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Abstract

This study investigates four teachers’ views and approach on teaching literature in the English classroom. The main reason for this study is to give an insight in some different ways of approaching this specific part of the national curriculum. The study is based on four separate interviews. The results are somewhat varied and provide an in-depth understanding of the subject. The study shows that there are different approaches for various reasons. These reasons are not only based in methodology but also personal preference and attitude to the subject. The results of the study also show that there is emphasis on teaching literature for various reasons, be it linguistic or cultural. The study also serves as an introductory guide for future pedagogues and teachers on some issues that need to be considered when teaching literature. Last but not least, this study serves as a possible starting point for further research in methodology concerning teaching literature in the English classroom. The possible directions for further study can be linguistic- or knowledge-based.
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Foreword

For as long as remember, I was almost battered by my parents as a child to read. By the age of seven I had read Jules Verne’s *Twenty-Thousand Leagues Under the Sea* with a bittersweet feeling. The thickness of the book was imposing and appalling. But I made it through captain Nemo’s adventures with delight at the end. Today I sit down with friends discussing phenomenon we have encountered in books, films and songs, in retrospect, I am glad my parents sparked my own passion for literature. My peers and I discuss settings, hidden agendas, character personalities, and our own interpretations. I was under the impression that this was a goal most of us had, to perceive the world through the great and grand thoughts the written word has given us.

So to my big surprise and disappointment during my final teaching practice, I discovered how limited the knowledge about basic literature is amongst upper secondary students, not to mention their knowledge of English literature. Furthermore, the standard of general knowledge is becoming more and more limited amongst teenagers in upper secondary school. I believe this to be connected with the lack of exposure to literature in all its forms. And I ask myself, are we losing the hold on our students? Are we moving into a generation where the gap between strong and weak students is becoming wider? Is society moving towards a trivialisation of knowledge and a passive attitude towards a well developed general knowledge of the world as it was, is and will be? This avalanche of what seems as desperation
is not the case I will bring up in this study. My study is a concern for a strong part of the national curriculum for the English courses in upper secondary school in Sweden.
Introduction and Purpose

If one takes a look at the purposes and goals of the English curriculum in Swedish schools, one will find that reading and understanding written text is a significant point stated in the curriculum. There are many elaborate methods on the market that explain how literature can and should be implemented into the ESL (English as a Second Language) education. In this study, within the term literature, novels, short stories, prose and lyrics are accounted for.

In upper secondary school in the courses English A through C, literature and texts of varied nature are criteria for the different levels of grading. The purpose of English as a subject does not only cover the pure understanding of language and its forms, but also an understanding of the culture the language has sprung from and an overview of the literal culture of the given countries.

This study intends to investigate the opinions and methods of teachers in the field concerning literature-based teaching. Four randomly selected teachers were interviewed in order to get a picture of how teachers work with literature. The investigation aims to show pedagogues in the field and future pedagogues how some teachers perceive literature in schools today. The term “literature” in this report covers the written word such as novels, short stories, lyrics and prose. Text books are not accounted for as literature due to their constructed and prepared nature.

The research questions to be explored in this report are;

- How do teachers use literature in their classroom today, and how do they perceive literature-based education?
- What benefits do teachers see in the usage of literature-based education in terms of language development, but also cultural understanding?

These questions are applied in order to get a deeper understanding of literature-based teaching from a teachers’ point of view, whereas earlier research has mainly been based on student
informants. The second question aims to explore the importance of a big but sometimes neglected area of the English syllabus. It also aims to function as the informing question for future pedagogues.

The Syllabus for English

The national criteria and curriculum of the English language at upper secondary school indicate the importance of a varied literature usage in the ESL classroom. The subject purpose states;

*Utbildningen i engelska syftar till att utveckla en allsidig kommunikativ förmåga och sådana språkkunskaper som är nödvändiga för internationella kontakter, för en alltmer internationaliserad arbetsmarknad och för att kunna ta del av den snabba utveckling som sker genom informations- och kommunikationsteknik samt för framtida studier.* (skolverket)

This guides pedagogues and teachers of English to what is required of upper secondary students once they have finished their studies in English. This does not cover texts as novels, movies and poetry alike, but it indicates an input on the teacher’s behalf to go outside the frames of the standardized textbook, given that the textbook does not cover all aspects of the English language. A textbook’s texts, no matter how authentic, might feel constructed and prepared for the students, thus questioning the credibility and authenticity. Altered and prepared texts for learners is a problem that Bo Lundahl examines in his book *Att läsa på främmande språk*, where he discusses advantages and disadvantages of such texts (p. 59-62). Lundahl argues that the text, if processed, can lose a lot of useful meaning and nuance once tampered with. A further explanation of Lundahl’s studies will be presented further in the report.

The syllabus for English also states that the student:

*fördjupar sin förmåga att läsa, förstå och kritiskt reflektera över texter på sakprosa och facktexter inom egna intresse- och kompetensområden eller inom studieinriktningen,*
These are some of the goals for the English curriculum, spanning from course A to course C. This shows that according to a national curriculum, we as teachers are required to do in depth teaching in English literature. In the syllabus, these goals are later on presented in detail for each individual course, and are also criteria for the different grades that are obtainable in the course. The national requirements for English are wide but thorough, considering the goal based grading system in the Swedish schools.

**Method**

The main data collection method for this study is qualitative interviews with randomly selected informants, currently working as teachers of English, in Sweden. Hatch’s work on how to go about collecting qualitative data serves this report as a framework and reference for terminology. Hatch categorizes the qualitative interview into three categories: *informal, formal* and *standardized interviews* (p. 92-94).

Informal interviews are basically a conversation, recorded in some way in the field of the case study (Hatch, p. 92). This presumes that the interviewer has good listening skills and a good sense of what questions to ask at the time of the interview. Informal interviews are therefore never used as a primary source due to their coincidental nature.

Formal interviews are categorized in themselves into *structured* and *semi-structured interviews*. The difference is determined in the nature of the conversation that takes place. In a structured format the interviewer is “in charge” whereas a semi-structured model it is more based on a flowing conversation (Hatch, p 94). In a formal interview one needs to strive for flexibility at the same time as it is important not to lose track of the subject at hand.

According to Hatch a formal interview is best executed if the interview leads from the given topic to where the informant takes it, in order to generate the most interesting interviews, since this makes the answers given by the informant flexible, at the same time keeping the interviewer flexible (p. 95).
A standardized interview is a form of systematic interviewing in order to collect standardized data for comparison. You ask the same questions, with the same words in the same order to all informants. Hatch compares this type of interviewing to an open-ended questionnaire (p. 95).

