

# **Deep Reading in English: How do Teachers Promote and Experience Deep Reading in the English Subject?**



Lillian Utne Skjæveland  
Autumn 2020  
Master Thesis  
Department of the Humanities  
University of Bergen

## Acknowledgements

First, thank you so much to my five informants for your thoughts and time. This thesis would not be possible without you. I would also like to thank my supervisor, Sigrid Ørevik for guiding me through the process of writing my thesis. Your honest answers and structured feedback have been invaluable. Thank you! Another great thank you goes to the Great Eight, my amazing fellow classmates at the master's programme. Because of you, the stays in Bergen were always enjoyable and special. I also want to thank all the teachers and staff at the University of Bergen for making the university experience warm and inclusive, as well as my Bergen located sister, Randi, whom I have loved visiting. Another big gratitude goes to Marit, Tore and Ida who willingly gave of their time to discuss my thesis. I have greatly appreciated your feedback. Another inspiration was Sharon. Thank you so much for motivational talks and for sharing your linguistic competence with me. Big thanks to my former colleague Runar too. Runar, you made my day when repairing the final document from format collapse. As usual, it took you five minutes to re-establish my grounds. Lastly, I thank my wonderful family: Torleik, who adds sparkles and cultivates my environment, thank you for everything you do. Jarle and Sha, thank you for all the interesting discussions around the “kvelds” – table. I love to hear about your artistic projects. Randi, Amalia and Rolf, thank you for being near and for all the amusing moments. Mor og far, thank you for fixing practicalities and for letting me use the holiday retreat as an office. Not least, thank you to my number one favourite in the world, my daughter Sigrid Johanne. I love you.

Lillian, Autumn 2020

## Abstract in Norwegian

Det blir stadig viktigere å mestre mer kognitivt krevende måter å lese på. Dette gjelder ikke minst engelsk, som er et etablert verdensspråk. For eksempel, viser en studie at studenter ikke er godt nok forberedt til å lese engelske tekster på universitetet (Hellekjær, 2019). Rapporten Fremtidens skole (NOU2015: 8) forklarer hvordan den raske samfunnsutviklingen krever nye ferdigheter, slik som dybdelæring, selvregulert læring og metakognisjon. Med den nye generelle læreplanen, CC17 (og senere LK20 (2019)), er disse begrepene blitt implementert som sentrale prinsipper for opplæringen.

Med denne oppgaven ønsket jeg å rette søkelyset på selve leseprosessen og bygge bro mellom ny overordnet læreplan, CC17, og nåværende kunnskapsløftet, LK06/13. Gjennom fem narrative intervjuer utforsket jeg hvordan ungdomsskolelærere praktiserte og erfarte arbeidet med dybdelesing i engelskfaget. Utgangspunktet for studien var begrepet *deep reading* (dybdelesing), et begrep utarbeidet av forskeren Maryanne Wolf. Dybdelesing utfordrer leseren emosjonelt og intellektuelt og er ofte karakterisert av å være kognitivt krevende. Grunnet behovet for å avgrense denne oppgaven er hovedfokuset konsentrert om dybdelesing av skjønnlitterære tekster.

Funnene indikerer at lærere driver med mye god og målrettet dybdeleseopplæring med fokus på før- og etter-lesing, men at arbeidet ikke er systematisert tydelig nok. Det foregikk heller ikke systematisk opplæring i metakognisjon tilknyttet lesingen.

Et funn underbygges av tidligere studier, som at lærerne oppfattet elevene sine som gode på lesestrategier som skimming og scanning, men mindre trente i å lese lengre og mer tidkrevende tekster. Dette funnet har imidlertid begrenset gyldighet da det kun representerer elevenes lesemåter indirekte.

Et overraskende funn var at til tross for at det leses så mye på skjerm så var det lite refleksjon rundt valg av medium. Dette ble tydelig når lærerne skulle begrunne valg av medium å lese fra, hvis beslutning ofte ble et resultat av hva som var tilgjengelig og mest gjennomførbart, i motsetning til hva som var best for det faglige utbyttet. De fleste lærerne foretrakk papirbøker men endte ofte opp med å la elever lese på skjerm, fordi bøker ikke var tilgjengelige. Dette kan skyldes den kontekstuelle virkelighet (Borg, 2003), som kunne by på muligheter så vel som begrensninger. Eksempler på muligheter og begrensninger kan være bestillingen i læreplanen som bla ikke etterspør en slik refleksjon, tilgangen til gode leserom og engelsk lesestoff og bøker.

Et optimistisk funn var at lærerne opplevde at de fleste elevene ble mer positive til dybdelesing etterhvert som de ble eldre. En mulig forklaring er at elevene ble tilvendt aktiviteten og således bedre lesere, og at de modnet. Det var ellers noe overraskende å lære om hvor mye tid lærerne brukte på å tilpasse dybdelesingen til den enkelte i tilfeller hvor elevene leste individuell bok.

Til sist har jeg gjennom denne oppgaven skuet fremover mot hvordan nye fagspesifikke læreplanmål i LK20 (2019) muliggjør for mer dybdelesing i engelskfaget. Jeg har også argumentert for metakognisjon på alle nivå, samt økt satsning til skolebibliotek og kvalifiserte bibliotekarer som del i laget rundt eleven for å lettere nå læreplanmålene.

## Abstract in English

It has become more important than ever to adept at more cognitively demanding reading activities. The official Norwegian report, NOU2015: 8, *The School of the Future* explains how the rapid social development demands for new skills, such as in-depth learning, self-regulated learning and metacognition. With the new core curriculum, CC17 (and later LK20 (2019)), these skills have been implemented as principles for education and all-round development.

With this thesis, I wanted to direct attention to the reading process and to draw lines and show connection between CC17 and the subject-specific curriculum, LK06/13. I interviewed five EFL-teachers on their practices and experiences with the teaching of deep reading in lower secondary school. Deep reading challenges readers emotionally and intellectually. It is a term established by the researcher, Maryanne Wolf.

My findings indicate that the teachers instruct and guide many of the deep reading activities, focusing on *pre-* and *post-*reading activities. However, the teachers did not necessarily instruct deep reading systematically. Nor did they instruct systematically in metacognitive awareness related to deep reading.

One finding corroborated with previous research, such as the teachers' observations on their pupils' reading strategies and habits. Many of the teachers said that their pupils were good multitaskers and skimmers, but lacked experience with extensive reading and the reading of literature. Nevertheless, it should be explicitly expressed that this finding represents an indirect pupil perspective and cannot be generalised upon.

One of the more surprising findings was that despite the great amount of time spent on digital reading, the teachers reflected little on the choice of which medium to read from. For example, some of the teachers reported that iPads or Chromebooks were used for deep reading activities if hard copies were unavailable. However, when reflecting upon what they believed was the most suitable medium for deep reading, the majority of the teachers were in favour of print. Nevertheless, my finding suggests that the teachers would let their pupils read from a book or the digital device out of practical reasons, not pedagogical reasons. A possible explanation is the teachers' contextual realities (Borg, 2003). Examples of contextual realities can be the requirements in the national curriculum which do demand for such reflections, access to books or reading spaces.

An optimistic finding was that four of the teachers experienced that their pupils would grow more positive towards deep reading activities as they grew older.

A surprising finding was the amount of time that many teachers spent in order to assist their pupils in finding a good book to read. Lastly, I discussed possible implications for the future practice of teaching deep reading in EFL in order to reach the required competence aims in the curriculum. In this regard, I have argued for the need for metacognition on all levels, as well as investing in school libraries and professional librarians in order to build competent and professional teams around our pupils.

# Abbreviations

EFL English as a foreign language

CC17 *Core curriculum, values and principles for primary and secondary education*  
(approved in 2017)

LK06/13 *The Knowledge Promotion* (2006/2013)

L97 *Læreplanverket for den 10-årige grunnskolen* (1997)

LK20 The new national curriculum in Norway, implemented Autumn 2020

ZPD Zone of proximal development

## Concepts explained

*Biliterate brain:* Wolf (2018) proposes that we are two different kinds of readers. On the one hand, we are digital readers on digital devices. On the other hand, we are analogue readers, reading on paper. According to Wolf (2018), digital reading and reading on paper cultivate different metacognitive skills and Wolf uses the term “the biliterate brain” to address this (p. 168). Wolf believes children of today are biliterate because they read both digitally and on paper, and she argues that biliterate children must be taught to skilfully code switch between the mediums they read from depending on the (con)text.

*Cognitive patience:* Cognitive patience refers to the ability to read attentively and staying focused on the reading task, without multitasking or skimming over parts of it (Wolf, 2018, p. 90).

*Continuous partial attention:* Continuous partial attention is a term coined by the former Microsoft executive, Linda Stone. It refers to the act of multitasking and dividing one’s attention (Wolf, 2018, p. 71). According to Wolf, continuous partial attention threatens processes that are necessary to strengthen old neural networks and develop new ones in a person’s brain. Examples of such neural networks are cognitive skills like analogical thinking, critical analysis, perspective taking and empathy. Without practicing these skills, we may lose the ability to navigate successfully through a complex reality (pp. 36-68).

*Digital reading:* When using the term digital reading, I am referring to reading texts on a screen. Unless otherwise stated, digital reading refers to reading from screens in general; being tablets, computers or smartphones. Note: The only exception is reading tablets specifically designed for reading, such as Kindles.

*Deep reading:* Deep reading is the consumption of long or substantial texts that challenge the reader emotionally and intellectually.

*Medium/ mediums:* Wolf (2018) mainly uses the term “mediums” when addressing the plural form of medium. The medium refers to the device or apparatus that one reads from. Examples of mediums are books, magazines, Kindles, computers, iPads, smartphones etc.

*Medium awareness:* Medium awareness is about reflecting upon how we process text differently from different mediums. When I call for medium awareness, I address being able to understand and reflect upon possible advantages and disadvantages of processing different types of text from different mediums, such as books, Kindles, computers, phones etc.

*Monotask:* Focusing on only one activity at the time.

*Multitask:* Focusing on many activities at the same time.

# Table of contents

---

1	Introduction .....	1
1.1	Introduction .....	1
1.2	Deep reading .....	3
1.3	Deep reading in EFL.....	4
1.4	Media bias? .....	4
1.5	Broader educational context.....	6
1.6	The aim of this study .....	9
1.7	Research gap .....	9
1.8	Research question .....	10
1.9	How deep reading is understood in this study .....	10
1.10	Outline of this thesis .....	11
2	Theoretical background.....	12
2.1	Introduction.....	12
2.2	Reading and deep reading.....	12
2.3	Reading Strategies .....	13
2.3.1	Deep reading and the deep reading processes.....	14
2.3.2	Digital reading.....	18
2.3.3	Reading comprehension.....	23
2.4	Deep reading in light of Language learning and reading in EFL.....	24
2.5	Reading instruction in EFL.....	27
2.6	The development of reading literature in EFL.....	29
2.7	Literature in the curriculum .....	30
2.8	Deep reading in light of neuroscience .....	34
2.9	Teacher cognition .....	36
2.10	Summary .....	37
3	Material and methods.....	39
3.1	Introduction.....	39
3.2	Quantitative and qualitative research .....	39
3.3	Research question .....	40
3.4	Research design .....	41
3.5	Collecting data.....	42
3.5.1	Interviews.....	42
3.6	Getting permission.....	44
3.7	Selecting and informing participants .....	45
3.8	Interview guide.....	46
3.8.1	Introduction.....	46
3.8.2	Interview guide Part 1.....	47

3.8.3	Interview guide Part 2.....	47
3.8.4	Interview guide Part 3.....	48
3.9	Conducting interviews.....	49
3.9.1	Interviews.....	49
3.10	Presenting data.....	50
3.11	Analysing data.....	50
3.12	Ethical considerations.....	52
3.13	Validity and reliability.....	53
3.14	Summary.....	56
4	Presenting results.....	57
4.1	Introduction.....	57
4.2	The teachers and their backgrounds.....	57
4.2.1	Table displaying teachers' education and background.....	58
4.3	Teachers' practices and reflections.....	59
4.3.1	Which medium: digital reading or reading on paper.....	59
4.3.2	Opinions on digital reading and reading on paper.....	62
4.3.3	Why teach deep reading in EFL.....	65
4.3.4	How teachers promote and work with deep reading in EFL.....	66
4.3.5	Examples from the classroom.....	71
4.3.6	Other interesting findings.....	75
4.4	Teachers' observations.....	76
4.4.1	Likert scale table displaying teachers' observations.....	77
4.4.2	Performance and endurance.....	78
4.4.3	Strategies and habits.....	79
4.4.4	Attitudes.....	81
4.5	Summary of interesting findings.....	82
5	Discussion.....	83
5.1	Introduction.....	83
5.2	Digital reading and reading on paper practices.....	83
5.2.1	Introduction.....	83
5.2.2	Time.....	83
5.2.3	Medium.....	84
5.2.4	The curriculum.....	87
5.2.5	Summary.....	89
5.3	Perspectives held by the teachers.....	89
5.3.1	Introduction.....	89
5.3.2	Why teach deep reading?.....	89
5.3.3	Teachers' attitudes on teaching deep reading.....	91



5.3.4	Challenges.....	92
5.3.5	Summary.....	94
5.4	Deep reading instruction practices in EFL.....	95
5.4.1	Introduction.....	95
5.4.2	Approaches .....	95
5.4.3	Deep reading community.....	97
5.4.4	Reading strategies.....	98
5.4.5	Summary.....	99
5.5	Experiences with part processes of Deep reading.....	99
5.5.1	Introduction.....	99
5.5.2	Deep reading processes.....	99
5.5.3	Imagery.....	100
5.5.4	Perspective-taking .....	101
5.5.5	Summary.....	103
5.6	Teachers' experiences with learners' performances, habits and attitudes.....	103
5.6.1	Introduction.....	103
5.6.2	Reading strategies.....	105
5.6.3	Attitudes.....	107
5.6.4	Summary.....	109
6	Conclusions .....	110
6.1	Summary of main Findings.....	110
6.2	Implications for practice .....	112
6.3	Suggestions for further research.....	114
	References.....	116
	Appendices.....	124
	Appendix 1: Consent from NSD .....	125
	Appendix 2: Information and consent form sent out to informants .....	129
	Appendix 3: Interview guide.....	132
	Appendix 4: Transcribed interviews.....	135
	Appendix 5: E-READ Stavanger Declaration Press Release 2019 .....	171
	Appendix 6: future of reading .....	173

# 1 INTRODUCTION

---

“We need to confront the reality that when bombarded with too many options, our default can be to rely on information that places few demands upon thinking” (Wolf, 2018, p. 198).

## 1.1 INTRODUCTION

This thesis studies *deep reading* by listening to and recording experiences and perspectives expressed by lower secondary school teachers in English as a foreign language (EFL). The personal context for wanting to explore deep reading in EFL grew out of my own experience. A few years ago, I noticed that the notion of reading in the era of the internet seemed to be changing. The media was painting an unsettling picture of low Pisa scores, digitalisation and young people’s reading habits. Being an English teacher concerned with the teaching of reading, this attracted my attention.

In 2016, I read *Tyranny of the Moment* by the Norwegian social anthropologist, Thomas Hylland-Eriksen (2001). In the book, he suggested that digitalisation was changing our habits and pointed to new practices such as repeatedly checking the news, our email and other updates. The message of his book was that speed and constant multitasking were distracting and interrupted longer thoughts and reflections. He prognostically wrote:

The new information technology that lurks in the background of this entire book, is still at the trial stage, and there is no way of knowing how it will be put to use in three, five or 20 years. It is nonetheless easy to see some consequences of information technology: it removes distance, shortens time and fills the gap with cascades of information. (Hylland-Eriksen, 2001, p. 76)

Simultaneously as reading Hylland-Eriksen’s book, a former teacher named John Hopkins (2016) published an amusing essay where he questioned people’s priorities like going shopping and consuming meaningless entertainment instead of seeking more intellectual

pleasures. The teacher was concerned about the development of the entertainment industry's presence and influence on society. An illustrating example can be seen in this extract:

I see Kim Kardashian's ass at the top of CNN.com, and I am scared.

Maybe it's all harmless fun. Like the good-spirited laughter of a live studio audience? Maybe. But I am sincerely worried we have not done enough to cultivate intellectual curiosity within our culture (Hopkins, 2016).

Originally, Hopkins blamed the 90s TV sitcom, *Friends*, as it signalled "a harsh embrace of anti-intellectualism in America, where a gifted man is persecuted by his idiot compatriots." This gifted man, Ross, liked to read and study, and his friends liked to mock him for it. Hopkins described how people like Ross dealt with hostile environments, and in the text, he claimed that popular culture seduced consumers into becoming uninterested in the world.

Hylland-Eriksen's book and Hopkin's essay were both relevant to me. As an English teacher, I see pupils consume entertainment daily. Notifications are constantly keeping them updated on the world around them, and they multitask and navigate between gadgets and websites at a quick speed. According to research from RescueTime (2019), which is an iOS-app monitoring people's smartphone use, young people spend on average more than 3 hours on their phone per day. Time spent on other devices such as computers, TV and tablets like iPads and Kindles comes in addition. This has made me wonder if there is some truth to Hylland-Eriksen's and Hopkin's worries. Are we too immersed in the entertainment technology and read less in depth? Or are we simply adapting to new times and ways; not in a worse way, just different?

The distinction between my pupils' school activities and the entertainment they consume is overlapping. For example, my pupils use Youtube and blogs both in and outside school. For me as a teacher, it enables access to their authentic worlds and makes it possible to discuss and reflect in environments that are of interest and known to them. However, I have also witnessed how easily distracted they are, how their gadgets pop up when they are not supposed to and how my pupils uncritically select Internet sources. They also seem to google for quick answers instead of using time exploring their own thoughts, and I have also felt that the pupils seem disinterested in classroom activities, especially when asked to monotask or to focus on more time-consuming activities, such as longer reads. I have introduced novels, but

they ask if we can watch the film instead. Another impression of mine is that my pupils avoid contemplative tasks and steer away from ambiguity. An illustrating example is when my tenth graders discussed the topic “love.” We had read extracts from the novel *The Fault in our Stars* (Green, 2012) and discussed different types of love. I then asked them to discuss love’s opposite, but the discussion went silent because the entire class agreed that it was “hate.” This example suggests there is a preference to conclude one’s thinking and move on. However, interestingly, the 2017 *Core Curriculum, values and principles for primary and secondary education and training* (CC17), requires the opposite. According to the curriculum, “pupils develop when they learn how to find correct answers, but also when they understand that simple and set answers are not always easy to find” (2017, p. 12).

Naturally, I want my pupils to be able to take part in the globally complex as well as the fragmented and splintered conversation, both online and in real life. I believe deep reading may enable them to navigate quickly and read deeply, contribute to developing good technical reading skills, as well as higher-level understanding, which in turn strengthen their ability to distinguish between fantasy, fiction, reality and fake news.

## **1.2 DEEP READING**

As will be explained in further detail in chapter 2, deep reading consists of part-processes interacting together during reading activities. It involves getting information to add to background knowledge, deducing and inducing, taking on others’ perspectives and thinking critically. I have summed up what the concept means to me in this simplified definition:

*Deep reading is the consumption of long or substantial texts that challenge the reader emotionally and intellectually.*

According to Maryanne Wolf (2018) who coined the term, deep reading refers to mental processes happening when we encounter emotionally and intellectually challenging texts (pp 35-68). To a large extent, this thesis rests on the work of Maryanne Wolf. Wolf is the Director of Center for Dyslexia, Diverse Learners, and Social Justice at the UCLA Graduate School of Education and Information Studies in California, USA. Her background within the teaching of reading is rich and varied and she has written many books about reading, such as *Proust and*

*the Squid: The Story and Science of the Reading Brain* (2007, HarperCollins), *Dyslexia, Fluency, and the Brain* (Edited; York, 2001), *Tales of Literacy for the 21st Century* (2016, Oxford University Press), and *Reader, Come Home: The Reading Brain in a Digital World* (August, 2018, HarperCollins).

### **1.3 DEEP READING IN EFL**

The *Education Act*, as referred to in the *Core curriculum* (CC17), states that “Education and training in schools and training establishments shall, in collaboration and agreement with the home, open doors to the world and give the pupils and apprentices historical and cultural insight and anchorage” (2017).

As one is increasingly aware, the world is not only physical anymore. Our pupils live digital parallel lives that connect them to people and places all over the world. English is a global language and as a result, it is also the global language online. Wolf (2018) claims that digitalisation has reshaped our reading habits in terms of both *what* we read and *how* we read. She explains how different ways of reading may strengthen or weaken certain neural circuits in the brain. For example, she writes that children today are learning to read and navigate online which strengthens their ability to multitask and focus on many things simultaneously. On the other hand, this reading technique does not foster concentration and comprehension. Wolf’s main argument is that children need a balanced and systematic reading instruction, teaching both contemplation and depth as well as skimming and multitasking.

### **1.4 MEDIA BIAS?**

Bigum and Kenway (2005) use the terms “Boosters” and “Doomsters” to describe dichotomous positions towards technology. Boosters are people who are “Anti- Schoolers” who uncritically cheer new technologies forward, whereas Doomsters are reactionary “Critics” who argue for the more traditional forms of teaching. Considering this, media headlines about deep reading seem dominated by warnings and concerns. A recurring

argument is that people's digital reading habits fail to foster the development of longer thoughts and are shown in the following examples. In the *New York Times*, author and journalist Patrick Kingsley (2010) criticised people's impatience with longer texts and blamed it on digital culture. Kingsley claimed digital culture encouraged people to rush through texts, missing out on contemplation and greater understanding. In the documentary, *Requiem for the American Dream* (2015), professor of linguistics, Noam Chomsky, claimed that young people would rather use a Saturday going to the mall than going to the library. In Norway, *Klassekampen* journalist, Bjørn Vassnes (2018), connected digital habits to changes in reading habits, and pointed to decreased book sales.

Wolf (2018) too is easily regarded as critical to the combination of digitalisation and deep reading. When quoted in or interviewed by the media, it is mainly as a spokesperson for the concerns. There are numerous podcasts on YouTube and Spotify where Wolf is being interviewed about the topic. In 2018, Wolf also published an article in the Guardian where she warned about the changing reading habits in the digital era:

Research surfacing in many parts of the world now cautions that each of these essential "deep reading" processes may be under threat as we move into digital-based modes of reading. (Wolf, in The Guardian)

However, it is worth noting that her worries are nuanced. Undeniably, although she establishes how technological devices add new challenges to the already challenging task of reading, she also acknowledges that digital devices have advantages. She explains how digital spheres may nurture new neural circuits in the brain, a discussion that also indicates that she tries to steer away from a digital-analogue dichotomy that corresponds to shallow versus deep. Wolf also writes that she finds it "important to be informed by the growing knowledge on the impact of different media if we are to prepare all our children, wherever they live, to read deeply and well, in whatever medium" (Wolf, 2018, p. 12). This suggests that she believes that deep reading can be mediated by digital tools. Digital reading will be elaborated on in chapter two.

## 1.5 BROADER EDUCATIONAL CONTEXT

The national curriculum, *The Knowledge Promotion* (2006/13), also referred to as LK06/13, affects approximately 600,000 pupils in 2848 primary schools in Norway. As teachers, our job is to allow pupils to practice being part of society in authentic situations as well as counterbalance trends in the same society. In the *Core Curriculum* (2017), it says:

The school's mission is the education and all-round development (Bildung) of all pupils. Education and all-round development are interlinked and mutually dependent, and their underlying principles should help schools accomplish this dual mission. Primary and secondary education and training is an important part of a lifelong process which has the individual's all-round development, intellectual freedom, independence, responsibility and compassion for others as its goal. The teaching and training shall give the pupils a good foundation for understanding themselves, others and the world, and for making good choices in life.

Thus, in my opinion, an important part of a teacher's task is to assist pupils in developing the cognitive and social skills necessary for them to master this. It is interesting to see that CC17 has culminated in competences that seem to contrast with what seem to be people's reading habits. Instead of multitasking and skimming the surfaces of learning, skills like integration, self – regulated learning and deep learning are promoted in the *Core Curriculum* (2017).

CC17, now LK20 (2019) was developed, in part, based on the Official Norwegian Report (NOU, 2015:18) entitled *The School of the Future*. The report explains how the rapid development of today's society requires new skills. The report poses new demands on school staff and children. Competences of the future are not only subject-specific but also cognitive, practical, social and emotional. Deep learning is characterised by investigating something in depth and requires that we develop some form of self-discipline in the process.

The report culminated in four major competence areas: Subject-specific competence, competence in learning, competence in exploring and creating, competence in communicating, interacting and participating (NOU, 2015:8, p. 11). These competences are referred to as 21st century skills and are defined as important for the future.

Metacognition, competence in learning, self-regulated learning and deep learning are also given special attention. Metacognition is described by learners who “monitor and reflect on one’s own thinking and learning” (NOU, 2015:8 p. 28). To monitor one’s learning, one also needs to be self-regulated. Self-regulated learning is defined as over time: to “learn to take initiatives and control parts of their own learning process” (NOU, 2015: 8, p. 28). In practice, being self-regulated means that learners need to have “strategies for planning, tracking and evaluating their own learning process, and for motivating their own effort” (p. 28). Further, we read: “By developing metacognition and self-regulation, pupils learn to be involved in a way that will promote in-depth learning” (p. 28).

Pupils are encouraged to develop strategies which can cultivate their ability to prioritise as well as to process and comprehend information. 21st century skills are identified as being required for success. In the Official Norwegian Report *2014: 7, Elevenes læring i fremtidens skole*, the Ludvigsen committee describes central development areas required for the 21st century society and workplace. These are technological development, globalisation, cultural diversity, democracy, addressing climate issues and the rapid development in the knowledge society (NOU 2014: 7, p. 12, my translation). The skills problem solving, critical thinking, cooperation and communication are given special importance and are closely tied to metacognition and self-regulated learning. Metacognition and self-regulated learning are concepts used frequently throughout the report, emphasising the importance of teaching young children to adapt and adjust to a changing world.

*Ungdataundersøkelsen* (2018), which studied Norwegian young people’s habits and well-being, shows that many young people suffer from stress and mental health problems. Two interdisciplinary topics, “health and life skills” and “democracy and citizenship”, are described under the English subject curriculum in LK20. These overarching topics, and in particular health and life skills, address that young people must be taught to master both their inner and outer lives. The aim, democracy and citizenship, emphasises the importance of interaction with others in order to develop understanding and knowledge about the world and one’s participation and role in society. Under the heading, health and life skills, one can read about the importance of developing one’s oral and written communicative skills in order to express one’s own emotions, thoughts and needs. This is also reflected in the NOU 2015: 8 report: “In the future, society will also place high demands on the individual’s ability to orient



him/herself in society, cope with everyday life and make good decisions in his or her own life” (p. 23).

As suggested, current reading practices may challenge deep learning and self-regulated learning. Looking at the concept in-depth learning, one sees how it is related to deep reading. According to The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, UDIR, in depth learning represents gradual processes where learners develop new connections and knowledge, increase understanding and learn to integrate their new knowledge in their thinking and actions (<https://www.udir.no/laring-og-trivsel/dybdelaring/> 13.03.2019). Fullan, Quinn and McEachen (2018) describe deep learning as a *process* where an individual manages to transfer what was learned in one situation over to another. Fullan, Quinn and McEachen also emphasise the importance of “learning to learn” (p. 95) as necessary to optimise learning and understanding. The report from NOU (2015:8) also suggests that the most important aspect of a competence is its application: “The knowledge and understanding pupils have of what they have learnt, how they can use what they have learnt and when to use it, play an important part in acquiring competence” (p. 10). Similarly, deep reading is about applying what one reads and gradually develop understanding and knowledge over time. For example, Wolf (2018) discusses how deep reading supports skills like connecting background knowledge to new information and how to make educated guesses.

In the Norwegian curriculum, reading is defined as one of five basic skills. Reading “involves mastering the reading of screen and paper texts with concentration, endurance, fluency and coherence” (Framework for basic skills, 2012, p. 8). In my school, we have textbooks, but read mainly on iPads. Thus, I wonder if the iPad has limitations or foster a potential that I have not yet realised and taken into use in my EFL-classroom. To read with *concentration, endurance, fluency and coherence* are cognitively demanding processes. Wolf (2018) argues that we need knowledge about possibilities and limitations of different mediums in order to become good readers. As explained, Wolf (2018) does not rule out, but questions whether deep reading can be fully maintained when reading on screen. Until recently, the Norwegian curriculum has not claimed a position on where these possibilities or limitations between different mediums lie. However, the national curriculum LK20 (2019) gives reason to be optimistic. According to Udir’s quality criteria for teaching aids published in June 2020, research on digital reading is now referred to under the heading: “Digitalisation in schools and

challenges for teaching resources” (my translation). It should be underlined that this document was not published when I conducted my research and has therefore not been accounted for in this thesis. However, it is worth noticing that this document both acknowledges and addresses possibilities and limitations of different mediums.

## **1.6 THE AIM OF THIS STUDY**

How to read, *what* to read and *why* deep reading is important are all relevant questions. In my thesis, I am curious to find out more about how deep reading is promoted and experienced by the teachers in the English subject in school. The intention is neither to go in detail, nor generalise about EFL pupils or teachers. Rather, it is to gain new perspectives by looking into other teachers’ teaching practices and observations on learners’ deep reading habits in EFL. In my view, this may contribute to the field of English didactics in a number of ways. Firstly, it will give recognition to the teacher experience. Secondly, it may direct attention to the reading processes. Thirdly, my thesis may assist in drawing lines and showing connections between the *Core curriculum* (2017) and the subject-specific curriculum in *The Knowledge Promotion* (2006/13). Lastly, my thesis may direct attention to the aspect of reading literature in the subject of English.

## **1.7 RESEARCH GAP**

There is little research on deep reading from a teachers’ perspective. There is one master thesis studying teacher’s attitudes towards reading in EFL (Harestad Bakke, 2010). Considering that this thesis investigates how the teachers teach reading in English, this thesis has been interesting. Hoff (2016), has also done interesting field work on reading in EFL. She investigated didactic opportunities and challenges connected to the fostering of “intercultural readers” in upper secondary school. However, there is little research on deep reading in EFL, mainly because deep reading is a relatively new term. For this reason, I believe that besides serving the purpose of improving my own teaching practice, my research may add new perspectives to the existing research on reading in EFL.

As explained in section 1.4, deep reading is also muddled by a biased media narrative, which may be useful to clear up. Many people have opinions on deep reading, but the research is sparse. Considering that Wolf's research (2018) on deep reading is relatively new and primarily deals with reading in the native language, I believe my project may be a useful contribution to the field of English didactics, as well as the public conversation on deep reading in general. In the end, I hope to generate a language that enables me to better defend my teaching practices.

## **1.8 RESEARCH QUESTION**

My research question is:

*Deep reading in English: How do teachers promote and experience deep reading in the English subject?*

In order to shed light on this, I will investigate how teachers incorporate deep reading in their teaching practices and what their observations and experiences in the EFL classroom are. I will also consider how the national curriculum maintains deep reading.

## **1.9 HOW DEEP READING IS UNDERSTOOD IN THIS STUDY**

I settled on using the phrase "long or substantial" about texts. It does not mean that the text has to be long, it could be a short text, a poem or a song lyric, but the term long or substantial is meant to illustrate that the texts demand more *cognitive patience* than usual. Cognitive patience refers to the ability to read attentively and to stay focused on the reading task without multitasking or skimming over the rest (Wolf, 2018, p. 90). I wish to interview teachers about how they perceive their pupils' endurance with texts. Thus, this only represents an indirect perspective on pupils' actual endurance. In terms of actual time, I was thinking around a minimum of 25 minutes. The reason I landed on 25 minutes was because when I asked teachers to give an estimate of how long their pupils could focus on texts in class, the majority reported that many pupils lost their concentration after 20 minutes. Only a few pupils could

endure more than 30 minutes. I therefore considered it a long or substantial read to have pupils stay put for more than 25 minutes.

I have tried to categorise the kind of texts Wolf (2018) talks about when discussing deep reading. In theory, deep reading refers to all kinds of texts that are complex in terms of syntax and length. However, her text examples are more often from fiction than from the scientific field. Even though she does not mention narrative texts explicitly, I have chosen to limit my understanding of deep reading to narrative texts. Like Fenner (2011), I will use the term *literature* when discussing narrative texts. Like Fenner (2018), I will also be concentrating on the most common literary genres like poetry, short stories and novels.

## **1.10 OUTLINE OF THIS THESIS**

My pupils live online lives that connect them to all over the world and in order to prepare them for life after school, I believe in developing their ability to read deeply in English. The purpose of this thesis is to find out how teachers promote and experience deep reading in EFL. Chapter two introduces my theoretical background where I give an overview of relevant theory and research. Chapter three describes the methods and procedures used in carrying out the teacher interviews, and in chapter four, I present my findings before I undertake a thematic analysis and discussion in chapter five. The thesis concludes with chapter six where I discuss implications for my study as well as suggesting some further research.

## 2 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

---

### 2.1 INTRODUCTION

There is quite a lot of both quantitative and qualitative research and documentation on reading. This especially applies for reading that focuses on performance and reading methods, such as the OECD's Programme for International Assessment, PISA, and the Norwegian national tests. In order to avoid becoming too comprehensive, only the most relevant research will be covered in my study. In the following, I will give an account of the theoretical background. I have concentrated on elaborating on the 2017 *Core curriculum, values and principles for primary and secondary education* (CC17) as well as the subject specific English curriculum in *The Knowledge Promotion* (2006/13). This is because, during the writing of my thesis, the teachers were all acquainted with, or teaching according to, these curricula. In addition, Wolf's theory on deep reading is central (2018). I also refer to other studies on reading as well such as research within EFL, language learning and neuroscience. Neuroscience is pertinent for the overarching aim "learning to learn" covered in the CC17. Lastly, I include theory on teacher cognition.

### 2.2 READING AND DEEP READING

How does deep reading relate to reading in general? Different researchers define reading somewhat different, but similar. Brevik (2015) writes, "Reading comprehension is a cognitive as well as social process that involves extracting and constructing meaning" (p. 11). Hellekjær (2007) offers the following definition: "reading comprises decoding the written text on the one hand and effectively processing the information on the other hand" (p. 2). And Urquhart and Weir (1998) explain that reading is "the process of receiving and interpreting information encoded in language form via the medium in print" (p. 22). These three definitions address

processes of reading. Alongside of this, *deep reading* establishes a broader way of understanding reading. Deep reading is not easily pinned down and defined. The concept is rooted in neuroscience and addresses a strategy, cognitive processes and affective aspects of reading.

Clowes (2018) problematizes deep reading as he believes it is a biased concept, “upholding a certain sort of reading that is immersive, literary and focused on narrative texts” (p. 705) He also thinks the term is too widely understood making it open for a variety of different interpretations: “In fact, the concept of deep reading is framed somewhat differently by different authors, and appears to have been created to conceptualize and account for changes that are taking place as we appropriate and adapt to new reading technologies” (Clowes, 2018, p. 705) Further, he questions the claim that deep reading is on a decline. He writes:

It is true that in the twenty-first century, the reading brain is called upon to subserve an ever greater number of tasks. It may be that we are doing less of certain sorts of reading as we do more of others, but there is no particular reason to think this is determined by the special fragility of the brain circuitry underlying reading, or that changes in this changes in the circuitry make us less able to perform other sorts of reading, or again that any changes that are taken place are irreversible” (p. 710).

Like Wolf (2018), Clowes (2018) acknowledges that we read differently, but instead of being worried, he calls for more evidence for the claims about the negative effects.

## **2.3 READING STRATEGIES**

There are different ways of reading, depending on what the goal of the reading is. The different ways of reading are often referred to as reading strategies. According to Simensen (2007), the most common reading strategies are *skimming*, *scanning*, *extensive* and *intensive reading*. Today, one often hears *browsing* being referred to and used as well.

*Scanning* is a practical approach if the intention of the reading is to search for specific information (Ørevik, 2018, Simensen 2007). In contrast, reading a novel demands another approach and is defined as *extensive reading*. Simensen (2007) writes that *extensive reading* is “usually silent reading and reading for pleasure” (p. 149). Ørevik (2018) suggests that

students who have had opportunities to practice extensive reading of literary prose, “often manage to read quickly and efficiently while staying focused on the development of the plot and sensitive towards the particular narrative and poetic characteristics of a literary text” (p. 109). *Intensive reading* (Simensen, 2007) also called *close reading* (Ørevik, 2018) is explained as a detailed and careful way of reading. This is often associated with the reading of texts in school books. The term *skimming* is a strategy used to get an overall understanding of the text. It means going through the text “as rapid as possible without taking in every word” (Ørevik, 2018, p. 108).

*Deep reading* refers to being immersed in the reading activity. It is similar to extensive reading. But in contrast to extensive reading, its many part-processes are addressed. Sometimes, deep reading also requires intensive reading. Its part-processes are about activating background knowledge and critical analysis as well as empathy. To read deeply may require for making inferences and for inductive and/or deductive approaches.

### **2.3.1 Deep reading and the deep reading processes**

Wolf (2018) explains how reading unites neural networks in the brain, and how the part-processes are necessary in order to strengthen old neural networks and develop new ones in a person’s brain. Different ways of reading may strengthen or weaken certain neural circuits. For example, she says that too much skimming and browsing at the expense of deep reading, threatens many of the deep reading processes and may make readers less enduring in navigating through the complexities of the world. Wolf (2018) illustrates how fictional texts can add such complexity and understanding by quoting Barack Obama. Obama had talked with the novelist Marilynne Robinson and told her that novels had taught him some of the most important things about being human. As this quote illustrates, Obama acknowledges both the affective and analytical aspects of the reading processes:

It has to do with empathy. It has to do with being comfortable with the notion that the world is complicated and full of grays but there’s still truth there to be found, and that you have to strive for that and work for that. And the notion that it’s possible to connect with someone else even though they’re very different from you.

(From a conversation in Iowa in 2015, quoted in Wolf, 2018, p. 47).

The part-processes of deep reading are relevant for the national curriculum and the reading of literature. Another connection is the *reader-response theory* (Simensen, 2007). The reader-response theory highlights the importance of engaging with a text. Simensen explains, “The fundamental concept is that meaning does not inhere in a text itself, but is created in the interaction between text and reader (p. 90). In the development of deep reading, engagement with the text is vital and both cognitive and emotional processes are essential. Deep reading consists of part-processes which are about getting information, adding background knowledge, making inferences, analogies, inductions, deductions, taking on the perspectives of others and developing empathy, and critical analysis. Wolf (2018) has comprised a list explaining the part-processes in deep reading as follows:

**1. Imagery.** Imagery is our capacity to form images when we read (pp. 40-41). “Together you and the author constructs images out of a set of carefully chosen, sensory details conveyed only by words” (p. 41).

**2. Empathy.** Empathy is enhanced as we read about others and take on their perspectives. According to Wolf, “The act of taking on perspective and feelings of others is one of the most profound, insufficiently heralded contributions of the deep reading processes” (p. 42).

Wolf (2018) states that *perspective-taking* represents a complex mix of cognitive, social and emotional processes that leaves ample tracks in our reading brain circuit (p. 50). “We welcome the Other as a guest within ourselves, and sometimes we become Other. For a moment in time, we leave ourselves; and when we return, sometimes expanded and strengthened, we are changed both intellectually and emotionally” (p. 44). Additionally, perspective-taking expands our internalized knowledge of the world (p. 45). In this regard, Wolf addresses the importance of what she calls *cognitive patience*. Cognitive patience is the ability to remain focused and “to immerse in the worlds created by books” (p. 46). The amount of time you spend with, for example fictional characters, is important and may develop a person’s empathy. This can also be related to the 21st century requirements. As explained in the introduction, 21st century requirements address cultural diversity and democracy (NOU 2014:7). A study that can be linked to this was conducted by Laird Iversen (2014), who did field work in Norwegian lower secondary school, following classroom discussions in the KRLE-subject where pupils with different beliefs and values would often discuss opposing value systems. He named these classrooms “communities of disagreement”



and concluded that such communities raised tolerance and understanding and were important building blocks in democratic societies. He writes:

I define a community of disagreement as a group with identity claims, consisting of people with different opinions, who find themselves engaged in a common process, in order to solve shared problems or challenges. (Laird Iversen, 2014, p. 324)

This is very relevant to the overarching aim “democracy and citizenship” which has a goal to develop the pupils’ “ability to think critically, learn to deal with conflicts of opinion and respect disagreement” (*Core Curriculum*, 2017).

In the context of EFL, the argument of taking on the perspectives of others has been studied by amongst others Fenner (2011) and Hoff (2016). Fenner holds that literature invites the reader to reflect in a more complex way than non-fictional texts. Hoff has studied and is concerned with the fostering of intercultural readers through the use of literary texts. Both researchers are explicit in addressing the national curriculum and its demands for maintaining the reading of literary texts in EFL (Fenner, 2011; Hoff, 2016).

Like Wolf (2018), Fenner (2006; 2011; 2018) claims that literary texts add valuable insights into other cultures and consequently provide readers with valuable insight into other people’s lives. Fenner (2011) discusses how literary texts may break down stereotypes and promote understanding of the world and discusses how fictional texts “open doors to gaining self-knowledge and personal insight” when worked with in the right way (Fenner, 2018, p. 225). Hoff (2016; 2018) argues along the same lines claiming that the reading of literary texts add a potential in acquiring understanding of the world, the Other and oneself. These ideas can be related to “Health and life skills” as described in CC17: “health and life skills shall help the learners to deal with success and failure, and personal and practical challenges in the best possible way” and that it shall develop “the ability to deal with thoughts, feelings and relationships” (2017).

**3. Background knowledge.** Background knowledge is about how we connect and add new knowledge to our previous knowledge. “Over the life span, everything we read adds to a reservoir of knowledge that is the basis of our ability to comprehend and predict whatever we read” (Wolf, 2018, p. 54). Background knowledge can be related to deep learning in the *Core*

*Curriculum* which states that “deeper insight is developed when the pupils understand relationships between fields of knowledge” (2017).

Wolf (2018) claims that as a society, we seem to be moving “from a group of expert readers with uniquely personal, internal platforms of background knowledge to a group of expert readers who are increasingly dependent on similar, external servers of knowledge (p. 55). This is particularly relevant for the 21st century requirements addressing the technological development (NOU 2014: 7). It may be required to critically be able to assess layout and use of technological servers when navigating between true, false, misleading or inadequate information online.

Also, Wolf (2018) is not only concerned with *how* we read but also *what* we read. She considers *information* the raw material of *knowledge*. She questions if we are exposed to, or expose ourselves to, good raw material:

Does the content of what we are reading in our present milieu provide us with sufficient background knowledge both for the particular demands of life in the twenty-first century and for the formation of the deep reading circuit? (Wolf, 2018, p. 55).

This can also be related to the rapid development in the knowledge society (NOU 2014: 7).

**4. Critical analysis.** Deep reading skills encompass the ability to think critically. Wolf emphasises that the method of science is a sophisticated process deployed through deep reading, “Getting to the truth of things – whether in science, in life, or in text – requires observation, hypotheses, and predictions based on inference and deduction, testing and evaluation, interpretation and conclusion through their replication” (2018, p. 58). This can be related to critical thinking in the *Core Curriculum* as it stated that “Schools shall help pupils to be inquisitive and ask questions, develop scientific and critical thinking and act with ethical awareness” (2017) According to Wolf (2018), critical analysis is vital, but difficult to both define and to foster. She writes, “From the standpoint of the reading brain, critical thought represents the full sum of the scientific-method processes” (Wolf, 2018, p. 62). In short, and overly simplified, critical analysis can be explained as a culmination of the deep reading processes.

### 2.3.2 Digital reading

When new technologies like computers were introduced in the early nineties, the researcher, Gunther Kress (2003) was prompt in addressing the transition from paper to screen. Kress recognised the social, economic, communicational and technological changes in the beginning of the 90s as “a revolution” (2003, p. 9). He discusses how the screen has been added to the written language and taken the role as the dominant medium of communication writing, “The screen is beginning to take the place of the book, and this is unmaking the hitherto ‘natural’ relation between the mode of writing and the medium of the book and the page” (p. 9). Kress explains how modes of communication have become more visual and follow a different logic: “If the book was organised and dominated by the logic of writing, the screen is organised and dominated by the image and its logic” (p.19).

Kress (2003) has a wide understanding of “reading.” He uses the term “literacy” to describe “when we make messages using letters as the means of recording that message” (p. 23). According to Kress, new modes of communication affect literacy. For example, the logic of the book is the written word and is understood as a temporal sequence, whereas an image is understood as spatial. Kress’ understanding of a text is also broad. For example, a text can be a book, an image, a video or a combination of these, and these different media affect how we read them. This is relevant in *The Knowledge Promotion* (2006/2013). In the framework for basic skills it says:

Reading means to create meaning from text in the widest sense. Reading gives insight into other people`s experience, opinion and knowledge, independent of time and place. The reading of texts on screen and paper is a prerequisite for lifelong learning and for active participation in civic life (p. 8).

Like Kress (2003), the curriculum juxtaposes the reading of texts on screen and on paper. According to Kress, reading is “interpretation” (2003, p. 38) He addresses different aspects of interpretation from semiotics, images, punctuation and interaction with a variety of texts, which he calls “interactivity” (2003, p. 5). Kress considers the text the central component in literacy. His understanding of literacy and technology acknowledges the sociocultural aspects of reading. This sociocultural dimension is also evident in the curriculum, which highlights

the importance of interaction in creating meaning and active participation (2006/13). The sociocultural theory will be outlined under sub heading 2.4.

