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Abstract:

To use literature in English as a foreign language (EFL) or English as a second language (ESL) classroom is something which, for many decades was regarded as too difficult or not relevant in many countries, Sweden being one of them. In the past few decades the view of literature as a means for education in Sweden has changed. Research shows that texts are useful to enhance critical thinking skills and to help foster democratic citizens, which is something the Swedish curriculum for upper secondary school advocates for. This study sought to examine what goals teachers apply to the teaching of literature and also how these goals were realized in the classroom and, reasons to why it what not realized if that was the case. The study was conducted using an online questionnaire, Google Forms, which was sent out to an upper secondary school in Sweden and posted on a Facebook page devoted to English teachers at upper secondary schools in Sweden. The results of the study showed that most of the goals stated in this study were realized to some extent in the EFL classrooms, but there were also discrepancies between teachers views on what is important to teach and what the curriculum states should be taught. An example of this was that some teachers did not teach the goal of text analysis, it was not found to be ‘interesting’ or ‘relevant’. However, the curriculum for English at upper secondary schools in Sweden, does not advocate that teachers should teach text analysis specifically. On the other hand, the curriculum does advocate that students should meet different forms of text. This study, therefore, also discusses possible ambiguities within the curriculum of English at upper secondary school.
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1. Introduction

The Swedish curriculum for the subject of English at upper secondary school states that the English language is something which affect how we interact in education, socially, culturally, and even politically in Sweden. The English language provides the opportunity to make contact with the English-speaking world and to understand its different cultural aspects. Furthermore, the curriculum also states that during their education “students should meet written and spoken English of different kinds, and relate the content to their own experiences and knowledge” (Skolverket, 2011a, p. 1). A major form of written English is that of fiction, poetry and drama, but literature of any sort can be a way for students to relate to and experience cultures from across the English-speaking world.

In the curriculum for English at upper secondary school, literature has its own part of the core content for the three different courses: English 5, 6 and 7. The section in core content regarding the skill of reception for English 5, it is expected that students interact with literature and other types of fiction as well as other types of factual texts. For English 6, the core content of reception is more specific, and includes “contemporary and older literature, poetry, drama and songs (Skolverket 2011a, pp. 3,7). English 7 advocates for the inclusion of “contemporary and older literature and other fiction in various genres such as drama” (Skolverket, 2011a, p. 11).

As part of the core content, literature is thus, an important part of what is supposed to be taught in the English class at upper secondary schools in Sweden. Moreover, reading literature can also be linked to more passages in the core content, for instance where students engage with understanding perspectives, structures, implied meaning, and strategies for reading (Skolverket, 2011a, p. 7).

The curriculum implies what should be read and what the outcome can or could be. What it does not explain is, how the goals of the core content should be applied in the classroom. This possible ambiguity in the curriculum, however, gives freedom for the teacher to pick and choose the goals which he or she finds most suitable for his or her class, or adapt the core content to the literature that has been chosen. Because of the ambiguity it is not clear what goals teachers apply. This study will therefore primarily focus on goals as they are currently applied in the upper secondary classroom of English.

My bachelor thesis Approaches to English literature in the upper secondary school classroom: A study from an EFL/ESL perspective (2017) revealed that according to previous research the goals generally set by teachers that taught literature in the EFL classroom were focused on critical thinking skills and fostering democratic citizens. The thesis gave an overview of goals set by teachers, but it was clear that too little research was set in the Swedish context. In this thesis an empirical study of two upper secondary schools was conducted using a questionnaire survey to examine what goals teachers apply.
1.1. Aim and research questions

The aim of this study is to examine which goals teachers apply when teaching literature in the Swedish EFL classroom at the upper secondary level. The study aims to show what choices teachers make when working with literature:

- What goals do teachers in Sweden apply to the teaching of literature in the EFL classroom?
- Are these goals realized or not in their teaching practice, and what reasons are there to explain how these goals are realized or not realized in class?