The form that will be used in this report is the semi-structured formal interview with a pool of core questions, which are presented later in the method section, in order to get the unique and personal answers that are needed for this explorative research.

When it comes to anonymity and confidentiality Runa Patel and Bo Davidson write that it is necessary to inform the informants of how the data they have submitted will be presented (p. 66-67).

Four informants were picked for this interview, two males and two females, two from inner city schools in Malmö and two from a small school in the small town Ystad. The interviewees’ names are not authentic in this report. The individual informants will be presented more closely in their own sections in the Interview Data and Results chapter. The informants’ age, ethnical background and education will not be presented, as they are factors that are not considered as crucial to the result outcome.

The school in Ystad is a part of the third largest upper secondary school in Sweden. This particular school teaches the childcare and healthcare programmes. The school holds approximately 400 students, of mixed ethnical background, but all living in Ystad and small communities around the town. The English A-course here is taught through four semesters, and the B-course is taught in the last year. This is due to the varied level of English the students have. The faculty at this school has prolonged the course time-span so that every student gets the chance to complete the course. The higher level students are given the possibility, and also are encouraged by the teachers, to complete the course during their first year, and many students take this opportunity. This way the teachers can put more effort into supporting the students that need more guidance and help in achieving the English syllabus criteria. From this school I have one male and one female informant.

The second female informant is from a school in Malmö that specialises in media design. The school also offers a hairdresser programme and a sports programme. The school houses approximately 500 students of mixed ethnicity, but most of the students have Swedish as their first language. The school is working according to the PBL (Problem Based Learning) system,
where the students are taking more responsibility for their learning, and all education is set in problem-based situations in specially designed cases. In essence, PBL is a top-down approach to teaching rather than a bottom-up method (Dahlgren, p. 5).

The last informant is a male teacher from an old, renowned inner city school. The school holds approximately a thousand students of mixed ethnic backgrounds. The focus at this school is on theoretical programmes such as natural and social science. The school prides itself in its reputation as the school with the leading student results in Malmö.

The interviews aim to give me insights into how literature is taught in schools today and ideas and attitudes concerning the subject. The main questions I aim to discuss with the interviewees are:

1. What do you think about literature such as novels, short stories, poetry, lyrics and movies in the ESL classroom? Do you see more than a linguistic value?
2. What is your opinion on how literature should be used in school?
3. How have you used literature in your teaching and what were the results?
4. How has your view on how we should use literature in the ESL classroom affected your planning when it comes to literature based tasks?
5. How do you think we as teachers should guide students in their reading? Do you consider any goal more important?
6. What is your opinion on the influence that reading in the first language might have on reading in English?
7. What is your opinion about the extent to which we use literature in schools today?

These are the core questions for the interviews. I will in the interviews allow the interviewees to elaborate on their answers, providing a more flexible and natural flow to the interview (Hatch, p. 94-95).

Three interviews were carried out at the schools where the informants worked part from one informant was interviewed in his private time due to irregular work hours. The interviews took approximately 40 minutes each, were recorded on tape and transcribed to paper. The transcription was made the same day the interviews were held.
This study is of a constructivist nature. The answers were varied and provided a situation for deep comparison analysis. The study benefits from the comparison to see if there are similarities in the attitudes concerning literature, since there is a national, standardized curriculum, it is interesting to see the variations in approach to one and the same subject.

The analysis itself will proceed as a report in its first stage and a comparative analysis in its second. In the final discussion and conclusion of this study, the comparative analysis results will be given a theoretical framework.

**Theory**

Bo Lundahl presents a thesis, in which he argues that literature in a foreign language classroom should be based on the students’ expectations, understanding and experience (p. 135). Lundahl argues that if there is no understanding and pre-work with the text at hand, the text will be hard to work with for the students. This ironically clashes with Gunilla Molloy’s text, where she states that upon asking students what they think of teacher-chosen texts the answer is generally a negative. Molloy states in her study that earlier studies have shown this negative attitude among students (p. 16). I will go deeper into Molloy’s research in the next section of this study. The statement of the negative attitude clashes with what Lundahl aims to promote. My interviews will hopefully give some clarity to the matter.

Lundahl also highlights the importance in understanding texts; that is, both understanding the information the texts provide, but also gaining that the understanding through context. By promoting the importance of understanding, he places the emphasis on working with the text in a most open way possible with writing and discussion as a generator for the understanding and the reading itself (Lundahl, p. 135). In my interviews I will find both the general opinion on this and unique answers considering questions on how informants go about with this in their own work.

Whereas throughout Lundahl’s text the emphasis is on understanding, he describes reading understanding as a triangle: “the text- reader’s language skill – reader’s knowledge of the world” (p. 21). This closed triangle shows the connection between the three points, thus they are dependant on each other. This would mean that they are also capable of influencing each
other and provide development. The triangle is presented as a co-relation in Lundahl’s text, but I would also like to explain it as such:

The language skill determines what kind of text the student is capable of coping with, whereas the student’s knowledge of the world defines the choice and contextual understanding of the text. The text then provides the student with more information, both in a linguistic aspect and in terms of knowledge of the world. Thus, in theory, the triangle can also be seen as an upward spiral in a situation with optimal recourses and conditions.

I will compare and contextualize the data received from the interviews with Lundahl’s theories. Lundahl’s theories cover the questions the interviews are based upon, thus making the comparison a natural part of the study.

Previous Research

In this section of the study, earlier studies of similar nature are presented to highlight how the subject of literature based teaching has been studied. The studies were of no significant importance to this study, but are in the related field of investigation.

Gunilla Molloy investigates what happens in the meeting between teenage readers and the text. The study is done on years 7-9 in secondary school in the subject of Swedish. Molloy also examines why students react negatively towards literature picked by the teacher. She bases this on a theoretical basis of the didactical pre-work a teacher has to do before choosing literature for students to read (Molloy, p. 31). The three core questions Molloy presents are ‘what’, ‘how’ and ‘why’, when it comes to preparing a text for students. ‘What’ determines the content of the text itself, what is brought up in the text, what is it about? ‘How’ concerns the process of how the text should be worked with in the classroom. ‘Why’ determines the motive the teacher has for choosing a certain text. This is highly influenced by the teacher’s style and personal preferences, but factors such as availability of a text also come into play here. In addition to these three core questions Molloy argues that a set of questions concerning when, where, who and with whom should also be considered.

