraries/media centres staffed with qualified school librarians and open during all school hours are fundamental preconditions for successful partnerships. In spite of the obstacles to partnerships in Norway, Sweden and the U.K., the contributors in this volume show that there is pedagogical space for bottom-up initiatives and partnerships.

#### SCHOOL LIBRARIES, PARTNERSHIPS AND GUIDED INQUIRY IN THE 21ST CENTURY

School libraries and teacher and librarian partnerships are essential for working with curriculum goals in the information age. This pertains to work with specific school subjects, work with interdisciplinary topics (Pihl, 2012c), and work with research-based approaches to learning and guided inquiry, which is becoming increasingly important in the 21st century (Kuhlthau, 2010). Inquiry-based learning facilitates in-depth exploration of a topic using multimedia resources. Kuhlthau (2010) proposes specific recommendations for the bottom-up development of sustainable teacher and school librarian partnerships in work with guided inquiry. First, systemic support for such partnerships must be obtained from fellow teachers and the headteacher. Second, a plan for joint implementation of inquiry-based learning must be developed. Kuhlthau suggests creating flexible three-member teams of teachers and school librarians that collaborate, according to students' needs and curriculum requirements. This facilitates constructivist learning in a "third space", which is at the intersection of the pupil's knowledge and experience (first space) and curriculum goals (second space). Third, a network of teachers and librarians is needed for sharing stories of success and dealing with problems encountered (Kuhlthau, 2010). To this, we add a fourth recommendation. We argue that a theoretical framework is needed for the analysis of expansive learning and

#### TEACHER AND LIBRARIAN PARTNERSHIPS?

for dealing with tensions, conflicts and contradictions in teacher and librarian partnerships. One such theoretical framework is cultural-historical activity theory (Edwards et al., 2009), which has proved fruitful in the analysis of expansive learning in interprofessional collaboration, as well as in the analysis of specific conflicts and contradictions in teacher and librarian collaboration (Eri & Pihl, 2016; Pihl, 2011).

The establishment of teacher and librarian teams is important for coordinating literacy practices in classrooms and at the school library. When school librarians participate in discussions about curriculum goals and the implementation of these goals in and across school subjects, they can co-ordinate their plans for literacy work in classrooms and at the school library. This ensures that children and teachers will use library resources and receive quality support and guidance during their work. Research indicates that close collaboration between a public library and a school library guarantees the quality of school library services. Thus, even a public librarian can join a teacher and librarian team, if possible.

Competition in schools and society is increasing, generating marginalization, especially among children from poor families and with parents with low levels of education (Bastien & Holmarsdottir, 2015). A loss of hope for the future among young people may generate social unrest (Balibar, 2007). From this perspective, the attachment of children and young people to a school library and a public library in the local community can prevent the processes of marginalization.

At the school level, teachers and school leaders have the power to define the literacy agenda in schools; that is, the content and methods used within literacy education. It follows that responsibility for the inclusion of librarians and libraries into the work with literacies in schools lies heavily on teachers and school leaders. For teachers to initiate partnerships, they need knowledge about how partnerships can support their work with curriculum goals. Educational research, teacher education and educational policy can provide teachers with such knowledge through teachers' concurrent and consecutive training as well as in professional competence development activities. Ultimately, political and educational research support for school and library partnerships is fundamental to the development of sustainable partnerships in the 21st century.

#### READING ENGAGEMENT AND SOCIAL LITERACIES

Reading is by far the most important factor influencing language development and learning among all children. Extensive reading outweighs the negative influence of low socio-economic status on educational achievement (Dickinson et al., 2012; Krashen, 2004; Mullis, Martin, Kennedy, & Foy, 2007; OECD, 2010; Ross, McKechnie, & Rothbauer, 2005; Sullivan & Brown, 2015). Literature-based education has powerful effects on reading and learning (Morrow & Gambrell, 2001). Access to high-interest books and reading material fosters reading engagement and extensive reading (Elley, 2000; Guthrie, 2016; Krashen et al., 2012). It is firmly established that reading for pleasure and partnerships between schools and libraries contribute to literacy development along with better and more

reading (Cullinan, 2000; Krashen, 2004; Krashen et al., 2012; Limberg, 2003). Therefore, it is paradoxical that there is a research gap in education related to the development of reading engagement in preschools and schools (Dickinson et al., 2012; Guthrie, 2016).

It is the actual reading experience and the sharing of these experiences with others that generate more reading (McKechnie, Oterholm, Rothbauer, & Skjerdingsstad, 2016). *What* children and young people read and the social context of reading are crucial to the development of reading engagement. Pupils' choice of library books and time to read for pleasure generate reading engagement, especially if and when the library provides books in different languages, genres and levels of complexity, as well as a stimulating reading environment (Dressman, 1997; Krashen, 2004; Krashen et al., 2012; McKechnie et al., 2016; Pihl & van der Kooij, 2016).

Studies indicate that the reading of fiction of one's choice strongly affects reading engagement. Such reading can even facilitate reading *above* the child's proficiency level in the language of instruction (Axelsson, 2000; Morrow & Gambrell, 2001; Pihl & van der Kooij, 2016) and may generate amazing reading experiences that children and youth cherish. They learn about other people's experiences in the world and reflect on their own positions in it (Pihl & van der Kooij, 2016). The pedagogical assumption that pupils and students only should read books *at* their proficiency level (i.e., tracked reading), is questionable from our theoretical perspectives. When they read a book that really interests them, they often continue to read even though the book may have passages, vocabulary or syntax that are not immediately intelligible to them (McKechnie et al., 2016; Pihl & van der Kooij, 2016). Fascination with the content pushes the reader forward. In this respect, the reading experience is not that different from an adult's reading experience. The reading experience stimulates the reader intellectually, emotionally and even ethically, prompting the reader to continue reading despite any difficulties. This is yet another important argument for why schools should provide all pupils and students with the opportunity for extensive reading of fiction and other books that interest them in school subjects and for pleasure.

In the following section, we give a brief overview of the chapters in this volume.

#### MULTIPLE LITERACIES, EMPOWERMENT, AGENCY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

In chapter two, Brian V. Street expands on key concepts within NLS and LSP in educational contexts. Street focuses on social partnerships as opposed to seeing literacy as an asocial "autonomous" skill as in many dominant approaches. He emphasizes the application of LSP in the context of "school and library partnerships", arguing that it makes better sense educationally to name and define literacies in the plural. This is an approach that can be applied to school contexts as well as libraries, where a variety of genres and texts are to be found. In addressing these issues, Street presents key concepts within NLS, including literacy events and literacy practices, and ethnographic perspectives. He then applies these concepts to the issues of learning in and out of school and applications to education.

In chapter three, Joron Pihl explores in a literature review the extent to which educational research addresses library use, and how the library can contribute to intercultural education. Pihl notes that within educational research, the topics of teacher and librarian collaboration and school and library partnerships are under-researched. Empirical studies indicate that education based on the use of library resources can help realize important aims of intercultural education and reduce social inequalities in education. These aims include non-segregated education, reading engagement among first- and second-language learners, the integration of information literacy in content teaching and learning as well as the empowerment of pupils as library users, and intercultural education. In line with educational theory and NLS, Pihl argues that recognition of the interests and linguistic and cultural resources of the reader should be the foundation for literacy education. Access to literature provided by the library is a precondition for such literacy education.

In chapter four, Helen Avery explores partnerships between a public library branch, five school libraries and two preschool libraries in a multi-ethnic urban neighbourhood in Sweden. This chapter is a study of the social literacy work of a school library network that builds on the multiple literacies among children and adults in the community. The network draws on the democratic ideals of the Swedish popular education tradition. Close collaboration took place between the librarians and the preschool educators, teachers and staff of the leisure time centres, which are part of the education system in Sweden. Such collaboration allowed the network to pool school library resources and work strategically with the professional development of school librarians. The library network also takes a proactive stance in developing opportunities for social action and communal cultural spaces in the neighbourhood. The outreach activities of the network provided children and adults with access to books and library resources from the cradle to old age. Young people learnt critical information skills and the network worked with multimodality and provided opportunities for social engagement in the community, thereby generating empowerment, agency and critical and multilingual literacies.

In chapter five, Ingebjørg Tonne and Joron Pihl analyze literature-based literacy education and library use in multilingual classes, focusing on the development of reading engagement. They present findings from the *Multiplicity, Empowerment, Citizenship: Inclusion through the Use of the Library as an Arena for Learning* project in Norway (Pihl, 2012c). A municipal public library, a public library branch, two schools and two teacher education institutions engaged in partnerships within literacy education for a period of four years. The teachers and public and school librarians implemented a “book-flood” programme, in which the pupils had extensive access to books and voluntary reading of fiction and prose in school subjects. The findings indicate that literature-based education, non-segregated literacy education and the sharing of reading and other literacy events and extensive use of library resources facilitated reading engagement in the language of instruction among both first- and second-language learners. Reading engagement was irrespective of gender and socio-economic or ethnic background. The authors



argue that this reduced inequalities in education. Tonne and Pihl attribute this to the “book-flood” programme, which was founded on NLS and teacher and librarian partnerships.

In chapter six, Ulla Damber investigates the literacy work of a public librarian in collaboration with preschool teachers and primary schoolteachers in Sweden. In this study in a multilingual, multicultural suburb on the outskirts of Stockholm, a public librarian tells her story about a joint project with preschool teachers and schoolteachers in grades one to three. The aim was to increase children’s interest in reading and the development of engaged readers. In a “book-flood” programme, children were literally flooded with books in preschool classrooms and at the public library. Damber highlights the work of the public librarian in collaboration with teachers and parents. Teachers, children and parents had extensive access to authentic children’s literature and shared reading experiences. As the linguistically and culturally diverse children were at different points in their reading development, as well as in their acquisition of Swedish as a second language, multimodal activities played a vital part in the work with reading. The multimodal activities included artwork and established a preunderstanding of texts, and were used as a means to enhance all children’s meaning-making and analysis of texts.

In chapter seven, Tone Cecilie Carlsten and Jørgen Sjaastad present and discuss an evaluation of a state-run school library development programme in Norway conducted between 2009 and 2013. They found that the goals set by the state for the development of school libraries in Norway were not met. Moreover, they found that the state did not take into account the results of the evaluation for the purpose of further development of school libraries in Norway, despite the fact that the state had commissioned the evaluation. The authors situate and discuss these findings from Norway in a broader context for school library politics. Their chapter summarizes some of the previous research related to school library development in several countries. The review shows that state support of school libraries is crucial for developing sustainable school libraries and institutionalizing teacher and librarian partnerships. They discuss the relationship between policy aims, valid implementation strategies and outcomes at the school level. Carlsten and Sjaastad examine possible reasons for the gaps between the stated political aims for school library development, and the weak political support of school libraries in Norway.

In chapter eight, Thomas Eri analyses the work of a school librarian and multilingual teachers in a multilingual book café at the school library. The school librarian and a group of multilingual teachers organized the multilingual book café for children and parents. The purpose of the book café was to provide a space for reading for pleasure in the children’s first and second languages and to involve parents in the children’s reading. However, the school librarian and multilingual teachers experienced problems with declining parental participation in the book café. Eri discusses these problems, focusing on contradictions between a “school literacy” discourse and a culturally sensitive discourse. He also addresses the role of the teacher-librarian without formal qualifications as a librarian. The study highlights the importance of addressing the tensions, conflicts and dilemmas in literacy practices as possible manifestations of systemic contradictions between

literacy discourses. Eri discusses the conflicts that arise when teachers implement classroom pedagogy into the space of the school library.

In chapter nine, Teresa Cremin and Joan Swann focus on the role of secondary school librarians in extra-curricular reading groups in the U.K. Cremin and Swann examine the nature and construction of the reading groups' practices and the dialogic dimensions to reading evidenced in such groups. Their research draws on case studies of reading groups that participated in a national book award "shadowing scheme", which involved student groups reading and discussing literature short-listed for the Carnegie Medal and the Kate Greenaway Medal and comparing their views with those of the award judges. The study indicates that the school librarians, working to develop students' pleasure in reading, profiled reading choice and agency in the shared social space for reading that they created. They sought to differentiate the extra-curricular reading groups from classes in English. Group members – both students and attending teachers – contributed to the shaping of these reading events. The informal relationships within the reading group afforded space for readers to construct a dialogic understanding of the literary texts, and in some instances, of the texts of their own and each other's lives. The pupils cherished these literary experiences, which to them were qualitatively different from the literary experiences in English lesson classes.

#### REFLECTIONS

The contributions in this volume highlight that teacher and librarian partnerships in literacy education, which include partnerships between public and school libraries and schools, enhance multiple literacies. The partnerships generate reading engagement, inquiry-based learning and agency irrespective of the students' socio-economic status, linguistic background or gender. These are important contributions to social justice in the 21st century. Partnerships enhance realization of the democratic mandate of both the teaching and the library profession.

We hope that the volume provides concepts, theoretical framework and empirical evidence for the value and importance of including teacher and librarian partnerships and the multiple literacies of pupils and communities into the very foundation of literacy education in the present era of multiplicity and digitalization. Teacher and librarian partnerships provide all children and youth with the opportunity to read the world and self. In so doing, young people learn to take charge of their own reading and literacy agenda, which is a resource for lifelong learning and citizenship. Children and youth gain knowledge and agency that open up participation in the local community and society in collaboration with other readers – hopefully for democratic agency in the 21st century.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> We use "school librarian" and "teacher-librarian" interchangeably in this volume. These are not protected professional titles. There are no formal educational requirements for the position as school

librarian or teacher-librarian. Some have formal qualifications as librarians while others, especially teachers who work in school libraries, may have no formal qualifications or limited qualifications.

- <sup>2</sup> The Library Manifesto: <http://www.ifla.org/III/misc/im-e.htm>  
The School Library Manifesto: <http://archive.ifla.org/VII/s11/pubs/manifest.htm>  
The Multicultural Manifesto: <http://www.ifla.org/node/8976>
- <sup>3</sup> [http://timssandpirls.bc.edu/pirls2016/downloads/P16\\_FW\\_Chap1.pdf](http://timssandpirls.bc.edu/pirls2016/downloads/P16_FW_Chap1.pdf), p. 12.

## REFERENCES

- Aabø, S. (2005). The role and value of public libraries in the age of digital technologies. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 37(4), 205–210. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0961000605057855>
- Andreotti, V., Biesta, G., & Ahenakew, C. (2015). Between the nation and the globe: Education for global mindedness in Finland. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 13(2), 246–259. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2014.934073>
- IFLA/UNESCO. (2009). *The multicultural library manifesto*. Retrieved from <http://www.ifla.org/node/8976>
- Au, W. (2009). *Unequal by design high-stakes testing and the standardization of inequality*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Audunson, R. (2005). The public library as a meeting-place in a multicultural and digital context. The necessity of low-intensive meeting-places. *Journal of Documentation*, 61(3), 429–441. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00220410510598562>
- Avery, H. (2014). The role of the school library: Reflections from Sweden. *Intercultural Education*, 25(6), 497–507. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2014.990279>
- Axelsson, M. (2000). Framgång för alla – från at inte kunna til at inte kunna låta bli att läsa [Progress for all – From not being able to read to not stop reading]. In H. Åhl (Ed.), *Svenskan i tiden – verklighet och visioner* (pp. 8–35). Stockholm: Nationelt Centrum, HLS Förlag.
- Balibar, E. (2007). Uprising in the Banlieues. *Constellations*, 14(1), 47–71. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8675.2007.00422.x>
- Barstad, J., Audunson, R., Hjortsæter, E., & Østlie, B. (2007). *Skulebiblioteket i Norge Kartlegging av skulebiblioteket i grunnskule og vidaregåande skule* [The school libraries in Norway A review of school libraries in primary and secondary schools]. Volda: Høgskolen i Volda.
- Barton, D. (2007). *Literacy: An introduction to the ecology of written language*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Barton, D., Hamilton, M., & Ivanic, R. (Eds.). (2000). *Situated literacies reading and writing in context*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bastien, S., & Holmarsdottir, H. B. (Eds.). (2015). *Youth 'at the margins'. Critical perspectives and experiences of engaging youth in research worldwide*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Beratan, G. D. (2008). The song remains the same: transposition and the disproportionate representation of minority students in special education. *Race, Ethnicity & Education*, 11, 337–354. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13613320802478820>
- Biesta, G. (2007). Why “what works” won’t work: Evidence-based practice and the democratic deficit in educational research. *Educational Theory*, 57(1), 1–22. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-5446.2006.00241.x>
- Biesta, G. (2014). How does a competent teacher become a good teacher? On judgement, wisdom, and virtuosity in teaching and teacher education. In R. Heilbronn & L. Foreman-Peck (Eds.), *Philosophical perspectives on the future of teacher education*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Bottery, M. (2006). Education and globalization: redefining the role of the educational professional. *Education Review*, 58(1), 95–113. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00131910500352804>

- Carlile, A. (2011). An ethnography of permanent exclusion from school: Revealing and untangling the threads of institutionalised racism. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 15(2), 175–194. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2010.548377>
- Carlsten, T. C., & Sjaastad, J. (2014). *Evaluering av program for skolebibliotekutvikling 2009–2013* [Evaluation of the program for school library development 2009–2013]. Oslo: NIFU.
- Collin, R., & Street, B. V. (2014). Ideology and interaction: Debating determinisms in literacy studies. *Reading research quarterly*, 49(3), 351–359. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/rrq.75>
- Cullinan, B. E. (2000). Independent reading and school achievement. *School Library Media Research Online*, 3.
- Daun, H. (2011). Globalization, EU-ification, and the new mode of educational governance in Europe. *European Education*, 43(1), 9–32. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.2753/EUE1056-4934430102>
- Davies, B., & Bansel, P. (2007). Neoliberalism and education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 20(3), 247–259. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09518390701281751>
- Deleuze, G. (2004). *Difference and repetition*. London: Continuum.
- Delgado, R., & Norman, P. (2008). Globalization in the face of standardization: Implications for teacher education. *Teacher Education and Practice*, 21(4), 461–463.
- DiBello, L., Harlin, R. P., & Carlyle, J. (2007). Why are so many minority students in special education? Understanding race and disability in schools. *Childhood Education*, 83(4), 246–246. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00094056.2007.10522925>
- Dickinson, D. K., Griffith J. A., Golinkoff, R. M., & Hirsh-Pasek, K. (2012). How reading books fosters language development around the world, *Child Development Research*. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2012/602807>
- Dressman, M. (1997). Congruence, resistance, liminality: Reading and ideology in three school libraries. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 27(3), 267–315. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03626784.1997.11075493>
- Dyson, A., & Gallannaugh, F. (2008). Disproportionality in special needs education in England. *Journal of Special Education*, 42(1), 36–46. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022466907313607>
- Edwards, A., Daniels, H., Gallagher, T., Leadbetter, J., & Warmington, P. (Eds.). (2009). *Improving inter-professional collaborations. Multi-agency working for children's wellbeing*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Elley, W. B. (2000). The potential of book floods for raising literacy levels. *International Review of Education*, 46(3–4), 233–255. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1004086618679>
- Engeström, Y., & Sannino, A. (2010). Studies of expansive learning: Foundations, findings and future challenges. *Educational Review*, (5), 1–24. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2009.12.002>
- Engeström, Y., & Sannino, A. (2011). Discursive manifestations of contradictions in organizational change efforts. A methodological framework. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 24(3), 368–387. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09534811111132758>
- Eri, T., & Pihl, J. (2016). The challenge of sustaining change: Contradictions within the development of teacher and librarian collaboration. *Educational Action Research*. doi: 10.1080/09650792.2016.1147366
- Evetts, J. (2006). Short note: The sociology of professional groups. New directions. *Current Sociology*, 54(1), 133–143. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011392106057161>
- Fibkins, W. L. (2013). *Class warfare: Focus on "good" students is ruining schools*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Fournier, V. (1999). The appeal to “professionalism” as a disciplinary mechanism. *Social Review*, 47(2), 280–307. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-954X.00173>
- Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (2005). *Reading the word and the world*. Great Britain: Routledge.
- Guthrie, J. T. (2016). Teaching for literacy engagement. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 36(1), 1–30. Retrieved from [http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15548430jlr3601\\_2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15548430jlr3601_2)
- Hedemark, Å. (2012). A study of Swedish children's attitudes to reading and public library activities. *New Review of Children's Literature and Librarianship*, 18(2), 116–127. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13614541.2012.716693>

- Krashen, S. D. (2004). *The power of reading insights from the research* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, Libraries Unlimited.
- Krashen, S. D., Lee, S., & McQuillan, J. (2012). Is the library important? Multivariate studies at the national and international level. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education*, 8(1). Retrieved from <http://backseatlinguist.com/blog/hello-world/>
- Kuhlthau, C. C. (2010). Guided inquiry: School libraries in the 21st century. *School Libraries World Wide*, 16(1), 17–28.
- Limberg, L. (2003). *Skolbiblioteks pedagogiska roll: En kunnskapsöversikt* [The pedagogical role of school libraries: A literature review]. Stockholm: Skolverket.
- Lipman, P. (2004). *High stakes education inequality, globalization, urban school reform*. New York, NY: Routledge. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203465509>
- Martin-Jones, M., & Jones, K. (Eds.). (2000). *Multilingual literacies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- McKechnie, L. E. F., Oterholm, O., Rothbauer, P. M., & Skjerdingsstad, K. I. (Eds.). (2016). *Plotting the reading experience: Theory/practice/politics*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Méhaut, P., & Winch, C. (2012). The European qualification framework: Skills, competences or knowledge? *European Educational Research Journal*, 11(3), 369–381. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.2304/eej.2012.11.3.369>
- Montiel-Overall, P. (2006). Teacher and teacher-librarian cooperation: Moving toward integration. *Teacher Librarian*, 34(2), 28–33.
- Montiel-Overall, P. (2007). Research on teacher and librarian collaboration: An examination of underlying structures of models. *Library & Information Science Research*, 29(2), 277–292. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2007.04.006>
- Montiel-Overall, P. (2008). Teacher and librarian collaboration: A qualitative study. *Library & Information Science Research*, 30(2), 145–155. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2007.06.008>
- Montiel-Overall, P. (2009). Teachers' perceptions of teacher and librarian collaboration: Instrumentation development and validation. *Library & Information Science Research*, 31, 182–191. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2009.04.001>
- Morrow, L. M., & Gambrell, L. B. (2001). Literature-based instruction in early years. In S. B. Neuman & D. K. Dickinson (Eds.), *Handbook of early literacy research* (Vol. 1., pp. 348–360). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Mulinari, D., & Neergaard, A. (2010). The “others” in Sweden. Neoliberal policies and the politics of “race” in education. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 8(2), 131–163.
- Mullis, I. V. S., Martin, M. O., Kennedy, A. M., & Foy, P. (2007). *PIRLS 2006. International report IEA's progress in international reading literacy study in primary school in 40 countries*. Chestnut Hill, MA: TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, Boston College.
- Oberg, D., & Henri, J. (2002). Information transfer and transformation in teacher-librarianship: Synergy across the Pacific. *International Information & Library Review*, 34(1), 35. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/iilr.2001.0183>
- OECD. (2006). *Assessing Scientific, reading and mathematical literacy: A framework for PISA 2006*. Paris: OECD. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264026407-en>
- OECD. (2009). *OECD Reviews of migrant education. Closing the gap for immigrant students: policies, practice and performance*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD. (2010). *Closing the gap for immigrant students: Politics, practice and performance*. Paris: OECD. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264075788-en>
- OECD. (2013). *2012 Results: Excellence through equity. Giving every student the chance to succeed*. Paris: OECD.
- Oswald, D. P., Coutinho, M. J., & Best, A. M. (2001). *Community and school predictors of over representation of minority children in special education*. Harvard, MA: Harvard Civil Rights Project.

- Pihl, J. (2009a). Ethno-nationalism and education. In S. Alghasi, T. H. Eriksen, & H. Ghorashi (Eds.), *Paradoxes of cultural recognition perspectives from northern Europe* (pp. 111–133). Farnham: Ashgate.
- Pihl, J. (2009b). Interprofessional cooperation between teachers and librarians: Analysing theoretical and professional arguments for cooperation in an era of globalization. In M. O’Dowd & H. Holmarsdottir (Eds.), *Nordic voices: Teaching and researching comparative and international education in the Nordic countries* (pp. 41–59). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Pihl, J. (2011). Literacy education and interprofessional collaboration. *Professions and professionalism*, 1(1), 52–66.
- Pihl, J. (2012a). Can library use enhance intercultural education? *Issues in Educational Research*, 22(1), 79–90. Retrieved from <http://www.iier.org.au/iier22/pihl.pdf>
- Pihl, J. (2012b). Desire, multiplicity and learning. *Scandinavian Library Quarterly*, 45(1), 8–10. Retrieved from <http://slq.nu/?article=volume-45-no-1-2012-11>
- Pihl, J. (2012c). *Multiplisitet, myndiggjøring, medborgerskap: Inkludering gjennom bruk av biblioteket som læringsarena* [Multiplicity, empowerment, citizenship: Inclusion through the use of the library as an arena for learning]. Oslo: Oslo and Akershus University College.
- Pihl, J. (2014). Lese- og skrivekyndighet og leseengasjement i flerkulturelle skoler [Reading and writing literacy and reading engagement in multicultural schools]. In B. Bolme Moen (Ed.), *Elevmangfoldet i klasserommet* [Diversity in the classroom] (pp. 39–56). Trondheim: Tapir Akademisk.
- Pihl, J. (2015). Epistemological and methodological challenges in research concerning youth at the margins. In S. Bastien & H. Holmarsdottir (Eds.), *Youth at the margins: Experiences from engaging youth in research worldwide* (pp. 42–63). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers. Retrieved from [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-052-9\\_3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-052-9_3)
- Pihl, J., & van der Kooij, K. S. (2016). Desire and becoming – Multilingual pupils’ reading experiences. In L. E. F. McKechnie, P. M. Rothbauer, K. Oterholm, & K. I. Skjerdingsstad (Eds.), *Plotting the Reading Experience – Theory/Practice/Politics* (pp. 301–316). Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Rafste, E. T. (2005). A place to learn or a place for leisure: Pupils’ use of the school library in Norway. *School Libraries World Wide*, 11(1), 1–16.
- Ross, C., McKechnie, L., & Rothbauer, P. (2005). *Reading matters: What the research reveals about reading, libraries and community*. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.
- Sassen, S. (1998). *Globalization and its discontents*. New York, NY: New Press.
- Small, R. V. (2002). Collaboration. *Teacher Librarian*, 29(5), 8.
- Small, R. V., & Snyder, J. (2009). The impact of New York’s school libraries on student achievement and motivation: Phase II, in-depth study. *School Library Media Research*, 12.
- Street, B. V. (1995). *Social literacies: Critical approaches to literacy in development, ethnography and education*. Routledge: London.
- Street, B. V. (2003). What’s “new” in New Literacy Studies? Critical approaches to literacy in theory and practice. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 5(2), 77–91.
- Street, B. V. (2005). *Literacies across educational contexts: Mediating learning and teaching*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishers.
- Sullivan, A., & Brown, M. (2015). Reading for pleasure and progress in vocabulary and mathematics. *British Educational Research Journal*, 41(6), 971–991. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/berj.3180>
- Thompson, G. L., & Allen, T. G. (2012). Four effects of the high-stakes testing movement on African American K-12 students. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 81(3), 218–227. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0042085907304947>
- Trainor, A. (2008). Why are so many minority students in special education? Understanding race and disability in schools. *Remedial & Special Education*, 29(1), 58–59. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0741932507309715>
- van der Kooij, K. S., & Pihl, J. (2009). Voices from the field negotiating literacy education in a multicultural setting. In H. Holmarsdottir & M. O’Dowd (Eds.), *Nordic voices. Teaching and*

J. PIHL ET AL.

*researching comparative and international education in the Nordic countries* (pp. 167–179).  
Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Vaught, S. E. (2011). *Racism, public schooling, and the entrenchment of white supremacy: A critical race ethnography*. New York, NY: SUNY Press.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind and society*. Boston, MA: M.I.T. Press.

Walford, G. (2013). Privatisation, education and social justice: Introduction. *Oxford Review of Education*, 39(4), 421–425. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2013.820464>

*Joron Pihl*

*Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, Norway*

*Tone Cecilie Carlsten*

*Nordic Institute for Studies in Innovation, Research and Education, Norway*

*Kristin Skinstad van der Kooij*

*Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, Norway*

BRIAN V. STREET

## 2. NEW LITERACY STUDIES IN EDUCATIONAL CONTEXTS

### INTRODUCTION

This anthology explores school and library partnership as sociocultural and intercultural practices and community building. A key component of this approach is the recognition of literacy as a social practice that involves exactly such social partnerships, rather than seeing literacy as an asocial skill. I will elaborate on literacy as social practices and point towards its application in the context of “School and library partnership”.

Rather than using the term literacy with a large *L* and a small *y*, in a general, technical sense as though it were “autonomous” of social context, I have argued it makes better sense educationally to name and define literacies in the plural, as *literacy practices* (Street, 2000). We need to look more closely at which literacy practices we are addressing, whether in school contexts or in libraries, where a variety of genres and texts are to be found. This approach to ethnographic and linguistic studies of literacy practices has been termed *New Literacy Studies* (more recently *Literacy as Social Practice*, LSP). I will unpack further what that means.

### NEW LITERACY STUDIES

New Literacy Studies (NLS) have proposed theoretical perspectives rooted in critical ethnography and culturally sensitive research, leading to programmes that are negotiated and participatory (Gee, 1991; Heath, 1983; Heath, Mangiola, Schecter, & Hull, 1991; Villegas & Baur, 1991). NLS consists of a series of writings about both research and practice that treat language and literacy as social practices rather than technical skills to be learned in formal education (Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Hamilton, Barton, & Ivanic, 1994; Gee, 1991; Street, 1984). The research requires language and literacy to be studied as they occur naturally in life, taking account of their different meanings for different cultural groups and the general context. The practice requires curriculum designers, teachers, and evaluators to take account of the variation in language meanings and uses that students bring from their home backgrounds to formal learning contexts such as the classroom. NLS, then, emphasizes the importance of culturally sensitive teaching (Villegas & Baur, 1991) in building upon students’ own knowledge and skills (Heath, 1983; Heath et al., 1991). Such research and practice are based upon new ideas about the nature of language and literacy and have in turn reinforced and



B. V. STREET

developed these ideas. A major tenet of this new thinking is the notion of *social literacies*.

### *Social Literacies*

This phrase (Street, 1995) refers to the nature of literacy as a social practice and to the plurality of literacies that this enables us to observe. That literacy is a social practice is an insight both banal and profound. It is banal, in the sense that once we think about it, it is obvious that literacy is always practised in social contexts; even the school, however, “artificial” it may be accused of being in its reading and writing teaching methods, is also a social construction. The site of learning (whether at school or within adult literacy programmes) has, like other contexts, its own social beliefs, and behaviours into which its particular literacy practices are inserted. The notion is also profound in that it leads to new ways of understanding and defining what counts as literacy, and has important implications for how we learn and teach reading and writing. If literacy is a social practice and it varies with social context then what is being learned is not the same, uniform concept in each case.

However, the view that literacy in itself has consequences irrespective of context has tended to dominate educational thinking, a view I have described as an *autonomous* model of literacy (Street, 1984). In contrast with this view, I have posed an *ideological* model of literacy, which argues that literacy not only varies with social context and with cultural norms and discourses (regarding, for instance, identity, gender, and belief) but that its uses and meanings are always embedded in relations of power. It is in this sense that literacy is always ideological – it always involves contests over meanings, definitions and boundaries, and struggles for control of the literacy agenda. For these reasons, it becomes harder to justify teaching only one particular form of literacy, whether in schools or in adult programmes, when the learners will already have been exposed to a variety of everyday literacy practices (Street, 2011). If literacy is seen simply as a universal technical skill, the same everywhere, then the particular form being taught in school comes to be treated as the only kind, the universal standard that naturalizes its socially specific features and disguises their real history and ideological justifications. If literacy is seen as a social practice, then that history and those features and justifications need to be spelt out, and students need to be able to discuss the basis for the choices being made in the kind of literacy they are learning.

The ideological model of literacy, then, offers a more culturally sensitive view of literacy practices as they vary from one context to another. It is about knowledge: the ways in which people address reading and writing are themselves rooted in conceptions of knowledge, identity, and being. It is also always embedded in social practices, such as those of a particular job market or a particular educational context and the effects of learning that particular literacy will be dependent on those particular contexts. Literacy, in this sense, is always contested; both its meanings and its practices, hence particular versions of it are

always ideological, in that they are always rooted in a particular worldview and in a desire for that view of literacy to dominate and to marginalize others (Gee, 1991; Besnier & Street, 1994). The argument about social literacies (Street, 1995) recognizes that the ways in which teachers or facilitators and their students interact is already a social practice that affects the nature of the literacy being learned and the ideas about literacy held by the participants, especially the new learners and their position in relations of power. It is not valid to suggest that literacy can be *given* neutrally and then its *social* effects only experienced afterwards.

### *Literacy Events and Literacy Practices*

It follows from this that researchers in NLS employing an ideological model of literacy would find it problematic to simply use the term literacy as their unit or object of study. If literacy comes already loaded with ideological and policy pre-suppositions, then it is difficult for learners and teachers alike to recognize the variety of literacies across contexts. So we have found it helpful to develop alternative terms. I have developed a working distinction between *literacy events* and *literacy practices* (Street, 1988) that I suggest is helpful for both research and in teaching situations. Barton (Hamilton, Barton, & Ivanic, 1994) notes that the term literacy events derived from the sociolinguistic idea of speech events. It was first used in relation to literacy by Anderson, Teale, and Estrada (1997), who defined it as an occasion during which a person “attempts to comprehend graphic signs” (Anderson, Teale, & Estrada, 1997). Shirley Brice Heath further characterized a literacy event as “any occasion in which a piece of writing is integral to the nature of the participants’ interactions and their interpretative processes” (Heath, 1983, p. 93). I have employed the phrase literacy practices (Street, 1984, p. 1) as a means of focusing upon “social practices and conceptions of reading and writing”. Later I elaborated the term to take into account both events in Heath’s sense and the social models of literacy that participants bring to bear upon those events, and that give meaning to them (Street, 1988). David Barton, in an introduction to his edited volume on *Writing in the Community* (Barton & Ivanic, 1991, p. 1) attempted to clarify these debates about literacy events and literacy practices and in a later collaborative study of everyday literacies in Lancaster, England, Barton and Hamilton begin their account with further refinements of the two phrases (1998, p. 6). Baynham (1995) entitled his book *Literacy Practices: Investigating Literacy in Social Contexts*. Similarly, Prinsloo and Breier’s volume on *The Social Uses of Literacy* (1996), which is a series of case studies of literacy in South Africa, used the concept of events. They extended it to practices, by describing the everyday uses and meanings of literacy amongst, for instance, urban taxi drivers, struggle activists in settlements, rural workers using diagrams to build carts and those involved in providing election materials for mainly non-literate voters. The concept of literacy practices in these and other contexts not only attempts to handle the events and the patterns of activity around literacy events but to *link* them to something broader of a cultural and social kind.

B. V. STREET

Recently, I have further elaborated the distinction with respect to work on literacies and multilingualism, in an article in an edited volume by Martin-Jones and Jones (Street, 2000). As part of that broadening, for instance, I noted that we bring to a literacy event concepts and social models regarding what the nature of the event is and makes it work, and give it meaning. Literacy practices, then, refer to the broader cultural conception of particular ways of thinking about and doing reading and writing in cultural contexts. One way of thinking about this is to see literacy events as something we can observe whilst literacy practices involve a deeper analysis of meanings; we can photograph or film events but not practices. A key issue, at both a methodological and an empirical level, then, is how we can characterize the shift from observing literacy events to conceptualizing literacy practices.

#### ETHNOGRAPHIC PERSPECTIVES

In contrast with the NLS approach, the dominant approaches to literacy in educational and in policy contexts can be characterized as universalist, making grand abstract claims about literacy and inequality whilst drawing upon evidence that may seem less general, rather rooted in the proponents' own cultural conceptions of what counts as literacy and inequality. This is a classic concern that ethnographers have with local but narrow meanings that are then generalized. The alternative social practice perspective is rooted in understanding what people are actually doing with reading and or writing in specific social contexts – and here an ethnographic perspective has proved very helpful. Rather than appealing to large statistical data sources where the methodological validity rests on what Mitchell (1984) terms *enumerative induction* based in representative sampling, an ethnographic perspective is founded on *analytic induction*:

The sophistication and elaboration for choosing a “representative” sample in this restricted sense have overshadowed the other kind of inference involved when analytical statements are made from associations uncovered in a statistical sample. This is the inference that the *theoretical* relationship among conceptually defined elements in the sample will also apply to the parent population. The basis of an inference of this sort is the cogency of the theoretical argument linking the elements in an intelligible way rather than the statistical representativeness of the sample: such inference is based on analytical induction rather than enumerative induction. It should be obvious that the inference from case studies is based on analytical induction. What the anthropologist using a case study to support an argument does is to ask how general principles deriving from some theoretical orientation manifest themselves in some given set of particular circumstances. A good case study, therefore, enables the analyst to establish theoretically valid connections between events and phenomena, which previously were ineluctable. From this point of view, the search for a “typical” case for analytical exposition is “likely to be less fruitful than a ‘telling case’”. (Mitchell, 1984, p. 240)

Ethnographic accounts of literacy can provide “telling cases” of what literacy means to different populations of users, focusing on the cultural and institutional locations of such meaning using analytic induction and avoiding the ethnocentrism involved in narrow, dominant approaches. The story of the Turtle and the Fish found on a Buddhist website poses this perspective in vivid metaphoric terms. To illustrate the error of ethnocentrism Buddhists relate the story of the turtle and the fish.

There was once a turtle, who lived in a lake with a group of fish. One day the turtle went for a walk on dry land. He was away from the lake for a few weeks. When he returned, he met some of the fish. The fish asked him, “Mister turtle, hello! How are you? We have not seen you for a few weeks. Where have you been? The turtle said, “I was up on the land, I have been spending some time on dry land”. The fish were a little puzzled, and they said, “Up on dry land? What are you talking about? What is this dry land? Is it wet?” The turtle said “No, it is not”, “Is it cool and refreshing?” “No, it is not”, “Does it have waves and ripples?” “No, it does not have waves and ripples”. “Can you swim in it?” “No, you can’t”. So, the fish said, “it is not wet, it is not cool, there are no waves, you can’t swim in it. So this dry land of yours must be completely non-existent, just an imaginary thing, nothing real at all”. The turtle said that “Well may be so”, and he left the fish and went for another walk on dry land”.