2. Background

2.1. Definition of terms

EFL: English as a foreign language is the term applied to the use and teaching of English when taught in country where a different language than English is the dominant language, in the instance of this thesis, Swedish.

ESL: English as a second language is the term applied to the learning and teaching of English to students where the dominant language is English, but the students have a different L1 (first language).

2.2. The Swedish curriculum regarding literature

In the Swedish curriculum for English at upper secondary school the aim of the subject advocates that, students should “develop knowledge of language and the surrounding world”. By using the language in different contexts, they should develop “all-round communicative skills” (Skolverket, 2011a, p. 1). Apart from language development, students should also be given the opportunity to “develop knowledge of living conditions, social issues and cultural features in different contexts” (p. 1). The question of how students should acquire this knowledge is not further explained in the curriculum. The core content for literature according to the curriculum for English 5, 6 and 7 are as follows (directly quoted from the curriculum):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core content</th>
<th>English 5</th>
<th>English 6</th>
<th>English 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Content and form in different kinds of fiction.</td>
<td>Themes, ideas, form and content in film and literature; authors and literary periods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception (reading and listening comprehension)</td>
<td>Literature and other fiction.</td>
<td>Contemporary and older literature, poetry, drama and songs.</td>
<td>Contemporary and older literature and other fiction in various genres such as drama.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only English 5 and 6 advocates for communication when working with different kinds of narratives, to be able to discuss and talk about the content and ideas of fictional texts or works. English 7 only advocates for literature as a means to enhance skills in reception (Skolverket, 2011a, pp. 3, 7, 11). In other words, English 7 is more about understanding text and the underlying meanings of a text. English 5 and 6 are also about understanding underlying meaning, but also lifts the notion of oral discussions about the content, themes, ideas, and form. In the commentary material for the core content of English, it is further developed that in English 6 and 7 complex texts are defined as texts which are of an abstract nature while formal texts are different kinds of academic texts (Skolverket, 2011b, p 8). Just as Skolverket points out, literature is a way to connect linguistically, culturally and socially to the surrounding world. Similarly, Langer (2005) and Bruns (2001) point to the value of literature when understanding both oneself and others regardless of age and teaching context.

### 2.3. History of English literature in the EFL/ESL classroom

Literature has not always been a natural part of teaching in EFL/ESL classrooms; focus has been on linguistic features of the target language e.g. grammar. The main reasons for this, according to Alemi (2011) is that both writers of the curriculum and teachers have considered that literary texts are either too difficult, not relevant in the teaching or simply too difficult to understand. She also stresses the cultural norms which texts can carry and the negative effects these can have if coming into conflict with one’s own country’s cultural norms (Alemi, 2011, p. 177). Hill (1994) point out that, in the sixties and seventies, the use of literature in the English classroom was not appreciated, but the views on literature has changed over the past decades (p. 7).

Alemi (2011), however, points out that this negative view on literary reading is most likely due to a lack of knowledge as to how literature can be used beneficially in the EFL/ESL classroom. Alemi lists four advantages (presented by Collie and Slater, 1987) of reading literature in the EFL/ESL classroom: language enrichment, cultural enrichment, authentic material and personal involvement. Alemi (2011) says that literary works allows the student to interact with a language which is much more varied and has different forms and styles. Culturally, literature allows the student to appreciate and develop understanding for diversity and ideology. Literary works also contain a wide subject area which ordinary textbooks, used in teaching, lacks. Lastly, literary works allow the students to reflect on their lives and themselves which as Alemi states, often is the reason to why students come to enjoy reading (Alemi, 2011, p. 178). What Alemi states about the advantages and positive effects of using literature in the EFL/ESL classroom is a direct mirroring of what the Swedish curriculum wishes to be taught in the language classrooms in Sweden, considering cultural aspects, critical thinking and personal growth.
2.4. Literature’s meaning in the language classroom and understanding the wider world