Wolf (2018), who discusses texts and reading in a more traditional sense, is concerned that digital reading alters the quality of attention, since reading digitally is associated with other forms of reading. One of the challenges she discusses is that too much browsing and skimming may lead to *continuous partial attention* (CPA). The term, CPA, was originally coined by the former Microsoft executive, Linda Stone and refers to the act of multitasking and dividing one's attention (Wolf, 2018, p. 71). According to Wolf, CPA threatens processes that are necessary to strengthen old and develop new neural networks in a person's brain. Examples of neural networks are cognitive skills like analogical thinking, critical analysis, perspective taking and empathy.

Wolf (2018) is an advocate for literacy and explains that her hope is that by focusing explicitly on the different ways of reading, skimming versus deep, we may help children to become more adept in navigating through a complex reality (pp. 36-68). She refers to a Chinese study (Liu, 2016) corroborating her argument that increased digital reading has led to different reading behaviours. The study was conducted among undergraduate students and compared laptop reading with smartphone reading. One of its findings was that smartphone reading raised new challenges, such as "more browsing and scanning, more selective reading, less in-depth reading, and less concentrated reading" (Liu, 2016). The study found that people skim read in patterns like Z or F, rather than contemplating over the entire content. Clowes (2018), who also refers to this study, questions whether a finding like this is of concern. Instead, he points to how the new technologies impacts diversity in reading:

Screen-based reading behaviour would clearly be problematic if it implied that the ability to engage in deep or concentrated reading itself was being undermined. However, it is far from clear that this has happened and trends over the last decade seem to indicate that concentrated reading, among many other forms of reading, is alive and well. Rather, we can see new strategies and new types of reading developing to cope with the new overabundance of text, sometimes called 'information overload'. The variety of types of reading we perform is increasingly supported by a range of technological substrates. These substrates in part develop to keep up with an ever-

expanding mass of texts, and as they do, our reading strategies become more various and differentiated (Clowes, 2018, p. 717).

The researcher, Carey Jewitt (2006) is interested in what the new technologies can contribute with in the learning processes. Jewitt writes that “discussing the differences between reading printed texts and screen-based texts in terms of efficiency, speed and accuracy is rather redundant” (Jewitt, 2006, p. 136). Jewitt is influenced by Kress’ (2003) way of thinking about literacy. She writes that she is against a pluralising of the concept of literacy as it dilutes its meaning:

Many others have argued that the concept of literacy needs to be expanded beyond language to account for the demands of new technology. In my opinion, this has led to the fragmentation of the concept of literacy into multi literacies visual literacy, digital literacy, and beyond to cultural literacy, emotional literacy and intellectual literacy. I am against this pluralising of the concept of literacy. It dilutes its meaning beyond usefulness. Talking about learning with new technology as demanding substantially different ‘literacies’ (Zammit and Callow, 2000), although a call for radicalism, serves to accommodate the new within the domain of the old. It is accommodation - not a challenge (Jewitt, 2006, p. 134).

Jewitt claims it is important to re-think reading in the era of digitalisation by considering and taking in use the resources available in the new technologies. Examples of such resources can be images, audio and video resources. Jewitt explores these resources and the relationship between images and texts. She also draws attention to the “in and out of-school” relationship (p. 107). For example, she acknowledged how many students, especially “young readers and computer literate readers” (p. 132) often privilege one mode over another.

Naomi S. Baron, who is a linguist at the American University in Washington DC, conducted a study where 429 university students from five different countries were asked about their reading habits (Baron, 2016). Among the findings, 92% reported that they concentrated better when reading print, that they were more likely to multitask when reading on screen and more likely to re-read printed text than online texts. Another survey from Bangladesh investigated the influence of Internet and social media on students’ habits of reading printed books. The study concluded that the students spent more time on electronic media than on reading books

and took more pleasure in technology or social media than in the reading of books (Obaidullah & Rahman, 2018).

Frønes' (2015) who studied Norwegian fifteen-year olds online competence, found that many lacked the necessary tools to navigate online. Blikstad-Balas (2016), who did similar research, found that young people struggled in assessing Internet sources and their credibility.

Within the field of English didactics, Habegger-Conti's study (2015): "Critical Literacy in the ESL classroom: Bridging the Gap between Old and New Media", pointed out that the teachers in upper secondary school experienced difficulties in getting their pupils to read longer fictional texts. The study also stated that there was a decline in students choosing the elective subject of English Literature and Culture subject in the third year (2015). Haugestad's master thesis (2015) on blended learning, which refers to the mix of digital and face to face learning, investigated different aspects of reading and digitalisation. In an upper secondary class course in literature and culture, Haugestad was concerned with how the student's digital life could be brought closer to their educational world. She explored how deep reading processes were maintained in a digital learning environment and findings indicated that most students seemed to favour blended learning, but that digital methods could not replace non-digital methods in all fields of learning. Naomi S. Baron also studied American students' reading habits and found they were less receptive when exposed to long, narrative texts (Baron, 2013).

According to the Evolution of Reading in the Age of Digitisation network (E-READ), both paper and screen have potential to offer the development of different cognitive processes. E-READ is a European research initiative consisting of 200 scholars and scientists of reading, publishing, and literacy from across Europe. The network studies how digital reading poses challenges by investigating and offering recommendations for the future of reading and deep reading (see appendix 6). The E-READ network gives reference to a meta-study consisting of 54 studies with more than 170.000 participants. This study reveals:

Research shows that paper remains the preferred reading medium for longer single texts, especially when reading for deeper comprehension and retention, and that paper best supports long-form reading of informational texts. Reading long-form texts is invaluable for a number of cognitive achievements, such as concentration, vocabulary building and memory. (The Stavanger Declaration on the Future of Reading, 2019)

Interestingly, the meta-study also found that “No differences were observed on narrative texts” (ibid). At the same time, an underestimated factor by educators, readers and “even researchers” was the *embodied cognition*: “i.e. that how and what we learn, know, and can do depends on features of the entire physical body” (ibid) which “may contribute to differences between reading on paper and on screen in terms of comprehension and retention” (ibid).

The Norwegian researcher Anne Mangen who is part of the E-READ network, is concerned with the spatial dimension of reading and how it connects to our cognition and comprehension (Mangen, Walgermo & Brønneck, 2013). For example, when we read, we can hold something like a book or a magazine that we can see, smell and feel with our hands. Consequently, something that we cannot see, nor fully understand, happens in our brain. This interaction, sequence or process, makes us able to make sense of what we read.

In one of Mangen’s studies (2013) she found that students reading in print performed better on reading comprehension than the pupils reading digitally. Her research compares the reading of different kinds of texts on different reading devices, such as different kinds of screen reading versus reading on paper. One of her experiments looks at reading comprehension among 72 tenth graders from two different primary schools in Norway. The students, who were randomised into two groups, read two texts: one literary and one factual. One group read the texts as PDFs on a computer screen, whereas the other group read the texts in print. Both groups answered the questions digitally. As she compared the results, the main findings were that students reading in print performed significantly better on reading comprehension than the pupils reading the texts as PDFs on screen (Mangen, Walgermo & Brønneck, 2013).

However, Mangen (2019) did a similar study that compares reading pocket books with reading on the digital tablet Kindle. Results showed differences on measures related to chronology and temporality in favour of print, but apart from that, few differences were found (Mangen, Olivier & Velay, 2019). The study was conducted among fifty 24-year olds, reading a twenty-eight page story. An extract from the summary of the study states:

It is concluded that, basically comprehension was similar with both media, but, because kinesthetic feedback is less informative with a Kindle, readers were not as efficient to locate events in the space of the text and hence in the temporality of the

story. We suggest that, to get a correct spatial representation of the text and consequently a coherent temporal organization of the story, readers would be reliant on the sensorimotor cues which are afforded by the manipulation of the book. (p. 1)

Ørevik (2018), who also refers to Mangen's studies in her article on digital technology in the classroom suggests that "Based on findings such as these, it seems sensible to retain an EFL classroom where printed and digitally mediated texts complement each other according to their affordances for learning" (p. 251). As Ørevik also brings up earlier in the text, digitalisation may increase interaction. When it comes to the classroom, it may change the roles between participants. She explains that "A traditional factual text in an EFL textbook is written by a knowledge authority transmitting information to a learner, and a traditional classroom discussion is led by the teacher....Exploring a website, taking part in a discussion in an online forum, or producing a text in collaboration with others, the student is invited to make active choices and draw on his/her experience and interest in more direct ways than in typical text-book-mediated schoolwork" (p. 244). For deep reading to take place, pupils would need guidance and support. Wolf (2018) suggests that we teach *medium awareness* and allow enough time to process the reading of longer, more time-consuming texts. Medium awareness is about reflecting upon how we process text differently from different mediums.

There are studies that illustrate how computer gaming has proven to promote English language learning. In both Brevik's study (2019) and Sundqvist & Kerstin Sylvén's study (2014), conclusions were that gaming affected pupils' grades in English positively. Similarly, a master thesis by Sætersmoen (2010) showed that digital habits among boys had a positive effect on their English school performances in both reading and writing. Another study by Brevik (2016) also documented that boys in upper secondary school who were poor readers in L1, demonstrated good reading skills in L2. The study suggested that this reading combination may be a result of the boys' gaming habits in their spare time, where English was the most frequently used language.

### **2.3.3 Reading comprehension**

Regarding young people's reading comprehension, established tests like PISA and the Norwegian national tests report a decline in lower secondary school pupils' reading performance. It should be mentioned that these tests are performed digitally. Nordic Institute



for Studies in Innovation, Research and Education's (NIFU) report from 2015 shows that students entering the university are unprepared and lack experience with reading comprehension. The students struggle in dealing with longer texts in both reading and writing (NIFU, 2015:28, p. 7). Unicef's report, *An Unfair Start: Inequality in Children's Education in Rich Countries* (2018), ranks Norway in 20th place as to gaps in reading comprehension among lower secondary school pupils. The report bases its findings on the Progress in International Reading Literacy Studies (PIRLS) results from. PIRLS assesses the extent of inequalities in reading comprehension among 41 of the richest countries in the world.

In the context of EFL, Hellekjær's studies (2019) on students' reading comprehension in English revealed that a majority of Norwegian pupils' scores were insufficient in their encounter with the requirements of the university courses. Hellekjær's quantitative study was using the International English Language Testing System (IELTS-test), to examine upper secondary school pupils' and first year students' academic reading proficiency in English. He found that 32% of the university respondents and 66% of the upper secondary school respondents had difficulties reading academic English texts (Hellekjær, 2019, p. 191). According to Ørevik (2018), "Multiple studies of second language reading show consistent correlation between vocabulary knowledge and reading comprehension. Furthermore, reading comprehension correlates with grammatical knowledge, in particular awareness of syntax" (p. 99). This suggests that pupils in lower secondary school would benefit from practicing more systematic and comprehensive reading in English.

## **2.4 DEEP READING IN LIGHT OF LANGUAGE LEARNING AND READING IN EFL**

According to Lightbown & Spada (2013), L1 models are useful in order to illuminate second language acquisition. Stephen Krashen (1981) believes we acquire second languages in the same way as we acquire first languages. Learning a first and a second language are both dependent on input and develop in stages (Lightbown & Spada, 2013; Krashen, 1981). When wanting to shed light on deep reading, the ideas of Krashen (1981) and Vygotsky (1978; 1986) are useful. In the following, Wolf's theory on deep reading will be viewed in light of Krashen's input hypothesis and Vygotsky's idea of sociocultural learning.

Firstly, it ought to be stressed that Wolf, Krashen and Vygotsky use different conceptual frameworks. Wolf (2018) focuses on the affective and cognitive processes of reading from a first language perspective. Krashen (1981) is concerned with second language acquisition and learning. Vygotsky (1978; 1986) is concerned with social language communities and language as a tool for thought. The conceptual frameworks of Wolf, Krashen and Vygotsky are not automatically coherent. Nevertheless, their frameworks can be applied in order to understand language learning and deep reading. They seem to share the idea that language enables cognitive processes within the learner and that interaction is important in order to increase vocabulary and develop understanding.

Wolf (2018) is mainly concerned with readers' interaction with texts. She argues that reading, but also writing are important interacting processes. As an example, Wolf's book, *Reader, Come Home* (2018) is written as a dialogue. Each chapter starts with "dear reader" and ends with "sincerely yours, your author." Wolf claims the dialogue is essential to learn, and as an example, she writes about how her own thoughts have developed and expanded through interaction with others through emails and letters.

Krashen (1981) is concerned with second language acquisition, but distinguishes between second language acquisition and second language learning. Language acquisition is natural, "meaningful interaction", and characterised as "very similar" to acquiring first languages (Krashen, 1981, p. 1). In contrast, language learning is characterised by formal instruction with focus on rules and error correction (p. 2).

Krashen calls for comprehensible input of language. The comprehensible input hypothesis is defined as acquisition that "occurs when one is exposed to language that is comprehensible and contains  $i + 1$ . The  $i$  represents the level of language already acquired, and the  $+1$  is a metaphor for language (words, grammatical forms, aspects of pronunciation) that is just a step beyond that level" (Lightbown & Spada, 2013, p. 106). Lightbown and Spada explain that in second language acquisition, this means that speakers modify speech to match the learner's communication requirements or that written texts are just slightly above the reader's level of comprehension. According to Krashen, acquisition happens when comprehensible input becomes *intake*. "Intake is, simply, where language acquisition comes from, the subset of linguistic input that helps the acquirer acquire the language (1981, p. 101). Intake is vital in order to build comprehension and understanding.

Krashen and Wolf are both concerned with the internal processes within the individual learner. They also address the importance of building an internal knowledge base. However, Wolf considers “information” the raw material of knowledge, whereas Krashen appears to view language a tool in order to communicate.

Vygotsky’s idea of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) is coherent with Krashen’s comprehensible input hypothesis, but, in contrast to the input hypothesis, ZPD is a much broader term addressing a broader room for manoeuvring. In the work *Mind in Society* (1978), Vygotsky defines the ZPD as follows:

It is the distance between the actual developmental level determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers (p. 86).

Vygotsky viewed language as a social construct. Where Krashen seems mostly concerned with the role of the learner as a recipient, Vygotsky highlights the learner’s abilities to construct language “in collaboration with adults and peers”. Krashen however, also stresses input’s impact on output. Vygotsky highlights the importance of both the context, the problem at hand (problem solving), and the other learners (peers). In *Thought and Language* (1986), Vygotsky explained how language was a tool for the individual’s further development of thoughts:

The linguistic milieu, with its stable, permanent words meanings, charts the way that the child’s generalisations will take. But, constrained as it is, the child’s thinking proceeds along this preordained path in the manner characteristic of the child’s own stage of intellectual development of generalisations and its final point – a fully formed concept. But the adult cannot pass on to the child his mode of thinking. He merely supplies the ready-made meanings of the words, around which the child builds complexes. Such complexes are nothing but pseudoconcepts. They are similar to concepts in their appearance, but differ substantially in their essence (Vygotsky, 1986, p. 120).

Wolf’s theory on deep reading shares thoughts with both Krashen’s (1981) and Vygotsky’s (1978; 1986) ideas of language learning. Vygotsky stresses the importance of interaction between the context and the other participants. Wolf (2018) acknowledges reading as

*interaction* between the reader and the text. She refers to Vygotsky's work *Thought and Language* (1986) where she explains that "written language not only reflects our most difficult thoughts, it propels them further." (Wolf, 2018, p. 89). Although Wolf (2018) refers to Vygotsky, she seems more concerned with the role of the reader as a recipient, and less concerned with a person's output and production. Nevertheless, Wolf (2018) refers to deep reading as an *active* process, and like Krashen, she is concerned with the internal processes within the individual learner.

## **2.5 READING INSTRUCTION IN EFL**

Even though L1 models are useful in order to illuminate second language acquisition, reading in L2 differs from reading in L1. Cultural references and unknown vocabulary may challenge communication. Vocabulary as well as reading speed are important in order to acquire fluency (Hellekjær, 2007; Simensen, 2007). Hellekjær explains how repeated interruptions like "looking up unfamiliar words may "disrupt the reading process to the extent that the reader will not remember anything of what he or she has been reading" (2007 p. 23). Ørevik (2018) also mentions Grabe's (2009) arguments that education, skills and experience may affect reading in a second language.

Brevik, Olsen and Hellekjær (2016) found a strong relationship between reading proficiency in L1 and L2 in upper secondary school. Brevik (2015) has also studied reading strategies among upper secondary pupils in general and vocational programmes and found that students reading in a second language used very much the same reading strategies as in L1. Brevik interviewed 21 teachers and observed five of the teachers' lessons. In addition, she interviewed and observed many of their students. Her findings, which were dependent on reading strategies taught in combination with reading activities, suggest that learners benefit from teachers who have cognitive awareness on *how* to teach reading strategies. She found that pupils receiving instruction in different reading strategies became more proficient readers. In addition, her study concluded that many teachers used and taught reading strategies more than they were aware of, but that when discussing reading strategies explicitly with other teachers and researchers, their approaches to teaching reading improved. Both

teachers and students increased their metacognitive awareness on reading when reading strategies were taught, talked about and reflected upon (Brevik, 2015).

Harestad Bakke's master thesis (2010) on attitudes and methods teachers have when teaching reading in EFL found that the majority of the teachers did not teach reading systematically or consistently. In her discussion, she writes "not one single teacher mentioned anything about reading strategies when asked how they teach reading" (2010, p. 79). Harestad Bakke, who interviewed ten teachers, also explains in her thesis how the teachers put an emphasis on pre and post textual work, but very little on the actual reading. She argues for the importance of working systematically and consistently over a long period of time, and suggests that "pupils need teachers that are aware of the importance of reading and to know how to help them become skilled readers" (p. 86).

Hoff (2016) studied the reading of literary texts from a sociocultural perspective in English in upper secondary school classes. Hoff used a model for intercultural reader (MIR), founded on the principles of reading as being a negotiative and communicative experience. She found that working with literary texts consists of a set of complex processes between literary task, texts and participants. One of the findings she discussed was the "crucial role of the teacher in recognising task and text potentials as well as in acknowledging and challenging student utterances when working with literature in the classroom" (Hoff, 2016, p. 455). Hoff's findings suggest that learners benefit from having teachers who reflect upon *how* to teach literature.

There are studies supporting the view that starting with extensive reading at an early level can improve cognitive development and language skills. Birketveit and Rimmereide (2017) studied 11-year old learners' perceived progress of extensive reading of picture books in EFL. The learners were free to choose which books to read, but minimum requirements were three illustrated picture books. Their findings suggested that the pupils' extensive reading of the picture books improved their cognitive development and writing. Most learners also responded positively to the reading project and were motivated by the fact that they could select the books they were to read. An implication was that the pupils' level of competence was matched by the right level of challenge. Simensen (2007) also suggests this when she discusses reading as a constructive intellectual process involving many subskills. She writes that "in order to develop all the subskills involved in listening and reading, a great deal of

practice with texts at the right level of difficulty and texts in different text types and genres is necessary” (Simensen, 2007, p. 150). This also aligns with Krashen’s comprehensible input hypothesis and how input affects output (Krashen, 1981), as well as with Vygotsky’s zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978).

## **2.6 THE DEVELOPMENT OF READING LITERATURE IN EFL**

Throughout the years, EFL has developed from easy instructions and habit formation into spontaneous language production (Fenner, 2001, p. 2). The status of literary texts in EFL have shifted. When the English subject appeared in the national curriculum in 1936, the language was considered a tool, and contents and methods focused on simple phrases and exchanges. The reading of literary texts in order to develop cultural understanding was not very prominent (Fenner, 2005).

Gradually, culture and intercultural competences gained ground. In the 1970s, Halliday and Hymes developed the term “communicative competence”, which viewed language as dependent on context (Fenner, 2005, p. 91). Until the 1990s, it was still a matter of learning *about* the other culture. Fenner (2018) writes that culture was normally viewed as “a static entity”, and that the aim of reading literature was “to become acquainted with the target language culture through reading authentic texts” (p. 219). Hoff (2018) explains how awareness on “intercultural competence” was raised by the Council of Europe in the late 90s and early 2000:

The council of Europe (CoE) in the 1990s further strengthened the view of culture as an integrated aspect of language teaching and learning. Based on a constructivist view of language learning and a new recognition of how language learners draw upon their own cultural background as a point of reference for their understanding of foreign cultures, intellectual awareness was included in the concept of communicative competence as described in the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CEFR) (CoE, 2001). (p. 69)

In contrast to cultural competence, intercultural competence sees culture as “dynamic” and learners are viewed as interacting “with the foreign culture and his or her own culture”

(Fenner, 2018, p. 219). Hoff writes, “the individual always exists and understands himself in relation to others” (2018, p. 70).

Hoff acknowledges intercultural competence as a “complex concept” (2018, p. 67). When elaborating on the concept, she refers to Byram (1997) who defines intercultural competence by the use of a model describing both affective and cognitive processes involved in intercultural communication: “Knowledge of others; knowledge of self; skills to interpret and relate; skills to discover and/or to interact; valuing others' values, beliefs, and behaviors; and relativizing one's self” (Byram, 1997, p. 34).

In the Norwegian curriculum from 1997, *Læreplanverket for den 10-årige grunnskolen* (L97), literary texts were highlighted and in-depth studies were conducted through project work and themes. In lower secondary school, there were requirements to read a whole novel, however, in some cases an easy reader (Fenner, 2018, p. 219). Fenner (2011; 2018), Hoff (2018) and Wolf (2018) all argue that literary texts may add insights into other people’s lives, which, they say, promote understanding of the world.

Focus on literary texts changed with the implementation of *The Knowledge Promotion* (2006 /13). Here, “both specific approaches to learning and examples of particular learning materials disappeared from the curriculum. Instead, wide competence aims related to discussing literature were included in the main area “culture, society and literature” with the aim of developing cultural competence” (Fenner, 2018, p. 219). *The Knowledge Promotion* also emphasises how school subjects should be relevant and useful, which did not sync very well with an overuse of literary texts. Similarly, due to factors such as the requirements of oral and written assessment, focus was more on language performance than deep reading activities and language comprehension. Lastly, there is also the dimension of time. During the course of two hours per week throughout every year of teaching, all competence aims are expected to be worked with and assessed. Up until the implementation of LK20, oral and written skills have been assessed separately.

## **2.7 LITERATURE IN THE CURRICULUM**

As written in chapter 1.5, the *Core Curriculum* (2017) explains:

The school's mission is the education and all-round development (Bildung) of all pupils. Education and all-round development are interlinked and mutually dependent, and their underlying principles should help schools accomplish this dual mission. Primary and secondary education and training is an important part of a lifelong process which has the individual's all-round development, intellectual freedom, independence, responsibility and compassion for others as its goal. The teaching and training shall give the pupils a good foundation for understanding themselves, others and the world, and for making good choices in life.

All-round development can be acquired through literature. Literature may enhance “compassion for others” and “a good foundation for understanding themselves, others and the world, and for making good choices in life” (2006/13).

*The Knowledge Promotion* (2006/13) was designed to be a subject specific complement to the *1994 Core Curriculum*. The 1994 core curriculum called for the development of Bildung. Fenner (2011; 2018) argues that literature is an important component in promoting Bildung. This corresponds to the concept of “all-round development” in the core curriculum, and is relevant. However, I wish to mainly focus on the concept deep learning and the overarching topics “democracy and citizenship” and “health and life skills” from the new core curriculum when arguing for the use of literary texts.

Literary texts are well suited to cover the demands of in-depth learning as well as the interdisciplinary topics “democracy and citizenship” and “health and life skills.” Looking at the concept of deep learning in the core curriculum, one sees how it is related to deep reading. Both are about taking the necessary time to immerse, to learn in depth, and about being self-regulated and focused on one topic or activity. As explained in chapter 1.5, in-depth learning describes a process where learners gradually develop new connections and knowledge, increase understanding and learn to integrate their new knowledge in their thinking and actions.

Literary texts are about cultural encounters and participation in the world (Fenner, 2011). Democracy and citizenship promote skills that are about the experiences of others as is explained in CC17: “They shall train their ability to think critically, learn to deal with conflicts of opinion and respect disagreement” (2017). Here, we see how perspective-taking is



represented. Literary texts are often about the experiences of others. Through characters and their life situations we can enhance our understanding of how other people live, think, feel and act.

Health and life skills shall help the learners “to deal with success and failure, and personal and practical challenges in the best possible way” (CC17, 2017). It also states:

Other issues that come under this topic are value choices and the importance of meaning in life and relations with others, the ability to draw boundaries and to respect others’ boundaries, and the ability to deal with thoughts, feelings and relationships” (2017)

As explained in the section on deep reading processes, the reading of literature is conducive to the development of these skills.

Hoff (2016) refers to *The Knowledge Promotion* where it says that literature holds a special potential for promoting “a deeper understanding of others and oneself” (2006/13). Hoff writes that the relationship between Self and Other is a cornerstone of intercultural competence (2016). This is similar to the part-process, *perspective-taking*, from Wolf’s deep reading processes as explained in chapter 2.3.1.

In the subject specific curriculum for 10th grade LK06/13, we also read about perspective-taking: “the subject of English shall contribute to providing insight into the way people live and different cultures where English is the primary or the official language” (2006/13). Further, it says that English provides a “good basis for communicating with, and understanding of, the rest of the world.” In the English subject curriculum, there are four out of the thirty aims that may, in my view, specifically target perspective-taking or the deep reading of literature. The first two deal with texts and may encompass deep reading, whereas the two next aims may encompass both perspective-taking and deep reading. These are:

- Understand spoken and written texts on a variety of topics
- Read and understand texts of different length and genres
- discuss and elaborate on different types of English literature from English-speaking countries

- describe and reflect on the situation of indigenous peoples in English-speaking countries (2006/13)

The competence aims in *The Knowledge Promotion* (2006/13) focus on production and do not emphasise deep reading. Atkinson and Coffey (2011) write that official documents are not neutral and that the construction of a document is a way of representing oneself collectively to oneself and to others (pp. 77 -78). They explain how official documents describe and justify, but may also apportion blame and responsibilities. A curriculum is a document meant to instruct, and official documents can highlight certain values or virtues or be presented as “institutionalised boasting” (p. 84). Telhaug, Mediås and Aasen (2006-2007) describe how the Norwegian educational policies changed in the 1980s and 90s as globalisation and neo-liberalism posed new demands on the nations. They write:

Equality and justice continued to be core values but they were referred to less frequently than previously, while the debate on efficiency, quality and skills became more prominent.

The subsequent school reforms and management of the school system have later been criticized for resting upon values like economic growth and an instrumentalist view on education and learning (Telhaug, 2005; Hovdenak, 2000). Since the year 2000, the assessment policy has also expanded to include tests like PISA (introduced in 2000) and the Norwegian national tests (introduced in 2004).

Looking at the competence aims in the English subject curriculum in *The Knowledge Promotion* (2006/13), one registers that the verbs are focused on action and production and less on contemplation. The action-oriented verbs appear more frequently than contemplative-oriented verbs. Examples of active verbs used in connection with the competence aims after year 10 are: *use, identify, select, comment, express, show, write, explain, discuss, elaborate, create, communicate, converse* (2006/13). These verbs align well with the interactive and sociocultural dimension of learning. The more contemplating verbs are: *read* and *understand*. The verb, *understand*, is mentioned seven times in total, two times alone and four times in combination with active verbs): *understand + use* (three times), *understand + listen* (one times), *understand + read + evaluate* (one time). There seem to be more opportunities for targeting and teaching deep reading in the new subject curriculum, LK20 (2019), considering its reduced aims.

## 2.8 DEEP READING IN LIGHT OF NEUROSCIENCE

Wolf (2018) discusses the need for *awareness* on all levels, from *what* to read, *how* to read, and from *which medium* to read from. She also addresses the need for knowledge about *cognitive patience* and the positive effects of deep reading. It is interesting to consider Wolf's claims on how to teach deep reading in light of recent studies within the field of neuroscience.

Within neuroscience, some researchers have demonstrated how students perform better when they believe in their ability to perform certain tasks. For example, Carol Dweck, a scientist within the field of psychology and neuroscience and the name behind the theory on *fixed and growth mindsets* (Claro, Dweck, Paunescko, 2016), studied how pupils who believed that their intellectual abilities could be developed and grow, outperformed students who believed that their abilities are immutable. Dweck refers to this as having a *growth mindset* or a *fixed mindset*. Dweck has found that people with growth mindsets, "tend to see difficult tasks as a way to increase their ability" (Claro, Dweck, Paunescko, 2016). In one study, researchers used dataset of all 10<sup>th</sup> grade public students in Chile and asked the students whether they agreed strongly with statements such as "intelligence is something that cannot be changed very much" or "you can learn new things, but you can't change a person's intelligence." Then they categorised the participants on a scale between fixed and growth mindset, and among some of their findings, was that those students who held more of a growth mindset outperformed those with a fixed mindset (Claro, Dweck, Paunescko, 2016).

Bettinger, Ludvigsen, Rege (2017) has used similar research within mathematics. One of her studies suggested that "a low-cost intervention focused on student's mindset can improve student's engagement and performance" (Bettinger et. al, 2017) The experiment examined 10th grade students' perseverance in math, and in the study, Bettinger et al. (2017) divided pupils in two groups, where one group was given information about the plasticity of the brain and instructions in how the brain works. Emphasis was put on how the brain can be trained and students were given strategies necessary to persist in spite of cognitive challenges. None of this information or practice was shared with the other group. When final test results were compared, they revealed that the group that was given information about the growing brain performed better than the group who were excluded from this information; pupils who tended

to lean towards a growth mindset performed better than pupils who leaned towards a fixed mindset.

The core curriculum states that learners should reflect upon their own learning and develop self-belief and that the teaching should “fuel the pupil’s motivation” (2017). Like the theory on fixed and growth mindsets (Claro, Dweck, 2016; Bettinger, Rege, 2017) addresses people’s understanding of the self as something that can grow and develop if given the right metacognitive tools, similar ideas are prevalent in CC17. “Learning to learn” is one of the principles for education and here we read:

Understanding their own learning processes and their development in subjects will contribute to the pupils’ independence and sense of mastering. The teaching and training shall fuel the pupils’ motivation, promote good attitudes and learning strategies, and form the basis for lifelong learning. This means that the teachers must monitor their pupils’ development closely and give them support appropriate for their age, maturity and functional level. (2017)

Correspondingly, Brevik’s research (2015) on metacognitive awareness in supporting reading comprehension is relevant. Wolf (2018) and Brevik (2015) both stress that instruction supplying the learners with metacognitive tools matters. Providing learners with reading strategies and a language to understand the strategies with may *contribute to the pupil’s independence and sense of mastering* as well as to *fuel their motivation*. Brevik’s research demonstrated how teaching reading strategies is conducive to learning. Brevik found that “metacognitive awareness had been sustained over time” (2015, p. 59) and that more students took responsibility during reading activities after being instructed in reading strategies. Similarly, Wolf discusses *how* to read from the perspective of the binary; a digital versus a non-digital reading perspective (2018). Wolf (2018) uses the term “the biliterate brain” (p. 168) to specify that there is a distinction between digital and non-digital reading in the same way that there is a distinction between different languages, and suggests that just like bilingual people manage to code switch between languages depending on the context, biliterate children should be assisted in learning to code switch between the medium they read from depending on the (con)text. According to Wolf (2018), being a digital reader may promote reading skills like skimming, whereas being an analogue reader holds a higher potential for promoting longer thoughts and contemplation.

Wolf argues that we must cultivate both digital and non-digital reading in order to “read deeply and well in whatever medium” (2018, p. 12). She calls for awareness of the different medium and their effects as well as limitations (pp 168-187). In addition, she acknowledges that more research is necessary “on the cognitive impacts of both print and digital mediums on all our children, particularly those with reading challenges, whether environmental or biological in origin” (p. 179). This suggests that Wolf has not reached a final conclusion as to where she stands on digital and non-digital reading.

## **2.9 TEACHER COGNITION**

Teacher cognition is well suited to consider when wanting to study how teachers think about their own teaching. Borg (2012) writes that studying teacher cognition qualitatively “allows for contextualised understanding of teaching” (p. 18). Teachers’ prior experiences, their knowledge and values may affect choices in the classroom and may consequently affect their pupils’ lives.

Teacher cognition addresses both the observable parts of teaching, what teachers do and say, and the unobservable parts of teaching. Examples of unobservable parts of teaching can be background influences such as a teacher’s prior language experiences, their prior teacher training, their knowledge, confidence and feelings. Borg writes that teacher cognition is “an unobservable cognitive dimension of teaching” and defines as “what teachers know, believe and do” (2003, p. 81).

Because teacher cognition acknowledges unobservable parts of teaching, it was not always a big field of research. However, Borg (2012) writes that “contemporary thinking in neuroscience argues against traditional divisions between the rational and emotional dimensions of decision-making” (p. 12). This suggests that teacher cognition acknowledges the whole human being as much as the role of the teacher. According to Borg, teacher cognition is “a term for teachers’ mental lives” (Borg, 2003, p. 86), and consists of beliefs, thoughts and knowledge. This cannot be understood as a static condition or concept, but refers to beliefs, thoughts and knowledge which are intricately connected and changing.

To illustrate the complexity of teacher cognition, Borg suggests that the theoretical framework of teacher cognition is confusing. For example, the role of words such “belief, cognition and conception of teaching” may have different understandings, as illustrated in Borg (2008). The word “belief” has according to Borg (2008, p. 36) five different definitions, and “conceptions of teaching” has three different definitions. Despite its complexity, teacher cognition is a useful tool in order for teachers to increase their understanding and cognition about their own classroom practices and consequently improving teaching practices. In CC17, the notion of “learning to learn” is relevant for pupils and learners. Similarly, teacher cognition provides teachers with a theoretical framework to apply in order to carry on with continuous improvement in teaching.

However, there may be gaps between what teachers say and what they do. Borg also addresses the contextual realities of the teachers and how the contextual realities sometimes prevent the teachers from teaching according to their beliefs and ideals (2003, p. 94). Contextual realities such as the curriculum, access to teaching resources, school buildings or disruptions in class may all offer both limitations and possibilities as to how the teachers manages to carry out a lesson plan.

As mentioned in section 1.5, in order to develop the basic skill of reading, the Norwegian Directorate of Education and Training did not (until June 2020) express a position as to whether there are differences between digital reading or reading on paper. This implies that the teachers have had to resolve this themselves. At the same time, access to digital aids in schools have been submitted to political decisions. This is relevant in regard to Borg´s (2003) theory of how a teacher´s ideals may not always reflect the contextual reality. For example, a teacher may want to offer a pupil a particular kind of learning material, say a laptop instead of an iPad, or a book instead of a PDF on a computer, but the contextual reality does not allow for this ideal. In such a case, there may be a mismatch between the ideal and the contextual reality.

## **2.10 SUMMARY**

In this chapter, documents, publications and research relevant to my thesis have been presented. I demonstrate how the curriculum, together with ideas by Wolf (2018), Fenner

(2011; 2018), Hoff (2013; 2017; 2018), Vygotsky (1978; 1986), Krashen (1981), Kress (2003), Jewitt (2006), Brevik (2015) and Mangen (2013; 2019) add useful perspectives when embarking on studying teachers' perspectives and teaching practices in EFL. As demonstrated, reading involves cognitive processes requiring practice and interaction with texts. As stated, the concept of deep reading is relatively new, and although it shares traces with other established reading strategies, there is little research on deep reading in English in particular. The theory most relevant for my research is the theory on *deep reading* by Wolf (2018) who suggests that there is connection between screen reading and the decline of deep reading skills. Wolf (2018) and Brevik (2015) stress the importance of assisting the learner in creating awareness on his/her own reading. This is in alignment with the demands of metacognition in the new core curriculum and the ability to reflect on one's own learning. Mangen's research (2013; 2019) elaborates on the matter of digital and non-digital reading. Fenner (2011; 2018) and Hoff (2013; 2017; 2018) discuss the role of literature and how reading literary texts builds good characters. In the next chapter, the methods used in this thesis will be explained and discussed.

## **3 MATERIAL AND METHODS**

---

### **3.1 INTRODUCTION**

Since this is an exploratory research covering the understanding of teachers' experiences, I landed on a qualitative approach as the best course of action. In my study, I interviewed five EFL teachers. In this chapter, an explanation of methods and the choices behind the research design will be presented, as well as a description of the procedures involved in collecting and analysing the data. I will elaborate on getting permission and the selecting and informing of participants. In addition, factors that might influence or disturb the study's reliability and validity will be discussed, before acknowledging some ethical considerations. Possible limitations of the chosen methods and material of the study will also be discussed, and lastly, since I am conducting research interviewing other teachers and am a teacher myself, I find it necessary to discuss my role as a researcher.

### **3.2 QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE RESEARCH**

The research question guides the researcher in the direction of either a quantitative or qualitative approach, or a combination of the two, depending on the intention of the study. Quantitative and qualitative research both have their strengths and weaknesses, and studies may contain elements from one another or might be combined, depending on the research question.

Creswell explains that qualitative research is a better approach if the intention is to explore and obtain a deeper understanding of a phenomenon through participants (Creswell, 2014, p. 30-34). In qualitative research we deal with texts such as observation notes, interview transcripts, documents, images and videotapes (Johannesen, Rafoss & Rasmussen, 2018, p.



21). Quantitative approaches are the best courses of action when wanting to study trends and patterns. Creswell explains, “Describing a trend means that the research problem can be answered best by a study in which the researcher seeks to establish the overall tendency or responses from individuals and note how this tendency varies among people” (Creswell, 2014, p. 27). Quantitative studies have more informants than qualitative studies and a quantitative researcher relies on statistical analysis and uses more close-ended approaches; for example, scaled answers where participants answer such as “strongly agree, strongly disagree, disagree and so forth” (Creswell, 2014, p. 33). In Johannessen, Rafoss and Rasmussen (2018), we read that in qualitative studies, we study words, whereas in quantitative studies, we look at numbers. However, Creswell underlines that quantitative and qualitative research are not to be viewed as “two end points in a dichotomy, but rather as different points on a continuum” (2014, p. 33). Nevertheless, in general, a qualitative researcher mainly interprets words.

To sum up, when landing on a research approach, it is important to establish what the intention of the study is. In this study, I wanted to explore deep reading in EFL through the perspectives of teachers. It was important to me that the attention was drawn to the teachers’ individual experiences through their own reflections.

### **3.3 RESEARCH QUESTION**

My ambition is to gain insight into and develop understanding on how teachers promote and experience deep reading in EFL. An overall aim is that an increased understanding of the teachers’ experiences will improve my own insight and teaching practice. In addition, I hope the study will add a valuable contribution to the already existing research in this field. I am mainly interested in how the teachers reflect upon the concept of deep reading and in their deep reading teaching practices, but am also curious about what they may have observed in the EFL classroom when working with deep reading activities.

When collecting evidence in order to answer my research question, I believe that *teacher cognition* is relevant. Borg (2012) believes qualitative studies allow for contextualised understandings of cognition, and examining teachers’ cognition is a useful theoretical tool in order to understand “a phenomenon not directly observable” (Borg, 2008, p. 167). Teacher cognition, as explained in the previous chapter, is defined as “what teachers know, believe

and do” (Borg, 2003, p. 81). As explained, teacher cognition addresses both the observable and unobservable parts of teaching, and factors such as the teachers’ prior experience, their schooling and the contextual realities may affect their teaching practices, thoughts and beliefs. Therefore, when considering teacher cognition, it is important to acknowledge that this is a complex set of intertwined factors, which are not easily measured or understood. When discussing perspectives held by individuals, “multiple perspectives” (Crystal, 2014, p. 274) may appear, meaning that many viewpoints from different individuals may apply for the same experiences. When identifying themes, these can be “hard to classify” (ibid), or very well fit into major or minor themes. Borg (2003) also suggests that there may be gaps between a teacher’s beliefs and his or her actions. My findings must therefore be viewed in light of this broader context. In the following, I will explain the choice of research design.

### **3.4 RESEARCH DESIGN**

A research design is a plan that explains how one wants to collect, analyse and report data in order to answer the research question (Creswell, 2014, p. 11). In the following, I will explain my reflections and choices behind this research design.

Since I aimed at focusing on teachers’ perceptions, observations and reflections, I decided to go for a narrative research design using interviews. I was interested in the thoughts, practices and beliefs of the EFL teachers. In my view, a narrative study provides a good representation of the teachers’ experiences. According to Creswell, “In education, these stories often relate to school classroom experiences or activities in schools” (2014, p. 36).

Initially, I considered an ethnographic research design using observation and follow-up interviews. Creswell explains that ethnographic studies are suited when “describing, analysing and interpreting a cultural group’s shared patterns and behaviour, beliefs, and language that develop over time” (Creswell, 2014, p. 35). However, because I was interested in focusing more heavily on the individual experiences of the teachers, an ethnographic approach was rejected.

According to Creswell, a narrative research design is used when one wants to “tell the stories of one or two individuals” (p. 36). This approach is useful when one wants to go in depth and

increase understanding about a phenomenon (Johannesen et al., 2016). A challenge with narrative studies is that they are small and subjective which may make them difficult to interpret. For example, by using a small sample, it can be hard to report trends or tendencies in the data collection.

Since the intention was to study as many aspects of deep reading in EFL as possible, using many participants was not ideal. Nevertheless, I knew I needed more informants than one or two in order to understand the phenomenon. After discussing this with my supervisor, I accepted that an ideal number of informants for a study like mine does not exist. In Johannesen, et al., (2016), an exact number for phenomenological studies is not specified. Instead, the authors suggest between ten and twenty-five informants for qualitative approaches. The authors add that fewer participants may be sufficient and, as a rule of thumb, the sample should be big enough to shed light on the research question (Johannesen et al., 2016). I notice that the older version of the book (Johannesen et al., 2006) operates with between five and twenty-five informants for phenomenological studies (p. 81). After conferring with my supervisor, I decided to interview five teachers as a starting point before evaluating if I would need more informants for my study.

After having conducted the interviews, I found that these were sufficient due to the richness of their descriptions and reflections. After transcription, the interviews consisted of nearly 50 pages of transcribed material. The informants will be discussed under the heading “selecting and informing participants”.

### **3.5 COLLECTING DATA**

I decided on a narrative study using one-on-one semi structured interviews. Here, I present thoughts and choices behind the planning of the research interviews. I explain what a research interview is and different approaches to carry out interviews. Lastly, advantages and disadvantages with research interviews will be discussed.

#### **3.5.1 Interviews**

A research interview is a purposeful conversation between a researcher and an informant. Creswell defines interviews as occurring “when researchers ask one or more participants

general, open-ended questions and record their answers” (2014, p. 6). One can conduct focus group interviews or one-on-one interviews (p. 240).

I settled on one-on-one interviews. The main reason was that I wanted the teachers to reflect individually so I could study whether their associations went in different directions or reflected any shared understandings. One-on-one interviews are considered the most time-consuming, and because of this, I did consider a group interview. This would have given the participants the possibility to reflect together. However, pitfalls, such as someone talking more than others could occur. Participants in a group interview might also be steered in each other’s directions of thinking, which could potentially make the data biased.

In scientific research, the interviews can be carried out in three different ways. These are unstructured, semi-structured or structured. Since I am exploring a phenomenon, I considered conducting unstructured interviews. However, in unstructured interviews, informants carry the direction of the conversation freely. Often, the researcher only provides a topic or a key word. For this reason, an unstructured interview was not an option. On the contrary, in order to get the information I was after, I realised I needed to include some closed questions and to have a well-structured interview. It was also vital that part-processes within Wolf’s deep reading theory were addressed (see section 2.3.1).

During the interviews, I also wanted to be able to comment and add follow-up questions and therefore opted for a semi-structured interview using a combination of closed and open-ended questions. A semi-structured interview is an interview in which the researcher does not follow a list of formalised questions, but asks more open-ended questions allowing for discussion with the interviewee. This makes it possible to attain more perspectives and gain new insights (Creswell, 2014, p. 229).

I decided to perform the interviews in person. One-on-one interviews are easily conducted through e-mail or by telephone (Creswell, 2014, p. 241), but I settled on seeking out participants whom I could meet in person. By interviewing informants in person, I would be able to meet the person and experience their non-verbal language and gestures as well. I also expected it would be easier to weed out misunderstandings and to add follow up questions.

A final dilemma I encountered when planning data collection, was whether I should conduct the interviews in English or in Norwegian. My personal preference was English. On the other

hand, using English might generate language barriers or influence my informants' language production. For example, would my informants feel comfortable expressing everything if using English? Or would using English lead the informants to talk more or less? After discussing these dilemmas with my supervisor, the conclusion was that as long as my informants first languages were Norwegian, Norwegian was the best option during the interviews. Thus, since all of the informants were Norwegian, I conducted all of the interviews in Norwegian.

Creswell (2014) describes how there may be challenges connected with scientific interviews. For example, he writes that "the interview data may be deceptive" (p. 240). This means that the interviewee may say what he or she thinks that the interviewer wants to hear.

Additionally, the researcher's presence may affect an informant. Another challenge is that "the interviews only provide information "filtered" through the views of the interviewee" (p. 240). Also, research bias may occur. An example is if a researcher leads the interviewee to answer in a desired way, or if an informant speaks untruly. The informant's narrative may also be distorted by false memories. On the other end, a narrative may be poorly or falsely retold by the researcher.