Molloy states that to work with these questions as a teacher when planning and choosing texts is a sign of didactical awareness. I would agree with Molloy on all accounts, considering the
importance of each and every question to a certain extent. It would be arguable though that
the added question *with whom* is valid only in the beginning stages of reader development.

Furthermore Molloy’s research is set in secondary stage of education and in students’ native
language, from students’ point of view, whereas this study intends to investigate upper
secondary, in the English classroom and from the teachers’ point of view.

In 2006 Birgitta Bommarco published a study about literature reading among upper secondary
students in Swedish. The study is about the interaction between the text and the reader, where
she holds as Molloy, the student and their work as main sources. The purpose of the study was
to investigate the interaction with the text, as the student produces a reflective product when
reading a text (Bommarco, p. 11).

Bommarco presents an interesting theory in her study concerning different stages that a reader
goes through when interacting with a text. The stages are set as rules, which are *rule of notice,
signification, configuration and coherence* (Bommarco, p. 53-55).

According to Bommarco the rule of notice is the first stage a reader goes through. There the
reader identifies elements such as title, genre and the framework of the text. These are the
criteria that define the first impressions of the text (Bommarco, p. 53).

The second rule of signification determines the first details of a text. Here the reader identifies
elements as setting, characters and their personalities, and the first elements of a plot outline
(Bommarco, p. 54).

Later the reader applies the rule of configuration. This is the rule that defines the linear
creation the reader makes. The plot is interpreted by the reader and the reader starts to develop
a personal understanding of the text (Bommarco, p. 54).

In the last rule, it applies to the post reading experience, where the reader concludes his or her
understanding and gains understanding of the coherence in the text, related to all its details
(Bommarco, p. 55). The reader fills in the former gaps and voids and makes a complete
interpretation of the text.

Bommarco’s study focuses on the text and the reader, thus it does not relate to the perspective
this study is taking. This study investigates the teachers perception of what they should pay
heed to when teaching literature and what skills teachers find important when reading and teaching reading.

Johan Elmfeldt also focuses on students in his study *Läsningens röster*. The purpose of the study is to investigate the interaction in the classroom amongst students. He focuses on the gender aspects in classroom situations when working with literature. He also focuses on the teaching itself whereas it is the teachers’ duty to reflect over his or her own teaching (Elmfeldt, p. 13). The study is carried out in two classes in their final course of Swedish in the upper secondary school.

Elmfeldt uses observation as main source for his study, complemented by student informants in interviews. Furthermore Elmfeldt’s observations concern two specific classrooms reading texts that will be the starting point for discussions concerning gender roles.

The study has a very specific approach that does not really correlate with this specific study. Elmfeldt’s purpose is to explain the scenery in a classroom, whereas this study aims to explore the teachers own reflections and understanding of literature in the English classroom.

Earlier studies are mostly based around the students’ interaction and understanding of literature. Due to the limited time frame in which this study was to be carried out in, there was no possibility to go deeper into what studies were made on the subject. But compared to the studies presented above, this study approaches from the opposite angle compared to the presented studies. The teacher and his or her own work is put into focus here, rather than the student.
Interview Results

This section of the report presents the results of the interviews that were carried out. In this report there are four informants, two male and two female. They were selected both from inner city schools in Malmö and from a school outside of Malmö in a small town. Two of the informants are from theoretical programmes and two are from practical programmes. The schools were presented earlier in the Methods section of the first chapter.

During the interview, the interviewees were asked a set of questions which were then later elaborated on in follow-up questions. The questions are presented earlier in this study.

The first question is to get the general attitude from the teachers on literature in the ESL classroom and what qualities they find in literature besides the linguistic elements presented. The second question concerns opinions about how literature should be used in the classroom. A follow-up question that occurred here was if the interviewees had an idea of how to improve the way we are teaching literature today, based on what they have seen and done. This is linked to the third question on how they use literature themselves in the classroom and what results are achieved. The fourth question concerns planning which is somewhat connected to the fifth question on how we as teachers should guide our students’ reading. The sixth question concerns the students’ previous reading experiences, not only in English but mostly in the first language. The seventh question concerns attitude towards the frequency of using literature in schools today. A last question was asked all the interviewees on if they were to give advice to future teachers of English, that intend to work with literature, what they should think about and carry with them in their planning and execution of literature based tasks with students.

Sofia

– “It’s a shame they don’t read more.”

Sofia has been teaching English for a longer period of time and she has also taught media and journalism earlier during her career. Now Sofia teaches English exclusively, both English A and B.
During the interview Sofia emphasised the importance and necessity of literature, especially novels and short texts. Her idea is that literature opens up a new world to the students that we might never be able to show them ourselves. Stories offer themes for discussion that one would have a hard time finding in other material presented in the classroom. A dilemma Sofia sees, is that we as teachers love literature and books, our dilemma is how we show this love and inspire students. This dilemma is due to what Sofia sees as the variety of exposure to literature among students. Sofia points out here that as a teenager she read a lot, since there was no internet and a narrow variation of shows on TV, today these things are taken for granted.

Sofia points out on the second question the problem with the students’ varied language level. Due to the variety, there should be more individualisation when reading texts and challenge each student separately. She feels that we as teachers should be familiar with the literature we present to the students, and we should choose the right text for each student. This followed the dilemma of student’s in some cases having a negative attitude against teacher chosen literature. According to Sofia, this puts us in a position where we have to heed the individual level and ask the student what goals he or she has with reading, but also what level he or she wants to achieve. Then remains the fact that the curriculum requires students to read a full novel, thus Sofia claims that the individualisation provides us a situation where students choose subjects of interest. If the student chooses something they personally like, the results generally come out more positive as well. According to Sofia, we as teachers could learn a lot from each other and cooperate in understanding the students.

The results Sofia has encountered have been varied, much due to the difference between the students’ reading skills. She says that some students can break down just by the thought of reading an entire book in their first language, let alone in English. This puts literature reading in the classroom where we have to challenge students gradually, in order for them to reach the curriculum requirements, Sofia says. When asked if she could mention a possible universal way or material for students, Sofia answered that she does not think so, because of differences such as sex, ethnicity and student language and reading level. She says that she would never force a male student to read an explicitly female book, although she has seen situations where male students have read more female oriented literature and found it somewhat interesting and exciting to see how girls think. “Nothing is definite” she says. Thus, Sofia promotes that a
selection of books should be presented in the class, and based on the presentations the students should be able to choose their favoured book.