In another version, the fish said: “Don’t tell us what it isn’t, tell us what it is”. “I can’t,” said the turtle, “I don’t have any language to describe it”.

This is the version that can help us understand what is involved in ethnography. If we go to another place, our first inclination is to describe it in terms of what it does *not* have that we are used to: wetland, waves for the fish, maybe science, or coca cola for westerners travelling in the East. In terms of religion or race for Easterners travelling in Europe, or literacy for those from dominant “literate” cultures who might see the people they are observing as “illiterate”. An Ethnographic perspective shifts us out of this mindset and helps us firstly to imagine things that do not exist in our own world and then to understand them in their own terms rather than to see them, in our terms, just as “deficits”. Instead of labelling others as illiterate, we might look more closely for the reading and writing practices they are engaged in.

One contribution of an ethnographic perspective to the understanding of cultural variation in general and of literacy in particular, is that it can help us to “untie the (k)not” that arises from the tendency to describe the difference as somehow a deficit. Much educational policy with respect to literacy can be seen to precisely fall into the “not discourse” that the fish in the previous story are stuck within. Policy makers and educators from “literate” societies, see others’ practices as lacking “literacy” like the fish from their water. They ask, “Do they have x: water, waves, literacy?” and when their lenses prevent them from seeing what other people actually do have, they invoke the “not” – “illiteracy”. However, perhaps the learners do already have significant uses of reading and/or writing that are not

B. V. STREET

exactly like those the teachers bring with them. Perhaps as ethnographers have demonstrated around the world, the literacy practices of other cultures are simply different from those defined by some educators and statisticians (Aikman, 1999; Besnier & Street, 1994; Collins & Blot, 2003). In order to know whether this is the case, we need other lenses than those worn by dominant (usually but not always), western commentators. The turtle realized that there was a problem, and went off to look again. He began to consider what other experiences the people on land might be having, to use his imagination and, eventually, to develop a language of description for describing this to people back home. In the last twenty years ethnographers have indeed travelled to many parts of the world to look for different literacies and have come back with multiple rich descriptions (Hornberger, 2002; Kalman & Street, 2012; Nabi, Rogers, & Street, 2010; Prinsloo & Breier, 1996; Robinson-Pant, 2014; Street, 1995; Wagner, 2004, 2011). The language of description has been refined to cater for this rich data set – we talk of literacy events and literacy practices, of multiple literacies and of different “models” for conceptualizing the field – autonomous and ideological models for instance (Street, 1984). I would like just to pick up on the implications of this approach and these terms for how we conceptualize literacy in educational contexts and how learning and teaching policies might then be drawn out.

#### LEARNING IN AND OUT OF SCHOOL

Research in the field of Literacy as Social Practice (LSP) (Barton, Hamilton, & Ivanic, 2000; Pahl & Rowsell, 2006; Street, 1984, 2005) – a term that has to some extent replaced that of New Literacy Studies – has, then, addressed issues of how literacy is learned in many different contexts, of which school is only one. By engaging in reading and/or writing in different local contexts such as in communities and in workplaces, learners come to terms with a variety of issues that they are not necessarily conscious of learning explicitly. Alan Rogers, in the forthcoming *Encyclopaedia of Language and Education* (2016), writes that the current interest in lifelong learning has directed attention to *informal* learning – that learning that takes place throughout life *outside* of formal and non-formal educational and training programmes. In his paper, he examines three such fields of investigation: embedded learning, situated learning, and unconscious learning. This involves recognizing the social complexity and variation beyond the narrow view of learning in formal education that has dominated much policy. Rogers argues:

The image has been used many times of an iceberg of learning: What cannot be seen is not only larger but also more influential than what can be seen, for it supports and indeed determines what can be seen above the water line. But because it “takes place below the level of consciousness”, much of this informal learning is not recognized as “learning”. Learning is seen by many people to be what goes on in a structured programme of intentional learning,

#### NEW LITERACY STUDIES IN EDUCATIONAL CONTEXTS

i.e. formal learning. But much learning is unconscious, informal; some have spoken of the “invisible reality of informal learning”. (Rogers, 2016)

Rogers concludes:

Our role, then, as educators and researchers is to identify more of what lies beneath the water line and to build on that in helping participants develop and expand their literacy practices. (Rogers, 2016)

The LSP approach also picks up the recognition of the “invisible” features of learning, in that it recognizes that the development and use of literacy practices derive from such everyday “invisible reality”; what we have elsewhere referred to as *hidden literacies* (Nabi et al., 2010; Street, 2009).

Applying these ideas to the acquisition of literacies in and out of school, we can identify a number of ways in which reading and writing are acquired and used that have implications for how literacy is taught and, in terms of this volume, the role that literacy texts can play in people’s engagement with libraries.

#### APPLICATIONS TO EDUCATION

The next stage of work in this area has been to move beyond these theoretical critiques and to develop positive proposals for interventions in teaching, curriculum, measurement criteria, and teacher education in both the formal and informal sectors, based upon these principles. It will be at this stage that the theoretical perspectives brought together in the New Literacy Studies or in Literacy as Social Practice will face their sternest test, that of their practical applications to mainstream education. Hull and Schultz (2002) have been amongst the first researchers to directly apply insights from NLS to educational practice and policy. They build upon the foundational descriptions of out-of-school literacy events and practices developed within NLS, to return the gaze back to the relations between in and out of school, so that NLS is not conceptualized simply as “anti-school” or interested only in small scale or “local” literacies of resistance. They especially want to use the understandings of children’s emerging experiences with literacy in their own cultural milieus to address broader educational questions about learning of literacy and of switching between the literacy practices required in different contexts. Hull and Schultz

[a]re troubled by a tendency ... to build and reify a great divide between in school and out of school and that sometimes this dichotomy relegates all good things to out-of-school contexts and everything repressive to school. Sometimes it dismisses the engagement of children with non-school learning as merely frivolous or remedial or incidental. (Hull & Schultz, 2002, p. 3)

In contrast to this approach and drawing strongly on work in NLS, they argue for “overlap or complementarity or perhaps a respectful division of labour”. They cite Dewey’s argument that there is much we can learn about successful pedagogies

B. V. STREET

and curricula by foregrounding the relationship between formal education and ordinary life.

From the standpoint of the “child” he observed, the great waste in the school comes from his inability to utilize the experiences he gets outside of the school in any complete and free way within the school itself; while on the other hand, he is unable to apply in daily life what he is learning in school. (Dewey, 1998, p. 76)

But how are we to know about the experiences of the child outside of school? Many teachers express anxiety that the children in their classes may come from a wide variety of backgrounds, and it is impossible to know them all. Hull and Schultz (2002, p. 14) respond by invoking the work of researchers “who have made important contributions to understanding literacy learning through ethnographic or field-based studies in homes, community organizations and after-school programs”. Their edited volume consists of accounts of such research in a variety of settings. They are aware of the criticism of such approaches that might over-emphasize the local or even romanticize out-of-school contexts and aim instead to acknowledge the complexities, tensions, and opportunities that are found there. Nor is their aim to provide an exhaustive account of such contexts – teachers are right to argue that this cannot all be covered. Instead, they aim to provide us all, but especially those responsible for the education of children, with an understanding of the principles underlying such variation and with help in listening to and appreciating what it is that children bring from home and community experience. Indeed, the book consists of both articles about such experience and comments by teachers and teacher educators on their significance for learning. Here, then, NLS meets educational practice in ways that begin to fulfil the potential of the approach, but through dialogue rather than simply an imposition of researchers’ agendas on educators. And a similar trajectory might be identified in the present volume as researchers and practitioners explore the relationship between these approaches to literacy and the role and functions of the library. It is exactly through partnerships between those working in these contexts that learners – and indeed professional too – can enhance their literacy practices and develop the multiple practices necessary for moving across the contexts.

In an edited volume on *Literacies across Educational Contexts* (Street, 2005) a number of authors from a variety of international contexts likewise take on this challenge and attempt to follow through such practical applications of the NLS approach. As with Hull and Schultz’s work (2002), the authors are conscious of the links between theoretical debate and the work of teachers in school addressing literacy issues. The collection of case studies ranges from formal education, including elementary, secondary and higher education and informal sectors such as community associations, international development programs and workplace literacies. Across these educational contexts, the authors are concerned not just to apply the general principles of NLS but with offering practical critiques of its application that force us to refine the original conceptualization: that volume, like the present one, then, is intended to be not a static “application” of theory to

practice, but a dynamic dialogue between the two. In attempting to work through the implications of these approaches for different sectors of education, the authors find limitations and problems in some NLS approaches – such as the “limits of the local” in educational as well as theoretical terms – that require them to go back to the underpinning conceptual apparatus. Theory, as well as practice, is subject to the critical perspective being adopted there, and researchers and practitioners will have to either adapt or even reject parts of NLS as it engages with such new tasks.

Approaches to situated learning, when allied to those from situated literacy suggest that the banking model of education, as Paulo Freire termed it, is inappropriate especially in the multilingual, multicultural situations that characterize contemporary hybrid cultural contexts. A question that Baker, Street and Tomlin (2003) address is how far such a culturally sensitive approach can be applied to numeracy education: Can we talk of multiple numeracies and of numeracy events and practices as we do of literacy? Can we build upon cultural knowledge of number, measurement, approximation, etc. in the way that Hull and Schultz (2002) and those in the *Literacies across the Curriculum* volume believe we can do for cultural knowledge of literacies, scripts, languages? Again, the questions being raised by NLS, when applied to new fields such as this, will lead to critiques not only of current educational practice but also of the theoretical framework itself. As with the critiques by Brandt and Clinton (2002), Collins, etc., NLS will be forced to adapt and change. The validity and value of its original insights and their applications to practice will be tested according to whether they can meet this challenge. This is an issue that will arise as authors in the present volume address the issue of how NLS approaches relate to the interprofessional collaboration for literacy involved in work with librarians.

#### REFERENCES

- Aikman, S. (1999). *Intercultural education and literacy: An ethnographic study of indigenous knowledge and learning in the Peruvian Amazon* (Vol. 7). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/swll.7>
- Anderson, A. B., Teale, W. H., & Estrada, E. (1997). 24 Low-income children’s preschool literacy experiences: Some naturalistic observations. In M. Cole, Y. Engestrom, & O. Vasquez (Eds.), *Mind, culture, and activity: Seminal papers from the laboratory of comparative human cognition*, (pp. 313–329). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press..
- Baker, D., Street, B., & Tomlin, A. (2003). Mathematics as social: Understanding relationships between home and school numeracy practices. *For the learning of mathematics*, 23(3), 11–15.
- Barton, D., & Hamilton, M. (1998). *Local literacies: Reading and writing in one community*. London: Routledge. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203448885>
- Barton, D., & Ivanic, R. (2000). *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context*. London: Psychology Press.
- Barton, D., & Ivanic, R. (1991). *Writing in the community*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Baynham, M. (1995). *Literacy practices: Investigating literacy in social contexts*. London: Routledge.
- Besnier, N., & Street, B. (1994). Aspects of literacy. In T. Ingold (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of anthropology* (pp. 527–562). London: Routledge.
- Brandt, D., & Clinton, K. (2002). Limits of the local: Expanding perspectives on literacy as a social practice. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 34(3), 337–356. Retrieved from [http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15548430jlr3403\\_4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15548430jlr3403_4)



B. V. STREET

- Collins, J., & Blot, R. K. (2003). *Literacy and literacies: Texts, power, and identity* (No. 22). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486661>
- Dewey, J. (1998). *The school and society*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Gee, J. P. (1991). *Social linguistics: Ideology in discourses*. London: Falmer Press.
- Hamilton, M., Barton, D., & Ivanic, R. (1994). *Worlds of literacy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heath, S. B., Mangiola, L., Schecter, S. R., & Hull, G. A. (1991). *Children of promise: Literate activity in linguistically and culturally diverse classrooms*. Washington, DC: NEA Professional Library, National Education Association.
- Hornberger, N. (Ed.). (2002). *The continua of biliteracy: A framework for educational policy, research and practice in multiple settings*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Hull, G. A., & Schultz, K. (Eds.). (2002). *School's out: Bridging out-of-school literacies with classroom practice* (Vol. 60). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Kalman, J., & Street, B. V. (2012). *Literacy and numeracy in Latin America: Local perspectives and beyond*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Mitchell, J. C. (1984). Typicality and the case study. In R. Firth (Ed.), *Ethnographic research: A guide to general conduct* (pp. 238–241). London: Academic Press.
- Nabi, R., Rogers, A., & Street, B. (2010). *Hidden literacies: Ethnographic studies of literacy and numeracy practices in Pakistan*. Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk: Uppingham Press.
- Pahl, K., & Rowsell, J. (Eds.). (2006). *Travel notes from the new literacy studies: Instances of practice* (Vol. 4). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Prinsloo, M., & Breier, M. (1996). *The social uses of literacy: Theory and practice in contemporary South Africa*. Bertsham, South Africa: Sached Books.
- Robinson-Pant, A. R. (2014). *Literacy and education for sustainable development and women's empowerment*. Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning.
- Rogers, A. (2016). Informal learning and literacy. In B. Street (Ed), *Encyclopedia of language and education*. Springer. Manuscript in press.
- Street, B. V. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice* (Vol. 9). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Street, B. V. (1988). Literacy practices and literacy myths. In R. Saljo (Ed.), *The written word: Studies in literate thought and action* (Vol. 23, pp. 59–72). Berlin: Springer Berlin Heidelberg. Retrieved from [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-72877-8\\_4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-72877-8_4)
- Street, B. V. (1995). *Social literacies*. London: Longman.
- Street, B. V. (2000). Literacy events and literacy practices. In M. Martin-Jones & K. Jones (Eds.), *Multilingual literacies: Comparative perspectives on research and practice* (pp. 17–29). Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- Street, B. V. (2005). *Literacies across educational contexts: Mediating learning and teaching*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Pub.
- Street, B. V. (2009). Hidden features of academic paper writing. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 24(1), 1–17.
- Street, B. V. (2011). Literacy inequalities in theory and practice: The power to name and define. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 31(6), 580–586. doi:10.1016/j.ijedudev.2010.09.005
- Villegas, A. M., & Baur, J. (1991). *Culturally responsive teaching*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Wagner, D. A. (2004). Literacy(ies), culture(s), and development(s): The ethnographic challenge. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 39(2), 234–241. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.39.2.6>
- Wagner, D. A. (2011). What happened to literacy? Historical and conceptual perspectives on literacy in UNESCO. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 31(3), 319–323. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2010.11.015>

*Brian V. Street*  
*King's College London, UK*

JORON PIHL

### 3. CAN LIBRARY USE ENHANCE INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION?<sup>1</sup>

#### INTRODUCTION

What do we know about the use of library resources within education? To what extent does educational research and intercultural educational research, in particular, address teaching and learning based on the use of library resources? Can library use enhance intercultural education? These are the research questions addressed in this article. The focus is primarily on research and educational practice related to elementary education based on the use of library resources. I address these questions against a background of the considerable challenges faced by European schools in relation to providing qualifications for students regardless of social, linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

The European Commission undertook a consultation (a Green Paper) in 2008, the results of which were released in a report at the end of 2009. The key issues were:

- closing the achievement gap between migrant children and their peers
- accommodating increasing numbers of pupils with different mother tongues and cultural perspectives
- developing intercultural skills among children and young people in schools
- adapting teaching skills and building bridges with migrant families and communities
- preventing schools from becoming segregated
- improving equity in education (Jaurena, 2010).

Intercultural educational research explores these topics. The focus is on developing culturally sensitive teaching and teacher education, fostering educational reform that integrates cultural diversity and internationalization into the curriculum, and moving beyond cultural diversity towards social justice in education (Gundara, 2000a; Gundara & Portera, 2008; Jaurena, 2010; Schoorman & Bogoth, 2010; Pihl, 2009a; Pihl, 2009b). However, although intercultural education has been on the political and research agenda in the EU in the past 30 years, implementation of intercultural education within particular nation states is far from complete (Gundara, 2000b; Gundara & Portera, 2008). Systematic differences in literacy persist, depending on the students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds (OECD, 2010). Segregated educational provisions for students from minority backgrounds are a serious problem (Beratan, 2008; Harry & Clinger,

2006; Dyson & Gallannaugh, 2008) and provide challenges for educational research to identify and explore strategies for the complete achievement of educational aims. A theoretical assumption underlying the research questions in this article is that teaching based on the use of library resources has unrecognized potential for contributing to the realization of intercultural educational aims. This idea is explored in the following text.

#### METHODOLOGY

To what extent does educational research and intercultural educational research, in particular, address teaching and learning based on library resources? This question was addressed by searching for publications in international databases and for literary reviews of publications addressing education based on library resources. A successful search of databases requires a definition of the search terms. Two concepts are relevant to the research questions: *library* and *learning resource centre*. A library is a place in which literary, musical, artistic or reference materials (such as books, manuscripts, recordings or films) are kept for use but not for sale. Computers are generally integrated into libraries today. To what extent traditional school libraries have computers and other audio-visual media depends on priorities at government and school levels, and resources available at specific schools. For some years the concept of learning resource centre (LRC) has been in use. An LRC is a library, usually in an educational institution, that includes and encourages the use of audio-visual aids and other special materials for learning in addition to books and periodicals. Teaching of information literacy is at present associated with both school libraries and LRCs.

To complete this study, I searched for publications in the Educational Research Database for Pedagogy and Psychology (ERIC) to identify the quantity of publications that address the topics *library* or *learning resource centre*. Initially, no limits were defined in relation to this search, and the initial results included all publications, not only refereed publications. A targeted data search was subsequently limited to refereed publications in academic journals. All searches were related to elementary education, alternatively primary education/primary school. Searches were limited to the following concepts: school library, learning resource centre, library resources, literacy, information literacy, and intercultural education. No limits were defined with respect to the year of publication. Thus, all available publications in refereed academic journals that included these concepts in the ERIC database are included in the following overview. The ERIC database registers publications on the basis of concepts that researchers use in titles, abstracts and articles in academic journals. If researchers used other concepts when writing about library use in education, the publications fell outside the targeted search conducted in this study, and further investigation is needed to complement this investigation. However, I suggest that it is likely that the concepts I chose for searching the databases were present in many if not most publications on the use of library resources in elementary education. Thus, because the concepts are registered in ERIC, I consider that the results of the data search indicate the priority

#### CAN LIBRARY USE ENHANCE INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION?

that educational research accords to education based on library resources. Searches were also conducted in Library, Information Science & Technology Abstracts. The following analysis focuses mainly on the results of searches in the ERIC educational database. Analysis of the second research question is based on literature reviews and empirical studies of literacy education based on library resources, with a particular focus on literature-based literacy education. The focus is primarily on studies conducted in Europe.

#### TO WHAT EXTENT DOES EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ADDRESS LIBRARY USE IN EDUCATION?

The search in ERIC shows that although “library” and “learning resource centre” are used in publications in peer-reviewed academic journals, the library concept predominates at all educational levels. There are few publications on library and LRCs at primary school level. More publications address secondary education, but there are still relatively few publications. The number of publications increases significantly at college and university level. One interpretation relates to the lower importance attached to the use of library resources at primary school level compared with higher levels of education.

*Table 1. Publications in the ERIC database based on searches of educational level and library, or educational level and learning resource centre as of 20 December 2012*

<i>Educational level</i>	<i>Publications on “library”</i>	<i>Publications on “learning resource centre”</i>
Primary school	243	28
Secondary school	1429	352
College	12,530	992
University	14,397	661

Based on the search criteria specified above (publications in refereed academic journals related to elementary education), altogether 30,537 publications concerned “elementary education”. Within this context, only 89 publications addressed “school library”. No refereed publications in academic journals registered in ERIC addressed “intercultural education” and “school library” as of 18 January 2012. No publications addressed “intercultural education” and “library resources”. Only 24 publications were on “literacy education” and “school library”, and only seven publications were on “literacy education” and “learning resource centre”. The ERIC database included four publications that combined “teaching information literacy” and “school library”, and two publications that combined “teaching information literacy” and “learning resource centre”.

The results indicate that educational research addresses education based on the use of library resources to a very limited extent. By contrast, a search into the Library, Information Science & Technology Abstracts database found 13,004 refereed academic articles on “school library” and 699 publications on “learning

resource centre”. Altogether, 1172 publications concerned a combination of the concepts “school library” and “information literacy”, and 317 publications concerned a combination of “elementary education” and “school library” as of 21 January 2012. The results indicate that publications on library use within education are found primarily within library and information science.

*Table 2. Search concepts and publications in peer-reviewed journals registered in the ERIC database as of 21 January 2012*

<i>Search concepts in ERIC database</i>	<i>Publications</i>
intercultural education and library resources	0
intercultural education and school library	0
intercultural education and learning resource centre	0
literacy education and school library	24
literacy education and learning resource centre	7
teaching information literacy and school library	4
teaching information literacy and learning resource centre	2

The results of the search of the ERIC database concur with other investigations of the importance attached to library use in education and educational research. Bergvall and Edenholtm (2000) conducted a literature review of studies of how factors and actors influence the integration of the library in teaching in Sweden, Canada and the USA. They found that teachers and school leaders are often uninformed about what the library can offer and the competence of the librarian. According to Bergvall and Edenholtm (2000), school leaders are crucial to determining whether the library is integrated into teaching. Another element that plays a decisive role is the nature of the pedagogical work, whether it stimulates investigation and collaborative learning. The attitudes and role of the teacher and the attitudes and role of the librarian are also decisive to determining interprofessional collaboration.

Limberg (2003) reviewed the international literature on the pedagogical use of the school library. The review shows that there are surprisingly few studies with a particular focus on the role of the school library in the development of literacy among pupils and their reading of literature (Limberg, 2003). According to Limberg, the library has a particular potential for improving learning, but this potential is used only to a limited extent. Consistent with the findings of Bergvall and Edenholtm (2000), Limberg’s review showed that the pedagogical use of the library depends on the pedagogy of the particular teacher or school, media resources at the school library, the school library room, the librarian and the information system. These factors interact with the character of the pedagogical work, the assignments given to pupils, and the school and organizational culture. The interaction between these dimensions and systematic teacher-librarian collaboration enhances meaningful learning of high quality (Limberg, 2003). Rafste (2005) drew similar conclusions from a study of pedagogical use of the school library. She found that the typical pedagogical use of the school library is

#### CAN LIBRARY USE ENHANCE INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION?

for homework. There is little systematic collaboration between teachers and librarians in relation to educational planning and the use of literature or other library resources in teaching and learning (Rafste, 2005). A study of the school libraries in Norway provides an example (Barstad et al., 2007). The study documented a clear division between primary and lower secondary schools, and upper secondary schools regarding the personnel resources available, competence of school library personnel and school library opening hours. At 80% of upper secondary schools, the person in charge of the library normally has the library as his/her only assignment. By contrast, only 18% of the primary and lower secondary schools employed one person whose sole assignment was to manage the library. The average allocation of personnel resources at primary and lower secondary schools is only 5.4 hours per week compared with an average of 29 hours per week at upper secondary schools (Barstad et al., 2007). A low priority for library use in elementary education has also been reported in other European countries (McCutcheon, 2010; Streatfield, Shaper, Markless, & Rae-Scott, 2011). Education based on the use of resources in school libraries and LRCs is not generally prioritized in educational policy in terms of infrastructure, economic funding and curriculum guidelines. The relatively weak position of school libraries and LRCs in elementary education is reflected in the review of academic articles mentioned above. That is, there are few educational research publications related to the use of library resources in elementary education. The results indicated that this is also true for intercultural educational research.

#### DOES LIBRARY USE ENHANCE INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION?

The major objectives of intercultural education are to achieve successful qualification of students in the language of instruction regardless of their cultural and socio-economic background or minority status, multilingual development, intercultural understanding and inclusive education. Literacy development is fundamental to realizing these aims:

Literacy is the ability to identify, understand, interpret, create, communicate, compute and use printed and written materials associated with varying contexts. Literacy involves a continuum of learning to enable an individual to achieve his or her goals, to develop his or her knowledge and potential, and to participate fully in the wider society. (UNESCO, 2004, p. 13)

Literacy education in the language of instruction is a great challenge in schools with multilingual students. Research on the development of literacy emphasizes the importance of the content of reading; that schools and students have access to a broad and varied body of authentic texts suitable for pupils with different interests and needs, and for pupils from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds and different literacy contexts (Dressman, 1997; Elley, 1991, 1992; Gambrell, 1996; Martin-Jones & Jones, 2000). Research documents the importance for reading engagement of pupils being free to choose what they want to read (Donham, 1998; Pihl, 2011) and those with poor reading ability being offered meaningful texts. The

importance of meaningful texts cannot be overestimated. This is important for all pupils and particularly in an intercultural context (Gundara, 2000a; Nieto, 2008). Children who are fascinated by what they read tend to become engaged readers, which is crucial to the development of literacy. PISA assessment of literacy shows that students who are engaged readers in their spare time but of low socio-economic status perform better than students of higher socio-economic status who are not engaged readers (Roe, 2011).

In the following, I discuss education in different countries where teaching is based on giving students extensive access to literature and other library resources, and the potential contributions to intercultural education (Elley, 1991, 1992; Morrow et al., 1997; Pihl, 2011; van der Kooij & Pihl, 2009). Elley (1991) reviewed “book flooding” programmes in the language of instruction in nine countries and found that linguistic minority pupils in these programmes learned the second language better and more rapidly than did pupils who were taught the second language by traditional methods. By contrast, an international study conducted in 32 countries showed that reading many textbooks has no positive effect on the development of literacy (Elley, 1992).

In Sweden, a successful project was developed in an elementary school, in which teaching in all subjects except math was based on the reading of fiction. Interprofessional collaboration between librarians and teachers, and institutional collaboration between the public library and the school library were central to the project. The project was developed in a poor suburb at the outskirts of Stockholm with a predominantly immigrant population. The project class had 24 pupils from a bilingual or multilingual background. The following first languages were represented in the class: Turkish, Somali, Arabic, Tigrinya, Spanish, Farsi, Urdu, Bengali, Tagalog, Vietnamese, Thai, and Serb. The educational approach was to develop literacy based on stimulation of joy of reading based on the reading of fiction and “flooding the classroom” with books. The assumption was that reading and work involving quality fiction engages the whole child by involving intellectual and linguistic capacities, emotions, fantasy and empathy. Even more important, given the nature of fiction, reading contributes to the acquisition of cultural capital in a broad sense. The literature was in Swedish. At the same time, priority was given to provide parallel books in the mother tongue of the pupils. Based on extensive work with fiction in teaching and extensive collaboration between the school and the public library, and between the teacher and school librarian, at the end of the project, the pupils scored above average in comprehension of Swedish words, reading in Swedish and math. A key pedagogical focus in the project was on the content of reading, which was given priority over form (Axelsson, 2000).

A similar project was recently conducted in Norway (2007–2011). The aim of the research and development project was literature-based literacy education and use of the library as a learning arena (Pihl, 2011). The Multiplicity project involved collaboration between teachers, librarians and researchers, and between schools, school libraries and the public library. One participating elementary school had 75% of linguistic minority students, and the other school had 11% linguistic

minority students. The literacy project generated reading engagement and extensive use of the school library and public library among both first- and second-language learners (Pihl, 2009, 2011). The students became ardent users of library resources to fulfil personal and educational needs, in and out of school. About 75% of the pupils became engaged readers in the language of instruction, irrespective of their first language. At the school with 75% linguistic minority students, 90% used the public library branch once a week or more for reading, borrowing books and for social purposes after participating in the project. Essential to the project was provision for non-segregated literacy education (van der Kooij & Pihl, 2009), extensive access to library resources in both the language of instruction and minority languages, voluntary reading at school and integrated pedagogical work with literature and information literacy (Bueie & Pihl, 2012). The major findings were that interprofessional collaboration between teachers and librarians facilitated inclusive literacy education and information literacy, the latter of which was integrated into literacy education and content learning. Education based on use of library resources and interprofessional collaboration required a learning process among teachers, librarians and school principals. The study documented the educational benefits of literature-based education and library use in terms of reading engagement regardless of the students' linguistic and socio-economic backgrounds (Tonne & Pihl, 2012), information literacy and inclusive education in an intercultural context. The project highlighted some important pedagogical preconditions for successful educational use of library resources in literacy education: collaborative teaching and school environments, support by institutional leaders, systematic collaboration between teachers and librarians related to planning and implementation, a well-developed and fully staffed school library, and collaboration between the school and public library. These factors are consistent with the findings of several other studies (Codispoti & Hickey, 2007; Kurttila-Matero, Huotari, & Kortelainen, 2010; Montiel-Overall, 2007; Rafste, 2005; Streatfield et al., 2011; Vaagan, 2004; Virkus, 2003).

#### DISCUSSION

The studies presented above suggest that the pedagogical use of library resources enhance intercultural education along several dimensions by encouraging the following:

- non-segregated educational programmes;
- reading engagement in the language of instruction among first- and second language learners that exceeds that obtained within traditional teaching and learning;
- multilingual literacy development based on minority students' reading of literature in their first language;
- information literacy integrated into content learning in school subjects;
- empowerment of learners as library users to pursue individual and educational needs and purposes in and out of school;



- student access to cultural capital based on intercultural teaching of diverse literature in the arts, social sciences and natural sciences.

However, such enhancements are related to changes in pedagogical priorities and professional and institutional development in schools. If students from low socio-economic backgrounds, students of colour or other minorities have poor educational achievements, theories of cultural deprivation tend to explain this with reference to family or ethnic background or the cognitive capacities of the individual child (Coleman, 1979; Herrnstein & Murray, 1994). However, the results of studies of content learning based on fiction and other library resources from an intercultural perspective may undermine theories of cultural deprivation. Many of the projects described above found that in literacy programmes based on extensive use of library resources, disadvantaged students develop reading engagement and literacy to a level higher than that achieved in traditional educational programmes, a finding that contradicts theories of cultural deprivation. I propose that education based on the use of library resources may enhance the quality of teaching in classrooms with students from diverse backgrounds and may thus help achieve intercultural aims. To do so requires that the quality of teaching moves beyond teaching of basic literacy and information skills to development of cultural and information literacy. This may, in turn, reduce the digital divide between students who have and do not have access to cultural capital, computers and the Internet at home (Streatfield et al., 2011; Virkus, 2003).

Today, diversity in the student population is juxtaposed with standardized qualification requirements and competition. Teachers are held accountable for the performance of their students. At the same time, they are expected to meet the educational needs of all children through didactic measures, which include differentiating and adjusting the content to an individual child's needs (Ainscow, 2004; Allan, 2003; Flem & Keller, 2000). However, it is almost impossible to differentiate and adjust teaching to meet the needs of individual children in a class with 25–30 pupils, especially when this is expected of teachers in every school subject. The textbook, which still has a strong position within teaching, only matches the qualifications and needs of some students in any given class. At this point, the library constitutes a potential resource for teaching because it can provide differentiated learning. Instead of the teacher making tremendous efforts to differentiate a given content defined by the textbook or the curriculum, the teacher can provide students with diversity in content reading and learning along several dimensions: language (multilingual literature), complexity, genres, topics, cultural perspectives etc. Library resources have the potential to meet the intellectual, emotional and artistic needs and interests of diverse students provided that the teachers and the pupils know how to make use of these resources. At this point, collaboration between teachers and librarians becomes vital, but studies indicate that one of the great challenges in schools is to develop systematic collaboration between teachers and librarians.

Dressman (1997, p. 291) criticized teaching based on “tracked” reading in which pupils are denied access to texts beyond their supposed “grade level” or “reading level”. This routinely restricts students’ reading to texts that are often of

low literary quality and little interest to the students, which may not motivate the student toward further reading. The library resources represent an alternative by offering a wide range of authentic and interesting texts at all levels and in all genres. The idea that literacy development takes place through social interaction and engagement with texts that are more complex than the supposed literacy level of the reader is substantiated by theories of language and literacy development and collaborative learning, notably those of Bakhtin (1986, 1981) and Vygotsky (1962, 1978). In many Western countries, poverty, social fragmentation and discrimination of immigrant minorities constitute social problems that undermine democratic participation. Young people, notably the white poor and immigrant minorities, struggle with experiences of exclusion and marginalization (Balibar, 2003, 2007; Gundara, 2000a). Having access to information and knowledge is vital to democratic participation (Schilssler et al., 2005; Soysal, 1994). The school and public library provide access to both. These are invaluable assets, particularly to the poor, who otherwise may be excluded from access to information literacy, books, newspapers, music and other services.

#### CONCLUSION

This study indicates that education based on library resources is an under-researched topic within intercultural educational research. Empirical studies show that library use can enhance intercultural education. Use of library resources can help provide non-segregated education. Literacy education based on students' voluntary reading of fiction and work with other library resources can make significant contributions to reading engagement, acquisition of linguistic and cultural capital among first and second language learners and development of multilingual literacy and information literacy. Library use has a potential for empowering students to use libraries for educational, personal and social purposes on their own initiative in and out of school.

These are important contributions to the realization of educational aims within intercultural education.

However, studies show that successful teaching and learning based on library use depends on institutional and professional change. Schools would benefit from developing school libraries or learning resource centres which are responsive to a diverse student population and the students' use of the internet and other media. Teachers and school leaders need to learn how to integrate the use of library resources into teaching and learning at all levels. They need to learn how to collaborate with librarians. These are challenges to intercultural educational research as well as teacher education and educational policy.

Further educational studies are required in order to further explore the potential of library use to enhance intercultural education in the twenty-first century. Qualitative and quantitative studies are needed at national, European and international levels. Furthermore, studies of interprofessional collaboration between teachers and school librarians/media specialists are needed from an educational perspective. This may in turn influence educational policy, to the effect

that education based on library use becomes fundamental within teacher education as well as primary and secondary education.

#### NOTE

- <sup>1</sup> This chapter is a reprint with permission of Pihl, J. (2012). Can library use enhance intercultural education? *Issues in Educational Research* (Special Issue in Intercultural and Critical Education), 22(1), 79–90.

#### REFERENCES

- Ainscow, M., Booth, T., & Dyson, A. (2004). Understanding and developing inclusive practices in schools: A collaborative action research network. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 8(2), 125–139. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1360311032000158015>
- Allan, J. (Ed.). (2003). *Inclusion, participation and democracy: What is the purpose?* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Axelsson, M. (2000). Framgång för al: Från at inte kunna til at inte kunna låta bli att läsa [Development for all: From not reading to not being able to stop reading]. In H. Åhl (Ed.), *Svenskan i tiden – verklighet och visioner* (pp. 8–35). Stockholm: Nationelt Centrum, HLS Förlag.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (Ed.). (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Balibar, E. (2003). *We, the people of Europe? Reflections on transnational citizenship*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8675.2007.00422.x>
- Balibar, E. (2007). Uprising in the Banlieues. *Constellations*, 14(1), 47–71.
- Barstad, J., Audunson, R., Hjortsæter, E., & Østlie, B. (2007). *Skulebiblioteket i Noreg kartlegging av skulebiblioteket i grunnskule og vidaregåande skule* [The school library in Norway. A review of the school library in primary and secondary school]. Volda: Høgskolen i Volda.
- Beratan, G. D. (2008). The song remains the same: Transposition and the disproportionate representation of minority students in special education. *Race, Ethnicity & Education*, 11, 337–354. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13613320802478820>
- Bergvall, P., & Edénholm, S. (2000). *Skolbibliotekets vara eller icke vara i undervisningen: En litteraturstudie att identifiera olika lärar-bibliotekarie- och skolledarrelaterade faktorer som påverkar skolbibliotekens integrering i undervisningen* [The school library – to be or not to be: A literature review]. Borås: Högskolan i Borås.
- Bucie, A., & Pihl, J. (2012). Litteraturbasert undervisning og digital publisering [Literature based education and digital publication]. In J. Smidt, E. S. Tønnesen, & B. Aamotsbakken (Eds.), *Tekst og tegn* (pp. 197–217). Trondheim: Tapir Akademisk Forlag.
- Codispoti, M., & Hickey, M. G. (2007). Teachers and librarians collaborate! Teaching about Hispanic culture. *Social Studies and the Young Learner*, 9(14), 21–24.
- Coleman, J. S. (1979). *Equality of educational opportunity*. New York, NY: Arno.
- Donham, J. (1998). *Enhancing teaching and learning: A leadership guide for school library media specialists*. London: Neal-Schuman Publishers, Inc.
- Dressman, M. (1997). Congruence, resistance, liminality: Reading and ideology in three school libraries. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 27(3), 267–315. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03626784.1997.11075493>
- Dyson, A., & Gallannaugh, F. (2008). Disproportionality in special needs education in England. *Journal of Special Education*, 42(1), 36–46. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022466907313607>
- Elley, W. B. (1991). Acquiring literacy in a second language: The effect of book-based programs. *Language and Learning*, 41(3), 375–411. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1991.tb00611.x>

## CAN LIBRARY USE ENHANCE INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION?

- Elley, W. B. (1992). *How in the world do students read?* Hamburg: The International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.
- Flem, A., & Keller, C. (2000). Inclusion in Norway: A study of ideology in practice. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 15(2), 188–205. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/088562500361619>
- Gambrell, L. B. (1996). Creating classroom cultures that foster reading motivation. *The Reading Teacher*, 50(1), 15–15.
- Gundara, J. S. (2000a). *Interculturalism, education and inclusion*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Gundara, J. S. (Ed.). (2000b). *Intercultural Europe: Diversity and social policy*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Gundara, J. S., & Portera, A. (2008). Theoretical reflections on intercultural education. *Intercultural Education*, 6(19), 463–468. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14675980802568244>
- Harry, B., & Klinger, J. (2006). *Why are so many minority students in special education?: Understanding disability and race in schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Herrnstein, R. J., & Murray, C. (1994). *The Bell curve intelligence and class structure in American life*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Jaurena, I. G. (2010). Cultural diversity in compulsory education: An overview of the context of Madrid (Spain). *Intercultural Education*, 21(4), 299–315. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2010.506022>
- Kurttila-Matero, E., Huotari, M.-L., & Kortelainen, T. (2010). Conceptions of teaching and learning in the context of a school library project: Preliminary findings and a follow-up study. *International Journal of Libraries & Information Services*, 60(3), 203–217. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/libr.2010.018>
- Limberg, L. (2003). *Skolbibliotekts pedagogiska roll: En kunnskapsöversikt* [The educational role of the school library: A literature review]. Stockholm: Skolverket.
- Martin-Jones, M., & Jones, K. (Eds.). (2000). *Multilingual literacies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- McCutcheon, S. (2010). School libraries in Istanbul, Turkey. *Information World*, 11(2), 459–470.
- Montiel-Overall, P. (2007). Research on teacher and librarian collaboration: An examination of underlying structures of models. *Library and Information Science Research*, 29, 277–292. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2007.04.006>
- Morrow, L. M., Pressley, M., Smith, J. K., & Smith, M. (1997). The effect of a literature-based program integrated into literacy and science instruction with children from diverse backgrounds. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 32(1), 54–76. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.32.1.4>
- Nieto, S. (2008). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. New York, NY: Longman.
- OECD. (2010). *Closing the gap for immigrant students: Policies, practice and performance*. Paris: OECD. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264075788-en>
- Pihl, J. (2009a). Ethno-nationalism and education. In S. Alghasi, T. H. Eriksen, & H. Ghoraschi (Eds.), *Paradoxes of cultural recognition perspectives from Northern Europe* (pp. 11–133). Farnham: Ashgate.
- Pihl, J. (2009b). Interprofessional cooperation between teachers and librarians: Analysing theoretical and professional arguments for cooperation in an era of globalization. In M. O' Dowd & H. Holmarsdottir (Eds.), *Nordic voices: Teaching and researching comparative and international education in the nordic countries* (pp. 41–59). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Pihl, J. (2011). Literacy education and interprofessional collaboration. *Professions and Professionalism*, 1(1), 52–66.
- Rafste, E. T. (2005). A place to learn or a place for leisure: Pupils' use of the school library in Norway. *School Libraries Worldwide*, 11(1), 1–16.
- Roe, A. (2011). *Lesedikdaktikk: Etter den første leseopplæringen* (2. utgave) [Literacy didactic: After primary literacy instruction (2nd ed.)]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Schilssler, S., Siegfried, H., Schilssler, H., & Soysal, Y. N. (Eds.). (2005). *The nation, Europe and the world: Textbooks and curricula in transition*. New York, NY: Berghahn Books.