Silverman (2014), who is critical towards methods like open-ended interviews, states that interviews do not appear to give direct access to facts and that they do not "tell us directly about people's 'experiences' but instead offer indirect 'representations' of those experiences" (p. 172). In *Interpreting Qualitative Data*, Silverman advocates observation because observation enables the researcher to objectively observe first hand, without the background knowledge of being immersed in the observed culture, group or setting (2014, chapter 8).

To sum up, in this section I have presented thoughts and choices behind the research interviews. I have also explained what a research interview is, how they can be carried out, as well as considered some advantageous and disadvantageous of interviews.

### **3.6 GETTING PERMISSION**

In order to conduct this study, I needed to seek permission from NSD as well as from the teachers I was going to interview. NSD approved my application in the autumn of 2018 (see

Appendix 1). The application included information from my project outline as well as relevant material like the consent form and the interview guide (see appendices 2 and 3). Like NSD also requests, I shared the necessary information with my informants individually via email.

### **3.7 SELECTING AND INFORMING PARTICIPANTS**

I conducted the interviews in the autumn of 2019. In this section, I will present my thoughts and choices behind the selecting, recruiting and informing of the participants.

Before conducting interviews, it is important to identify participants' characteristics (Creswell, 2014, p. 230). I decided on a homogenous sampling, and wanted to interview English teachers with different lengths of teaching experience. I pondered on using an even more homogenous group, for example, only newly educated teachers, or only very experienced teachers. However, my goal was to sample different EFL teachers with different levels of experience.

When selecting participants, my main interest was to find formally educated EFL teachers with different years of teaching practice. By formal education I meant requirements for pedagogical education and a minimum of 60 study points in English. 60 study points are the standard requirements in Norway for teaching English in lower secondary school. Apart from this, any years of teaching practice, from newly educated to lifelong experience, was considered relevant.

To recruit the right informants, snowball sampling was used (Creswell, 2014). Despite the relatively small number of participants, I ended up spending some time recruiting the variation I needed among my informants. Privately, I do not know many English teachers from the district, and if I did, I would consider it problematic to use them in my study since my role was as a researcher and not as a colleague or friend. "Snowball sampling is a sampling procedure in which the researcher asks participants to identify other participants to become members of the sample" (Creswell, 2014, p. 12). Purposeful sampling is "a qualitative sampling procedure in which researchers intentionally select individuals and sites to learn or understand the central phenomenon" (Creswell, 2014, p. 10). Informants were

recruited using two techniques. I sent out emails to all the schools and asked them if they could forward my request to the teachers in their English departments. My second approach was to contact random English teachers directly. I sent them emails with my request and distributed recruitment material and information about the project. Since I held a position as a vocational counsellor at the time, I sent out e-mails via other vocational counsellors in the district and asked them to forward my request. I specifically asked them to put me in contact with teachers that I did not know on a personal level. Out of eight requests sent via counsellors, I was given contact information to five EFL teachers in four different schools. I emailed the five teachers and four accepted to participate in my project. All four were women with between two to twenty years of experience.

I needed at least one more informant, and asked two more vocational counsellors to put me in contact with English teachers, preferably males, since there were already four female informants. The advantage with this approach, was that I could, based on the informants who had volunteered already, carry out a purposeful selection to ensure better differentiation among my participants. I asked two male English teachers from two different schools for an interview, in which one agreed to participate. I ended up with five informants from five different schools. The informants were all EFL teachers with a formalised teacher education, including pedagogy and English.

I believe that five informants, with interviews lasting between 25 and 40 minutes, provide enough data for this study. I believe that having too many informants could have resulted in an immense amount of data. The reflection around abstract concepts together with their practices and experiences could also have made working with a large amount of data difficult. On the other hand, using only one or two informants would leave me with an insufficient amount of data.

## **3.8 INTERVIEW GUIDE**

### **3.8.1 Introduction**

The data collection process follows a set of steps. Creswell explains that “The researcher selects participants and sites, gains permission to conduct the study, decides on the type of

data to collect, develops means for recording information, and administers the data collection, while anticipating field issues and ethical concerns” (2014, p. 255). Because I was interested in the teachers teaching experiences as well as their observations from the EFL classroom, I constructed a three-sectioned interview guide (see appendix 3). The first section was meant to cover formalities, like their education, practices and contextual backgrounds. The second section was designed to obtain information about their teaching practices and which conditions they were teaching under. Lastly, the third section aimed at covering how the teachers perceived their pupils’ habits and experiences during reading and deep reading exercises. In the following, I will present the interview questions as well as some relevant thoughts and perspectives regarding the questions in my interview guide.

### **3.8.2 Interview guide Part 1**

The intention of the first part was to establish the teacher’s professional background and experience. In this section, closed questions were used, though with the possibility to comment, elaborate or explain if necessary.

### **3.8.3 Interview guide Part 2**

The questions in the second part of the interview guide aimed at understanding of the teachers’ practices when teaching deep reading. Here, I wanted to investigate how the teachers planned, reflected and conducted their lessons. I asked a combination of open, exploratory questions formulated as “how do you understand/think”, “tell me about”, “can you give an example of”, as well as closed questions such as “can you give an estimate of the time spent on reading in books vs digitally?” I mixed the closed and the open-ended questions instead of sectioning them together. The practical and theoretical aspects were also interesting. Practical aspects can be access to reading material and the contextual environment. Do they read in the classroom, in a group room or on a sofa? Do they sit or lie down? Do they have reading activities in quiet places or noisy places? On the other hand, I did not want to specify all of these questions but rather see what the informants chose to focus upon. Lastly, and most importantly, was uncovering the theoretical aspects. What does the teacher think and want to achieve with the deep reading activities and how does he or she plan to facilitate deep reading activities?



Question number 15 in my interview guide is an exploratory question. Here, I ask the teachers “to talk about” an English session where they worked with reading. I asked about “novels”, “short stories” or “demanding articles” because I wanted to keep all doors open as to how this question could be interpreted. I formulated the question in such a way that the informants understood I preferred hearing about fictional examples, without necessarily dismissing factual text examples if they preferred elaborating on that. I was as much interested in the content of the answers as their interpretation and understanding of the question. Question number 16 and 17 are also exploratory open-ended questions. These questions focus on Wolf’s part processes as explained in chapter 2.3.1. Questions 15-17 are lengthier and include questions within the questions. I was interested in how the teachers explored these questions and what did they would choose to focus on.

When it applies to the other deep reading processes, these are not treated in separate questions. The terms “analogical thinking” and “critical thinking” are asked about indirectly in section two and three. Critical thinking, is well established in the CC17, now LK20 (2019). For this reason, I decided to avoid singling out a question devoted to critical thinking alone. Instead, I decided to leave it to the informants to draw any parallels to critical thinking. IN addition, since I am focusing on literary texts, I wanted to focus on the affective deep reading processes. When covering “empathy”, this is included in “perspective taking”.

To sum up, the purpose of the interview guide: part 2, was to seek information about the teachers’ reflections, thoughts around planning lessons and how they promote deep reading in EFL. The questions were aimed at investigating deep reading from a teacher’s planning point of view. However, I also aimed at gaining an overview of the structural and practical potentials and/or limitations of the teaching of deep reading, such as access to reading areas, group size and the time they had at their disposal.

### **3.8.4 Interview guide Part 3**

In section three, there are ten main questions, including an open phrase requesting final comments. The intention of these questions was mainly to gain understanding of and for the teachers’ experiences through their observations in the EFL classroom. Here, I aimed at investigating how the teachers perceived their students reading habits and reading routines when they practiced more demanding reading activities in EFL.

In order to find the answers that I requested, I asked mostly open, exploratory questions. However, some questions, such as question 19, 22 and 27 carry a different wording. Question number 19 is a closed question including seven statements. Here, I ask the teachers to scale the answers, because I wanted to spot if there might be tendencies. I had read research on reading habits (Pisa, 2018; National tests, 2019; Liu, 2016; Mangen 2013; 2019; Frønes 2015; 2017; Baron; 2016) and wanted to see if EFL teachers could confirm or reject this. However, I encouraged the teachers to comment freely using as many words they needed.

Questions 20, 22 - 26 and 28 are exploratory questions heading in a descriptive direction. In questions 20, 22-26 and 28, phrases like “how would you describe + phenomenon” are used as a point of departure to seek information about the teaching situation and students reading habits in EFL. Besides these questions, I included a question (question 21) where I asked the teachers to identify and categorise their students most common reading strategies. In this question, the categories were already set, as I had identified three distinctively different reading strategies and asked the teachers to try and rank them in terms of how they perceived they fit best with their students’ reading habits. In addition, I included a question dealing with the teachers’ opinion on the relationship on reading/writing (question 27).

### **3.9 CONDUCTING INTERVIEWS**

As explained, I gained permission from NSD, then selected and informed participants before collecting the data through interviews. The interviews were recorded, and during our conversation, I also took notes. Before conducting the interviews, I did a pilot interview. The pilot did not lead to any significant changes. In the following, I will explain how the interview process.

#### **3.9.1 Interviews**

A semi-structured narrative study permits interaction between the researcher and the interviewee. Thus, I decided to comment or ask follow-up questions during the interview. I carried out the interviews as a researcher. However, a backdrop was our mutual experience as English teachers. In this case, I was both a teacher and as a researcher. Coming from the same

contextual reality, can be an advantage. An ethical issue however, is whether I should, and to what extent, share my experiences with my informants or not (Creswell, 2014, p. 253). This dilemma has no clear answer.

The interviews were conducted in the informants preferred location. Two informants chose to come to my house and three informants chose to be interviewed at their own place of work. I perceived the interviews as pleasant encounters. When they were in my home, I offered coffee or tea, when I visited them in their schools, I was offered coffee or tea. One of the informants was knitting during the interview.

I recorded the interviews and took notes on a piece of paper. I was conscious of only talking or adding my comments when I found it absolute necessary. The aim was to construct a setting where the informants felt encouraged to talk as much as possible.

### **3.10 PRESENTING DATA**

The data was collected through teacher interviews with a duration between 25 and 40 minutes. All the data was then transcribed, and after transcription, the data consisted of 34 pages of text material (font size 10, 1.5 line spacing, see appendix 4). I read through the transcripts several times before presenting it in chapter 4.

As shown in Creswell (2014), qualitative researchers collect data first before preparing it for data analysis. In this thesis, the data will be presented in chapter 4, and then analysed and discussed in chapter 5. Consequently, there will be some repetition when discussing the data in chapter 5. I understand that it would be less monotonous for readers if the collected data was presented and analysed together in one chapter, but in my view, this adds more clarity and transparency to the thesis. By presenting data without comments in a chapter of its own, it is also possible to consolidate these without the researcher's interpretations.

### **3.11 ANALYSING DATA**

In my research paper, I carried out a thematic analysis which I present in line with Brown and Clarke (2006). Braun and Clarke argue that thematic analysis offers an “accessible and

flexible approach to analysing qualitative data” (p. 77). They provide some guidelines for how to conduct a structured thematic analysis without limiting its flexibility. In my analysis, I make use of their suggestions and navigate the discussion through their six recommended phases. These six phases are:

Description of the process 1. Familiarizing yourself with your data: Transcribing data (if necessary), reading and re-reading the data, noting down initial ideas. 2. Generating initial codes: Coding interesting features of the data in a systematic fashion across the entire data set, collating data relevant to each code. 3. Searching for themes: Collating codes into potential themes, gathering all data relevant to each potential theme. 4. Reviewing themes: Checking if the themes work in relation to the coded extracts (Level 1) and the entire data set (Level 2), generating a thematic ‘map’ of the analysis. 5. Defining and naming themes: Ongoing analysis to refine the specifics of each theme, and the overall story the analysis tells, generating clear definitions and names for each theme. 6. Producing the report: The final opportunity for analysis. Selection of vivid, compelling extract examples, final analysis of selected extracts, relating back of the analysis to the research question and literature, producing a scholarly report of the analysis. (p. 87)

I began by scanning the texts in search of tendencies, patterns, contradictions or simply my immediate thoughts, and aimed at labelling relevant parts, words or sentences. My goal was to see if I could identify complementing or contrasting findings, or interesting or relevant topics. Creswell (2014) writes that coding the data is a typical procedure in qualitative analysis. According to Braun and Clarke (2006), “A theme captures something important about the data in relation to the research question, and represents some level of patterned response or meaning within the data set” (p. 82).

Braun and Clarke (2006) discuss and argue that a thematic analysis acknowledges the researcher’s role as the one who selects, edits and deploys the informants’ arguments. What is important is that the theoretical framework and methods match what the researcher wants to know, and that they acknowledge these decisions, and recognise them as decisions.

When analysing the data, themes were challenging to pin down. In this regard, Braun and Clarke (2006) add another useful perspective:

An important question to address in terms of coding is: what counts as a pattern/theme, or what 'size' does a theme need to be? This is a question of prevalence, in terms both of space within each data item and of prevalence across the entire data set. (p. 82)

Initially, as I did not know what to code or how many codes to include. I coded information that was repeated, if something surprised me, or confirmed or contradicted previous research. To begin with, I aimed at coding as much as possible, and used markers in different colours to single out and label findings. I also tried to see if there were recurring words, or experiences.

I was studying each interview in detail, going through the questions one by one, and aimed at doing a comparative analysis similar to the one described in Creswell (2014, p. 61). For example, I looked at how deep reading was dealt with and worked with in question 10. I then went through question 10 in all five interviews, before I moved on to question eleven, then twelve, etc. Like in Creswell's example, I was open to expand or delete any categories or themes if needed, and like Braun and Clarke (2006) recommend, I was open to redefining themes throughout the whole process.

### **3.12 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

Skaalvik claims educational research may be problematic as it is positioned between contrasting needs. On the one hand, education in Norway is financed by the taxpayers' money and the public has the right to know how this money is spent. On the other hand, educational research affects individuals such as pupils, teachers and often parents. Children, especially, have the right for protection and privacy (Skaalvik, 1999, p. 89).

There are ethical issues connected to all aspects of the research process, and Creswell claims that it is a complex matter as it is not only a matter of following a set of rules. He writes, "In all steps of the process, you need to engage in ethical practices" (2014, 37). This could be in the selecting of methods, participants, in the analysing process or in the production of the interview guide.

Before conducting this research, I reflected upon how my informants and I could discuss the pupils in such a way that their right for protection and privacy were not violated.

Consequently, I landed on designing an interview guide that posed general questions about pupils without the risk of revealing individual characteristics. Questions were also designed in such a way that they aimed at avoiding producing answers that contributed to creating stereotypes.

Part of the information I sought dealt with pupils' reading habits. Creswell (2014) writes that one-on-one interviews may provide "useful information when you cannot directly observe participants, and they permit participants to describe detailed personal information" (p. 240). By interviewing the teachers, I would be able to indirectly ask them about their students' habits. Additionally, if wanting to observe pupils, I would have to involve and gain permission from many more people making the data collection very time consuming.

Lastly, I have included the size of the teachers' EFL classes and the region they teach in. However, I have not included information about the distribution of boys/girls in their classes or how their pupils score on tests. Nor have I identified the schools or their specific location

### **3.13 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

Skaalvik (1999) discusses how educational research can be problematic as it affects many individuals, not only pupils. The advantages have to be weighed against the disadvantages in order to justify a research project (Skaalvik, 1999). In this thesis I believe I have argued for the need to conduct this research.

I acknowledge that pitfalls may occur in research and have aimed at avoiding them. I have endeavoured to practice reflexivity; reflecting on my own biases, values and assumptions (Creswell, 2014, p. 10). These reflections are expressed throughout this research paper.

In order to know if the research is valid and reliable, the whole process must be evaluated. In qualitative research, validity refers to the methods of the researcher and to what extent he/she has conducted, analysed and discussed findings in a way that reflect reality as well as the aim of the study (Johannesen et al., 2016, p. 232). A relatively small sample like this imposes limitations on validity (Johannessen et al., 2006, p. 199). As already mentioned, this is a small-scale survey with only five informants. As a consequence, findings cannot be

generalised upon. Other potential limitations of this study are the reliance on self-reporting and that the pupils are only represented indirectly through the teachers' perspectives.

In the chapter on quantitative research, Creswell writes that "reliability and validity are bound together in complex ways" (2014, p. 77). Creswell defines validity as: "the development of sound evidence to demonstrate that the test interpretation measures what it claims to measure" (2014, p. 177). Reliability refers to how consistent results from a study are. It is not very common to ask for reliability in qualitative research. For example, because of the role of the researcher and his/her interpretation of data that is based on text, it would be challenging to produce the same results if it were repeated some other time and place. Similarly, the informants would not likely produce the same answers if interviewed at some other time. For this reason, I will only consider validity when discussing how believable my findings are, or whether my data is truthfully interpreted.

"Validating findings means that the researcher determines the accuracy or credibility of the findings through strategies such as member checking and triangulation" (Creswell, 2014, p. 283). In my study, I carried out a thematic analysis and have looked at what the teachers say and analysed their experiences according to the theory presented in chapter 2. Creswell writes that "Triangulation is the process of corroborating evidence from different individuals, types of data, or methods of data collection in descriptions and themes in qualitative research" (2014, p. 283). Since I have only based my findings on two different sources, this may affect validity.

As mentioned, potential implications of this study, are its indirect presentation of pupils and the reliance on self-reporting. Pupils are not directly represented and may be mistakenly portrayed. The teachers' narratives may be problematic too. A narrative study is about telling a story and sampling can be small. According to Creswell, sometimes only one or two informants are used (2014, p. 36). Narratives can be subjective and may not reveal the truth, and teachers' beliefs about their own practice may not always correspond with what they do in the classroom.

Another possible challenge to the validity may lie in the interview guide. Some of the questions are vaguely formulated whereas others are closed. The question on reading strategies, as discussed in section 5.4.4 was too vague, whereas the statements about reading

proficiency and endurance, as discussed in section 5.6.1, demonstrated how some answers proved to be of little use. In retrospect, the answers on reading strategies and the method I used in section three proved to be incomplete in order to answer parts of my research questions.

I also regard the overlapping curricula a potential challenge to validity. CC17 was implemented before LK20 (2019), and LK06/13 was still in use. Many schools were still teaching according to the 1994 curriculum, and the teachers may be influenced by new ideas and thought as well as former curricula. I have tried to be consistent in addressing the CC17, LK06/13, and at the same time look ahead, without mixing them up. This was also my endeavour during the interviews. Nevertheless, both the teachers and myself may have been affected by this overlap of educational documents.

There is also the risk of response bias. That is most common in survey research, but could potentially be relevant for my interviews as well. A response bias occurs when “the responses do not accurately reflect the views of the sample and the population” (Creswell, 2014, p. 11).

As already discussed in previous sections, other biases may occur. A participant may tell the researcher what he or she thinks the researcher wishes to hear, and a researcher may lead the interviewee in order to get a certain response.

Also, only a few of the part-processes of deep reading are addressed. For example, questions on how they worked with analogical thinking or critical thinking were not included in order to avoid introducing too many abstract and competing concepts. Critical thinking is given much attention in CC17, and has been established in the teaching practice for some time, especially when it comes to the reading of factual texts. My concern was that this would overshadow the focus on literary texts.

Another limitation of the study may be my role as researcher. Objectivity in research is vital. Findings are expected to be based on the data, not a researcher’s subjective attitudes or opinions (Johannesen, et al., 2016, p. 234). A researcher’s bias can affect validity in all areas of the research process, such as when designing questions for the interview guide, during the interviews or when analysing data. According to Creswell, “qualitative research do not typically use the word *bias* in research; they will say that all research is interpretative and that the research should be self-reflective about his or her in the research, how he or she is



interpreting the findings, and his or her personal and political history that shapes his or her interpretations” (2014, p. 283).

As a researcher, I should be able to critically conduct the process and analyse and discuss findings with a nuanced gaze. However, a limitation may be my identification with the informants. Being an English teacher myself, may influence my feelings of loyalty with the informants. Thus, being on the “inside” may affect validity. Accepting this, and that a researcher comes with his or her own perspectives, acknowledges that the researcher is a factor in the research process. That being said, I have aimed at practicing reflexivity (Creswell, 2014) by reflecting on my own biases, values and assumptions.

### **3.14 SUMMARY**

In this chapter, I have discussed how I interviewed five EFL teachers. I have presented which choices I made in order to answer my research question. I explained the methods, the choices behind the research design, as well as given a description of the procedures involved in collecting and analysing the data. I have given an account on the process of getting permission and the selecting and informing of participants. In addition, factors that might influence or disturb the study's reliability and validity have been discussed, including ethical considerations and possible limitations.

## 4 PRESENTING RESULTS

---

### 4.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, information collected from the five interviews will be presented. As described in the previous chapter, results presented here will be repeated in chapter 5 where the results will be accompanied by an analysis and discussion. As explained in section 3.11, the reason I decided to present the results and the discussion in separate chapters was to strengthen the clarity and transparency to the thesis.

My research question was: *Deep reading in English: How do teachers promote and experience deep reading in the English subject?* The presentation of the data begins with relevant information about the informants. Secondly, findings in regard to the research question will be laid out. These findings will be presented reflecting the structure of the interview guide; meaning focus on teaching practices will be given attention first. Then, the teachers' observations concerning student performance, strategies, habits and attitudes will be laid out. Finally, interesting findings will be highlighted.

### 4.2 THE TEACHERS AND THEIR BACKGROUNDS

When presenting background information about the teachers, I have chosen to include their gender, as well as the length of each interview. Only one informant was male. The five informants contributing to this thesis were all teachers of English in lower secondary schools. Their teaching practice ranged from two to thirty years of experience. They all had experience from studying and teaching one or more other school subjects in addition to English. All five had a minimum of 60 study points in English.

Below is table 4.2.1 displaying the background and teaching experience of the teachers:

#### 4.2.1 Table displaying teachers' education and background

Informant	Years of teaching	Experience and background	Education	Number of students in each EFL - group	Gender	Length of interview
A	6 years	Teaches in lower secondary school, has previously taught at international primary and lower secondary school	Masters in English, also studied religion	11, 16, 11	Woman	36,23
B	18 years	General teacher, works in a secondary school, teaches Norwegian and English	Has studied to become general teacher, major in social science and English	12, 12	Woman	33,44
C	30 years	Teaches English, In-depth English studies, Social Science, Food and Nutrition, also works as a social counsellor	Minor in English, minor in Music, + teacher education (two years)	28	Woman	33,14
D	2 Years	Teaches Social Science and English	Studied master in Political Science, studied PPU (one year) undergraduate teaching program) and has a BA in English	25	Woman	24,41
E	16 years of teaching in total, has taught 6 years in English	Has worked in three different secondary schools belonging to three different municipalities, taught Physical Education, Social Science and Religion (KRLE). Works today as a principal, has also been working as a social counsellor	General teacher (teacher education 1st-10th grade), studied Sport, Physical Education, Social Science and Religion (KRLE), later studied English in a nationwide competence building program (Kompetanse for kvalitet)	30	Man	40,01

As the table illustrates, informants B, C and E followed a rather complete four-year general teacher-training programme. This programme prepared teachers for teaching in primary and lower secondary school from 1st to 10th grade. This teacher-training programme was introduced in the early 1990s and discontinued in 2010, when two new teacher-training programmes were introduced to take its place.

Informant A studied a teacher education programme at the master's level, primarily aiming at preparing teachers for lower secondary and upper secondary school. Informant D's background was similar to informant A's. D finished a Bachelor's degree in English, as well as a master's degree in Political Science. She later studied practical pedagogy and didactics (PPU).

### **4.3 TEACHERS' PRACTICES AND REFLECTIONS**

Since this thesis aims at investigating both the teachers' practices and their observations, focus on the teachers' practices will be given attention first. Here, I start out by reporting which medium, for example book, Kindle, iPad, or other, is used for reading, as well as the amount of time teachers report spending on the different media in EFL. Secondly, the teachers' opinions and thoughts on digital reading and reading on paper will be elaborated, before I present the teachers' responses to the importance of deep reading. Fourthly, findings in regard to how the teachers promote and work with deep reading in EFL will be provided. Here, both the approaches and the content will be laid out. Lastly, and before concluding with further reflections, examples from the classroom will be presented.

#### **4.3.1 Which medium: digital reading or reading on paper**

All five informants reported reading both digitally and on paper. All had distributed teaching material in the form of English textbooks in addition to a digital device. Other texts were either printed out or made available on screen. Two of the teachers worked in schools that had distributed iPads to every pupil. Three of the teachers worked in schools where every pupil had their own Chromebook. Four out of five teachers reported that their pupils would read

from a digital device more often than from paper or books. The results from their answers are summed up in the table 4.3.1.1 below:

#### 4.3.1.1 Table displaying use of paper format/digital device

Informant	Use of books/digital tool-reading in approximate percentage of classroom time	Digital device
A	Mostly screen, 60% reading on screen, 20% in paper format	iPad
B	Mostly screen, 80% reading on screen, 20% in paper format	iPad
C	Mostly screen, 80% reading on screen, 20% in paper format	Chromebook
D	50-50 screen and paper	Chromebook
E	Mostly books	Chromebook

Informant A used more textbooks with the younger pupils than the older ones, who used more iPads and other texts in paper format. With the older pupils, she used authentic short stories because their English was better. She said, “in lower secondary they are quite good in English.” She also reported using many different apps to assist EFL learning in general.

Informant B reported using digital tools, mainly iPads, as much as 80% of the time. She used different webpages, for example from the British council. She distributed all school material for her pupils online, using OneNote. Paper copies were not handed out. She did not like the pupils’ current textbook, “eh...it’s (the textbook) really outdated, I don’t like it. I liked it to begin with and have distributed it among my pupils but it functions merely as an encyclopaedia. I design my own lesson plans.”

Informant C also reported using digital tools more or less 80% of the time. Traditional schoolbooks were distributed as well. Chromebooks were used as the main reading resource in EFL, including audiobooks. However, pupils also used hard copies or other printed material. In addition, objects and illustrations were used to assist pupils’ reading activities.

Informant D said that she facilitated more for screen reading than for reading on paper, but concluded that her pupils probably read an equal amount on screen and on paper. If information had to be “new,” Internet was the main reading source. Schoolbooks were distributed and used alongside available Internet resources, webpages, films and shorter videos. Short clips or videos were used as homework, “for inspiration.” When using literary texts, these were mainly text extracts used to supply a topic “to get a new image, a new perspective, on what we are working on.” She would sometimes use a factual text to offer new perspectives as well.

Informant E currently holds a full-time position as a principal in a lower secondary school, but taught English until last year. He reported using “mostly books,” but after Chromebooks were distributed, he used the Chromebooks when reading shorter novels and short stories. Pupils would then read on screen or listen to the story from the Chromebook. Informant E had not used the Chromebooks or other digital devices when facilitating for bigger reading projects. In these cases, books in paper format were used. English textbooks were also distributed and used.

#### **4.3.2 Opinions on digital reading and reading on paper**

The teachers’ responses to the question on how technology interacted with deep reading activities were mixed. Informants B, C and D said they considered it a supplement, whereas informant A said it was challenging. Informant E emphasised that he found the question difficult to answer, but also concluded that it was challenging. Informant C also pondered on the activities connected to different kinds of reading. In the section below, I will go through their responses.

Informant A said digital reading was challenging. According to her, the iPad had potential to be of great service, “but I often feel it is better to bail it and read on paper instead.” However, her examples throughout the interview also confirmed that she often let the pupils use the iPad for reading. For example, in question ten when she was asked how she combined deep reading with technology she replied, “if you engage in ‘deep reading’ with an iPad, you may be aided by, for example, having the text read out aloud for you.” She also mentioned that the webpages published with the textbooks often had good reading resources as well as teaching

manuals and audio resources that teachers and pupils could use. She said she preferred that pupils read longer texts in paper format if the intention was to understand as much of the content as possible. In this way they could easily underline words while reading.

Informant B said she considered the technology a supplement. She distributed reading material online and used apps where the pupils could work with what they had read. During reading projects, pupils could choose to read digitally or on paper depending on where the literature they wanted to read was available. However, she said she did prefer that pupils read from a hard copy during big reading projects because she wanted the reading periods to be “old-fashioned” and that pupils have “a physical book and just sit there.” However, if books were not accessible in the “old-fashioned” way, she let them read from their iPad. She remarked that she endeavoured to facilitate for individual differences. She also said that she did not like to read in depth using an iPad herself. “Either I need my Kindle, which is also digital but somehow I find it different from the iPad. The iPad is so flickering,” she explained. She had not discovered any challenges when pupils read on the iPad instead of reading on paper. However, only two girls had so far read longer novels on the iPad.

Informant C did not answer the question directly, but said Chromebooks were used as the main reading resource in EFL and that she considered the implementation of it in general as a supplement. She then pondered:

Something I find a bit peculiar is that once we read deeply, we read on paper, but to find out about things in a proper way, we are dependent upon the technology. For example, to access airline prices and to locate airports and everything.... I find it totally amazing.

When I asked if it could be an alternative to read the literature on Chromebook as well, she answered:

It might be all the same (hipp som happ) but I prefer they get to hold a physical book and that they get to see how far they have read in the book, like, it's almost a bit of an archaic way of teaching (museumsundervisning), this is a book, for some, many of them have never read a book.



She also remarked that she had asked her pupils in In-depth English studies class if they had been read to as little kids, and some reported that they lacked that experience. “So that is why I think it is important to hold a book,” she concluded.

Informant D said she considered the technology a supplement to the reading activities in EFL and mentioned the possibility of having a text read aloud on the device. However, she also informed that she lacked experience with having pupils read an entire novel in EFL. She mainly used extracts from novels. Then they were mainly reading them on paper. Sometimes she read for her pupils, and they would then have the text on paper in front of them.

Informant E, when asked about technology’s interaction with deep reading, said, “That was one of the questions I found difficult to answer” and “yes, I have read the research claiming that this isn’t necessarily for the better, but now I have been teaching English for many years. However, I experience that the pupils are very much the same concerning this, and I am sorry, but I don’t know how to answer that.” After more contemplating he said that he believed the time spent with technology in the EFL classroom resulted in less time spent on deep reading:

Interact, no, well, one has, one can read on a screen in the same way as one can read from a book and I don’t know if there is a difference, eh, when it comes to the pupils’ learning outcome, or motivation or how much time teachers spend on this. I think maybe we are heading in the direction where we spend less time on it, because we have learning technology. I think that most EFL teachers spend less time on it now than before.

To sum up, the teachers addressed different aspects concerning challenges, possibilities and preferences regarding technology’s interaction with deep reading. Nevertheless, it was interesting to note that none of the five informants seemed to reflect too much upon which medium to read from. Findings implied that as long as their pupils would read, the teachers would let them read from whatever medium was available; sometimes a book in paper format, other times a digital device, despite the fact that four of the teachers said they preferred that their pupils read from a book or hard copy when reading a longer text.

### 4.3.3 Why teach deep reading in EFL

In chapter two, I look at relevant competence aims and objectives in *The Knowledge Promotion* (2006/13) and the *Core Curriculum* (2017). Together with theories, claims and research on reading, I argue why deep reading is important. That being said, I did not include questions concerned with *why* deep reading is important in the interview guide. However, during the interviews, the teachers disclosed thoughts about why they believed deep reading was important. I have chosen to include these reasons here. Overall, the teachers seemed concentrated on techniques and skills. They mentioned the importance of vocabulary building and its effects on writing performance. Although only one of the teachers talked explicitly about *Bildung*, all of the teachers made remarks indicating similar ideas. The following is a summary of what the informants said.

All five informants believe that reading in general was important in order to cultivate writing. Informant A, B, C and E said they found working with deep reading important in order to build vocabulary.

Informant E explained how practicing deep reading was important in order to combat poor reading scores among lower secondary school pupils. He mentioned how results from the national tests revealed that 8th graders' scores on comprehension were low. He said:

Norwegian pupils' English is very good, especially when it comes to communication, pronunciation and understanding, but they fall through when reading longer texts because they encounter words they do not understand. This hinders the pupils when reading longer texts.

Informant C claimed deep reading had a calming effect:

There is a reason why I read all the demanding texts together with my pupils. I'm forcing them into a form. I want them to feel the peace and quiet that eventually develops; that their pulse goes down and that reading is good.

Informant B suggested something similar:

It is my job to expose them to longer texts, because if there is something I believe in, in this broken up and snap-induced and so on, eh, like, their habits are likely that they do not expose themselves to longer English texts and so it is my job to do that.

Informant C and D also mentioned that deep reading was important in order to cultivate perspective-taking, and informant E mentioned *Bildung*. Informant C explains:

Well, I think that when they read, they get a relationship to it, both emotionally and that they become wiser, as well as it inspires their writing.

Informant D describes his experiences here:

I have done it like this, in order to gain new perspectives, I have found an extract from a novel to add a new perspective to the topic we are working on.

Informant E explains:

Deep reading, which is particularly important, especially when it comes to written communication, but also when it comes to *Bildung* which you address.

Lastly, it ought to be mentioned that during the interviews, none of the informants uttered negative attitudes towards teaching deep reading or the teaching of literature. None of them claimed it useless or a waste of time. Informant E claimed there was too little time to do it properly. My overall impression was that all five teachers enjoyed working with literature in the EFL-classroom and that they endeavoured to increase interest for reading literature among their pupils. Informant A, B and E shared statements that were explicitly positive towards reading literature. Informant A says, “I prefer reading fiction and my pupils often enjoy it, especially if they can recognise themselves in the stories”. Informant B informs “I enjoy working with short stories.” Informant E said he disliked reading before, when he was a young boy, but as an adult, he enjoyed it very much.

To sum up, the teachers addressed different perspectives on why deep reading was important. Mainly, the teachers seemed concentrated on techniques and skills.

#### **4.3.4 How teachers promote and work with deep reading in EFL**

This section presents how the teachers cultivate and motivate for deep reading in the EFL classroom. *How* they teach and *what* they teach will be addressed here. The teachers’

approaches will be presented as *before*, *during* and *after* deep reading activities. Then, their thoughts on the content (*what* to read) will be laid out.

All five teachers said they practiced reading strategies with their pupils. Informant D said she would instruct her 8th graders in reading strategies, but not her older pupils. Informant A explained that she would guide her pupils through a text, commenting on paragraph structure or just on how many paragraphs there were, looking at pictures and discussing the title. She would sometimes assign them the task to skim through the text before reading it from the beginning. Informant B said she did not instruct in reading strategies, because her pupils knew them and were used to her instructions from previous lessons. Informant C said she would ask her pupils to skim a text or instruct them to look at the text, using established techniques like the BISON overview or other techniques, such as looking at pictures or reading text in the margin. Informant D said she instructed her 8th graders in reading strategies, but not the 10th graders as they knew what to do. Informant E's main concern was vocabulary used timeing go through difficult words and phrases.

Also, all five of the teachers said they would discuss text categories or genres with their pupils. They had different explanations. Informant A did not mention genre features. Informant B said she would focus on the message of the text. Informant C found genre useful for the pupils and she often used writing frames, especially considering a future exam. She explained, "When they suddenly have an exam and are all alone and don't know. In the exams, it often says write a text, but knowing about genre and for example how to write an essay might be useful for them." Informant D said that in Norwegian classes they would focus more on the message of the text whereas in English they would use more time discussing text genre, such as the short story, novel or article. Informant E had spent most time on factual or argumentative articles and fictional stories. He also addressed the development of teaching genre:

Now, there has been changes concerning the teaching of genre, through the years, and what I find most popular among my pupils is to practice writing an argumentative text or an article, eh, so I have spent much time on this. It seems that most pupils, independent of their starting point, manage to build up an article in an okay way with an introduction, text body and conclusion. So I have spent a good deal of time doing

that. I have also spent some time on stories and how to create a good story. So, I have mostly worked with these two genres.

Before a deep reading activity, Informants A, B, C and E reported that they present the activity as a book reading project. The book project is presented as a positive and enjoyable activity where they use time motivating the pupils to read more for fun. For example, teacher B explained:

I had some boys now who wanted to read *Oliver Twist* by Dickens. I asked them if they didn't want something more up to date, but they said, "no, no." They really liked this story about *Oliver Twist*, found it very exciting. Well..... I kind of sold it in a bit, I told them that in this book he (Oliver) is taught how to steal, and they like, wow, can I read that book, hahaha, and I gave them an easy reader. But still, they read Dickens.

The teachers all explained aspects of the book projects for their pupils. They explained aspects such as the length of the project, its content, methods and which activities they are expected to perform when they are finished reading. They also explained how they expected their pupils to behave during reading sessions. For example, where they could sit while reading and what they are allowed to and not allowed to do.

Informants A, B, C and E prepared their pupils for reading in most of or all of the EFL-classes over a period from between one and two months. Informant D did not have experience with reading novels with her pupils in EFL, but she had done so in Norwegian. In EFL, Informant D mainly read extracts from novels or short stories as part of a larger topic study. Only Informant C reported reading the same book together with her pupils. In her work before reading the text she would typically talk about the title, the cover, illustrations or their expectation or immediate thoughts before starting to read. They would then sit in the classroom and read and listen simultaneously. Sometimes they would stop and have discussions or talk about difficult words along the way.

During book projects, Informants A, B and E started out by assisting their pupils in finding novels to read. They used libraries and the Internet to find literature. Informant B said she brought private books from home, and Informant E said he had ordered extra books in an attempt to match every pupil with a book they enjoyed. However, he said he often felt unable "to get the last five boys" to read during reading periods.

Informants A, B, C and E tried to understand their pupils' interest and level of comprehension. Informant C, who read the same book with her class, said it was sometimes challenging to reach everyone's level in class. In her opinion, some pupils would benefit from reading only two pages at a time and then discuss before reading on. She addressed group size:

I think large groups hinder that they may do deep reading on their personal level, some are behind and some do not get the challenges they really need and we end up somewhere in the middle.

Informant A also addressed challenges with reaching everyone:

If I find a text that everyone is going to use, it is difficult to reach everyone's level of understanding. In that case, I will make the text understandable by shortening it down or by adding explanations to their copies. This demands much more from me as a teacher. It's more time consuming to plan and prepare, but it may help the pupil, eh, because it is a pity if the alternative is that for example two or three of the pupils read something completely different than the rest.

Informant B mentioned how small groups enabled her to better reach and help everyone, "I am lucky to only have twelve pupils." She explains that this has made it easier for her to help everyone find something to read.

When having pupils read the same stories, normally short stories, all informants said they would work on understanding vocabulary, words, phrases or concepts. When reading novels, Informants A, B and E would spend less time on words, let their pupils read different books and sit or lie around the school building, in the library, classroom, hallway or a good place where they would feel relaxed. The teachers endeavoured to facilitate for positive reading experiences. As Informant B put it:

It isn't exactly a reading room, the classroom. You sit up straight. It doesn't exactly invite for cosy reading with a book to sit straight up for a long period of time. So, I believe, like, in my mind, they would concentrate better at home, so, in this period they were permitted to sit anywhere they felt comfortable, the library, the hallway, or they could lie down.

Informant A and E said they would sometimes let their pupils bring drinks, chocolate, juice or biscuits to the reading sessions. Informant A explained:

Sometimes in the library, they can bring a pillow, and sometimes if they have managed to read a lot, they can bring a chocolate or something, because not everyone enjoys reading so you have to motivate them or be a bit trickster-like.

Besides trying to create a positive environment, Informants A, B and E mirrored their pupils' behaviour during reading projects. They took part in the reading community with the pupils by reading books too. Instead of doing other work, for example assessing papers or planning lessons, they would practice the same activity that they expected their pupils to do. Informant B said she would sometimes help some of her pupils to sum up reading along the way.

Informants A and E had facilitated for deep reading activities without there necessarily being activities connected to them. A said she would sometimes let her pupils have a reading siesta where they read a book of their choice, just for enjoyment. Informant B and C said there would always be a pre- or after-reading activity connected to the reading, and Informant D said she could not remember having let her pupils ever read just for fun.

The after reading activities of deep reading projects were normally explained before the reading projects began. Mainly, the pupils would talk about what they had read, write a report, an analysis or a summary. They could also be asked to describe characters, the setting or other features from the stories. If the pupils read the same text, Informant A and C said they would use groups and let pupils discuss or answer questions. Informant C said she created groups where book conversations took place. She would then attend the groups in order to assess her pupils. Informant A said she would go through texts with the entire class. In cases where there was a film, Informants A and C said they would sometimes watch it and compare the film to the text. Informant B said her pupils could choose to present orally or written, normally she required an analysis of the text they had read where they used a technique she referred to as PPP; point, evidence, explain. The PPE-technique expected the pupils to find proof for their claims about the text. Informant D, who mainly used extracts from novels or short stories let her pupils answer questions to texts after reading them. She said she found it difficult to assess deep reading because an individual's interpretations and understanding of a text was individual.

For the bigger reading projects, Informants A, B and E let their pupils pick books to read. If their pupils had difficulties finding a read, they would help them or find something for them. Informant C was the only one who guided her pupils through the entire book reading project. Informant B said that depending of their level of comprehension, some of her pupils read thick novels whereas others read an easier short story. This was also the case in Informant A and E's groups. Informant A said she had experienced pupils picking books beyond their level of comprehension, which did not affect their motivation positively.

All the teachers, when reading extracts from novels or short stories together with their pupils in class, picked stories that they liked themselves or believed would be interesting or useful to their pupils. On which type of story she would recommend Informant A said, "stories they would recognise themselves in" or "be useful for them on the exam". Informant D remarked, "the only time I have had the impression that my pupils have been interested in deep reading is when we have been reading old exams." Informant B had another experience. She used an extract from an authentic text about slavery, *The Underground Railroad* by Colson Whitehead when the class had discussed slavery. Prior to the reading, her pupils had each been studying an American state. She was trying to visualise the African American's escape from slavery and after eagerly reading and discussing the text extract with her pupils, she asked them to investigate their state's stand on slavery. Some of her pupils realised that their state was not even established at the time of the American Civil War.

To sum up, the teachers seemed to endeavour facilitating for positive reading experiences. They would prepare for reading activities, teach reading, discuss texts and open up for role play. Three of the teachers would let their pupils choose which book to read. All five teachers would, though in different ways, endeavour to construct reading communities. They mentioned the importance of vocabulary building and its effects on writing performance.

#### **4.3.5 Examples from the classroom**

Question 15-17 intended to explore, through examples, how the deep reading processes were promoted and worked in the English classroom. Question 15 was an open question, seeking whatever information the teachers wished to share about deep reading activities. Four teachers used literary text examples, and one informant addressed issues of writing fiction rather than reading when answering this question. Questions 16 and 17 were more specific; exploring



teaching situations where the part-processes of deep reading, imagery and perspective taking, were recognised. As explained in section 2.3.1, these are vital aspects of the deep reading processes. The examples will be structured chronologically. In chapter 5, I will discuss whether the examples manage to maintain the deep reading processes.

Question 15: *Could you tell me about a school activity or a classroom situation where you worked on a novel, short story or a demanding article?*

Informant A read a modernised version of the story about the good Samaritan. Here, she said, her pupils had pre-knowledge about the biblical story so they had a reference when reading the modernised version. The story portrayed young kids with mobiles who were at the underground. The class read the story together, stopped and talked about what they read along the way, and she let her pupils talk and sum up together in groups. Afterwards, she facilitated for a roleplay in order for the pupils to work through what they just read. She distributed the roles for them.

Informant B read an authentic extract from *The Underground Railroad* by Whitehead. She added a glossary explaining difficult words to accompany the text. The glossary was distributed online. She read the text for her pupils, took breaks routinely to summarise parts of the text together with her class and she added follow up questions.

Informant C talked about how she would teach her pupils to write fiction, using a step-by-step programme. Here they focused on different aspects of fiction, such as how they could build a character or create excitement. She showed them model texts that they could use as guidance.

Informant D's example was about an experience she had when she read an extract from *Lord of the Rings* by Tolkien. After the reading, the pupils answered questions that were aimed at checking "how much they understood from what they read." I asked if the text extract they read was authentic or not. Informant D did not know.

Informant E read a book extract from Wilbur Smith. According to informant E, it was a brutal book with good descriptions and grotesque scenes:

Eh, and then there will be eyes popping, so I believe that if you want to get a class immersed in deep reading you need to choose literature strategically.

He said that afterwards, they would talk about why the book was good, and what choices the writer had made in order to make the book exiting.

*Question 16: Wolf talks about the term «imagery», the ability to visualise and form images while we read. Have you had any experiences in your teaching related to this? For example, in how you teach pupils to utilize visualisation and imagery? Or, maybe something has popped up during a classroom or teaching situation? Tell me, what are your thoughts and experiences when it comes to the teaching of imagery?*

Informant A used Bella in *Twilight* by Stephanie Meyer as an example. Informant A had asked her pupils, “Why do you think Bella in *Twilight* is not very well explained, as opposed to Edward, who is described as really handsome. Why do you think Bella’s looks are not explained in detail?” They would then discuss this, and Informant A would suggest that a possible explanation was that the reader should be able to identify with Bella or imagine being Bella. According to Informant A, the girls especially had acknowledged this.

Informant B said she may give her pupils an extract and ask them to continue writing. She would also let them roleplay or make a film. She gave an example where her pupils acted out a news report scene from the Tower of London. They should imagine that they were the first reporters on the scene after the imprisonment of Bloody Mary. Her pupils had made an Imovie, and she was enthusiastic when she talked about how her pupils had performed “with imagination and emotions and with music and the Imovie and, yes, it was just, fantastic, so they really got to visualise being there, with a pencil case as a microphone, and yes....”