This discussion brought us to the problem of motivating students. Sofia sees the greatest obstacle to be students’ self-esteem. If they have a “failure attitude” the work will be a lot harder than it need to be. This is also connected with the students’ previous reading experiences, says Sofia. “Students who read a lot do not need an ‘warm-up’ lap, they just pick up a text and read, whereas untrained readers need a chapter or two to actually get into the flow of reading” Sofia explains. So she emphasises that we need to inspire students. She mentions many ways of doing this such as through the media of film, role-play and dramatisation, however, most importantly we as teachers be inspired and have a positive attitude to the material we provide. Materials that Sofia has found easiest and most fulfilling to work with are short texts and song lyrics. Sofia says that due to the fact that some students just can’t handle longer texts for in depth analysis, short texts are more realistic to work with and students actually accomplish closure and results with the literature based task. Song lyrics are used for translation purposes since they are so accessible, and students can bring in lyrics of their own favourite songs, which in itself motivates them. Sofia says it should never be “the must” that makes students read, it should be motivation and inspiration, which in order requires us teachers to keep the literature vivid and ourselves find it interesting. This connected with Sofia’s answer to question five, where she promotes inspiration and motivation as main factors, saying that guidance should never be forced upon the student.

When asked about planning literature based tasks, Sofia says that even here she does the planning somewhat individually for all students. At the school where Sofia teaches, the A course of English spans over two years. She says that motivated students come themselves and ask for literature, and as the course goes along she works with every student individually and adapts the text and task individually, based on the student’s own goals and capability. It is not until the B-course that Sofia does the literature based task simultaneously with all the students. Sofia was asked if she had worked at a more theoretically challenging programme, due to the specific course outline at Sofia’s school, if she would have done it in a different way. Even in the A-course Sofia said that she probably would have made the literature part of the course as a collected assignment for the students. She would probably also demand more from the students as well. On practical programmes Sofia says that the most important thing is to make sure that everyone makes it. Since there is such diversity regarding the individual
level of knowledge, she would have wanted to see some sort of level grouping, but it is hard in the upper secondary school, she says. Since Sofia mentioned that she would have asked more from her students, were they at a theoretical programme, she was asked about grades. “The measuring stock is somewhat different then, but at practical programmes it is not always the grade that is the issue for the student, instead, the focus is on actually completing the set task with a result” she says.

As to reading in the first language Sofia feels that the language does not determine that much. It is the reading itself and the study tradition in the home that is crucial. Sofia believes that a student that reads a lot in his or her private time is more prone to succeed in reading in English. Sofia also believes that the reading of literature will enhance the aptitude for language.

When it comes the extent we use literature Sofia is again troubled. Sofia says that there should be more literature in school in general, not only in English, but the problem is that we as teachers sometimes have a hard time finding the right forum to reach our students. Sofia believes that teachers would benefit a lot from getting further education themselves on alternative forms of literature and material in order to reach all students better, homogenous classes is a rarity according to Sofia. Again, she brings up the fact that short texts are the material she is more inclined to use when dealing literature with students today. It is flexible and manageable for all students. Since the result and closure are important to the student, according to Sofia, we should make these our primary goals.

Sofia ends by saying that as teachers we should choose and give the students the texts we like ourselves and find interesting for the students. We should like the texts we give the students, since it is a lot easier to promote and teach something we like ourselves, since time is limited as it is with the students.

Comments

Sofia shows a very passionate attitude towards approaching literature and sees to the benefit of the students that they read as much as possible, as long as they read. During the interview, Sofia held a very warm and humble tone to the subject, she was not always able to give a straight answer, but all answers were given with what one could call with humble resolve.
Sofia is however determined to help students by making them complete a task, rather than aiming for a specific grade. Individualisation is something Sofia proclaims strongly in her opinions and she points out the lack of time a teacher has to deal with. At the end of the interview she said: “What a shame that they don’t read more, why don’t they understand the wonderful value of literature?” Sofia clearly enjoys literature on her own and has a passion for it, but she seems somewhat distressed about the lack of interest or level amongst students to handle literature.

**Adam**

– “*Book reviews give me an allergic reaction.*”

Adam works at the same school as Sofia does and is teaching English and Swedish. Adam has been teaching for only a few years.

Adam opens his statement also that literature is a natural part of the ESL classroom, adding the fact that it is a part of the national curriculum. Adam emphasises the language in literature, saying it is so varied from the normal language we are using, and we can only encounter it in written literature, but also in its wider aspect such as poetry and song lyrics. Furthermore, Adam points out the importance of the general knowledge that can be acquired by reading literature such as cultural understanding, linguistic and cultural presentation. Literature, according to Adam tells us a lot about us as human beings, no matter where the literature is from, it testifies to its own culture. Adam further emphasises that the language in literature is often more spontaneous and realistic than in regular textbook material, which can come off as constructed and simplified. Another reason for Adam’s positive attitude towards literature in the ESL classroom is that in practically oriented programmes, there is usually a lack of general knowledge about literature, which makes it even more natural for Adam to lay emphasis on teaching literature and reading literature with the students.

Adam’s opinion differs from Sofia’s being more determined and optimistic, where as being a Swedish teacher as well he states that literature in the Swedish classroom is a natural part of the language learning process; he tries to approach it in the ESL classroom in the same way. He sees literature as a living material, thus it also becomes natural to work with. Adam here
again points out that in English, the usage of modified texts such as Easy reader or sample texts can feel fake and constructed, which makes it lose its value. When asked why he thinks such material is used, Adam answers that there is an idea that students are not interested in literature, which he disagrees with. The idea is based on the idea that literature could be too complicated or too far removed from the world the students live in. Adam was also asked about the idea of students getting a negative attitude towards teacher-chosen literature, and he answered that it doesn’t really matter what the student reads, as long as he or she reads. He states that as teachers, we have an image of what good literature is. But it all comes down to who the student is and what the student wants, Adam says. A motivated student should be encouraged to make his or her own choices, but on a general note there should be a selection presented to the students.

Adam works with literature mostly in an exploratory and analytical way, where the students can reach the literature in depth. Adam says that introducing this is important and one should start from easier texts and move on from there. This can easily be done with song lyrics, as those texts are closely connected to prose and poetry. Adam gives examples of how he usually presents a song lyric that he finds interesting content-wise, and describes how he does a guided analysis to show students in what ways it can be done. He moves on by letting students bring in their own lyrics to do the same thing and bring it up in class. Adam says that this gives the students a natural passage to move on to prose and poetry since most lyrics if not all, are poetry. Adam also mentions that the good thing about song lyrics is that it is something students are familiar with and they expose themselves to lyrics in their life outside school. At the end of the interview Adam adds; “I dare say that a well designed literature based assignment, can cover all curriculum requirements and goals”.