J. PIHL

- Schoorman, D., & Bogoth, I. (2010). Moving beyond “diversity” to “social justice”: The challenge to re-conceptualize multicultural education. *Intercultural Education*, 21(1), 79–85. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14675980903491916>
- Soysal, Y. (1994). *Limits of citizenship migrants and postnational membership in Europe*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Streatfield, D., Shaper, S., Markless, S., & Rae-Scott, S. (2011). Information literacy in United Kingdom schools: Evolution, current state and prospects. *Journal of Information Literacy*, 5(2), 5–25. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.11645/5.2.1629>
- Tonne, I., & Pihl, J. (2012). Literacy education, reading engagement and library use in multilingual classes. *Intercultural Education*, 23(3), 183–194. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2012.701424>
- UNESCO. (2004). *The plurality of literacy and its implications for policies and programme. UNESCO education sector position paper*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Vaagan, R. (2004). Developing the multicultural school library: Vahl Primary School, Oslo. *New Library World*, 105(9/10), 337. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/03074800410557295>
- van der Kooij, K. S., & Pihl, J. (2009). Voices from the field: Negotiating literacy education in a multicultural setting. In H. Holmarsdottir & M. O’Dowd (Eds.), *Nordic voices: Teaching and researching comparative and international education in the Nordic countries* (pp. 167–179). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Virkus, S. (2003). Information literacy in Europe: A literature review. *Information Research*, 8(4).
- Vygotsky, L. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/11193-000>
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind and society*. Boston, MA: M.I.T. Press.

*Joron Pihl*  
*Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, Norway*

HELEN AVERY

## 4. A LIBRARY AND SCHOOL NETWORK IN SWEDEN

### *Social Literacies and Popular Education*

#### INTRODUCTION

The topic of this article is the Commons, an integrated school and public library network in an urban multi-ethnic neighbourhood in southern Sweden. In 2011, the Commons network was awarded a national prize as the best school library in Sweden for its outstanding collaboration with the teachers and its exemplary work in stimulating learning. The study explores ways this library – school partnership contributes to the development of literacy and democratic competencies, allowing children to become active members of their local community.

In Sweden, school libraries fall under the provisions of the general Library Act (SFS 2013:801), which states that the primary mandate of libraries is to work for the development of a democratic society by contributing to knowledge transmission and freedom of opinion. Libraries should be accessible to all. The law further stresses that people with disabilities, national minorities, and people with mother tongues other than Swedish constitute prioritized groups that should be devoted special attention, for instance through access to literature in different languages. Finally, libraries are required by the Library Act to collaborate to give everybody access to the collective library resources available in the country. Considering the specific missions that libraries have, the latest changes in the Education Act (SFS 2010:800), stipulating that all schoolchildren should have access to a school library, also indirectly widen pedagogical approaches within schools.

School libraries play an important role in mediating information and teaching information literacy (Alexandersson & Limberg, 2012). This role was expressed in the preparatory work for the new law on school libraries, while the Swedish national curriculum Lgr11 underlines that

the working environment in the school is organized such that pupils have access to guidance, teaching material of high quality, as well as other assistance in order to be able to independently search for and acquire knowledge through such means as libraries, computers, and other learning aids. (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2011, p. 20)

In Sweden, libraries have historically been a driving force in the broad movement of popular education, and in this article, I will devote particular attention to the ways in which popular education pedagogies, and libraries, in particular, can

H. AVERY

address the contemporary challenges of an increasingly heterogeneous society. Popular education in a Swedish context concerns the efforts of individuals and groups

[t]o create their own knowledge and shape their own paths of education. The aims are said to be that by developing their own abilities, people shape the conditions to go out and make changes and improve society in a democratic direction. Building up preparedness for action is part of the aims of studies and learning. (Klasson, 1997, pp. 13–14, my translation)

Historically, the popular education movements played a central role in Sweden's development into a welfare society with democratic institutions. These movements also largely contributed to a lifelong learning approach to education. Today, popular education organizations are still publicly subsidized, while the pedagogical approaches remain visible in formal education aims, with a focus on democracy and democratic capabilities perceptible alongside the more recent market-oriented educational paradigms (Laginder, Nordvall, & Crowther, 2013).

#### METHODOLOGY

The Commons integrated library network consists of a public library branch and the five school libraries in the neighbourhood. I undertook a follow-up study of the network in the winter and spring of 2015, based on an earlier ethnographic study in May 2012 (Avery, 2013). The follow-up study of 2015 aimed to gain a clearer picture of how various elements in the library's pedagogical strategy interconnect and combine to strengthen the neighbourhood as a community.

The Commons library network and the local secondary school have won several national awards for the quality of the library-school collaboration and the highly integrated manner of working. In this case, the same core team of professional librarians works with school and out-of-school activities. While popular education traditions and a democratic mandate are features that characterize Swedish libraries more generally, this case is interesting to investigate as an example of the expanded potentials of library and school collaborative practices when combined with a community-oriented approach (Chelliah, 2014).

Examining library practices poses particular challenges to the use of ethnographic methods of observation because the practices are both place-transcending and situated (Carlsson, Hanell, & Lindh, 2013). This is why I combined observation and interviews, as well as analysis of local policies and working documents used by schools and libraries in the neighbourhood. Drawing on Stake (1995), this article attempts to provide a holistic view of the significant dimensions observed in the material. Although a set of issues was used as a starting point, the analysis is explorative, following these questions as they evolve in the process, rather than imposing a fixed grid of interpretation. Alongside the library network, this study has also involved the leisure time centres of the neighbourhood, with which the network collaborates closely. Leisure time centres in Sweden are a form of education that is governed by the national curriculum, and the centres are

staffed by educators who obtain their qualifications from schools of education, on programmes run in parallel to the teacher programmes. At the same time, the centres are a non-compulsory form of education, with greater freedom to attend to the needs of the individual, and which like libraries constitute part of the out-of-school contexts for children's activities.

In the earlier study (Avery, 2013), semi-structured in-depth interviews had been conducted with two librarians and three leisure time centre leaders, supplemented by observations and an analysis of local action plans. In the winter and spring of 2015, I conducted a new set of observations at the neighbourhood centre, along with semi-structured follow-up interviews with leisure time centre staff and librarians. I visited the neighbourhood on five different occasions in the January-May period, choosing different weekdays and times of day, and made field notes during the study; each visit lasted approximately two hours. I talked with library users of different ages (Aabø & Audunson, 2012) to gain a clearer perception of some of the roles that the library played in the neighbourhood. I also had informal conversations with young people involved in the local grassroots movement "Do not touch the citizens' park", which protested against plans to construct housing blocks in the schoolyard and in the small park adjacent to one of the leisure time centres. Conversations with these young people took place in the context of the protest actions that they staged.

In addition to interviews and observations, I studied local press archives covering the neighbourhood for the 2000–2015 period. Theories about social (Street, chapter two in this volume) and multilingual literacies (Molle, Sato, Boals, & Hedgspeth, 2015; Pihl, 2012) inform the analysis of the findings, while reflections are also made in relation to popular education pedagogy (Klasson, 1996; Laginder, Nordvall, & Crowther, 2013).

#### SOCIAL LITERACIES AND POPULAR EDUCATION IN SWEDEN

The concept of *social literacies* places literacy practices in the wider social, cultural and political context, from which situated practices take their significance for the people concerned. The concept encompasses an aspiration to support agency and empowerment. Rather than looking for aspects of these practices that correspond to predefined norms, the approach is open and explorative. By being open to multiple ways of using and practising literacy, social literacies also appear particularly useful as a framework to reflect on ethnically diverse and rapidly changing societies. Street (chapter two in this volume) argues that:

Approaches to *situated learning*, when allied to those from situated literacy suggest that the banking model of education, as Paulo Freire termed it, is inappropriate especially in the multilingual, multicultural situations that characterize contemporary hybrid cultural contexts.

Popular education in Sweden is also close to the emancipatory thoughts of Freirean pedagogy. Historically, popular education pedagogy emerged from early social movements. From the outset, it has aimed to create a democratic society through



citizen education and by supporting self-development in relation to a variety of purposes. Besides the growing workers' movement, this comprised the suffragettes, the temperance movement, Christian churches, farming associations and more specific movements, such as health and gymnastics associations or anti-war groups. In the Swedish context of the early social movements, citizenship was not perceived as passively performing the civic duties of the obedient citizen, but rather as taking active responsibility for the functioning of society, as well as contributing to social transformation and development. Self-improvement in this historical context is not understood as an individualistic endeavour, but rather as an understanding of learning that is based on the individual's own needs and interests, and which can be managed by the people themselves.

Popular education can take the form of individual studies, or collaborative learning in the form of so-called study circles (Gougoulakis & Christie, 2012). In study circles, a group of participants decides to learn more about a subject they define themselves, and meet on a regular basis to exchange thoughts and discuss readings on this subject. People's high schools (*folkhögskolor*) were historically important as libraries, as training centres for leaders and as education providers. Today, these education centres still offer upper-secondary-level programmes, as well as a very wide range of post-secondary education, and cultural or community-oriented activities. They have highly diversified orientations, and several of the people's high schools offer platforms for projects run by Swedes with an immigrant background. Popular education has, until today, been a part of the people's mobilization (Street, chapter two in this volume), aiming towards cultural or social change, building on the free pursuit of knowledge and frequently displaying a collectivistic orientation. However, while much of the literature emphasizes the empowering role, Dahlstedt, Ålund and Ålund (2010) point to contradictions in how the Swedish system and a specifically Swedish understanding of participatory democracy position immigrants. The traditional popular education umbrella organizations (*studieförbund*) control the subsidies for immigrant associations, but give little opportunity for them to express differences, or to work for social and economic rights.

Libraries in Sweden were a local environment in which many of the social movements that made Sweden into a welfare state emerged (Gougoulakis & Christie, 2012). The social movements of the time created their own libraries (see, for instance, Thorsson & Viklund, 2006), and used library work as an important component of their activities. Library work thus assumed a special significance as part of movements for social changes, which were eventually successful.

The social commitment of the libraries was expressed in the materials the libraries contained, including self-produced materials made by the organizations or by individuals. These libraries thus generated not only readers but also writers (Zetterlund, 1997). The libraries played a role in a pedagogical sense as a shared place devoted to adult learning and discussion where study circles took place, but also allowing the development of learner-driven and self-directed pedagogies more generally. They searched for relevant technical materials and adapted them to the study groups, as well as distributing the self-produced literature, manuals,

databases and textbooks. These libraries were frequently practice-oriented and provided technological information for agriculture, crafts, homemaking and various professions. The strong emphasis on practice-oriented aspects of education in a lifelong learning perspective remained a characteristic of Swedish education until recently, as have the traditions of participatory democracy. The people's libraries were separated from the study movements of the popular education organizations towards the end of the 1940s (Klasson, 1997). Compared with the early days, libraries' official role as a vehicle of popular education has been gradually watered down and has been replaced today by notions of cultural policy.

Klasson (1996) argues that librarians' work can be understood through three overarching models: *guardianship*, *market*, and *dialogue*. In the first model, the librarian defends some kind of societal values or mandate and functions as an authority in relationship to library users. In the market model, the librarian offers services and passively responds to users' requests. The dialogue model instead implies active collaboration, where users not only participate in the library's activities but also participate in developing library practices and setting agendas. This kind of close collaboration also supposes that the value base of both librarians and users is visible, and value issues are not avoided. Klasson makes a further distinction between libraries that mobilize and those that adapt. Mobilization is active library work with the aim of providing resources for cultural emancipation, for learning that leads to change and knowledge that results in action. By contrast, adaption instead tends towards compliance with dominating cultures and striving towards consensus.

#### THE COMMONS INTEGRATED LIBRARY NETWORK

The library network consists of a public library neighbourhood branch, five school libraries, and two preschool libraries. The public library branch also serves as a school library for the lower secondary school. The team consists of four professional librarians, a library assistant, and a teacher-librarian who works exclusively at one of the schools, but attends the network meetings. One of the professional librarians only works at the public library, while the three others share their time between the public library, the schools, the preschools and the various outreach activities of the network. Educators have the main responsibility for the preschool libraries, and teacher librarians take care of the primary school libraries alongside the librarians from the network. The network is fully integrated. This means that the public and school libraries of the neighbourhood are organized as a combined entity, from the point of view of organization, resources and staffing. The main library premises are located at the neighbourhood branch, while additional premises and books are found at the different primary schools, preschools, leisure time centres and other locations across the neighbourhood. In the following, the term "branch" will be used for the physical premises of the public/school library in the building where the secondary school is located, while the terms "network" and "librarians" will be used for the core team of professional librarians.

H. AVERY

An important characteristic of the library network is the community-oriented approach (Chelliah, 2014), and the strategies, therefore, need to be seen in the context of the local community. Key features of the library's work include: school and library collaboration; emphasis on physical accessibility and proximity; building personal relationships and trust over time (Vårheim, 2014); supporting collective projects in the local public space; supporting literacy in every language; working multimodally; and strong local connections combined with national and global networking (Avery, 2013).

The library branch premises are small and homelike: two cosy rooms and a small office with a door that is usually open. The homelike atmosphere is accentuated by the fact that when the children get older, they are invited to have tea with the librarians. One of the rooms is primarily for adults and children, while the other is mainly for schoolchildren. However, both rooms are open to the public except when the children are working on special projects. The architecture also facilitates communication and collaboration. One of the leisure time centres is just down the corridor and school administrators work in the adjacent offices.

Collaboration with the secondary school's head teacher or with the leader of the leisure time centre is never more than a few steps away; communication is informal, face-to-face and friendly. The three entities (school, library and leisure time centre) form a cultural centre, which is jointly responsible for elaborating strategies. The library additionally collaborates with virtually every group and administration that exists in the area, ranging from midwives to the police. Important platforms for local collaboration are neighbourhood networks such as the "village council", or the group of organizers of the annual neighbourhood festival.

The library space is non-commercial. This means that access is not determined by income. Not only do users not have to pay for library services, but also, these services are geared to give accessibility to active citizenship for groups that might otherwise be barred from full participation.

### *The Importance of Place and Space*

The name of the neighbourhood (Norra Fäladen) means Northern Commons, and the neighbourhood referred to in this chapter was in fact constructed on land that was originally used collectively by the local farmers. Housing in the neighbourhood is segregated into several distinct areas. The apartment blocks with moderate rents have a very high percentage of immigrant families, which has earned the area the nickname of "ghetto". There is also student housing, semi-detached houses with a relatively high percentage of immigrant families, and a more recently developed residential area with mainly white ethnic Swedish inhabitants, mostly high-income young families with children. Besides Arabic- and Persian-speaking immigrants, the neighbourhood has a large Chinese community, an Icelandic community, and a small Roma enclave. Approximately 12,000 people live in the Commons.

The complex of buildings that houses the public/school library of the Commons neighbourhood was built in the early 1970s. The centre of the neighbourhood, where this library branch is situated, was constructed in the same period and expresses the urban vision of the architects of the time. Thus, the library is in a building that also houses the lower secondary school and a leisure time centre with a small stage. There are rooms for public meetings, music practice and municipal administration, and spaces for local associations.

Just behind the library building is a recreational area, with a leisure time centre that uses hands-on pedagogy and space for children to try out and gain practice in sustainable technologies and gardening. The neighbourhood centre just across the road contains a shopping centre, primary care, dentists, a church and parish centre, an activity centre for the elderly, a marketplace, a few coffee shops, restaurants and a pharmacy. Next to the neighbourhood centre are one of the primary schools, some preschools and other leisure time centres. The preschools in the area work with Freirean pedagogies, as well as outdoor pedagogy.

The urban planning of the neighbourhood has prioritized spaces open to the public, rather than spaces reserved for commercial interests. An underpass unites the two sides of the area and makes it possible for children to visit the library without having to cross the road. More generally, bicycle paths allow children to circulate freely in the neighbourhood, while car traffic is restricted. The library and schools in the network benefit from this accessibility and the physical proximity of the different parts of the neighbourhood.

#### *Partnership and Interprofessional Collaboration*

The librarians devote considerable attention to building strong collaboration, investing in continuous competence development and spending sufficient time in reflection and planning. In Sweden, teacher librarians often suffer from isolation because there is seldom more than one person employed for library work at each school. A large proportion of schools do not allocate the resources prescribed by law to their school libraries (National Library of Sweden, 2014). By pooling library resources from the public library neighbourhood branch and the school libraries in a network, the Commons has created a dynamic community of practice.

The network also sets time aside for strategic activities. The strategic work includes competence development and capacity building of their partners. In addition to collaboration with the teachers, teacher librarians, head teachers and special education professionals, the core team of librarians have close collaboration with the preschool and leisure time centre staff. The librarians participate in meetings and decision-making contexts for the various networks they belong to, including the school, the neighbourhood council and the municipal cultural and social authorities. The work of the librarians further includes applying for external funding to supplement their budget. The librarians coach teams of schoolchildren and teach them project management skills so that the pupil teams can conduct various projects autonomously. Finally, the librarians work with numerous

outreach projects oriented towards neighbourhood residents who are not already involved in associations or other existing networks.

Having several professional librarians, teacher librarians and other library staff involved in the network means that each person has partners to share experiences with. In addition, the librarians of the network become much more mobile. The branch can be staffed and keep ample opening hours while one or more of the librarians is out in the neighbourhood, active within the schools or away in other locations for training and networking. Any competence-building training that someone in the team attends is shared with the others, and outwards to other partners in the neighbourhood, achieving a multiplier effect. At the same time, working with a relatively stable circle of partners of a manageable size and with converging aims means that energy does not have to be devoted to (re)building collaborative structures for each new project. This means that the threshold for new collaborative initiatives is low (Avery, 2013).

Although the school and the library are distinct entities, the spaces are permeable to each other, and the pedagogical practices complement each other (Pihl, 2012). When the secondary school deals with a particular topic or theme, the library network mobilizes corresponding resources and provides space for displays of school projects in the branch premises or other locations covered by the network. The librarians are part of all the planning meetings at the secondary school, and library work is written into the pupils' schedule. The professional librarians have some sessions in the classrooms, while pupils do certain parts of their schoolwork in the branch premises. Importantly, this gives a public dimension to the pupils' schoolwork, and parents get to see what their children are doing at the public library.

#### *Library Accessibility and Outreach Strategies*

Several studies suggest that physical accessibility and strong interpersonal contacts are crucial factors in library work, especially when working with disadvantaged groups and users with immigrant backgrounds (Hederén & Larsson, 2012; Stigendahl, 2008). The librarians are well aware of the importance of accessibility and go to great lengths in their outreach. They spend much of their time going to various sites in the neighbourhood, and the library is always visible in any neighbourhood event or gathering. The following are a few examples that illustrate the library's outreach strategies:

- *Expecting parents*: The library contacts all expecting parents through the children's health-care services and by collaboration with midwives, offering a voucher for a free children's book and information on library services that may interest young families. The public library invites expecting parents to group meetings at the library, where the families can share their concerns and exchange experiences.
- *Special interests*: When a young reader has a special interest, the library will order books and help find internet resources and establish contacts with networks or local clubs so that the child can pursue that interest.

- *Sports reading*: New library sections have been established with reading and writing circles located at the club house of the junior football club and at the stables of the riding school.
- *Forest excursion literacy*: A librarian has accompanied the “nature bus” excursions, playing the role of a forest troll, answering children’s questions and letters about plants and animals in the woodlands.
- *Refugees*: With the recent influx of newcomers, a librarian now goes out to asylum seeker camps and refugee accommodation, taking books along, and facilitates discussions and events. Special focus has been placed on the unaccompanied minors.

Providing equal literacy support to the various languages spoken in the area is another extremely important factor that has helped create a vibrant local cultural atmosphere. The library’s policy in this respect is highly proactive. Examples include:

- *Multilingual book bags*: The library prepares book bags with read-aloud books in the 19 main languages spoken in the area, and places these book bags at day-care centres. These books are exchanged and renewed at regular intervals. Parents can take the bags home and read to their children if they are too busy to come to the library.
- *Bookshelves*: Even if there is only one reader in a rare language, the library orders a shelf of books in that language from the international library. When the reader has finished these books, the library orders a new shelf with fresh books.

Because many families are only passing through the area, and will not be settling in Sweden permanently, immigrant languages are placed on par with Swedish as equally valuable media for learning, communication, and expression. Additionally, immigrant languages are equally respected and prioritized by the library network regardless of whether they are common or rare in the neighbourhood. In other words, the network’s policy does not limit itself to reproducing the status quo in terms of the relative prestige of the various languages. Instead, the library actively contributes to supporting diversity, providing spaces and resources for various interests and languages to develop, as well as overcoming social or physical barriers to accessibility. Rather than creating competition between linguistic communities, this supports a climate of mutual respect, trust, and engagement (Kumlin & Rothstein, 2010). The underlying conceptualization of democracy applied by the library network is thus pluralistic, rather than polarizing or emphasizing majority/minority status.

#### *Proactive Collaboration and Partnership*

The library’s support and forms of collaboration are highly differentiated and individualized. Most importantly, support is provided because the library is there for everyone (Kumlin & Rothstein, 2010; Pihl, 2012). Rather than seeking to achieve a learning aim defined by third parties, the library allows the child or group

H. AVERY

of children to pursue their own interests and helps them to realize their own projects. In this respect, the approach resembles the concerns of the New Literacy Studies (Schultz & Hull, 2002; Street, chapter two in this volume).

Miller (2014, p. 311) points to the question of proactive relationships between the public library and the wider community. Strong networks may be created if the library expands “beyond the walls”. In this particular neighbourhood, the fact that many residents are newcomers or transient means that a wider array of contact interfaces is needed. In addition, a number of users are not literate, and may not be accustomed to visiting libraries.

By systematic, proactive collaboration in the community over several decades, the library has contributed to shaping a local culture where the child engages in motivating literacy practices in a large array of settings. The library makes systematic use of book circles and discussion groups. It encourages writing/blogging, film, drama and other expressive work driven by the children’s own interests. It involves children and young people in acquisitions and activity planning. It teaches them project management skills, which help the children run their own projects effectively. The various activities combine to shape a local culture where children are interested in texts and want to share their ideas and feelings with others. This means children receive peer literacy support, and these practices have high status in the local youth culture.

### *Community Engagement and Challenges*

The Commons network is engaged in a collaboration that includes the entire span of activities within institutions in the community. These include school libraries, daycare and preschools, schools, leisure time centres, residents’ associations, interest groups and non-governmental organizations, parent representatives, sports clubs, social and health services, migration and refugee authorities, and the church. Above all, the local population and the children themselves make substantial contributions to the network, driving the issues that interest them.

The value base of the library involves the popular education ideal of participatory democracy: that is, citizens’ continuous and active engagement in setting agendas at all levels of activity and decision-making (Glassman & Patton, 2014; Klasson, 1997; Laginder, Nordvall, & Crowther, 2013). This means that it is essential to involve children, parents and young people themselves in making decisions about library projects and in realizing these projects. The library did not have to “feed” the community with ideas and energy. It could instead benefit from the creativity and engagement of the local inhabitants. This differs from the conception of users as “consumers” of cultural materials provided by the library and the idea that libraries transmit culture and knowledge to a passively receiving public. The value base of the library network corresponds to the dialogue model for library work (Klasson, 1996). The approach supports social literacy in the sense given by Street:

It is about knowledge: the ways in which people address reading and writing are themselves rooted in conceptions of knowledge, identity, and being. (Street, chapter two in this volume)

Knowledge and literacies are not abstract or neutral. Instead, they are situated practices, embedded in relations of power, and carrying specific meanings for the people involved.

The librarians interact with children and adults from a life course perspective, working with whole families, following children from infancy and through the school years. This has significantly influenced the interpersonal relationships between the librarians and library users. At the same time, library work is based on strong interpersonal relationships. The community-oriented approach with multiple partnerships, therefore, involves greater attention to induction and the transfer of competence to new staff, allowing them to be introduced to the extended networks and partnerships the library acts within. The approach also means that the boundaries between school, after-school and out-of-school activities have been partly blurred. Focus lies instead on citizenship, in the sense of community and active engagement in the locality.

However, accountability pressures force schools and libraries to cut costs and reduce activities. Additional challenges are posed by broader developments in society. Effects of wider structural developments on lifestyles and the cohesion of the community could be perceived in the case of the Commons. The diversity of housing forms in the neighbourhood originally created a patchwork where bridging and integration took place across socio-economic boundaries. Such bridging was possible because residents shared the same schools and used the same services locally. The children went places together and did things on their own. By contrast, in the most recently built high-income area of detached houses, parents instead drive their children to activities in other parts of the town. At the local level, the combination of free school choice and a lifestyle based on cars rather than bicycles has pushed this area further away from the rest of the neighbourhood. The new white, middle-class residents do not need library services and have little opportunity to meet or interact with other parts of the population. To gain an edge in future transnational job markets, white, middle-class parents from this part of the neighbourhood often place their children in the English-medium international school instead of in the neighbourhood schools. Significantly, residents in this high-income area do not refer to themselves as living in the Commons.

The educational activities of the library involve inter-professional collaboration with a very wide range of professions, and across a wide range of organizations. From the point of view of formal schooling, not only has the network integrated public and school library resources, but the librarians are also regular members of the teacher teams at the secondary school. They participate in educational planning and teaching. The librarians play a central role, particularly in connection with the theme and group projects, individual projects, whole-of-school projects and neighbourhood projects in which the pupils are involved. However, collaboration is not equally close with the primary schools. In the primary schools, the network's



H. AVERY

contacts are mainly the Swedish teachers who act as teacher librarians at the different schools.

#### DISCUSSION

The library network has worked systematically over several decades with intercultural practices and community development. The integration of the public library branch and the schools in the network is interesting because it provides an opportunity to study resilient practices and long-term dynamics. Among the factors that have made this library's practices self-driving and resilient was the initial initiative to combine a number of school library branches within a neighbourhood. The group was sufficiently small to allow the formation of a close-knit team with a flat structure. At the same time, pooling resources within the network, as well as extensively collaborating with activity centres and local associations, has helped the network maintain an autonomous margin for action. The library network contributed to developing competence among the different groups in the neighbourhood. However, the competence building did not include the school teachers who collaborated with the library and school network. This was because the national system for continuous teacher training does not attribute a role to public librarians. Partnerships between libraries and schools, and collaboration between librarians and teachers are not embedded as a regular part of the structure of the educational system. Thus, schools and teachers who actually collaborate with librarians find it hard to prioritize the time required for the competence building offered by public librarians. To be prioritized, it seems that such training events would have to be a part of specific, formal development projects supported by the educational system. This shows that relatively weak support for library-school partnership and librarian-teacher collaboration at the level of educational policy is an obstacle to such collaboration.

The study shows that the library branch creatively combines features of formal and informal literacy education (Hull & Schultz, 2001; Street, chapter two in this volume). It has succeeded in building trust and strong interpersonal relationships with partners in the community over time. The network has provided the local community with tools for agency, social action, and expression, combining sensitivity to the individual interests of the pupils with collective activities and group dynamics. Rather than basing literacy practices on a monocultural national agenda, the network connects with the multiple and hybrid backgrounds of its users. Over time, these practices contribute to forging alliances that enable local collective action. Library work for democratic capabilities does not attempt to offer "Swedish" heritage to newcomers, but provides stimulating meeting spaces, giving voice to children, youth and adults in the neighbourhood, and supporting new forms of youth citizenship. The public library provides spaces where boundary-crossing between the private and the public can take place.

An important aspect of the library's practices, in this case, is the way individual interests and group dynamics are articulated. This is particularly significant with respect to strategies to manage culture and identity in heterogeneous societies. In

public discourse, the idea of monocultural unity is frequently contrasted with “Balkanized multiculturalism” or individualistic self-interest. In the Commons, however, individual and collective empowerment reinforced and supported each other. Increased diversity does not have to be an obstacle to co-operation, but can instead contribute to the overall quality of life for all.

The library network builds on strong elements within the popular education tradition in Sweden. The form of popular education applied in this neighbourhood has a local basis, with a bottom-up perspective more frequently found in rural areas (Eriksson & Forsberg, 2010). Empowering local groups also empowers the individuals, who learn that their ideas and initiatives can be realized in action. By offering a small-scale arena for projects at the local level of the neighbourhood, the library gives children and young people opportunities to practice democratic skills.

By building a sense of affiliation with their local place (Ambrosini & Boccagni, 2015), young people learn how to form alliances, conduct collective projects and gain a voice. A clear example is a protest against the development of high-rise housing in the schoolyard. The sense of belonging to the neighbourhood played a role, as did the experience of collaboration with people of different ages and backgrounds locally. The library also provided crucial technical information concerning planning, legal procedures and the sessions of the municipal council. Sustained protests were expressed in social and other media. This mobilized cultural events locally. Delegations of young people presented their points of view in defence of their school at city planning offices and municipal council meetings. A series of appeals were then launched to the courts, which ruled that this high-rise development was not acceptable. The schoolyard and the small park adjacent to the leisure time centre were saved. Through successful social mobilization, the young people learned important lessons about democratic participation and struggles. There is now a suggestion to rename Borgarparken (Park of the Townsfolk) to Medborgarparken (Citizens’ Park).

Cultural norms and legitimate educational capital in schools value certain literacy practices more than others (Hull & Schultz, 2001). Learners are thereby positioned as having a more or less valuable linguistic and sociocultural background. This can ultimately limit access to education. These aspects are equally relevant with respect to ethnically diverse students. Just as a working class background can become an educational disadvantage, so too are transnational and multilingual pupils placed at a disadvantage because of their difference from the monolingual cultural capital which dominates in schools.

By contrast, the library’s proactive support of multiple languages and close collaboration with preschools and parents creates a sub-culture with respect for the actual diversity in the neighbourhood (Ambrosini & Boccagni, 2015; Chelliah, 2014). This has created a rich and stimulating cultural environment for all. Working with children’s discussion groups, in a way that is similar to the Swedish study circle model (Klasson, 1997), teaches children ways of discussing important issues and sharing experiences. This strengthens individuals and generates positive group dynamics, which feed into the local sub-culture. The strong acceptance, recognition, and visibility of diverse individuals contribute to openness towards

H. AVERY

others. These are important democratic values and practices in societies that are characterized by rapid demographic changes due to extensive migration.

#### CONCLUSIONS

The study has explored an integrated school and public library network in light of the popular education pedagogy (Klasson, 1996) and the New Literacy Studies' concept of social literacies (Street, chapter two in this volume). The research question was: In what ways do library-school partnership and interprofessional collaboration support children with diverse backgrounds to become active members of their local community, with democratic competencies and agency?

The network applies a community-oriented approach to integration (Chelliah, 2014) in an ethnically and socio-economically diverse urban neighbourhood. The Commons library network is exceptional in the strength and diversity of the partnerships it has established, and the strategic long-term work it has pursued over several decades. Importantly, it accepts all local languages as equally fundamental for literacy, social participation, and learning. This is rare to find and makes the case particularly interesting.

In the Commons neighbourhood, a climate of trust and acceptance has been enhanced by the library's systematic work in bridging generations and building the local identity. It is important that residents do not merely live in the area; the area belongs to its residents. In other words, all residents, new or old, or simply living in the area for a shorter period, are seen as full members of the local community, entitled to take the initiative, be visible and have a voice in the local and public space. The library's project is to integrate all into the local community, and this project is not dependent on language, culture, social class or religion. The important point is therefore not simply the number of languages or cultures represented in the area, but how they are positioned (Kumlin & Rothstein, 2010; Molle et al., 2015). As a public space and institution, the library confers legitimacy as well as visibility to projects and forms of cultural expression that take place within its framework. At a time when we are witnessing the emergence of extreme and violent nationalisms (Ambrosini & Boccagni, 2015), these discussions concerning the global, the local and the transnational (Eriksen, 2004; Pihl, 2009) appear more relevant than ever.

In the Commons, we have seen that literacy support was not mainly achieved through collaboration with teacher librarians, but through multifaceted cultural, social and emotional work in the community. This work did not follow the market model (Klasson, 1996) or simply adapt to out-of-school literacy practices that already existed among the children. Instead, intensive dialogue and trusting interpersonal contacts over time led to dynamics of cultural expansion and transformation. The multilingual and multicultural literacy practices that the Commons implemented were vital for the multi-ethnic neighbourhood. These social literacy practices worked outside the constraints set by the curriculum and national language-in-education policies. Collaboration with teachers was mainly concerned with subject teaching, project work, and critical information literacy.

The librarians' pedagogical approach drew on the popular education tradition (Gougoulakis & Christie, 2012) of enabling self-directed work and learning oriented towards social action.

The notion of social literacy (Street, chapter two in this volume) looks at literacy and knowledge as situated practices, with meaning and functions defined by the people who are involved. This understanding of literacy lies close to the conceptions of learning and development in the popular education movement. Historically, the popular education tradition in Sweden emerged largely from local initiatives, and the later nationwide movements kept a foundation in the local associations. Knowledge and education in the popular education movement often concerned practical technologies that were relevant to people's daily lives. In other words, the notions of knowledge and learning were connected to a local context and to practical actions decided on and carried out by the participants of a study circle or people's high school course.

In much formal schooling, abstract and decontextualized forms of knowledge tend to be prioritized. The curriculum defines the kinds and specific elements of knowledge that count. An important consequence for non-ethnic Swedes is that such abstract knowledge is mediated through the Swedish language and through the Swedish nation-building project. The library can, in line with the ideas of Hull and Schultz (2001), perform a bridging function by offering pedagogies that are both complementary to and integrated with the practices of the local schools and leisure time centres. Street argues that collaboration between schools and libraries plays a central role:

It is exactly through partnerships between those working in these contexts that learners – and indeed professionals too – can enhance their literacy practices and develop the multiple practices necessary for moving across the contexts. (Street, chapter two in this volume)

By bridging the divide between inside and out-of-school, the library helps children feel at home and entitled to act in both settings and thereby contributes to shaping identities of belonging.

Despite the ambition of empowering pupils through access to written language in schools, too narrow a focus on basic literacy skills tends to position pupils according to their basic skills in the language of instruction. The pupil may feel devalued, and the activities themselves are seldom motivating or age appropriate. In the Commons school and library network, working with social literacies and multilingual literacy practices in this ethnically diverse context, therefore, played an important role in strengthening academic literacies (Molle et al., 2015; Pihl, 2012). Working with emotionally and socially meaningful activities contributed to improving access to formal education. Besides information literacy and a critical use of media (Buckingham, 2015; Fabos, 2008), a very central aspect of the pedagogy used in the Commons was to give children and young people opportunities to set agendas themselves and carry out projects in the public space, with actual social impacts and results.