Informant C said she would let the pupils talk about their images and how they imagined what they read. For example, she asked them to describe and explain which images they had gathered after reading a book. Afterwards, they saw the film and then discussed differences and similarities between the film and the book. She said this was a good approach if the topic or book was unknown to them. She said, however, that sometimes it would go the other way around. For example, many of her pupils had seen the films about Harry Potter and the images were there first. When they read, many of her pupils would have scenes in their head, and would sometimes realise that this scene did not match the scene in the book.

Informant D said she could not think of anything.

Informant E demonstrated using two examples. In an extract from Wilbur Smith, he had assisted with a picture as a background drop while reading a description:

There is a scene in the book where two people have had a fight and one of them is lying on the ground with a torn Achilles heel, unable to move and lying in the desert without access to water. The scene is very well written; it ends with the appearance of a vulture that patiently waits for the person to die. Eh, and the fight between the person and the vulture is relatively grotesquely described. What I may have done before reading this passage is to have a picture displaying a vulture on the wall, but not more than that, because the rest, they are going to imagine themselves.

The other example was from a text written by a young girl, “The girl who played with the wind,” which was about a girl committing suicide. He would go through the text one passage at a time, asking questions along the way such as, “What do you think will happen next, what do you imagine when we read this?”

*Question 17: Wolf talks about the term «perspective-taking», the ability to take on the perspective of others and the ability to put oneself in the shoes of others. Do you have any experiences in your teaching related to this? For example, in how you teach pupils to utilize perspective-taking? Or, maybe something has popped up during a classroom or teaching situation. Tell me. What are your thoughts and experiences when it comes to the teaching of perspective-taking?*

Informant A said it was about how you ask questions and how you activate the right thoughts. In her opinion, it was important to avoid just retelling a story. She gave an example where the class read a story about a car accident. She would ask questions such as: “How do you think it feels for the person who drove the car and ended up killing a child?” “What do you think it is like for the parents?” and “How do you think it was for the child, the child had died instantly.” She had also asked questions about the narrative technique, such as “Why do you think we only get to hear about what happened before and after, but not during the accident?” The teacher would run the discussion and urge her pupils to take on different perspectives.

Informant B was also asking her pupils different types of questions. She would run a discussion and urge her pupils to take on different perspectives. She gave an example from the short story, “A Day’s Wait” by Ernest Hemingway. In the story, a boy overhears a conversation about body temperature and draws the conclusion that his own temperature is so high that he must be about to die. Informant B says:

The father’s name is Celsius, which is the whole point, so to challenge the pupils on imagining being nine years old and lying in bed overhearing that conversation. What goes through your mind? And what goes on in the father’s mind when he realises that his son has been lying there convinced he is about to die? The story isn’t so intimidating since it’s a misunderstanding, after all he isn’t going to die.

Informant C would use dramatization, facilitating for role play. She used an example from the book *The Curious Incident with the Dog in the Night Time* by Mark Haddon. The task was to make a role play about being different like the main character in the story, who presumably has Asperger’s syndrome.

Informant D said they once learned about the Commonwealth and that when investigating a new topic or place, the pupils would sometimes say that they didn’t think it was like that there and that they had imagined it to be different. The pupils’ perspectives on the place shifted as new knowledge was acquired.

Informant E used discussions and would let his pupils talk together in groups. He said larger groups were an advantage because then there were better opportunities to learn from more pupils. He said that the pupils learned a lot from each other and explained “around texts dealing with empathy where maybe some pupils don’t manage to see the message, you may have other pupils who manage to put it into words.” Another great opportunity was the classroom where an open-minded and safe environment would provide the pupils a positive arena to bring in their thoughts and perspectives.

#### **4.3.6 Other interesting findings**

According to the teachers, there were challenges concerning the teaching of deep reading. Informant B thought that access to literature was an obstacle. Informant E also mentioned difficulties in finding the right book, but his main concern was too few teaching hours in

English. Informant C mentioned group size as a hindrance to better adapt for deep reading on an individual level. Informant A said pupils gave up too easily in their encounter with longer and more time-consuming texts. Informant D said the pupils lacked knowledge about words and concepts to fully immerse in deep reading.

Another interesting perspective was enlightened by two comments from Informants B and C. They both addressed the issues of reflecting upon learning and teaching. Informant C added that she and her colleagues would spend 20 minutes together with each pupil about learning. They would talk about the English subject, how the pupil could best learn, as well as discuss the pupils' social role in the group. Informant C said:

You cannot start with deep learning before you understand why you learn things, and we have noticed a big difference after beginning to ask what they need this learning for, and they say smart things.

Informant B said:

This conversation has made me more aware about reading and on how much I do subconsciously, and that I have to offer a contrast to the speed in which we work with texts, they need depth.

#### **4.4 TEACHERS' OBSERVATIONS**

In this section, I will present what the teachers said about their pupils' performances, endurance, habits and attitudes. The first seven questions requested the teachers to scale their level of agreement to statements, using Likert scale from one to five, one being least, to gain a better perspective, some statements were general, other were specific. Further comments were encouraged and welcomed. Here is what they answered:

#### 4.4.1 Likert scale table displaying teachers' observations

	Observation:	Informant A	Informant B	Informant C	Informant D	Informant E
1	My pupils are good readers:	4, "they did well on national tests"	4	"In the middle, because I have both, 3"	"Very varied, in the middle"	4
2	My pupils can concentrate on a longer text for 10 min:	5	5	5	"Some, a few"	5
3	20 min:	4	4	"Most of them [manage to read for 20 min]"	"Very varied, many fall behind"	4
4	30 min:	4	4	"I usually don't read for more than 20-25 minutes"	"Very few"	"Two or three pupils perhaps, it depends on the pupils"
5	Longer:	"One hour if they read their own book, otherwise thirty minutes"	"I loose quite many, mostly boys"	.....	"Two or three pupils perhaps"	.....
6	My pupils are motivated for reading longer texts:	"No, maybe two, I think very few read at home"	"4 -when they may choose which book to read"	"Yes, they are motivated when we read novels with them, we build up their expectation and have a kick off"	"Some are motivated, others are not"	"Two or three pupils are motivated before we begin, but it is a fairly big job for a teacher to motivate many of the pupils"
7	My pupils are easily distracted when reading longer texts:	4	"3+, 4, it depends on the choice of book, and the classroom isn't exactly a reading room"	"hm, the only time there is absolute quiet is when we read and listen"	"yes, they easily shift focus"	"when the pupils are at different levels, it is challenging"

#### 4.4.2 Performance and endurance

There is consensus in the first three questions. The informants consider that most pupils “are good readers.” Four informants report that their pupils can concentrate during reading for ten minutes. Four out of five also claim most pupils manage to stay focused for twenty minutes. The informants all report various degrees of decline in concentration as the texts get longer. Informant A and B mentioned that pupils may stay focused much longer if reading a book of their choice. Three of the informants mentioned that there were differences between boys and girls and that boys struggled more when it came to deep reading. Informant A said boys were more outspoken in a negative matter towards the activity than girls, Informant B said that boys did not endure reading for as long as girls. Informant E explained how he strategically chose reads in order to reach the boys, whom he often experienced struggled more, “boys are often behind on deep reading.” However, all of the teachers frequently mentioned individual differences among pupils and the teachers were many times hesitant to generalize their answers. An exchange from the interview with Informant E illustrates this:

L: 30 minutes?

E: Two-three pupils, and yes, two-three because it is very pupil-dependent

L: Longer?

E: .....

L: The pupils are motivated for long and more time-demanding reads?

E: Two-three are motivated, I think. As I talked about earlier, it is quite a big job for a teacher to motivate some of the pupils to do just that.

L: Some are maybe motivated before you begin, and some you manage to motivate?

E: Exactly, and a final third is very hard to motivate, even when you have the right text, the right book.

L: The pupils are easily distracted when reading longer, more time-consuming texts?

E: Well, again, what is kind of hard and that we haven't really discussed is, if you are going to have the same text, a longer literary texts where the intention is that you are going to read and reflect around the content of that text, like, we have a class, and as you are aware of there are many different levels of understanding among pupils in a

class, eh, so this makes it very demanding to read the same text, to sit together with the same book, so that is why I have, as I mentioned, more success, if it's going to be a longer literary text, to adapt (for an individual book), but then again, you will miss the opportunity to in the same way, go through the text together.

Answers concerning how easily distracted pupils were while reading were diverse. Informant A and D said they agreed, Informant A said “4” (agree) and Informant D said, “yes, pupils are easily distracted,” whereas informant C’s statement claimed the opposite expressing that they were focused during deep reading sessions. Informant B answered that it depended on the book they read.

#### **4.4.3 Strategies and habits**

When asked to say something about their pupils deep reading strategies and habits, all informants assumed that their pupils mostly skim-read or scanned texts. The words *skimming* and *scanning* were used interchangeably without further explanation. Informant A, B and C said their pupils would encounter reflective reading mainly in school. Informant A explains, “but reflective reading, then I will have to be there and lead.” Informant B said that “they meet coherence in school,” while Informant C said that the pupils use their spare time on how-to videos and scanning whilst the reflective reading happens in school. Here, Informant C did not give examples, she said scanning but may have meant skimming.

Informant A said, “When thinking about habits, I mostly think of bad habits, but I’ll try and think of both good and bad”. She said reading went well if they read alone, especially with hard copies, but she mentioned that many of her pupils were easily distracted by each other if they sat close together while reading. An example of this is if one would read a bad word, he/she might say “look at this word,” and the others would be distracted. If they read on the iPad, the iPad itself might be a distraction. She had experienced that they had sent messages, played online computer games or listened to music on their iPad instead of reading. She believed the iPad could assist in reading activities if used specifically for that purpose. She said, “this might work if the use of the iPad was better, now it’s like they use it for listening to music or sending messages and all kinds of strange things.” Her pupils would also play computer games on their iPads. However, according to Informant A, her pupils were fairly well self-regulated if they “do not hate the book, then they can read longer, than if reading



online.” Another challenge which she mentioned was the pupils’ struggles to seek out suitable reading material online. Pupils would spend much time googling and searching and less time on actual reading. Also, as a teacher, she spent time “sometimes wasted”, on seeking out good, relevant and suitable literature for her pupils, but may end up with denied accessed due to payment requirements. She also said, “So, it is, like, in a way, that the digital tools give us possibilities but also limitations.” Informant A also suggested that hard copies were better to read from than an iPad because of the distractions on the iPads.

Informant B believed that her pupils were able to endure longer reads and that they understood more words than they realised and explained, “They have an amazing passive vocabulary.” However, she also believed that very few read books in their spare time. Also, the gamers, she claimed, did well because of their vocabulary, “but they need more input (that something happens/excitement) in order to endure longer.” Her pupils in the middle would need more support and assistance, for example a talk and summing up after having read another chapter. Similarly, Informant E mentioned that assessment tests had shown that pupils struggled with “reading between the lines”.

Informant C, like Informant A and B, believed very few of her pupils read books in their spare time. She believed that the kind of texts they read were mainly for practical use, including “how to” videos on YouTube. Informant C’s pupils were guided and monitored through reading activities by their teacher. She explained how she forced her pupils into a form of behaviour: “there’s a reason why I am reading all the demanding texts together with my pupils, I’m forcing them into a form”. Informant E, who, like Informants A and B, let his pupils choose a book and read for themselves during reading projects, said he had experienced that some pupils just pretended to read. But he assumed that his pupils did what they had to, deep reading included, as many were motivated by wanting to do well in school. In his experience, to read on their own, they needed motivation, but when reading together it was easier to involve everyone in the reading process. He believed some pupils would struggle with self-regulated learning explaining, “it is in my experience difficult if they read a demanding text, especially if they have no pre-knowledge of it”. He said many fell through because of difficult words.

Informants A and D said that their pupils would often go straight ahead and try and find information about what the text is about without reading it. Informant A seemed to find this

frustrating, “I feel they just skim through the text, and there are some pupils, they just go straight on looking for information without reading it first.” Informant D said her pupils would read texts that were useful to them. She mainly referred to online information seeking. Some pupils would find the information they needed, others would need more assistance in searching out information online, as some struggled more with words and concepts. Her pupils used mainly Wikipedia and regular Google searches.

#### **4.4.4 Attitudes**

When discussing their pupils’ attitudes towards deep reading, the teachers would mostly emphasise individual differences, but also mention variables like gender, level of maturity, and their pupils’ prior reading experiences. As gender has already been discussed, I will only repeat that three teachers claimed boys struggled more with motivation, attitudes or endurance.

Informants A, B, C and E said that the 8th graders typically responded more negatively to information about reading projects than older pupils. Informant A, B and C said their pupils would be more negative when inexperienced with reading books. However, Informant D said her 10th graders had been more negative than her 8th graders. Informant A, B and C claimed that pupils enjoyed it more as they got used to it. Informant A said some of her pupils used the argument that their parents never read a book so they did not have to either. Informant A mentioned many potential challenges:

Many pupils hear at home from their parents that they have never read a book in their life and so you don’t have to either. My pupils struggle with thinking out of context, to be independent. I discover it in their vocabulary, and the funny thing is that they are digital natives but I feel more competent than them in finding this and that online.

Informant E, who taught in a private school focusing on sports, said “it is fairly agreed upon at my school, that reading is boring.” Informant C said that if she gave her pupils a mission connected to the reading activity, they would be positive, but she regarded that they were not ready to enjoy reading for readings sake. She believed that her pupils would understand the point of reading more as they got older saying, “I think it has to do with age, age and maturity.”

#### **4.5 SUMMARY OF INTERESTING FINDINGS**

Data from the interviews point in the direction that all informants endeavoured to facilitate for positive reading experiences. In different ways, the teachers tried to create good reading communities. During book reading projects, there was a difference in how much the teachers supervised the processes. Informant C's pupils were followed through the entire book reading project, whereas the pupils of Informants A, B and E were given more responsibility and individual choice. The teachers addressed different challenges, possibilities and preferences concerning technology's interaction with deep reading. An interesting finding was to note that the informants seemed to reflect much upon what kind of texts their pupils read and how these texts were read and worked with before, during or after, but not much upon which medium these texts were read from. Pupils habits will also be discussed.

## **5 DISCUSSION**

---

### **5.1 INTRODUCTION**

In this chapter, the teachers' thoughts and practices regarding how they promote and experience deep reading in EFL will be discussed in light of the theory presented in chapter 2. The discussion will be structured under these five headlines:

- Digital reading and reading on paper practices
- Deep reading perspectives held by the teachers
- Deep reading instruction practices
- Experiences with part-processes of deep reading, focusing on imagery and perspective-taking
- Experiences with learners' performances, habits and attitudes.

### **5.2 DIGITAL READING AND READING ON PAPER PRACTICES**

#### **5.2.1 Introduction**

There are three relevant and inter-related themes to consider when looking into EFL teaching practices concerning digital reading and reading on paper. These are the distribution of time, the national curriculum and teachers' felt or tacit understanding of deep reading practices. As shown in table 4.3.1.1, all informants reported reading both digitally and on paper. Four of five teachers reported that their pupils would read on a digital device more often than in paper format.

#### **5.2.2 Time**

Based on the information about how much time is spent on digital reading and reading on paper (see table in 4.3.1.1), I wonder how much time is actually spent on reading on paper. In retrospect, I realise that I could have asked the teachers this question explicitly. However,

since I did not, I had to look at the data available. As specified in *The Knowledge Promotion*, pupils in lower secondary school are to undergo 222 teaching hours of English from year 8-10 (2006/13). If divided equally among the three years of lower secondary schooling, the pupils will have 74 teaching hours in English per year.

Considering what the teachers reported, this means that of 74 teaching hours, pupils read more than half this time from a digital device. This time estimate does not count the amount of time spent on writing, talking or other EFL activities that are not reading. Thus, the interviews suggest that not much time is spent on reading on paper.

Wolf (2018) claims that the dimension of time spent on digital reading affects comprehension, knowledge and cognitive patience. She says she worries that “multiple hours (and years) of daily screen reading, are subtly changing the allocation of our attention to key processes when reading longer, more demanding texts” (p. 39). As explained in chapter 2, Wolf (2018) argues that digital reading is well suited for practicing skimming, browsing and the reading of shorter texts, but that reading on paper is better for cultivating contemplation and cognitive patience.

Informant E was the only one who reflected on the amount of time spent on deep reading on paper in EFL. On the question on how he believed technology affected with deep reading he said:

One can read from a book and I don't know if there is a difference, eh, when it comes to the pupils' learning outcome, or motivation or how much time teachers spend on this. I think maybe we are heading in the direction where we spend less time on it (deep reading) because we have learning technology. I think that most EFL teachers spend less time on it now than before.

This interview extract implies that teacher E has reflected upon, but does not know exactly, how technology affects or interacts with deep reading.

### **5.2.3 Medium**

In my study, the pupils of two of my informants used iPads. Three of the teachers reported having Chromebooks. Like text books, the digital device was school property but was handed

out one to each pupil to keep for one or more years. Apart from the textbooks and sometimes other books if available, the digital device was the only available medium to read from. The iPad was frequently used as an extended textbook. A Chromebook is a laptop whereas an iPad resembles a smartphone. Liu's research (2016) compared laptop reading with smartphone reading and found that smartphone reading resulted in more browsing and scanning. The study found that instead of consuming entire larger chunks of texts, the students read less concentrated and less in depth and would skim read in patterns resembling the letters Z or F. This suggests that readers may transfer reading strategies from one device to another, which may ultimately affect comprehension. It is worth contemplating on to what extent the pupils build good reading habits when reading on their iPads or Chromebooks. Here, I believe that the Core Curriculum (2017) offers a special potential for positive development in this area. With the overarching aim "learning to learn," there are opportunities to teach medium awareness and practice reading in different mediums. EFL teachers, together with their pupils, can discuss and reflect upon potentials and limitations of different mediums in combination with the different reading activities.

Mangen's studies (2013; 2019) also suggest that pupils would benefit from learning more about medium awareness and how to choose wisely between them. Her studies discuss the spatial dimension of reading and how it connects to cognition and comprehension and suggest that it is not indifferent what medium one reads from. When we read, we can hold something, a book or a magazine that we can see, touch, smell and feel. Studies like these suggest that in order for pupils to develop good deep reading skills, pupils may benefit from having access to different mediums to read from.

Borg (2003) argues that in order for EFL teaching practices to be more productive, teachers need to challenge themselves and question their teaching practices. My informants defend their practices regarding different aspects of their teaching, such as why and how they teach deep reading and which texts they choose. However, surprisingly, none of the teachers defended their choice of medium. Informant E said he knew there existed research claiming digital reading "isn't necessarily for the better." He acted partly upon this knowledge by for example ordering extra books, however not consistently. Informant D said she chose the digital device "if information had to be new," but all in all, the teachers seemed to be less concerned with which medium the texts in general were read from. Mainly, the teachers

would let their pupils read from a book or a digital device out of practical reasons, not pedagogical reasons. For example, Informant C said she assumed that to read on paper or screen would be “all the same,” and Informant B said she would let her pupils read from their tablet if the book was unavailable as hard copy.

However, a counterintuitive finding was that the teachers did express their preferences about which medium to read from. Informants A, B and C said that they wanted that their pupils to read from a book and not the digital device during reading projects. Informant B said she wanted her pupils to have “a physical book and just sit there,” and Informant C remarked that it could be an alternative to read the literature on the Chromebook, but that she preferred “they get to hold a physical book and that they get to see how far they have read in the book.” Informant B and C’s preference corroborates with Mangen’s studies (2013, 2019) that emphasise the spatial dimension of reading. I believe this finding implies that Informants A, B and C express their experience through a tacit understanding of what they believe to be good pedagogical practice. This “felt”, or tacit, understanding can also be understood in light of Borg’s (2003) theory on teacher cognition. Although, teacher cognition is an immense area of research and cannot be pinned down to simple explanations, I believe that Informants A, B and C express a value which is part of their teacher cognition. This value may have been shaped by their own preferences for reading, former experiences or teaching practices.

As explained in section 1.4, Wolf (2018) suggests that deep reading can be mediated by digital tools. Nevertheless, she claims it is vital to cultivate both digital and non-digital reading. Informants A, B and C believe deep reading on paper is better than deep reading on a digital device. This belief was compromised if paper books were unavailable. According to Borg (2003), teachers’ beliefs do not always correspond with what they do in the classroom. This may be due to surprising elements or that the context conflicts with their ideals (Borg, 2003, p. 94). This may be a possible explanation. Informants A, B and C believed that reading on paper was better to read from than from a digital device. Nonetheless, they would let their pupils read from a digital device because the context, hard copies being unavailable, made the ideal, reading on paper, unrealisable.

Another interesting perspective to include in the debate on medium awareness is *how* teachers B and C express themselves when talking about the mediums. The two informants chose to use value-laden remarks when explaining why they wanted their pupils to read from books

instead of from a digital device. Informant B said she wanted the reading project to be “old-fashioned,” and Informant C said, “it’s almost like it’s a bit of an archaic way of teaching.” These statements made me reflect upon whether the introduction of new technologies has altered the way books are perceived, or only represent the two informants in this particular study. The two statements imply that Informants B and C perceive digital reading and reading books as different. A possible explanation might be that they wish to communicate that they are aware of the fact that the world has moved forward in a more technological direction, but nonetheless value traditional teaching materials. Another possible explanation for their choice of wording may be that it reflects the context of increased implementation of digital devices in schools, which has moved the debate on digitalisation and learning in a more polarised direction (Bigum & Kenway, 2005). In this polarised landscape, we often see that technology is regarded as modern and up to date, whereas books are regarded as outdated and old-fashioned.

#### **5.2.4 The curriculum**

An interesting perspective when interviewing the teachers was that there were few statements suggesting that they reflected on the different possibilities and limits of the different mediums when working with deep reading. This lack of reflection was at first surprising, but after consulting the curriculum, one realises its vagueness in its aims and requests about medium awareness.

Since the implementation of *The Knowledge Promotion* (2006/13), digital skills are considered a basic skill. The curriculum states that digital skills are developed through the use of digital resources in *acquiring* knowledge and *expressing* one’s competence (my emphasis). *The Knowledge Promotion* states that pupils should reflect upon when to use a digital device: “independence and judgement in the choice and use of digital tools, media and resources” ([https://www.udir.no/contentassets/fd2d6bfbf2364e1c98b73e030119bd38/framework\\_for\\_basic\\_skills.pdf](https://www.udir.no/contentassets/fd2d6bfbf2364e1c98b73e030119bd38/framework_for_basic_skills.pdf)). However, throughout the curriculum, there are no specifications about when not to use a digital device, nor specifications addressing challenges or opportunities of different mediums. There are explicit aims and recommendations about using a variety of digital tools for learning and for learning to distinguish between them. Nonetheless, little instruction is added about when it is most convenient *not* to use digital tools. In the end, it is up to the



school staff, teachers and learners to decide when and how to use the digital tools and for what purpose. This requires that teachers, as well as learners, possess the competence and knowledge to do so.

Another perspective on *The Knowledge Promotion* (2006/13), is how it instructs teachers in the English subject. Informant D was the only teacher who did not read an entire novel with her pupils. However, she supplied a “new perspective” on a fact-oriented theme using literary extracts or short stories. She explained that she felt this was more efficient than reading an entire novel. In section 2.9, I discuss the concept of teacher cognition. Borg, (2003) describes this as amongst other things the culmination of a person’s beliefs, thoughts and knowledge. With this in mind, it is interesting to recall that informant D finished her teacher training in 2016. This means that she had recently been instructed in how to use *The Knowledge Promotion* (2006/13). Informant D has studied political science and taught social science in addition to English. Her educational background and teacher practice indicate that both the subject curricula: Social Science and English, are likely to be fresh in her memory. In addition to being new to teaching, she may be concerned with managing her teaching correctly. These may be factors affecting her teacher cognition and may be a possible explanation as to why she would not include an entire novel in her English courses.

In my view, the competence aims in *The Knowledge Promotion* (2006/13) are represented as industrious and not targeted at teaching deep reading. To begin with, as many as thirty competence aims may force the teachers to be economical in their teaching approaches and may require frequent assessment situations. It may also affect the deep reading as it changes the focus from the reading in itself to the after-reading activities, where the reading can be documented and assessed. Consequently, frequent assessment situations demand teaching approaches that require production. As explained in chapter 2.7, Atkinson and Coffey (2011) explain how official documents are not neutral (p. 77 -78) and may represent “institutionalised boasting” (p. 84). Considering this, it appears that *The Knowledge Promotion* (2006/13) aims at reflecting an effective and pragmatic society as it demands for production. I believe the new subject curriculum, LK20 (2019), offers a new direction, as it presents a more unified syllabus which seems to hold the value of contemplation higher than *The Knowledge Promotion* (2006/13). This is evident in the new English subject curriculum (LK20) where there is more room for in-depth learning. For example, the core element

“encounter with English speaking texts” (2019) contributes to strengthen the position of the text itself. This core element is also considered in the new Norwegian curriculum (LK20, (2019) see: norsk) under the heading “text in context” (2019).

### **5.2.5 Summary**

The digital device was frequently used as an extended textbook. Studies support that pupils may transfer reading strategies from one device to another, however more research is required. *The Knowledge Promotion* (2006/13) is unspecific about limitations of digital devices and about when to use a digital device for reading and when not to use one. My overall impression was that the teachers would read from whatever medium was available without contemplating on whether this was the best course of action or not in order to maximise the outcome of the reading. However, quite interestingly, Informants A, B, C and E seemed to have a “feeling” or tacit knowledge of when they believed that their pupils would best benefit reading from paper or screen.

## **5.3 PERSPECTIVES HELD BY THE TEACHERS**

### **5.3.1 Introduction**

When discussing the perspectives held by the teachers, some unifying and some multiple perspectives (Crystal, 2014, p. 274) were revealed. Multiple perspectives, as explained in chapter 3.3, mean that many viewpoints from different individuals, in this case the teachers, are presented under one theme. Multiple perspectives make it difficult to say something unifying or summarising about the teachers’ perspectives. However, it is relevant to consider why they think teaching deep reading in EFL is important. Furthermore, the teachers’ own attitudes, and views on benefits of and challenges with deep reading are interesting to explore.

### **5.3.2 Why teach deep reading?**

The teachers all held perspectives on why deep reading in EFL was important. Benefits of deep reading were addressed directly or indirectly. Some of these views centred on the development of skills, such as deep reading’s positive effects on vocabulary and writing. Other reasons focused on facilitating for emotional development, for example using deep

reading to regulate emotions and calm down. Contemplation and perspective-taking were also mentioned. Challenges with the cultivating of deep reading were access to literature and difficulties in reaching every pupil with motivational reading material. One informant also mentioned time.

One of the unifying perspectives was that all five informants believed that deep reading was important in order to cultivate writing. My informants' concern aligns with Krashen's input hypothesis as explained in section 2.4. Krashen (1981) views input as the main success factor in language learning and believes that language is acquired through exposure to language. Like Krashen, my five informants understand input as affecting the output. This perspective, that input affects output, is exemplified by both instrumentalist and holistic views. The holistic view was represented by all informants. They believed deep reading increased their pupils' vocabulary and ability to express themselves. An example of an instrumentalist view was stated by Informant E who explained that deep reading was important in order to combat poor reading scores among lower secondary school pupils on national tests. He said that "they fall through when reading longer texts because they encounter words they do not understand and this hinders the pupils when reading longer texts."

Four of the teachers addressed reading's impact on and importance for understanding and speaking. This aligns with Vygotsky's view on the importance of language skills in order to communicate one's thoughts, as described in section 2.4. Vygotsky viewed language as a social construct and has explained how language is a tool for the individual's further development of thoughts (Vygotsky, 1986, p. 120). Researchers like Simensen (2007) and Hellekjær (2007) have discussed vocabulary's importance in an EFL context. When interviewing the teachers, they did not refer to theory but explained that they believed vocabulary building was important. I perceived their reflections as tacit knowledge and believe this too can be viewed as an example of Borg's concept of teacher cognition, "what teachers know, believe and do" (Borg, 2003, p. 81). Interestingly, Borg (2003) refers to a study by Gatlinton (1999) where he found that the most common focus of teachers' pedagogical thoughts was concern for language management such as explaining vocabulary and creating contexts for meaningful use (p. 93).

Informants B and C seemed committed to using deep reading activities as a tool in order to offer the opportunity for contemplation and counterbalance trends in society. For example,

informant C said she wanted her pupils to feel the “peace and quiet”, and informant B said she felt it was her job to expose her pupils to longer reads. Informant C also believed deep reading regulated emotions as it contributed with “peace and quiet that eventually develops, that the pulse goes down and that reading is good.” This is also relevant for the overarching aim in the *Core Curriculum* “health and life skills” which states it shall “give the pupils competence which promotes sound physical and mental health” (2017). This suggests that Informant C acknowledged that competences of the future are not only subject specific but also emotional. Informant B’ convictions can be linked with Hylland-Eriksen’s (2001) claims that reading hastily interrupts longer thoughts and reflection.

because if there is something I believe in, in this broken up and snap-induced and so on, eh, like, their habits are likely that they do not expose themselves to longer English texts, and so it is my job to do that.

Two of the informants shared ideas in line with all-round development and perspective-taking. Informant E mentioned all-round development explicitly. *The Knowledge Promotion* (2006/13) reflects the notion that literary texts add valuable insights into other cultures, the Other and oneself, and may give readers valuable insights; thoughts also addressed by Fenner (2011; 2018), Wolf (2018) and Hoff (2013; 2018). I believe this aligns well with what three of the informants said. Informant C says “Well, I think that when they read, they get a relationship to it, both emotionally and that they become wiser,” Informant D explains, “In order to gain new perspectives, I have found an extract from a novel to add a new perspective to the topic we are working on,” while informant E describes the importance of deep reading, especially when it comes to written communication, but also when it comes to *Bildung*. These statements suggest that the teachers reflect beyond the mere technical benefits of practicing deep reading.

### **5.3.3 Teachers’ attitudes on teaching deep reading**

I believe that teachers who enjoy reading themselves are more prone to be successful in the deep reading classroom. My overall impression was that all five teachers enjoyed working with literature, but that one informant preferred factual texts. Informants A, B and E shared statements that were explicitly positive towards reading literature.

### 5.3.4 Challenges

To reach every pupil with a text matching their interest and difficulty level can be challenging. This was also evident in this study. Some teachers reported spending a lot of time trying to match up pupils with good reads. Birketveit and Rimmereide (2017) who studied 11-year old learners' language progress after extensive reading of picture books in EFL, concluded that an implication for learning outcome was that the pupils' level of competence was matched by the right level of challenge. This aligns with Simensen (2007) who highlights the necessity to "practice with texts at the right level of difficulty" (p. 150), as well as Krashen's (1981) comprehensible input hypothesis.

Informant C read the same book with her class. She found it challenging to reach everyone's level of comprehension due to group size explaining "I think large groups hinder that they may do deep reading on their personal level, some are behind and some do not get the challenges they really need and we end up somewhere in the middle." Despite this insight, Informant C held on to her practice reading the same book with her class. Birketveit's and Rimmereide's (2017) study concluded that pupils who read books of their choice were more motivated for extensive reading.

The Informants A, B and E reported spending a lot of time on trying to find books matching their pupils' level of comprehension and interest. Informant E for example, explained how he once ordered extra literature for thousands of Norwegian kroner and as result "managed to connect a few more. Still I did not manage to connect the last five-six pupils to the task." I wonder if this time could be managed more methodically. For example, the amount of time Informant E reported spending on administering reading projects and ordering books did not seem insignificant. In my judgement, cooperating with other school employees and delegating the ordering of books to school librarians could save teachers' time. Instead, a teacher could spend time targeting processes of the deep reading more systematically.

Two informants mentioned that access to literature may be a challenge; however, both of these teachers remarked that the possibilities of accessing more literary texts were now greater because of the digital devices. Informant B for example, had let two of her pupils read novels online because the hard copies were unavailable. This example is a good illustration that a

digital device can contribute to reach more pupils with an interesting read matching their level of comprehension.

Informant E claimed that there was too little time to do deep reading properly. I agree with him. Considering the amount of time available in the course of lower secondary school (222 teaching hours in the course of three years), as well as the amount of competence aims, thirty in total (LK06/13), I believe little time is left to contemplate on novels. However, as already mentioned, the new curriculum gives reason for optimism. Firstly, in-depth learning is implemented as one of its key concepts in the Core Curriculum (2017). Secondly, the subject specific aims have been reduced to nineteen in LK20 (2019). The competence aims in this new curriculum are mainly expressed through active verbs (use, express, explore, write, describe), and only two aims are specifically targeting the reading of literature: “read discuss and convey content from different texts” and “read, interpret and reflect on English-speaking literature.” Nonetheless, in addition to the core element “encounter with English texts,” there are three more aims in LK20 (2019) that can be perceived as opening up for deep reading. These are:

- To use sources critically.
- Explore and reflect upon the situation of minorities in the English-speaking world and in Norway.
- Explore and describe ways of living and thinking, explore communication patterns and diversity in the English-speaking world. (my translation)

In the first bullet point, the competence aim can apply for both literary and factual text sources. In the second competence aim, literary texts can add valuable insights into the history of individuals and provide understanding of how it feels to grow up in a minority culture. The third aim can be understood as literary texts being valuable point of departures when the intention is to explore diversity, different ways of thinking and living, and different communication patterns.

Teaching pupils deep reading in EFL may demand more cognitive patience than teaching them to read in their first language. In this regard, Informant A’s remark considering the digital device both a challenge and a supplement was particularly interesting. I was of the impression that she was ambiguous about the iPad and not quite consistent in how to best

utilise it. On one side, she used its apps and resources available in order to increase the learning outcome saying, “if you read ‘deep reading’ with an iPad, you may be aided by, for example, having the text read out aloud for you.” On the other side, she said it was challenging due to her pupils’ habits of falling for distractions on the digital device. Wolf (2018) is concerned about distractions because distractions threaten focus, which in turn can threaten long term memory. This is relevant for CC17’s (now LK20) demands for self-regulated learning. However, distractions can be both internal and external. External factors can be addressed directly by teachers. For example, a teacher can endeavour to provide the pupils with a good space to read. In contrast, internal distractions are more difficult to address. If a pupil is reading a book, there is no guarantee that the pupil is actually engaging with the text. Informant A’s example suggests that her pupils lack practice and strategies in being self-regulated when reading deeply on the iPad. This seems to give Informant A a sense of lacking control, and might be a possible explanation for her mixed feelings about the iPad. Considering Brevik’s research (2015) on teaching reading strategies and research on how to grow a growth mindset (Bettinger, Ludvigsen, Rege, et al., 2017; Claro, Dweck, et al., 2016), I believe in addressing the distractions prior to a deep reading activity by engaging in metacognitive conversations. By tailoring the reading more systematically and by practicing self-regulated learning, for example by addressing the internal distractions, pupils can develop their ability to self-motivate and to develop into sustainable deep reading habits.

### **5.3.5 Summary**

In this section, I discussed multiple perspectives, as well as insight into teacher cognition (Borg, 2003). I believe these perspectives draw on what Borg (2003) describe as “complex, practically-oriented, personalised, and context-sensitive networks of knowledge, thoughts, and beliefs” (p. 81) The teachers’ responses reveal underlying values, such as why they believe teaching deep reading in EFL was important. Some of their views confirmed theories, such as language output being dependent on input (Krashen, 1981). Perspective-taking was addressed, and challenges with the cultivating of deep reading addressed time, access to literature and difficulties in reaching every pupil with a read that matched their field of interest and level of competence.

## **5.4 DEEP READING INSTRUCTION PRACTICES IN EFL**

### **5.4.1 Introduction**

In this section, I discuss how the teachers promote and work with deep reading in the EFL classroom. I will concentrate on the book reading projects, and three inter-related aspects will be considered: approaches, contextual realities and reading strategies. The teaching approaches will be addressed as *before*, *during* and *after* deep reading activities. When considering the contextual realities, I will reflect on how some of the teachers change their classroom routines during book projects and endeavour to create good reading environments. I will discuss reading communities and how the teachers work with reading strategies.

### **5.4.2 Approaches**

All the teachers approached the question on how they taught deep reading through literature as something they had a practice for. Looking at their experiences, four of the teachers had organised bigger reading projects where pupils would read an entire novel. Studying these book projects, they implied both opportunities and challenges for the development of deep reading skills. It could for example be challenging to reach everyone's field of interest or level of comprehension, but at the same time, made it easier to facilitate adapted reading.

Four of the informants documented having organised bigger reading projects with a duration of between one and two months, where pupils would read a longer text, preferably an entire novel. A time span of this length enables the pupils to step in and out of a story, which may allow them to practice their cognitive patience as well as vital deep reading processes. Wolf (2018) believes that time is important in order to develop perspective-taking. Informant E, who spent two months on the project, said, "I still haven't managed to decide for myself if it's worth the time." In my view, in a deep reading perspective, two months can be time well spent. Wolf (2018) emphasises the importance of allocating enough time to be able to fully immerse in the deep reading processes. Another argument is that fiction is a way to simulate what happens in the real world, thus being relevant for "health and life skills." Fictional characters can teach us a lot about real people. I therefore believe the time the informants spend on the projects is a valid justification, as it takes time to get to know, understand, and



sometimes even like fictional characters, the same way it takes time to get to know and understand real people.

Informants A, B and E let their pupils read a novel of their choice. Adjustments were made, meaning that some pupils would read long and comprehensive novels whereas others would read an easy reader. In the pre-reading phase, preparation included talking about the project. Informants A, B and E would also spend time trying to match their pupils with a suitable text or book. Birketveit and Rimmereide (2017) found learners responded mostly positively to a book reading project and were motivated by the fact that they could select the books they were to read. Informants A, B and E had experience with this; however, they also explained how it was not without efforts. Informant D, perhaps due to only having two years of teaching experience, had only organised the reading of extracts from novels. A possible explanation might be that her educational background differed from the other teachers' educational background. Borg (2003) explains how a teacher's background may affect a teacher's teaching practices. Informant D had a master's degree in Political Science, a study programme that traditionally has had a high representation of factual texts.

Before reading projects, Informant A, B, C and E worked on establishing expectations and a good reading environment. The after reading activities were explained prior to the deep reading activity. According to Simensen (2007), it is a normal and good practice to inform about the purpose of the reading beforehand. Pupils were told that they were expected to document their reading and reflections through production, either written or spoken. This suggests that the after reading activities hold a vital position.

The teachers tried to create interest and prepare pupils mentally and emotionally. This is relevant for in-depth learning and metacognition, as expressed in *The School of the Future*: "By developing metacognition and self-regulation, pupils learn to be involved in a way that will promote in-depth learning" (NOU 2015:8). Deep reading is a process that, especially when reading alone, requires self-regulated learning. This means that one needs to motivate one's own effort and "learn to take initiatives and control parts of their own learning process" (NOU2015:8, section 2.4.1). Informant E also outlined how he would explain the value of reading, its positive effects, such as vocabulary building. He said, "I illustrate by pointing at research on reading, fringe benefits and such, to motivate my pupils." This introduction to the reading projects suggests that Informant E tries to help his pupils construct a metalanguage

for learning. As explained in chapters 1.5 and 2.8, metacognition is about being able to monitor and reflect on one's own thinking and learning and they are expected to know how they learn and why they learn.

### **5.4.3 Deep reading community**

During the book reading project, Informants A, B and E would read a novel too. This suggests that the teachers would try to create a reading community together with their pupils. Vygotsky (1978, 1981) was concerned with the social communities and the notion of language development as a social construct. By creating a reading community in which the teachers themselves participate, they give their pupils a chance to mirror behaviour. In addition, their pupils can read at their own level and pace, which aligns with Vygotsky's ZPD (1978) and Krashen's comprehensible input hypothesis (1981). During the reading sessions, Informants A, B and D would change the setting and break up the normal classroom routine. Their pupils could sit or lie around in different locations of the school buildings, such as hallways and libraries. Informants A and E would at times let their pupils bring a treat "for reward or motivation." On the positive side, many individual adjustments made it possible for their pupils to read at their own level and pace and may be good practice in order to become self-regulated and motivated in one's own learning (CC17). On the negative side, group discussions could not be carried out if they all read different books.

In contrast, Informant C led and monitored the book reading project from start to finish. Together with her 28 pupils, she routinely broke up the reading with reading-related activities. I believe this approach could be beneficial for readers who need more help and instruction along the way. In a social constructivist perspective, it also enables learners to better help each other co-construct knowledge and understanding (Vygotsky, 1978; 1981). Nevertheless, this approach may be less motivating than selecting a book of one's choice (Birketveit and Rimmereide, 2017). Consequently, I believe that Informant C's approach may be less motivating for some learners, especially pupils who are well self-regulated and motivated. Informant C said that reading the same novel led her to end up teaching "somewhere in the middle." This also suggests that she was not happy with her compromise, as it signals that her practice did not match her teaching ideal. According to Borg (2003), it is not uncommon that teachers' teaching ideals and realities do not match. Informant C argued that the classes were

too big to teach deep reading at an individual level. Informant E reported the same class size and shared a similar experience. During deep reading activities, he explained how challenging it was to get everyone to read. He had also experienced how some pupils would only pretend to read.

#### **5.4.4 Reading strategies**

All five teachers said they taught reading strategies and would discuss text genres. Informant A focused on genre, B focused on the message of the text, C found genre useful and often used writing frames, and informant D focused on genre, such as the short story, novel or article.

Their examples illustrate that before, during and after reading activities are monitored and guided with an emphasis on pre- and post-textual work. This indicates that systematic reading instruction is taking place, but mainly before and after the reading activity in itself. Apart from informant E who talked about fringe benefits of reading with his pupils, there were few indications of systematic instruction in creating a metalanguage related to the deep reading. Brevik's study (2015) concluded that many teachers used and taught reading strategies more than they were aware of, but that discussing reading strategies explicitly with other teachers and researchers, improved their approaches to teaching reading. In her study, both teachers and students increased their metacognitive awareness on reading in cases where reading strategies were taught, talked about and reflected upon. Harestad Bakke (2010) argued that "pupils need teachers that are aware of the importance of reading and who know how to help them become skilled readers" (p. 86). Slightly revised, I believe this statement is still relevant. My impression is that my informants are well aware of the importance of deep reading. A future implication for the teaching of reading, and deep reading, will then be that pupils need teachers who know how to teach deep reading and who are aware of the importance of metacognitive instruction in reading and deep reading. I also believe that instruction in metacognitive understanding about fixed and growth mindsets as demonstrated by Bettinger, Ludvigsen, Rege (2017) and Claro, Dweck and Paunescko (2016), might be relevant to consider in order to build requested curricular skills like self-regulated learning and self-motivation as described in the *Core Curriculum* (2017).

### **5.4.5 Summary**

In this section, I looked at how the teachers worked with deep reading and discussed some approaches and their contexts. The pupils of Informants A, B, C and E spent between one and two months with the book projects. Like Wolf (2018), I believe sufficient time to immerse in reading is an important factor in developing the deep reading processes, especially perspective-taking as it takes time to get to know fictional characters. Before book reading projects, teachers gave instructions and tried to match up their pupils with a book matching their level of comprehension and interest. During reading projects, Informant C chose a book and guided the reading process firmly, whereas Informants A, B and E let their pupils choose individual books to read. The contrasting examples show how all the teachers try to create good reading communities in order to cultivate their pupils' deep reading skills. Lastly, it appears that the teachers focus on pre- and post-reading activities and do not necessarily instruct systematically in metacognitive awareness on reading.

## **5.5 EXPERIENCES WITH PART PROCESSES OF DEEP READING**

### **5.5.1 Introduction**

Questions 15-17 intended to explore examples of how deep reading was dealt with in the English classroom. As explained in section 2.3.1, imagery and perspective taking are considered vital part- processes of deep reading, thus being especially relevant for the reading of literary texts. The five teachers all shared examples of teaching situations where they worked with these processes. Here, I will discuss some teaching situations that I believe have managed or failed to maintain deep reading processes. I will also discuss whether the examples align with the theory on the reading of literature as well as relevant competence aims in *The Knowledge Promotion (2006/13)*.

### **5.5.2 Deep reading processes**

In question 15, I was particularly interested in how the teachers promoted and worked with deep reading in general. Qualified examples of how to cultivate deep reading processes (Wolf, 2018) were given by Informant A and B. In Informant A's example, they read a modernised

version of “The Good Samaritan.” Informant A demonstrated how she activated her pupils’ *background knowledge* by using a plot that was familiar to them. The example also demonstrates how they get to practice *perspective-taking*, *imagery* and *empathy*, as they were distributed different roles to dramatize the text after reading and discussing it. There are also opportunities to practice their *critical thinking* where they are to interpret the situation and the different characters. Informant B’s example from reading *The Underground Railroad* suggested the activation of similar part-processes. She activated her pupils’ *background knowledge* when she asked them to investigate whether their state was for or against slavery. She also invited her pupils into *critical thinking* and to make *educated guesses* when asking them “Why do you think they didn’t teach the slaves to read?” The teaching situation also demonstrated *perspective-taking* and *empathy* as underlying premises for the reflection around the text.