Adam says that his results are generally good. It all comes down to creating a creative and interesting assignment, and the students will take on the assignment with enthusiasm. When asked about how we should motivate our students, Adam says that he doesn’t see it as selling a concept. He rather wants to see it as bringing up an already existing interest. Adam points out that when a student has a hard time reading it does not necessarily mean that the student does not want to read. Adam also puts results in a perspective and asks himself what are good results? “This is highly individual, but at the same time results are measured to some sort of national standard” Adam says.
When it comes to planning literature based tasks Adam finds it easier than to make other tasks. He says his planning is connected with the way he works with literature, it gives him a set way of how he wants his lessons to look and what results he aims for with the students. He aims for literature understanding primarily and language acquisition secondarily, since he believes that language acquisition comes along naturally anyway. His goal with reading literature is to give the students an understanding of how plots work in literature, based on the classic Aristotle model about plot outline, climax and such, he says. The hardest part Adam thinks is trying to teach the students to understand themes. He says that getting the big picture is not the problem, it is rather getting it to the point on how themes work in literature that is the problem with students. What Adam is trying to say is that students might understand outline and plot, but not the actual theme of the text. But Adam also points out that reading is a process and a separate skill that requires training. He says that it is unrealistic to believe that all students will develop this skill to a proficient level and manage all literature based tasks, but it should be a goal.

When asked about guidance and direction, Adam believes that we as teachers should avoid giving too much direction and guidance. He also says that is also in a way dependant on the nature of a given task and its purpose. He believes guidance to be more favourable to see it as give the student the proper tools for reading, rather than guidance. Tools can be such as grammatical understanding and vocabulary, but Adam believes that those tools are given better in a different forum than a literature based task.

According to Adam, there is neither too much nor too little literature used in school today, although he claims that literature is utilised in the wrong way. He points out that tasks such as book review writing almost give him an allergic reaction, explaining it to be a minimum effort and requirement on behalf of the student one could expect. He does, however, emphasise that more authentic text in the ESL classroom, as he sees it to be the teacher’s obligation to provide quality material, in addition to the text books, at the least.

Adam ends by saying that the most important thing to think about when teaching students literature is your own passion. Adam is determined that if the teacher shows his own passion and interest in the material it will rub off on the students. He also mentions the importance of giving the right task for a given text.
Comments

Adam was the second informant for this report and, as Sofia, he is very enthusiastic about literature. Adam has more belief in literature based tasks than Sofia it seems, and is more comfortable teaching literature. Despite the fact that they work at the same school and share the same pool of students, Adam does not see the matter of literature as vulnerable as Sofia makes it sound, meaning he doesn’t believe in the idea that students are necessarily negative towards literature.

While Adam has a strong and very classical approach to literature compared to Sofia, they share the same passion and enthusiasm, and both believe in individualisation. By classical approach means that Adam teaches the students a rather academic form of literature analysis and understanding. It is interesting to see that despite the fact that many students have a low level of English at their school, these teachers believe in the students’ ability to manage the task.

The students at their school are aiming for professions where English is of very limited use but in fact necessary. The students need English mainly as a tool of understanding if encountering English children or patients. But even though they only need English for this the teachers put much effort in teaching literature, and in Adams case, on classical literary analysis and understanding.

Gloria

– “An MVG student that doesn’t motivate himself is not an MVG student.”

Gloria is teaching at the school that works with the PBL system and has been working there for only a few years. She works full time as an English teacher.

At first Gloria responds with a more professional approach than previous informants, and states that there should be more emphasis on literature, due to what is said in the national curriculum. But Gloria also points out that literature is a source for cultural and social understanding, but in order to understand literature the students must understand the language first. She also says that she likes to work with literature and wants to give it as much room as
possible, but says that there is time and availability of material that regulates how much room literature based teaching can get.

On the subject of how we should use literature, Gloria says it should be based on the group of students you will work with and also on what material will be used. Gloria believes that all students should read the same book, in order for the teacher to have a more controlled view of their development, their strengths and weaknesses. Gloria presents a very clear view on how she wants to work with literature and says that questions to the text is preferable to promote discussions in the classroom, but also writing assignments that cover the writing criteria of the English curriculum. Gloria explains the system the school is based upon. Students should do as much as possible themselves and the teaching is case and problem based. The teacher should serve more like a mentor, rather than as a traditional lecturing teacher, Gloria explains. There is hardly ever any traditional teaching at this school. Gloria explains that the aim is to provide the task and tools to complete it, and then continue the process with individual mentorship. But she emphasises that this does not rule out the traditional form of teaching. Some tasks and areas require tutoring but this should be flexible so the students can work individually, and the aim is that it falls under the criteria for being problem based learning.

When asked if there is a specific plan for how this works with literature, Gloria says that there are no specific guidelines, but in problem based learning the case or the problem is the centre, not the text.

This raised the question regarding how this approach would cover the understanding and taking part of classic literature. Gloria points out that this is something specific for the B-course and concerns literature history and can be worked into a larger perspective with the history of Swedish literature, thus remaining the case model and letting the students work with “big picture” problems, as PBL promotes.

Gloria explained further that she works in the same way as she presented in answer to the second question. Classroom sets of books are preferred, since they give the possibility to do follow-up evaluations on all students and to make comparison between students. Gloria says this makes it easier to detect if any student has difficulties with the text, and then it is easier to give the student the needed aid. When asked what is done about students who do not feel challenged enough by the book given as a classroom set, Gloria says that the students is told to do more reading on their own, although does not give the impression that there is any
extensive further work done with this voluntary reading in the classroom. Gloria points out that a student that is at a very high level is required to take responsibility for his or her own education and development. A student that aspires for the top grade should also work for it, not only just slide through the presented material. This shows us that there is an emphasis, not only by Gloria but also by the problem based learning system that students should be responsible for their own learning. Gloria clarifies that the teacher should of course guide the student in the right direction and give suggestions to the student on what material is appropriate for that student’s level. This also answers the question concerning guidance, where students are encouraged to self-motivation and are given tools primarily accompanied by mentorship. Thus guidance comes as a secondary priority.

Gloria says that planning is much influenced by what material is available at the school and also the level of the group. She finds it enjoyable to plan literature based tasks, but as she said earlier there is an emphasis is on the problem based learning system.

When it comes to reading in the first language, Gloria believes that it would be good to gain more understanding of how different languages interact with each other since language is the tool we are reading with. Thus Gloria promotes more emphasis on language, than reading as a skill of its own.