## REFERENCES

- Aabø, S., & Audunson, R. (2012). Use of library space and the library as place. *Library & Information Science Research*, 34(2), 138–149. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2011.06.002>
- Alexandersson, M., & Limberg, L. (2012). Changing conditions for information use and learning in Swedish schools: A synthesis of research. *Human IT*, 11(2), 131–154.
- Ambrosini, M., & Boccagni, P. (2015). Urban multiculturalism beyond the “backlash”: New discourses and different practices in immigrant policies across European cities. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 36(1), 35–53. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07256868.2014.990362>
- Avery, H. (2013). Pratiques d’engagement collaboratifs et le rôle de la bibliothèque dans un quartier urbain multiethnique en Suède [Collaborative engagement practices and the role of the school library in a multi-ethnic Swedish suburb]. *Education & Formation*, E-300, 97–107.
- Buckingham, D. (2015). Defining digital literacy – What do young people need to know about digital media? *Nordic Journal of Digital Literacy*, 9, 21–35.
- Carlsson, H., Hanell, F., & Lindh, K. (2013). Exploring multiple spaces and practices: A note on the use of ethnography in research in library and information studies. *Information Research*, 18(3), paper C17.
- Chelliah, R. (2014). *Community building, multiculturalism and the suburban public library* (Doctoral thesis). School of Computer and Security Science, Edith Cowan University, Perth.
- Dahlstedt, M., Ålund, A., & Ålund, A. (2010). Villkorat partnerskap: Demokrati och social inkludering i relationer mellan bildningsförbund och föreningar bildade på etnisk grund [Partnership with conditions: Democracy and social inclusion in relations between popular education federations and associations based on ethnicity]. *Dansk Sociologi*, 21(4), 75–94.
- Eriksen, T. H. (2004). Place, kinship and the case for non-ethnic nations. *Nations and Nationalism*, 10(1/2), 49–62. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1354-5078.2004.00154.x>
- Eriksson, L., & Forsberg, A. (2010). The part played by popular education in local development processes in suburban and rural areas of Sweden. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 29(3), 323–341. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02601371003700626>
- Fabos, B. (2008). The price of information: Critical literacy, education, and today’s Internet. In J. Coiro, M. Knobel, C. Lankshear, & D. J. Leu (Eds.), *Handbook of research on new literacies* (pp. 839–870). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Glassman, M., & Patton, R. (2014). Capability through participatory democracy: Sen, Freire and Dewey. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 46(12), 1353–1365. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2013.828582>
- Gougoulakis, P., & Christie, M. (2012). Popular education in times of societal transformation: A Swedish perspective. *Australian Journal of Adult Learning*, 52(2), 237–256.
- Hederén, A., & Larsson, S. (2012). *Biblioteken som lärmiljöer* [Libraries as environments for learning]. Report 2, 2010–2012. Östergötland: Länsbibliotek Östergötland.
- Hull, G., & Schultz, K. (2001). Literacy and learning out of school: A review of theory and research. *Review of Educational Research*, 71(4), 575–611. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00346543071004575>
- Klasson, M. (1996). Kulturbevarare, kulturbärare, kulturbyggare, kulturförnyare [Culture preservers, culture transmitters, culture builders, culture renewers]. *Kulturpolitisk Tidskrift*, 2, 15–22.
- Klasson, M. (1997). Temat bibliotek, folkbildning och livslångt lärande [The topic of libraries, popular education and life-long learning]. In M. Klasson (Ed.), *Folkbildning och bibliotek: På spaning efter spår av folkbildning och livslångt lärande i biblioteksvärlden* [Popular education and libraries: Looking for traces of popular education and lifelong learning in the world of libraries]. Borås: Valfrid.
- Kumlin, S., & Rothstein, B. (2010). Questioning the new liberal dilemma: Immigrants, social networks, and institutional fairness. *Comparative Politics*, 43(1), 63–80. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.5129/001041510X12911363510394>

- Laginder, A., Nordvall, H., & Crowther, J. (Eds.). (2013). *Popular education, power and democracy: Swedish experiences and contributions*. Leicester: NICA.
- Miller, J. (2014). A comparative study of public libraries in Edinburgh and Copenhagen and their potential for social capital creation. *Libri*, 64(4), 316–326. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/libri-2014-0025>
- Molle, D., Sato, E., Boals, T., & Hedgspeth, C. A. (Eds.). (2015). *Multilingual learners and academic literacies: Sociocultural contexts of literacy development in adolescents*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pihl, J. (2009). Ethno-nationalism and education. In S. Alghasi, T. H. Eriksen, & H. Ghorasi (Eds.), *Paradoxes of cultural recognition perspectives from Northern Europe* (pp. 111–133). Farnham: Ashgate.
- Pihl, J. (2012). *Multiplisitet, myndiggjøring, medborgerskap: Inkludering gjennom bruk av biblioteket som læringsarena* [Multiplicity, empowerment, citizenship: Inclusion through the use of the library as an arena for learning]. Oslo: Høgskolan i Oslo og Akershus.
- Schultz, K., & Hull, G. (2002). Locating literacy theory in out-of-school contexts. In G. Hull & K. Schultz (Eds.), *School's out: Bridging out-of-school literacies with classroom practice* (pp. 11–31). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- SFS 2010:800. (2010). Education Act, Swedish Code of Statutes.
- SFS 2013:801. (2013). Library Act, Swedish Code of Statutes.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. London: Sage.
- Swedish National Agency for Education. (2011). *Curriculum for the compulsory school system, the preschool class and the recreation centre*. Stockholm: Swedish National Agency for Education.
- Thorsson, P., & Viklund, C. (2006). *Arbetarrörelsens bibliotekssträvanden i Sverige – exemplet ABF-biblioteket i Oskarström* [The library ambitions of the Labour Movement in Sweden – The example of the library of the Workers' Educational Association in Oskarström]. Borås: Bibliotekshögskolan.
- Vårheim, A. (2014). Trust in libraries and trust in most people: Social capital creation in the public library. *The Library Quarterly*, 84(3), 258–277. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/676487>
- Zetterlund, A. (1997). Om folkbildningens roll i biblioteksvärlden idag [On the role of popular education in the library world of today]. In M. Klasson (Ed.), *Folkbildning och bibliotek: På spaning efter spår av folkbildning och livslångt lärande i biblioteksvärlden* [Popular education and libraries: Looking for traces of popular education and lifelong learning in the world of libraries] (pp. 26–47). Borås: Valfrid.

*Helen Avery*  
*Centre for Middle Eastern Studies, Lund University, Sweden*

INGEBJØRG TONNE AND JORON PIHL

## 5. LITERACY EDUCATION, READING ENGAGEMENT AND LIBRARY USE IN MULTILINGUAL CLASSES<sup>1</sup>

### INTRODUCTION

The topic of this paper is literacy education, reading engagement and library use in multilingual classes. Why study reading engagement? Within educational research, there is a major focus on the teaching and learning of literacy skills, relations between reading and writing, between reading and cognitive development and the impact of socio-economic and sociocultural background on student reading and achievement (Kempe, Eriksson-Gustavsson, & Samuelsson, 2011; Kirmizi, 2011; Nikolajeva, 2010; Peercy, 2011; Sood & Mistry, 2011). A recurring theme is the systematic differences in reading achievements between students, depending on their socio-economic and sociocultural background. This achievement gap is a challenge to both teachers and researchers (Hartas, 2011; Hvistendahl & Roe, 2004; Lindsay, 2010; Stanovich, 1986).

The theoretical assumption underpinning this study is that development of reading engagement is crucial to the development of literacy. In this paper, we explore the following question: What facilitates reading engagement in the language of instruction in multilingual classes? How can teachers and schools successfully contribute to reading engagement? In multilingual classes, the level of proficiency in the language of instruction varies among first-language speakers as well as between first- and second-language speakers. This variation represents a challenge to literacy education. In this paper, we analyse a literature-based literacy programme in the language of instruction and results in terms of reading engagement in three classes where the vast majority were multilingual students.

In the late PISA study, reading engagement is defined in terms of the students' voluntary reading and their attitudes towards reading (Roe, 2008). In our study, we operationalize reading engagement in terms of the frequency and quantity of the students' voluntary reading, their use of the public library for literacy purposes, and their attitudes towards reading.

The multilingual school in this study is situated in a mid-size Norwegian city. The socio-economic status of the families in the area is the lowest in the city in terms of unemployment, the number of welfare recipients and level of education. About 75% of the students at the school were multilingual. Of the multilingual children, some were born in Norway while others had immigrated at elementary school age. The children under study were in fourth grade in the school year 2008/2009, the main year under discussion in this paper and the year for the student survey on reading engagement.

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The PISA reports document achievement gaps between individual students that are related to gender and socio-economic and ethnic background (Hvistendahl & Roe, 2004; Kjærnsli, Lie, Olsen, Roe, & Turmo, 2004; Kjærnsli & Roe, 2010). A recent study by Bakken and Danielsen (2011) confirms the existence of such gaps in Norway. There is a significant effect of the number of books in the students' homes on their academic performance. Bakken (2004) states:

Students with relatively few books at home have, in the ten-year period (1992–2002), shown a weakened level of school achievement, while those students who grew up with many books at home performed even better than that category of students did ten years ago. In 1992, the difference was 27 percentage points with regard to educational achievements, between those who had fewer than 20 books at home and those who had more than 500. In 2002, the difference was 35 percentage points. (Bakken, 2004, pp. 84–85, our translation)

For children who have few books at home, it is especially important that schools provide rich access to books. In general, there is a positive correlation between students' socio-economic status and their attitudes to reading and reading engagement (Roe, 2008). However, there is one promising exception. Students from homes with low socio-economic status who are engaged and voluntary readers in their spare time perform better than students with higher socio-economic status but less reading engagement in their spare time:

The most interesting finding is perhaps that students from low socio-economic backgrounds, but with high levels of reading engagement, on average, score better than students from medium or high socio-economic backgrounds that are less reading engagement. This calls for cautious optimism, because it is, in fact, possible for the school to affect the students' attitudes towards reading, whereas schools cannot affect the students' socio-economic background. (Roe, 2008, p. 43, our translation)

Although schools cannot affect a student's socio-economic background, they can provide access to literature and opportunity for voluntary reading. The PISA study indicates that this can be particularly beneficial for students with few books at home. A literature-based literacy education programme is a case in point.

A single textbook on any specific school subject is rarely suited to the multiple interests, levels of proficiency in the language of instruction and diverse needs of children in socially and culturally complex classrooms. Literature-based programmes in literacy education provide students with great access to fiction and multiple literary genres at different levels of complexity. The students are allowed time in class for voluntary reading. The pedagogical work is organized in relation to the students' reading. The students visit the public library to access literature. The students dramatize what they read, and they may also visit the theatre or watch movies related to their reading. They talk and write about what they are reading



and share this with each other; they paint, draw and listen to literature read by teachers and librarians. They get the opportunity to meet authors through writers' visits (Alleklef & Lindvall, 2003).

An important pedagogical principle in literature-based literacy education is that all the participating students are given equal access to reading materials that they find interesting. Equally important is that they share literary experiences with each other (Gambrell, 1996). The development of literacy is a form of social practice (Barton, 2007; Street, 1997, 2003). In *New Literacy Studies* (Barton, 2007; Street, 1997, 2003) it is emphasized that literacy activities are embedded. The activities are entrenched in particular social interactions, they are shared experiences and, furthermore, they are fixed to, or take part in forming, the agents' identity:

... literacy is a social practice, not simply a technical and neutral skill; that is, it is always embedded in socially constructed epistemological principles. It is about knowledge: the ways in which people address reading and writing are themselves rooted in conceptions of knowledge, identity and being. It is also embedded in social practices, such as those of a particular job market or a particular educational context. (Street, 2003, pp. 77–78)

People develop a passion for reading in contexts where reading is social, enjoyable and meaningful to the reader (Barton, 2007; Barton, Hamilton, & Ivanic, 2000; Martin-Jones & Jones, 2000). Literature-based programmes in literacy education provide students with reading material of various genres and complexity. This, in combination with individual choice of books and book-sharing pedagogical activities, facilitates student reading. In this context, the access to library resources can make a difference.

Reading engagement is analysed from various angles in research on literacy education. The common theoretical assumption is that children's exposure to books they find interesting, and reading books of their own choice, facilitates and enhances reading engagement (Alleklef, 2003; Axelsson, 2000; Certo, 2010; Dressman, 1997; Elley, 1991; Gambrell, 1996; Morrow, 1997; Pihl, 2012; Roe, 2011). Studies indicate that increasing the amount and breadth of children's reading contributes to an intrinsic desire to read. Specifically, creating classroom cultures that foster reading and the sharing of books enhances reading engagement (Gambrell, 1996; Roe, 2008). According to Gambrell (1996), the motivation to read is, in turn, connected to six research-based factors. These factors involve access to books and a variety of literacy practices: the teacher is an explicit reading model; the classroom is a book-rich environment; there are good opportunities for choosing literature; there are opportunities to interact socially with each other; there are opportunities to become familiar with a wide range of books; and there are appropriate reading-related incentives (Gambrell, 1996).

Empirical studies of literature-based literacy programmes (also called "book flooding programmes") indicate that students' reading of fiction in the language of instruction, the reading of books to students and the pedagogical integration of reading, writing and book-sharing activities contribute towards increased motivation for reading and the incidental learning of language and content.

Research presented by Elley (1991), Morrow et al. (1997), Axelsson (2000) and Alleklev and Lindvall (2003), for instance, has shown a positive correlation between the reading of fiction in school subjects, students' literacy performance and content learning. These studies from different parts of the world show that the mentioned reading activities enhance literacy development and reading engagement. This also pertains to students from linguistic minority backgrounds who read fiction and other books that interest them in the language of instruction (Alleklev & Lindvall, 2003; Axelsson, 2000; Elley, 1991, 1992; Morrow et al., 1997).

The approach in the literature-based literacy project presented here addresses several of the factors that are held in the research literature to facilitate reading engagement. We examine and discuss the relationship between reading engagement and the development of a book-rich environment at school with a literature-based literacy programme including the use of the public library in literacy education.

#### MATERIAL AND METHOD

The research and development project involved a team of educational researchers, a teacher team at a multilingual school and public librarians who collaborated within literacy education for four years (Pihl, 2011). The multilingual school in the study is situated in a mid-size Norwegian city. A branch of the public library is located in the vicinity of the school, and the main public library is situated in the city centre. The socio-economic status of the families in the area is, on average, low in terms of unemployment, numbers of welfare recipients and level of education. At the start of the project, the school had approximately 600 children and almost 80 staff members (Espevoll, 2009). About 75% of the students at the school were multilingual. Of the multilingual children, some were born in Norway while others had immigrated at elementary school age. Eighty-four children from three classes were followed from grade three through to grade six. The school principal, six teachers, one assistant, two bilingual teaching assistants, one school librarian and one public librarian participated in the project. The children were in fourth grade in the school year 2008/2009, the main year under discussion in this paper. Teachers and librarians collaborated to provide the classes with fiction and prose related to thematic topics in Norwegian, social science and visual arts. Teachers and librarians worked with the fiction in multiple pedagogical ways in which the sharing of literary experiences was central (Axelsson, 2000; Barton, 2007). The librarian from the public library introduced new literature to the children and teachers.

A literature-based literacy programme in the language of instruction was initiated by educational researchers in a research and development project (2007–2011) (Pihl, 2009, 2011; van der Kooij & Pihl, 2009). The aim was to provide literacy education based on student reading of fiction in school subjects. This was implemented in terms of non-segregated educational provisions. All pupils were included in the literature based literature-based literacy program regardless of

individual proficiency in the language of instruction, special educational needs or linguistic minority background. The pedagogical interventions stimulated the students' voluntary reading at school, at home and at the public library. Extensive use of the public library within literacy education was an important pedagogical intervention within the project. Students' individual choice of books was central.

The researchers proposed interprofessional collaboration between teachers and librarians and use of library resources in order to realize the aims (Bueie & Pihl, 2009; Pihl, 2009; van der Kooij & Pihl, 2009). Interprofessional collaboration was developed in network meetings and steering group meetings, which worked as "change laboratories", based on the principles outlined by Engeström in his theory of expansive learning (Engeström, 1987; Engeström & Sannino, 2010; Pihl, 2011). Researchers conducted participant observations, interviewed teachers and librarians within the project, monitored student reading and conducted an electronic survey in June of 2009.

The effect of collaboration between researchers, teachers and librarians was that the teachers incorporated reading and work with fiction into the school subjects, and, together with the librarians, they selected books suitable for the specific classes and integrated the use of the public library and library resources into their pedagogical work. Literature-based literacy education was organized into four multidisciplinary topics during 2008 and 2009. Within these topics, the children were provided with books in the classrooms, with a total of 227 books rotating between the three classes. The teachers in two of the classes took the children to the public library seven times during the spring semester in 2009, whereas the third class visited the public library once on an organized trip. As part of the library visits, the librarian read and presented new, high-quality books to the visiting student groups.

The quantitative analysis is based on observations and documentation of the students' reading and on a survey of the students in June 2009, after two years of pedagogical work with reading within the book-flooding program. Here, we present findings from the reading documentation and from the electronic survey on the children's reading habits and use of the public library. Altogether, 66 of the 84 fourth graders in the project school completed the survey, representing a 79% response rate. Reading engagement was analysed in terms of frequency and correlation analysis of reading enjoyment, voluntary reading and use of the public library for literacy purposes. Based on ethical considerations, we did not conduct a pre-test of reading engagement among the students in the three classes. The reason was that we knew that the students had not had the chance to engage in extensive voluntary reading and library use. We thus considered it unethical to ask the students to answer a survey in which all questions concern student reading and library use.

#### RESEARCH INTERVENTIONS AND NON-SEGREGATED LITERACY EDUCATION

Van der Kooij and Pihl (2009) identified two discourses that coexisted in the school in the initial phase of the research project: a "resource discourse" and a

“deficiency discourse”. With the former, the staff regarded multilingualism as a resource for the student, the school and society, and had high goals of integration, equality and democratic participation for all the children. The deficiency discourse, however, involved a focus on what the minority children “lacked” when they came to school. The staff looked for new ways to compensate for what they characterized as “holes” in the everyday knowledge, conceptual understanding and vocabulary that the minority children brought to school.

In the initial phase, the presence of the deficiency discourse was a challenge to the implementation of educational provisions requiring the inclusion of all students. The aim of the project was that literature-based education, and, in particular, extensive use of library resources, should involve all students, regardless of their proficiency in the language of instruction. Extending both the quality and the quantity of the use of the local branch of the public library, with its free access to qualified librarians and a wide selection of books, was a key method in the project for including all students in literacy education.

Several studies show that segregated teaching of minority children seldom has positive educational or social effects (Amrein & Berliner, 2002; Bakken & Danielsen, 2011; Nordahl, Kostøl, & Mausestagen, 2009). Segregated teaching is also counter-productive to reaching the school’s goals of social equality and inclusion. In line with the deficiency discourse, however, the teachers first decided that only “low achievers” should visit the public library on a regular basis during school hours. Use of library resources was regarded as a compensatory measure, which should only be provided to the “needy”. At the time, the teachers were not convinced by the research findings presented in favour of non-segregated educational measures. Thus, at the start of school in August 2008, the teachers organized library visits only for a small, selected group of pupils from minority backgrounds – the second-language learners with literacy performance in the language of instruction at a critically low level. This amounted to segregated education.

After some weeks, however, the teachers stopped segregating the children into high- and low-achiever groups when visiting the library. Several factors contributed to the changes in teacher practice. The teachers seemed to be influenced by the dissemination of research that substantiated the impact of non-segregated teaching on student learning and motivation. Furthermore, research presented about the positive outcomes of voluntary reading, along with the children’s eagerness to read within the actual literature-based literacy programme, contributed to changes in the teachers’ practices (Pihl, 2011).

#### LITERATURE-BASED LITERACY EDUCATION, LIBRARY USE AND READING ENGAGEMENT

The researchers monitored the reading of all 84 students in fourth grade. The students’, teachers’ and researchers’ careful documentation of the students’ reading throughout the school year showed that the students read a total of 123,000 pages during this year, yielding an average of 1464 pages per student. This means that, on

average, each of these 84 students, most of whom were second-language learners from low socio-economic backgrounds, had read the equivalent of 15 books of almost 100 pages each in the language of instruction during one school year.

Bakken (2004) showed that the number of books in a student's home significantly affects his or her academic performance. In our electronic survey, students answered the question "How many books do you own?" The median value of the responses was 18. Although the question only pertained to the books owned by the students themselves, it is fair to assume that the number gives an indication of the number of books in the family. For a comparison, in we also administered the survey in a different school in a different area of the same city, in a middle-class area with only 11% minority students. The median value of number of student-owned books, as reported by the students in this school (N = 50), was 40 books. A typical student in the comparison school hence reports to own more than twice as many books as the typical student of the school under study. The students under study here are likely to belong to the groups of students who have few books at home, in turn, correlated with low school achievements as measured by achieved grades in school (Bakken, 2004).

What made the average student who owned only 18 books read 15 books with almost 100 pages each during one school year? The survey results and reading accounting observations indicate that the literature-based literacy programme, which gave students access to books they found interesting and encouraged voluntary reading in school, facilitated reading engagement.

The survey shows that the overwhelming majority like to read, and that they read often in their free time: Altogether, 97% (64 out of 66) of the students reported that they enjoyed reading. When asked how often they read for pleasure, 88% reported that they read every day or several times a week because they wanted to. Only one student reported never reading for pleasure. Three-quarters of the students liked to read for half an hour or more when they read for pleasure. These results show that two years into the project, the overwhelming majority of students in the project had a positive attitude towards reading. They engaged in voluntary reading in their spare time because they enjoyed it.

The survey also documented the students' use of the public library in their spare time. The students reported their use of the local branch of the public library, as well as their use of the main public library in the city centre. In the survey, almost 90% of the students reported visiting the local public library branch at least once a week, and 68% of the students reported using this library several times a week or even daily. As noted earlier, there were seven visits to the local public library organized by the teachers and the librarian during this school year for each student in two of the classes, and one visit for each student in the third class. The remaining library visits reported by the students were visits they had made on their own.

These students also used the main public library in the centre of the city. Our survey shows that 60% of the students visited the main public library at least once a month. There was a small but statistically significant correlation between visiting the local branch and visiting the main public library: a student who visited the local

branch often was also likely to have visited the main public library often (Pearson's  $r = 0.362$ , correlation is significant at the 0.05 level [2-tailed])

The students' main activities at the public library were borrowing and reading books. Altogether, 95% of the students borrowed books and 64% read books at the public library. It is interesting that 50% of the students reported that they were with friends at the library. This indicates that the literacy practices the children engaged in at the library were social activities, which they shared with friends to a considerable extent.

From this we conclude that the students hold a high degree of reading engagement, as analysed in terms of reading enjoyment, voluntary reading and use of the public library for literacy purposes. The overall high frequency of voluntary public library visits may well compensate for the relatively low numbers of books these students owned and the likely correspondingly low total number of books at home. The public library differs from the classroom in interesting ways. A library is a social place where people interact with each other and with the library resources available, which works within New Literacy Studies emphasize as important for literacy activities such as reading. The public library is characterized as a "liminal space" by Dressman (1997) a "low-intensive" learning arena by Audunson (2005) and "back-stage" by Rafste (2005), in contrast to the school, which is characterized as a "high-intensive arena" (Audunson, 2005) and "front-stage" (Rafste, 2005). The complementary qualities and resources of the public library may provide possibilities for a student to develop reading engagement according to his or her level of linguistic proficiency, interests and pace when the student uses the public library for his or her own needs.

The teachers and librarians play important roles as facilitators in a literature-based literacy education programme. If the school and teachers acknowledge the potential contributions of librarians and the public library within literacy education, this may pave the way for interprofessional collaboration within literacy education. Pihl (2011) holds that in the present situation, in which discourses of accountability dominate the education sector, the mandate of the teaching profession is acutely ambivalent. Teaching is supposed to contribute to qualifications and democratic inclusion, but research indicates that education contributes towards the reproduction of social inequality. The reproduction of social inequality is mediated by high-stakes testing (Amrein & Berliner, 2002; Pihl, 2009; Wiley & Wright, 2004). Against this background and the present state of multiplicity, the question of how teaching can qualify all pupils in the language of instruction and contribute to literacy, inclusion and democratic citizenship is a pressing issue

The changes in literacy teaching practices at the school, which involved the literature-based programme and collaboration between the school and library within literacy education, provided the students with access to literature and reading in a new and stimulating milieu. The sharing of literary experiences was central to the project. Teachers dealt with literacy education as a social phenomenon. Without this, those children in the multicultural school who had few books at home would have had limited opportunities to choose reading material that interested them. In the project, they had the opportunity to engage in voluntary

reading at school and at home, in a non-segregated literacy education. They read fiction as well as facts within certain subjects in the school curriculum. The library provided the school classes with relevant books in their classrooms and minimized the use of a 'one fits all' textbook for the whole class. The organized trips to the local branch of the public library assisted the children in using the public library for their own reading purposes, giving them access to literature and, we suggest, extensive opportunity to express and develop their reading engagement. The results indicate that this, in combination with individual choice of books and sharing of literary events in an inclusive pedagogical environment, is important for the development of minority and majority student literacy and reading engagement.

The results indicate that the school has the potential to promote reading engagement, even among students with low socio-economic status and among second-language learners. Literature-based literacy education based on collaboration between teachers and librarians has a positive effect on the development of reading engagement in terms of attitudes to reading, and the frequency and amount of voluntary reading and reading-related activities, such as library use. The results give rise to cautious optimism that literature-based literacy education has the potential to reduce possible negative effects of low socio-economic status and minority background on reading engagement in the language of instruction.

Recent studies show that reading engagement has in turn positive impact on reading achievement. This is recently confirmed by Krashen et al. (Krashen, Lee, & Mcquillan, 2012), based on the data from PIRLS; conducted in 40 countries in 2007. Based on multivariate analysis at national and international level, Krashen et al. conclude that the access to books had a larger impact on reading achievement than poverty. These are important arguments in favour of literacy education giving priority to development of reading engagement. And the access to libraries proved to be a decisive factor in providing children and young people access to books and reading (Krashen, Lee, & Mcquillan, 2012). The potential for use of library resources in teaching and learning is, however, far greater than the actual use of library resources in literacy education (Pihl, 2012).

#### CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have analysed the relationship between a literature-based literacy programme in the language of instruction and reading engagement in multilingual classes. We have presented results from a literacy project in Norway (2007–2011), which show promise in terms of reading engagement in the language of instruction among both first- and second-language learners. As the teachers did not practise literature-based literacy education or use the public library regularly before the research and development project started in 2007, we argue that the literature-based programme facilitated the reading engagement documented among the children during the 2008/2009 school year. We suggest that non-segregated, literature-based literacy education and use of library resources in literacy education contributed to the positive results in terms of reading engagement. Collaboration

between teachers and librarians within literacy education may contribute to realization of the mandate of the teaching profession in a multilingual school. This collaboration has yielded promising results with regard to reading engagement among all students. In conclusion, research documents a positive interrelationship between literature-based literacy education, students' access to books in classrooms and libraries, voluntary reading and reading engagement in the language of instruction among first and second language learners. And this does in turn have positive impact on reading achievement. At a time when teachers increasingly are under pressure to "teaching to the test", these research findings provide important arguments in favour of literacy education providing time and space for voluntary reading and library use in school.

#### NOTE

- <sup>1</sup> This chapter is a reprint with permission of Tonne, I., & Pihl, J. (2012). Literacy education, reading engagement, and library use in multilingual classes, *Intercultural Education*, 23(3), 183–194. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2012.701424>

#### REFERENCES

- Allekleiv, B., & Lindvall, L. (2003). *Listiga Råven: Läsinlärning genom skönlitteratur* [Cunning Fox: Literacy learning through fiction]. Falun: Strålns Tryckeri.
- Amrein, A. L., & Berliner, D. L. (2002). High stakes testing, uncertainty and student learning. *Educational Policy Analyses Archives*, 10(18). Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v10n18.2002>
- Audunson, R. (2005). The public library as a meeting-place in a multicultural and digital context: The necessity of low-intensive meeting-places. *Journal of Documentation*, 61(3), 429–441. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00220410510598562>
- Axelsson, M. (2000). Framgång för alla – Från at inte kunna til at inte kunna låta bli att läsa [Progress for all – From not being able to read to not stop reading]. In H. Åhl (Ed.), *Svenskan i tiden – verklighet och visioner* (pp. 8–35). Stockholm: Nationelt Centrum, HLS Förlag.
- Bakken, A. (2004). Nye tall om ungdom: Økt sosial ulikhet i skolen? [New data on youth: Increased social inequality in school?]. *Tidsskrift for ungdomsforskning*, (1), 84–91.
- Bakken, A., & Danielsen, K. (2011). *Gode skoler – gode for alle?: En case studie av prestasjonsforskjeller på seks ungdomsskoler* [Good schools – good for everyone?: A case study of performance differences in six secondary schools] (NOVA Rapport, Vol. 10). Oslo: NOVA. Retrieved from <http://www.udir.no/globalassets/filer/tall-og-forskning/forskningsrapporter/gode-skolar--gode-for-alle.pdf>
- Barton, D. (2007). *Literacy an introduction to the ecology of written language*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Barton, D., Hamilton, M., & Ivanic, R. (Eds.). (2000). *Situated literacies reading and writing in context*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bueie, A., & Pihl, J. (2009). Forskningsbasert skoleutvikling: utfordringer i etableringsfasen [Research based school development: Challenges in the initial phase]. In B. Groven, T. M. Guldal, O. F. Lillemyr, N. Naastad, & F. Rønning (Eds.), *FoU i Praksis 2008: rapport fra konferanse om lærerutdanning: Trondheim 17. og 18. april 2009* (pp. 31–40). Trondheim: Tapir Akademisk Forlag.
- Certo, J., Moxley, K., Reffitt, K., & Miller, J. A. (2010). I learned how to talk about a book: Children's perceptions of literature circles across grade and ability levels. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 49(3), 243–263. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19388070902947352>



LITERACY EDUCATION, READING AND LIBRARY USE IN MULTILINGUAL CLASSES

- Dressman, M. (1997). Congruence, resistance, liminality: Reading and ideology in three school libraries. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 27(3), 267–315. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03626784.1997.11075493>
- Elley, W. B. (1991). Acquiring literacy in a second language: The effect of book-based programs. *Language and Learning*, 41(3), 375–411. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1991.tb00611.x>
- Elley, W. B. (1992). *How in the world do students read?* Hamburg: The International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.
- Engeström, Y. (1987). *Learning by expanding: An activity-theoretical approach to developmental research*. Helsinki: Orienta-Konsultit Oy.
- Engeström, Y., & Sannino, A. (2010). Studies of expansive learning: Foundations, findings and future challenges. *Educational Review*, (5), 1–24. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2009.12.002>
- Espesvoll, C. (2009). *Litteraturbasert undervisning i en flerkulturell skole: Utfordringer og muligheter* [Literature-based teaching in a multicultural school: Challenges and opportunities] (Unpublished master's thesis). Høgskolen i Oslo, Oslo.
- Gambrell, L. B. (1996). Creating classroom cultures that foster reading motivation. *The Reading Teacher, International Reading Association*, 50(1), 14–25.
- Hartas, D. (2011). Families' social backgrounds matter: Socio-economic factors, home learning and young children's language, literacy and social outcomes. *British Educational Research Journal*, 37(6), 893–914. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2010.506945>
- Hvistendahl, R., & Roe, A. (2004). The literacy achievement of Norwegian minority students. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 48(3), 307–324. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00313830410001695754>
- Kempe, C., Eriksson-Gustavsson, A. L., & Samuelsson, S. (2011). Are there any matthew effects in literacy and cognitive development? *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 55(2), 181–196. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2011.554699>
- Kirmizi, F. S. (2011). The relationship between reading comprehension strategies and reading attitudes. *Education 3-13*, 39(3), 289–303. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03004270903514320>
- Kjærnsli, M., Lie, S., Olsen, R. V., Roe, A., & Turmo, S. (2004).  *Rett spor eller ville veier?: Norske elevers prestasjoner i matematikk, naturfag og lesing i PISA 2003* [Right track or wrong track?: Norwegian students' performance in mathematics, science and reading in PISA 2003]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Kjærnsli, M., & Roe, A. (2010). *På rett spor: Norske elevers kompetanse i lesing, matematikk og naturfag i PISA 2009* [On the right track: Norwegian pupils' competence in reading, mathematics and science in PISA 2009]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Krashen, S., Lee, S., & Mcquillan, J. (2012). Is the library important? Multivariate studies at the national and international level. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education*, 8(1), 26–36.
- Lindsay, J. (2010). *Children's access to print material and education related outcomes findings from a meta-analytic review*. Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates.
- Martin-Jones, M., & Jones, K. (Eds.). (2000). *Multilingual literacies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Morrow, L. M., Pressley, M., Smith, J. K., & Smith, M. (1997). The effect of a literature-based program integrated into literacy and science instruction with children from diverse backgrounds. *ProQuest Psychology Journals*, 32(1), 54–76.
- Nikolajeva, M. (2010). Literacy, competence and meaning-making: A human sciences approach. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 40(2), 145–159. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2010.481258>
- Nordahl, T., Kostøl, A. K., & Mausesthaugen, S. (2009). *Skoler med liten og stor forekomst av atferdsproblemer: En kvantitativ og kvalitativ analyse av forskjeller og likheter mellom skolene* [Schools with small or large frequency of behavioral problems: A qualitative analysis of differences and similarities between schools]. Elverum: Høgskolen i Hedmark.

I. TONNE & J. PIHL

- Peercy, M. M. (2011). Preparing english language learners for the mainstream: Academic language and literacy practices in two junior high school ESL classrooms. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 27(4), 324–362. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2011.596105>
- Pihl, J. (2009). Interprofessional cooperation between teachers and librarians: Analysing theoretical and professional arguments for cooperation in an era of globalization. In M. O’Dowd & H. Holmarsdottir (Eds.), *Nordic voices: Teaching and researching comparative and international education in the nordic countries* (pp. 41–59). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Pihl, J. (2011). Literacy education and interprofessional collaboration. *Professions and professionalism*, 1(1), 52–66.
- Pihl, J. (2012). Can library use enhance intercultural education? *Issues in Educational Research*, 22(1), 79–90.
- Rafste, E. T. (2005). A place to learn or a place for leisure: Pupils’ use of the school library in Norway. *School Libraries World Wide*, 11(1), 1–16.
- Roe, A. (2008). *Lesedidaktikk: Etter den første leseopplæringen* [Reading didactics: After the first reading instruction] (1st ed.). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Roe, A. (2011). *Lesedidaktikk: Etter den første leseopplæringen* [Reading didactics: After the first reading instruction] (2nd ed.). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Sood, K., & Mistry, M. T. (2011). English as an additional language: Is there a need to embed cultural values and beliefs in institutional practice? *Education 3–13*, 39(2), 203–215. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03004270903389913>
- Stanovich, K. E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 22, 360–407.
- Street, B. (1997). The implications of the “New Literacy Studies” for literacy education. *English in Education*, 31(3), 45–59. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-8845.1997.tb00133.x>
- Street, B. (2003). What’s “new” in New Literacy Studies?: Critical approaches to literacy in theory and practice. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 5(2), 77–91.
- van der Kooij, K. S., & Pihl, J. (2009). Voices from the field: Negotiating literacy education in a multicultural setting. In H. Holmarsdottir & M. O’Dowd (Eds.), *Nordic voices: Teaching and researching comparative and international education in the nordic countries* (pp. 167–179). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Wiley, T. G., & Wright, W. (2004). Against the undertow: Language-minority education policy and politics in the “Age of Accountability”. *Educational Policy*, 18(1), 142–168. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0895904803260030>

*Ingebjørg Tonne*

*Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, Norway*

*Joron Pihl*

*Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, Norway*

ULLA DAMBER

## 6. LIBRARIAN AND TEACHER COLLABORATION

### *Enhancing Second-Language Learners' Literacy Development*

#### INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to explore the partnership and collaboration between a public librarian and teachers of pupils from preschool to grade three in a multicultural suburb in Stockholm. Their aim was to create literacy growth, personal growth, and empowerment among pupils learning in their second language, and their collaboration substantially contributed to high achievements in reading among these second-language learners.

The roles of the public library and librarian will be highlighted with respect to children's overall literacy development. The interpersonal collaboration exemplifies the professional exchange of knowledge and experiences that was initiated by the teachers, and which is not often found in studies of librarian and teacher collaborations. The study is based on the public librarian's narrative of the partnership and collaboration. The collaboration between the librarian and the teachers started in the preschool class, with the librarian leading book talks with the children. Subsequently, the collaboration deepened, and the librarian – as well as providing books and giving book talks – was also included in the teaching team's planning and follow-up activities.

The library was also a major component in creating collaboration between the school, the parents, and the local community. The close relationship between the parents, the library and the school turned the library into an arena for literacy learning where the children could find books and engage in voluntary reading to develop their interests and identity. According to Hedemark (2011), libraries may offer spaces for reading that are free of the control and evaluation of teachers. Dressman described the potential of libraries by saying “classrooms are fundamentally spaces devoted to literacy as work, and libraries are fundamentally spaces devoted to literacy as the pursuit of personal desire” (1997, p. 161). In this study, both classrooms and libraries show potential with respect to both purposes.

The question of equity and how all children may be encouraged to establish and nurture an interest in reading is at the heart of this study. This is closely linked to teachers' and librarians' perceptions of literacy, and how literacy may be taught when children with different abilities, backgrounds and languages are targeted (see Street, chapter two).

In the following account of this collaborative project between the school and the public library, the line between the arenas was blurred. Both pragmatic literacy

U. DAMBER

learning and reading for pleasure took place alongside intercultural work with integrational aims (Sandin, 2011). The librarian's narrative illustrates learning as a culturally shaped activity, both for the adults involved and the children in the school (Sfard & Prusak, 2005). I conducted an in-depth interview with the public librarian in 2008. The following questions guided the exploration:

- What characterizes the collaborative literacy practices of the public librarian and the teachers?
- How did the library make literacy practices accessible to all pupils?
- How did the perception of students' minority language backgrounds as resources rather than impediments influence the partnership between the teachers and the librarian?

#### READING THE WORD AND THE WORLD

An initial step in dealing with literacy, irrespective of one's status as a researcher, teacher, librarian or parent, is to clarify what the term means. In this study, I apply a sociocultural perspective on reading as a situated activity (Street, 1984). A sociocultural perspective describes reading as *participation* in socially, culturally and historically constructed practices (Au & Raphael, 2000; Barton, 2007; Cummins, 2000; Gee, 2001; New London Group, 1996; Street, 1995). People's literacies constitute linguistic and cultural resources. Because there is an uneven distribution of knowledge and power, literacy in the majority language has a different status to literacy in minority languages. As Heath and Street (2008, p. 20) write, “[s]igns and symbols are not innocent”. In this extended definition of literacy, not only the text but also the reader's prior experiences of the world, social identifications, and attitudes, and the surrounding culture and society contribute to the outcome of the negotiations of meaning, enabling different constructions of meaning. Both Street and New Literacy Studies conceptualize language, identity, and culture as dynamic entities. They use the plural form “literacies”, which allows for critical framing of the relationships between school and marginalized learners' literacy activities (Au & Raphael, 2000). Thus, as cultural practices vary from context to context, New Literacy Studies “offers a more culturally sensitive view of literacy practices” (Heath & Street, 2008, p. 103) than literacy as solely a matter of skills.

Often different definitions of literacy overlap. There are good reasons to view literacies as dynamic, as they vary with the social and cultural environment (Luke & Kale, 1997; Street, 1995). However, reading the word eventually always involves reading the world (Freire & Macedo, 1987).

#### CASE STUDY

This case study is based on an interview with the public librarian who collaborated with teachers and children in a “book flood” project in preschool and school.

The interview with the librarian, referred to here as Sue, was initially supported by a thematically structured interview guide. Central themes were her perceptions of pupils, views of literacy, collaboration with the teachers and relationships with parents. The interview developed primarily as story-telling. I asked Sue to share her experiences from her collaborative work with the children and teachers. I audio-recorded the interview over two sessions. The first part lasted one-and-a-half hours and the second lasted around one hour. I transcribed the interview as an initial step of the analysis (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000), and later translated it. I analysed the entire interview, with a specific focus on perceptions of literacies and how the librarian's practice was affected by changes in those perceptions (Clandinin & Huber, 2010; Lieblich, Tuval-Mashich, & Ziber, 1998). I identified Sue's central ideas about collaboration with the pupils and teachers and coded the data. The codes were then grouped into themes that recurred in the narrative (Pidgeon & Henwood, 1997). The interview was complemented by interviews with the collaborating teachers.