One of the examples I found less successful was shared by Informant D, who explained how she read an extract from Tolkien’s *Lord of the Rings* with her pupils. After the reading, the pupils were asked to answer questions aiming at “checking how much they understood from what they read.” In my opinion, this teaching situation implies an instrumentalist view of the task, as the pupils were expected to document how much they understood, not how they processed and interacted with the text. It should however be added that Informant D did not say anything about what kind of questions they were answering. Thus, the questions could potentially have been open and reflective, inviting for deep reading processes to be activated. For example, assuming that this textbook is an updated one, Fenner and Ørevik (2018) explain how after L97, textbooks tended to focus more on the individual learner’s “experience, understanding and reflection” (p. 84). Furthermore, considering that *The Knowledge Promotion* (2006/13) had moved in a communicative and social constructivist direction, this could mean that the questions that Informant D’s pupils were asked to answer were inviting for such reflections.

### **5.5.3 Imagery**

In question 16, I investigated how the teachers worked with imagery (see section 4.3.5 for complete examples). Informant B let her pupils write their own continuation after reading an extract or let them dramatize or make a film. Informant C let the pupils talk about their

images. Informant D could not think of anything. In my view, the best examples of how to create awareness on the process of visualisation were shared by Informant A and E.

Informant A, who discussed the appearance of Bella in *Twilight*, had her pupils reflect upon why Bella's looks were not as thoroughly explained as opposed to Edward's. Edward was described as dark, mysterious and handsome. Informant A would suggest that a possible explanation was that the reader should be able to identify with Bella, something which according to Informant A, many of the girls intuitively understood. I believe this is a good example of how a literary text may open up to self-reflection and self-knowledge. According to Fenner, when worked with in the right way, literature "open doors to gaining self-knowledge and personal insight" (Fenner, 2018, p. 225). This is also highlighted in the *The Knowledge Promotion* (2006/13). However, it is less likely that the boys would identify with Bella or Edward, and thus, the choice of text could perhaps be questioned. Nevertheless, Informant A demonstrated how she endeavoured to give her pupils scaffolding in order to connect their internal images to their own lives.

Informant E assisted his text with an atmosphere-creating picture while reading a "grotesquely described" extract from Wilbur Smith. He showed a picture of a vulture allowing the pupils to take this as the starting point for their own personal imagery. In my opinion, the choice of text can be questioned, for example, was this a text suited for everyone? Nevertheless, I believe that how he chose to teach imagery demonstrated a structured and thought through approach. Informant E's reasoning was that young people yearned after entertainment and that he therefore chose a dramatic story about death and despair in order to catch and keep his pupils' attention. I also believe his reasoning is a good example of how a teacher endeavours to bridge the gap between what he considers to be his pupils' needs and the demands of the curriculum.

#### **5.5.4 Perspective-taking**

In my view, Informants A, B and E acknowledged the classroom discussion when investigating perspective-taking and different perspectives in literary texts (see section 4.3.5 for complete examples). I have chosen to discuss Informant A and E's cases. However, it should be mentioned that Informants B, C and D both acknowledged perspective-taking. Informant B promoted it through classroom discussions, Informant C through roleplay and

Informant D, who was largely fact-oriented in her selection of teaching material, used literary texts to add new perspectives on a topic her pupils were already working on.

Informant E emphasized that the pupils learned a lot from each other explaining that “around texts dealing with empathy where maybe some pupils don’t manage to see the message, you may have other pupils who manage to put it into words.” This suggests that the sociocultural dimension is maintained in the *after reading* activity (Vygotsky, 1978; 1986). Ørevik (2018), who also refers to Vygotsky, explains that “Texts are read, interpreted, discussed, reflected on, and related to other texts together with peers and teachers, which is conducive to a deeper understanding of curricular topics” (p. 95). Similarly, Informant E explains how pupils can assist each other in acquiring other perspectives and a deeper understanding through classroom discussions.

Informants A, B and E demonstrate how they facilitate welcoming “the Other as a guest within ourselves” (Wolf, 2018, p. 44). Informant A and B focused on how to ask good questions in order to activate thoughts and not just re-tell a story. Informant A’s pupils had read a story about a car accident and asked her pupils how they believed it felt for the different people involved in the accident. These questions would invite the pupils to reflect upon the different roles in the story, help the pupils to shift perspectives in time and to reflect on reasons why the most important event in the story, the accident, was not described.

In order to maintain deep reading as a whole, Wolf declares perspective-taking “one of the most profound, insufficiently heralded contributions of the deep reading processes” (2018, p. 42). Both Fenner (2001) and Wolf (2018) claim that literary texts give readers valuable insight into other people’s lives. Laird Iversen (2014), who did field work in Norwegian lower secondary school, found that those classrooms with the highest level of tolerance were classrooms where pupils openly communicated disagreement. He followed classroom discussions in the KRLE-subject where pupils with different beliefs and values would often discuss opposing value systems. These classrooms were called “communities of disagreement” and his study concluded that such communities raised tolerance and understanding and were important building blocks in democratic societies. This is very relevant to the overarching aim “democracy and citizenship” which has a goal to develop the pupils’ “ability to think critically, learn to deal with conflicts of opinion and respect disagreement” (*Core Curriculum*, 2017). By organising group conversations, contrasting

perspectives may be revealed. Group discussions may even uncover strong disagreement and argument, but may in turn cultivate enhanced understanding. Informant A's teaching example shows how to bridge the pupils' self with other pupils' selves and opinions in the classroom, as well as the different characters in a text.

### **5.5.5 Summary**

In this section, I have discussed and problematized teaching situations that I believe have managed or failed to maintain deep reading processes. I have also illustrated how some teachers' examples from the EFL classroom align with relevant competence aims and theory on the reading of literature.

## **5.6 TEACHERS' EXPERIENCES WITH LEARNERS' PERFORMANCES, HABITS AND ATTITUDES.**

### **5.6.1 Introduction**

This section proved challenging to analyse and discuss. Firstly, I found few unifying findings. I also recognise that the indirect pupil perspective is problematic, and I may have made it difficult for my informants when asking them to be unifying in their answers about their pupils deep reading habits. For example, in the third section in the interview guide, the first seven statements requested the teachers to express their level of agreement on a one to five Likert scale as shown in table 4.4.1. (for statements from the interview guide, see appendix 3). The teachers' further comments were encouraged and welcomed, but the statements' design requested statistical answers.

To begin with, the teachers many times responded hesitantly. Also, when going through the data, conflicting answers were revealed. For example, statement 7 was "My pupils are easily distracted." Here Informant C answered "hm, the only time there is absolute quiet is when we read and listen," and Informant D answered "yes, they shift focus easily". Informant E on the other hand, was dodging this question, replying, "when the pupils are at different levels, it is challenging." It is an interesting finding in itself that the teachers answer differently. A possible way of understanding it may be due to the teachers' personal and educational



background, their teaching practices and contextual realities. In this regard, Borg's (2003) concept of *teacher cognition* may be relevant.

Secondly, some answers proved to be of little use. For example, all five informants answered that they mostly agree (score 4) to the statement about their pupils reading performance: "My pupils are good readers" (see table 4.4.1/Appendix 3). However, I did not ask my informants to specify what they meant by "good readers." As a result, I do not see how a discussion on performance can serve well in shedding light on my research question. In retrospect, I believe the method used in section three proved partly insufficient in order to answer all of my research questions. Five of the first seven statements dealt with pupil's endurance with reading tasks. Four of the statements dealt explicitly with how long pupils could concentrate on the reading activity. Statement seven dealt with whether or not pupils were easily distracted. The intention of looking into these issues was to investigate pupils' endurance with texts, what Wolf (2018) calls "cognitive patience" (p. 90). This was described as the ability to read with attention and to stay focused on the reading task without multitasking or skimming over the rest. With that being said, the informants' answers to the first seven statements suggested that most pupils managed to perform the reading tasks they were asked to do. The informants said there were individual variations and all informants estimated various degree of decline in concentration as the reads became longer. Two teachers said that pupils focused longer if reading a book of their choice, which indicates that they were more motivated to read (see Birketveit and Rimmereide, 2017).

Nevertheless, to connect the data from these statements to the pupils' cognitive patience is problematic. In order to investigate pupils' cognitive patience, it would be more reliable to conduct an experiment where pupils were set to perform a deep reading activity where cognitive patience could be measured. Also, the teachers' experiences with their learners' performances, habits and attitudes, is an indirect perspective that is debatable. There is no guarantee that these observations are not misinterpreted or misunderstood by the informants. The teachers may also be influenced by their different teaching ideals, practices and understandings which are variables that may violate my analysis.

However, a few functional and interesting findings have emerged from this section, and will consequently be discussed here. These are the pupils' reading strategies and habits, and how pupils' attitudes towards deep reading activities may be influenced and changed when

supported by good reading experiences. I will also briefly discuss what the informants said about gender.

### **5.6.2 Reading strategies**

All of the informants said that they believed their pupils' most frequently used reading strategies were skimming, scanning or both. Even though this information has not been checked and verified, the teachers' assumptions about their pupils are supported by studies on young people's reading habits. RescueTime Screentimestats (2019) reported how a young person spends on average three hours on the phone per day. Liu (2016) found that smartphone readers skim-read in patterns like F or Z. Some studies report that young peoples' reading habits are changing due to increased digitalisation (Liu, 2016; NIFU, 2015) and Hellekjær's study (2019) on how students are unprepared for the reading of academic texts when reaching university. Frønes' study (2015) shows 15-year-olds lack proper tools to navigate online, and the PISA report (2018) and Norwegian national tests (2019) revealed that young people struggle more with reflective reading. The above-mentioned studies corroborate with the EFL-teachers' observations on their pupils deep reading habits. For example, when I asked Informant E about whether he believed his pupils read a lot, he said no, but when I asked about other kinds of reading like texting and reading updates or blogs, his answer was expressed with certainty, "yes, yes, definitely," and "I believe they will be very skilled at skimming." Nevertheless, it is necessary to keep in mind that this is only his personal judgement.

As the example of informant A also illustrates, to read from an iPad offers other uses and may demand much of a pupil's ability to be self-regulated and self-motivated for comprehensive reading. Wolf (2018) presents the term "the biliterate brain," which refers to someone growing up switching between print-based reading systems and digital-based reading systems (see section 2.8). She calls for awareness on the possibilities and limitations of the different mediums. I therefore believe that teaching the pupils biliteracy could assist them with metacognitive awareness and a language to use in order to better understand their habits, behaviours and needs.

Furthermore, some of the teachers' statements about their pupils' reading habits suggested that their pupils may have more pragmatic approaches to texts than their teachers. Informants

A and C talked about how deep reading was best secured if they monitored and guided the deep reading process. For example, Informant A said:

Reflective reading they mostly do under my supervision, when I stand there and tell them what to do, guided by the teacher, because they don't do it on their own, unless they find something they are interested in. Maybe then they will do it, but reflective reading, then I will have to monitor and guide them.

Informant C, who read a book together with her pupils, said something similar "I'm forcing them into a form of (reading) behaviour." C believed her pupils mostly read for practical use, and that they looked at "how to" videos on You Tube.

Informants A, B and C believed very few of their pupils enjoyed reading books in their spare time. Informant E said pupils at his school often expressed that reading as an activity in itself was boring. Informant A and D reported that their pupils would often go straight to the task and search information online. Informant D described this in an informative way, "scanning is most frequently used, they read to find information, to answer questions in a text, they are concerned with whether a text is useful for them or not." Informant A who shared a similar experience seemed on the other hand frustrated about this:

I often feel that, if pupils are going to work on something, if we have a text to read through with questions to it, I feel they just skim through the text. And there are some pupils, they just go straight on looking for information without reading at first.

My first impression here is that the pupils considered texts first and foremost as a tool, as something they could use for other purposes. Informant A and D's examples may also imply a certain degree of cognitive impatience with the reading task. However, their examples may also illustrate that the teachers could have different teaching ideals. Different teaching ideals may ultimately affect how they feel about their pupils' reading habits. Informants A and D for example were talking about a very similar situation, though they recollected and reflected very differently upon it. A possible interpretation is that Informants A and D have different ideas or different ideals when it comes to the role the literary text should have in teaching. Whether teaching ideals may ultimately affect how they feel about their pupils' reading habits is hard to say. Nonetheless, it is worth contemplating these different variables when investigating their experiences with deep reading in EFL.

Another interesting aspect discussed in Borg's article (2003) is how teacher training affects teacher cognition, which in turn may affect practice. Informant D had a master's degree in Political Science and a bachelor's degree in English before finishing PPU. She had two years of teaching practice. Informant A had a master's degree in English literature and six years of practice. I perceived Informant A and D to weigh literary and factual texts differently. Informant D's examples seemed to favour factual texts. Her examples were more concerned with thematic approaches and she focused on concept building and fact-based knowledge. Informant A on the other hand used many literary text examples. This may have influenced their contrasting thoughts and reaction to a similar experience.

### **5.6.3 Attitudes**

When discussing pupils' attitudes towards deep reading, I found reason to be optimistic. Four of five informants claimed that 8th graders typically responded more negatively to reading projects than 10th graders. Informants A, B and C said pupils seemed to enjoy reading projects more as they grew used to it. If other EFL teachers have related experience, this is good news, as it suggests that positive attitudes towards certain seemingly unpopular tasks can be cultivated. The teachers also believed that when pupils got to select a book of their choice, they were more positive towards the activity of reading it than the pupils who did not get to choose a book of their choice. As explained in section 2.5, the motivational factor in choosing books is supported by Birketveit's and Rimmereide's study (2017).

Deep reading consists of processes that take time to develop. The teachers, by organising bigger reading projects, invite and allow their pupils to practice deep reading and learn more about the experience of reading a book over a longer period of time. As explained, during reading projects, Informants A, B and E read books also during the reading projects. Informant C read the same book together with the class. Despite these different approaches, all of the teachers can be seen as modelling the behaviour of reading. By taking part in the reading activity, they help their pupils to understand the reading behaviour. However, even though the behaviour can be observed, there is no guarantee that the pupils are actively participating in the text. An example of this was reported by Informant E who said that some pupils had only pretended to read. Obviously, Informant E's pupils were familiar with the reading behaviour but were nevertheless somehow not engaging with the text.

According to Vygotsky (1978) social communities hold a central position in the process of developing cognition. Some pupils may already know or fit well into a culture, in this case the culture of reading, whereas others lack experience or struggle. Why some pupils adjust and respond more willingly to deep reading activities than others may have different explanations. Some pupils may be more used to multitasking and have difficulties adjusting to monotasking. Some pupils may also struggle with learning difficulties and may be more vulnerable to internal or external distractions. Another explanation may be their sociocultural background. Vygotsky (1978) believed that children acquired their cultural values through social communities together with more knowledgeable peers. The importance of cultural insight and anchorage are also expressed in the *Education Act (Core Curriculum, 2017)*:

Education and training in schools and training establishments shall, in collaboration and agreement with the home, open doors to the world and give the pupils and apprentices historical and cultural insight and anchorage.

Examples of knowledgeable peers can be parents, siblings, friends, pupils or a teacher. Some pupils may read books at home or have parents who read books, thus being acquainted with the culture of reading. The teachers reasoning for wanting to expose and introduce their pupils to a deep reading culture can also be understood in this perspective. Informant A said “many pupils hear at home from their parents that they have never read a book in their life and so you don’t have to either.” Informant C remarked similarly, that when she asked her pupils if they had been read to as little kids, some reported that they lacked that experience. These examples suggest that Informants A and C had pupils who were not acquainted with a reading culture.

Three of the informants mentioned that there were differences between boys and girls and that boys struggled more when it came to deep reading. This is supported by the PISA report from 2018 documenting that girls have higher reading scores than boys. Also, the official Norwegian report, the Stoltenberg report, (NOU 2019:3) concluded that boys struggle more with school-related activities than girls. Informant A said boys were more negatively outspoken towards deep reading activities than girls. Informant B claimed that boys did not endure reading as long as girls did while Informant E said boys were “often behind on deep reading.” However, all of the teachers focused mainly on individual differences and not on gender when discussing deep reading related challenges. It should be emphasized again that this information is based on the teachers’ observations and reflections.

My informants' experiences with the book projects suggest that young learners can adapt and grow into a deep reading culture and that their attitudes can change in a positive direction. Informant C believed that her pupils would appreciate reading more as they grew saying "I think it has to do with age, age and maturity." Informants A, B and C said they believed their pupils would encounter reflective reading mainly in school. From my point of view, I believe it is vital to continue embarking on reading projects, not just to practice technical language skills and emotional development, but also in order to maintain self-regulated learning and deep learning. *The Knowledge Promotion* expresses how literary texts can "instil lifelong joy of reading and a deeper understanding of others and oneself" (2006/13). Long or substantial literary texts may benefit a pupil's knowledge of and compassion for the world around them and their ability to take on others' perspectives (Wolf, 2018; Fenner, 2001, 2005). To read a long and comprehensible literary text invites the reader to experience in-depth learning. As explained in chapter 1.5, Udir explains in-depth learning as a gradual process where learners develop new connections and knowledge, increase understanding and learn to integrate their new knowledge in their thinking and actions (2017). Similarly, deep reading is about applying what one reads and gradually developing understanding and knowledge over time (Wolf, 2018). By practicing deep reading and addressing monotasking as a skill, I believe that also those pupils who are vulnerable to distractions within the environment and themselves can adapt better to deep reading.

#### **5.6.4 Summary**

The five EFL teachers said that they believed their pupils' most frequently used reading habits were skimming, scanning or both. Studies report that young peoples' reading habits are changing due to increased digitalisation. The teachers' experiences with their pupils' attitudes towards deep reading, suggested that they enjoyed reading projects more as they grew used to the activity and experience. I also discussed how different teachers seemed to perceive and reflect differently upon similar experiences, how some pupils are more vulnerable to distractions than others, and how pupils may represent coming from different sociocultural backgrounds. Finally, I considered learners' chances of developing positive attitudes towards the deep reading culture.

## 6 CONCLUSIONS

---

### 6.1 SUMMARY OF MAIN FINDINGS

My findings point in the direction that all informants incorporate deep reading activities in their teaching. When working with literary texts, the teachers tend to focus on the *pre-* and *post-*reading activities. As a possible explanation, I believe this may be due to the demands in *The Knowledge Promotion* (2006/13), which focuses predominantly on production. A connected finding was that the teachers instruct and guide much of the deep reading activities, however they do not necessarily direct attention to the deep reading systematically. Nor do they teach systematically in metacognitive awareness on deep reading.

Some of my findings corroborated with previous research, for example, the teachers' observations and reflections on their pupils' reading strategies and habits. Many of the teachers said that their pupils were good multitaskers and skimmers, but lacked experience with extensive reading and the reading of literature. As I suggested when discussing digital reading and reading on paper, I found it worth contemplating about the extent that our pupils transfer their reading habits from one device to another. Considering that a young person spends three hours on average on a smartphone per day (RescueTime screentimestats 2019), how does this affect his or her other reading activities on other devices? It is interesting to see that CC17 has culminated in competences that seem to contrast with what seem to be people's preferred reading strategies and habits. The PISA report (2018) shows that 15-year olds read less in their spare time than before. The report also shows that there is a small decline in reading proficiency since 2015 among the 15-year olds. The teachers I talked to all believed skimming and scanning represent the main reading activity among their pupils. Informants A, B and C said they believed their pupils would encounter reflective reading mainly in school. Their comments, practices and experiences suggest that the EFL teachers try to counterbalance their pupils reading habits and strategies, as the teachers promote deep reading activities alongside other forms of reading. Nevertheless, it should be explicitly expressed that this finding represents an indirect pupil perspective and cannot be generalised upon.

One of the more surprising findings was that despite the great amount of time spent on digital reading, the teachers reflected little on the choice of which medium to read from. The teachers reflected much on the content and their teaching practices, but very little on the selection of medium involved in deep reading activities. A possible explanation can be due to the contextual realities (Borg, 2003), such as the requirements in the curriculum, which did not demand for medium awareness, or the access to books and good reading spaces. As documented in this thesis, the digital device was often used as an extended textbook. Some of the teachers reported that iPads or Chromebooks were used for deep reading activities if hard copies were unavailable. At the same time, when reflecting upon what they believed was the most suitable medium for deep reading tasks, the majority of the teachers were in favour of print. Nevertheless, my finding suggests that the teachers would let their pupils read from a book or the digital device out of practical reasons, not pedagogical reasons.

Another interesting finding were the contextual and pedagogical adjustments teachers did in order to introduce their pupils into a deep reading culture of literature. Four of the teachers experienced that their pupils would grow more positive towards deep reading activities as they grew older. Again, this is an indirect pupil perspective and cannot be generalised upon. Nevertheless, I believe this finding indicates that learners can be encouraged and cultivated into a culture of deep reading. For example, teachers invested time in tracking down reading material, they changed the classroom routines and took in use external motivational factors like letting their pupils bring pillows, tea or biscuits to the reading sessions. The teachers also assimilated into the deep reading culture by reading books like their pupils, instead of doing other work. These attempts were all aimed at cultivating good reading communities and positive deep reading experiences.

A last surprising finding was the amount of time that many teachers spent in order to assist their pupils in finding a good book to read. The amount of time was not insignificant and I am prone to question if this time could be spent more wisely. In the following section, I will suggest some possible solutions to better targeting deep reading and for better time management.



## 6.2 IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

How can we teach deep reading in EFL? One opportunity lies in the new curriculum. Deep learning and metacognition are given much attention. Metacognition is about reflecting upon what is learned and how it is learned. This is coherent with Brevik's (2015) research demonstrating how specific metacognitive instructions enhance pupils' metacognitive awareness which in turn may affect performance. Similarly, Wolf (2018) argues for medium awareness. In contrast to *The Knowledge Promotion* (2006/13), LK20 is more focused on in-depth learning. I believe it is important to address time-management. The English subject-specific aims in LK20 have been reduced, which provides an opportunity for EFL-teachers to re-think their teaching practices and incorporate more process-oriented deep reading activities in their practice. Instead of being mainly focused on *after*-reading activities, EFL teachers can focus more on the reading activity and the text. This can be done by taking the necessary time to read (see Birketveit & Rimmereide, 2017) and by talking with our pupils about the processes of deep reading. I also believe that an increased focus on fixed and growth mindsets can assist pupils in addressing their internal speech, especially for those pupils who are particularly vulnerable to distractions. Bettinger, Ludvigsen, Rege (2017) and Claro, Dweck, Paunesco (2016) have demonstrated how an internal speech addressing individual growth and development as opposed to fixed understandings of the self and one's abilities can improve one's learning outcome.

Another suggestion for future EFL practices is to allow for reflecting upon different mediums. Wolf (2018) problematises digital reading and how she believes this threatens deep reading processes. However, she is not specific about which digital device she is actually talking about when warning about too much digital reading, and I believe a legitimate follow-up question is whether the digital device is a problem in itself or only makes its multiple uses more available. Addressing such challenges could be counteracted with an increased focus on "learning to learn" addressed in the *Core Curriculum* (2017). I believe it is important to discuss the different digital devices with our pupils. By integrating medium awareness and by teaching reading strategies and medium awareness alongside the aims in the curriculum, pupils get the chance to develop their cognitive skills and increase their learning outcome. In general, there will also be a need to talk more with our pupils about the benefits of reading and as stated in *The Framework for Basic Skills* (2012), to help them develop "independence

and judgement in the choice and use of digital tools, media and resources relevant to the task” (p. 12). This is also expressed by the E-READ network:

Students should be taught strategies they can use to master deep reading and higher-level reading processes on digital devices. In addition, it remains important that schools and school libraries continue to motivate students to read paper books, and to set time apart for it in the curriculum. (Stavanger declaration, 2019)

Wolf (2018) discusses reading from the perspective of a binary; a digital versus a non-digital reading perspective and for how digital reading and reading on paper have the potential to cultivate and refine different metacognitive skills. Unlike many teachers, pupils have grown up and are socialised into this binary landscape. She claims that just like bilingual people are able to code switch between languages depending on the context, biliterate children should be assisted in learning to code switch between the mediums they read from depending on the (con)text. According to Wolf (2018), to be a digital reader promotes general skills like multitasking and reading skills like skimming. To read on paper, better promotes longer thoughts, critical thinking and contemplation. The goal is to foster both the skimming-mode of reading AND the more reflective, contemplative deep reading. As mentioned in the introduction, Udir’s quality criteria for teaching aids published in June 2020, acknowledges and addresses possibilities and limitations of different mediums. On UDIR’s webpage, aspects of reading on paper versus screen is accounted for with reference to the E-READ network (<https://www.udir.no/kvalitet-og-kompetanse/laremidler/kvalitetskriterier-for-laremidler/kunnskapsgrunnlag-kvalitetskriterium-engelsk/generelt-om-laremiddel/digitalisering-av-skolen-og-utfordringer-for-laremiddelfeltet/#lesing-pa-papir-og-skjerm>).

Thus, another implication for teaching deep reading lies in the school communities. One of my findings implied that the teachers did not defend their choice of medium for deep reading tasks pedagogically, but rather made the decision out of practical reasons. Metacognitive conversations, including medium awareness specifically addressing where the digital devices offer opportunities and challenges could be introduced on all levels in the educational sector. I suggest that teachers and school staff read up on relevant research and discuss their teaching practices in light of it. This is also recommended by the E- READ network:

Teachers and other educators must be made aware that rapid and indiscriminate swaps of print, paper, and pencils for digital technologies in primary education are not neutral. Unless accompanied by carefully developed digital learning tools and strategies, they may cause a setback in the development of children's reading comprehension and emerging critical thinking skills (Stavanger declaration, 2019)

A reflective practice can develop school staff's and teachers' metacognitive understanding of teaching and consequently improve teaching practice. In my opinion, school owners should participate in these metacognitive conversations as much as they can. That would make them better equipped to make well-informed decisions in order to support the development of pupils' deep reading skills. Examples of such priorities could be to improve school libraries, cooperate with other English teachers, and invest in books or proper reading tablets like Kindles. Like the E-READ network also suggests, librarians play a vital role in promoting proper reading skills. As such, I firmly believe that an investment in school librarians who are good at building relations with young people and who are updated on digital and non-digital reading material could assist pupils in finding good reads. Professional librarians working alongside teachers, school nurses, social workers and special educators, can help achieve good professional teams around our pupils, which in turn increase the chances of reaching the demands of the curriculum. One of my findings indicated that teachers spent a lot of time assisting their pupils with finding books, and an investment in school librarians could free some of this time so that teachers could focus more dedicated on deep reading instructions and its processes.

### **6.3 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH**

Because this is a small-scale qualitative survey with only five informants, findings cannot be used to generalise EFL teachers' practices or their pupils. Nevertheless, based on my findings, I wish to suggest two relevant studies that I consider interesting to undertake for further research. The first one is research into young people's English deep reading habits and their cognitive patience in English. The second approach is to do more research on teachers' deep digital reading practices in the English classroom.

I believe it is important to gain more insight into young people's deep reading habits and their cognitive patience in English. To read in English can be more cognitively demanding than to read in a first language. Our goal should be to encourage pupils to seek cognitively demanding activities, and I believe that the deep reading of literature is a good course of action in maintaining such a goal. One of the core elements in English is about providing for the "encountering of English texts," and one of the subject specific aims are specifically targeted at "interpreting and reflecting upon English speaking literature and youth literature" (LK20, 2019, my translations). To find out more about the young people's deep reading habits, a larger scale survey could be conducted where pupils elaborate on their reading habits in English. To investigate pupils' cognitive patience, it would be interesting to conduct an experiment by using the research on reading strategies by Brevik (2015), Wolf's demands for biliterate brains (2018), and Rege's research on fixed and growth mindsets as theoretical frameworks (2016). Different groups could be given instruction in reading strategies (Brevik, 2015) and necessary information on deep reading processes and media awareness (Wolf, 2018), as well as information about fixed and growth mindsets (Rege, 2016). The study could see if the group's instruction in the experiment led to a development in their metacognitive language in order to understand themselves and their learning processes better. It would be interesting to consider the effects of such a study.

The second suggestion for further research would be to learn more about deep digital reading practices in the English classroom. Many schools are now using tablets or other digital devices, and pupils would benefit from having language teachers who are capable of defending their practices not only when it comes to *what* pupils read, but also *how* pupils read and from *which medium* pupils read. In addition, it can increase teachers' metacognitive awareness on their own teaching practices in general. Now, with LK20's (2019) emphasis on skills like metacognition, deep learning and self-regulated learning, there is more focus on teaching pupils to reflect more deeply upon what they learn and how they learn. Increasing our own awareness around deep digital reading practices would help us better assist our pupils when they select their own texts and embark on their own independent-driven reading activities.

## REFERENCES

---

- Arneberg, Per (2008). *Pedagogisk dannelse og etikk*. Cappelen akademisk forlag.
- Baron, N. (2013). Redefining Reading: The Impact of Digital Communication Media. *PMLA*, 128(1), 193-200. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23489277>.
- Baron, Naomi & Calixte, Rachele & Havewala, Mazneen. (2016). The Persistence of Print among University Students: An Exploratory Study. *Telematics and Informatics*. 34. 10.1016/j.tele.2016.11.008. retrieved from: <https://www-sciencedirect-com.pva.uib.no/science/article/pii/S0736585316305378>
- Bigum, Chris & Kenway, Jane (2005). New Information Technologies and the Ambiguous future of schooling -some possible scenarios. Published in *Extending educational change* (s. 95–115). New York: Springer. Retrieved from [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/1-4020-4453-4\\_5](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/1-4020-4453-4_5)
- Birketveit, Anna & Rimmereide, Hege Emma (2017) Using authentic picture books and illustrated books to improve L2 writing among 11-year-olds, *The Language Learning Journal*, 45:1, 100-116, DOI: 10.1080/09571736.2013.833280
- Bettinger, E., Ludvigsen, S., Rege, M., Solli, I., Yeager, D. (2017) Increasing perseverance in math: Evidence from a field experiment in Norway. c,d a Stanford University, United States b Sten Ludvigsen, University of Oslo, Norway c University, in *Journal of Economic Behaviour & Organization*, volume 146, February 2018, pages 1-55, retrieved from sciencedirect august 2019, <https://www-sciencedirect-com.pva.uib.no/science/article/pii/S0167268117303426>
- Blikstad-Balas (2016) *Faglig og ikke-faglig bruk av teknologi I klasserommet. I Krumsvik, R.J (red). Digital læring i skole og lærerutdanning. 2. Utg.* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget. 136-150
- Borg, Simon (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36(2), 81-109.doi:10.1017/S026144803001903. Retrieved from: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/language-teaching/article/teacher-cognition-in-language-teaching-a-review-of-research-on-what-language-teachers-think-know-believe-and-do/F6B40C79983C27649FC1157D4023A776>
- Borg, Simon (2008) *Teacher Cognition and Language Education: Research and Practice*, Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2009. *ProQuest Ebook Central*, <https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.pva.uib.no/lib/bergen-ebooks/detail.action?docID=742551>.
- Borg, Simon (2012) *Researching Language Teacher Cognition and Practice : International Case Studies*, edited by Roger Barnard, and Anne Burns, Channel View Publications,

2012. *ProQuest Ebook Central*, <https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.pva.uib.no/lib/bergen-ebooks/detail.action?docID=1024795>.

Brevik, Lisbeth. (2019). Gamers, Surfers, Social Media Users: Unpacking the role of interest in English. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*. 10.1111/jcal.12362. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/jcal.12362>

Brevik, L. M., Olsen, R. V., & Hellekjær, G. O. (2016). The complexity of second language reading: Investigating the L1-L2 relationship. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 28(2), 161-182

Brevik, Lisbeth, (2016). The gaming outliers. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303083771\\_The\\_Gaming\\_Outliers\\_Does\\_out-of-school\\_gaming\\_improve\\_boys'\\_reading\\_skills\\_in\\_English\\_as\\_a\\_second\\_language](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303083771_The_Gaming_Outliers_Does_out-of-school_gaming_improve_boys'_reading_skills_in_English_as_a_second_language)

Brevik, L. M. (2015) *How Teachers Teach and Readers Read : Developing Reading Comprehension in English in Norwegian Upper secondary School*, PHD dissertation. Oslo: University of Oslo.

Braun, Virginia & Clarke, Victoria (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology, *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3:2, 77-101

Claro, Susana., Dweck., Carol, Paunesco, David. (2016) "Growth Mindset Tempers the Effect on Poverty on Academic achievement" *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* (2016)

Clowes, Robert W. (2018). Screen Reading and the creation of new cognitive ecologies. *AI & Soc* 34, 705–720 (2019). Retrieved from <https://link-springer-com.pva.uib.no/article/10.1007/s00146-017-0785-5>

*Core curriculum - values and principles for primary and secondary education* (2017). Oslo. Kunnskapsdepartementet. Retrieved from <https://www.udir.no/lk20/overordnet-del/?lang=eng>

*Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment* (2001). Council of Europe. Modern Languages Division, Strasbourg/Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Creswell, J.W. (2014). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. 4th edition. Pearson Education Limited,

Crystal, David, *English as a Global Language*, (2012) 2. Edition (originally published 1997) [http://culturaldiplomacy.org/academy/pdf/research/books/nation\\_branding/English\\_As\\_A\\_Global\\_Language\\_-\\_David\\_Crystal.pdf](http://culturaldiplomacy.org/academy/pdf/research/books/nation_branding/English_As_A_Global_Language_-_David_Crystal.pdf)

Elstad, Turmo (2008) *Læringsstrategier, søkelys på lærerens praksis*, Universitetsforlaget

E-READ conference UiS (2018), <https://lesesenteret.uis.no/om-lesesenteret/aktuelt/mer-om-den-faglige-bakgrunnen-for-cost-e-read-konferansen-article127472-12719.html> (last retrieved September 2020)

Fagfornyelsen (2017). Retrieved from <https://www.udir.no/laring-og-trivsel/lareplanverket/fagfornyelsen/>

Fenner, Anne-Brit., Ørevik, Sigrid (2018). Analysis of learning materials. Fenner, Anne-Brit., Skulstad, Aud., *Teaching English in the 21st Century, Central Issues in English Didactics*, Fagbokforlaget.

Fenner, Anne-Brit (2018). Approches to Literature. Fenner, Anne-Brit., Skulstad, Aud., *Teaching English in the 21st Century, Central Issues in English Didactics*, Fagbokforlaget.

Fenner, Anne-Brit (2005). Engelskfagets utvikling i et danningperspektiv. *Fagenes begrunnelser*. Fagbokforlaget.

Fenner, Anne-Brit (2011). Litteraturen rolle i utviklingen av interkulturell kompetanse. *Communicare*. Et fagdidaktisk tidsskrift for fremmedspråksenteret. Nummer 1, 2011

Forskningsetiske retningslinjer for samfunnsfag (2019). Retrieved from: <https://www.etikkom.no/forskningsetiske-retningslinjer/Samfunnsvitenskap-jus-og-humaniora/>

Frønes Tove S. (2017) Å lese og navigere på nettet. En studie av elevers navigasjonsstrategier. Doktorgradsavhandling ved Det utdanningsvitenskapelige fakultet, Universitetet i Oslo.

Frønes, Tove S. (2015). Elever på nett. [https://www.uv.uio.no/ils/forskning/prosjekter/pisa/publikasjoner/publikasjoner/pisa2009\\_elever\\_pa\\_nettpopdatert\\_15\\_juni\\_2015.pdf](https://www.uv.uio.no/ils/forskning/prosjekter/pisa/publikasjoner/publikasjoner/pisa2009_elever_pa_nettpopdatert_15_juni_2015.pdf)

Fullan, Michael., McEachen, Joanne., Quinn, Joanne. (2018). *Dybdelæring*. Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

Habegger-Conti, Jena (2015). Critical Literacy in the ESL classroom: Bridging the Gap Between Old and New Media. Retrieved from <https://journal.uia.no/index.php/NJMLM/article/view/170#.XaBxrkYzZPY>

Harestad Bakke, Margrethe (2010) Teaching reading in EFL instruction, what are teacher's attitudes towards reading in EFL-instructions and how is it taught in class? Master Thesis. University of Oslo. Retrieved from: <https://www.duo.uio.no/handle/10852/32416>

Haugestad, Astrid (2015). Blended Learning in English Literature. Master thesis. University of Oslo. Retrieved from: <http://bora.uib.no/handle/1956/10034>

Hellekjær, Glenn Ole (2007). Reading, From a Forgotten to a Basic Skill. *Språk og språkundervisning*. Nr. 2, pp 23-29.

Hellekjær, Glenn Ole (2019). PhD revisited, The Acid Test. Does upper secondary EFL instruction effectively prepare Norwegian Students for the reading of English textbooks at colleges and universities?" *English Didactics in Norway, 30 years of doctoral research*, Ulrikke Lindal og Lisbeth M Brevik, p. 191.

Hochanadel, Aaron (2015). MBA, Fixed And Growth Mindset In Education And How Grit Helps Students Persist In The Face Of Adversity. Kaplan University, USA Dora Finamore,

- EdD, Kaplan University, USA. Retrieved from: <https://search-proquest-com.pva.uib.no/docview/1655539157?OpenUrlRefId=info:xri/sid:primo&accountid=8579>
- Hoff, Hild (2018) Intercultural competence. Chapter 3 in Fenner, A., Skulstad, A. S. (2018) *Teaching English in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Fagbokforlaget, Bergen.
- Hoff, Hild (2017) Fostering the «Intercultural Reader» An Empirical Study of Socio Cultural Approaches to EFL – Literature. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*. Retrieved from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321384540\\_Fostering\\_the\\_Intercultural\\_Reader\\_An\\_Empirical\\_Study\\_of\\_Socio-Cultural\\_Approaches\\_to\\_EFL\\_Literature](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321384540_Fostering_the_Intercultural_Reader_An_Empirical_Study_of_Socio-Cultural_Approaches_to_EFL_Literature)
- Hoff, H. E. (2013). “Self” and “Other” in meaningful interaction: using fiction to develop intercultural competence in the English classroom. *Tidsskriftet FoU i Praksis*, 7(2), 27-50.
- Hopkins, David (2016): <https://medium.com/s/story/how-a-tv-sitcom-triggered-the-downfall-of-western-civilization-336e8ccf7dd0> (Retrieved 22. March 2019)
- Hovdenak, Sylvi Stenersen (2000). *90-tallsreformene. Et instrumentaistisk mistak?* Gyldendal akademisk
- Hutchison, P. D., Nyks, K., & Scott, J. P. (2015). *Requiem for the American Dream*. The Film Collaborative. Cal., United States.
- Hylland Eriksen, Thomas (2001) *Øyeblikkets Tyranni (Tyranny of the Moment)* Aschehoug forlag.
- Iversen, Lars Laird, (2019) From safe spaces to communities of disagreement. *British Journal of Religious Education*, 41:3, 315-326, DOI. Retrieved from: 10.1080/01416200.2018.1445617
- Jewitt, Carey (2006) *Technology, Literacy and Learning: A multimodal approach*. Routledge. London and New York.
- Johannessen, Asbjørn., Tufte, Per Arne., Christoffersen, Line., (2006) *Samfunnsvitenskapelig metode*. 3. Utgave, Abstrakt forlag
- Johannessen, Asbjørn., Tufte, Per Arne., Christoffersen, Line., (2016) *Samfunnsvitenskapelig metode*. 5. Utgave, 2. Opplag, Abstrakt forlag
- Johannessen, Lars E. F., Rafoss, Tore., Rasmussen, Erik Børve., (2018) *Hvordan bruke teori? Nyttige verktøy i kvalitativ metode*. Universitetsforlaget.
- Kingsley, Patrick, (2010). The art of slow reading. Article in the Guardian, 15. July. 2010. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2010/jul/15/slow-reading>
- Knowledge Promotion* (2006/2013). English Subject Curriculum (ENG1-03). Oslo: Kunnskapsdepartementet. Retrieved from <https://www.udir.no/kl06/ENG1-03>
- Krashen, Stephen D. (1981). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*, Pergamon Press, Oxford.



Kress, Gunther (2003) *Literacy in the New Media Age*. Routledge. London and New York.

Kunnskapsgrunnlag for kvalitetskriterium for læremiddel i engelsk <<https://www.udir.no/kvalitet-og-kompetanse/laremidler/kvalitetskriterier-for-laremidler/kunnskapsgrunnlag-kvalitetskriterium-engelsk/>>

Liu, Ziming., Xiaobin Huang, (2016) «Reading on the move: A study of reading behaviour of undergraduta smartphone users in China», 2016, retrieved from sciencedirect august 2018: <https://www-sciencedirect-com.pva.uib.no/science/article/pii/S074081881630216X>

Ludvigsen S., Gundersen, E., Indregård, S., Ishaq, B., Kleve, K., Korpås, T., ... Sundberg, D. (2015) *NOU 2015: 8. The School of the Future: Renewal of Subject and Competences*. Official Norwegian Report. Oslo: Ministry of Education and Research. Retrieved from: <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/nou-2015-8/id2417001/> (28.09.2018)

Ludvigsen S., Gundersen, E., Indregård, S., Ishaq, B., Kleve, K., Korpås, T., ... Sundberg, D. (2015) *NOU 2014: 7. Elevenes læring i fremtidens skole*. Official Norwegian Report. Oslo: Ministry of Education and Research. Retrieved from: <https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/e22a715fa374474581a8c58288edc161/no/pdfs/nou201420140007000dddpdfs.pdf>

Læreplan i engelsk (ENG01-04), retrieved from Udir sept 2020: <https://www.udir.no/lk20/eng01-04>

Mangen, A., Olivier, G., & Velay, J. L. (2019). Comparing Comprehension of a Long Text Read in Print Book and on Kindle: Where in the Text and When in the Story?. *Frontiers in psychology*, 10, 38. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00038>

Mangen, Anne & Kristiansen, Marie. (2013). Tekstlesning på skjerm: Noen implikasjoner av et digitalt grensesnitt for lesing og forståelse.. *Norsk pedagogisk tidsskrift*. 97. 52-62, [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/256563725\\_Tekstlesning\\_pa\\_skjerm\\_Noen\\_implikasjoner\\_av\\_et\\_digitalt\\_grensesnitt\\_for\\_lesing\\_og\\_forstaelse](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/256563725_Tekstlesning_pa_skjerm_Noen_implikasjoner_av_et_digitalt_grensesnitt_for_lesing_og_forstaelse) (retrieved August 2020)

Mangen, Anne; (2013) Walgermo, Bente R; Brønnick, Kolbjørn: "Reading Linear Texts on Paper Versus Computer Screen: Effects on Reading Comprehension" *International Journal of Educational Research* 58 (2013) 61-68 (retrieved November 2019)

Mangen, A. (2008). Lesing og nye teknologier. Lesing på skjerm, <https://lesesenteret.uis.no/boeker-hefter-og-materiell/boeker-og-hefter/lesing-pa-skjerm-article80068-12686.html> (retrieved November, 2019)

Mar, Raymond A., Oatley, Keith., Hirsh, Jacob., Paz, Jennifer dela., Peterson, Jordan B., (2005) "Bookworms versus nerds: Exposure to fiction versus non-fiction, divergent associations with social ability, and the simulation of fictional social worlds" University of Toronto, Department of Psychology, Sydney Smith Hall, 4th Floor, 100 St. George St., Toronto, Ont., Canada M5S 3G3 Available online 15 September 2005

Nasjonale prøver I engelsk (2019) <https://skoleporten.udir.no/rapportvisning/grunnskole/laeringsresultater/nasjonale-proever->

ungdomstrinn/nasjonalt?orgaggr=a&kjonn=a&trinn=8&sammenstilling=1&diagraminstansid=34&fordeling=2&indikator=2129&diagramtype=8

NIFU, «2015) rapport om studieforberedthet, 2015:28  
<https://www.nifu.no/publications/1286780/>

NOU 2015:8 (2015), Fremtidens skole, fornyelse av fag:  
<https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/nou-2015-8/id2417001/>

Obaidullah, Md & Rahman, Molla. (2018). The impact of internet and social media on the habit of reading books: A case study in the southern region of Bangladesh. *Studies in English Language and Education*. 5. 25-39. 10.24815/siele.v5i1.8966.

file:///C:/Users/Lillian/Downloads/The\_impact\_of\_internet\_and\_social\_media\_on\_the\_hab.pdf (retrieved September 2020)

Pisa, [https://www.oecd.org/pisa/Combined\\_Executive\\_Summaries\\_PISA\\_2018.pdf](https://www.oecd.org/pisa/Combined_Executive_Summaries_PISA_2018.pdf) (retrieved August 2020) og resultater oppsummert på udir, <https://www.udir.no/tall-og-forskning/finnforskning/rapporter/pisa-2018/> (Retrieved August 2020)

RAND. (2002). Reading for understanding. Toward an R&D program in reading comprehension. RAND Reading Study Group. USA: Rand Education. Retrieved from: [http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monograph\\_reports/2005/MR1465.pdf](http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monograph_reports/2005/MR1465.pdf)

RescueTime screentimestats 2019, <https://blog.rescuetime.com/screen-time-stats-2018/> retrieved 18.09.2020

Simensen, A. M. (2007) *Teaching a Foreign Language – Principles and Procedures*, Oslo, Fagbokforlaget

Silverman, David, (2014) *Interpreting Qualitative Data* 5. Edition, Sage, Los Angeles, California

Skaalvik, Einar M, «Ethiske spørsmål i skoleforskning» (1999), I *Etikk og metode*. Oslo, De nasjonale forskningsetiske komiteer: Skriftserie nr. 12. (20 sider).