Gloria considers closure and quality more important than quantity. Since there is a lack of time to go through much material, it is the quality of the chosen material that is more important than the quantity. Gloria explains that cutting down on the quantity in favour of quality is something she believes in.

Finishing off with that tip, Gloria says that teachers should cooperate across subjects. Gloria also says that this could enhance the amount of material that can be used without cutting down on quality. Gloria also emphasises that variation is important and to have a well planned and wide assignment for the students. She also adds at the end that one should approach literature based task and every other task with a positive attitude.

Comments
Gloria is very professional and to the point during the entire interview. The tone and view that is presented comes off as very professional and instrumental. Although Gloria does comment on the importance of literature other than for linguistic purposes, she points out that the text itself never works as the centrepiece for the assignment, this due to the PBL system at the school. Differing from Adam and Sofia, she sees the linguistic acquisition as the primary task, and textual understanding as secondary.

During the interview there was a lot of emphasis on the PBL system and how it incorporates literature, which was basically only mentioned as a set part of the curriculum rather than something interesting and worth exploring. Gloria’s personal view of literature seems positive, and she does point out that literature is fun and interesting to work with, and she would enjoy working with it as much as possible, but it is restricted by time, which limits the amount of literature based tasks. Gloria seems influenced more by the school culture and the PBL method, rather than by personal preference.

Another issue that separates Gloria and from both Adam and Sofia is the emphasis on individualisation, as Gloria prefers and works mainly with classroom-sets of literature. There is a valid point to classroom-sets, which will be brought up in the deeper comparison in the discussion analysis.

Michael

- “We should explain the importance of reading.”

Michael has been working quite some time as a teacher and is employed at one of the older and more renowned schools in Malmö. Michael also works fulltime teaching English in all courses, A through C.

Michael emphasises that the students can relate their everyday life to the authenticity literature provides. He points out that learner textbooks are constructed in a way that can make the content seem fragmented, whilst literature can give students a more holistic picture and a complete story. Michael also points out the value of the general knowledge that literature brings. Moreover, he mentions the quantitative aspect of literature, that the more text we read, we gain more proficiency in the language.
Michael approaches the second question about the informant's opinion on how literature should be used, very much in the same fashion as Gloria, that it is very dependant on what group you are about to teach. Michael suggests that in a class where the level is high there should be a stronger emphasis on literature based tasks. But the problem Michael sees is that it is the amount of text the students have to process that is the problem. In weaker classes shorter texts should be used rather than novels. Michael stresses how important it is for students to feel that they have completed a task. He points out that if the text is too long there is a risk of losing students on the way. Michael was asked about how he thinks one could keep students interested even in longer texts, and he says that they should be given some sort of aid, such as wordlists. As an introduction to a novel, students should also be engaged in the reading in the classroom, since they do most of the reading outside the classroom later on, he says. Michael says that the positive aspect of this is that the students can read in their own pace and that they do not feel the pressure of the classroom. He says that with the weakest students, a change of text might be advisable.

Michael also works with one book that the students read together. After that, they get to read a book of their own choice. When reading a book together, Michael works with reader diaries and lets the students present their diary two or three times during the period when they should read the book. This is done to get an idea of the progress the students are making, but also to avoid making the assignment a simple review. Michael believes simple reviews to be unfulfilling due to the possibility of cheating, but also that many students can see it as an easy way out and not showing their full potential. Michael says that it is not necessary to like the book you give the students yourself, it is more important that the book appeals to the students. Michael explains that the books the students read might not be of personal interest. Michael promotes reading the same book with the entire class since it is easier to follow up on. With a wide range of books it is harder to keep track of the progress the students are making. It is easier to give all the students the same assignment. Michael also says this shows in the results. If given the same book and same assignment the results are better and more even. When there is a wide range of titles, the results vary in quality. Michael also believes that it is easier for the students to if they read if prepared in some way with assignments and guidance. Michael feels that when it comes to guidance we should point out the importance of reading. When reading in English, he believes that it is important that they read as much as possible. In order
to achieve higher grades Michael feels that is not enough to just stick to the curriculum. The student needs to read a lot on his or her own.

On the subject of students protesting against teacher chosen literature, Michael believes that this is usually a silent protest that is not easily acknowledged by the teacher. He says that students usually are positive, and according to his experience, those protesting against teacher chosen literature, are the ones who try to get away with reading something easier than the given book. The books that are hard to promote for students are the classics, but Michael feels that he would like to work more with literature, especially classical literature with the students. However, once again he brings up the problem with varying student levels and lack of time. This answers the question of quantity of literature, where Michael says he would like to see more literature in the ESL classroom.

According to Michael, planning literature based tasks is not more difficult than planning other activities. It does, however, take a little bit more time to make sure that the task given is interesting and has quality. Michael emphasises that he would like to work more with literature than he does, but is both taxed for time and also there is such a variety in the level of the students.

When it comes to reading in the first language Michael states that this is a very complex matter which cannot be answered easily. However, he says the reading, no matter language, enhances the reading skill in any language one might encounter. The problem he sees with going in depth about the lingual influence is that many students do not even master their first language, and thus it is hard to say if there is any impact on the second language. He believes that a low level in the first language afflicts the second language, in this case English, in a negative way.

Michael finishes by pointing out the importance to read in sections, like the diary model he uses. This makes it easier to follow student progress, plus it is easier for students that are weaker to keep up. Michael also says one should promote the importance of reading literature, not only for the linguistic value but also the value of general knowledge and achieving the higher curriculum goals.

*Comments*
Michael holds a very relaxed attitude and tone throughout the interview, but there is a notion of slight disappointment when he mentions that he would like to work more with literature, when it comes to analysis, classics, etc. Michael clearly values literature and expresses a will to work with it to a further extent than he does at presently.

Michael’s views differ from those expressed by Adam and Sofia as he supports the idea of classroom-sets of literature to have a better overview of the students, although he expresses a higher level of individualisation than Gloria.

Michael’s views turned out to be surprising considering the renowned school he works at. The interesting information was that despite the school’s famous high standard, Michael indirectly points to a slight distaste for literature among the students and a very varied level of English in the classroom. This limits the choice of literature and the possibility to work with it.
Analysis and Discussion

This part of the study will present a discussion in two levels. First, in the “Great Findings” section, the large-scale similarities and differences will be compared and discussed, both concerning informants and the schools they represent. In the second section, “These Little Things…”, the more detailed information given by the informants will be compared and discussed based on the separate questions for the interviews. In the conclusion section I will summarise the analysis and further explore the questions that were posted in the beginning of this study.