I contacted Sue and her colleagues after an initial quantitative study encompassing 1,092 grade-three classes (children aged 9–10 years) in Stockholm. The study explored teacher and classroom factors contributing to classes with high achievements in reading in the Swedish language. As the role of the teacher and the classroom conditions that influenced pupils' reading results were the intended focus, socio-economic status (SES) and language factors were statistically controlled for. However, there were no significant differences between overachieving and underachieving classes, including factors influenced by the teachers' work. Therefore, I decided to do a qualitative follow-up study in this low-income, multicultural district.

I targeted eight classes that had high achievements in reading, based on reading test scores. It was in this context that I discovered the collaborative work between Sue and the teachers that led to novel ways of viewing and working with multilingual pupils' literacy development (Damber, 2010). In the qualitative follow-up study, I also interviewed the teachers. Sue's participation and ambition of giving the library a prominent role in the children's literacy development justifies the use of her narrative as the topic of this article. In the interviews, the teachers reaffirmed Sue's narrative about their collaboration. Sue summarized the outcomes of the collaborative work at the very beginning of the interview: "Well, the project has now come to an end, but the ideas, the ways of working and the approach [to literacy] can be further spread", thus sharing her visions of the future.

Access to and participation in literacy practices is a major focus in the following analysis. The "four resources" model influenced the analysis of the literacy practices with respect to the children's access to and participation in these practices (Freebody & Luke, 2003). A culturally sensitive model of literacy informs the analysis (see Freebody & Luke, 2003; Janks, 2010; Street, 1984, 1995, and Street, chapter two in this volume).

#### THE FOUR RESOURCES MODEL AS AN ANALYTICAL TOOL

In a heteroglossic and heterogenous society, the four resources model, describing literacy as a complex set of different interdependent practices, provides a basis for “the institutional shaping of social practices and cultural resources ... [and] access to technology and artefacts” (Luke & Freebody, 1999). The four resources model is not founded on the idea of one universal method, or one proper scientific theory (Freebody & Luke, 2003). Instead, it aims to provide a sort of trial-and-error approach to literacy and literacy education, which also well describes the project in which Sue took part, with a *simultaneous* focus on decoding, text participation, text use and learning to take a critical stance on texts. An important aspect is a focus on the pupils’ *resources* as second-language learners, as opposed to a focus on their alleged linguistic deficits (Pihl, 2010).

Issues such as attention to the different reading conditions that children have must all gain importance if the negative effects of the deficit discourse are to be counteracted (see Damber, 2011, 2010; and Street, chapter two in this volume). Sue and the teachers rejected taken-for-granted assumptions about their multilingual pupils’ poor abilities to perform well in school. The team did not see the multilingual pupils as suffering from language deficits. On the contrary, Sue describes how she and the teachers remodelled their practice based on recognition of the pupils’ resources (Martin-Jones & Jones, 2000).

#### RESEARCH ON COLLABORATION BETWEEN SCHOOLS AND LIBRARIES

Through the history of Swedish libraries, schools and libraries have been linked to one another, at least in policy documents (Limberg & Hampson Lundh, 2013). In particular, the democratic school reforms in the middle of the previous century emphasized the library as a resource for pupils’ self-directed learning and critical thinking (Carle, Kinnander, & Salin, 2000). However, the reform in 1991, which shifted the responsibility for schools from the state to the municipalities, led to varied conditions for libraries and school libraries, partly depending on the municipal economy. In some schools, these facilities have been more of a storage room for books than a school library, with a teacher responsible for lending the books. Even though the function of the library as a stimulus for children’s reading and autonomous learning has never been questioned, the quality and practices at local libraries depend on local negotiations between school districts and municipalities. This study illustrates one important prerequisite for the development of existing practices, both in schools and public libraries, namely partnership and collaboration between librarians and teachers who communicate and interact with joint purposes (Granberg & Olsson, 2009).

Many quantitative studies, both Scandinavian and international, indicate that school library services may have a positive impact on pupils’ reading levels (Small & Snyder, 2010; Söderlund, 2009). When it comes to school libraries, positive effects on students’ reading abilities are predominantly found when the library is staffed with a full-time librarian (Chan, 2008). Lance and Loertscher (2001) found

a strong correlation between library funding and student achievement. Later studies by Lance, carried out in the US and Scotland, show that after socio-economic factors, the school library is the single factor with the most impact on student achievement (Lance, 2002). Even though there are studies of collaborative projects between teachers and librarians, such as that of Montieil-Overall and Grimes (2013), the reports on teacher–teacher collaboration vastly outnumber the studies of librarian-teacher collaborations. However, quantitative studies seldom explore the relations between student achievement and school libraries or the effects of collaborative projects between librarians and teachers (Limberg & Lundh, 2013). A recurring feature in reports on library and school collaborative projects is that the librarians are often more intent on collaborating, while the teachers are more reluctant to participate in such initiatives (Latham, Gross, & Witte, 2013) (see Pihl, chapter three in this volume). A Norwegian study by Tonne and Pihl (2012) showed that qualitative aspects of the collaborative work carried out by librarians and teachers have a positive impact on the teaching of reading, through the socialization of the pupils into readers. It is hoped that the present study will shed further light on the nature of collaboration when the librarian is a full member of the teachers’ work team.

#### LIBRARY-SCHOOL PARTNERSHIP IN THE BOOK FLOOD PROJECT

The collaboration and partnership between school and library, and between Sue and the teachers, started as a book flood project (Clay, 1998; Elley, 2000). The project introduced preschool class children and school pupils to authentic children’s books, rather than “traditional” textbooks, as first reading materials. When children encountered authentic literature from the very start of the preschool class, creating meaning became the focus, rather than the skill of decoding. The librarian indicated that the project was an attempt to do something about the low achievement levels in Swedish in this multilingual residential district. An administrator interested in Reading Recovery (see Clay, 1998) arranged an in-service course for preschool and school teachers who decided to try a book flood approach to reading acquisition. The librarian recalls the beginning of the project:

I took that course as well, as I belonged to the same department in those days. And after that course, they [the teachers] said “Can’t we try this? We really want to!” And they were really experienced teachers, and they had worked together for many years. But we had no name for it, and it was not intended as a project, but it was just an idea from the teachers.

Sue and the teachers started to flood the classroom with authentic children’s literature. Sue remembers:

I helped the teachers to find books. The teachers continuously wanted to borrow more books from the library and, of course, they could. However, I felt some hesitation, as they more or less emptied the library’s stock of children’s books!

In book flood projects, children are encouraged to read for pleasure. They are offered a large number of authentic children's books to read from the very start of their reading experience. The methodology has gained ground in New Zealand and is also referred to as literature-based literacy. Book flood programmes have been implemented in various parts of the world (Clay, 1998; Tonne & Pihl, chapter five in this volume). Elley (2000) and Au and Raphael (2000) state that the reading of authentic literature, as an alternative to textbooks, shows positive effects on the literacy development of children learning second languages. According to Nicholson (2000), book flood projects are also proven to generate reading engagement. In Sweden, Axelsson (2013), Alleklev and Lindvall (2001) and Damber (2011, 2010) have indicated a positive correlation between the reading of fiction in school subjects, pupils' literacy performance and content learning.

In the context of this study, it is important to note that the children who learn to read within the realms of a book flood programme are given the opportunity to develop several reader resources, rather than just decoder skills (Freebody & Luke, 2003; Tonne & Pihl, chapter five in this volume). To become a reader, the child has to master the practice of decoding. However, according to Freebody and Luke, this is not the only practice that the potential reader has to learn. There is also the practice of text use. Readers need to learn to adapt language use and text structure according to the situation, the recipient(s) and the mode of communication in order to participate in creating meaning from texts. The reader engages in "understanding and composing meaningful written, visual and spoken texts in ways that connect texts' meaning systems to people's available knowledges" (Freebody & Luke, 2003, p. 56). They draw meaningful inferences from those connections.

#### COLLABORATIVE LITERACY PRACTICES

Sue gave an account of how the book flood project and collaboration with teachers started. In the beginning, she was not convinced that the librarian had a role to play in the preschool class as those children had not learnt to read yet:

I knew that they were really engaged teachers and preschool teachers. And that they had introduced a new model for literacy learning. The elementary teachers went down to the preschool class once a week. When the children had finished preschool class as six-year-olds, the primary school teacher received those children in grade one in school.

Sue describes how the teachers wanted her to carry out "book talks". She presented books to the children in the preschool class and talked with the children about the books. She describes how she had second thoughts about the project: "six-year-olds... I mean... they can't even read!" However, she then describes how she realized that the children in the preschool class were capable of interpreting and relating to stories long before the skill of decoding was acquired. A positive reading experience is fundamental to the development of a desire to read. She quickly realized that both the children and the teachers very much appreciated the



book talks. The teachers picked up on the content of the books and worked with the reading material afterwards.

According to the four resources model, the institutional shaping of social practices is a continuous process. Such processes of change also include the reshaping of the norms and values that dominate in local practices. The changes in norms and values are important features of practices in transformation. Sue recalls how she was amazed that the small children in preschool were so interested in the books and capable of making meaning, even before formal reading tuition.

According to Freebody and Luke (2003), decoding abilities and the ability to use and participate in texts, together with the development of competence in critically analysing texts, develop in parallel. Thus, the pre-understanding of what print really is, the purpose of print and the perceptions of who is invited into the reading community all emerge as important areas of interest in the early phases of literacy acquisition. In particular, when considering literacy education for children from linguistic minorities, trust in the children's resources becomes crucial.

Importantly, a reappraisal of literacy is subtly indicated in the quotations above. During Sue's encounter with the preschool children in the book talks, her understanding of literacy underwent changes. At first, she viewed literacy as the skill of decoding. She remembers how she was thinking: "they can't even read". Then, she became engaged in the children's meaning-making processes when she read stories to them. Sue viewed literacy learning as a strictly linear process of skill development at the start of the project. However, her perception of literacy changed and she became aware of the children's resources as meaning-makers, whereby they engaged with the content of the text and the pictures before they had cracked the alphabetical code (Freebody & Luke, 2003). According to Sandin (2011), the traditional way of viewing literacy was contested by an emancipatory view of literacy. The library, later on, came to play a vital role in the emancipation process.

Furthermore, the professional roles changed as preschool teachers, schoolteachers and the librarian no longer worked side by side, but in collaboration. The group of children was very heterogeneous in terms of multilingualism and cultural and social backgrounds. The collaboration between Sue and the teachers made it possible to meet the children's different literacy needs in ways a single teacher would rarely be capable of (Damber, 2010). This created an important condition for change, namely that Sue and the teachers engaged in reflecting on the nature of literacy and how literacy learning occurs in the multilingual classroom.

#### LITERACIES AS SOCIAL PRACTICES

The socialization of members into the reading community in the classroom began by building an understanding of what print was and ensuring that everyone could share the experiences of texts in a wide sense. The adults prioritized reading for the children and dealt with texts before they introduced the children to formal reading instruction (see Damber, 2011). The children's own experiences formed the point

of departure, according to Sue. The aim was to create conditions that allowed all the children to participate in classroom activities (Janks, 2010; Luke & Freebody, 1999). The focus had shifted from decoding to experiencing texts in a broader sense. Sue and the teachers discarded traditional reading primers. They brought authentic children's literature, and Sue returns to her memories of the early "book flooding" of the classroom: "I helped the teachers to find titles appropriate for beginning readers, and they borrowed what was in the library those months before we started to carry out our work as more of a project".

One thematic mini project sprang out of the desire to get the diverse group of pupils to join together around something they had in common. Sue took the initiative after she had attended an in-service course about diversity:

About angels ... what they mean to us in our everyday lives. I mean... we are surrounded by them. "Oh, that looks like an angel!" There are flowers named after angels, texts, paintings... We actually are surrounded by them, even if we don't think about it. We realized that some angels are the same in Islam, Christianity and Judaism.... It was all about a common denominator.

The project began, and the children were told to ask their parents what "angels" they knew about. All of them returned with tales of different angels. The teachers took the children to museums and showed them books about angels at the library. Sue and the teachers asked the children about their personal conceptions of angels during individual interviews and arranged workshops where the children created their own angels, helped by art educators who were invited to take part in the creative processes.

The project contained several interesting features. Firstly, an intercultural project was created as a result of the adults' reasoning about how the pupils could interact around something that both adults and children found genuinely intriguing. The assumption was that everybody could contribute, irrespective of their cultural backgrounds. Neither the children nor the adults *knew* anything about some aspects of angels beforehand (for example, angels in Vietnam). In this respect, the project demonstrates "give-and-take" in an authentic way. This authenticity is embedded in the use of authentic literature, mediating a vision of learning for real purposes (Allekleiv & Lindvall, 2001). Secondly, the project exemplifies experience-based learning, where the pupils' own lives and experiences constituted the basis of learning (see Barton, 2007). Thirdly, a wider concept of "text" is employed in the project, including a multimodal approach to literacies (see Freebody & Luke, 2003; New London Group, 1996; and Street, chapter two in this volume). By including aesthetic events in literacy practices, both literate and illiterate children could contribute to the outcome of the project. They were all included in the literacy practice.

Luke and Freebody (1999) described a family of practices such as the decoding, participation in and use of texts. In addition, the practice of text analysis calls for attention. Text analysis is about manipulating the text:

[U]nderstanding and acting on the knowledge that texts are not transparent windows on the world, that they are not ideologically natural or neutral, that they represent particular views and silence others, influence people's ideas; and that their designs and discourses can be critiqued and redesigned in novel hybrid ways. (Luke & Freebody, 1999, p. 57)

In particular, the idea of including multimodal input and output in the concept of literacy points towards the 21st century's New Literacies Studies (New London Group, 1996; Street, chapter two in this volume).

A fourth important factor involved the parents:

The parents were assigned a task. To come and look at their children's artwork at the exhibition here at the library. To visit the exhibition... and the library ... that the parents... that they were part of [it] ... I believe that was part of the success of the project, that we managed to engage all of the parents.

In the following, I elaborate on the collaborations between the school and the parents, and the public library and the school.

#### LITERACY PRACTICES ACCESSIBLE TO ALL PUPILS, FAMILIES, AND SCHOOLS

The collaboration between the school and the parents was one of the factors that contributed to the pupils' high levels of reading achievements (Damber, 2010). When the children had mastered decoding, those beginning to learn Swedish as a second language devoted a lot of time to reading at home, to catch up with the reading of their native Swedish peers. Thus, collaboration with the parents was crucial. Parents of many children, including parents of several toddlers, attended the short but frequent parents' meetings about reading engagement; leaving children with a babysitter for a short period was easier than leaving them for several hours. At the parents' meetings, Sue and the teachers provided explicit information about how the parents could assist the children in their reading. Sue explains:

There was no socializing at the parents' meetings. No superfluous activities like coffee and cookies ... just straight information: "This is how far we have got. At Christmas, the children will be at this point. If you don't have them read during Christmas vacation, they will lose ground. So, you have to make sure that your children go to the library, borrow books and read. You listen to them read. Then they will stay at this level and then we will move on next term" ... In communicating with parents, we never said, "I would like you to come", "It would be kind of you to come", the way Swedes often express their directives. We simply said: "Come". I believe that explicit communication is paramount. These parents did not understand the way Swedes express themselves [for example] "Could you please be so kind as to..." when they really mean "Do this" or "Do that".

U. DAMBER

The teachers recommended several activities at home, such as support of the mother tongue in literacy acquisition, reading as an interactive enterprise and repetition (Baker, 2003; Cummins, 2000; Street, 1995). In this way, the parents, some of whom were illiterate, were engaged in the meaning-making processes, using both the mother tongue and Swedish (see Freebody & Luke, 2003). Sue continued to use these activities when parents were invited to come to the library. She talked with the parents about the reading materials the library could offer in different languages and the resources that the library could offer both them and their children. According to the librarian, the fact that the parents saw with their own eyes how the children trusted the librarian paved the way for future visits to the library: “The parents trusted us. They had confidence in us. And for many years, the parents came to the library for different reasons, so we could help out”.

#### LIBRARIES “IN BETWEEN” SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY

Access is a key word when discussing the functions of libraries. The pupils experienced the library as a sanctuary or resting place, which facilitated reading for pleasure where no one had any intention of controlling or evaluating their reading experiences. In addition, the library had a very important function for the parents (Sandin, 2011). The exhibition of the children’s artwork was the first invitation for parents to visit the library, and many more visits followed. Parents were encouraged to visit the library to borrow books for their children. However, the library also offered newspapers and books in different languages. The library was the place both grown-up children and parents turned to for support with such tasks as with navigating the Swedish bureaucracy, completing forms and job applications: “When a problem turned up ... the parents turned to us, asked us, and together we tried to find a solution”.

Through the children’s trust in the librarian, the parents felt that the librarian was trustworthy and not under any obligation to evaluate them. The library’s resources became a bridge between Swedish society and the local community. Using Freire’s wording (Freire & Macedo, 1987), the library offered possibilities to read both the word and the world.

#### MULTIMODAL LITERACY PRACTICES

Literature-based literacy teaching with real-world applications came to be the norm in this district. A ripple effect eventually occurred, and word spread that the children’s language and literacy performance were notably improved (see Damber, 2010):

Our project turned into a pilot project. At the same time, a language policy [a local policy document with the purpose of implementing a language focus across the curriculum] was implemented in the schools and preschools.

A crucial improvement in the pupils’ literacy performance was noticed in the following year, both by the teachers and the librarian, when the pupils were well on

their way with their writing development. The importance of paying respect to different perspectives on story content guided the activities. The children engaged in reading, creative writing, acting and art production.

Book reviews were discarded. Instead, the idea was that the children should take on the role of the character, either in reading, dramatizing, in producing art objects or in writing. They took on the role of the character they were to portray. They wrote, "I am NN". At that point, something happened with their language. And it was so obvious. I mean so obvious. Their texts became so interesting! I believe that it had to do with the fact that they had read the book, they built up a relation ... and they had knowledge about what they were going to write about. And they took on the role. Even if they were not necessarily going to act it out, they got familiar with the character. This way of thinking ... I versus the portrayed character.

The pupils, thus, experienced what a change in perspectives is about. According to the librarian, their texts reflected how they worked as authors with ownership of their texts. By taking on the role of a fictional character, they also explored the role of an author.

Increased encounters with children's books also generated reading habits that were not restricted to the school environment. The young pupils, from the very start of their literacy trajectories, were given a lot of responsibility for their writing, their reading and their own interpretations of texts:

Our [the children's and the adults'] interpretations were equally valid. We talked a lot about this ... that we had no right to impose our interpretations on the children just because we were adults. As adults, we are more experienced and have wider frames of reference, but we have no precedence when it comes to interpretations. The children were given full responsibility, and that was a lot of responsibility.

To sum up, the pupils engaged with the literature and in discussions, becoming text users and producers. They were socialized into becoming text users and creating text from early on. The children engaged in multiple and diverging interpretations of texts, thus taking their first steps in becoming critical readers (Freebody & Luke, 2003).

## CONCLUSION

The collaborative work among the public librarian, teachers and parents shows how inclusive approaches to literacy learning and literacy development may be developed with rather simple means in an ordinary school. The teachers succeeded in bridging formal and informal learning arenas, with the close collaboration of the public librarian. The librarian and the public library played an important part in these processes. The librarian's function was not limited to book provision, even though access to authentic literature is a central characteristic of the collaborative project. Instead, she was deeply involved in the school projects, from setting aims,

through implementation to evaluation and finding ways forward, contributing with her competence in all phases of the project. The librarian encouraged and facilitated the teachers' and parents' extensive use of the library and its services, enhancing both reading for learning and reading for pleasure.

Literature and literacy fulfil functions that reach far beyond the technical aspects of reading. The act of reading opens up doors to the world beyond geographical, social and cultural limits (Freire & Macedo, 1987). Reading is embedded in integrative processes for equity, in terms of equal chances to acquire (academic) language, as well as intercultural understanding and tolerance through participation in, and joint analyses of, stories (Au & Raphael, 2000). The literacy events that the librarian created in the classes were developed within a culturally sensitive literacy model (Freebody & Luke, 2003; Janks, 2010; Street, 1985; Street, chapter two in this volume). This holistic view of literacy, encompassing the whole family of literacy practices, enabled the children to develop their literacy in *different* ways, depending on their specific interests and different potentials.

Notably, the public librarian played a crucial role in the whole transformation of the literacy practices, from perceiving reading as a technical skill to a much wider conception of literacies. Sue's professional experience and competence worked as an inspiration in the joint work between her and the teachers. In addition, her position as a librarian paved the way for the library to become a resource for both children and adults.

The most salient feature of empowerment, however, is how the adults viewed their pupils as resourceful and capable text users, participants and analysts. All pupils in this study cracked the alphabetic code and became fluent readers in Swedish as a second language. The early focus on the whole family of literacy practices, with the use of multimodal input and multimodal expressions, enabled the children to show their capacity and gain respect for their resources from the very start, regardless of their linguistic minority background. This contributed significantly to their reading engagement, enhancement of their literacy development and subsequent high proficiency in Swedish as a second language.

The teachers and the librarian gradually developed a shared concept of literacy as social practice. This study reflects a shared culturally sensitive model of literacy, as a result of joint analyses of the literacy practice and a trial-and-error approach to literacy education based on the needs and resources the children had. The same concepts, principles and ways of collaborating indicate that reading for pleasure stimulates reading for learning. The principles may be applied in other contexts and other countries to contribute to high reading engagement and literacy achievements among second-language learners.

#### REFERENCES

- Alleklev, B., & Lindvall, L. (2001). Läs- och skrivprojektet Listiga Råven – att läsa i skolan och lära för livet [The reading and writing project the Clever Fox – reading in school and learning for life]. In K. Naclér (Ed.), *Symposion 2000: Ett andraspråksperspektiv på lärande* [Symposion 2000: A second language perspective on learning (pp. 185–199)]. Stockholm: Sigma Förlag.

- Au, K. H., & Raphael, T., E. (2000). Equity and literacy in the next millennium. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 35(1), 177–188. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.35.1.12>
- Axelsson, M. (2013). Flerspråkighet och lärande [Multilingualism and learning]. In K. Hyltenstam & I. Lindberg (Eds.), *Svenska som andraspråk – i forskning, undervisning och samhälle* [Swedish as a second language – in research, education and society (pp. 547–577)]. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Barton, D. (2007). *An introduction to the ecology of written language* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Carle, T., Kinnander, S., & Salin, S. (2000). *Lärarnas riksförbund 1884–2000: Ett stycke svensk skolhistoria ur fackligt perspektiv* [The Teachers' National Association 1884–2000: A piece of Swedish educational history from the Union's perspective]. Stockholm: Informationsförl.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Huber, J. (2010). Narrative inquiry. In B. McGraw, E. Baker, & P. Peterson (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of education* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Elsevier. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-044894-7.01387-7>
- Clay, M. (1998). *Reading recovery: A guidebook for teachers in training*. Auckland: Heinemann Education.
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Damber, U. (2010). *Reading for Life: Three studies of Swedish students' literacy development* (Doctoral thesis). Linköping University, Department of Behavioural Sciences and Learning, Linköping.
- Damber, U. (2011). Literature and empowerment. *US-China Education Review*, 8(4), 88–102.
- Dressman, M. (1997). *Literacy in the library: Negotiating the spaces between order and desire*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvin.
- Elley, W. B. (2000). The potential of book floods for raising literacy levels. *International Review of Education*, 46(3), 233–255. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1004086618679>
- Freebody, P., & Luke, A. (2003). Literacy as engaging with new forms of life. The “four roles” model. In G. Bull & M. Anstey (Eds.), *The literacy lexicon* (2nd ed., pp. 52–57). Sydney: Prentice Hall.
- Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the word and the world*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Gee, J. P. (2001). Reading as situated language: A sociocognitive perspective. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 44(8), 714–725. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1598/JAAL.44.8.3>
- Granberg, O., & Ohlsson, J. (2009). *Från lärandets loopar till lärande organisationer* [From the loops of learning to learning organizations]. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Heath, S. B., & Street, B. V. (2008). *On ethnography: Approaches to language and literacy research*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Hedemark, Å. (2011). *Barn berättar: En studie av 10-åringars syn på läsning och bibliotek* [Children's voices: A study of 10-year-olds' view of reading and libraries]. Sweden: Svensk Biblioteksörening.
- Janks, H. (2010). *Literacy and power*. London: Routledge.
- Lance, K. C. (2002). Impact of school media programs on academic achievement. *Teacher Librarian*, 29(3), 29–34.
- Lance, K. C., & Loertscher, D. V. (2001). *Powering achievement: School library media programs make a difference: The evidence*. San Jose, CA: Hi Willow Research & Publishing.
- Latham, D., Gross, M., & Witte, S. (2013). Preparing teachers and librarians to collaborate to teach 21st century skills: Views of LIS and education faculty, American Association of School Librarians. *School Library Research*, 16.
- Lieblich, A., Tuval-Mashiach, R., & Zilber, T. (1998). *Narrative research: Reading, analysis and interpretation*. London: Sage.
- Limberg, L., & Lundh, A. (Eds.). (2013). *Skolbibliotekets roller i förändrade landskap: En forskningsantologi* [The school library's roles in changing landscapes: A research anthology]. Lund: BTJ förlag.
- Luke, A., & Freebody, P. (1999). *Further notes on the Four Resources Model*. Retrieved from <http://kingstonnetworknumandlitteam.wikispaces.com/file/view/Further+Notes+on+the+Four+Resources+Model-Allan+Luke.pdf>

U. DAMBER

- Luke, A., & Kale, J. (1997). Learning through difference: Cultural practices in early childhood language socialization. In E. Gregory (Ed.), *One child, many worlds: Early learning in multicultural communities* (pp. 11–29). London: David Fulton.
- Martin-Jones, M., & Jones, K. (Eds.). (2000). *Multilingual literacies: Reading and writing different worlds*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.
- Montiell-Overall, P., & Grimes, K. (2013). Teachers and librarians collaborating on inquiry-based science instruction: A longitudinal study. *Library & Information Science Research*, 35(1), 41–53. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2012.08.002>
- New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(1), 60–92. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.17763/haer.66.1.17370n67v22j160u>
- Nicholson, T. (2000). *Reading the writing on the wall: Debates, challenges and opportunities in the teaching of reading*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Pidgeon, N., & Henwood, K. (1997). Using grounded theory in psychological research. In N. Hayes (Ed.), *Doing qualitative analysis in psychology* (pp. 245–273). Hove: Psychology Press.
- Pihl, J. (2010). *Etnisk mangfold i skolen: Det sakkyndige blikket* [Ethnic diversity in schools: The expert eyes] (2nd ed.). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Sandin, A. S. (2011). *Barnbibliotek och lässtimulans: Delaktighet, förhållningssätt, samarbete* [Children's libraries and stimulation to read: Participation, attitude, cooperation]. Stockholm: Regionbibliotek Stockholm.
- Sfard, A., & Prusak, A. (2005). Telling identities: In search of an analytic tool for investigating learning as a culturally shaped activity. *Educational Researcher*, 34(4), 14–22. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0013189X034004014>
- Söderlund, M. (2009). Nytt skolbibliotek: Påverkas elevernas läsning? En undersökning av två åttondeklasser i Eskilstuna [Novel school library: Will the pupils' reading be affected? A study of two eight grade-classes in Eskilstuna]. In K. Rydbeck (Ed.), *Spelar skolbiblioteket en roll* [Does the school library make a difference?]. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet.
- Street, B. V. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Street, B. V. (1995). *Social literacies: Critical approaches to literacy in development, ethnography and education*. Harlow: Longman Group Ltd.
- Tonne, I., & Pihl, J. (2012). Literacy education, reading engagement, and library use in multilingual classes. *Intercultural Education*, 23(3), 183–194. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2012.701424>

*Ulla Damber*  
*Mid Sweden University, Sweden*  
*Umeå University, Sweden*



TONE CECILIE CARLSTEN AND JØRGEN SJAASTAD

## 7. A STATE-RUN SCHOOL LIBRARY PROGRAMME IN NORWAY

### *Political Contradictions*

#### INTRODUCTION

As in several other nations, there is a clear contradiction in state-run school library development in Norway; during the past decade, there has been a political agreement that school libraries should be prioritized in policy development, yet the government does not give school libraries sufficient priority when it comes to financial support and formal regulations.

This chapter analyses a school library development programme in Norway that was run by the state in the period 2009–2013. The aim of the programme was to improve conditions for school libraries at a national level to ensure preconditions for lifelong learning for all students (see Pihl, 2012). Our research questions were: What was the relationship between the policy aims and outcomes at the school level as the programme came to a close? What is the current status of state-level policy for school libraries since the formal completion of the development programme in 2013?

Using a mixed-methods approach, we present findings from an evaluation based on survey and interview data. We interviewed scholars in charge of implementing the development programme, school leaders, school librarians and teachers. We outline some challenges of school library policy implementation through its apparent contradictions, which may also be relevant for other countries that aim to improve conditions for school library development through centralized policy measures.

#### THE SCHOOL LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

In recent years, the concept of the school library has, in many ways, changed from representing a book collection to facilitating a new learning environment. It is thus what we may call a “distributed learning arena”, which is a learning arena that works beyond its own context, distributing knowledge and information through paper publications as well as mediated through digital technology (Hoel, 2010; Ingvaldsen, 2013; Limberg, 2002; Lonsdale, 2003). This empirical perspective corresponds with the new theoretical tradition in literacy studies termed New Literacy Studies (Street, 2003). According to this approach, literacy is not viewed only as the acquisition of skills, but also as a social practice (Carlsten, 1998;

*J. Pihl et al. (Eds.), Teacher and Librarian Partnerships in Literacy Education  
in the 21st Century, 89–102.*

© 2017 Sense Publishers. All rights reserved.

Gee, 1999; Pihl, chapter three in this volume). The school library as a “modern” arena for literacy development has been noted in a number of policy papers in Norway and other countries (Carlsten & Sjaastad, 2014).

Nevertheless, as elsewhere, Norway does not seem to provide sufficient resources, optimal governmental organization or the appropriate legal provisions for school libraries to grow into the potential of the 21st century learning arena that educational policy aims to prescribe (e.g., House of Representatives. Standing Committee on Education and Employment, 2011; Svensk biblioteksörening, 2007; Pihl, Carlsten and van der Kooij, chapter one in this volume).

This does not mean that centralized efforts have not been attempted. When it came to prioritising different measures to support the aims of literacy development in schools, the Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research initiated a national programme called Programme for School Library Development in 2009–2013. The programme was based on a series of studies and other policy developments, and, as such, was well-grounded (Carlsten & Sjaastad, 2014). The main aim was to develop school library conditions nationwide, and therefore help municipalities and schools in developing reading skills, reducing social and digital divides, and promoting the personal growth of the individual student. The school library was supposed to be an arena for learning in all disciplines and across disciplines, and for teaching literature and competence in digital learning resources. An additional goal of the programme was for school librarians and teachers to increase their formal competence in school library research topics and the use of school libraries in education.

A part of the state-run plan was also to provide school owners and schools with support to integrate school libraries systematically into the teaching of reading and information literacy. A group of scholars at the University of Agder (UiA) was appointed as main executives. Schools wrote applications to seek funding, in which they described their plans for the development of their local school library. The UiA group decided which development projects to fund. The funding was used differently by the different schools, for instance, to hire staff, create new permanent activities, or to buy digital tools or new furniture. The schools were not supposed to use the funding to increase their book collection.

Over the four-year period, roughly €4.3 million was allocated for the implementation of the programme in Norway. Most of the resources were spent on the execution of school projects across the country. However, the national programme only encompassed around 6% of all Norwegian primary and lower secondary schools. Across Norway, 173 schools participated in the first year, with 37 of these schools receiving funding for the second year. Funding criteria included the quality of the tender, geographical distribution, and the type and size of the school.

Given the low number of participating schools, the state-run programme was indeed limited in scope. To determine whether the national dimension in this programme was more than a rhetorical feature, we examined the output of the national performance goals as stated by the Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. These national goals were as follows.

#### A STATE-RUN SCHOOL LIBRARY PROGRAMME

- Fifty percent of school librarians in primary and lower secondary schools shall be trained<sup>1</sup> in school library development.
- There shall be an increase in the number of municipalities and schools that have actively adopted the school library in education and who have anchored the library in its long-term planning to strengthen literacy.
- There shall be established models for systematic use of school libraries in education.

In this chapter, we ask: What was the relationship between these three policy aims and the measurable outcomes at the school level? What is the current status of state support for school libraries since the formal completion of the development programme in 2013?

#### A MIXED-METHODS DESIGN

We address these research questions based on results from a national evaluation we conducted in 2014 (Carlsten & Sjaastad, 2014). The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training funded the evaluation. In the evaluation, we used a mixed-methods design, which included a document analysis and a survey of all school leaders in the development programme. It also included a case study of five strategically selected elementary and lower secondary schools. During the visits to these case schools, we carried out focus group interviews with school leaders, school librarians and teachers. In addition, we also interviewed the scholars in charge of implementing the development programme.

We also refer to the regular national survey *Questions for School – Norway* conducted by the Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. The survey is conducted every six months and is distributed to 150 school owners and 737 school leaders, about one-third of that population in Norway. In the spring of 2009 and 2013, the surveys included questions related to school libraries (Vibe, Evensen, & Hovdhaugen, 2009; Vibe & Hovdhaugen, 2013).

Therefore, we have representative survey data for both the year in which the programme for school library development started and for the year it ended. This enables a discussion of the relationship between the national policy aims and the outcomes at the school level.

To comment on the current status of school libraries since the formal completion of the development programme in 2013, we refer to a document analysis of relevant policy papers from the Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research, and to the national budgets for 2014, 2015 and 2016 from the Norwegian Ministry of Finance.

#### PREVIOUS RESEARCH ON POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

During the last decade, we have seen an increase in studies on the impact of school libraries on student learning. In Norway, these studies focus on learning outcomes related to the use of school libraries in a sociocultural learning perspective, rather

than attempting to carry out experimental effect studies linking the school library to a measured increase in literacy (Carlsten & Sjaastad, 2014). While there is an obvious political interest in understanding what creates literacy improvement, our perception is that it is methodologically challenging to find a way to measure a causal relationship between school library use and literacy. This may also explain why it can be difficult to obtain funding for such studies (see Pihl, Carlsten and van der Kooij, chapter one in this volume). In Norway, as in other countries, research projects demonstrate the potential of school libraries and school librarians to improve educational and community outcomes as a whole (see Avery, chapter four; Cremin and Swann, chapter nine; Damber, chapter six; and Pihl, chapter three in this volume).

However, some U.S. studies claim to have found significant measurable learning outcomes for students through a strategic and systematic focus on school libraries (e.g., Francis, Lance, & Lietzau, 2010; Mancall, 1985; National Centre for Educational Statistics [NCES], 2005, 2009). We find the same claim in research and surveys from Australia, New Zealand and the U.K. (Barrett, 2010; Lonsdale, 2003; Ngan, 2012). German studies have highlighted the need to place school libraries within a government structure with continuous monitoring (Holderried & Lücke, 2012). Swedish and Norwegian studies point out that the school library is a specific organizational context for learning. As noted, this is a perspective that is based on recent sociocultural learning theory (cf. Carlsten & Sjaastad, 2014). Such studies emphasize that reading practices and reading skills are social practices. Literacy development is enhanced through the use of school libraries as an important learning arena across disciplines and levels of schooling (e.g., Ingvaldsen, 2013; Limberg, 2002; Pihl, 2012).

What we know about school library policy implementation from previous research may be categorized into three levels:

- Macro level: Knowledge on the premises of state-level decision-making,
- Meso level: Knowledge on the implementation strategies of school owners and schools,
- Micro level: Knowledge on the level of integration of school librarians.

#### *Macro Level*

At the macro level, the literature highlights one central finding that seems to be pervasive for projects on school libraries that have managed to create links between national political goals, measures and results; the development of school libraries as a resource in schools should have continuous state monitoring (Achterman, 2008; Gamoran, Secada, & Marrett, 2000; Kirmse, 2013; Lance, Hamilton-Pennell, & Rodney, 2005; NCES, 2005, 2009; OECD, 2009; Schlamp, 2013). In 2007, a school library survey in Norway also found that there was a need to support schools to develop school libraries in a professional way (Barstad, Audunson, Hjortsæter, & Østli, 2007). Research in Sweden supports the notion that continuous state support is needed for school library development (Ingmarson,

2010; Jensinger, 2013; Skolverket, 2007; Svensk biblioteksforening, 2007). Previous research on policy aims at the state level emphasizes that sustained state support is considered a necessary condition for school libraries to develop in a positive way across schools and municipalities.

### *Meso Level*

At the meso level, studies and evaluations of school libraries clearly point to the fact that local projects must have a clear foundation both in school leadership and at the level of the school owner (e.g., Achterman, 2008; Francis et al., 2010; Carlsten & Sjaastad, 2014). A number of U.S. studies emphasize the need for middle management to actively co-ordinate government policies and goals for school libraries and local school library policies (Francis et al., 2010). More specifically, we know from this research that the understanding of school owners and school leaders towards government goals and their support for the corresponding school library practice are essential to ensure positive results. The research also indicates several factors related to school libraries that contribute to improved learning outcomes, such as flexible opening hours for the school library and the presence of a formally trained librarian for the support and guidance of both students and teachers (Francis et al., 2010). The Norwegian evaluation confirmed this finding (Carlsten & Sjaastad, 2014). In a survey, the Great Australian School Libraries Campaign (FAIR, 2015) sought nominations for “great school libraries”; nominators were requested to answer the following questions, taken to represent the institutional quality of a school library:

1. Is there a qualified teacher-librarian managing the library?
2. Is the library open whenever the school is open?
3. Can students learn information skills in the school library?
4. Can students borrow the resources they need, when they need them?
5. Can students borrow popular fiction without a long waiting period?
6. Is there enough space for a whole class to fit into the library?
7. Is there high-speed access to the internet?
8. Are students encouraged to use online resources?
9. Are there special activities, for example, Book Week, the Premier’s Reading Challenge?
10. Do students, parents and teachers think the library is AWESOME?

### *Micro Level*

At the micro level, the literature links the institutional level with the individual and professional levels in schools. It shows that student learning is affected when the school librarian is part of a clear and comprehensive educational plan (Kuhlthau 2010; Rafste 2001). In fact, the school librarian should ideally be a teacher-librarian, with a combination of library professional skills and teaching skills (Achterman, 2008; Francis et al., 2010; Pihl, 2012; Rafste, Sætre, & Sundt, 2006).