Skaftun, Atle (2019) Stener kan ikke flyve: Om digitaliseringen av skolen. Retrieved from: <https://lesesenteret.uis.no/blogg/stener-kan-ikke-flyve-om-digitalisering-av-skolen-article124347-22354.html>

Stavanger Declaration on the Future of Reading (2019), E-READ. <https://ereadcost.eu/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/StavangerDeclaration.pdf> and press release: <https://ereadcost.eu/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/StavangerDeclarationPressRelease.pdf>

Stoltenberg rapporten, <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/nou-2019-3/id2627718/> retrieved August 2020)

Sundqvist, Pia og Sylvén, Liss Kerstin (2014) “Language-related computer use: Focus on young L2 English learners in Sweden”, *Recall* 2014, doi: 10.1017/S0958344013000232 <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/recall/article/language-related-computer-use-focus>

on-young-12-english-learners-in-sweden/254E2562978AFFBF98CC812368E766F7 (retrieved August 2019)

Sætersmoen, Margrethe, «Gutters lesing på nett», a master Thesis (2010)  
<https://brage.bibsys.no/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11250/132621/S%C3%A6tersmoen.pdf?sequence=1>(retrieved August 2019)

Telhaug, Alfred Oftedal (2005) *Kunnskapsløftet -Ny eller gammel skole: Beskrivelse og analyse av Kristin Clemets reformer i grunnsopplæringen*. Cappelen akademisk forlag.

Telhaug, Alfred Oftedal., Mediås, Asbjørn., Aasen, Petter. (2006-2007). The Nordic Model in Education: Education as part of the political system in the last 50 years. *Scandinavian journal of educational research*, 2006-07, Vol.50 (3), p.245-283 <https://www.tandfonline-com.pva.uib.no/doi/full/10.1080/00313830600743274>

Udir, Framework for basic skills (2012) Utdanningsdirektoratet.  
[https://www.udir.no/contentassets/fd2d6bfbf2364e1c98b73e030119bd38/framework\\_for\\_basic\\_skills.pdf](https://www.udir.no/contentassets/fd2d6bfbf2364e1c98b73e030119bd38/framework_for_basic_skills.pdf) (last retrieved 9. Sept 2020)

Udir, <https://www.udir.no/laring-og-trivsel/rammeverk/rammeverk-for-grunnleggende-ferdigheter/2.1-digitale-ferdigheter/> (retrieved 15.08.2020)

Udir, <https://www.udir.no/laring-og-trivsel/lareplanverket/grunnleggende-ferdigheter/lesing/god-leseopplaring--for-larere-pa-ungdomstrinnet/lesing-som-grunnleggende-ferdighet/> (retrieved 03.10.19)

Udir, English national curriculum after year 10, *The Knowledge Promotion, LK06/13*:  
<https://www.udir.no/kl06/ENG1-03/Hele/Kompetansemaal/kompetansemaal-etter-10.-arstrinn>, (retrieved 28.09.2018)

Udir, analyse av nasjonale prøver, <https://www.udir.no/tall-og-forskning/finnforskning/tema/nasjonale-prover/nasjonale-prover-8.-og-9.-trinn-2019/> (retrieved September 2020)

Ungdataundersøkelsen (2017), link <http://www.ungdata.no/Kart> - <http://www.ungdata.no/> (retrieved 28.09.2018)

Urquhart, S., & Weir, C. (1998). *Reading in a Second Language: Process, Product and Practice*. London and New York: Longman.

Vassnes, Bjørn (27. 9. 2018), *Klassekampen*, on digitalisation and decreased book sales Klassekampen, 10. November 2018

Vygotsky, L (1978) *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard U Press.

Vygotsky, L (1986) *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Wolf, Maryanne (2018) *Reader Come Home, the Reading Brain in a Digital World*, HarperCollins Publishers, 195 Broadway, New York, NY1007

- Wolf, Maryanne (2016) *Tales of Literacy for the 21st Century*. Oxford University Press
- Wolf, Maryanne., Ullmann-Shade, Catherine., Gottwald, Stephanie., (2012) «The Emerging Evolving Reading Brain in a Digital Culture: Implications for New Readers, Children With Reading Difficulties, and Children Without Schools» *Journal of Cognitive Education and Psychology*; New York Vol. 11, Iss. 3, 2012, pp. 230-240
- Wolf, Maryanne (2014) Balance technology and deep reading to create biliterate children. Joan Richardson (R is director of PDK Poll of Public Attitudes to Schools) *The Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 96, No. 3, November 2014, pp. 14-19
- Wolf, Maryanne (2018) at the E-READ conference UiS, October 2018, <https://www.uis.no/news/interview-with-maryanne-wolf-preserving-deep-reading-in-a-digital-world-article125661-8865.html> (retrieved Desember 2018)
- Wolf, Maryanne (2018), article published in the Guardian <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/aug/25/skim-reading-new-normal-maryanne-wolf> (retrieved 25. August, 2018)
- Yang, Crain, Berwick, Chomsky, Bolhuis, (2016) “The growth of language: Universal Grammar, experience, and principles of computation” Retrieved august 2019 from sciencedirect: [https://www.sciencedirect-com.pva.uib.no/science/article/pii/S0149763416305656](https://www.sciencedirect.com/pva.uib.no/science/article/pii/S0149763416305656)
- Ørevik, Sigrid, (2018) «Reading and Literacy» chapter 4, Fenner, Anne-Brit, Skulstad, Aud, *Teaching English in the 21st Century, Central Issues in English Didactics*, Fagbokforlaget, 1. Edition.
- Ørevik, Sigrid, (2018) «Reading and Literacy» chapter 10, Fenner, Anne-Brit, Skulstad, Aud, *Teaching English in the 21st Century, Central Issues in English Didactics*, Fagbokforlaget, 1. Edition.

## **APPENDICES**

---

Appendix 1: Consent from NSD

Appendix 2: Information and consent form sent out to informants

Appendix 3: Interview guide

Appendix 4: Transcribed interviews

Appendix 5: E-READ Stavanger Declaration Press Release 2019

Appendix 6: E-READ Future of reading 2019

## **APPENDIX 1: CONSENT FROM NSD**

20.03.2019

**Medleskjema for behandling av personopplysninger**

### **NSD NORSK SENTER FOR FORSKNINGSDATA**

NSD sin vurdering

Skriv ut

#### **Prosjekttittel**

Deep reading in English: how do teachers promote and experience deep reading in the English subject?

#### **Referansenummer**

114259

#### **Registrert**

19.03.2019 av Lillian Utne Skjæveland - Lillian.Skjeveland@student.uib.no

#### **Behandlingsansvarlig institusjon**

Universitetet i Bergen / Det humanistiske fakultet / Institutt for fremmedspråk

#### **Prosjektansvarlig (vitenskapelig ansatt/veileder eller stipendiat)**

Sigrid Ørevik, Sigrid.Orevik@uib.no, tlf: 4755582362

#### **Type prosjekt**

Studentprosjekt, masterstudium

#### **Kontaktinformasjon, student**

Lillian Utne Skjæveland, lilliansutne@gmail.com, tlf: 90134287

#### **Prosjektperiode**

01.03.2019 - 31.12.2020

#### **Status**

02.03.2020 - Vurdert med vilkår

## Vurdering (2)

### 02.03.2020 - Vurdert med vilkår

NSD gjør oppmerksom på at vilkårene satt den 20.03.2019 fremdeles gjelder for prosjektet.

NSD har vurdert endringen registrert 02.03.20. Vi har nå registrert 28.02.20 som ny sluttdato for forskningsperioden. I tilfelle det skulle bli aktuelt med ytterligere utvidelse av den opprinnelige sluttdato 01.07.20, må vi vurdere hvorvidt det skal gis ny informasjon til utvalget). NSD vil følge opp ved ny planlagt avslutning for å avklare om behandlingen av personopplysningene er avsluttet. Lykke til videre med prosjektet! Kontaktperson hos NSD: Silje Fjelberg Opsvik Tlf. Personverntjenester: 55 58 21 17 (tast 1)

### 20.03.2019 - Vurdert med vilkår

FORENKLET VURDERING MED VILKÅR Etter gjennomgang av opplysningene i meldeskjemaet med vedlegg, vurderer vi at prosjektet har lav personvernulempe fordi det ikke behandler særlige kategorier eller personopplysninger om straffedommer og lovovertridelser, eller inkluderer sårbare grupper. Prosjektet har rimelig varighet og er basert på samtykke. Vi gir derfor prosjektet en forenklet vurdering med vilkår.

Du har et selvstendig ansvar for å følge vilkårene og sette deg inn i veiledningen i denne vurderingen. Dersom du følger vilkårene og prosjektet gjennomføres i tråd med det som er dokumentert i meldeskjemaet, vil behandlingen av personopplysninger være i samsvar med personvernlovgivningen.

VILKÅR Vår vurdering forutsetter:

1. At du gjennomfører prosjektet i tråd med kravene til informert samtykke
2. At du ikke innhenter særlige kategorier eller personopplysninger om straffedommer og lovovertridelser
3. At du følger behandlingsansvarlig institusjon (institusjonen du studerer/forsker ved) sine retningslinjer for datasikkerhet
4. At du laster opp revidert(e) informasjonsskriv på utvalgssiden(e) i meldeskjemaet og trykker «bekreft innsending», slik at du og behandlingsansvarlig institusjon får korrekt dokumentasjon. NSD foretar ikke en ny vurdering av det reviderte informasjonsskrivet.

### KRAV TIL INFORMERT SAMTYKKE

De registrerte skal få skriftlig og/eller muntlig informasjon om prosjektet og samtykke til deltakelse. Du må påse at informasjonen minst omfatter:

- Prosjektets formål og hva opplysningene skal brukes til
- Hvilken institusjon som er behandlingsansvarlig
- Hvilke opplysninger som innhentes og hvordan opplysningene innhentes
- At det er frivillig å delta og at man kan trekke seg så lenge studien pågår uten at man må oppgi grunn
- Når prosjektet skal avsluttes og hva som skal skje med personopplysningene da: sletting, anonymisering eller videre lagring
- At du/dere behandler opplysninger om den registrerte basert på deres samtykke
- Retten til å be om innsyn, retting, sletting, begrensning og dataportabilitet (kopi)
- Retten til å klage til Datatilsynet
- Kontaktopplysninger til prosjektleder (evt. student og veileder)
- Kontaktopplysninger til institusjonens personvernombud

På nettsidene våre finner du mer informasjon og en veiledende mal for informasjonsskriv: [http://www.nsd.uib.no/personvernombud/hjelp/informasjon\\_samtykke/informere\\_om.html](http://www.nsd.uib.no/personvernombud/hjelp/informasjon_samtykke/informere_om.html)

Det er ditt ansvar at informasjonen du gir i informasjonsskrivet samsvarer med dokumentasjonen i meldeskjemaet.

**2. TYPE OPPLYSNINGER OG VARIGHET** Prosjektet vil behandle alminnelige kategorier av personopplysninger frem til 01.07.2020

**3. FØLG DIN INSTITUSJONS RETNINGSLINJER** NSD legger til grunn at behandlingen oppfyller kravene i personvernforordningen om riktighet (art. 5.1 d), integritet og konfidensialitet (art. 5.1. f) og sikkerhet (art. 32).

Dersom du benytter en databehandler i prosjektet, må behandlingen oppfylle kravene til bruk av databehandler, jf. art 28 og 29.

For å forsikre dere om at kravene oppfylles, må dere følge interne retningslinjer og/eller rådføre dere med behandlingsansvarlig institusjon.

**NSD SIN VURDERING** NSDs vurdering av lovlig grunnlag, personvernprinsipper og de registrertes rettigheter følger under, men forutsetter at vilkårene nevnt over følges.

**LOVLIG GRUNNLAG** Prosjektet vil innhente samtykke fra de registrerte til behandlingen av personopplysninger. Forutsatt at vilkår 1 og 4 følges, er det NSD sin vurdering at prosjektet legger opp til et samtykke i samsvar med kravene i art. 4 og 7, ved at det er en frivillig, spesifikk, informert og utvetydig bekreftelse som kan dokumenteres og som den registrerte kan trekke tilbake. Lovlig grunnlag for behandlingen vil dermed være den registrertes samtykke, jf. personvernforordningen art. 6 nr. 1 bokstav a.



**PERSONVERNPRINSIPPER** Forutsatt at vilkår 1 til 4 følges, vurderer NSD at den planlagte behandlingen av personopplysninger vil følge prinsippene i personvernforordningen om:

- lovlighet, rettferdighet og åpenhet (art. 5.1 a), ved at de registrerte får tilfredsstillende informasjon om og samtykker til behandlingen
- formålsbegrensning (art. 5.1 b), ved at personopplysninger samles inn for spesifikke, uttrykkelig angitte og berettigede formål, og ikke behandles til nye, uforenlige formål
- dataminimering (art. 5.1 c), ved at det kun behandles opplysninger som er adekvate, relevante og nødvendige for formålet med prosjektet
- lagringsbegrensning (art. 5.1 e), ved at personopplysningene ikke lagres lengre enn nødvendig for å oppfylle formålet

**DE REGISTRERTES RETTIGHETER** Så lenge de registrerte kan identifiseres i datamaterialet, vil de ha følgende rettigheter: åpenhet (art. 12), informasjon (art. 13), innsyn (art. 15), retting (art. 16), sletting (art. 17), begrensning (art. 18), underretning (art. 19) og dataportabilitet (art. 20).

Forutsatt at informasjonen oppfyller kravene i vilkår 1, vurderer NSD at informasjonen om behandlingen som de registrerte vil motta oppfyller lovens krav til form og innhold, jf. art. 12.1 og art. 13.

Vi minner om at hvis en registrert tar kontakt om sine rettigheter, har behandlingsansvarlig institusjon plikt til å svare innen en måned.

**MELD VESENTLIGE ENDRINGER** Dersom det skjer vesentlige endringer i behandlingen av personopplysninger, kan det være nødvendig å melde dette til NSD ved å oppdatere meldeskjemaet. Før du melder inn en endring, oppfordrer vi deg til å lese om hvilke type endringer det er nødvendig å melde:

[https://nsd.no/personvernombud/meld\\_prosjekt/meld\\_endringer.html](https://nsd.no/personvernombud/meld_prosjekt/meld_endringer.html)

Du må vente på svar fra NSD før endringen gjennomføres.

**OPPFØLGING AV PROSJEKTET** NSD vil følge opp ved planlagt avslutning for å avklare om behandlingen av personopplysningene er avsluttet.

Lykke til med prosjektet!

Tlf. Personverntjenester: 55 58 21 17 (tast 1)

## **APPENDIX 2: INFORMATION AND CONSENT FORM SENT OUT TO INFORMANTS**

### **Kan du hjelpe meg i forskningsprosjektet ”Deep reading i EFL”?**

Jeg skal skrive en masteroppgave om dybdelesing i engelskfaget i ungdomsskolen.

Dybdelesing –deep reading- er en term brukt av Harvard-utdannede Maryanne Wolf. Wolf har studert hvordan våre lesevaner påvirker hjernen og, som hun mener, i forlenging følelsene. Ifølge Wolf er deep reading en konsentrert form for lesing. Tekstene er tidskonsumerende og fordrer tolking, innlevelse, og kritisk refleksjon. Det kreves utholdenhet og konsentrasjon. Wolf snakker i utgangspunktet om tekster av både skjønnlitterær og faglig art, men i min studie kommer jeg til å fokusere på den skjønnlitterære biten. Jeg er interessert i læreres erfaringer med denne typen lesing blant elever i engelsk.

I anledning prosjektet ønsker jeg også å studere læreplaner i engelsk på ungdomstrinnet for å se hvordan dybdelesingen uttrykkes, i tillegg vil jeg intervju engelsklærere for å få belyst hvordan de opplever de unges lesevaner i møte med lesingen det legges til rette for i undervisningen. I dette skrivet får du informasjon om målene for prosjektet og hva deltakelse vil innebære for deg.

#### **Formål med studien:**

Formålet er å lære mer om hvordan det jobbes med dybdelæring i engelskfaget. Det er hittil noe forskning som indikerer bekymring for folks lesevaner. Carr beskriver blant annet hvordan multitasking hindrer oss i å fokusere (2008), Wolf beskriver hvordan hjernen endrer seg i digital tekstkultur (2018), Mangen viser til studier som indikerer at vi husker mer når vi leser på papir versus skjerm (2013), Fenner beskriver hvordan litteraturen ikke blir godt nok ivarettatt i læreplanene (2005/2018), men det finnes også de som er positive (Ludvigsenutvalget promoterer digitalisering i rapporten NOU:2015: 8 *Fremtidens skole* og fremhever nye måter å jobbe på som en viktig del av fremtidens skole og arbeidsliv (2015), og Clowes finner bekymringen grunnløs og viser til menneskets evne til å tilpasse seg nye tider (2018).

**Hvem er ansvarlig for forskningsprosjektet?**

Lillian Utne Skjæveland

Masterstudent ved Universitetet i Bergen

**Hvorfor får du spørsmål om å delta?**

Utvalget er strategisk plukket, og du får spørsmål om å delta fordi du innehar erfaring som lærer i engelskfaget i ungdomsskolen.

**Hva innebærer det for deg å delta?**

Jeg vil be deg om å stille på intervju i løpet av mars. Intervjuet vil vare ca 30-40 minutter, det kan finne sted der det er mest hensiktsmessig for deg, og spørsmålene vil dreie seg om dine observasjoner og arbeidsmåter i klasserommet i engelskfaget på ungdomstrinnet. Deltakere kan også trekke seg når som helst i prosessen.

**Ditt personvern – hvordan jeg oppbevarer og bruker dine opplysninger:**

Jeg vil bare bruke opplysningene om deg til formålet fortalt om i dette skrivet. Intervjuene vil bli tatt opp på bånd og vil bli slettet etter transkribering. Som informant vil du og din skole være anonym og all informasjon vil bli behandlet konfidensielt og i samsvar med personvernregelverket. Det vil ikke være mulig å identifisere deg, din skole eller elever i den endelige rapporten.

**Hva skjer med opplysningene dine når vi avslutter forskningsprosjektet?**

Prosjektet skal etter planen avsluttes våren 2020 og identifiserbare opplysninger vil bli slettet.

Hvis du har spørsmål

Hvis du har spørsmål, ikke nøl med å ta kontakt med undertegnede

Med vennlig hilsen

Lillian Utne Skjæveland  
90134287  
lilliansutne@gmail.com

---

**Samtykkeerklæring**

**Jeg har mottatt og forstått informasjon om prosjektet «Deep reading in EFL», og samtykker til:**

**å bli intervjuet rundt min lærererfaring**

**Jeg samtykker til at mine opplysninger behandles frem til prosjektet er avsluttet, våren 2020**

---

**(Signatur og dato)**

## APPENDIX 3: INTERVIEW GUIDE

Informasjon det kan være lurt å lese før intervjuet

Dybdelesing er i min studie forstått som lengre og mer tidkrevende tekster innen både sakprosa og skjønnlitteratur, men da jeg må gjøre noen avgrensninger ifht tid og plass har jeg valgt å ha hovedfokus på skjønnlitteratur. Det er en del forskning som indikerer bekymring for folks lesevaner (Carr (2008), Wolf (2018), Mangel (2013) og Fenner (2005/2018).

Digitalisering og manglende trening har fått noe av skylden for dette, men det finnes også de som er positive (Ludvigsenutvalget (2015), Clowes (2018)). Her er en nærmere beskrivelse om deep reading, fra min prosjektskisse.

Deep reading is a term attributed the cognitive scientist Maryanne Wolf, and is hallmarked to impede the formation of the slower cognitive processes like critical thinking, personal reflection, imagination and empathy (Wolf: 2018, 8). In my understanding, deep reading is a concentrated form of reading that shares traces with both intensive and extensive reading. According to Simensen (2007), intensive reading is reading in a detailed and careful way, whereas extensive reading “usually means silent reading and reading for pleasure and enjoyment”. My definition of deep reading is: *the consumption of long or substantial texts that challenge the reader emotionally and intellectually.*

### Spørsmål:

#### Part 1 - Background questions:

1. Hvor mange år har du undervist?
2. Hva er din bakgrunn?
3. Hvilke andre fag underviser du?
4. hvor mange elever har du i per klasse i engelsk idag?

#### Part 2 - Praksisundersøkende spørsmål (undersøker rammer, rutiner og lærers praksis)

5. Leser elevene på papir eller skjerm? Anslagsvis tidsforbruk på hver ca?

6. Beskriv type og bruk av læremidler, lærebøker, lærebrett, o.l, som brukes i undervisningen
7. Hvordan legger du til rette for lesing av deep reading, for eksempel gjennom litteratur, i engelskundervisningen?
8. Jobber du med bestemte lesestrategier i EFL?
9. Jobber du med tekstsjangre i EFL, eller har du andre framgangsmåter?
10. Hvordan kombinerer du teknologi med deep reading i EFL-klasserommet?
11. Hvordan mener du deep reading er synliggjort i de lokale læreplanene i engelsk på din skole?
12. Hvordan legger du opp for å ivareta dette i EFL-undervisningsaktivitetene? Hvilke metoder, tekster og aktiviteter bruker du? (In what ways do you facilitate for deep reading in the classroom?)
13. Legger du til rette for deep reading aktiviteter i form av lesesiesta/lesestund? I så fall hvordan, og hva er dine erfaringer med dette?
14. Do you facilitate deep reading without there necessarily being activities connected to them?
15. Kan du fortelle om ei økt kor du jobba med ei lengre novella, bok, krevande artikkel etc?
16. Wolf snakker om begrepet «imagery» evnen til å danne seg indre bilder over hva man leser. Har du gjort deg noen erfaringer i undervisning knyttet opp mot dette? For eksempel i måten du etterstreber at de skal oppøve evnen til imagery, enten at du har planlagt økter, eller noe har oppstått underveis i undervisningen? Fortell (How do you teach pupils to utilize visualisation and imagery?)
17. Wolf snakker om evnen til perspective taking og det å sette seg inn i andres situasjon, som et ledd for å oppøve empati. Har du gjort deg noen erfaringer i undervisning knyttet opp mot dette? For eksempel i måten du etterstreber at de skal oppøve evnen til perspective-taking, enten at du har planlagt økter, eller noe har oppstått underveis i undervisningen? Fortell (How do you teach pupils to utilize empathy and perspective taking?)
18. Hva er dine tanker rundt vurdering i student performance i deep reading, for eksempel, hvordan vurderer du student performance i deep reading?

**Part 3 - Hvordan læreren observerer og forstår eleven i EFL-undervisningen (experience deep reading) (beskrive)**

19. På en skala fra en til fem, der 1 er minst og fem er mest, hvordan vil du vurdere disse påstandene? Kom gjerne med utfyllende kommentarer om nødvendig.

-Elevene mine er gode lesere

-Elevene mine kan konsentrere seg om en lengre tekst i engelskfaget på et tidsrom på 10 minutter

-20 minutter

-30 minutter

-lenger

Elevene mine er motiverte for å lese lengre og tidkrevende tekster

Elevene mine lar seg lett distrahere når de skal lese tidkrevende tekster?

20. Hvordan vil du beskrive elevene dine sine lesevaner i engelskfaget generelt? Styrker, svakheter, vaner, etc.
21. Hvilke lesemåter går mest igjen, ranger: **skimming** –få en kjapp oversikt, **scanning** –å lese så raskt man kan i jakt på en bestemt informasjon, **reflekterende lesing**, setter lesing i sammenheng for å forstå større helhet, **ortografisk lesing**, at eleven kjenner igjen ord og leser uten å nødvendigvis sette det i sammenheng med en større kontekst (en leser ord for ord)?
22. Hvordan vil du beskrive elevene dine sine holdninger til deep reading i engelsk, bruk gjerne eksempler.
23. Hvis du har undervist i skolen en stund, hvordan vil du beskrive elevers utvikling ifht dybdelesing i engelskfaget?
24. Hvordan interagerer bruk av teknologi med dybdelesingen i engelskfaget? Læringsfremmende, utfordrende, supplerende? kom gjerne med eksempler.
25. Utifra hvordan du kjenner nåværende og tidligere elever, er det noe du anser som spesielt utfordrende knyttet til å ivareta deep reading I EFL? (Do pupils face challenges in their meeting with deep reading in EFL)
26. Hva er din erfaring med elevers evne til selv-regulering I møte med lengre, krevende tekster? (Do they need lots of encouragement, how do they approach it.
27. Hva tenker du ifht lesingens påvirkning på skrivingen, noen tanker?
28. Dealing with uncertainty and ambivalence in texts, hva er din erfaring med elevers møte med å tolke, gjette, dedusere, indikere?

Har du en sluttkommentar, noe du vil tilføye?

## APPENDIX 4: TRANSCRIBED INTERVIEWS

### Informant A, 8. April 2019

#### Part 1. Background questions:

LS: Hvor mange år har du undervist:

A: 6 år i barne og ungdomsskole

LS: Hva er din bakgrunn?

A: Master i engelsk og religion NTNU

LS: Hvilke andre fag underviser du?

A: religion (KRLE) og norsk

LS: Hvor mange elever har du i hver klasse i engelsk i dag?

A: 9. trinn -11 elever, eng F -16 elever, 7. trinn 11 elever

#### Part 2. Praksisundersøkende spørsmål:

LS: Leser elevene på papir eller skjerm? Anslagsvis tidsbruk på hver ca?

A: De leser begge deler, litt mer skjerm enn papir, ca 60-40, 60 på skjerm

LS: Beskriv type og bruk av læremidler, lærebøker, lærebrett o.l, som brukes i undervisningen?

A: iPad, med ulike apper, mye book creator, explain everything, ithink på u-trinn, quest og new flight, bruker og stager til kopi -synes dette er bedre, bruker og headphoner mest på 7. trinn På 7. trinn leser vi mest på det som er i lærebok, quest, tekstene der er lettere for elevene å forstå, det er kanskje litt svakere klasse, hvis det er lov å si, i questbøkene er det også lærerveiledning som følger med, lettere å bruke det når du vet de trenger hjelp, men på ungdomsskolen er de egentlig ganske sterke i engelsk så der har eg brukt mye noveller som eg har funnet utenom som eg huske sjøl frå då eg sjøl va elev.

LS: Hvordan legger du til rette for lesing av deep reading? For eksempel gjennom litteratur, i engelskundervisningen?

A: Ja, for eksempel hvis me har lest den der av Roald Dahl, the land lady, huske du den? (nikker) Den så handle om ei dama som leie ut et rom, så komme det en mann forbi som ser at det leies ut et rom, det e egentlig sånn grusomme thriller av RD, då går me alltid gjennom teksten ilag, så går eg alltid gjennom sånn c ake de kan forvente av teksten for de trengje mye sånn easy in to for å få med handlingen for å forstå någe, så pleie me ofte



lesa ilag først høgt, så der eg tar stor del av det og så dele eg opp mellom de, så pleie de i grupper etterpå lese det sammen og der dei og skal oppsummere, så går me gjennom alle vanskelige ord, ber dei sette strek under, og då funke det best å ha en hard copy, å ha det for hånd, for då kan de sette strek under de ordå som dei lure på. Så går me gjennom i plenum etterpå ke det handle om, åsså då etterpå pleie eg som regel å ha någen oppgaver klar til de, me kjøre litt sånn standard oppgaver med litt sånn spørsmål til teksten men det går jo an å gjer någe meir kreativt enn det eg gjorde nå då, åsså laga litt utav det.

LS: Bruker du bestemte lesestrategier i EFL?

A: Lesestrategier, ja, eg hjelpe de veldig i gang me teksten, hvis det e bilder, se på bildene, ser på tittel, prøve å finne ut kor mange avsnitt det e, kor lang e an, koss kan me vite det e novelle, åsså lese, viss det følge med en sånn liten oppsummering på slutten så pleie eg avåte å lese den for dei fysst, åsså har eg avåte bedt dei skrimma fysst, bare sjå raskt øve, ke dreie det eg om, ke tror dåkke det dreie seg om, for det at ofte -det gjelde egentlig både sakprosa og skjønnlitteratur, så kan du lesa fort igjennom åsså se ke det dreie seg om, åsså vett du egentlig sånn ca ka vil skje nå liksom.

LS: mm, så litt sånn «the gist of the message»?

A: Ja

LS: det e ofte det me kalle for skumlesing- for å få et øveblikk, åsså går dåkke meir inn i dybden ittekvert?

A: mm, ja, åsså ser på struktur

LS: Jobber du med tekstsjangre eller har du andre framgangsmåter?

A: Ja, eg har jo egentlig bare brukt de tekstene som eg har brukt sjøl og som eg sjøl lige, men eg bruke jo tekstsjanger, eg fortrekke jo når me ska lesa extensive så foretrekke eg å bruka skjønnlitteratur, og det syns elevane og ofte e veldig kjekt, spesielt hvis det e et kjent verk som de på en måte kan kjenna seg igjen i, så eg prøve å bruke viktige noveller for eksempel, viktige utdrag fra romaner fra kjente forfattere eller som dei kan få på eksamen då.

LS: Hvordan kombinerer du teknologi med deep reading i EFL-klasserommet?

A: ja, asså, skulle ønska eg kunne gjort det lettare i klasserommet enn det det e nå for hvis du ska lesa deep reading med ipad så kan det ver at du får en del hjelp, for eksempel at du kan få lest opp en tekst på ipad, men det e jo og litt utfordringer for eksempel på skolen der me jobbe så e det sånn at hvis eg vil ha tak i den Roald Dahl sin novella så må eg leita lenge for å finna an, kanskje finne eg den kanskje ikkje, og någen gonge må du leita så sinnsykt lenge og så til slutt finne du an og så koste den penger åsså vett du at ah kan ikkje bruk an. Så det e liksom sånn at de digitale verktøyene våre gir muligheter men og begrensninger, at man bruke lang tid på å leite, så då blir det ofte at me velge å kjøre hard copy åsså lese opp fra ark då. Men någen læreverk sånn som quest for 7. klasse då de har jo mange av dei tekstene som e på lærersidene, så då kan eg spille høyt for de. Då

kan de og gå inn sjøl og sjå og då e det jo ord som e utheva og sånn, så de kan slå opp med ein gang eller så de kan få forklaringen på.

LS: Hvordan mener du deep reading er synliggjort i lokal læreplan i engelsk på din skole?

A: godt spørsmål, huske ikkje heilt i hovet, men det står vel någe sånt som at elevene skal møte en rekke skjønnlitterære tekster, eg huske ikkje om det e ordet «møter» men det e noe lignende i alle fall, og då tenke eg det e litt opp til læreren, men eg tenke det e kanskje ikkje så spesifisert, eh at man ska møte tekster både for esxtensive reading men og for pleasure reading då, hvis du skjønner hva jeg mener, så eg vett ikkje om det e så veldigt, altså det kan ver det e meir forankra enn det eg vett då.

LS: Hvordan legger du opp for å ivareta dette i EFL undervisningsaktivitetene? Hvilke metoder, tekster og aktiviteter bruker du?

A: Ja, sånn ja, eh, sei det, viss eg fysst ska ha en tekst som eg vett om enn time så legge eg av heile timen til det. For då vett eg at eg lese ikkje bare en tekst i 20 minutt og så går videre, eg sette av tid, og veldig ofte pleie eg å plukke opp tråden igjen seinare. Em, hvis m eska lesa enn tekst som e litt lange så pleie eg kjøra sånn at eg prøve å få de inn i teksten åsså kan eg lesa aleina åsså tar me vanskelige ord og spørsmål til teksten, lese høgt etterpå og ta spørsmål og ord underveis. Ofte blir det mye refleksjonsspørsmål for ofte e det sånn at du må tenka litt og reflektera, og du må jo leita itte ting i teksten, symboler, kontraster, metaforer, veldig ofte, og det gjørr jo at de blir liksom sånn veldig obs på, veldig ofte når du skrive enn tekst så kan du finnud veldig mye hvis du bare lese litt mellom linjene, og eg merke at 7. klasse e ikkje så veldig flinke på det ennå, 9. klasse har komt seg nå siden jul, ja, så det viktigste bare å sette av nok tid viss enn ska lese en veldig lange tekst, meir enn et par sider, så e det lurt åsså sette av i alle fall mange timer til det, for viss du ikkje ska ta teksten opp igjen så va det sånn, javel, det va den teksten, ferdig me an. Då e det bedre å ha an liggende, kanskje me kan sjå filmen til slutt viss det e en film til eller et eller annet.

LS: legge du til rette for deep reading i form av lesesiesta, lesestund, i så fall koss og ke e dine erfaringer?

A: ja, godt spørsmål, me har hatt masse lesesiesta egentlig, det eg syns e utfordrende med det e at viss eg har funne tekst som alle skal lese så vil det slite med å nå nivået til alle. Så eg må enten gjer den teksten til de som slite litt kortere eller gi ordforklaringer, det kreve jo og mye meir av meg i forhold til planlegging på den, eh, men det kan hjelpe eleven då, for det e litt synd hvis me har enn tekst som e annerledes til tri av elevene, då miste du litt av den gisten då, eh, men når me har hatt lesesiesta så har det for det mesta vært når de har valgt dine egne bøker, og då syns de vel det e ganske ok å sitta å lesa enn time. Eg vett at någen lærere pleie å ha 20 minutter bare men eg syns det blei litt lite igjen då. Så tar det ofte litt tid å finna seg enn stol og en plass, så det me har gjort då e at me har hatt iallfall enn halvttime, avogtil enn time, og så oftast med bok sei har valgt sjøl, åsså kan dei få lov å sitta der dei vil i klasserommet, någen gonge i mediateket, åsså kan de ha med puta, og någen gonge viss de har fått til å lest mye så får dei lov å ha med seg enn sjokolade eller någe, for det e ikkje alle som lige å lesa så då må du motivera di eller lokka di.

LS: Do you fascilitate reading without there nescessarily being activities connected to them?

A: Ja, mest viss de har valgt sin egen bok. For då kan eg ikkje alltid sei någe om det, eg vett ikkje keslags bøker dei lese alltid, eller kor langt dei har komt så då kan eg ikkje sei så mye om det så då får de bare lesa for pleasure då og så får dei læra någe av det og og så får dei kosa seg.

LS: pleie du godkjenne/overvære ke dei får lese?

A: någen av elevene vett eg velge bøker som e tilpassa di og bra for di, og någen ganger seg eg elever som velge heilt feil bøker, enten veldig kjokke og har for stor tro på egne ferdigheter åsså miste dei motivasjonen for dei komme seg ikkje gjennom, di forstår jo ingenting og då prøve eg å hjelpa di, men den største utfordringen då e at ingen syns de bøkene eg velge e någe kjekke, sånn at då blir det faktisk litt problematisk, at di ikkje gidde å begynne på en bok som eg har valgt for den e kanskje for lang så e an egentlig ikkje det når du komme inni an, så då.

LS: Kan du fortelle om ei økt kor du jobba med lengre novella, bok, krevende artikkel el l?

A: eh, ja, då kan eg ta ei eg nettopp hadde, e me leste ei veldig liten novella som e veldig kjent for di frå før av, det e om den barmhjertige samaritanen, bibelsk fortelling, så va det lagt en modern versjon av denne her så va det någen folk så va ute på t-banen og som opplevde litt forskjellig og då va det sånn at ungdommane hadde mobiltelefonar og sån forskjellig og det va veldig moderne språk, så tenkte eg den her vil di liga, åsså kjente di historien ifra før så di hadde någen knagga å henga det på då, så hadde eg og tatt med meg novellå på digital lyd så di kunne hørre på an mens de leste, som me hørte på samtidig som de fulgte med i bokå, så stoppte eg an underveis etter kvart avsnitt så spurte eg «ka skjedd nå», så va det enn eller fleire elever som gjenfortalte ke som hadde skjedd, åsså kjørte me gjennom til det va ferdig, eg tror kanskje det å lytte gjennom å snakka kanskje tok 25 minutter eller noe sånt, og når me va ferdige med det så fekk di gå i grupper, eg meine det va fire eller fem for det va fire eller fem roller i an, så då kjøre, eg overstyrte de litt og sa kem som va keslags rolle, for å finna rolle så passa di, med tanke på lengde og någen vil jo ikkje lesa så mye, og og for å unngå at den aller flinkaste bare seie enn setning (utfordrer de) for de e typisk at någen av di vil slappa litt av. Så då va det å gå i sine grupper så måtte di gå sammen og øva på sine eh, replikker då, åsså, timen etterpå, det va enn to 60-minuttersøkter då, timen etterpå fekk di framføra dette då, så lesa tekstan då, så då gjorde med det ganske nøye då me gjorde en aktivitet ut av lesingå (Q: opplevde du at dei fekk reflektert over innholdet og tok det inn emosjonelt?) A: Ja, faktisk, for då skulle di på en måte rollespele det ut og då vise de jo mye følelser når ting og tang skjedd, og de gjekk veldig inn for å visa ke følelser som va i stykket så då fikk di i alle fall forstått ke det handla om då.

LS: Wolf snakker om begrepet imagery, evnen til å danne seg indre bilder og se for seg det man leser. Har du gjort deg noen erfaringer knyttet til dette? For eksempel i hvordan du etterstreber at de skal oppøve evnen til imagery, enten du har planlagte økter, eller noe har oppstått underveis i undervisningen. Fortell:

A: Eh, ja, eg kan ikkje huska me har hatt någen spesifikke økter om det, der det kun har handla om det, men me har jo snakkt om kossen ser dåkke for dåkke personen ser ut, koss ser dåkke for dåkk plasssen di e, for eksempel leste me nettopp ei novella -ja det va på norsk då-men då va det veldig mye fokus på at det va fint vær ute og at

det va varmt og då snakkte me om ja, ke årstid det va då, jo det va sommer, så me har brukt det då for å tolk an, men eg har avåte brukt det når me har snakkt om twiight-bokå for der står det jo om Bella, så står ikkje hu forklart så veldig nøye, hu e veldig anonyme i forhold til koss hu ser ut, mens Edvard ser kjempefine ut, så då snakke me om, ja koffår trur dåkke at Bella ikkje blir så grundig beskrevet, skildra på en måte, og mitt svar e jo at eg ska kjenne meg igjen i hu, du ska kjenne deg igjen i hu, alle di andre jentene ska kunne se for seg at di kunne verb ella liksom. Då va det mange av jentene som tok den ganske fort. Åsså viss me og har sett på adaptation, fra bok til film, å ja eg trudde aldri han skulle se sånn ut, åsså har eg funne feil og koss det ska se ut i bokå, koss di ser for seg det ska se ut og koss det ser ut i filmen.

LS: Wolf snakker og om evnen til perspective taking og det og sette seg inn i andres situasjon, som et ledd for å oppøve empati. Har du gjort deg noen erfaringer i undervisning knyttet opp mot dette? For eksempel i måter du etterstreber at de skal oppøve evnene til perspective taking?

A: ja, me leste nettopp ei novella som eg ikkje huske navnet på, det handla om en unge som blir påkjørt og drept, og det va jo litt interessant for eg visste jo at i klassen va det e enn gutt som hadde mista begge besteforeldrene sine i bilulykka, så eg visste jo at dette kunne bli litt spennende å ta det nå, om det va greit å ta det nå eller om det va dumt, å det gikk egentlig veldig bra, og de snakkte veldig mye om då i diskusjonen etterpå, eg hadde jo gjort klar spørsmål, og kom innpå dette her me koss e det for han som kjørte på ungen, kossen trur du han føle seg, koffår blei det bare beskrevet før og etter ulykkå, koffår blir ikkje uhellet forklart, jo fordi det e tiden etterpå som e viktig for han då, koss han ska få lov å leva livet sitt med dette her han har gjort, koss trur dåkke det va for foreldrene, for di har jo mista ungen sin, det e kanskje litt vanskelig å relate to det, men de har jo foreldre sjøl som de glad i, koss hadde det vært liksom, åsså barnets perspektiv, ungen døde momentant i fortellingen, det e jo ikkje alltid det skjer sånn, så me snakka ganske mye om koss det vil følås då. Og det va han gutten som hadde mista begge besteforeldrene, han blei veldig engasjerte og kanskje litt vel for engasjerte for han begynte å snakka mye om ke han kunne tenkt seg å gjort med dei som hadde kjørt på besteforeldrene hans, og så ville han ta hevn på det. Og då tenkte eg sånn at ja men me snakkte jo nettopp om at det e ingen som gjørr sånt med vilje akkurat då, så koffår e det greit med hevn, å de og e jo skada for livet nå etter at de har gjort någe sånt.

LS: fikk du inntrykk av at han sa det fordi han ikke var kognitivt moden for å ta inn andres perspektiv?

A: eg tenkte denne gutten e kanskje litt umoden og så e han litt opptatt av at folk ska sjå på han, en form for å få oppmerksomhet, eg ser for meg at han skulle tøffa seg litt, ha sa han skulle drept de som drepte besteforeldrene hans.

LS: koss reagerte klassen?

A: eh, ja di sa egentlig ikkje så mye men de leste nok meg og forstod at eg ville gå videre og ikkje fokusere på hevn men heller snakke om kossen me kunne forstå.

Part 3: Observational questions

LS: På en skala fra en til fem, der en er minst og fem er mest, hvordan vil du vurdere disse påstandene? Kom gjenre med utfyllende kommentarer.

LS: Elevene mine er gode lesere:

A: eg vil tro en 4 egentlig, på kor gode de e til å lesa, kor flinke di e til å lesa, og te teksta som e tilpassa diras aldersnivå så tror eg di e fire, men viss du tenkte på god, koss flinke di e til å lesa ilar en dag, så tenke eg di e dårlige til det, for det e bare enn person i klassen som like å lesa på fritid, men av di tekstene me lese her så tenke eg fira, og eg har sett og at di får ganske gode resultat på nasjonal prøve i lesing.

LS: Elevene mine kan konsentrere seg om en lengre tekst i engelskfaget på et tidsrom på 10 minutter:

A: 5

LS: 20 min

A: ja, kanskje 4 då

LS: 30 minutter

A: ja eg tror og 4 på den

LS: Lenger

A: en time går greit hvis de har med egen bok, men viss eg har plukkt ut et stykke som tar veldig lang tid å lesa e 30 minutter eller meir så trur eg di vil mista litt fokus ja.

LS: Elever er motivert for å lese lengre tidkrevende tekster

A: nei, det vil eg ikkje tro egentlig, kanskje 2 på den då.

LS: får inntrykk av at dei lese når det e tilpassa nivå?

A: ja, det e jo de færreste som leser hemma, de må liksom tvinges i gang, men så syns de fleste det er greit når de er komt i gang då.

LS: Elevene lar seg distrahere

A: Ja, det vil eg tro. Nivå 4

LS: Hvordan vil du beskrive elevene dine sine lesevaner i engelskfaget generelt? Styrker? Svakheter? Vaner? Etc?

A: når eg tenke på vaner tenke eg mest på uvaner, ting som de gjør som e negativt men eg kan prøve å tenke ut begge deler, ting som eg ser e at når de skal esa aleina på skolen går det ganske ok, men med enn gong di ska sitte sammen med noen, vennepar eller sette seg i samma krånå i mediateket, så blir det veldig fort tull. Og då klare de ikkje fokusa, og då ska de kanskje bare fortella etellerannet, eller hvis di lese etellerannet, for eksempel hvis det står et stygt ord så seie di sjå her i bokå, så eg trur ikkje di får den der gode, eg trur ikkje di får så vanvittig bra fokus, men viss di sitte aleina då klare di og jobba ganske godt med det. Og då e det bedre med hard copy, eller ei bok, med enn gong di ska inn på ipad å lesa så e di inne på alt mulig aent rart så det går ikkje

an å få en skikkelig god økt der så det e jo bare herk, sjøl om de då, sånn så någen gonge får me jo tak i litt sånn digitale hjelpemidler sånn at di kan hørre teksten samtidig som di lese. Men det hadde kanskje funka viss det vs litt bedre bruk av ipaden for nå går di så fort inn for å hørre musikk eller senda enn snap allslags mye rart sånn som det der.

LS: hvilke lesemåter går mest igjen, ranger gjerne, skimming, scanning, reflekterende lesing? Ortografisk lesing? (leser opp definisjoner på disse)

A: Eg føle ofte at viss elevene ska jobbe med någe, viss me har en tekst me ska lese gjennom som eg har spørsmål te, og ikkje ska jobba så fort med di på forhånd, så føle eg di skimme fort gjennom teksten sin åsså e det någen av elevene, ikkje alle, men någen, som dride i å lesa an, i det hele tatt, di gjør ikkje skimming heller, de går bare rett på å jakta på informasjonen då, di prøve bare å finne svaret med ein gong. Og reflekterende lesing gjør di helst egentlig når eg står å passe på di og seie m eska jer dette her, lærerstyrt, for di gjør ikkje sånn sjøl, med midre di komme over en kort tekst som kan ver interessant for di, då kan det ver di jer det, men reflekterende lesing då må eg ver med å styra di, men ortografisk lesing trur eg ikkje eg kjenne til di gjer.

LS: Hvordan vil du beskrive elevenes holdninger til deep reading i engelskfaget? bruk gjerne eksempel.

A: holdninger generelt i klassen, me hadde et prosjekt før jul, boka di, planen var at eg skulle finne bøker så skulle eg og to medlærere sette opp bøkene og presentere di, så satte me di opp så kunne elevene gå rundt i ro og mak og lese på di og velge ke bøker di ville ha, å når di fikk hørre at me skulle ha dette prosjektet og lesa x-antall uker så var det mye stønning og eg hate å lesa og du får meg aldri til å lesa. Litt sånne holdninger, ofte meir negartivt fra guttene enn jentene tror eg. Og etter hvert syns de det va greit nok, de fikk sitte i ro og fred og syns det va ro og fred, holdningene endret seg etter hvert, det blei bedre.