Great findings

Comparing the schools the informants represent gave a few interesting results. The most interesting result was the school Michael represents was the one to be presumed to have the highest level of English due to its reputation. Michael’s information indicates that there are difficulties when it comes to motivating the students, and also students’ language level varies. Whereas Adam that represents a school with practical programmes, that has a less academic reputation, sees no difficulties of working with literature at an individual level with a very in-depth form of literature analysis and actually manages to see positive results. In essence, the pre-interview result that was expected from the two schools was somewhat reversed. This raises a new question in the analysis, can the workload of students be distinguished from the programme they are attending, or from the method the teacher presents the subject?

Lundahl stresses the importance of pre-work made when working with literature (p. 135). Adam’s approach indicates that with proper introduction, even in-depth analysis can be presented to the students. Michael explains his work with classroom-set texts with very brief pre-work, whereas his work with individually chosen texts, where students are presented with various ways of analysis produce reflective work that show more varied and, according to Michael, positive results. So in answer to the question posted above, it is highly dependant on what work is put into the text before it is read, and how well students are prepared. Lundahl does point out the necessity of the basic tools such as the language itself, since if language is too limited, the assignment given to the students might end in negative results (p. 29).
It was also a surprise when Gloria emphasised the importance of focusing on the linguistic qualities of a text rather than on the content. Furthermore, in the interview Gloria commented that the job market today wants: “independent, outgoing, educated people with a good general knowledge”. This somewhat contradicts what we have seen from the other informants, who had placed the emphasis on the text itself rather than on its linguistic value. All of the informants pointed out the knowledge that can be acquired from reading literature; yet one informant stresses this as a secondary element. It is important to point out that Gloria did stress the cultural and social values of literature, explaining that literature has to be worked with in many ways, but her first answer and main point was that the linguistic value came first.

Lundahl discusses this issue on what should be stressed the most, linguistic or content value of the text (p. 27). Gloria’s point that is going against the general attitude is not wrong. It shows the another way to approach this issue. Lundahl discusses the issue by describing a student at a high level who might be able to read without encountering any obstacles and who thus manages the text without problems. A student who, on the other hand, has problems with the linguistic part might encounter difficulties in understanding. Lundahl points out that the second student is in a positive situation and is challenged and experiences learning by coping with the obstacles. A problem might occur if the obstacles are too big and the student gives up. Lundahl also points out that the first student can loose a lot if he or she does not encounter any obstacles and does not learn anything new. Lundahl therefore suggest something in between. Students should be sufficiently challenged at all times, both with linguistic as well as content obstacles. Adam’s comment on how to cope with this issue becomes valid. Adam says that linguistic barriers are better dealt with in other forums and with other approaches, so that when students are working with literature they can focus on the content rather than the linguistic obstacles.
Those little things…

The interviews were carried out on the basis of a set of questions in order to investigate the primary questions for this study. The questions that were the main focus for the interviews were:

1. What do you think about literature such as novels, short stories, poetry, lyrics and movies in the ESL classroom? Do you see more than a linguistic value?
2. What is your opinion on how literature should be used in school?
3. How have you used literature in your teaching and what were the results?
4. How has your view on how we should use literature in the ESL classroom affected your planning when it comes to literature based tasks?
5. How do you think we as teachers should guide students in their reading? Do you consider any goal more important?
6. What is your opinion on the influence that reading in the first language might have on reading in English?
7. What is your opinion about the extent to which we use literature in schools today?

Questions 1,2,5 and 6 will be dealt with more in depth since they have given the widest variety of results. Questions 3,4 and 7 are equally important but can be answered more straightforwardly and therefore given less space for analysis.

In the first question the informants’ opinions on literature are, in general, similar, but with different emphasis. As mentioned above three informants emphasised the cultural and content qualities of a text, whereas one emphasised the linguistic qualities. Sofia as well as Adam emphasise the cultural and social content that the students can acquire by reading and understanding texts, whereas for Michael suggests the authenticity in literature is greater and more valuable than in regular textbooks. Gloria puts emphasis on the linguistic value literature provides. Adam also points this out but in a different way. Gloria points out the possibility of acquiring language while Adam points out the quality of the language as being very specific for literature. All of the informants also pointed out that literature is a source for understanding culture and social structures in society.
Lundahl discusses all the qualities that are mentioned by the informants as important. Lundahl argues for authenticity as being the best model for linguistic structure (p. 67). He also points out the natural language acquisition that takes place when reading authentic texts and literature (Lundahl, p. 64). Furthermore, Lundahl also puts emphasis on the cultural and social content of a text (p. 135). Therefore no priority should be ruled out since all are equally important. An argument that would be valid here is the one Adam presents when he says that the linguistic qualities can be taught in different forums in order to focus on a deeper understanding the content of the text. But this is all relative and connected with the purpose of reading the text. If the assignment is to do in depth text analysis, Adam’s suggestion seems as a more valid, whereas in an assignment aimed at obtaining a natural language acquisition, Gloria’s emphasis on the linguistic qualities is accounted for. This leads to the conclusion that most important of all is the pre-work and pre-reading of a text. The teacher needs to make sure that the scaffolding and preparation of the students is sufficient for the set task.

In the second question on how literature should be used, the results were somewhat more separated. Sofia and Michael used their literature for discussion topics. Adam focuses on text analysis, whereas Gloria points out flexibility with stress on language acquisition. This relates to the first question that pedagogues should make it clear for both students and themselves what the purpose of the assignment is. The scaffolding and preparations need to be sufficient in order to carry out the assignment with the students. Lundahl outlines three main purposes for reading literature in the classroom: language acquisition, information or experience (p. 34).

The third question regarding how the informant uses literature, generated a variety of answers due to every teacher’s personal preference. We can see different varieties of how to go about teaching. Sofia prefers using short stories for deeper class discussions and analysis, explaining that it gives all students the possibility of completing the assignment in a meaningful way and get closure. Adam uses various forms of literature in order to give the students as broad image of literature as possible and approaches each form of literature in an analytical way. Gloria and Michael both prefer the classroom-set texts in order to keep track of students and follow their reading closer in order to explore issues when they occur. But the main difference can be paired up where Sofia and Adam preferred to individualise and Gloria and Michael preferred full-class assignments.
Lundahl argues that every method has its purpose. Every way of reading with a class is valid but for specific reasons. A full-class reading is a more controlled environment whereas individual reading gives the student more freedom but requires more pre-knowledge (Lundahl, p. 137). An argument in favour of more individualised reading would be that it enhances students’ self-esteem, creating satisfaction when the student manages to complete a literature-based task with minimal amount of help. On the other hand, just as Lundahl states, when a class reads the same text it gives more possibility to deal with themes and topics that concern every student.