While this is a stated aim, Norwegian studies show that the reality is different. In a well-known study on school libraries from 2007, 55% of school librarians in upper secondary schools had formal training as librarians and pedagogues, while only 9% of school library staff in elementary and lower secondary schools reported having such a professional background (Barstad et al., 2007).

While research demonstrates a clear impact of school libraries and school librarians on student learning and community building, findings also show inherent political contradictions. The 2011 Australian inquiry into school libraries and school librarians in Australian schools noted that:

There is a perception by many librarians that they have to constantly demonstrate their worth to principals and the wider school community in order to receive support.... Whilst research demonstrates a clear correlation between a good school library and teacher-librarian and student achievement, the link is not always appreciated, acknowledged or made best use of. (House of Representatives. Standing Committee on Education and Employment, 2011)

This political contradiction in state-run school library development is also present in Norway (Carlsten & Sjaastad, 2014). In the next section, we elaborate on the findings from our evaluation of the state-run school library development programme 2009–2013.

#### RESULTS OF THE SCHOOL LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME 2009–2013

The evaluation of the programme concluded that it was successful for the participating schools and school owners. The school leaders, teachers, school librarians and school owners at the municipal level all reported that the state support for school library development was very valuable for their local work (Carlsten & Sjaastad, 2014). However, as noted earlier, the national programme only included around 6% of the schools in Norway.

##### *The First National Goal*

We have listed above the three goals for the improvement of school libraries at the national level. The first goal was for 50% of primary school librarians to be trained in school library development. Given that only 6% of the schools took part in the development programme, one must look for positive effects for schools outside the programme.

However, only around 30% of schools reported that they had persons with such formal training in 2013 (Vibe & Hovdhaugen, 2013). The survey *Questions for School – Norway* showed great variation between school levels. Only 9% of school librarians in primary and lower secondary schools reported having a three-year degree in school library development education in 2009 (Vibe et al., 2009). After the state-run programme was completed in 2013, this number had increased to 11% (Vibe & Hovdhaugen, 2013).

In comparison, 50% of school librarians in upper secondary schools reported to have the relevant three-year degree in 2009, and this number increased to 55% in 2013 (Vibe & Hovdhaugen, 2013). These figures confirm earlier Norwegian studies (e.g., Barstad et al., 2007) as well as findings from our other datasets (Carlsten & Sjaastad, 2014).

In conclusion, there was no significant increase in trained school librarians at the national level as a result of the school library development programme. In fact, the number of reported teachers responsible for the school library work *without* any formal training in such work increased within the same period from 48% in 2009 to 56% in 2013 (Vibe & Hovdhaugen, 2013).

### *The Second National Goal*

The second national goal stated that there should be an increase in the number of municipalities and schools that actively used school libraries to achieve educational aims, and that had integrated the school library in its long-term planning to strengthen literacy education. This goal was evaluated through interviews, document analysis and survey analysis.

The first sub-question to be answered related to the number of schools that actually had a school library. In *Questions for School – Norway* conducted in 2009, school leaders and school owners reported that 83% of schools had a library (Vibe et al., 2009). In 2013, the number had decreased to 79% (Vibe & Hovdhaugen, 2013). Observing this decreasing trend, the second question asked whether the school owners had a plan for school library work. In 2013 – the year in which the four-year state-run programme ended – 75% of municipalities had no such plan. Given that the state emphasized that the development programme should not replace or impair the responsibility of the municipalities with respect to school libraries, the second national goal has not been fulfilled (Carlsten & Sjaastad, 2014).

At the school level, over 70% of responding school leaders reported that the school library had a central place in the school's educational work (Vibe & Hovdhaugen, 2013). However, school library activities were more often reported to be related to reading for pleasure than as a pedagogically planned activity, which confirms similar findings in the Programme for International Student Assessment studies (OECD, 2009). When visiting schools and interviewing school librarians and school leadership, we found that the role of the school library varied in terms of its place in the enacted curriculum. While some school leaders had regular meetings with the school librarian and teachers in curriculum groups, other school leaders organized the school library as a free space where no formal learning goals were intended to guide the reading (Carlsten & Sjaastad, 2014).

### *The Third National Goal*

The third goal for school libraries at the national level was whether there should be established models for systematic use of school libraries in education. We found it

difficult to assess this goal and its wording raised a number of issues with informants and survey respondents: What was meant by “established models for systematic use”? What was meant by a school library model? What would systematic use of such a model mean – the dissemination of ideas of best practice through the school owner, or something different? Would there be state support to maintain the models for systematic use after the programme ended in 2013?

In 2013, 38% of primary and lower secondary schools reported developmental work where the school library was part of a systematic activity (Vibe & Hovdhaugen, 2013). One question relevant for assessing this goal was to ask if there was increased co-operation for school library development between schools and school owners (i.e., the municipality). Only 15% of the respondents answered affirmatively. As already emphasized, in the framework of the development programme, the state explicitly said that the programme itself would not replace the school owners’ responsibility. In that sense, the results of the state development programme were quite weak in terms of development of sustainable models for school libraries at the national level.

#### *The First Research Question*

Our first research question was to examine the relationship between these three national policy goals and the measurable outcomes at the school level. The relation between performance goals and goal attainment can be summarized as follows:

*Table 1. Goal attainment of the library programme (adapted from Carlsten & Sjaastad 2014)*

	<i>Performance goal</i>	<i>Goal attainment</i>
1	50 percent of school librarians in primary schools are trained in school library competence	Not met
2	Increased the number of municipalities and schools that have implemented the school library in education and anchored the school library in its long-term educational planning in order to strengthen literacy	Not met
3	Establishment of models for systematic use of school libraries in education	Yes, at project schools

Overall, we come to a split conclusion. While the programme for school library development was successful for the 173 participating schools, it was not successful at the national level. Although the programme set national goals, it was not designed in a way that made it possible to accomplish these goals. Thus, there was a clear gap between policy goals and outcomes at the national level.



*The Second Research Question*

Our second research question was not covered by the evaluation published in 2014 (Carlsten & Sjaastad, 2014). We wanted to know about the current status of state support for school libraries since the formal completion of the development programme in 2013. The university community responsible for executing the programme only received a relatively small amount of funding to keep the websites they had developed active. Although some attention was paid to the programme's conclusions by interested organizations in Norway, the government chose not to further pursue the realisation of the original 2009 national goals.

Research shows a clear need for state support in order for school libraries to develop and receive enough support (Achterman, 2008; Gamoran et al., 2000; Kirmse, 2013; Lance et al., 2005; NCES, 2005, 2009; OECD, 2009; Schlamp, 2013). Since the state-run programme ended, and we completed our research, published our report and presented the findings to the government, there has been no sustained state support for school library development in Norway. In fact, after this evaluation was delivered to the Minister of Education and Research, the programme was terminated. When the programme was terminated the government did not decide to implement the successful new models for use of school libraries in education. As we noted in the introduction, this is a signal of *political contradiction* in the state-run school library development in Norway. Despite initial political agreement that school libraries should be prioritized in policy development, the government decided not to give school libraries sufficient priority when it came to financial support and formal regulations.

In the following section, we discuss some possible reasons why the Norwegian state authorities failed to sustain and develop school libraries in Norway, in contrast to the state's own declared aims.

## DISCUSSION

What may be the reasons for the gap between the ambitious policy goals for school library development and the poor results of the development programme? Examination of the framework for the development programme reveals some possible sources of conflicting interests.

First, while the rationale for the school library development programme aligned with the current understanding of literacy and school improvement, the upscaling implementation measures did not. Although the framework allowed for an implementation strategy developed from ideas in sociocultural theory, the reality was that school libraries were still treated by state authorities more as an independent additional arena for learning (in contrast to the view informed by New Literacy Studies), than as a comprehensive distributed learning arena. Thus, at the national policy level, the concept of literacy as a social practice is not as well established as that of literacy as a basic skill. At the school level, the support of research-based findings about learning as sociocultural practice is stronger than at the macro level (cf. Carlsten & Sjaastad, 2014; Pihl, 2012; Rafste et al., 2006).

Whatever the reasons, it seems strangely optimistic that the government would believe that a project targeted at only 6% of schools would spread nationwide. If the sociocultural understanding of literacy and school improvement were to be taken seriously, a larger sample of the school population should have been involved in a bottom-up perspective. By executing this programme with the 173 schools involved, the school library would have the opportunity to be something more than an arena for enthusiasts. However, the systematic state support did not spread outside the sample population, nor were there any plans for the support to expand beyond the given programme time frame for most of the schools involved (Carlsten & Sjaastad, 2014).

Second, the legal provisions were not very clear concerning implementation and co-ordination in practice, which may also have affected the political alignment of aims and resource allocations. The Education Act § 09-2 second paragraph merely says that “pupils shall have access to a school library” (Ministry of Education and Research, 1998). Regulation § 21-1 complicates the issue further:

The school should have a school library unless access to a school library is secured through cooperation with other libraries. Libraries not located at the local school shall be available to pupils during school hours, so that the library can be used for educational purposes. The library should be specially adapted for school. (Ministry of Education and Research, 2006)

Accordingly, school libraries have a very weak foundation in the Norwegian Education Act. One implication of this weak judicial framework is that it is not clear if or how a public library should be best adapted for school co-operation. Aligned with this lack of detail on school and library co-operation, there is no regulation of formal requirements for staffing or for opening hours. This situation is not unique to the Norwegian case (Pihl, Carlsten, & van der Kooij, chapter one in this volume).

Third, for policy implementation strategies to work, the responsible parties must be defined. In Norway, the responsibility for public libraries and school libraries is located in two different ministries, the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Education and Research. The Ministry of Education and Research is responsible for school library development, whereas both ministries are responsible for stimulating co-operation between schools and public libraries. Apparently, co-ordination of policies that support collaboration between public and school libraries is difficult to obtain when the political responsibility is divided between two ministries. This situation adds certain challenges to the governance of school libraries in Norway (Pihl, 2011). This is emphasized by the regulation of the law, which states that “the school should have a school library unless access to a school library is secured through cooperation with other libraries” (Ministry of Education and Research, 2006). This regulation requires the close co-operation of two different ministries on school libraries, which in itself adds risk to the success of a well-executed policy implementation.

A further complication is the change in the Norwegian law concerning libraries, which was enacted on 26 April 2013. Here, the requirement for organized

co-operation between public libraries and school libraries in the municipality was removed (Ministry of Culture, 2013). The Ministry of Culture (2013) stated that it was appropriate that the municipality should be in charge of ensuring co-operation between public libraries and school libraries. It would be up to the municipality to optimize the use of municipal resources by establishing close co-operation between the public and school libraries. Several other organizational requirements and tasks were also removed from the library law (Carlsten & Sjaastad, 2014), which added to the weak position of school libraries in the Education Act. In sum, we can say that school libraries were weakly protected by the Norwegian Education Act both before and after the period of the national programme.

Finally, it is important to add that while the status of the school library as a cultural and community building arena has been downplayed in the past decade, the focus on measurable learning outcomes has increased (Carlsten & Sjaastad, 2014). This priority of the measurable (e.g., reading skills in the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study) over the seemingly unmeasurable (e.g., reading for the formation of the self over time) may also give the classroom political priority over the school library as a learning arena. This may point to the fact that the political contradiction presented in this chapter is also a case of contradiction between literacy discourses (Eri, chapter eight in this volume).

#### CONCLUSION

We have highlighted the clear political contradiction in state-run school library development in Norway. Our analysis of the state-run school library development programme 2009–2013 showed that although clear goals were set, the measures to achieve these stated goals were far from realistic. What was called a national programme on paper was never national in reality. The question that remains is: Why?

As noted above, educational policy in Norway prioritizes teaching and learning of basic skills. Although the government has provided no argument for why it decided not to implement the models for the use of school libraries in education on a national level, we find it reasonable to believe that this has to do with the concept of basic literacy skills, which the government promotes. Apparently, the assumption is that systematic use of the school library in education is not conducive to development of basic literacy skills. Thus, we suggest that the low priority that government policy ascribes to systematic use of school libraries in education in Norway is a manifestation of contradictions between literacy discourses; a sociocultural discourse and a basic skills discourse (Eri, chapter eight in this volume). We claim that the political contradictions found in the Norwegian case may point to a larger and more ideological discussion relevant for stakeholders in other countries working to achieve sustainable state support for school library development.

#### NOTE

<sup>1</sup> The level and scope of education or training were not specified in the national goal.

REFERENCES

- Achterman, D. L. (2008). *Haves, halves, and have-nots: School libraries and student achievement in California*. Denton, TX: UNT Digital Library. Retrieved from <http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc9800/>
- Barrett, L. (2010). Effective school libraries: Evidence of impact on student achievement. *School Librarian*, 58(3), 136–139.
- Barstad, J., Audunson, R., Hjortsæter, E., & Østli, B. (2007). *Skulebibliotek i Norge: Kartlegging av skulebibliotek i grunnskole og vidaregåande opplæring* [School libraries in Norway: A survey of school libraries in elementary, lower secondary, and upper secondary schools]. Arbeidsrapport nr. 204. Volda: Høgskulen i Volda/Møreforskning Volda.
- Carlsten, C. T. (1998). *God lesing – god læring: En aksjonsrettet studie av undervisning i fagtekstlesing*. [Good reading – good learning: Action research on subject matter reading instruction] (Doctoral thesis). Det psykologiske fakultet, Universitetet i Bergen, Bergen.
- Carlsten, T. C., & Sjaastad, J. (2014). *Evaluering av Programme for Skolebibliotekutvikling 2009–2013*. [Evaluation of the Programme for School Library Development 2009–2013]. Oslo: NIFU-rapport 2014:4.
- FAIR. (2015). *Great School Libraries campaign: Summary report*. Australia: Freedom of Access to Information and Resources (FAIR). Retrieved from <https://fair.alia.org.au/sites/fair.alia.org.au/files/u3/Summary%20of%20survey%20v2%20FINAL.pdf>
- Francis, B. H., Lance, K. C., & Lietzau, Z. (2010). *School librarians continue to help students achieve standards: The Third Colorado Study*. Denver, CO: Library Research Service.
- Gamoran, A., Secada, W. G., & Marrett, C. B. (2000). The organizational context of teaching and learning: Changing theoretical perspectives. In M. T. Hallinan (Ed.), *Handbook of sociology of education* (pp. 37–63). New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Press.
- Gee, J. P. (1999). Reading and the new literacy studies: Framing the National Academy of Sciences report on reading. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 31(3), 355–374. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10862969909548052>
- Hoel, T. (Ed.). (2010). *Lesing i skolebiblioteket* [Reading in the school library]. Stavanger: Lesesenteret, Universitetet i Stavanger.
- Holderried, A., & Lücke, B. (Eds.). (2012). *Handbuch schulbibliothek: Planung – betrieb – nutzung*. [Handbook on school libraries: Planning, organization, and use]. Wochenschau-Verlag: Opplag.
- House of Representatives. Standing Committee on Education and Employment. (2011). *School libraries and teacher librarians in 21st century Australia*. Canberra, Australia: Standing Committee on Education and Employment.
- Ingmarson, J. H. (2010). *Elevers kunnskapsarbeid i skolebiblioteket. En kunnskapsøversikt* [Students' knowledge work in the school library. A systematic review]. Norway: Nationella Skolebiblioteksgruppen.
- Ingvaldsen, S. (2012). Skulebibliotekutvikling [School library development]. *Nynorskopplæring*, 26. *Sjette årgang*, 12–14.
- Ingvaldsen, S. (2013). The Norwegian school library programme: The library as a tool for literacy training and education. *Scandinavian Library Quarterly*, 46(1).
- Jensinger, E. (2013). Headmaster's view of the school library. *Scandinavian Library Quarterly*, 46(1).
- Kuhlthau, C. C. (2010). Guided inquiry: School libraries in the 21st century. *School Libraries Worldwide*, 16(1), 17–28.
- Lance, K. C., Hamilton-Pennell, C., & Rodney, M. J. (2005). *Powerful libraries make powerful learners: The Illinois study*. Canton, IL: Illinois School Library Media Association.
- Limberg, L. (2002). *Skolebibliotekets pedagogiske rolle: En kunnskapsøversikt* [The role of the school library: A systematic review]. Stockholm: Skolverket.
- Lonsdale, M. (2003). *Impact of school libraries on student achievement: A review of the research*. Melbourne, Australia: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Mancall, J. C. (1985). An overview of research on the impact of school library media programmes on student achievement. *School Library Media Quarterly*, 14(1), 33–35.

## A STATE-RUN SCHOOL LIBRARY PROGRAMME

- Ministry of Culture. (2013). *Prop 135 L (2012–2013) Endringer i lov om folkebibliotek* [Changes in the law on public libraries]. Oslo: Ministry of Culture.
- Ministry of Education and Research. (1998). *Education Act. Act relating to primary and secondary education* (LOV-1998-07-17-61). Oslo: Ministry of Education and Research. Retrieved from <https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/1998-07-17-61>
- Ministry of Education and Research. (2006). *Regulation concerning the Education Act* (FOR-2006-06-23-724). Oslo: Ministry of Education and Research. Retrieved from <https://lovdata.no/dokument/SF/forskrift/2006-06-23-724>
- Ngan, E. M-X. (2011). *Unlocking the potential of school libraries: What actions are New Zealand primary school principals taking to integrate the school library in information literacy initiatives?* (Master's thesis). School of Information Management, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand.
- National Centre for Educational Statistics (NCES). (2005). *Fifty years of supporting children's learning: A history of public school libraries and federal legislation from 1953–2000*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- National Centre for Educational Statistics (NCES). (2009). *Characteristics of public and Bureau of Indian Education elementary and secondary school library media centres in the United States: Results from the 2007–08 schools and staffing survey*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2013/2013314.pdf>
- OECD. (2009). *PISA 2009 Results: What makes a school successful? Resources, policies and practices* (Vol. IV). Paris: OECD.
- Pihl, J. (2011). Literacy education and interprofessional collaboration. *Professions & Professionalism*, 1(1), 52–66.
- Pihl, J. (2012). Desire, multiplicity and learning. *Scandinavian Library Quarterly*, 45(1).
- Rafste, E. T. (2001). *Et sted å lære eller et sted å være?: En casestudie av elevers bruk og opplevelse av skolebiblioteket* [A place to study or a place to be?: A case study of students' use and experiences of school library]. Series of dissertations submitted to the Faculty of Education, University of Oslo, Oslo.
- Rafste, E. T., Sætre, T. P., & Sundt, E. (2006). Norwegian policy: Empowering school libraries. *IFLA Journal*, 32(1), 48–53. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0340035206063894>
- Schlamp, G. (2013). *Die Schulbibliothek im Zentrum: Erfahrungen, Berichte, Visionen* [The school library in the center: Experiences, stories, visions]. Berlin: Bibspider.
- Skolverket. (2007). *Redovisning av uppdrag till myndigheten för skolutveckling att utveckla skolbiblioteken och deras pedagogiska roll* [Paper to the authorities for school development to develop school libraries and their role]. Stockholm: Skolverket.
- Street, B. V. (2003). What's "new" in New Literacy Studies?: Critical approaches to literacy in theory and practice. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 5(2), 77–91.
- Svensk biblioteksförning. (2007). *Skolbiblioteken: En underutnyttjad och underprioriterad resurs* [School libraries: A resource with no priority]. Stockholm: Svensk biblioteksförning.
- Universitetet i Agder. (2011). *Tekstmangfold og tilpasset opplæring i skolebiblioteket: Ressursskoler 2010–2011 i Program for Skolebibliotekutvikling* [Multiplicity and adapted education in the school library: Resource schools 2010–2011 in the Programme for School Library Development]. Unpublished report.
- Universitetet i Agder. (2012). *Lærelyst og leseglede i skolebiblioteket: Ressursskular 2011–2012 i Program for skolebibliotekutvikling* [Learning motivation and reading for fun in the school library: Resource schools 2011–2012 in the Program for School Library Development]. Unpublished paper.
- Universitetet i Agder. (2013a). *Undre og spørje, skape og dele... skolebiblioteket i undervisninga: Ressursskular 2012–2013 i Program for Skolebibliotekutvikling* [Wondering and asking, creating and sharing... the school library in instruction: Resource schools 2011–2012 in the Program for School Library Development]. Unpublished paper.
- Universitetet i Agder. (2013b). *Program for skolebibliotekutvikling: Sluttrapport* [Program for school library development: Final report]. Unpublished paper.

T. C. CARLSTEN & J. SJAASTAD

Vibe, N., & Hovdhaugen, E. (2013). *Spørsmål til skole – Norge våren 2013* [Questions to school – Norway spring 2013], rapport 25/2013. Oslo: NIFU.

Vibe, N., Evensen, M., & Hovdhaugen, E. (2009). *Spørsmål til skole – Norge våren 2009* [Questions to school – Norway spring 2009], STEP rapport 22/2009. Oslo: NIFU.

*Tone Cecilie Carlsten*

*Nordic Institute for Studies in Innovation, Research and Education, Norway*

*Jørgen Sjaastad*

*Nordic Institute for Studies in Innovation, Research and Education, Norway*

THOMAS ERI

## 8. A MULTILINGUAL BOOK CAFÉ AT THE SCHOOL LIBRARY

*Contradictions between Literacy Discourses*

### INTRODUCTION

In the last three decades, top-down-initiated and system-wide changes in standardized curricula and pedagogy have replaced localized teaching practices within literacy education (Grimaldi, 2011; Sleeter, 2012). It is a paradox that literacy education is being standardized in local contexts that are increasingly multicultural and multilingual (Janks, 2010). In contrast to system-wide standardization, localized educational innovations are initiated and implemented by practitioners and typically involve ideas aimed at developing “culturally responsive teaching” (Hedegaard, 2003; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Several educational innovations in the Nordic countries make use of library resources. These are manifestations of culturally responsive teaching within literacy education (for example, Alleklev & Lindvall, 2000; Pihl, 2012). However, “systemic contradictions” created by system-wide standardization trigger challenges to sustaining localized educational innovations in schools (Sannino & Nocon, 2008). Systemic contradictions should not be confused with work-related tensions that stem from interpersonal power relations or differences in values and attitudes, miscommunication, or personal motives and interests. Systemic contradictions are conflicts and dilemmas manifested in discourse and practice that are related to larger social and institutional structures. For example, a practitioner’s experience of a conflict or a dilemma can be a manifestation of systemic contradictions within the socio-economic formation of capitalism. An illustrative example would be when a teacher’s obligation to foster democratic citizens is threatened by an increase in rigorous testing and the ranking and sorting of students in school. In such a situation, the teacher experiences a dilemma arising from a historically accumulated contradiction between the use value of education to citizens and the exchange value of education to foster competitive producers and consumers within global capitalism (see Eri & Pihl, 2016).

How systemic contradictions affect efforts to develop culturally responsive literacy practices in school through the use of library resources is an under-researched topic. This study explores systemic contradictions in an extra-curricular multilingual book café at the school library in a Norwegian primary school. The teacher-librarian and five bilingual teachers planned and implemented the book café. Three research questions guide this study:

*J. Pihl et al. (Eds.), Teacher and Librarian Partnerships in Literacy Education in the 21st Century, 103–118.*

© 2017 Sense Publishers. All rights reserved.

T. ERI

1. What types of contradiction occur in the book café?
2. How do the teacher-librarian and the bilingual teachers respond to the contradictions?
3. How can teachers work to address and resolve systemic contradictions within literacy education?

The aim of the multilingual book café was to stimulate *reading engagement* through literacy practices that are inclusive of the pupils' linguistic and cultural background. Voluntary reading that switches between the pupils' first language and the language of instruction was an important part of the educational activity of the book café. The Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) defines individual reading engagement as “the motivational attributes and behavioural characteristics of students' reading” (OECD, 2009, p. 70). Engaged readers read because they enjoy it, they read on a voluntary basis, they take part in social reading activities, they have positive attitudes towards reading, and they often use libraries for literacy purposes (OECD, 2009; Roe, 2008; Tonne & Pihl, 2012). Reading for pleasure in childhood is also shown to boost progress in vocabulary, cognitive development, and even mathematical skills (Sullivan & Brown, 2015).

I explain the theoretical framework of this study followed by a contextual description of the multilingual book café and the research design. I then analyse tensions observed at the book café and in meetings between the teacher-librarian and the bilingual teachers. Lastly, I discuss how these tensions are manifestations of contradictions between literacy discourses, and the need for school practitioners to develop reflexive ways of addressing contradictions in order to resolve them.

## TWO DISCOURSES OF LITERACY

### *School Literacy Discourse*

Discourses are different ideological perspectives or positions that are expressed in text, talk, and in social practice (Fairclough, 1992). Within New Literacy Studies (NLS), school literacy is defined as “a dominant literacy, supported by powerful institutions and infiltrating other domains, including the home” (Barton & Hamilton, 1998, p. 207). Street refers to dominant school literacy discourses as based on an “autonomous” literacy model (Street, 1984; Street, chapter two in this volume). An autonomous literacy model makes universal claims to a generalizable set of skills and teaching methods and presents literacy values as neutral. This is a crucial point, and I agree with Street that generalization and standardization are attributes of the political motives and objectives that underlie dominant school literacy discourses. However, in this chapter, I will not use the term autonomous in conjunction with dominant school literacy discourses. This is to avoid confusion with the concept of “autonomous teachers”. Autonomous teachers are necessary for the development of educational innovations. However, standardization of school literacy restricts the autonomy of the teacher.

The primary focus of school literacy in Norwegian educational policy is the teaching, learning and assessment of basic skills (Norwegian Directorate for



Education and Training, 2012). This is manifested in the National Curriculum as learning outcome descriptors in all primary and secondary school subjects. The National Curriculum is aligned with the National Education Act. Teachers are required by law to adhere to the framework and outcome descriptors in their teaching. Schools and teachers are held accountable and judged by their ability to teach the National Curriculum effectively, as measured by pupil test scores on standardized national tests. The national standardization of teaching, learning and assessment is a result of a comprehensive curriculum reform that was introduced in 2006 with increased focus on outcome-based learning (Ministry of Education and Research, 2006). The curriculum reform in Norway was aligned with the European Qualifications Framework (EQF) and the Bologna Process when the Ministry of Education in Norway adopted in 2011 its principles in the Norwegian Qualifications Framework for Lifelong Learning (The Norwegian Agency for Quality Assurance in Education [NOKUT], 2014, p. 4).

One of the most important objectives of the EQF is to standardize educational systems in European countries to facilitate “transnational mobility for workers and learners and contribute to meeting the requirements of supply and demand in the European labour market” (The European Parliament and Council, 2008, p. 1). Critical voices have raised concerns that the standardizing of educational systems is primarily designed to meet neo-liberal demands expressed by capital and international competition, rather than to meet pupils’ diverse strengths, interests, and needs (e.g. Apple, 2000; Giroux, 2011; Ratner, 2015). Standardization of basic skills and competence will enable competition and the free flow of workers across nations.

Education has become a commodity in the international marketplace “through which people are reconfigured as productive economic entrepreneurs of their own lives” (Davies & Bansel, 2007, p. 248). Standardization, making schools accountable for results, and the ranking and sorting of pupils are seen as necessary instruments in a market economy to transform pupils into successful entrepreneurs who can produce the best for themselves, their families, their employer, and their nation. A contradiction between these dominant discourses in educational policy and social justice is evident. In Norway, as in most other Western countries, the social inequalities between young people, the increasingly stratified workforce, and the widening achievement gap resulting from pupils’ socio-economic and sociocultural backgrounds are growing (Bakken, Frøyland, & Sletten, 2016). These are the consequences of a neo-liberal policy that undermines the important long-term educational goals of social justice (Giroux, 2016) and democratic citizenship (Biesta, 2011).

System-wide standardization is promoted by dominant school literacy discourses that are not typically concerned with the relationship between text and social context but are more committed to transmitting the culture of school literacy to the homes (Auerbach, 1989). Becoming literate in this perspective means being able to acquire academic language, thinking, and abstraction independent of social context (Russel, 2009, p. 17).

The National Curriculum does not impose upon schools and teachers the use of a specific set of teaching, learning, and assessment strategies. Nevertheless, the autonomy of schools and teachers is becoming more restricted. The local education authorities decide on specific teaching and assessment programmes to be used in all schools as standard in their district. For instance, in the Norwegian capital of Oslo, most primary schools use a localized and modified version of the “Early Years Literacy Programme”, which originated in Australia, and “Guided Reading”, which originated in New Zealand. These programmes use levelled books according to the pupils’ reading skills, as determined by reading tests. The programmes also depend on pupils’ homes to support and extend school literacy activities by giving them homework. Teachers use reading logs to track and control home reading. Parents document home reading activities by signing their name daily or weekly in the reading log. Parents are encouraged to use guided reading methods when they read with their children at home. These methods include for instance pre-reading strategies, asking predetermined questions related to the text, talking about pictures in the text, and doing grammar exercises such as finding nouns in the text. It is interesting to note that by the time these literacy programmes were adopted by local educational authorities in Norway (around 2006–2007), New Zealand and Australia, were ranked respectively fifth and seventh of 58 OECD countries in PISA (OECD, 2007, p. 47). This is statistically significantly above the OECD average. In comparison, Norway was ranked 25<sup>th</sup> of 58 OECD countries, which is statistically significantly below the OECD average.

Countries that do well in international standardized tests are considered successful within the global capitalist economy. Competition between countries is promoted as a tool for raising standards. Within this “new global orthodoxy” (Grimaldi, 2011), countries further down the list seek to raise standards by imitating school literacy models and practices used by the top-ranked countries.

#### *Culturally Responsive Literacy Discourse*

NLS has been one movement among others that in the last three decades has taken part in a “social turn” away from studying individual behaviour towards a focus on social and cultural interaction (Gee, 2000, p. 180). NLS criticizes dominant school literacy discourses and applies a different view of literacy in which “language is tied to people’s experiences of situated action in the material and social world” (Gee, 2004, p. 44). Street refers to this view as an “ideological” literacy model (Street, 1984; Street, chapter two in this volume): literacy is ideological because it varies with social and cultural context and is always contested and related to power and dominant discourses. The ideological literacy model does not disguise the ideological and cultural dimensions of literacy. Consistent with this perspective, the social turn within psychology and the learning sciences, especially activity theory approaches, has also contributed to a new conception of literacy and learning (Hull & Schultz, 2001). In this study, I use insights from both NLS and activity theory to theorize literacy learning.

Texts are physical artefacts shared among people in specific but dynamic social and cultural contexts. The cultural context consists of a range of *cultural tools* that mediate human interactions and learning. The cultural tools are imbued with meaning and power by past use, they shape human activity and practices, but are also reshaped through collective human actions and intervention. Hence, the myriad of literacy events going on both in and out of school are not separated from the human practices and activities in which they mediate (Russel, 2009, p. 18). Following this perspective, literacy education needs to be *responsive* to diverse, complex, and dynamic cultural and social contexts. However, how schools and teachers respond to cultural diversity can be laid out on a continuum from considering “diversity as a problem in literacy development to diversity as a resource in literacy development” (Nocon & Cole, 2009, p. 24). I refer to the resource discourse of diversity as a *culturally responsive literacy discourse*.

Culturally responsive teaching within literacy education means to be concerned with what the pupils and their communities are actually doing when they read, write, and speak and what it means to them in their cultural-historical and social context. Teachers are obliged to learn about the cultural identities and practices represented by pupils and parents. Culturally responsive schools are open to issues considered important by pupils and parents and are willing to include these issues in the curriculum. This involves promoting pupils and parent engagement and giving shared responsibility to them in developing learning activities.

## RESEARCH DESIGN

### *Context*

The research object of this study is an extra-curricular, multilingual book café at a school library in Norway. The school library was located within a primary school in a multicultural suburban area of a medium-sized city, where 75% of the population are of non-Western origin, with residents of Turkish and Pakistani background constituting the majority. Statistics from 2002–2008 show that the socio-economic status of the population in the suburb is low and deteriorating (Sørli, Havnen, & Ruud, 2010). Families with high education and income are moving out, while parents with lower education and income are moving in. The total number of pupils at the primary school is around 600 with approximately 80% from a minority background. The school has been advocating culturally sensitive teaching practices for many years.

The school participated in the Multiplicity project, a development project concerned with literature-based literacy education as a shared pedagogical practice among teachers, teacher-librarians/school librarians, and public librarians (See Eri & Pihl; Pihl, 2009, 2011; Tonne & Pihl, 2012; van der Kooij & Pihl, 2009). A teacher-librarian is defined as a person who holds a full qualification as a teacher and some qualification in librarianship based on continued in-service training. I was involved as a researcher in the Multiplicity project. When the teacher-librarian at the school told me that they planned to develop an extra-curricular multilingual

book café at the school library, I became especially interested in exploring this innovation further because it was a teacher-initiated innovation developed by the teachers themselves. The head teacher gave a team of teachers the responsibility to plan and develop the book café. The team consisted of the teacher-librarian and a group of five bilingual teachers (Norwegian/Albanian, /Arabic, /Urdu, /Tamil, and /Turkish). The teacher-librarian had participated in the Programme for School Library Development, a competence-building programme run by the state (see Carlsten & Sjaastad, chapter seven in this volume). The book café was to be held at the school library on one day every other month between 4 p.m. and 5.30 p.m. The bilingual teachers worked part-time at the school, as with several schools in the school district. The school library was well equipped with a core of children's literature both in Norwegian and in the various languages represented among the pupils at the school. The aim of the teacher team was to stimulate reading engagement in the first and second language and motivate parents of third-grade language-minority pupils (8 year-olds) to use the library and to read at home with their children. The team decided that multilingual and voluntary reading of authentic literature provided by the school library should be the main activity at the book café. A long-term goal formulated in the team's planning document was to "stimulate collaboration between school and home and collaboration between the local public library and home" (my translation). A branch of the public library was located just 300 metres from the school. The team had the idea that if the parents developed reading engagement and relations with the school library, they would also start using the public library more.

### *Analysis*

The unit of analysis in this case study (Creswell, 2013, pp. 97–101) is the pedagogical activity of a team of bilingual teachers and a teacher-librarian within the boundary of a multilingual book café at the school library. I conducted non-participant observation at the first and second book cafés and audio-recorded four team meetings. The teacher team gave me access to the teacher-librarian's comprehensive minutes of the remainder of the meetings. I investigated how the team planned and implemented the book café and analysed the potential contradictions that occurred in the activities of the book café.

I use a methodological framework based on cultural-historical activity theory (CHAT) (Engeström & Sannino, 2011). This framework conceptualizes problems such as tensions, conflicts, and dilemmas as potential manifestations of systemic contradictions within and across institutional contexts. An important methodological point is that CHAT has its basis in dialectics, meaning that in most human activities opposing forces are simultaneously present. These systemic contradictions have the immanent quality as obstacles *and* as potential driving forces for change and development. Systemic contradictions can become a driving force for change by identifying, analysing and resolving them.

Another central point is that we can only study contradictions indirectly, through their manifestations such as dilemmas, and conflicts in human actions, interactions,

A MULTILINGUAL BOOK CAFÉ AT THE SCHOOL LIBRARY

and discourse. In CHAT, it is the interrelations and distinctions between the societal, the social, and the psychological levels that are of analytical interest (Kontinen, 2013; Langemeyer, 2006).

A MULTILINGUAL BOOK CAFÉ AT THE SCHOOL LIBRARY

I now present and discuss observations on the two multilingual book cafés I attended and on audio-recorded data from one of the team meetings. I describe how and why the teacher team introduced a reading log into the first book café, and why they later decided to abandon it. Finally, I comment on the declining participation of parents at the book café and why it was difficult for the team to handle this problem.

*Reading for Pleasure and a Reading Log*

The teacher team invited between 50 and 60 pupils and their parents to the first book café. The purpose of the book café was to stimulate joint reading for pleasure in the pupils' first language and in the language of instruction. The assumption was that reading for pleasure generates reading engagement. The bilingual teachers wrote a formal invitation in the parents' first language. They also spoke directly on the phone or face-to-face with many of the parents to inform them about the purpose of the book café and to remind them about the time of the book café (4 p.m. to 5.30 p.m.). About 60% (30 pupils, 30 parents) of those invited attended the first book café, and the bilingual teachers considered this a high attendance.

The teacher team introduced a *reading log* at the first book café. There is nothing in the audio-recorded data that explains the team's rationale for introducing the reading log. The teachers do not talk about it. However, at the start of the book café, the teacher-librarian talked to the parents for about 30 minutes about the importance of reading with their children at home. The bilingual teachers then handed out the reading log worksheet to each of the parents. The instruction on the reading log worksheet was as follows:

*What the pupil has to do:* Read aloud from the book in the first language. The pupil must read 10 minutes on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays.

*What the parent has to do:* Listen to the child reading. The parent must write their name on the worksheet after the child has finished reading. Then, the parent has to read the book aloud for the child. The reading logs have to be placed inside the book and be put in the child's school bag every day. Enjoy reading together!

<i>Day</i>	<i>Title of the book</i>	<i>Signature parents</i>	<i>Teacher comment</i>
Monday			
Tuesday			
Wednesday			
Thursday			

Figure 1. The reading log (my translation from Norwegian)

The teacher-librarian told the parents at the book café: “the most important thing is not to fill out the reading log worksheets, but to spend time reading to your children and make them read to you” (my translation). However, the log instructs the parent to sign every day that the child has read aloud and the parent has listened, and also that they have read to the child according to the instructions. The reading logs were checked and signed every week by the bilingual teachers during school time. Thus, the log is an instrument with which the teacher can control the child’s and the parent’s home reading.

In addition to the reading logs, the pupils were given a reading diary in which they could write and draw impressions related to the stories they read from library books. The bilingual teachers emphasized that filling out the reading log worksheets was obligatory while working with the reading diary was voluntary. In the reading diary, the pupils could write in their first or second language as it suited them best.

After the introductory session with the reading logs, the parents sat together with their children in the school library and listened to them reading. The bilingual teachers supervised the parents on how they could initiate a book talk with their children. The book café ended with a social event in which parents, teachers, and pupils ate fruit and cakes together in the school library.

#### *Problems with the Reading Log*

The teacher team experienced problems with the reading logs. They did not stimulate more frequent reading and book talks at home. Some parents signed the reading log even though they had not read with their child. The teacher-librarian and the bilingual teachers discovered the problem with the logs during school when they asked the children about the contents of the books they had supposedly read at home according to the reading logs. In the minutes from the team meeting held three months before the second book café, the teacher-librarian wrote:

Last [school] year the pupils had to sign a reading log four days a week after reading 10 minutes at home with their parents. This was not successful. The teachers discovered that the parents sometimes signed the reading log even though their children had not done the reading. (Minutes from team meeting, August 2010)

The team decided to abandon the reading logs and instead emphasize work on reading for pleasure and the reading diary in future book cafés.