LS: Viss du har undervist i skolen en stund, hvordan vil du beskrive elevenes utvikling ifht dybdelesing i engelskfaget?

A: Endring på kullene i lesing, kullet i fjor forstod mer mellom linjene, eg vett ikkje koffår det e skilnad på di, men den største forskjellen var på den internasjonale skolen eg jobba før, der va det elever fra 10 ulike land, men jevnt over var de mye sterkere enn elevene jeg har nå, jeg opplevde og at de hadde en annen holdning til å lese, vi leste hele boka samlesing i klassen, en tykk bok, det tror jeg ikke jeg kunne gjort med 10. klasse her engang.

LS: Hvordan interagere dybdelæring m teknologi, læringsfremmende? Utfordrende? Supplerende? Kom gjerne med eksempel.

A: Eg syns for det meste det e utfordrende, for som sagt tidligere, det åsså finne gode plasser på nettet, og det med at di holde seg på plasser på nettet som eg har gitt di, og det her med at någen plasse tilbyr di lyd andre plasse ikkje, så du kan risikere å leita deg ihel for å finna någe. Og elevene finne aldri någe sjøl på nettet som di kan bruka, for eksempel hvis di skulle lest en lange artikkel eller ei novella, kanskje den største utfordringen syns eg då, sånn så nå har me hatt prosjekt lenge og då når elevene sjøl ska leita på nett så prøve eg å sei søk på engelsk, prøv åsså søk på engelsk då finne dåkke mye meir, og då finne di mye meir forslag og då gir di så fort opp (utholdenhet) -om di då komme inn på ei sia med en lang artikkel om det emne di ska søka på så prøve di å

søka på å finna enn kortare enn, så eg tror det e liksom den holdningen at di ikkje orke engang å begynna så eg syns egentlig at ja, ipaden som me har då kunne vært et glimrende instrument men eg føle ofte det e bedre å baila den og vær på papir på en måte.

LS: Utifra hvordan du kjenner nåværende og tidligere elever, er det noe du anser som spesielt utfordrende knyttet til å ivareta deep reading i EFL?

A: elevene gir littegrann opp hvis de møte litt for mange vanskelige ord, og elevene ska jo egentlig ikkje lese noen tekster som e altfor avanserte for di men eg ser jo at bare di møte noen vanskelige ord så gir di litt fort opp og at di spør veldig mye etter hjelp, spesielt hvis di ska søke på et emne di har, elevene gir fort opp og hopper videre, hvis lærer har funnet en artikkel og sagt her finner du svar på det du lurar på, for eksempel om 2. verdenskrig eller hitler eller noe sånt, så hopper de bare vekk fra artikkelen og plutselig er jeg tilbake til de og da sitter de med et spel eller etellerannet annet.

LS: Hva er din erfaring med elevers evne til selvregulering i møte med lengre og krevende tekster?

A: hvis du tenke på en bok de sjøl har valgt, eh, så føle eg kanskje, så lenge di ikkje hater boka, då kan di lese litt lenger, enn viss di er på ipad eller nett. Det e litt lettere å holde dei fast med en skriftlig tekst.

LS: Hva tenker du om lesingens påvirkning på skrivingen?

A: crucial, mange elever like ikkje å lesa, og får høre hjemme at foreldre sier de aldri har lest en bok og at da trenger ikke du heller, eg høre elevar sei far min har aldri lest ei bok så koffår ska eg, merker det på ordforråd, idiommer og ord dei kanskje ikkje forstår for dei har ikkje lært seg å tolke utifra kontekst, og eg føle dei slite med å ver selvstendige i det heila tatt, dei klare ikkje finna fram, så eg blir litt matt, det som er rart er at de er digital natives men jeg føler meg mer kompetent enn de både til å finne info og til å finne fram til ting på nett.

LS: Har du en sluttkommentar?

A: ingen sluttkommentar.

## **Informant B 12. April 2019**

### Part 1. Background questions

LS: Hvor mange år har du undervist?

B: 18 år

LS: Hva er din bakgrunn:

B: Allmennlærer med fodypning i samfunnsfag og engelsk, og så har eg etterpå tatt mellomfag i engelsk

LS: Hvilke andre fag underviser du?

B: per i dag så står det på timeplanen min norsk og engelsk

LS: Hvor mange elever har du per klasse i dag?

B: 12 elever per klasse, me har delt en klasse i to.

### Part 2. Praksisundersøkende spørsmål

LS: Leser elever på papir eller skjerm? Anslagsvis tidsforbruk på hver ca?

B: dei leser nok mest på skjerm, eg ville gjerne sagt 80-20, me har lærebok, eh, new flight, den e veldig utdatert, like na ikkje, likte na godt til å begynne med, eg har delt na ut men den fungere som et oppslagsverk egentlig. Eg bruke mest lærebrettet, då bruke eg british council sine sider blant annet, så finne eg litteratur som eg har lest sjøl, eg bruke andre lærebøker som sine sider som utgangspunkt, åsså designe eg på en måte mine egne læreopplegg då, i onenote. Legge dette ut digitalt (kopierer ikkje opp)

LS: Jobber du med bestemte lesestrategier i EFL?

B: lesestrategier, ja, bruker vel konsekvent før, under og etter lesing, og så bruke eg det å jobbe med ord, bygge opp ordbank, finne synonym, instruerer ikkje i lesestrategien før oppstart, den er innarbeidet, sier ikkje nå er det prereading, dei vett det på en måte, så sette eg opp oppslag i klasserommet, for nå har eg ikkje 8. trinn ennå, så dei to klassane eg har, 9. og 10, dei er så innarbeida med mine metoder.

LS: Jobber du med tekstsjangre i EFL, eller har du andre framgangsmåter?

B: eg e glad i å jobbe med noveller, og så legge eg opp hvert år at dei får lese en selvvalgt tekst, eller roman, det er alt etter kor flinke de er til å lese selvfølgelig, eg har noen nå som leste ei veldig tykk bok, noen leste ringenes herre, mens andre leste en forenkla utgave av oliver twist som eg hadde, så det e veldig varierende men nålet mitt er at man skal lese og ha den teksten som fordypning i en måned, då legge eg alle engelsktimene opp til at de får lese, de leser alle timene på skolen og hjemme, det ligge fast inne hvert år, somregel sånn i januar, for det



e enn gode periode syns eg då til det, og så er det etterarbeid og presentasjoner til det, så nå hadde de digital innlevering for eksempel, der de leverte, og då går det på, då prøve eg å komme inn på literary analysis i alle, altså kem fortelle, ke e tema, ke e beskjeden -ke e message, haha, blir veldig direkte oversatt, eh, ja budskap, alle dei, i det hele tatt, alle dei skad ei liksom innom og henvisa til teksten, så då bruke eg enn metode som eg har lært som hette PEE, point evidence explain, dei ska finna bevis for det dei påstår i teksten, og sitere det.

LS: Hvordan kombinerer du bruk av teknologi med deep reading i EFL-klasserommet?

B: teknologi i efl, eg har sagt litt om det, men for eksempel novellene, nogen novelle finne eller har eg, i new flight, men det kan ver at studentane mine komme innom med ei nevolla og den e publisert digitalt, eg har funne noe eg har lest privat og då dele eg den ut for den novellå syns eg kunne fungera, så veldig mye blir delt ut digitalt, åsså e det ikkje minst at dei ska for eksempel lesa et utdrag og levera inn til meg og då utnytte eg det at dei kan ta opptak, eh ja, åsså e der en app som hette explain og då tar dei bilde av utdraget kor dei ska forklara ke det utdraget vise, kem så fortelle, å det e så herligt for nå sist hadde eg enn elev som egentlig ligger an til 2, og hu hadde tatt ei sia, hu leste narnia, og så kunne hu på første siå fortella meg at det va 3. person narrative for det dei forklare om alle fira ungane på første siå. Når dei lese selvvalgt bok leser nokon på nett og nokon på papir, dei fekk velgs tekster heilt sjøl, me hadde hatt litt om ungdomslitteratur, eh, åsså sitte jo eg på masse ungdomsbøker siden eg har ungdommer heima, på engelsk, eh så mange av bøkene dei valgte komme jo eg med, men så var det noen eg ikkje greide å få tak i hverken på biblioteket eller, eg har egentlig lyst at den perioden skal vær ikkje gammeldagse, men då skad ei ha ei fysiske bok og sitta der, men noen bøker der måtte eg bare rett og slett gi dei e-bok, altså dei fekk den inn på ipaden sin, elevane reagerte ikkje på det, at eg må lesa på bok og den på skjerm, men eg syns vel at dei mista noe av den der å sitte å bla i ei fysiske bok foran seg, eh men hovedmålet va å lesa.

LS: du har ikkje merka någe forskjell ifht kor fort dei lese, kor fokuserte dei er, kor mye dei huske e.l.l?

B: egentlig ikkje, eg kan ikkje sei eg merka någen forskjell på det. Eh, alle guttane fekk ei fysiske bok, men så va det to jente som valgte seg ei bok eg ikkje fekk tak i, men dei klarte på samme måten å fordypa seg.

LS: Hvordan mener du deep reading er synliggjort i de lokale læreplanene i engelsk på din skole?

B: Me legger 4 veker i kvart alderstrinn med selvvalgt litteratur, lese fortrinnsvis noveller og fokusere på, litt sånn så e i tiden, ser den fra forskjellige vinkler og kanskje og komme så langt å analysere na, på engelsk, det begynne me med våren i åttende, eh, og begynne å jobbe med språket på den måten, så eg vil sei at det e godt synlig.

LS: Hvordan legger du opp for å ivareta dette i EFL-undervisningsaktivitetene? Hvilke metoder, tekster og aktiviteter bruker du?

B: elevane får bruke alle timane i en gitt periode, då forvente eg kanskje, eg introdusere en tekst på tirsdagen og så tar me oppfølging på torsdagen, eh, åsså e heila poenget mitt at, eg e flink i engelsk, eg ska ikkje stå, det e elevane mine som ska bli flinkare i engelsk, så derfor e det dei som sitte og jobbe, så eg sette dei i grupper, så dei

har komt med ønskeliste om dei like å jobba i grupper, par eller aleina, så då får dei jobba på den måten, eh, åsså blir eg meir som en mentor eller veileder.

LS: Do you facilitate deep reading without there necessarily being activities connected to them?

B: nei, det er alltid et for eller etterarbeid, alle tekstene blir jobbet med i en eller annen form.

LS: Kan du fortelje om ei økt kor du jobba med ei lengre novella, bok, krevande artikkel etc

B: Ja, i går, me har hatt om slaveriet i usa, og då leste eg ei bok som hette the underground railroad, så foreslo eg for den andre læreren, for eg lige å ha både fagtekst og skjønnlitterær tekst, så då passa dette godt, me jobba i går med et utdrag fra den bokå, det va lett for meg å velge utdrag fra den bokå siden eg hadde lest heila bokå sjøl, og då tenkte eg, dette kan bli, nå kan eg skyta meg sjøl i foten for her har eg ei vanskelige bok, det e high fly amerikansk, eh, ja, det e ikkje tilpassa 9. klasse men eg tenkte dei ska få sjå koss autentiske tekster er, åsså ska eg heller bygge stillas rundt di te at di faktisk kan skjønna innholdet, eh, og då va poenget mitt og at di skulle få disse bildene i hodet av koss denne flukten her va, og igjen, eg delte dette ut digitalt, og på siå hadde eg laga til ei ordlista til dei som eg meinte ville støtta opp under lesingå, dei skulle ikkje kunne ordå men dei skulle ha dei som hjelp mens eg leste for dei, og det va heilt stilt og eg leste høyt i 45 minutter, og eg kom med oppfølgingsspørsmål, det blir blant annet påpekt at den eine slaven seie til den andre, hu seie, «åh, kan du lese» åsså stoppte me opp og eg spurte ke trur dåkke va poenget med å ikkje læra dei å lesa? Så fekk me litt debatt rundt det, åsså stilte eg di spørsmål, for dei har fordypa seg i en egen stat åsså spurte egd ei kor e din stat ifht borgerkrigen, kor står du, hadde din stat slaver, eller e den så nye den staten din at den ikkje eksisterte under borgerkrigen, og eg trudde det kunne bli vanskelig men eg hadde gjort noen rette grep for å få dei med, eg snakka kanskje litt for mye norsk ifht ke eg like sjøl, men det blei spetten då for at dei skulle skjønna handlingen

LS: Wolf snakke om begrepet imagery -evnen til å danne seg indre bilder mens man leser. Har du noen erfaringer i undervisning knyttet opp mot dette? For eksempel i måten du etterstreber at de skal oppøve evnen til imagery, enten at du har planlagte økter, eller noe har oppstått underveis i undervisningen? Fortell

B: ja, eksempelet eg nettopp ga, men samtidig så har eg kanskje gitt dei et utdrag og bedt dei om å skriva vidare, forestill deg at du e den personen, bruk alle sansane, åsså har eg gitt di ei fantastiske ordlista som eg har funne der dei ska bruka sansane, verb, uttrykk, ord, der du på enn måte beskrive ke du hørre, ke du ser, ke du føle, åsså ska di utvida øyeblikket då, så då har dei både gjort det skriftlig og muntlig, og någen har og lagt enn film der dei sette seg inn då, någen laga enn skjønnlitterær film der det va utdraget då, sånn så her, då måtte de setta seg inn i det å gjer rollefordelingå, åsså har eg lagt oppgaver kor dei skulle ver nyhetsreporter, og då måtte dei og sette seg inn i koss det va å ver der, me hadde nettopp hatt om tower of london, og enn av mine favoritthistorier e henrik 8. og alle hans koner, og dermed skulle dei late som dei va cnn-reporter og dei stod utenfor tower of london i 1536 å hu skulle hoggast håve av, og dermed så må di jo setta seg inn i, ke foregår, åsså va det så stilig for dei lagte te med imovieen å det va sånn nyhetsgreie og musikk og det va bare, ja, fantastisk, så då fekk di verkligen sett seg inn i å forestilt seg då at di va der, då måtte di jo fram med mange ord og uttrykk, og dei levde seg verkligen inn i det, med penal som mikrofon, og ja.....

LS: Wolf snakke om evnen til perspective taking og det å sette seg inn i andres situasjon, som et ledd i å oppøve empati. Har du gjort deg noen erfaringer i undervisningen knyttet opp mot dette? For eksempel i måten du etterstreber at de skal oppøve evnen til perspective taking? Enten du har planlagte økter eller noe har oppstått underveis i undervisningen? Fortell.

B: ja, eg har ei novella av earnest hemingway som eg like godt, a day's wait, som handle om en gutt trur han ska dø, for han hørre at han har 104 grader i temperatur i kroppen, at han har feber, og han har hørt at du dør når du har 45, så han ligge bare å vente på at han ska dø, åsså e det jo selvfølgelig faren hette celsius som e heila greiå, så han har på en måte låge enn heile dag, så den der utfordra elevane på, forestill deg at du e ni år og du ligge i den sengå og du overhørre denne samtalen ke foregår inni hodet ditt, ke foregår i faren sitt håve når han finne ut at sønnen har låge og forestilt seg at han komme til å dø, ikkje løye han ikkje får lov å gå på jakt, santvel, eh, så den syns eg e veldig gode til å bruka på å øva seg på den der empatiske, sette seg inn i andres situasjoner, åsså e den litt sånn ufarliggjørande for det e jo bare tull eller han har hørt feil eller han har misforstått, så det blir litt morsomt ut av det uten at det blir sånn dødsalvorlig, for det blir jo bare morsomt i slutten. For då, skulle det sitte noen der med dødsangst eller i det hele tatt så tar du på en måte brodden litt av det, poenget e jo at dette e humoristisk, hahahaha....

LS: Hva er dine tanker rundt student performance i deep reading? For eksempel hvordan vurderer du student performance i deep reading?

B: ja, sånn så då di hadde sin fordypning så kunne dei velga enten muntlig eller skriftlig, og presentera, og då va det noen sånne spørsmål, det va en litterær analyse egentlig, om dei valgte å ta den då skriftlig eller om di vil ta den muntlig, det valgte di sjøl, eh, åsså blei det då gitt karakter på, alt eller om dei klarte å visa meg, enten skriftlig eller muntlig, kem så fortalte historien, budskap, sitat, henvisning til kilder e me jo særns nøye med, det å sitere med hermetegn i tekst, å unngå overforbruk av «said», for det e jo alltid det i skriving, the authos said, eller the authos says, åsså har eg gitt di ei ordlista, her er alternativ til det.

### Par 3. Observational questions

LS: På en skala fra en til fem, der en er minst og fem er mest, hvordan vil du vurdere disse påstandene? Kom gjenre med utfyllende kommentarer.

LS: Elevene mine er gode lesere:

B: Gode lesere i den forstand at dei lese godt, ikkje alle får med seg alt alltid, 4

LS: Elevene mine kan konsentrere seg om en lengre tekst i engelskfaget på et tidsrom på 10 minutter:

B: 5

LS: 20 min

B: 4

LS: 30 min

B: 4

LS: Lenger

B: 3, mister en del, någen faller fra etter hvert, synd å sei det men gutter faller fortare fra enn jenter er min erfaring

LS: Elever er motivert for å lese lengre tidkrevende tekster

B: 4, eg såg kor mye meir motiverte elevane blei når dei fekk velge bok sjøl.

LS: Elevene lar seg lett distrahere når de skal lese tidkrevende tekster.

B: 3+ 4, det har med valget og jer, men det har og med dette med deep reading, man snakka om før, mange intelligensar og måten å lese på, og det e ikkje akkurat et leserom, et klasserom, altså du sitte jo rett opp og ned, altså det innbyr jo ikkje til å sitte å kose seg med ei bok. Eg vil tru i mitt lille hode at dei klare å lese lenger når dei e heima sjå seg sjøl, kan rigga seg te en god plass, på samme måte som du fyller med på en film hvis det e koselig og greit rundt, det e ikkje innbydende et klasserom til å sitte å lese over lengre tid.

LS: så du tenker romstruktur legger føringer for aktiviteten

B: Ja, så derfor i den perioden fekk dei lov å setta seg i mediateket for eksempel, dei fekk lov til å gå på gangen, legga seg på golvet, altså

LS: dei fekk større frihet?

B: ja, og det e sånn så eg bare kjenne på meg sjøl atte eg lige ikkje å fordypa meg på ipad, eg klare ikkje å lesa bok på ipad sjøl, enten så må eg ha kindl-en min, den e jo digitale, men på en eller annen måte så e det någe med, eg syns det blir så flakkande, men eg trengje någen sånne tilpasninga sjøl, for å sitte å lesa over lengre tid, så derfor åpna eg opp for det og mesteparten benytta seg av det.

LS: Hvordan vil du beskrive elevene dine sine lesevaner i engelsk generelt? Styrker, svakheter, vaner o.l?

B: Dei har et fantastisk passivt ordforråd. De skjønne meir enn dei kanskje trur, så trur egd ei har meir stamina i engelsk enn ke dei trur, å derfor så e det og litt av mitt poeng å utsette dei for dette her med lenger tekster, for det e någe eg har tru på i dagens brokkete og veldig snap og diverse, eh, vanane e nok at de lese nok ikkje dei utsette ikkje seg sjøl for lengre engelske tekster, eh, det e dei færreste

LS: så klasserommet er den arenaen kor dei møte på den mest -sammenhengen?

B: ja, den sammenhengen, den coherence, når det e ei bok for eksempel, trur egd ei færreste, sjøl om dei e høgt oppe på karakterskalaen, ikkje frivilligt dukke ned i ei engelskbok, åsså har eg jo noen gamere, dei holder litt lenger ut, men dei e samtidig avhengige av litt meir input, men dei har jo et fantastisk ordforråd så dei klare seg godt, di profitere på det då, at dei har det ordforrådet. Min erfaring, eller mine tanker rundt det er at dei som er glade i engelskfaget, eller dei som like engelsk, dei har naturligt nok en større utholdenhet enn dei som ikkje lige det, så e det min oppgave då å utsetta dei for det, hahaha (ler)

LS: Hvilke lesemåter går mest igjen? Ranger gjerne, skimming, scanning, reflekterende lesing, ortografisk lesing? (Leser opp definisjoner på lesemåter)

B: eg ligge nok mest på reflekterende lesing og scanning i undervisning, på fritidå og eget initiativ scanne dei mest, dei leiter etter bestemt informasjon, kan ver i en tekst, «kor foregår handling» så leite dei, så kan det ver nettsider, eller finn verb i presens

LS: Hvordan vil du beskrive dine elever sine holdninger til deep reading i engelsk? Bruk gjerne eksempel.

B: det som alltid går igjen er «øøh, ska me lesa i fire veker, i niende dabbe det av og på 10. trinn e det åh, skam e lesa, ok», dei e ikkje vant med det i åttende, det e oppdragelse, holdninger endrer seg underveis og har sammenheng med vaner. Og også, hvis eg ikkje hadde hatt den erfaringen eg har så hadde eg kanskje syns det va for lenge med 4 veker på 8. trinn og korta ned, for eksempel til to veker, men dei komme aldri gjennom ei bok på to veker tenke eg, og så e det og, veldig viktig poeng, eg sitte og lese samtidig som dei lese, mm.

LS: Viss du har undervist i skolen en stund, hvordan vil du beskrive elevers utvikling ifhttt dybdelesing i engelskfaget?

B: Ja, eg har fleire elevar nå som ikkje reagerer på at dei får ei bok på 300 sider i engelsk, eh, ja så dei e meir mottakelige, hovedgrunnen er at dei e flinkere i engelsk, og så må dei ikkje bli ferdige, men så har eg lånt dei någen private bøker og då har det skjedd at dei spør om å låne boka to veker til for dei har lyst å bli ferdige, selvfølgelig kan dei det, eller at dei har sett filmen og har lyst å lese boka, eller at dei har kunnskap, en forkunnskap, då har dei og lyst å lesa, for eg har någen gutta nå som ville lesa oliver twist av dickens og eg spurte dei om di ikkje heller skulle finna någe som va litt meir uptodate og dei bare neinei, dei likte veldig godt denne historien om oliver twist, dei syns den virka veldig spennande, for eg solgte den jo litt inn og då, eg sa han lære å stjela, å då bare, oi kan eg få lesa den bokå, hahaha (ler) åsså va det altså en forenkla utgave i tillegg, men altså dei lese altså dickens, haha (ler).

LS: Hvordan interagerer bruk av teknologi med dybdelesingen i engelskfaget? Er det læringsfremmende, utfordrende, supplerende, annet?

B: interaksjon teknologi -dybdelesing -eh eg har jo komt med noen eksempel på under, før og etter, eg vil jo sei det e supplerende.

LS: Utifra hvordan du kjenner nåværende og tidligere elever, er det noe du anser som spesielt utfordrende knyttet til å ivareta deep reading i EFL?

B: Eg tenke tilgang til litteraturen, det at eg klare å finna dei bøkene eller litteraturen dei vil lesa, eg e ikkje, det e ikkje mitt poeng å ha en kanon, at alle må igjennom ei eller annen bok av roald dahl for eksempel, men at hvis di velge den bokå sjøl så e dei meir motiverte, så tilgang til litteratur, eg e så heldig at eg har bibliotek heima, og eg e flink å bruka biblioteket på Bryne, så det å planlegge litt, ke vil du lese om tre uker, men så e eg og så heldig at eg kun har tolv elever så dermes så e det og lettere å finne.

LS: Hva er din erfaring med elevers evne til selvregulering i møte med lengre, krevende tekster? Do they need lots of encouragement? How do they approach it?

B: middelselevene trenger selvfølgelig meir stillas, dei forstår ikkje at ja men så lenge det e bare 10% e du ikkje forstår, dei henge seg meir opp i det dei ikkje forstår enn det dei forstår, som nok er deiras øvelevelsstrategi tenke eg, og erfaring, så dei trengje mye støtte og kanskje oppdeling, så hvis dei får ei bok så lese dei ett kapittel, så snakke me om det, tar enn oppsummering på norsk, så har eg og erfart at hvis det e ei litå ordlista på sia, det va litt derfor eg lagte te den ordlistå då me leste den der underground railroad, at hvis der e med sånn forklaring på sia så e det med til at di e sjøldrevne då, så seie eg du får nesten ikkje lov å sitte med ordlistå å slå opp ord.

LS: eg kom på dette med ambivalens og usikkerhet -tåle, svake lesere mer avhengige av å forstå alt

B: Ja, derfor må eg bygge og trygge dei då,

LS: Kva tenker du om lesingens påvirking på skrivingen? Noen tanker?

B: alfaomega, ordforråd, setningsstruktur, skildring, modelltekst, viss eg ska bruke ny type sjanger så har eg alltid eksempel på den, så svare eg alltid på oppgavene sjøl og, dette e mitt forsøk på den oppgaven eg har gitt, men det å henta inspirasjon fra lesing tenke eg e et absolutt.

LS: Har du en sluttcommentar?

B: Bare at dette gjorde meg bevisst på lesing og kor mye eg jer ubevisst, og at eg må fortsette med å være en motpol mot det kjappe, dei trengje fordypning.

## **Informant C, 29. April 2019**

### Part 1. Background questions

LS: Hvor mange år har du undervist?

C: 30 år

LS: Hva er din bakgrunn?

C: grunnfag eng, lærerskule toårig og grunnfag musikk

LS: Hvilke andre fag underviser du?

C: samfunn, eng f, det er litt det samme, arte seg litt forskjellig men tilsvarende, mat og helse så er eg sosialrådgiver og.

LS: Hvor mange elever har du i per klasse i engelsk i dag?

C: 28 stk

### Part 2. Praksisundersøkende spørsmål

LS: Leser elever på papir eller skjerm, anslagsvis tidsbruk på hver?

C: tror det er 80-20 i favør teknisk

LS: Beskriv type bruk av læremidler, lærebøker, lærebrett ol, som brukes i undervisningen.

C: stort sett i papirutgave, chromebook, alle elever har det, ellers bruke me vanlige konkreter og halvkonkreter men i engelsk er det mye chromebook og bøker

LS: Hvordan legger du til rette for lesing av deep reading? For eksempel gjennom litteratur, i engelskundervisningen?

C: ja, då har eg tenkt littegrann, her jer nok folk mye ulikt, veldig ofte så starte eg med førlesing, at me ser litt på ke kan me om dette fra før, eh, og di notere seg det, snakke litt sammen om ke di kan fra før, minne kverandre på dette som me har snakkt om, åsså går me jo øve på dette med nærlesing, og dette kan skje på forskjellige måter, men i engelsk så føle eg ofte, me ser fysst på ord, altså ord som vil forstyrre forståelsen, sånn at me lære oss di fysst, åsså går me inn på sjølve lesingå, men ellers så e det jo eh, mange måter å tilnærme seg det på, og ofte så har eg ofte delt opp en tekst som de pusle sammen, og prøve å finne ut ke som e innholdet og koffår di har fått akkurat dette puslespillet

LS: jobbe du teknisk med teksten først før du går på selve innholdet?

C: Ja, veldig, mm.

LS: Jobber du med bestemte lesestrategier?

C: eh, ja, me bruke jo en del bison-prinsippet, skimming, altså at me lese litt fort, ser på bilder, bruke bildetekst, ser i margen, ke se det som står der

LS: tar du det litt ittekvert avhengig av ke tekst dåkke jobbe med?

C: Ja, men når me lese skjønnlitteratur, då bruke eg veldig ofte at di lese og hørre lydbok, det bruke eg veldig ofte på stor tekstmengde, lese pluss lytte

LS: Jobber du med tekstsjangre i EFL, eller har du andre framgangsmåter?

C: Det e nok litt av kvert men hvis me bare ska lesa enn tekst for innholdet sin del så e det ikkje alltid at eg har fokus på det andra, då hoppe eg kanskje over sjanger for eg har lyst at m eska gå rett på innhold, eh, men eg bruke veldig ofte sjanger, skriverammer, veksle på å vise ulike for at di ska se på ke som e hensiktsmessig, for eksempel bruksanvisning til vaskemaskin, som eventyr, altså sånne ting som e hensiktsmessig, eg ser hensikten med å jobba med tekstsjangre og det e når di plutselig komme på eksamen og di e aleina og di ikkje vett, på eksamen står det ofte at dei ska velge teksttype, ikkje velg sjanger men type, men då kan det ver veldig greit at di vett ke det e og at di kan for eksempel skriva et essay

LS: Hvordan kombinerer du teknologi med deep reading i EFL-klasserommet?

C: bruker mye lydbok, individuell og felles, somregel lytter me i heil klasse, høre litt, stoppe litt, snakke, hørre litt videre, og ofte då e det en sånn spesifikk bestilling på ke dei ska se etter mens me lese. Når dei lese skjønnlitteratur, lese dei på papir,

LS: Lese dei på skjerm?

C: ikkje så mye skjerm, men hvis di lese en eksempeltekst som eg dele med di, då e den på skjerm, og då e det veldig greit for hvis di ska skrive notater i grupper så kan di skriva på samme dokument. Det samma hvis me drive med kameratvurdering, som at di ska lesa en tekst, eller di lese kansje for kverandre og at di då kan dela dokumentet.

LS: Hvordan mener du deep reading er synliggjort i de lokale læreplanene på din skole?

C: eg syns jo me har, me har jo ikkje satt det i system på en god måte, men me har tenkt det, for me har leseprosjekt kvert år, me lese ein roman, me lese in på 8. ein på 9. og ein på 10. så har me prosjekt rundt det.

LS: Hvordan legger du opp for å ivareta dette i EFL-undervisningsaktivitetene? Hvilke metoder, tekster og aktiviteter bruker du? Fortell

C: ja, di bruke jo mye, hvis me holde på med et prosjekt så bruke di mye nærlesing for å skaffe seg info til prosjektet, tenke hvis di har en storyline, di ska ha en karakter, den karakteren ska jobba i london, di må finna seg et yrke di kan ha i london, kordan di komme seg til jobben, altså alle di tingene der, då må di inn i stoffet, og det blir veldig individuelt for di e jo forskjellige personer og ja, mm...



LS: Legger du til rette for deep reading i form av lesesiesta/ lesestund el lignende?

C: me har ikkje så mange små drypp, men me har jo, når me har disse store leseprosjektene så går jo gjerne disse over to måneder, sånn at då lese me jevnlig over de to månedene. Då lese me litt kvar time og har litt andre aktiviteter i tillegg som kan ver knytta opp mot lesingen, for eksempel at me studere persongalleriet, men og tema og har drøfting, eller at me har the curious incident (felles referanse) så går me jo ganske tungt inn i det med asberger og det å ver annerledes, og då lese me litt og det e aktiviteter knytta til både bokå og men og, vinkling og koss bokå e skrevet, den e skrevet veldig stakkato og skjematisk og der e jo ganske mange fiffige småting med den bokå som di må studere og finne ut av. Alle lese samtidig, di lese, lydboken e på. Sitter samla i klasserommet, hører og lesar.

LS: Do you facilitate reading without there necessarily being activities connected to them?

C: veldig sjelden, og det komme, der tenke eg, der e det et lite generasjonsskifte, dei må settes i gang, før va det større andel elever som ville lese bok på eget initiativ.

Kan du fortelle om ei økt kor du jobba med ei lengre bok, novella, krevande artikkel eller lignande? For eksempel, en time eller periode.

C: Når me skulle lære å skrive skjønnlitteratur, då hadde eg laga et trinnvis opplegg kor me såg på koss lage en person, koss man skildre, lage et miljø, bygge spenning, og då hadde eg laga små eksempeltekster, som til slutt blei ein heil tekst, og di gjorde det samme med sine tekster så di og fikk en heil tekst, så satte med det sammen, skreiv begynnelsen og slutten, lagte et høydepunkt, og då va det jo 28 forskjellige noveller, så det va produksjon basert på modellering. Di måtte gå veldig inn imin modelltekst så dei måtte studere ke di måtte jer.

LS: Wolf snakke om begrepet imegery, evnen til å danne seg indre bilder når man lese, forestilling, visualiseringsevne, har du gjort deg noen erfaringer i undervisning knytta opp mot dette? For eksempel i måten du etterstreber at dei skal oppøve evnen til imegry, enten du har planlagte økter eller noe har oppstått i undervisningen?

C: eg tenke på sånn så når me lese the help på 10. trinn så e det veldig vanskelig for elevene å forestille seg koss dette landskapet e i disse husene og kor onde di kvite amerikanerne egentlig framstår, altså di skjønne det jo, men då e det viktig at di fysts fortelle om sine bilder som di har fått gjennom bokå før di ser film om dette her, så tar me en samtale etterpå om deiras egne bilder i bokå og om dei svarte til det dei såg på filmen, og akkurat der så jer det veldig ofte ikkje det men heilt motsatt når me lese harry potter for der har di bildene i håve allerede, di har filmen i håve, så der blir di faktisk bevisst på at di lage sine egne bilder mens di lese.

LS: Wolf snakke og om evnen til perspective taking og det å sette seg inn i andres situasjon, som et ledd i å oppøve empati. Har du gjort deg noen erfaringer i undervisningen knyttet opp mot dette? For eksempel i måten du etterstreber at de skal oppøve evnen til perspective taking, eller at noe har oppstått underveis i undervisningen?

C: mm, det bruke eg veldig mye dramatisering til, når eg har lyst di ska visa at, sånn som for eksempel han som har asberger, at di lage en situasjon om en som har asberger, og må sette seg inn i hans situasjon, då syns eg di vise at di forstå koss han har det og vise mye empati.

LS: Hva er dine tanker rundt student performance i deep reading? For eksempel hvordan vurderer du student performance i deep reading?

C: vurdering deep reading – ja, eg kan jo måla forståelsen deiras då, det kan eg, då bruke eg veldig mye fagsamtaler, gjerne i grupper, grupper på tri syns eg e veldig fint til det, og der syns eg jo ofte et problem at me e så målstyrt, for kver gong m eska vurderer någe som ska gi di et produkt i form av en karakter så må det bunne i et konkret mål, så me kan ikkje bare snakka løst og fast om ting,

LS: samtalen blir litt låst kanskje?

C: me e nødt for å ha det veldig konkret ifht om du har nådd et mål, men då kan det ver greit å ha satt målene sjøl, at di e at di e formulert på en sånn måte at det e lett for di å skjønne og då har fagsamtale rundt det fungert bra. Så det syns eg e en god vurderingsform.

Part 3. Observational questions

LS: På en skala fra en til fem, der en er minst og fem er mest, hvordan vil du vurdere disse påstandene? Kom gjerne med utfyllende kommentarer.

LS: Elevene mine er gode lesere:

C: hmm..... ja, det må bli midt på for eg har begge deler, 3

LS: Elevene mine kan konsentrere seg om en lengre tekst i engelskfaget på et tidsrom på 10 minutter:

C: 5

LS: 20

C: di fleste

LS: 30 min eller lenger

C: pleier ikkje ha meir enn 20-25 min men eg pleie sei fra på forhånd kor lang tid det vil ta, de må ha en forventning

LS: Elever er motivert for å lese lengre tidkrevende tekster

C: ja, når me lese di romanene så e di det, for me har jo hatt en kikkoff og me har skapt en forventning og interesse for det.

LS: Elevene mine lar seg lett distrahere når de skal lese tidkrevende tekster?

C: hmm... eg har en veldig urolig, og di gangene di e heilt rolige e når me lese, me lese og høre, det e et krav at di ska lese og høre

LS: eg hadde en lignende erfaring sjøl, høytlesing gjorde at alle blei stille – kanskje i respekt for kvarandre?

LS: Hvordan vil du beskrive elevene dine sine lesevaner i engelskfaget generelt? Styrker? Svakheter? Vaner? Etc?

C: eg trur di lese veldig lite, eg trur di bruke, det di lese trur eg e kun til praktisk bruk, og det di må lese, blir pålagt, ting di trengje finne ut, koss di ska oppdatere telefonen, osv. Di går veldig fort på «how to» på youtube, og viss di ikkkje finne det der bruke di mye wikipedia, må styres vekk fra det heile tida, bruker ikkje snl automatisk, men ikkje på engelsk,

LS: hvilke lesemåter går mest igjen, ranger gjerne, skimming, scanning, reflekterende lesing? Ortografisk lesing? (leser opp definisjoner på disse)

C: eg tenke, viss di sitte alleina og skal løse et problem så bruke di scanning, men hvis det e styrt, lærerstyrt, i klasse, så e det reflekterende lesing.

LS: Får di kontrast i skulen med å bli eksponert for reflekterende lesing?

C: Ja, det e how to på fritidå og refleksjon på skulen

LS: Hvordan vil du beskrive elevenes holdninger til deep reading i engelskfaget? bruk gjerne eksempel.

C: hvis di sitte sammen og det e någe di ska finna ut av et problem, eller di ska finna någe i teksten, någe di ska fortella te någen andre ittepå, eller di har et oppdrag, som di vett det kan ver lurt å ha et eller annet å komma med, så syns eg di e positive til det, då syns eg di går i gang med litt sånn liv og lyst og kjøre på. Viss det e någe sånn som at di ska oppnå någe for sin egen del så syns eg kanskje ikkje di tar det så alvorlig, det har någe med alderen å gjørr trur eg, alder og modning

LS: Viss du har undervist i skolen en stund, hvordan vil du beskrive elevenes utvikling ifht dybdelesing i engelskfaget?

C: der e en endring, det va meir fokus på det tekniske med språket, gramatikk, ord, og det va fleire emner, faget e annerledes, så putte me heller inn gramatikk og ortografi med det me holde på med, så nå har me kanskje bare to emner, me har bedre tid enn før, så syns eg kanskje måte me jobbe på nå legge opp til en dypere forståelse. Me har kun dvelt dei siste årå, eg opplever det supplerende at elevene har fått chromebook, lettere å vise, dele, gi tilbakemelding, differensiering blir lettere, eg pleie ofte gi store oppgaver i ett dokument så jobbe elevene i sitt eget tempo, så e det kanskje en stor oppgave til slutt til di som ønske en større utfordring.

LS: Hvordan interagere dybdelæring m teknologi, læringsfremmende? Utfordrende? Supplerende? Kom gjerne med eksempel.

C: Det som e litt rart e at med ein gong me dybdelese så e det på papir, men for å finna ut av ting på en skikkelig måte så e me jo avhengige av teknologien, viss di ska planlegge en reise så må di ha tilgang til finn og til flyselskap og flyplasser og det som ligge der, eg tenke då e jo dette heilt fantastisk.

LS: kunne det vært et alternativ å lese skjønnlitteraturen på chromeb?

C: Det e kanskje hipp som happ men eg har jo lyst at di ska holde i en bok og at di ska se dette med kor langt di har komt i boken, altså, det ser sånn ut, det e nesten litt sånn museumsundervisning, sånn e bok, for någen, mange av di har ikkje lest bok, nå har me for eksempel begynt å lese engelsk fordypning, og då spurte eg om noen hadde lest an, ingen hadde lest an, eg spurte om noen hadde blitt lest an for når di va små og det va ingen, så spurte eg ke dei pleide, om någen pleide bli lest for då dei va små, någen hadde ikkje blitt lest for, så derfor tenke eg at dette med bok e viktig og holde i en bok.

LS: Utifra hvordan du kjenner nåværende og tidligere elever, er det noe du anser som spesielt utfordrende knyttet til å ivareta deep reading i EFL?

C: eg tenke jo store grupper hemme at di får driva deep reading på sitt nivå, någen halse etter, någen får ikkje nok utfordring, og me blir liggende et sted i midten. Me treng mindre grupper, nå har eg ikkje iop-elever, men eg har elever med konsentrasjonsvansker, så di kunne kanskje hatt mulighet til å lest to sider om gongen og snakka om det før me leste meir, men eg har ikkje mulighet til det.

LS: Hva er din erfaring med elevers evne til selvregulering i møte med lengre og krevende tekster?

C: Det er en grunn til at eg lese alle dei tunge tekstene sammen med i, eg tvinge di jo inn i en form. Eg vil at di ska kjenna på den roen som ittekvert komme med at nå må pusten gå roligere og at det e godt å lesa.

LS: Hva tenker du om lesingens påvirkning på skrivingen?

C: ja, eg tenke jo det at når du lese tekster og skjønne det du leser og får et forhold til det, både følelsesmessig og at du blir klokere, så tenke eg det inspirere skrivingen, så får du og meir å skrive om, lære meir.

LS: Hvordan vil du beskrive elevers evne til å tåle ambivalens og uncertainty:

C: ja, eg tenke det e vanskelig for di å skjønna og me må ta utgangspunkt i deiras språk, me må ta utgangspunkt i kanskje emojiene de bruke, det e ikkje nok det du bruke, du må putte på tegn for å forsterke det, men ke seie han her, jo han seie han har tenkt å ta livet sitt for eksempel, eg trur di gir opp når di ikkje forstår det, eg trur di blir stressa hvis det har betydning for vurderingen diras.

LS: Har du noe du vil tilføye?

C: ja, eg vil føye til dette, du kan ikkje begynne med dybdelæring hvis du ikkje skjønne koffår di lære ting, og me merke enorm forskjell i klassen når me spør ke di ska bruke læringen til (metasamtaler) Og di komme me smarte ting, for eksempel, den store læresamtalen 20 min samtale om koss di lære, rolle i gruppe, osv.

## **Informant D, 16. mai 2019**

### Part 1. Background questions:

LS: Hvor mange år har du undervist:

D: 2 år

LS: Hva er din bakgrunn?

D: er i utgptk statsviter, har tatt ppu etterpå pluss BA i engelsk

LS: Hvilke andre fag underviser du?

D: underviser samfunn og engelsk

LS: Hvor mange elever har du i hver klasse i engelsk i dag?

D: har en klasse i samfunnsfag og en i engelsk – 25 elever i hver

### Part 2. Praksisundersøkende spørsmål

LS: Leser elevene på papir eller skjerm? Anslagsvis tidsbruk på hver ca?

D: litt blanding, mest skjerm, i vekå ca 50-50

LS: Beskriv type og bruk av læremidler, lærebøker, lærebrett o.l, som brukes i undervisningen?

D: crossroads, pluss bruker ting som ligger ute på nett, nettsider, videoer, korte snutter, gi lekse for eksempel at dei, me bruke canvas, me lage ei infosida med viktige begrep for perioden og korte videosnutter som inspirasjon til emnet.

LS: Hvordan legger du til rette for lesing av deep reading? For eksempel gjennom litteratur, i engelskundervisningen?

D: tenke ikkje heilt koss du tenke men sånn enn har gjort e at en har funne utdrag av kortere, av roman, som har med emnet en holde på med, for å få et annet bilde, som de kan lesa for å få et annet perspektiv på det me jobbe med. Viss en jobbe med global challenges for eksempel så kan en finne en skjønnlitterær tekst eller faktatekst som handle om det emnet

LS: Bruker du bestemte lesestrategier i EFL?

D: jobbe ikkje så mye med lesestrategier på 10. trinn, men på 8. trinn så var det mye fokus på det så dei skulle prøve ut forskjellige og finne ut ke som passa best for dei.

LS: Jobber du med tekstsjangre eller har du andre framgangsmåter?

D: dei jobbe mest med budskap, avsender i teksten i norsken, i engelsk jobbe me meir med ulike typer tekster, kategoriserer, novelle, artikkel, fokus på sjanger, mmm.

LS: Hvordan kombinerer du teknologi med deep reading i EFL-klasserommet?

D: teknologi med deep reading, viss me ska lesa et utdrag, kombinere med å sjå trailer til film, eller når me hadde om klimaforandringar så såg me en dokumentar og leste en tekst om det etterpå så dei fekk forskjellige perspektiv så teknologien kan på en måte utfylla det di lese, någen forstår bedre av å se eller hørra, det variere om dei lese skjerm eller papir, det avhenge av kor ny informasjonen trengje å ver, viss dei ska ha den nyaste informasjonen så blir det til at dei lese på skjerm.

LS: Hvordan mener du deep reading er synliggjort i lokal læreplan i engelsk på din skole?

D: synliggjort i lokale læreplaner, kan ikkje huska at eg har sett någe om det

LS: Hvordan legger du opp for å ivareta dette i EFL undervisningsaktivitetene? Hvilke metoder, tekster og aktiviteter bruker du?

D: ja, nei, eg prøvde jo å tenka på ke me har gjort som går på det, eg vett at i 8. trinn så leste me samme bok i engelsk som dei leste i norsken sånn at historien va kjent for di, men enn aen metode eg har brukt e at di jobbde i grupper og skulle gjenfortelle enn historie ved hjelp av bilder, ikkje tegneserie men bare bilder, så skulle gruppå gjenfortella til klassen ke historie di hadde lest og visa bildene til klassen.

LS: legge du til rette for deep reading i form av lesesiesta, lesestund, i så fall koss og ke e dine erfaringer?

D: eg har prøvd å ha høytlesing for dei, der eg som lærer lese et utdrag, tekst eller artikkel, meir pga at det e vanskelige ord som de ikkje vett koss di ska uttale men då har elevane og teksten foran seg på papir. Eg har ikkje hatt erfaringer med at elevane lese ei selvvalgt bok

LS: Har de lest bare for å lese?

D: Kan ikkje huske at eg har gjort det

LS: folk jer det ulikt, men det komme litt an på klassane og

D: Ja, det jer det.

LS: Kan du fortelle om ei økt kor du jobba med lengre novella, bok, krevende artikkel el l?