All informants shared a mutual point of view when it came to alternative approaches on how to deal with literature. Not all informants mentioned all suggested methods, but every informant’s suggestions overlapped the others. Methods materials mentioned were films, re-enactment and song lyrics amongst other. Lundahl mentions these methods as a way of working with literature during reading and after reading as “tasks” (p. 159). What Lundahl doesn’t take into account is to consider these methods as pre-reading activities. This shows that there are alternative methods with activities and material that is not necessarily connected to the literature directly, but which can lead to a better understanding of literature. This is a note-worthy point for future pedagogues to take into account in order to find new and interesting methods to lead students into working with literature and making it easier for them to read.

The fourth question concerning planning received slightly different responses. All the informants had a very positive attitude towards planning tasks that involve literature. The difference was that whilst Sofia and Adam did individual planning and had a preset image of how they want to teach literature, where as Gloria and Michael planned the entire class of students rather than the individual student. None of the informants saw the planning as harder, only more time consuming in Gloria’s and Michael’s case. Gloria also dealt with the issue of PBL and had to plan the lessons to a certain extent to fit that method.

The fifth question concerning teacher guidance gave some various results. Sofia pointed out that the most important thing for pedagogues is not to guide the students, but to maintain the students inspiration. Teachers should inspire rather than guide. Adam says we should avoid guiding the students, but this is also dependent on the task. He points out what we should provide tools for students, rather than guiding their reading. Gloria’s opinion compares with
Adam’s since the PBL system promotes the students own input rather than guidance from a teacher. Michael presents a third approach where the teacher should guide or promote the language and reading skills. Michael also says it is important that they read a lot and it is the teacher’s duty to guide students towards further reading.

Lundahl points out the importance of preparing the students (p. 135). The general conclusion is to guide students before the reading and tutoring them. Guidance is connected with the nature and purpose of the task rather than just the fact that the task is literature-based. So again the informants all bring valid points that all should be accounted for.

The question concerning reading in the first language and what influence it has on the reading Lundahl implores that it is a great advantage if the student is already trained in reading in his or her first language (p. 27) He discusses that the reading skill of every student is somewhat a stand-alone skill that benefits from reading in any language. The language determines only the language acquisition that takes place while reading.

This brought up a few interesting views. Sofia argues that it isn’t really the language itself that is the primary element, but the reading skills and study tradition that the student has from home that determines the capability of reading in a second language. Sofia also argues that language aptitude is important. Lundahl stresses the same approach, but emphasises the first language and its development as important to later enhancing the reading skill (p. 28). Adam also separates the language skill from the reading skill. Reading skills require continuous training, but yet language development, no matter language, benefits from reading and vice versa. Apart from what has been stated, Gloria also added that it would be important in the multicultural society for language teachers to understand each separate language’s effect on other languages, in this case, English. Michael agrees but adds that the problem is that many students today have not yet developed sufficient skills in their first language in either language skill or reading skill, which makes the process harder. Pedagogues should pay heed to students’ earlier reading, no matter language, since the reading skill can be considered separated from the language proficiency. Reading in any first language therefore is important for the reading skills in a second language.

When it comes to the question concerning the quantity of literature in school the general answer is that there is enough literature. But the informants each bring up certain points on
this issue. Adam, for example discusses whether the way we utilise and contextualise the literature we present in schools today is of sufficient quality. The quality issue is something all informants mentioned. When using literature it should be used in a creative and productive way, rather than just a small and uncreative task. Gloria debates that quality in this matter is far more important than quantity. The quantity can be even lowered to make sure that the quality is at as high level as possible. Both Sofia and Michael mention that there is enough literature but they still would wish to see and use even more literature.

**Conclusion**

This report aimed to explore two questions:

- How do teachers use literature in their classroom today, and how do they perceive literature-based education?
- What benefits do teachers see in the usage of literature-based education for the benefit of language development, but also cultural understanding?

Teachers today perceive literature as a necessary part of the curriculum that deserves a lot of attention since the benefits of studying literature are so many. Throughout the analysis we have seen the informants pinpointing different qualities and approaches to literature. This shows that as a pedagogue we need to be as open-minded and flexible as possible when approaching literature-based tasks. This report shows the importance of preparation and purpose of a task as well as motivation and inspiration for the students in order to create a challenging and at the same time workload for the students. The information given by the informants was on a whole quite similar but details did point out that each informant perceives literature-based education in their own way and values some elements above others. In view of Lundahl’s theories it is evident that no element is more important than the other, but all should be accounted for as far as possible. This emphasises what Gloria and Sofia said about the need for more cooperation between teachers, to learn as much as possible from each other and to help each other to make the tasks for the students as educative and interesting as possible, not to forget to make it inspiring and meaningful for the students.
The qualities of literature that are beneficial according to the informants in a linguistic perspective, are that the language presented in literature and authentic texts is of a specific nature and works as a model for language structure. Apart from the natural language acquisition, literature serves as one of the main sources to understanding social, cultural and historical background of which the language is a part. For literature-based assignments to be as educational and beneficial as possible there should be a stress on the planning, scaffolding and pre-work that is put into a task concerning literature, as well as a clear purpose for the task to what result the teacher is aiming for the students to obtain.

The final question concerning advice for future and present teachers also gave a wide range of things to account for. This query completes the questions explored in this study. Several points were consistently brought up by the teachers. They all stressed how important it is to always keep your own interest in the subject and your own passion to motivate students. Students will have a hard time getting involved in a task if the teacher does not fully support it him or herself. Another valid point was cooperation with other teachers, even across subject to enhance quantity without the loss of quality. Flexibility in the well balanced workload for the students so that everyone feels that they have a chance of completing the task given to them, rather than striving for a specific grade. This stresses one of the main points in this study concerning proper planning. It is very important that the student is in focus. Working with literature should be enjoyable for all members in the classroom. This also requires teachers to be role models for the students and support them. Without support many students might never completely enjoy literature.
Post Script

This study is supposed to serve as a starting point for helping future teachers and pedagogues to deal with a rather complex part of the English curriculum. Bo Lundahl has already provided a lot of research into the matter but future teachers need more know-how on methodology in the classroom. I hope this study will serve as an inspiration for others to continue researching this specific area of teaching in order to make teaching better in the future, and last but not least, to maintain literature, despite the rapid society of internet and television we live in.
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