They wanted to arrange a book café every other month. However, due to their heavy workloads during school time, they were not able to follow this plan. In fact, the team arranged the second book café eight months after the first one. Because it was a new school year, they invited a new group of parents of third graders. On this occasion, only about 25% of the invited parents attended (13 pupils, 13 parents).

The second book café focused more on pupils performing with poems, songs, and short stories in the pupils’ first languages Urdu, Turkish, Albanian, Arabic, and

Tamil. The pupils proudly presented work they had done at home in the reading diary to the parents. After this session, the parents sat individually with their children. Some listened to their children reading, while others had conversations with their children about the text. The book café ended with book lending and a social event just as the first time.

I have described how a team consisting of a teacher-librarian and five bilingual teachers introduced a multilingual book café for the purpose of reading for pleasure and to stimulate reading engagement. The teacher team introduced a reading log, which obliged the children and parents to report on their reading. The reading log was an instrument to control the children's and parents' reading at home. However, reading for pleasure is by definition voluntary. It is a contradiction in terms to introduce reading for pleasure within a regime of strict reporting and control of the reading. The parents resisted the teachers' instructions and filled out the log even though their children had not read at home. Therefore, the teacher team decided to abandon the use of the log at the book café. A relevant question is why the teachers gave the parents "homework" (the reading log) in the first place when the book café was supposed to be an extra-curricular and voluntary activity.

I argue that there is a mismatch between the team's goal to stimulate reading for pleasure and voluntary co-reading at home, and the decision to use a reading log. The reading log is a pedagogical instrument designed to control pupils' and parents' home reading. It appears that the teachers had difficulty relinquishing the dominant school literacy strategies and tools in an extra-curricular and voluntary book café. They did not negotiate with the parents on the decision to use the log but expected the parents to make use of it without resistance. If dominant school literacy tools are to be used in extra-curricular activities, it is at least necessary to open up a dialogue on the different expectations and interests between parents and teachers (Anderson & Minke, 2007). Learning in and out of school intersects in extra-curricular activities. Teachers and parents would need to negotiate the use of pedagogical strategies and instruments at this crossroad.

I suggest that the parents' resistance is a manifestation of a systemic contradiction between a school literacy discourse and a culturally responsive literacy discourse. Within a school literacy discourse, it makes sense that a teacher controls the content, methods, and pace of reading. However, the aim of the book café was reading for pleasure and collaboration with parents about reading at home. When teachers introduce a reading log, the log becomes the main object instead of reading for pleasure. The parents were already acquainted with reading logs. The log works as a form of institutionalized surveillance system – a "panopticon" (Foucault, 1977) – for monitoring and assessing home reading. A reading log has a disciplining effect on children and parents and was, in fact, counter-productive in stimulating reading for pleasure and reading engagement.

When the teacher team planned the book café, they did not include the public librarian from the branch of the public library in the close vicinity of the school. We should recall that the teacher-librarian was not primarily trained as a librarian. If the team had collaborated with the public librarian, it is possible that they would not have introduced the reading log in the first place. A public librarian's mandate

is to stimulate reading engagement through voluntary reading, to serve the needs of the public, and to facilitate the development of democratic citizenship (UNESCO, 1994). A reading log is not part of the public librarian's professional toolbox. Unlike teachers, public librarians are not obliged to rank and sort pupils. They are not under the same pressure to increase pupils' reading performance in standardized tests. These differences in *professional vision* (Goodwin, 1994) might be part of the reason why the teacher team did not consider collaborating with the public librarian.

The teacher team encouraged the pupils to write and draw in the reading diary about the books they read. Work with the reading diary did not involve reporting to the teachers. I looked at several of the reading diaries, and it was clear that most of the pupils had done much writing and drawing on a voluntary basis in the six months since they had been given the diary. Three of the diaries were full, with 50 A4 pages of text and drawings. The diary gave the pupils an opportunity to engage with their voluntary reading in terms of other voluntary literacy practices like writing and drawing. This was a successful outcome.

The team was able to resolve the contradiction between reading for pleasure and using a reading log by abandoning the latter. However, a new problem arose, namely declining parent participation.

#### *Declining Parent Participation*

The teacher-librarian and the bilingual teachers planned to launch a workshop for the third book café together with advisors at the National Centre for Multicultural Education (NAFO) in Norway. NAFO had worked with the school for many years to assist in developing culturally sensitive teaching and multilingual teaching practices at the school. The topic of the workshop was how language minority parents can support their children's reading engagement. The teacher-librarian and the bilingual teachers expected that parents would find this topic both interesting and useful and would, therefore, prioritize attending the next book café. Unfortunately, the team had to cancel the third book café due to the very low response from parents. In one of the team meetings, the team discussed possible reasons for the declining parent participation (the transcript is translated from Norwegian):

*Teacher-librarian:* What can be the reasons for the low response from parents to attend the book café that day? What have you heard about reasons?

*Bilingual teacher 1:* The parents of (name) said they don't have time to participate. I tried to pressure them to get more information about why they couldn't find time. I found out that it is not completely true what they say.

*Teacher-librarian:* You think there is something else behind it?

*Bilingual teacher 1:* Yes. I think they just did not want to come.

*Teacher-librarian:* They just said they didn't have time. We don't know more than that, so OK.



- Bilingual teacher 2:* I have heard from parents that there have been many meetings in the evening lately and there was a soccer game the same day. The parents who have 3-4 children in school have to attend many parent–teacher conferences. Some said they did not have a babysitter.
- Bilingual teacher 1:* I notice that when school starts in autumn, then the parents are eager to follow up on schoolwork, but at the end of the school year, they are very indifferent.
- Teacher-librarian:* It has not seemed like a lack of babysitters has been a problem before.
- Bilingual teacher 2:* Most of our parents work in the evening, at least some of them. Therefore, it can be difficult these days in relation to their work situation. Maybe there are no more babysitters left because of many parent–teacher conferences lately?

The teacher team mention several possible reasons for the declining participation of parents. The reasons are formulated as “don’t have time”, “did not want to come”, “a soccer game the same day”, “have to attend many parent-teacher conferences”, “did not have a babysitter”, “at the end of the school year, they are very indifferent”, and “work in the evening”. The team did not address these reasons further in the meeting. More importantly, they did not consider the literacy practices they introduced at the book café and how this may have contributed to the problems that followed; that is, the content of the book café and the teachers’ way of organizing it.

For many of the parents, it was clearly a question of not prioritizing the book café over other tasks. It is possible that parents had heard from other parents about the use of the reading log, and lost interest in the multilingual book café because of that. Unfortunately, I do not have information from parents that may substantiate this. However, it is not unlikely that parents with children in the same class communicate with each other about extra-curricular activities that target them specifically.

There is a strong relationship between the socio-economic status of parents, in terms of low formal education and low income, and the academic achievement of their children (Bakken & Elstad, 2012; Opheim, Gjerustad, & Sjaastad, 2013). Parents with low socio-economic status are also less likely to participate in home–school collaboration (Bæck, 2010). Pupils who need parent involvement the most, have the least engaged parents in school. This is worrying because reinforcing learning, socialization, and democratic citizenship depends on shared values and interest between home and school (Hoëm, 2010).

The teacher team aimed at empowering parents of minority-language pupils to become more involved in social reading activities. This is an important issue to be addressed by teachers. However, the teacher team placed the full responsibility on the parents for declining parent participation. They put the blame on parents even though it was the team who single-handedly defined the content and activity of the

book café. Parents were not invited to participate in planning or evaluation. The teacher team acted according to a “discourse of deficit”. The dominant school literacy discourse that endorses standardized and universal literacy education disregards parents’ literacies. Instead, a discourse of deficit is promoted as the sole explanatory factor for educational failures putting the blame on pupils’ “bilingualism, perceived parent apathy, lack of cognitive stimulation or lack of home literacy” (Gibbons, 2006, p. 66). The discourse of deficit is a false argument that “comes from examining only our own language or culture in detail and then identifying certain aspects which other cultures lack” (Barton, 1994, p. 99). This is done without examining other possible ways that literacy is realized in social relationships and works as a community resource, for instance, in more oral literacy practices.

An extra-curricular book café is not a classroom. As shown in Cremin & Swann’s case study (Cremin & Swann, chapter nine in this volume), it is possible to stimulate pupils’ reading engagement by structuring extra-curricular activities differently than school literacy practices. In their study, the school librarians enabled development of students’ reading engagement by creating an inclusive dialogic space for co-construction of informal reading activities. However, the teacher team in this study behaved as if they were in a classroom, instructing and controlling parents at the book café. The teacher team did not become acquainted with family literacy practices and the needs and desires of parents. Involvement of parents in planning and evaluating the book café could have created a space for dialogue about literacy practices in which the families can engage (see also Avery, chapter four and Damber, chapter six in this volume).

## DISCUSSION

In this chapter, I have analysed the kinds of contradictions that occurred in an extra-curricular book café organized by teachers, and how the teacher-librarian and the bilingual teachers responded to these contradictions. I now discuss the third research question posed earlier: How can teachers work to address and resolve systemic contradictions within literacy education?

This study shows the importance of addressing tensions, conflicts, and dilemmas occurring in teachers’ literacy practices as possible manifestations of systemic contradictions. Standardization of school literacy structures the field of action of teachers and consequently restricts the teachers’ autonomy to develop localized and culturally responsive literacy practices. The cognition of teachers is influenced by the teacher mandate, expressed as dominant discourses in the National Curriculum and the Education Act. Attention to how institutionalized power manifests itself in practice corresponds with Street’s ideological model of literacy that relates the distribution of power to cultural and social contexts (Street, 1984; and Street, chapter two in this volume).

Acquisition and understanding of theoretical concepts are necessary for teachers to address tensions they experience in practice that arise from systemic contradictions in the educational system (Freire, 1972, p. 124). Knowledge of theoretical concepts

such as “power relations,” “contradictions,” and “competing literacy discourses” is a precondition for reflexive interpretation (Alvesson & Sköldbberg, 2009, pp. 271–274). Reflexive interpretation involves critical self-reflection and attention to institutionalized power, discourse, and ideology. For example, the teacher team were partly able to resolve the problem with the reading log by abandoning its use after the first book café. However, they did not engage in critical self-reflection on how the school literacy discourse affected their cognition and pedagogical actions in an activity that they at the outset defined as culturally responsive. The issue of declining parent participation at the book café is another illustrative example. I argue that the problem here is related to an uneven distribution of power between the teachers and parents that prevents parents from gaining influence and agency. Acting on power relations requires teachers to pay attention to institutionalized power and to engage in critical self-reflection.

Teachers can play a significant role in facilitating collaboration between the activity systems of home, school, and leisure activities (such as public library use). A precondition is that they are able to resolve the contradictions that potentially arise in such collaborations. This study shows that the teacher-librarian and the bilingual teachers had difficulty transgressing school literacy practices, even with the best intentions of implementing a culturally responsive literacy practice at the school library. Teachers tend to perceive school libraries as an extension of the classroom. Thus, the affordances of the library are not utilized (Dressman, 1997; Limberg & Alexandersson, 2003).

I argue that schools, teachers, and teacher-librarians would benefit from the expertise of public librarians and the resources of public libraries to develop more culturally responsive literacy practices. However, this necessitates change on many levels. In Norway, inter-professional collaboration between teachers and librarians needs to be: (1) part of the mandate of both teachers and public librarians; (2) included as a topic in the educational sciences, not only within the library and information sciences; (3) included in the National Curriculum at all levels; (4) included in the teacher training and librarian training curricula; and (5) included in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of school literacy activities at schools.

Inter-professional collaboration between teachers and librarians has to start in the professional training of both professions. The different professional knowledge cultures, the rules that govern their practice and possibly different conceptions of literacy have to be negotiated and worked on to develop a shared object of activity. Library use should be included in relation to all types of literacies; reading for pleasure and in work with school subjects. Well-equipped and well-designed libraries are indispensable for students in higher education. They should also be seen as indispensable for literacy development throughout primary and secondary education. All pupils, and, in particular, disadvantaged groups with access to few books at home, need access to library resources. Schools can play a crucial role in preparing all children to use library resources for learning and for life.

## REFERENCES

- Alleklev, B., & Lindvall, L. (2000). *Listiga räven: läsinlärning genom skönlitteratur* [The cunning fox: Learning to read through fictional literature]. Falun: En bok för alla.
- Alvesson, M., & Sköldberg, K. (2009). *Reflexive methodology: New vistas for qualitative research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London: Sage.
- Anderson, K. J., & Minke, K. M. (2007). Parent involvement in education: Toward an understanding of parents' decision making. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 100(5), 311–323. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/JOER.100.5.311-323>
- Apple, M. W. (2000). Between neoliberalism and neoconservatism: Education and conservatism in a global context. In N. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education. Critical perspectives* (pp. 57–77). New York and Abingdon: Routledge.
- Auerbach, E. R. (1989). Toward a social-contextual approach to family literacy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 59(2), 165–182. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17763/haer.59.2.h237313641283156>
- Bakken, A., & Elstad, J. I. (2012). *For store forventninger?: Kunnskapsløftet og ulikhetene i grunnskolekarakterer* [Too high expectations?: The knowledge promotion and inequalities in primary grades], Vol. 7/2012 (p. 277). Oslo: Norsk Institutt for Forskning om Oppvekst, Velferd og Aldring. Retrieved from [http://www.udir.no/Upload/Rapporter/2012/NOVA\\_slutt.pdf?epslanguage=no](http://www.udir.no/Upload/Rapporter/2012/NOVA_slutt.pdf?epslanguage=no)
- Bakken, A., Frøyland, L. R., & Sletten, M. A. (2016). *Sosiale forskjeller i unges liv* [Social differences in the lives of youth], Vol. 3/2016. Oslo: Norsk Institutt for Forskning om Oppvekst, Velferd og Aldring. Retrieved from <http://www.hioa.no/Om-HiOA/Senter-for-velferds-og-arbeidslivsforskning/NOVA/Publikasjoner/Rapporter/2016/Sosiale-forskjeller-i-unges-liv>
- Barton, D. (1994). *Literacy: An introduction to the ecology of written language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Barton, D., & Hamilton, M. (1998). *Local literacies: Reading and writing in one community*. London & New York, NY: Routledge. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203448885>
- Biesta, G. J. J. (2011). *Learning democracy in school and society: Education, lifelong learning, and the politics of citizenship*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6091-512-3>
- Bæck, U. D. K. (2010). Parental involvement practices in formalized home-school cooperation. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 54(6), 549–563. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2010.522845>
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Davies, B., & Bansel, P. (2007). Neoliberalism and education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 20(3), 247–259. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09518390701281751>
- Dressman, M. (1997). Congruence, resistance, liminality: Reading and ideology in three school libraries. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 27(3), 267–315. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03626784.1997.11075493>
- Engeström, Y., & Sannino, A. (2011). Discursive manifestations of contradictions in organizational change efforts: A methodological framework. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 24(3), 368–387. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09534811111132758>
- Eri, T., & Pihl, J. (2016). The challenge of sustaining change: Contradictions within the development of teacher and librarian collaboration. *Educational Action Research*. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2016.1147366>
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. London: Allen Lane.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. London: Penguin.
- Gee, J. P. (2000). The new literacy studies. From “socially situated” to the work of the social. In D. Barton, M. Hamilton, & R. Ivanič (Eds.), *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context* (pp. 180–196). London & New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gee, J. P. (2004). *Situated language and learning: A critique of traditional schooling*. New York, NY & London: Routledge.

#### A MULTILINGUAL BOOK CAFÉ AT THE SCHOOL LIBRARY

- Gibbons, P. (2006). *Bridging discourses in the ESL classroom: Students, teachers and researchers*. London: Continuum.
- Giroux, H. (2011). *On critical pedagogy*. New York, NY & London: Bloomsbury.
- Giroux, H. (2016). Pedagogies of disruption and the challenge of social justice under regimes of neoliberalism. *Revista Hipótese*, 2(1), 58–79.
- Goodwin, C. (1994). Professional vision. *American Anthropologist*, 96(3), 606–633. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/aa.1994.96.3.02a00100>
- Grimaldi, E. (2011). Neoliberalism and the marginalisation of social justice: The making of an education policy to combat social exclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 16(11), 1131–1154. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2010.548105>
- Hedegaard, M. (2003). Cultural minority children's learning within culturally-sensitive classroom teaching. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 11(1), 133–151. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14681360300200164>
- Hoëm, A. (2010). *Sosialisering – kunnskap – identitet* [Socialization – knowledge – identity]. Vallset: Oplandske bokforlag.
- Hull, G., & Schultz, K. (2001). Literacy and learning out of school: A review of theory and research. *Review of Educational Research*, 71(4), 575–611. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00346543071004575>
- Janks, H. (2010). *Literacy and power*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kontinen, T. (2013). A Gramscian perspective on developmental work research: Contradictions, power and the role of researchers reconsidered: Outlines. *Critical Practice Studies*, 14(2), 24.
- Langemeyer, I. (2006). Contradictions in expansive learning: Towards a critical analysis of self-dependent forms of learning in relation to contemporary socio-technological change. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 7(1).
- Limberg, L., & Alexandersson, M. (2003). The school library as a space for learning. *School Libraries Worldwide*, 9(1), 1–15.
- Ministry of Education and Research. (2006). *Knowledge promotion*. Oslo: The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. Retrieved from <http://www.udir.no/Stottemeny/English/Curriculum-in-English/Curricula-in-English/>
- Nocon, H., & Cole, M. (2009). Relating diversity and literacy theory. In L. M. Morrow, R. Rueda, & D. Lapp (Eds.), *Handbook of research on literacy and diversity* (pp. 13–31). New York, NY & London: The Guilford Press.
- Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. (2012). *Framework for basic skills*. Oslo: Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. Retrieved from [http://www.udir.no/contentassets/fd2d6bfbf2364e1c98b73e030119bd38/framework\\_for\\_basic\\_skills.pdf](http://www.udir.no/contentassets/fd2d6bfbf2364e1c98b73e030119bd38/framework_for_basic_skills.pdf)
- OECD. (2007). *Executive summary PISA 2006*. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/pisa/pisaproducts/39725224.pdf>
- OECD. (2009). *PISA 2009 assessment framework: Key competencies in reading, mathematics and science*. Paris: OECD Publications.
- Opheim, V., Gjerustad, C., & Sjaastad, J. (2013). *Jakten på kvalitetsindikatorer: Sluttrapport fra prosjektet "Ressursbruk og læringsresultater i grunnskolingen"* [Hunting for quality indicators: Final report of the project "Use of resources and learning outcome in primary and secondary education"]. Oslo: NIFU, Nordisk institutt for studier av innovasjon, forskning og utdanning. Retrieved from <http://www.nifu.no/files/2013/05/NIFUrapport2013-23.pdf>
- Pihl, J. (2009). Interprofessional cooperation between teachers and librarians: Analysing theoretical and professional arguments for cooperation in an era of globalization. In M. O'Dowd & H. Holmarsdottir (Eds.), *Nordic voices: Teaching and researching comparative and international education in the Nordic countries* (pp. 41–59). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Pihl, J. (2011). Literacy education and interprofessional collaboration. *Professions and Professionalism*, 1(1), 52–66.

T. ERI

- Pihl, J. (2012). *Multiplisitet, myndiggjøring, medborgerskap: Inkludering gjennom bruk av biblioteket som læringsarena* [Multiplicity, empowerment, citizenship: Inclusion through the use of the library as an arena for learning]. Oslo: Oslo and Akershus University College.
- Ratner, C. (2015). Neoliberal psychology: A macro cultural psychological analysis. In A. Larrain, A. Haye, M. Morgan, G. Sullivan, & J. Cresswell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the international society for theoretical psychology*. Toronto: Captus Press. Retrieved from <http://www.sonic.net/~cr2/Neoliberal%20Psychology.htm>.
- Roe, A. (2008). *Lesedidaktikk: Etter den første leseopplæringen* [Reading didactics: After the first literacy program]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Russel, D. R. (2009). Texts in contexts: Theorizing learning by looking at genre and activity. In R. Edwards, G. Biesta & M. Thorpe (Eds.), *Rethinking contexts for learning and teaching: Communities, activities and networks* (pp. 17–30). Abingdon & New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sannino, A., & Nocon, H. (2008). Special issue editors' introduction: Activity theory and school innovation. *Journal of Educational Change*, 9(4), 325–328. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10833-008-9079-5>
- Sleeter, C. E. (2012). Confronting the marginalization of culturally responsive pedagogy. *Urban Education*, 47(3), 562–584. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0042085911431472>
- Street, B. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sullivan, A., & Brown, M. (2015). Reading for pleasure and progress in vocabulary and mathematics. *British Educational Research Journal*, 41(6), 971–991. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/berj.3180>
- Sorlie, K., Havnen, E., & Ruud, M. E. (2010). *Levekårsutvikling og flytting på Fjell i Drammen* [Living conditions and mobility at Fjell in Drammen]. Oslo: Norsk institutt for by- og regionforskning. Retrieved from [http://www.nibr.no/filer/2010-21.\\_w\\_.pdf](http://www.nibr.no/filer/2010-21._w_.pdf)
- The European Parliament and Council. (2008). *The recommendation on the establishment of the European Qualifications Framework for lifelong learning*. Strasbourg: EU Law and Publications. Retrieved from <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2008:111:0001:0007:EN:PDF>
- The Norwegian Agency for Quality Assurance in Education (NOKUT). (2014). *The Norwegian qualifications framework for lifelong learning (NQF)*. Oslo: NOKUT. Retrieved from [http://www.nokut.no/Documents/NOKUT/Artikkelbibliotek/Norsk\\_utdanning/NKR/20140606\\_Norwegian\\_Qualifications\\_Framework.pdf](http://www.nokut.no/Documents/NOKUT/Artikkelbibliotek/Norsk_utdanning/NKR/20140606_Norwegian_Qualifications_Framework.pdf).
- Tonne, I., & Pihl, J. (2012). Literacy education, reading engagement, and library use in multilingual classes. *Intercultural Education*, 23(3), 183–194. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2012.701424>
- UNESCO. (1994). *UNESCO public library manifesto*. Retrieved from <http://www.unesco.org/webworld/libraries/manifestos/libraman.html>
- van der Kooij, K. S., & Pihl, J. (2009). Voices from the field: Negotiating literacy education in a multicultural setting. In H. Holmarsdottir & M. O'Dowd (Eds.), *Nordic voices: Teaching and researching comparative and international education in the nordic countries* (pp. 167–179). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(1), 20–32. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022487102053001003>

*Thomas Eri*  
*Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, Norway*

TERESA CREMIN AND JOAN SWANN

## 9. SCHOOL LIBRARIANS AS LEADERS OF EXTRACURRICULAR READING GROUPS

The research object of this chapter is school librarians as leaders of extracurricular reading groups in secondary schools. The study was undertaken in England where young people continue to read less independently and find less pleasure in reading than many of their peers in other countries (Twist, Schagen, & Hodgson 2007; Twist, Sizmur, Bartlett, & Lynn, 2012). Attention has thus turned towards all those who work to foster young people's engagement and pleasure in reading, including school librarians (Cremin & Swann, 2015). However, whilst studies of teachers' practices and reading interactions abound, there is scant research focused upon the practices of school librarians. The chapter's purpose is to explore the role of secondary school librarians in extracurricular reading groups. The research questions addressed are twofold: What is the nature of the reading groups' practices and how are they constructed and maintained by the school librarians and group members, and, what dialogic dimensions to reading are evidenced in these groups? The research draws upon case studies of seven secondary school extracurricular reading groups led by six school librarians and one teacher, all of whom were participating in a national book award "shadowing" scheme. The scheme involves student groups reading the books shortlisted (by UK children's librarians) for two prestigious book awards: the Carnegie Medal and the Kate Greenaway Medal. The groups spend part of the summer term reading and discussing these shortlisted books and are able to upload their reviews and compare their views with those of the award judges when the medal winners are announced. The research findings indicate that the school librarians, working from the commonly expressed purpose of developing students' pleasure in reading, sought to differentiate the extracurricular reading groups from English, and profiled reading choice and agency in the shared social space that they created for reading. Group members, both students and attending teachers, contributed to the shaping of these reading events, and the relatively informal relationships that obtained between group leaders and members, afforded space for readers to construct a more dialogic understanding of the literary texts and, in some instances, of the texts of their own and each other's lives.

### READING ENGAGEMENT AND SCHOOL LIBRARIANS

International surveys indicate that an increasing number of British teenagers view reading as a waste of time; they rarely choose to read (OECD, 2010). This is affirmed by UK surveys (Clark, 2013). However as Maybin (2013) observes, seen

*J. Pihl et al. (Eds.), Teacher and Librarian Partnerships in Literacy Education in the 21st Century, 119–137.*

© 2017 Sense Publishers. All rights reserved.

through the lens of such large-scale surveys, reading is framed more as a measurable result than a lived experience and a socially situated process. The complex factors that interact to develop young readers and the myriad elements that characterize their engagement as readers cannot be captured in quantitative data.

In contrast, the study upon which this chapter draws, adopted a qualitative stance, and taking a sociocultural perspective, viewed reading as a social practice and the group leaders and the young people's interactions with texts and other speakers as dialogic (Bakhtin, 1981, 1986). From a psychological perspective, reading has often been viewed "as a silent and solitary activity, in which interpretation occurs in the interaction between an individual reader and a text" (Swann, 2012, p. 78). From a sociocultural perspective, reading, like any social activity, is seen to involve a set of cultural practices rooted within webs of relationships. The focus thus shifts from reading as a personal skill or competence, towards reading as a social-cultural practice, situated and embedded within the context of its use. As Bruner asserts, "most learning in most settings" is "a communal activity, a sharing of the culture" (1986, p. 127). The study thus recognized that the cultural practices of the extracurricular reading groups both shaped and were shaped by members' engagement, relationships, and identities.

To date, research examining the role of adults in school-based discussions of literature has almost exclusively focused on classroom teachers. It has persistently shown that teacher-directed discussions are characterized by an interaction pattern of teacher initiation, student response and teacher evaluation (commonly described as IRE) (Cazden, 1988; Mehan, 1979). The teacher sets the discussion focus and employs direct questions and probes, which may produce a somewhat procedural understanding of the set text (Edwards & Mercer, 1987). By contrast, studies of student-led literature discussions suggest these involve a more collaborative discourse, teacher repositioning and scope for increased student participation (Maloch, 2002; Short, Kaufman, Kaser, Kahn, & Crawford, 1999). However, appropriating new ways of interacting in reading groups is perceived as professionally demanding (Evans, 1996).

There is scant research focused upon the interaction patterns of school librarians, the ways in which they position themselves in reading groups and their roles in enhancing reader engagement. Historically, Garrison (1979) argues, school librarians brought the practices of the public library with them when organizing space and time in school libraries, and retained a focus, arguably as they still do, on developing young people's access to and discernment in selecting reading materials and pleasure in reading. The school librarian's agenda is more focused on fostering the will to read than the skill, which is the teaching profession's predominant emphasis and the core of national assessments. In accountability cultures, test scores take precedence over reader engagement, which may partly explain why research examining school librarians' discursive interactions with readers/texts is limited. School libraries tend to be viewed as "essentially subordinate to the activities and curriculum of the classroom" (Dressman, 1997, p. 270), arguably offering students additional enhancement, not core competencies.



Yet, the relationship between reader engagement, which school libraries seek to foster, and reading attainment is widely recognized as bi-directional (OECD, 2010). Additionally, as Pihl (2012) observes, few peer-reviewed academic journals encompass attention to school libraries and Ross, McKechnie and Rothbauer (2006, p. ix) state that the research literature on reading, libraries, and community is “scattered and fragmentary”.

Furthermore, despite evidence that school libraries impact upon reading achievement (Krashen, Lee, & McQuillan, 2012), and that trained school librarians constitute a positive factor in the development of young readers (Novljan, 1998), provision is limited in some countries (Majid, 2005), making international comparisons difficult. The only known study, which has documented the discursive channels through which the practices and programmes of school librarians frame and socialize young readers, was undertaken in 1992–1993 (Dressman, 1997). This revealed that the ethos and opportunities that elementary school librarians sought to establish – the “guiding narratives” of their libraries – echoed their own reading lives and education. Dressman’s examination of the children’s responses to library practices highlights that whilst two of the libraries served to reproduce the wider social order, the third operated more as a “liminal space” in which the conflicting discourses of the librarian and the gaps in procedures enabled the young to negotiate ways of reading and produce their own meanings. However, the breadth of Dressman’s analysis did not afford space to analyse the specific nature of the situated literacy events, nor the librarians’ role in constructing these.

Thus, the current study, in focusing on how school librarians in their roles as leaders of extracurricular reading groups co-construct these groups and interact with texts and readers, seeks to redress the balance and respond to a gap in the field.

#### THE METHODOLOGY

Case studies of seven extracurricular reading groups are the focus here. These were drawn from a larger study of the Carnegie and Kate Greenaway medal “shadowing” scheme (2011–2012). In this, young readers select texts from a shortlist of eight books (chosen by public librarians across the UK) and gather in reading groups to discuss them, comparing their views with those of the national judging panel of Youth Libraries Group librarians. The medals were first awarded in 1937 and 1956 respectively “to pinpoint books of excellence” (Barker, 1998, p. xi). The intention of the shadowing scheme, with its dedicated website, is to provide an infrastructure for schools to use to “stimulate reading” (Butler, Simpson, & Court, 2011, p. 131). Carried out in collaboration with the Chartered Institute of Librarians and Information Professionals (CILIP), who run the awards and the scheme, the study was funded by the Carnegie UK Trust. This chapter addresses two research questions:

- What is the nature of the reading group practices and how are these practices constructed and maintained by the school librarians and group members?
- What are the dialogic dimensions to reading as a social practice in these groups?

School reading groups were selected to ensure as diverse a range as possible along several dimensions: geographical location; a social and cultural mix; the inclusion of boys as well as girls; and a range of abilities across the sample. This chapter draws on the data from seven secondary phase groups who were visited two or three times across the shadowing period from April to June 2012, alongside observations undertaken in English classrooms in the schools. Five of the groups comprised mixed-gender 11–18-year-olds of mixed-ability (according to the librarian group leaders), one comprised a mixed-gender group of 11–13-year-olds (described as “very able”), and the last group comprised 12–13-year-old girls (described as mixed-ability). Predominantly, group members were 11–14 year-olds. The majority attended reading groups of their own volition; a few had been encouraged to attend by their teacher/ school librarian. The groups had 12–25 members and usually met in the lunch hour or after school for 40–60 minutes.

Because the study viewed reading as a social-cultural practice that can be best understood through an exploration of the ways in which reading practices are enacted in real contexts (Cairney, 1995), case study was chosen as the research strategy. It examines “the complex dynamic and unfolding interactions of events, human relationships and other factors in a unique instance” (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000, p. 181), in this case in the seven reading groups. The data sources for the case studies included:

- Semi-structured interviews with group leaders (six librarians, one English teacher); and other adults attending (six teachers, one voluntary parent helper);
- Semi-structured group interviews with 30 students from the groups; in two cases timetabling made this difficult, and group members completed adapted interview schedules individually and in writing;
- “As and when” informal conversations with the seven group leaders and group members (n=20);
- Observations of meetings, recorded as field notes;
- Audio-recordings of activities, which were later transcribed. These allowed a closer focus on group interaction;
- In two schools, observations of English lesson that some group members participated in;
- Mapping of physical spaces (e.g., diagrams, photographs);
- Collections of other evidence (e.g., posters, student book reviews posted to the shadowing website).

Qualitative analysis of the complementary data sources allowed the identification of major themes. Using Braun and Clark’s (2006) thematic analysis, data were coded inductively and then grouped into broader categories, with cross moderation of these undertaken by an additional researcher to enhance potential trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The analysis of audio-recorded data and transcripts allowed “thick descriptions” (Geertz, 1973) of reading experiences to be constructed, the social construction of readers and reading to be examined, and the reader identity positions of adults and young people to be explored in the context of group activities and interpretations of literary texts. Ethically the work was

#### SCHOOL LIBRARIANS LEADING EXTRACURRICULAR READING GROUPS

guided by the British Educational Research Association Ethical Guidelines (2011). All data were anonymized, and pseudonyms are used throughout.

A number of themes about the nature of the reading group practices and how these were constructed and maintained were identified through the interviews and observations. The findings reveal that working from a commonly expressed purpose – developing students’ pleasure in reading – the librarians sought to differentiate the extracurricular reading groups from English, foregrounded reading choice, and created a shared social space for reading. Group members, both students and attending teachers, contributed to the shaping of these reading events, and negotiated and enacted their own relational identity positions as readers within them. With regard to the dialogic dimensions of reading evidenced, the data indicate that the relatively informal relationships obtained between most group leaders and members afforded space for readers to construct a more dialogic understanding of the literary texts, and, in some instances, of the texts of their own and each other’s lives.

#### SCHOOL LIBRARIANS AND GROUP MEMBERS AS CO-CONSTRUCTORS OF EXTRACURRICULAR READING GROUP PRACTICES

##### *Profiling Reading for Pleasure and Differentiating Extracurricular Reading from English*

A common theme across the school librarians, which was voiced in their interviews and evidenced in their behaviour and interactions, was that the purpose of the reading groups was to enrich reader satisfaction. They perceived that shadowing broadened the range of students’ reading and that the young readers gained in confidence through discussing and debating their ideas, but saw the *raison d’être* of their groups as “fostering reading for pleasure”. All the librarians commented upon the uniqueness of the extracurricular setting, and often contrasted their role with that of English teachers, particularly with reference to reading for pleasure:

Generally, English lessons focus on how meanings are created and analysis of texts while the focus for the group is on reading for pleasure and what they particularly enjoyed.

Strikingly, although no interview prompts tabled this notion, group members also strongly differentiated their reading groups from reading in English. They also commonly perceived (as did both the school librarians and attending teachers) that there was more time and space for informal talk and discussion in shadowing groups than in English lessons. Furthermore, the quality of the discussion was also perceived as different; there was a lot of involvement from different speakers and a great deal of arguing and debate in extracurricular contexts. Direct comparisons between the two contexts are not straightforward because different sets of practices and purposes for reading prevail in formal and informal education. Nonetheless, the group members’ views were borne out with regard to the discussion of texts in the English lessons observed, which was consistently different from that in the

extracurricular groups. The English lessons focused on developing a literary understanding of set texts, worked towards predetermined outcomes (that related to learning objectives evidenced in assessed written work) and were characterized by IRE recitation patterns (Mehan, 1979) on the part of the teacher. The young people perceived curriculum-focused reading as preparation for the end-of-unit written assessment, which was seen as the key driver in English and was, for them, unrelated to reading for pleasure. The significance of assessment in the English curriculum was foregrounded by all involved, including teachers attending the extracurricular reading groups:

The students know they are being, it is the burden – pressure – of continuous assessment, they know that everything they are doing is being watched or marked in English.

Significantly, set against the perceived task-focused nature of English lessons and the dominance of assessment and exam preparation, the school librarians and the English teacher (who led one group) sought to provide a less instrumental, and more relaxed and sociable space for reading. Considerable work went into creating and sustaining this distinctiveness. As the English group leader commented:

We are doing it for fun, we are doing it to enjoy the books, to share a group activity that they all like doing ... they all are very sociable and like each other, you know it is a social thing; nobody is going to be marking what they are doing.... the pressure is not there ... I mean you try and make group activities in English fun and [include] group discussion, but you always want an end product in a class situation, you want something you can assess, tick a box.

The pressure of “performativity” (Ball, 1998) was evident in the librarians’, teachers’ and group members’ voices and is underscored by the narrow national curriculum conceptualisation of reading as a set of cognitive skills, owned by individuals and separable from text and context. This “autonomous” model of literacy (Street, 1984) has become popular in educational regimes, driven by market-based notions of accountability, such as that in England. In contrast, Street’s (1984) “ideological model”, in alignment with the sociocultural stance adopted in this study, emphasizes the varied, situated and contingent nature of literate activities.

### *Offering Choice*

Related to reading for pleasure was the school librarians’ focus on providing choice to young readers, both in selecting particular shadowing texts and ways of working in the group. The librarians expressed considerable trust in the shortlist of eight books and did not seek to read or evaluate them before the groups started. Multiple copies were purchased, and members were invited to select and read them in any order. This was popular:

#### SCHOOL LIBRARIANS LEADING EXTRACURRICULAR READING GROUPS

There is no set book, so you can see what appeals to you and think “I’ll try that”.

It’s more up to you, and because it’s sort of a challenge, you want to read them because you are encouraged by others.

In meetings, individuals who had read the same book, sometimes formed subgroups. In the smallest groups, whole-group discussions were held. No discernible patterns of group organization were observed, students could choose whom to sit with and this varied. A lack of predetermined reading pace was also evident, and there was no pressure to read during shadowing sessions, when the short-listed books were discussed and when debate predominated. Again, whilst no questions sought to explore comparisons between extracurricular reading and reading in English, both students and librarians contrasted the sense of agency, which they perceived appertained in the reading groups, with a perceived lack of autonomy in English:

... when you read in class, and at primary school, it’s [a] reading for the sake of reading, sort of thing; it’s reading so that the teachers know you can read ... but when you’re here, you read because you enjoy reading, and you want to broaden your horizons of books.

Obviously, if they’re presented with the text in English, they have no choice but to read it ... At the moment Year 7 have been reading *Sport: Fiction or Nonfiction* – they have to do a half termly big book review, and a lot of them don’t want to read sport. They have no choice ... whereas I feel they do have that element of choice here, and I try to not make it lesson-like.

The school librarians constantly encouraged group members to exercise their rights as readers, and in tune with Pennac’s (2006) “right to remain silent”, frequently voiced the view that students did not have to discuss the book they were reading: “If you’re not ready to or simply don’t want to, that’s fine, see what others think”. Careful attention was also paid by librarians and groups members to readers’ positions in a text, ensuring no “spoilers” were voiced that might reveal as yet unread events. On occasions when this happened, members of the groups spontaneously made a commotion in order to prevent the unknowing reader hearing the spoiler and in one case a teacher put her hands over her ears. The school librarians’ practices with regard to choice were aligned with the perceived benefits of shadowing: widening members’ reading repertoires, developing their sense of agency as discriminating readers and enabling them to connect to their interests and find pleasure in reading. This practice of foregrounding choice and connecting to students’ interests is aligned to multiple studies that indicate choice and interest enhance readers’ motivation, self-determination, and engagement (Clark & Phythian-Sence, 2008; Krashen, 1993; Moss & Macdonald, 2004; Pihl, 2012). However, it should be noted that the student’s “choice” was framed by the medal shortlist; books beyond this remit were not read and discussed in the sessions.