D: Jobba med et utdrag av ringenes herre der elevane va i mindre grupper og leste utdrag i mindre grupper og så skulle di svara på spørsmål til utdraget i gruppå etterpå bare for å sjå om de forstod det. Det som va då va at det va veldig stor variasjon på kem som forstod og ikkje forstod det alt etter hvilken gruppesammensetning det va, viss det va sterke lesere – eller sterke elever med gode engelskkunnskaper så forstod dei meir av handlingå enn viss det va ei gruppa, det va en tekst ifra lærebokå, vet ikke om den var autentisk eller tilpassa.

LS: Wolf snakker om begrepet imagery, evnen til å danne seg indre bilder og se for seg det man leser. Har du gjort deg noen erfaringer knyttet til dette? For eksempel i hvordan du etterstreber at de skal oppøve evnen til imagery, enten du har planlagte økter, eller noe har oppstått underveis i undervisningen. Fortell:

D: eg kan ikkje huske at eg har hatt noen tanker eller gjort någe sånt, eg vett ikkje om eg skjønne heilt ke du meine

LS: det kan ver for eksempel som barn at man ser for seg når man blir lest for, klare elever se for seg?

D: .....

LS: Wolf snakker om evnen til perspective taking og det og sette seg inn i andres situasjon, som et ledd for å oppøve empati. Har du gjort deg noen erfaringer i undervisning knyttet opp mot dette? For eksempel i måter du etterstreber at de skal oppøve evnene til perspective taking?

D: igjen, det e ikkje någe eg tenke på, off, det e nye ord for meg her

LS: viss eg seie stereotypes, har du for eksempel opplevd at elevar har fått knust fordommane sine i møte med lesing?

D: ikkje som eg vett eg komme på, det einaste eg kan tenka på e at me hadde om sånne tidlige land i commonwealth og då va det, itte di hadde presentert det, at di skreiv og om ting di fant interessant, då va det en del som kom fram, atte tenkte ikkje det va sånn, at dei hadde forestilt seg at det va på en måte men så va det heilt annerledes, det e vel det einaste eg komme på.

LS: (nikker bifallende hvis jeg ikke husker feil...)

LS: Hva er dine tanker rundt student performance av deep reading, for eksempel hvordan du vurderer student performance?

D: det syns eg e vanskelig egentlig for det blir så individuelt, for det e jo ikkje någe rett eller feil svar på det egentlig, så det vil bli vanskelig å vurdere.

LS: På en skala fra en til fem, der en er minst og fem er mest, hvordan vil du vurdere disse påstandene? Kom gjenre med utfyllende kommentarer.

LS: Elevene mine er gode lesere:

D: det e veldig variert, det e en veldig varierte klasse så det er elever midt på treet og svake og sterke, det gjelder lesing generelt

LS: Elevene mine kan konsentrere seg om en lengre tekst i engelskfaget på et tidsrom på 10 minutter:

D: noen, en del

LS: 20. min

D: veldig variert, fleire detter av

LS: 30 min

D: svært få

LS: Lenger

D: 2-3 stykker kanskje

LS: Elever er motivert for å lese lengre tidkrevende tekster

D: noen vil være det, mens andre ikke vil, den eneste gangen eg kanskje har opplevd at heile klassen har vært motivert for lengre og tidkrevende tekster har vært når me har jobba med tidligere eksamensbesvarelser, ting som de ser e relevant, motiverte når det er relevant.

LS: Elevene lar seg distrahere

D: blir lett ukonsentrerte, ja.

LS: Hvordan vil du beskrive elevene dine sine lesevaner i engelskfaget generelt? Styrker? Svakheter? Vaner? Etc?

D: det e jo dei som går rett på og finne informasjon men så har du dei som trengje mye hjelp og støtte til å finne infoen, men bare det å vite hva de skal finne, ke som e viktig, men der trur eg mye henge sammen med ordforråd og begrepsforståelse og ordforrådet på engelsk, det å på en måte veileda dei inn på sider der språket ikkje e så vanskelig. Bruker mye wikipedia. Dei søker bilder hvis dei lager presentasjoner, når dei søker vanligvis så føler egd ei søker generelt på google for å få opp søkeresultatet og ikkje spesielt på bilde. Sikkert någen som går inn på youtube og ser videoer om det.

LS: hvilke lesemåter går mest igjen, ranger gjerne, skimming, scanning, reflekterende lesing? Ortografisk lesing? (leser opp definisjoner på disse)

D: scanning går mest igjen, dei leser for å finne informasjon, svare på spørsmål i en tekst, dei er opptatt av om teksten er nyttig for dei, om dei kan finne informasjonen.

LS: Hvordan vil du beskrive elevenes holdninger til deep reading i engelskfaget? bruk gjerne eksempel

D: varierte holdninger, det avhenge av ke elevar det e, ke interesser di har, ke type tekst di ska lesa, når eg skulle lesa bok med dei i åttende der dei skulle lesa ei bok dei hadde hørt om så følte eg at holdningane va bedre enn i 10. når dei skulle lesa ei bok dei ikkje hadde hørt om. Der det blei en del, de forstod ikkje sammenhengen (notat: virker som engasjement økte når elevane kunne meir -mestring)

LS: Hvordan interagere dybdelæring m teknologi, læringsfremmende? Utfordrende? Supplerende? Kom gjerne med eksempel.



D: supplerende, sånn så i dag har du jo gode hjelpemidler med teknologien, for eksempel at du kan få teksten opplest, så eg tenke det supplere, (mitt notat, om man får tilgang til new information – dette med oppdatert informasjon har hun sagt før)

LS: Utifra hvordan du kjenner nåværende og tidligere elever, er det noe du anser som spesielt utfordrende knyttet til å ivareta deep reading i EFL?

D: det går på ordforrådet, språket, begrep, det som e utfordringen te elevane e at dei ikkje kan nok ord eller kan nok av språket alltid te å forstå spesielt når det e tekster som e en informasjonstekst som har en del begrep då.

LS: Hva er din erfaring med elevers evne til selvregulering i møte med lengre og krevende tekster?

D: hvis di ska lesa det på egen hånd så e min erfaring at dei må motiveras, hvis en lese felles e det lettare å få alle med, hvis dei ska lesa sjøl så e det mange som late som dei lese, uten å egentlig få det med seg

LS: Hva tenker du om lesingens påvirkning på skrivingen?

D: eg tenke jo meir en lese jo meir vil en lære det der å strukturere setninger på engelsk, som å lære koss ordstillingå e på engelsk ifht norsk, at det vil hjelpe med det.

Hva tenker du om elersv evne til å tåle ambivalens

D: min erfaring e at dei syns det e meir spennende når dei kan undre litt og tenke sjøl, når du får at det e sånn at det ikkje e et heilt klart svar, du skape et engasjement føle eg

LS: Har du en slyttkommentar?

D: nei

## **Informant E, 7. September 2019**

LS: Hvor mange år har du undervist:

E: Undervist 16 år, men ikke i engelsk i 16 år

LS: Hva er din bakgrunn?

E: Bakgrunn er faglærerutdannet, eh, har jobbet i totalt i tre forskjellige kommuner som lærer, deretter som sosialrådgiver og nå er eg rektor. Jeg tok kompetanse for kvalitet i engelsk så jeg har ikke undervist i engelsk i 16 år, har undervist 6 år i engelsk.

LS: Hvilke andre fag underviser du?

E: Faglærerutdannet i idrett, kroppsøving, samfunnsfag og KRLE

LS: Hvor mange elever har du i hver klasse i engelsk i dag?

E: vil understreke at det er første året jeg ikke underviser i noenting siden jeg var rektor, men i fjor var jeg rektor og underviste i engelsk i tillegg til det, eh, også, vanligvis, inkludert i fjor, har jeg har hatt klasser som har vært opp mot 30 elever. Jeg har aldri operert med to-lærer

LS: så du har hatt ansvar for oppimot 30 elever alene?

E: ja

Part 2. Praksisundersøkende spørsmål:

LS: Leser elevene på papir eller skjerm? Anslagsvis tidsbruk på hver ca?

E: I stor grad har jeg brukt bøker. Etter innrullingen av chromebook så brukte eg noe chromebook i arbeidet med felles forståelse av kortere bøker eller lengre noveller, så da leste de på chromebook men det var i fellesskap (oppfølgingsspørsmål: leste dere høyt sammen -nei) de leste stille hver for seg eller lyttet

LS: Beskriv type og bruk av læremidler, lærebøker, lærebrett o.l, som brukes i undervisningen?

E: Når eg har brukt, i forhold til det emnet som du undersøke så har eg brukt bøker

LS: lærebøker eller andre typer bøker?

E: nei, skjønnlitterære bøker, aldri brukt lærebøker for det e jo meir utkast, altså eg har jo selvfølgelig brukt det og men då ikkje retta mot deep reading.

LS: Hvis du tenker engelskfaget som helhet, hvilke læremidler bruker du?

E: altså, eg har brukt både lærebok, kortere og, altså extracts av ulike typer tekster og det e kanskje då me har i størst grad gått inn i teksten mens når eg har hatt større leseprosjekt der de har lest skjønnlitterære bøker, eh, så har eg ikkje brkt lærebok då, naturligvis.

LS: Hvordan legger du til rette for lesing av deep reading? For eksempel gjennom litteratur, i engelskundervisningen?

E: Da er jeg nødt for å komme med det som er ankepunktet mitt, eh, nå er det litt ulikt koss skolene legger opp til timefordelingen sin og det ligger jo der fra kunnskapsløftet av, i utgangspunktet då så er det 120 minutter per år, det er ekstremt lite. Eh, og dette vet jeg at veldig mange engelsklærere, dyktige engelsklærere, har vurdert å gi seg i engelskfaget for de får ikke tid til alt det som de har behov for i henhold til kunnskapsløftet. Det er to karakterer, muntlig og skriftlig, det blir jo vurdert om de ska slås sammen, det burde de, for då vil en lærer i mye større grad ha en mulighet til å gjøre dette, deep reading som er svært viktig, spesielt i skriftlig kommunikasjon men og i forhold til dannelsen som du er inne på, men der er for lite tid til å drive dette i ungdomsskolen, det har låge på meg i mange år, jeg har hatt det som prosjekt, jeg skal komme tilbake til det, kordan jeg har organisert det, men alltid vært slitasje for meg i forhold til tidsbruk og det må stå som et ankepunkt for det er for lite tid. Jeg vet det er kjedelig for mange snakke alltid om at det er for lite tid, men jeg tenke, spesielt i et så viktig fag som engelsk er, som kanskje er et av de viktigste framtidsgagene i en mindre verden så burde det vært flere timer satt av til engelskfaget

LS: så mer tid?

E: Ja, for det virkelig forhindre å drive med dette som er viktig og som gir veldig mange gevinster. Så det var jeg nødt for å få sagt.

LS: Bruker du bestemte lesestrategier i EFL?

E: Ja, jeg bruke veldig mye tid når jeg ska gjennomgå en tekst på det som dei gjør i barneskolen, eh, nemlig, se på bilder, se på overskrifter, finne fram forkunnskap i forhold til temaet, og så har jeg og veldig god erfaring med at jeg alle leser glosser i forkant av å lese en tekst, då har jeg ein større forståelse av di ordene som komme i tekster, det som nasjonale prøver viser nå, nå sist, nå ruller de ut i disse dager, og det som 8. Klasse streve med når dei skal lese lengre tekster, det er jo, norsk ungdom er jo veldig gode i engelsk, spesielt kommunikasjon og uttale og forståelse, men de falle gjennom på lengre tekster, fordi de har endel ord som dei ikke forstår. Så det hindre elever i å lese lengre bøker og det hindre elever i å, og derfor er jeg veldig opp.., når jeg har hatt disse elevene på lengre leseprosjekter, de må bruke mye tid på å finne ei bok som er tilpassa diras nivå, det hette jo at hvis du har ei side og du ikke klare å ta innholdet i frå den side så har du ei for vanskelig bok. Heilt greit at man har to-tre ord man ikke forstår, men man må forstå den totale sammenhengen. Og her er det mange elever som streve. Rett og slett vokabular og ordforråd som forhindre forståelsen av lengre tekster. Nei, åsså, så det åsså når du ska lese tekster ifht til det du spurte om med lesestrategier så er det viktig at dei har en forforståelse i forhold til ordforrådet. Men det klare man ikke styre på samme måten når man setter en elev til å lese en lengre tekst alene.

LS: Så gloseinnøving først?

E: først ja, men ikke i den gamle formen av at man ska sitte hjemme å pugge ei glosa og lære seg koss den staves, det er misbruk av tid, då må man heller øve på uttrykk, såkalte chunks, det er bedre, men mer når man jobbe mer indirekte inn mot tekster

LS: Seie du feks nå ska me lesa ei novella og ei novella e bygd opp sånn osv?

E: Eg har brukt veldig mye tid på, for eg har forsøkt her, nå har det vært i bevegelse dette med sjangrer, opp igjennom tiå, og det som eg oppleve som mest lukrativt har vært å øva på å skriva en argumenterende artikkel eller en artikkel, eh, så det har eg brukt mye tid på, så det vise seg at det favner om dei fleste elever uavhengig av utgangspunkt så klare dei fleste å bygga opp enn artikkel på en greie måte med innledning, hoveddel og avslutning, så det har eg brukt en del tid på, åsså har eg på den andre siden brukt endel tid på fortelling, og jobbd mye med kordan de kan skape en god fortelling. Så det e kanskje de sjangrene eg har jobba mest med. Det betyr og at det e de sjangrene eg har lest flest tekster av sammen med elevene. Korte og lngre, eh, og då de sjangrene eg har brukt mest tid på å skrive. Ja.

LS: Ja? For grunnen til at eg har med det spørsmålet er fordi det nå er mer fokus på retorikken, som står i fokus i læreplanene, der teksten har et budskap, en mottaker og avsender, at du skal forstå kor avsenderen kommer fra, sant, at det er forskjell på å være en blogger som kommuniserer til publikummet sitt enn en som skal skrive en jobbsøknad og vil være attraktiv på arbeidsmarkedet, men (min erfaring er) mange lærere seie jo at det er veldig ryddig å jobbe utifra sjangre fordi det er mer oversiktlig for elevene, kanskje litt sånn eg tolke deg og, at du jobber med sjangerbegrepet selv om det, som du sier, har vært i bevegelse

E: mm, ja, ja, eg samtykke.

LS: Hvordan kombinerer du teknologi med deep reading i EFL-klasserommet?

Mm, eg syns det e vanskelig, eh, eg e nok ikkje de som e lengst framme i skoene der personlig, eh, eg, eg har jo brukt det som eg va inne på tidligere, men ett av dei spørsmålene eg syns det e vanskelig å gi et svar på, eh, og eg har egentlig ikkje et godt nok svar.

LS: Nå e du rektor, og har dåkke teknologi som elevane mottar når dei begynne?

E: ja, dei har pc, når eg va avdelingsleder med ansvarlig for læringsteknologi og som når me har dette oppe i fellestidene, me e en ny skole, der me e nødt for å samle oss om en forståelse av ke læringsteknologi e, eg va på konferanse på det i fjor, og det e utrolig spennende å se kor ulik man e, det som me jobbe med ved min skole e at det ikkje bare skal bli ei bok, at man bruke den som erstatning for ei skrivebok, men at man faktisk tar den i bruk.

LS: Men sånn som koffår landet dere på pc?

E: Det er bestemt, fordi Wang-skolene var toppidrettsgymnas og har tradisjonelt hatt pc-er, men det foregår nå en diskusjon på korvidt man bør endre det, fordi det er driftsdyrt og i tillegg så kreves det mye kompetanse, og så e det faktisk og noe elevene ikkje er vandt til. Elever flest er vandt til nettbrett, eh, og chromebook for eksempel er myeenklere å håndtere enn en pc. Men me jobbe nå veldig bevisst, me er en ung virksomhet som sagt, men me e bevisst på at lærerne tar det i bruk som læringsteknologi.

LS: Hvordan mener du deep reading er synliggjort i lokal læreplan i engelsk på din skole?

E: Når me har hatt nasjonale prøverså lage me en strategisk tiltaksplan, eh, og veldig mye dreie seg om lesing. Eh, og det som blei gjort i fjor va me starta året, hadde årsplanen, så kom nasjonale prøver som ga oss et resultat der me ser, blant annet, at elevene strever med de lengre tekstene og det å ta ut formålet med de tekstene. Nei, og det me gjorde då, det va at me va inne og redigerte årsplanene i skoleåret sånn at de kunne tilpasses de tiltakene vi så måtte gjøres. Så det blir spennende å se nå då når me ska ha nye nasjonale prøver på 9. Trinn, blant annet så satte me igang en lesemåned, februar er lesemåned hos oss ((minus vinterferien)) der alle fag og alle lærere, eh, legger inn i den perioden at de skal lese, og det e i naturfag -naturfaglige tekster, og det e med utgangspunkt i resultatet på nasjonale prøver. Sånn at naturfagslæreren får beskjed om at i naturfagskoret elevene sånn og sånn og det va han svak på, sånn at då må naturfagslæreren inn og jobbe med det

LS: og da jobber de med fagtekster?

E: ja, og da jobber de med fagtekster og så jobber engelsk og norokslæreren med skjønnlitterære tekster hvis det er det som har vist seg å være vanskelig for elevene. Den februar lesemåned blir kickstarta av forfatterbesøk. Så på den måten har me spesielt fokus på lesing. Og når det gjelder deep reading så er dette noe som er lagt til engelsk og norsk som skal gjennomføres i den perioden spesielt.

LS: Hvordan legger du opp for å ivareta dette i EFL undervisningsaktivitetene? Hvilke metoder, tekster og aktiviteter bruker du?

E: Ja, men då kan eg jo dra inn litt av det eg har gjort, eg kan fortelle om leseprosjektet eg har hatt med elevene, eh, der eg har satt av en lang periode, et par måneder, då starte eg det prosjektet med at eg gjennomgår verdien av å lesa, verdien av deep reading, eh, kordan det blant annet fremme ordforråd, fremme skriftlighet i engelsk og evnen til å, eh, plukke opp, visualisere då. Eh, legge fram en del forskning, eh, ja, frynsegoder og sånn for å motivere elevene. I tillegg legge eg selvfølgelig fram rammene, og en del av det eg har gjort er at eg prøve å tilrettelegge for at det ska bli en gild stund, det e jo som kjent ikkje alle elever som syns det e gøy, og målet e å få dei med, så eg har ofte hatt at dei har lov å ha med seg te, någen drikke kaffi, det e lov å ha med seg litt jus, dei kan ha med seg kjeks, åsså bryte eg litt opp koss dei sitte, dei kan sitte rundt omkring i klasserommet, någen har med seg pute, åsså sitte me å lese då, og då e det veldig viktig at eg og sitte og lese, alle har då lesestund, så lese dei i tillegg hemma, eh, men då har me jo hver vår bok, så etterarbeidet dreier seg jo ikkje om at man samles sammen og reflektere kring den bokå, eh, så her dreie det seg om at dei hver for seg skal inn og reflektere rundt den boken dei har lest. Då får dei en oppgave på det som dei presentere for meg. Eh, og då har eg holdt det gående i et par måneder. Eg har forsatt ikkje klart å bestemma meg for om det e verdt tidsbruken. Et annet type leseprosjekt jeg har hatt er at vi har hatt felles, da er det mer sånne ferdige undervisningopplegg, eh, og då har eg blant annet brukt «the landlady» av Roald Dahl, det e en ganske vanskelig tekst, Roald Dahl e jo fantastiske te å skriva, det e ikkje mange som skriva enklare men samtidig så sofistikert som han, og når eg har valgt de fengande tekster, sjøl den dag i dag.. men det e en ganske krevende tekst for ungdomsskolelever, den høre me på med sammen, og så stoppe me opp underveis og så reflektere me omkring det som har skjedd, eh, og det e for meg et vellykka opplegg, det tar ikkje så lang tid som det prosjektet eg sa isted, men då lese me en skjønnlitterær

tekst, eller me hørre på an samtidig som dei har den foran seg på læringsteknologi, nettbrett, eh, og så stoppe me opp underveis og så går me gjennom kor me reflektere omkring det som me har lest.

LS: Har elevene evaluert eller kommet med tilbakemelding på denne måten å jobbe på?

E: Det siste har dei evaluert, dei syns det va spennende, dei syns det va utfordrende og lærerikt, men eg har ikkje, eg merke det at på dei større leseprosjektene som eg nevnte så har eg hatt et par ganger, så merke eg at det er dei elevane som trivst med å lesa som gir tilbakemelding på at dette va kjekt prosjekt. Eg klare veldig sjelden, sjøl om eg et år kjøpte inn litteratur for mange mange tusen, å treffe hver enkelt elev sitt interessefelt, så klarte eg hekte på et par til på bakgrunn av dt, men eg strevde fortsatt med å få med dei fem-seks. siste.

LS: legge du til rette for deep reading i form av lesesiesta, lesestund, i så fall koss og ke e dine erfaringer?

E: Kjeks, puter, jus og te, som nevnt, men eg bruke jo tid på kortere tekter og ande bøker men det e de to prosjektene som eg har nevt kor eg har spesielt fokus på det, i forkant av at me ska inn i den skjønnlitterære verden og lesa tekstar og reflektere rundt di og skriva fortellinger så pleie eg og ofte å lese opp tekster som eg syns e god og motiverende, blant annet elevetekster. Det å samtale omkring og diskutere elevtekster opplever eg ofte som verdi.

LS: Do you facilitate reading without there necessarily being activities connected to them?

Ja, eg har gjort det og, det nevnte leseprosjektet der det at dei må lesa ut uten at me bruke så mye tid på det i etterkant.

LS: Kan du fortelle om ei økt kor du jobba med lengre novella, bok, krevende artikkel el l?

Ja, nå fortalte eg det med landlady men nå kan eg ta ein aen. Eg har lest fra Wilbur Smith, ikkje nødvendigvis heila bokå, men deler av den, og det har eg gjort fordi at, det som eg ofte oppleve som spesielt vanskelig i den sammenhengen e det mannlige kjønn, guttane, som ofte henger etter på deep reading, og den boken har eg valgt fordi den e ganske brutal, den e veldig god på beskrivelser, stor bruk av visualisering av litt sånn groteske scener, eh, og då har eg store øyne i stor del av salen. Eh, så hvis du ska få med deg en klasse på deep reading så tror eg at for å treffa flest mulig, og då tenke eg spesielt på guttane, så må du ver veldig strategisk i valg av litteratur (mitt notat, Wolf, What you read and how you read) og det opplevde eg som en suksess å lesa den bokå, kor me i etterkant jobba med koffårr dette va en god tekst, hvilke grep gjør forfatteren, ke kan du ta med deg vidare i din skriving, hvilke bøker kunne du tenkt deg å lest, koffårr ville du ikkje lest den bokå, koffårr ville du lest an.

LS: Wolf snakker om begrepet imagery, evnen til å danne seg indre bilder og se for seg det man leser. Har du gjort deg noen erfaringer knyttet til dette? For eksempel i hvordan du etterstreber at de skal oppøve evnen til imagery, enten du har planlagte økter, eller noe har oppstått underveis i undervisningen. Fortell:

E: Mm, ja! Då kan eg jo fortsetta på det eksempelet eg hadde i sted, der e det blant annet en scene kor der e to mennesker som har hatt en slosskamp, og så har den eine blitt liggende igjen med avkutta akilleshæl, kan ikkje

bevega seg, ligge i en ørken uten tilgang til vann. Den scenen vare veldig lenge og er utrolig godt skrevet, eh, den ende med at det komme n gribb og står ogvente tålmodig på å gå til angrep på dette mennesket som etterhvert dør. Eh og den kampen mellom den gribben og det mennesket e relativt grotekst beskrevet, det eg gjerna har gjort i forkant, det e at eg har et bilde av en gribb ((mitt notat: bruker bilder til å støtte opp om lesingen)) framme mens eg lese. Eh, men ikkje meir enn det, for dei ska jo se for seg sjøl, men dei får det blide av den gribben. Kan ta et annet eksempel, ei novelle skreve av en elev, eijenta i sjette klasse, en uendelig imponerende novelle som eg ofte tar i bruk som hette «jenta som lekte med vinden», då snakke me litt om ke kan det ver, eh,overskriften, og så lese me avsnitt for avsnitt, og tar gjerne elevene med på ke kan skje nå, ke ser du for deg, kor e denne jentå, dette e ei novella som ende med at hu tar livet sitt då, hoppe fra taket, i et vindkast. Og då drar me elevene inn i det universet, eh, ja

LS: Wolf snakker og om evnen til perspective taking, og ang perspective taking, det e gode eksempler du har gitt allereie, det å sette seg inn i andres situasjon, som et ledd for å oppøve empati. Har du gjort deg noen andre erfaringer i undervisning knyttet opp mot dette? For eksempel i måter du etterstreber at de skal oppøve evnene til perspective taking?

E: ja, for det som eg tenke e at her e jo fordelene at du har ei stor elevgruppa, eg har ofte sagt at, men det e jo meir på generelt nivå, elevene lære ekstremt mye av kvarandre (mitt notat: sociokultur), du kan lære så og så mye av læreren og så lærer du mye av dine medelever, og det å ha et klassemiljø der det e trygt og godt å komme med dine tanker er fordelaktig for læreren, og har du en sånn klasse så kan du i stor grad eh, samtale omkring tekster som dreie seg om empati kor du har noen som kanskje ikkje klare å se budskapet og så får du andre elever til å sette ord på det. Eh, så eg har både læringsvenner, grupper, men det e og samtale om det i fellesskap for å sikre forståelse for alle så du kan utvikle dannelse og empati. Og den nevnte teksten har eg jo blant annet brukt til det, den dreide seg jo om mobbing. Elevane blir alltid sjokkerte når dei høre at teksten er skrevet av en sjetteklassing, eg skal gi deg teksten ein gong så du kan få lese den.

LS: Ja, takk, den vil eg gjerne lese

LS: Kan man vurdere dette, eller skal man bare la være eller, ke tanker?

E: Ja, eg vurdere det sjelden dette, det er ikkje mitt fokus når eg jobbe med dette, mitt fokus e å utvikle diras evner på di områdene eg ønske di ska bli bedre på når me drive me dette, men det e klart, det vise jo igjen i skriftlig produksjon, eh, ofte, og dette har eg mye forskning bak meg på så e elever som lese mye skjønnlitteratur som blir de gode skriverne. Leser du mye så har du særdeles stor sjans for å få de øverste karakterene på ungdomsskolen i skrivning, spesielt når du skrive skjønnlitterært. Men då e me tilbake igjen på, de som ikkje lese mye de kan og klare gode karakterer i skriftlig kommunikasjon men då e det at dei skrive meir saklig litteratur, saktekster. Men å vurdere, når man jobbe med deep reading, ja, man tar det jo med i den muntlige kompetansen då, underveisvurdering, men utover det så ønsker jeg at det skal være minst mulig formelt hvis eg klare.

LS: Det er jo fristende å spørre hvor du stiller deg i karakterdebatten men det er jo et litt annet tema

E: eh, ja, hehe.

Part 3. Observational questions:

LS: På en skala fra en til fem, der en er minst og fem er mest, hvordan vil du vurdere disse påstandene? Kom gjerne med utfyllende kommentarer.

LS: Elevene mine er gode lesere:

E: 4

LS: Elevene mine kan konsentrere seg om en lengre tekst i engelskfaget på et tidsrom på 10 minutter: E: 5

LS: 20 minutter

E: 4

LS: 30 minutter

E: 2-3, og det havner jo på 2-3, for det er veldig elevavhengig, ja

LS: Lenger

E: .....

LS: Elever er motivert for å lese lengre tidkrevende tekster

E: 2-3 motiverte, eg syns, som eg va inne på tidligere, det e en ganske stor jobb for læreren å motivere en del av elevgruppa til akkurat det

LS: noen er kanskje motivert fra før og noen klarer du kanskje å motivere?

E: riktig, og en siste tredjedel er det fryktelig vanskelig å motivere, selv om du har den rette teksten, rette boka.

LS: Elevene lar seg lett distrahere når dei skal lese lengre tidkrevende tekster?

E: ja, igjen, det som e litt vanskelig som me ikkje har vært så mye innpå e jo, hvis du ska ha en felles lengre skjønnlitterær tekst som dei skal lese med utgangspunktet at du og ska gå inn og reflektera rundt teksten, så har man jo i en klasse, det vett jo du og veldig godt, så har man i en klasse veldig ulikt nivå blant elevene, eh, så det gjør det jo veldig krevende å sitte med samme tekst, sitte med samme bok, så derfor har eg jo, som eg har vært inne på før, større success med, hvis det ska ver en større, lengre skjønnlitterær tekst, tilpassa seg, men då får du ikkje den muligheten at du kan sammen gå inn i teksten på samme måte.

LS: Når du har hatt disse leseprosjektene, har du opplevd då at de har klart å bli immersed in books og at dei ikkje holde på med andre ting, forstyrre kverandre, sjekke et eller annet?



E: ja, i stor grad så har eg det, ja, med noen heilt få unntak. Noen ganger har eg satt dei sammen i fagsamtaler i etterkant, noen har lest samme bok, og så har dei då, etter en skisse fra meg, så har dei då samtalt om bokå, i di tilfellene har eg jo då vurdert det.

LS: Hvordan vil du beskrive elevene dine sine lesevaner i engelskfaget generelt? Styrker? Svakheter? Vaner? Etc?

E: eh, styrkene diras e nok at de e, eg tror nok at en svakhet e at det. E nok i stor grad ytre motivasjon som e motivasjonen som drive lesevanene diras. Veldig mange av de. Og det e veldig mye at vanen e at de gjør det for de må. De fleste. Styrkene e at de tar til seg de strategiane som me har lært de sånn at di klare å komma seg gjennom de tekstane som de er bedt om å lese. Eh, svakhetene har eg vært litt inne på, mange klare ikkje å favna om tekstane for de falle ut på grunn av for mange vanskelige begrep.

LS: Men oppleve du egentlig at elevene lese mye? På. Mobiler feks? Og sånn snap og altså, at dei forholde seg me til tekst men kanskje ikkje til den teksten som me snakke om her?

E: Jaja, definitivt. Definitivt,

LS: ja, for hvis dei har noen styrker, ville du sagt at det e en styrke de har, at de forholde seg mye til korte tekster eller andre typer tekster?

E: Ja, de blir nok veldig gode på skimming

LS: haha, ja, det seie Maryanne Wolf og, og det komme jo nå..

LS: Ja, ke lesemåter som går mest igjen skimming, scanning? Reflekterende lesing? Ortografisk lesing? (leser opp definisjoner på disse)

E: Ja, det e nok skimming og scanning altså, men samtidig så lese man jo fortsatt en del i skolesammenheng og i utgangspunktet en del tekster som extracts fra intensive reading då, som man sammen går gjennom, men igjen, eg trur det e mindre og mindre av deep reading, extensive reding

LS: Hvordan vil du beskrive elevenes holdninger til deep reading i engelskfaget? bruk gjerne eksempel.

E: Ja, eg tror, altså holdningen e at det å lesa e litt kjedelig, nå e eg på en idrettsungdomsskole og då og det e nok over snittet elever som bruker tid på nettopp idrett, åh, gjerna ikkje sitte hemma, eller det e littuttalt og, at de ikkje bruke så mye tid på å lesa skjønnlitterære tekster på sin fritid.

LS: Men det e interessant at det e idrettselever, min fordom, at de har, eh, de vett ke det vil sei å treni for å bli gode, oppleve du at noen klare å overføra dette til lesingen?

E: Noen men igjen, då e det basert på at de ønske et godt resultat i form av en karakter. Eh, og det kan me og ta med ein gang men det e mange fordommer retta mot en idrettsungdomsskole, en friskole, eh, og ein av de e at me får inn elever som gjør det bra i alle skolefag, tvert imot, så får me jo inn en del elever, spesielt gutter, som har en veldig interesse for, og et veldig behov for, eh, å driva med trening fire fem skoledager, men så streve de i

skolefag, eh, og det gjør jo at den skoleuka, for en sånn type elev, blir mye mer spiselig og med positive fortegn fordi det oppleves så mye meir motiverende å gå til skolen når du får den idretten i tillegg. Me hr enkeltelever som me følge veldig tett opp og som ikkje nødvendigvis e så veldigmotivert for skolefag og då heller ikkje extensive reading så me må motivera di. Me ligge forøvrig på snittet i kommunen på nasjonale prøver på 8. Trinn. Men ja, det e veldig interessant det du stille spørsmål med, om me kan bruke diras... og man sko jo tro, og det har eg og lest før og at hvis me har et par elever som e veldig glad i fotball så vil de, så komme de til å syns det e gøy å lese boka til zlatan, men det e ikkje nødvendigvis noen kombinasjon der.

LS: en rådgiver på toppidrett sa på en rådgiversamling engong at gode idrettsutøvere klarte overføre det de hadde lært i idretten over på skolearbeidet, som disiplin og selvregulering

E: Og det e heilt riktig, for me har jo veldig mange av den typen elever og, for igjen, de har jo og tatt et aktivt valg og det igjen gjør jo at man blir meir motivert. Og jevnt over så e det en interesse i klasserommet for å gjør det bra og det e status i klasserommet for å gjør det bra.

LS: Hvordan interagere dybdelæring m teknologi, læringsfremmende? Utfordrende? Supplerende? Kom gjerne med eksempel.

Det va et av dei spørsmålene eg syns det va veldig vanskelig å svare på.

LS: Interagerer med bruk av teknologi...?

E: Ja, og jada eg har lest forskningå som seie at det ikkje nødvendigvis e til det positive, men eg oppleve relativt lite endring i fht, hvis eg går tilbake i tid, nå har ikkje eg undervist i engelsk i så mange år men eg oppleve en elevmasse som e nokså lik på akkurat det. Og eg beklage men eg klare ikkje svare bedre på det

LS: det e heilt flott svar

E: Interagere - nei altså, man har jo, man kan jo lese på skjermen på samme måte som man kan lese på bok og eg vett ikkje om der e så stor forskjell, eh, ifht elevens utbytte, eller motivasjon eller tidsbruk frå lærers side, eg tror kanskje me går i retning av at me bruke gjerna mindre tid på det, fordi man har læringsteknologi, eg tror nok at lærere flest i engelskfaget bruker mindre tid på det nå enn de gjorde før, uavhengig av hvilken nasjonal læreplan som gjelder. Så trur eg at bruk på læringsteknologi er lik mindre tid brukt på deep reading.

LS: du sa iallefall noe om at det va kjedelig, noen va vanskelige å motivere

E: ja, der e korte svar på det og lange svar, og det med tid til faget e definitivt til stede, eh,men eg tror jo, det, min erfaring, det e meir på generelt grunnlag då, det e ikkje bare engelskfaget, men min erfaring e, det ser eg og, det kreve mye meir av meg idag enn det gjorde før, å motivera elevene generelt. Elevane idag e vandt til at ting går kjapt, de har mye tilgjengelig underholdning der ute, eh, elever idag er ikkje vandt til å kjede seg, elever før i tiden, altså før i tiden for meg er ikkje meir enn fem-seks-syv år tilbake, eh, og iallfall 10-femten år tilbake, va i større grad i stand til å kjede seg. Det krever veldig mye av læreren idag å motivere elever, et godt eksempel på det er å stå der framme og samtale om 2. Verdenskrig, det var rasende lett før men det er ikkje så lett idag. Og det tror eg dreie seg om at der e en underholdningsbransje som konkurrere med læreren i klasserommet som gjør

det veldig krevende for læreren å være motivator. Og det tror eg blir et større og større problem. Og derfor tror eg me må tenka at me ska ta i bruk læringsteknologien på en motiverende måte hvis me ska komma rundt det problemet.

LS: Utifra hvordan du kjenner nåværende og tidligere elever, er det noe du anser som spesielt utfordrende knyttet til å ivareta deep reading i EFL?

E: Mi erfaring med det e at di streve med det, eh, samtidig så, eh, som eg va litt inne på tidligere, hvis du klare å finne de rette tekstene til de ulike elevene eller til klassen forsåvidt, så har du selvregulert de i forkant. En elevs evne til å regulere seg sjøl i møte med en krevende tekst som eleven ikkje har kjennskap til i forkant, då e min erfaring at det e vanskelig.

LS: Og det med lesings påvirkning på skriving sa du jo og...

E: Ja, det har ekstremt mye å sei altså, virkelig et av de viktigste punktene for meg.

LS: Hva med elevers evne til å tåle usikkerhet, tolkning etc,

E: Eh, nei det e, det e jo der me ser di store forskjellene og på kartleggingsprøvene, at en del elever ikkje får til, å lesa mellom linjene, og det e jo noe som den profesjonelle i klasserommet må veileda de gjennom og trene dei opp til, og det blir jo bare enda mer aktuelt nå i fagfornyelsen med dybdelæring og livsmestring og de andre gode tverrfaglige emnene, så det er jo hyperaktuelt, her trengeren del elever støtte fra læreren, eller medelev, som eg var inne på tidligere.

LS: Har du en sluttkommentar?

E: Eg må bare sei at eg sjøl va en gutt som ikkje likte å lesa og blei sjøl en deep reading kar i eldre alder, så det kan komme seinare sjøl om man i klasserommet ikkje alltid får med seg alle, åsså har eg og i seinare tid sett kor mye du har igjen for det, men eg endre tilbake til ankepunktet mitt, at det e for lite tid. På min skole ønske eg å leggja opp til at dette blir et større tverrfaglig prosjekt sånn at man kan få tid til det.

## APPENDIX 5: E-READ STAVANGER DECLARATION PRESS RELEASE 2019

### E READ: The Stavanger Declaration on the Future of Reading



*Press Release: The new importance of reading*

**The medium matters: Well over one hundred scientists publish interdisciplinary Stavanger Declaration on the future of reading in the era of digitisation in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 22 January 2019:**  
**<https://www.faz.net/aktuell/feuilleton/buecher/themen/stavanger-erklaerung-von-e-readzur-zukunft-des-lesens-16000793.html>**

Over the last four years members of the European research initiative E-READ have been researching the impact of digitisation on reading practices. The research has specifically focused on how readers, and particularly children and young adults, comprehend or remember written text when using digital materials compared to printed ones. The Stavanger Declaration, signed by well over one hundred scholars and scientists, is based on research by experts from a wide range of scientific fields, with different experiences and views, contains a summary of the outcomes. Its predominant conclusion is that the transition from paper to digital is not neutral.

One of the Declaration's main findings is that although comprehension may benefit when digital text presentation is properly tailored to an individual's preferences and needs, readers become overconfident about their comprehension abilities when this is not the case, leading to more skimming and less concentration on reading matter when reading digitally. A meta-study of 54 studies with more than 170.000 participants demonstrates that comprehension of long-form informational text is stronger when read on paper than on screens, particularly when the reader is under time pressure. Contrary to expectations about the behaviour of 'digital natives', such screen inferiority effects compared to paper have increased rather than decreased over time, regardless of age group and of prior experience with digital environments.

Research also indicates that reading has effects beyond the ones we consciously pursue when reading for entertainment, learning, and finding information. Given a reading diet of appropriate length and complexity, reading has the potential to foster mental focus, patience and discipline, offers emotional and aesthetic experiences, increases linguistic knowledge and enhances economic and personal well-being. Skimming texts doesn't bring such benefits.

In today's hybrid reading environment, paper and digital technologies each offer different advantages for different purposes. In order to properly manage the digital transformation, we need to gain a better understanding when to use which to best advantage. Therefore, the

Stavanger Declaration calls for caution when introducing digital technologies to education and urges for further research on pressing issues regarding screen technologies and cognition. Teachers and other educators must be made aware that rapid and indiscriminate swaps of print, paper, and pencils for digital technologies in primary education are not neutral. Unless accompanied by carefully developed digital learning tools and strategies, they may cause a setback in the development of children's reading comprehension and emerging critical thinking skills.



The **Evolution of Reading in the Age of Digitisation (E-READ)** is a COST-funded European research initiative bringing together almost 200 scholars and scientists of reading, publishing, and literacy from across Europe. *[For more information please visit <<http://ereadcost.eu>>]*



The **European Cooperation in Science and Technology (COST)** provides funding for the creation of research networks, called COST Actions. These networks offer an open space for collaboration among scientists across Europe (and beyond) and thereby give impetus to research advancements and innovation. *[For more information please visit <<https://www.cost.eu/#>>]*

**For more information, please contact:**

- Dr Anne Mangen, [anne.mangen@uis.no](mailto:anne.mangen@uis.no)
- Prof. Adriaan van der Weel, [a.h.van.der.weel@hum.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:a.h.van.der.weel@hum.leidenuniv.nl)
- Prof. Miha Kovac, [miha.kovac@mkz.si](mailto:miha.kovac@mkz.si)

Stavanger / Leiden / Ljubljana, 22 January 2019

## APPENDIX 6: FUTURE OF READING



### COST E-READ Stavanger Declaration Concerning the Future of Reading



We live in an era of ever more swift and pervasive digitisation. Digital technologies offer tremendous opportunities with respect to the production, access, storage and transmission of information, at the same time as they challenge a number of long-established reading practices. Over the last four years a group of almost 200 scholars and scientists of reading, publishing, and literacy from across Europe, have been researching the impact of digitisation on reading practices.

Paper and screens each afford their own types of processing. In today's hybrid reading environment of paper and screens, we will need to find the best ways to utilize the advantages of both paper and digital technologies across age groups and purposes.

Research shows that paper remains the preferred reading medium for longer single texts, especially when reading for deeper comprehension and retention, and that paper best supports long-form reading of informational texts. Reading long-form texts is invaluable for a number of cognitive achievements, such as concentration, vocabulary building and memory. Thus, it is important that we preserve and foster long-form reading as one of a number of reading modes. In addition, as screen use continues to grow, it will be one of the urgent challenges to discover ways in which to facilitate deep reading of long-form texts in a screen environment.

#### Key findings:

- Individual differences in skills, abilities, and predispositions form distinct learning profiles that affect children's ability to use and learn from digital versus print sources;
- Digital text offers excellent opportunities to tailor text presentation to an individual's preferences and needs. Benefits for comprehension and motivation have been demonstrated where the digital reading environment was carefully designed with the reader in mind;
- Digital environments also pose challenges. Readers are more likely to be overconfident about their comprehension abilities when reading digitally than when reading print, in particular when under time pressure, leading to more skimming and less concentration on reading matter;

- A meta-study of 54 studies with more than 170.000 participants demonstrates that comprehension of long-form informational text is stronger when reading on paper than on screens, particularly when the reader is under time pressure. No differences were observed on narrative texts;
- Contrary to expectations about the behaviour of ‘digital natives’, such screen inferiority effects compared to paper have increased rather than decreased over time, regardless of age group and of prior experience with digital environments;
- Our embodied cognition (i.e. that how and what we learn, know, and can do depends on features of the entire physical body) may contribute to differences between reading on paper and on screen in terms of comprehension and retention. This factor is underestimated by readers, educators and even researchers.

These findings are consistent with those conducted in countries outside of Europe. In light of these findings, we have formulated the following recommendations:

#### Recommendations:

- Systematic and careful empirical investigation into the conditions under which learning and comprehension is enhanced – and of the circumstances under which they are hindered – in both print and digital environments needs to be conducted.
- Students should be taught strategies they can use to master deep reading and higher-level reading processes on digital devices. In addition, it remains important that schools and school libraries continue to motivate students to read paper books, and to set time apart for it in the curriculum.
- Teachers and other educators must be made aware that rapid and indiscriminate swaps of print, paper, and pencils for digital technologies in primary education are not neutral. Unless accompanied by carefully developed digital learning tools and strategies, they may cause a setback in the development of children’s reading comprehension and emerging critical thinking skills;
- Appropriate action is needed to develop better guidelines for the implementation of digital technologies, especially in education, but also in media environments more generally. With respect to education this pertains, for example, to the development of empirically validated instruction in digital literacy skills (selecting, navigating, evaluating, and integrating information encountered digitally). Such digital skills will be applicable in many contexts, for example in dealing with government communication and other public information;

- Educators, reading experts, psychologists, and technologists should partner to develop digital tools (and related software) that incorporate insights from research about the processing of digital and printed formats, including the role of embodied cognition, for reading practices;
- Further research into digital learning materials should involve increased cooperation among technology developers and humanities and social science researchers to help facilitate unbiased and evidence-based public debates on the digital transformation.

### Questions for future research

As the use of digital materials for both education and personal reading grows, important questions about the future of reading, the pedagogy of literacy, and the long-standing importance of textual communication arise:

- In what reading contexts and for what readers can the use of digital text be most fruitful?
- Conversely, in which domains of learning and literary writing should the medium of paper be encouraged and championed?
- Is the tendency for screen reading to be more fragmented, less concentrated, and to involve more shallow processing turning skimming into the default reading mode that is carried over to paper reading habits?
- Is our susceptibility to fake news, biases and prejudices amplified by overconfidence in our digital reading skills?
- What can be done to encourage deeper processing of texts in general and, in particular, of texts read on screen?

### Who are we?

Evolution of Reading in the Age of Digitisation (E-READ) is a European research initiative bringing together almost 200 scholars and scientists of reading, publishing, and literacy from across Europe, in a joint effort to research the impact of digitisation on reading practices. Much of our research has focused on how readers, and particularly children and young adults, comprehend or remember written text when using print versus digital materials. The members and relevant stakeholders of this EUfunded COST research Action met on 3–4 October 2018, in Stavanger, Norway, to discuss the main findings of four years of empirical research and



debates (2014 – 2018). The Stavanger Declaration Concerning the Future of Reading represents a summary of this exchange.