*Creating Convivial Spaces for Reading*

The school librarians and English group leader paid considerable attention to establishing a supportive reading environment, physically and socially. The six groups that met in school libraries were surrounded by colourful displays, posters, photos and in one case collages of the Carnegie shortlist, made in a group's after-school arts session. Whilst the group that met in a staff development room voiced a sense of recognition at being able to use this staff space, they were surrounded by blank walls rather than by literary displays. The displays in the English classrooms that were visited, foregrounded information on assessment, lists of textual features and literary devices. Seating arrangements also differed; in classrooms, students sat in rows facing the teacher's desk and whiteboard, often in assigned seats, while in extracurricular reading groups, seating arrangements were more informal, members sat around tables haphazardly arranged with no sense of facing an adult, and had the freedom to choose where to sit and with whom. In the extracurricular reading groups, adults mixed with younger members, and there was no evidence of hierarchical arrangements. In one school, in which several teachers and a voluntary parent helper attended the lunchtime group, they sat randomly; there were often several adults in one group and none in others. This indicated to the young people that no one was "supervising" or monitoring their conversations and that the adults who chose to attend were there on their own terms as readers and group members. The school librarian related this to being "on the same level" as the younger readers:

I think one of the pleasures is there really is not a teacher and pupil divide. It's the one thing that Jean (teacher) and I feel totally comfortable with, sitting down with the kids and just talking with them on exactly the same level and putting our point of view across ... because we are on the same level with them. ...It's almost like just a normal book group, it's not a pupil and teacher book group, it's just like a normal book group because we all do it together.

Other indicators of informality included considerable freedom of movement. Group members moved around while they listened to, and sometimes joined in, discussions with other groups, continuing to talk even when standing. Group members occasionally lounged on the chairs or sat on the tables, and the adults too appeared to be at ease and sat informally. If members arrived late, no sense of approbation was observed, and space was made for them to join in. In the discussion, young people rarely raised their hands to speak; interaction was more conversational and spontaneous in nature, as discussed later. In addition, food was consumed, group leaders and members brought lunch or snacks and everyone ate together. This connects to the practice in adult reading groups where food and drink accompany book discussions, denoting sociability and a relaxed atmosphere (Allington & Swann, 2009). This range of informal educational practices was understandably distinctive to extracurricular group meetings.

## SCHOOL LIBRARIANS LEADING EXTRACURRICULAR READING GROUPS

Drawing upon Goffman's (1971) dichotomy of front-stage versus backstage, Rafste (2005) argues that secondary school libraries are positioned "back-stage", whilst the classroom is "front-stage". This was borne out with regard to the formality of the English classroom and the marked informality of the extracurricular reading group contexts. The students referred to physical differences in the two settings in terms of comfort, atmosphere and "freedom". Not dissimilarly, Audunson (2005) characterizes public libraries as "low-intensive meeting places", whilst Dressman (1997) perceives school libraries as potentially "liminal spaces". Notably, it was evident that the convivial reading group spaces observed in the current study, which, as noted, were materially as well as socially constituted (Leander & Sheehy, 2004), influenced the reading practices enacted within them, and in turn served to shape the social relations between the readers.

### DIALOGIC DIMENSIONS TO READING IN EXTRACURRICULAR READING GROUPS

#### *Reader Relationships*

As noted, the extracurricular reading spaces were conducive to and indicative of relatively informal, friendly and non-hierarchical relationships. School librarians often welcomed group members personally and tended to be highly approachable. In discursively constructing their identities in the groups, the librarians did so in relation to others present, to the students and attending teachers, for example. They saw the building of relationships with students as a critical part of their role, and differentiated themselves from teachers in this respect:

I think ... a librarian is about building those relationships, which teachers do as well but I think in quite a different way. I think students often see you as somebody to go to in school, partly because you are always there ... and so they will talk about all kinds of stuff with you which automatically makes them much more comfortable in a sort of book group situation like this. It is a strange kind of role.... I mean you hear everything from them about what is going on at home, what is going on with their friends, and you get to know them much more as a person I think than a teacher would.

The school librarians' one-to-one recommendations from within the shortlist were often targeted, demonstrating their knowledge not just of the literature but of individual readers. Reciprocal recommendations were common, with group members vehemently insisting their peers or a specific adult read particular texts. The librarians, through expressing their affective engagement in texts, and voicing their personal and emotional responses, often opened up their values and made multiple life-to-texts and text-to-life moves in the discussions (Cochran-Smith, 1984). For example, in connecting to the plight of the protagonist in *A Monster Calls* (Patrick Ness), one librarian falteringly spoke of the recent loss of his mother and voiced a sense of guilt at past challenges between them. The extended pause that ensued was broken by one student reaching out to touch his shoulder and

another observing, “I’ll bet she loved you, though – she was your mum, my mum says mothers can’t help it”. The conversation that followed, about parents whilst loosely connected to the text, was maximally connected to group members’ lives.

During literary debates, Kress (2005, p. 33) argues that teacher talk deviates between two key notions: “this is a literary text to be discussed as ‘literary text’” and “this is a text ... about life and needs to be related to me and you to your lives”. In this instance and in many others, the librarians and the English teacher who was also a group leader positioned themselves as co-readers alongside the students, and privileged inter-relational and personal foci in discussions over ideational or textual ones. Students too tended to position themselves as individuals and group members, rather than pupils. Additionally, some of the teachers who attended came to be seen differently – as less teacher-like, at least in the context of the group:

- Georgia: Miss K [Drama/English teacher] is different when she’s here because normally she’s like a Drama teacher and an English teacher...
- Mia: More relaxed.
- Georgia: And she like, she treats you as one of the pupils like everyone else, but when we come here she treats us like...
- Mia: Friends.
- Fiona: Friends – like, someone that we can talk to, we can talk about the books and have our own opinion, whereas, like in drama, if say, we say something like, we didn’t like what we are doing, we would be made to do it anyway.
- Georgia: And she’s more relaxed here.

Such perceptions were noted by many young people, who voiced the view that in reading groups teachers related to them in a more relaxed manner. A librarian felt similarly about the English teachers in his group, and believed that the “non-teacher-like” relationships evident in shadowing might persist in other contexts:

It [group membership] breaks down the barriers and ... I think any of those girls would be able to approach Jean now and say, if not their own teacher, they would happily go and approach Jean and say, “I am ... struggling with this?” or “Can I talk to you about this?” And they would feel far more confident knowing that Jean would talk to them about it, and not as a teacher.

For some English teachers, the reading group appeared to create a space in which they could engage personally and adopt a more dialogic and discursive stance towards reading than they perceived they usually enacted or felt able to enact in their classrooms, which, as one observed, was “inevitably assessment focused”. Another noted she had an “objectives/assessment focused literacy mindset” and it was a relief to leave this behind, albeit temporarily. Several teachers commented positively on their rather different roles and relationships in extracurricular group reading, noting that:



It's vastly different, and I enjoy this so much more because with Carnegie they tell me about the book, rather than me asking questions, and sometimes I've not read it and even if I have, it's different, and we're more equal.

I come in part because in this group I can be a reader – you know, one of the group, whereas in class I have to be the leader and the teacher – here it's different, I can be me.

The transition for English teachers was, however, not always straightforward and tensions were voiced by staff who in the moment-to-moment interactions, positioned themselves as group members and readers, yet were simultaneously teachers. For instance, on one occasion two teachers noticed three boys at a table without adults “messing around” and tipping their chairs. Neither took action, but in conversation afterwards, one commented: “I felt caught – it's not my class, and in any case, this is *their* time. Anyway, maybe their book was boring, I didn't see what they were reading, did you?” The other teacher expressed a degree of guilt that she had not acted, observing by way of explanation that she was “in a really interesting discussion about *Mina* (by David Almond), so I left them to it”. The first teacher perhaps felt her own authority was compromised in this “liminal” space, though by implying that the tedium of the text may have justified the boys' actions she appeared to be empathizing with them as a reader. The second, positioned as a fellow reader and engaged in her own book discussion, disregarded the traditionally conceived institutional role of the teacher on this occasion, although this caused her a degree of tension. These examples evidence the socially situated nature of reading and the complex construction and enactment of different identity positions in the reading groups.

#### *School Librarians Balancing Intervention and Standing Back*

The construction of reading relationships was also accomplished discursively in and through the literary text discussions. The data show that the school librarians tended to position themselves as co-readers; alongside group members, they read the books on the shortlist and came to the sessions prepared to listen to members' views and to give their own interpretations. They elicited contributions from students, mostly accepted their perspectives, even where these differed from their own and did not seek to impose their views. The transcriptions and observational notes demonstrate that the school librarians frequently balanced intervention in discussion with “holding back,” in order to allow the young people to have their say. In this way, they positioned themselves variously as “the meddler in the middle” with an open-ended enquiry, and “the guide on the side” with a listening ear (McWilliam, 2008). They appeared aware of their roles as facilitators and listeners. One typically noted: “I really just like listening to the kids talking ... I try not to dominate it or anything ... It's their viewpoints that are important”. The following extract from a discussion of Annabel Pitcher's *My Sister Lives on the Mantelpiece* demonstrates this. The book focuses on a family torn apart by a terrorist attack in which Jamie's ten-year-old sister Rose died. The urn with her

remains lives on the mantelpiece. Following a parental split, Jamie and Rose's identical twin sister Jasmine are taken to live elsewhere by their racist father. As a displaced trio, they variously suffer bullying, eating problems and alcoholism as they try to come to terms with her death. In the end, Jasmine finds a photo of Rose on their last birthday and the memory of Rose's separation from her twin returns. Jasmine remembers how betrayed she had felt over the last months of Rose's life when her twin, who had always been dressed the same and been Jasmine's "identical other half", had begun to differentiate herself as an individual. She recalls Rose's tenth birthday gift of a hair clip to her that was different from Rose's own. Five years older, Jasmine finally accepts her own uniqueness, she has her hair dyed pink and visits Rose's grave to say goodbye.

- Hannah: I liked the ending, though.  
Librarian: Yeah? Did you find it satisfying – the end?  
Hannah: Yeah but...  
Sadia: How is it satisfying? The ending was rushed.  
Hannah: Yeah it was but...  
Sadia: I don't know, it kind of tied in, well it didn't at all, but [laughter] the story was because they mentioned it before I think, and then they kind of went back to it.  
Dianne: I think the ending just added another issue into their life.  
Librarian: Yes, another one! Yeah.  
Dianne: The ending could have been an ending for any book. If I had just read it, I wouldn't have recognized it as being any good for "My Sister".  
Librarian: Yeah  
Hannah: I thought [unclear] the thing (the father's racism) would come back.  
Dianne: Because I didn't mind the rest of the book.  
Librarian: It was just the end that really disappointed you?

Here, the school librarian's authentic question in response to Hannah's comment opened up the discussion space. In contrast to the IRE pattern, the librarian offered brief affirmative responses to indicate she was attending, but in essence left most of the space for the young people to voice their views; hers was but "one voice among many" (Nystrand, 1977).

Another example in which a different group of students discusses the same book, with a turn by turn commentary, evidences the diversity yet commonality documented in the discursive practices of the librarians. In the following dialogue, the student, Di, refers to the hate Rose's father feels for Muslims as a result of the Muslim-led terrorist attack in Trafalgar Square. His racism is problematic, particularly for Jamie, who has found companionship and solace from his only friend at school, Sunya, a smart, funny Muslim girl.

SCHOOL LIBRARIANS LEADING EXTRACURRICULAR READING GROUPS

Table 1. A transcript extract from a reading group discussion

<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Speech</i>	<i>Commentary</i>
Librarian:	Is it the way the story is set out and the way the story develops or is it the characters, do you think, that pull you along and make you want to read more?	Librarian encourages a focus on narrative structure: plot and characterisation.
Helen:	It's the way the... it's both. It's the way the story and the characters are developed that makes you want to read on, it's got that tension that makes you want to sit on the edge of your seat.	Helen overlaps the librarian's turn, a characteristic of relatively informal, collaborative talk.
Di:	I... I used to have a very bad...	
Librarian:	[unclear] come on Di, you are bursting to say something.	Librarian is about to say something but picks up on Di trying to get in, and brings her into the discussion. There are more overlaps.
Di:	...reputation of putting a book down after a few chapters, and you are like "I will read you" and then... I forget it exists. This one I was like "Mam, I am not going to bed yet, no". [Others laugh]	
Librarian:	Because this is not the thing, the kind of thing, you read either Di, is it?	She shows her awareness of Di's personal reading preferences ...
Di:	No, I usually never finish one in a day, and I finished it in an entire day. I was like – "Ahh you amazing book!"	
Librarian:	So can you explain what it is?	and encourages her to say more.
Di:	I just loved it. There was like mini plots in it as well as the main one that you just had to know what is happening: "Oh my god, that's happened, wait, how does that affect that? Why does he hate ..."	Di is reporting her earlier thoughts.
Helen:	... so much?"	Helen completes Di's turn.
Cerys:	Yeah like, why?	

In this extract, the librarian initially encouraged a focus on narrative structure, but then sensitively responded to Di as a reader, drawing her in and inviting elaboration. Although the librarian clearly led this discussion, the dialogue was relatively non-hierarchical; her turns took the form of facilitative questions and the students, whose contributions overlapped as they offered interim thoughts, did not relate exclusively to her. Such broad characteristics were largely shared by the other librarians, who also adopted complex, dynamic roles as co-readers and facilitators, both intervening with authentic questions and standing back to listen. Nystrand (2006) argues that authentic questions, which are responsive to previous utterances, are characteristic of dialogic discourse, but that teachers too often

foreground pre-planned questions and acceptable answers. This was not observed in the context of the extracurricular reading groups, and librarians often commented upon the students' different perspectives. As one observed, a group discussion was often "... non-linear. There's a lot of involvement from other students, and a lot of arguing ... They don't need to give a literary justification, they can ... say they don't like something". Such argumentation is evidenced in the next extract in a peer-peer context.

*Peer Discussions without Adults*

The informality and space in sessions meant that group members often sat without an adult to discuss books and in this extract, following a whole-group session in which members had read aloud self-chosen excerpts, four girls gathered around a table. Earlier Maisie had read aloud from the young adult novel *Between Shades of Grey* (by Ruth Septyns). This tale follows the life of Lina, her mother and younger brother at they are deported from their native Lithuania and taken on trains to a Siberian labour camp during the Second World War. Maisie had previously commented: "It's really depressing, and I don't want to talk about it" and at the time this had been respected, but later as the girls settled, Nadia returned to the text.

- Nadia: Going back to *Shades of Grey*.  
Maisie: Do we have to?  
Nadia: It was shocking, and I want...  
Cerys: The "rolling coffin", you, like, feel their despair.  
Nadia: Terribly shocking, I didn't know it was like that, such hardship...  
Tanya: You must have heard of the Holocaust, surely?<sup>1</sup>  
Nadia: Yeah but not like this, the suddenness, the disrespect, they're treated like caged animals.  
Tanya: They are wily, though. [She is referring to the Lithuanian prisoners].  
Maisie: What do you mean?  
Tanya: Well, bartering with the watch and her drawing and ... you know, that woman who ... [prostitutes herself to make money for food for her family].  
Maisie: That's not being wily for god's sake! They're captives! Wouldn't you? Wouldn't anyone one of us? Like, use what we have to survive?  
Tanya: I wouldn't do *that*, no way.  
Cerys: You might, you can't know.

#### SCHOOL LIBRARIANS LEADING EXTRACURRICULAR READING GROUPS

- Maisie: They were desperate, degraded, but they still loved. You might do it to keep your family alive... [Pause]
- Tanya: Not me. No way.
- Nadia: Anyway. Lina didn't want to draw the commander – she refused at first. It was clever that – she kind of drew her way out of there, like in her imagination and for real almost.

Tension and disagreement run through this extract, linked both to Nadia's insistence that they return to the book and the potency of the subject matter. Drawing on Maisie's earlier reading, Cerys quoted from the text, and Nadia too, in empathetically responding to the characters' plight, alluded to Maisie's chosen passage in which the train was described as "a cage on wheels", observing "they're treated liked caged animals".

Quickly, though, the group made the transition from "text" to "life". Maisie, offended by Tanya's assertion that the Lithuanian prisoners were wily, was drawn in, and blurring the boundaries, made an emotionally charged appeal to the group to consider the fictional family's precarious position and their own moral values. This related to incidents in which their mother has sold their father's watch and other women had prostituted themselves in order to make enough money to feed their families.

Later, after Tanya reasserted her position that there was "no way" she would do that, Nadia, perhaps seeking to reduce the palpable tension, took the group back to the text by commenting on its construction and Lina's less intimate route to survival. Lina, whose skills as an artist were noticed by the guards, was commissioned to draw the Russian prison commander and made money this way. Later, she even managed to smuggle some of her drawings out in a desperate attempt to connect to her father (who was in a prison camp) and let him know his family was alive, struggling for life in a work camp in Siberia. The strength of feeling and conflicting views appeared productive here, and gave shape to the discourse and hence governed the construction of meaning as a dynamic, dialogic event. The extract is reminiscent of "inside-text talk" (Cremin et al., 2014, p. 116), as, drawing on a history of shared experience and a text in common, the girls employed the language of affect in order to generate new thinking. They were engaged in collaboratively making meaning, connecting to their own lives and moral compasses.

#### CONCLUSION

This research offers a novel contribution to an underdeveloped field in relation to school librarians as leaders of secondary phase extracurricular reading groups. It contributes new understandings about the nature of such reading groups' practices and how these are constructed and maintained by school librarians and group members, as well as the dialogic dimensions to reading in these contexts. The study did not seek to compare the practices of teachers and librarians, whose roles, work and contexts differ, yet at the same time, it was striking that shadowing,

particularly as an extracurricular activity, was so strongly differentiated from “English” by both students and group leaders. Whilst it is inappropriate to generalize from the seven case studies, the findings reveal that working from a commonly expressed purpose – developing students’ pleasure in reading – the librarians sought to differentiate the extracurricular reading groups from English, foregrounded reading choice, and created a shared social space for reading and discussing literary texts. Their informal guidance, the lack of pressure in this context and the explicit, albeit limited choice, appeared to enable the young readers to find texts that had personal resonance and meaning for them. However, the school librarians did not construct the groups alone, group members, both students and attending teachers, contributed to the shaping of these reading events, negotiating and enacting their own relational identity positions as readers within them. For the attending teachers, their repositioning in these groups sometimes created tension.

With regard to the dialogic dimensions of reading evidenced, the analysis reveals that relatively informal relationships obtained between group leaders and members, a relaxed context was co-created, and a discursive stance towards reading was adopted by both the school librarians and the teachers in the groups. This served to afford space for the readers to construct a more dialogic understanding of the literary texts, and, in some instances, of the texts of their own and each other’s lives. In particular, in some of the discussions, there was evidence of the readers considering the social, historical and moral challenges and dilemmas presented in the text. This reinforces the point that in the extracurricular groups, readers’ interpretations of the text, whether with or without adults, were a dialogic accomplishment. The data suggest that such group reading can be a fully social process and is a potential site for developing a dialogic, relational self (Lysaker, Tonge, Gausson, & Miller, 2011).

Additionally, the data highlight that through a complex yet informal orchestration of intervention and standing back, the school librarians enabled the co-construction of open and supportive “dialogic spaces” (Wegerif, 2005) for reading. In these, there was scope for peer-to-peer conversation, debate, and disagreement. There was limited evidence of IRE (Mehan, 1979) on the part of the school librarians and the extracurricular reading groups were more characteristic of an invisible than a visible pedagogy (Bernstein, 1977); the discourse patterns were mainly relaxed, responsive and not overtly instructional. The school librarians often, although not always, generated questions for which there were no specific “correct” answers and the students were free to voice their views without attention to the assessment agenda that was widely perceived to prevail in “English”. Significantly, in the informal extracurricular reading groups, the somewhat flattened hierarchy impacted upon the identity positioning of members; both school librarians and attending teachers positioned themselves as co-readers, and younger readers were positioned and positioned themselves as group members rather than students/pupils.

In sum, the study reveals the nuanced skillset of school librarians and indicates that given the continual decline in students’ reading for pleasure in England,

## SCHOOL LIBRARIANS LEADING EXTRACURRICULAR READING GROUPS

increased recognition of their potential contribution is urgently needed. However, in the context of marked reductions in library spending (School Library Association, 2012), performative pressures, and the relatively low positioning of librarians in secondary school hierarchies, ensuring recognition of their contribution may prove problematic. Nonetheless, with schools moving further away from what Fielding (2006) calls person-centred education, school librarians (as readers and staff members) may be uniquely positioned to develop reader to reader relationships with young people that enable the collaborative exploration of personal, social and moral issues. Such relationships, based on texts in common, might serve both to nurture the engagement of young readers and to undermine the dehumanising trend in contemporary education.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The financial support of the Carnegie UK Trust and the support offered by the Chartered Institute of Librarians and Information Professionals are acknowledged.

## NOTE

<sup>1</sup> The reference to the Holocaust here does not mean that those deported were Jews.

## REFERENCES

- Audunson, R. (2005). The public library as a meeting-place in a multicultural and digital context. *Journal of Documentation*, 61(3), 429–441. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00220410510598562>
- Allington, D., & Swann, J. (2009). Researching literary reading as social practice. *Language and Literature*, 18(3), 219–230. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0963947009105850>
- Bakhtin, M. (1981) [1935]. Discourse in the novel. In M. Holquist (Ed.) *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin* (pp. 269–422). Austin, TX: University of Texas.
- Bakhtin, M. (1986) [1953]. The problem of speech genres. In C. Emerson & M. Holquist (Eds.), *Speech genres and other late essays* (pp. 60–102). Austin, TX: University of Texas.
- Ball, S. J. (1998). Performativity and fragmentation in “Postmodern Schooling”. In J. Carter (Ed.), *Postmodernity and fragmentation of welfare* (pp. 183–203). London: Routledge.
- Bernstein, B. (1977). Class and pedagogies: Visible and invisible. In J. Karabel & A. Halsey (Eds.), *Power and ideology in education* (pp. 511–534). New York, NY: Oxford.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Butler, K., Simpson E., & Court, J. (2011). Promoting excellence: Shadowing the CILIP Carnegie and Kate Greenaway Medals. In J. Court (Ed.), *Read to succeed* (pp.131–152). London: Facet.
- Cairney, T. (1995). *Pathways to literacy*. London: Cassell.
- Clark, C., & Phythian-Sence, K. (2008). *Interesting choice: The (relative) importance of choice and interest in reader engagement*. London: National Literacy Trust.
- Clark, C. (2013). *Children's and young people's reading in 2012*. London: National Literacy Trust.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (1984). *The making of a reader*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education* (5th ed.). London: Routledge Falmer. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203224342>

- Cremin, T., Mottram, M., Collins, F., Powell, S., & Safford, K. (2014). *Building communities of engaged readers: Reading for pleasure*. London: Routledge.
- Cremin, T., & Swann, J. (forthcoming, 2015). Literature in common: Reading for pleasure in school reading groups. In L. McKechnie, P. Rothbauer, K. Oterholm, & K. I. Skjerdingsstad (Eds.), *Plotting the reading experience – theory, practice, politics*. Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Dressman, M. (1997). Congruence, resistance, liminality: Reading and ideology in three school libraries. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 27(3), 265–315. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03626784.1997.11075493>
- Edwards, D., & Mercer, N. (1987). *Common knowledge: The development of understanding in the classroom*. London: Methuen/Routledge.
- Evans, K. (1996). Creating space for equity?: The role of positioning in peer-led discussion. *Language Arts*, 73, 194–203.
- Fielding, M. (2006). Leadership, radical student engagement and the necessity of person-centred education. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 9(4), 299–313. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13603120600895411>
- Garrison, D. (1979). *Apostles of culture: The public librarian and American society, 1976–1920*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: selected essays*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Goffman, E. (1971). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Krashen, S. (1993). *The power of reading*. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited, Inc.
- Krashen, S. D., Lee, S., & McQuillan, J. (2012). Is the library important?: Multivariate studies at the national and international level. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education*, 8(1), 26–38. Retrieved from <http://jolle.coe.uga.edu/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/Is-the-Library-Important.pdf>
- Kress, G., Jewitt, C., Franks, A., Hardcastle, J., & Reid, E. (2005). *English in urban classrooms: A multimodal perspective on teaching and learning*. London: Routledge Falmer. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203397305>
- Leander, K., & Sheehy, M. (Eds.). (2004). *Spatializing literacy research and practice*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lysaker, J., Tonge, C., Gauson, D., & Miller, A. (2011). Reading and social imagination: What relationally-oriented reading instruction can do for children. *Reading Psychology*, 32, 520–566.
- Majid, I. A. M. (2005). Use of school libraries by teachers in Singapore schools. *Library Review*, 54(2), 108–118. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00242530510583057>
- Maloch, B. (2002). Scaffolding student talk: One teacher's role in literature discussion groups. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 37(1), 94–112. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.37.1.4>
- Maybin, J. (2013). What counts as reading? PIRLS, EastEnders and the man on the flying trapeze. *Literacy*, 47(2), 59–66. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/lit.12005>
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674420106>
- Moss, G., & McDonald, J. W. (2004). The borrowers: Library records as unobtrusive measures of children's reading preferences. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 27, 401–412. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9817.2004.00242.x>
- McWilliam, E. (2008). Unlearning how to teach. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 45(3), 263–269. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14703290802176147>
- Novljan, S. (1998). Pupils' reading is better in schools with a librarian: Evidence from Slovenia, (Research Note). *Journal of Research in Reading*, 21(3), 228–231. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9817.00059>
- Nystrand, M. (2006). Classroom discourse and reading comprehension. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 40, 392–412.
- OECD. (2010). *PISA 2009 results: learning to learn – student engagement, strategies and practices 2010*. New York, NY: OECD.



#### SCHOOL LIBRARIANS LEADING EXTRACURRICULAR READING GROUPS

- Pennac, D. (2006). *The rights of the reader*. London: Walker.
- Pihl, J. (2012). Can library use enhance intercultural education? *Issues in Educational Research*, 22(1), 79–90.
- Rafste, E. T. (2005). A place to learn or a place for leisure: Pupils' use of the school library in Norway. *School Libraries World Wide*, 11(1), 1–16.
- School Library Association. (2012). *School libraries in 2012: A survey*. Retrieved from <http://www.sla.org.uk/blg-school-libraries-in-2012---the-sla-survey.php>
- Short, K., Kaufman, G., Kaser, S., Kahn, L., & Crawford, K. (1999). Teacher watching: Examining teacher talk in literature circles. *Language Arts*, 76, 377–385.
- Street, B. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swann, J., & Cremin, T. (2012). Shadowing English: Reading for pleasure and the Carnegie and Kate Greenaway Shadowing Scheme. *English Drama and Media*, Sheffield NATE. October 2012.
- Swann, J. (2012). Creative interpretations: A discursive approach to literary reading. In R. Jones (Ed.), *Discourse and creativity* (pp. 53–71). London: Pearson Education.
- Twist, L., Schagen, I., & Hodgson, C. (2007). *Readers and reading: The national report for England (PIRLS)*. Slough: NFER.
- Twist, L., Sizmur, J., Bartlett, S., & Lynn, L. (2012). *PIRLS 2011: Reading achievement in England*. Slough: NFER.
- Wegerif, R. (2005). Reason and creativity in classroom dialogues. *Language and Education*, 19(3), 223–237. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09500780508668676>

*Teresa Cremin*  
*The Open University, UK*

*Joan Swann*  
*The Open University, UK*

## ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS

**Helen Avery** has a background in education and applied linguistics. She has a Ph.D. in didactics as well as degrees in Classical Arabic and Modern Standard Arabic. She is currently a researcher at the Centre for Middle Eastern Studies, Lund University, working on a project about the education of refugees: *Education in Transition* (<http://www.cmes.lu.se/research/research-areas/education-in-transition>). Helen Avery also works in teacher education at the School of Education and Communication, Jönköping University. Among her recent publications on libraries and education are “The Role of the School Library: Reflections from Sweden” in *Intercultural Education* (2014) and “Pratiques d’Engagements Collaboratifs: Le Rôle de la Bibliothèque dans un Quartier Urbain Multiethnique en Suède” in *Education & Formation* (2013). Helen Avery has lived in Switzerland and Sweden for many years, where she was employed in international and non-governmental organizations. Her research focuses on the issues of language, education and diversity in a wide variety of contexts. Her current research interests include creativity, interdisciplinary pedagogy and education for sustainability with a focus on the development of new approaches to address the educational challenges of migration.

**Tone Cecilie Carlsten** is an educational researcher at the Nordic Institute for Studies in Innovation, Research and Education (NIFU). Over the past 10 years, she has been involved in several international research projects and national evaluations related to state implementation strategies in the education sector. She took part in NIFU’s evaluation of the Norwegian governmental effort to strengthen the development of school libraries in 2009–2013. With a background as an elementary and secondary schoolteacher in several countries, Tone Cecilie Carlsten also has practical experience of working with the issues of multicultural awareness, literacy development and alternative learning environments. In her current research, she continues to explore policy implementation strategies in the education sector and examines how schools develop cultures for sharing knowledge in practice. Relevant publications include “Knowledge in Teacher Learning: New Professional Challenges” in *Professional Learning in the Knowledge Society* (2012, co-authored with Kirsti Klette) and “Phased Implementation: Successful Alignment of Tools of Implementation to Improve Motivation and Mastery in Lower Secondary Schools in Norway” in *The Yearbook 2014, From Political Decisions to Change in the Classroom: Successful Implementation of Education Policy* (2014, co-authored with Eifred Markussen) for the Consortium of Institutions for Development and Research in Education in Europe (CIDREE).

#### ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS

**Teresa Cremin** is Professor of Education (Literacy) at The Open University, U.K. Her sociocultural research focuses mainly on teachers' literate identities and practices, creative pedagogical practice in literacy, and the arts and the sciences from the early years through to higher education. A Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences, the Royal Society of the Arts and the English Association, Teresa is also a director of the Cambridge Primary Review Trust and a trustee of the U.K. Literacy Association. Current projects include an examination of teachers as writers and the value of co-mentoring relationships with professional writers – a study that applies intersectionality theory to understand the positioning of struggling boy readers in primary schools, and an examination of creativity in early years science. Publications include *Writer Identity and the Teaching and Learning of Writing* (2017, co-edited with Terry Locke); *Storytelling in Early Childhood: Enriching Language, Literacy and Culture* (2017, co-edited collection); *Researching Literacy Lives: Building communities between home and school* (2015); *Building Communities of Engaged Readers: Reading for Pleasure* (2014) and *The International Handbook of Research on Children's Literacy, Learning and Culture* (2013, co-edited with Kathy Hall, Barbara Comber and Luis C. Moll).

**Ulla Damber** is senior lecturer in literacy development at Umeå University and senior lecturer in education at Mid Sweden University. She is associate professor in education. Her research interests are in primary school students and preschool children's literacy development. Publications include "Read-Alouds in Preschool – A Matter of Discipline?" in the *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy* (2015) and "Reading with Preschool Children Guided by Regulatory or Emancipatory Purposes: A Case Study" in *The International Journal of Literacies* (2014). Ulla Damber has also written about critical literacy for a Swedish audience, mainly through her engagement in an in-service teacher training campaign (*Läslyftet*) conducted by the Swedish National Agency for Education. Her research focus at present is on children's encounters with literature and multilingual learners' literacy development in relation to school development. She is also currently involved in a school development project and action research projects in preschool.

**Thomas Eri** is assistant professor at the Department of Primary and Secondary Teacher Education, Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences. His main research interest is educational change and development from the perspectives of cultural-historical activity theory and critical pedagogy. His current Ph.D. project examines the conditions for the development of teacher and librarian collaboration within literacy education. He has recently published "The Challenge of Sustaining Change: Contradictions within the Development of Teacher and Librarian Collaboration" in *Educational Action Research* (2016, co-authored with Joron Pihl).

**Joron Pihl** is Professor Emerita of Multicultural Education at the Department of International Studies and Interpreting at Oslo and Akershus University College

of Applied Sciences. Her research interests lie in the development of educational theory, methodology and teacher professionalism that are responsive to multiplicity in schools. She was head of the research and development project *Multiplicity, Empowerment, Citizenship: Inclusion through the Use of the Library as an Arena for Learning* (2007–2011). Recent publications include “The Challenge of Sustaining Change: Contradictions within the Development of Teacher and Librarian Collaboration” in *Educational Action Research* (2016, co-authored with Thomas Eri), “Desire and Becoming – Multilingual Pupils’ Reading Experiences” in *Plotting the Reading Experience – Theory/Practice/Politics* (2016, co-authored with Kristin Skinstad van der Kooij) and “Epistemological and methodological challenges researching youth at the margins” in *Youth at the Margins* (2015). Joron Pihl is a reviewer for a number of international journals including the *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* and the *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*. She is a member of the Nordic Centre of Excellence: Justice through Education in the Nordic Countries (JustEd; [www.justed.org](http://www.justed.org)) and serves on the Management board of JustEd.

**Jørgen Sjaastad** is senior researcher at the Nordic Institute for Studies in Innovation, Research and Education (NIFU). He has a Ph.D. in science education and is currently involved in several evaluations and surveys in the Norwegian school sector. He took part in NIFU’s evaluation of the Norwegian governmental programme to strengthen the development of school libraries in 2009–2013. Jørgen Sjaastad is currently involved in research in early writing instruction focusing on the use of digital tools. In 2015, he conducted an expert panel study of the most important outcome factors of early writing instruction. He is interested in how governmental efforts are implemented in schools and received by teachers. He recently published “The Impact of Digital Devices vs. Pen(cil) and Paper on Primary School Students’ Writing Skills – A Research Review” in *Computers and Education* (2016, co-authored with Sabine Wollscheid and Cathrine Tømte).

**Kristin Skinstad van der Kooij** is Associate Professor of Multicultural Education at the Department of International Studies and Interpreting, Oslo and Akershus University College. Her Ph.D. in education is from New York University and she has taught and conducted research in the U.S.A., Sierra Leone and Norway. She teaches M.A. and Ph.D. courses in multicultural education, epistemology, and research methodology. Her research interests focus on teaching and learning in light of multiplicity and the development of intercultural knowledge in school subjects. Publications include “Negotiating Literacy Education in a Multicultural Setting” in *Nordic Voices: Teaching and Researching Comparative and International Education in the Nordic Countries* (2009) and “Desire and Becoming – Multilingual Pupils’ Reading Experiences” in *Plotting the Reading Experience – Theory/Practice/Politics* (2016, both articles are co-authored with Joron Pihl). Current projects include a research and development project involving pupils as researchers in their own lower

#### ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS

secondary schools in Finland and Norway, a research project on collaboration in history education across the formal/non-formal institutional divide and a comparative research project on teacher education for social integration in Japan and Norway. She is a member of the Nordic Centre of Excellence: Justice through Education in the Nordic Countries (JustEd, [www.justed.org](http://www.justed.org)).

**Brian V. Street** is one of the founding scholars of New Literacy Studies. He is Professor Emeritus of Language in Education at King's College, London and Visiting Professor of Education at the University of Pennsylvania. Brian V. Street conducted anthropological fieldwork in Iran during the 1970s, from which he developed theoretical approaches to literacy in a cross-cultural perspective. He taught social anthropology at Sussex University for more than 20 years, and has worked and lectured in countries including the U.S.A., Australia, Brazil and South Africa, applying cross-cultural perspectives to educational issues surrounding literacy, language and development. Brian V. Street is involved in the international project *Learning Empowerment through Training in Ethnographic Research* (LETTER). He is President of the British Association for Literacy in Development, co-editor with Juliet McCaffery of *Theory and Practice in Literacy and Development* (BALID) and editor of the UNESCO journal *Prospects*. Recent publications include *Literacy and Development: Ethnographic Perspectives* (2000, edited collection; short-listed for the BAAL Book Prize in 2002); *Adult Literacy and International Development: Stories from the Field*, NIACE (2012, co-authored with Alan Rogers); and "Academic Writing: Theory and Practice" in the *Journal of Educational Issues* (2015). His forthcoming book *Ethno-Numeracy* is co-edited with Kara Jackson, Keiko Yasukawa and Alan Rogers.

**Joan Swann** is Professor Emerita of English Language at the Open University, U.K., where she was Director of the Centre for Language and Communication. She is a sociolinguist with a particular interest in the analysis of spoken interaction. Her teaching and research cover English as a global language, language and identity, language and education and language and creativity. Recent and current projects under this last heading include the discourse of reading groups, with a focus on how adults and children talk about literary texts in both institutional and more everyday settings, and how this talk is particularly focused on creative interpretation. Of theoretical interest is the integration of cognitive and sociocultural perspectives in the analysis of literary reading. She is also concerned with the applications of such analysis, for instance in the evaluation of extra-curricular reading projects in schools (with Teresa Cremin). Recent publications include *The Discourse of Reading Groups: Integrating Cognitive and Sociocultural Perspectives* (2016, co-authored with David Peplow, Paola Trimarco and Sara Whiteley); *English in the World: History, Diversity, Change* (2012, co-edited with Philip Seargeant); and *Creativity in Language and Literature: The State of the Art* (2011, co-edited with Ronald Carter and Rob Pope).

**Ingebjørg Tonne** is Professor of Norwegian as a Second Language at the Department of Linguistics and Scandinavian Studies, University of Oslo. Her Ph.D. is in linguistics. Tonne's research focus is on second language acquisition and contrastive grammar. Currently, she studies the validity of assessment standards for writing in Norway, with special attention to second language writers (*The Norm Project*). Publications include "Morphological Correspondences in the Reading-Writing Relation among L2 Learners" (2015, co-authored with Joron Pihl) in *The Reading Matrix*; "Andrespråkseleven, Leseprøver og Litteraturbasert Leseopplæring [The Second Language Learner Reading Tests and Literature Based Reading Instruction]" (2013, co-authored with Joron Pihl) in *Nordand: Nordisk Tidsskrift for Andrespråksforskning*; "Norske Grammatikkarbeider med et Andrespråksperspektiv – en Oversikt [Norwegian Grammars with a Second Language Perspective – An Overview]" (2015, co-authored with Else Ryen) in *NOA: Norsk som andrespråk*; and "Andrespråksdidaktisk Forskning – en Oversikt over Hva, Hvordan og Hvorfor i Andrespråk i Grunnskolen i 30 år [Second Language Didactics – An Overview over What, How and Why in Second Language Teaching in Primary/Lower Secondary School for 30 years]" (2015, co-authored with Kirsten Palm) in *NOA: Norsk som andrespråk*.