Literature, according to Langer (2005), can be a way for students to understand their meaning in the world. Literature can be a way of learning to understand oneself, how to change oneself, or how to make change in others. Langer (2005) explains that through literacy theory which is a way of using language to mediate ideas, to read from different perspectives and to adapt thoughts and language makes it possible for people to change themselves, regard themselves in a new light or to create and re-create their surrounding world. Literacy means giving students the tools to think about themselves and others and re-evaluate their place in the world or society (Langer, 2005, pp. 11, 13). Bruns (2001), explains literature’s role in people’s lives in a similar manner, and she says that through literature it is possible to understand other people’s feelings, behavior, and beliefs. Through literature it is possible to understand the world and society in which we live (Bruns, 2001, pp. 12-13). This is precisely what the curriculum states (as mentioned above) that one of the aims for English is to understand the surrounding world and different cultural aspects and contexts.

Lundahl (2012) has interested himself in and adapted Langer’s (2005) literary theory, despite Langer’s (2005) focus on English as an L1 (mother tongue) and Lundahl (2012) as an L2 (second language). Lundahl (2012) discusses Langer’s reader-response approach where the reader and his or her understanding is in focus, and whether cultural aspects or narrow interpretation of a literary work restricts understanding. Lundahl (2012) finds Langer’s (2005) approach interesting because of the positioning of the reader as the center and not what can or could be true about a literary work. He means that students should be able to react, interact and act on that which is read. This can, according to Lundahl (2012), be accomplished after students have read a text, by asking creative and cognitive questions such as; what does this text mean to you? what are your thoughts after reading this? or, what would you have done? (Lundahl, 2012, p. 262, 263).

According to Langer (2005) literature can be read and discussed in two different ways, either objectively or subjectively. Objectively means that one relates ideas, events and emotions to one another while subjectively means that we try to interpret and relate ideas and topics to ourselves and see how these interpretations differ between individuals (Langer, 2005, p. 18). Bruns (2001) also advocates working subjectively with literary texts, since this gives individuals the opportunity to discuss values, perspectives and moral codes which may help individuals to become more empathetic (Bruns, 2001, pp. 12-13). However, Langer (2005), who supports the simultaneous use of both objective and subjective approaches has seen that despite the fact that schools advocate the use of subjective approach, but they in practice tend to lean more towards the objective approach with surface reading and understanding and teacher-centered classrooms. Therefore, she states that, focus needs to shift towards the student centered subjective form, where the students’ ability to think is in focus (Langer, 2005, p. 77). Langer (2005) says that some teachers are not used to a student-centered classroom, with student-based goals and that old habits make teachers work away from the subjective approach, and away from student-based goals (Langer, 2005, pp. 110-111). Bruns (2001) agrees with Langer (2005) in her critique of the teacher-centered classroom and advocates for teachers to re-evaluate their views, habits and instructions in the literature classroom (Bruns, 2001, pp. 87, 113).
2.5. Reading literature in a foreign language

Landmark and Wiklund (2012) have studied the teaching of literature through the perspective of teaching Swedish as a second language. However, teaching and reading literature in a second language is different than reading in your mother tongue, regardless of the target language. The most important aspect, according to Landmark and Wiklund (2012), when using literature in the L2 classroom is to expand the ways in which teachers use literature; teachers need to see the full use of perspectives and purpose when using literature in their teaching (pp. 15-16). Parkinson and Thomas (2000) experience the same issues as Landmark and Wiklund when studying how literature is used when teaching English as a second or foreign language. The approaches to literature need to be expanded and they find that there is a discrepancy between what teachers’ goals are and what the outcome really is (pp. 26-27).

Landmark and Wiklund’s (2012) approach on how to bridge this gap regarding literature is mainly theoretical and focuses on how different theories can bring forth opportunities within the classroom. However, Parkinson and Thomas (2000) appeals to how the curriculum is often disregarded by teachers; instead focus is set to their own ideas and views on how literature should be taught. Parkinson and Thomas (2000) list what is typically directly linked to the teaching of literature, some of them being: reading aloud, content aspects, cultural aspects, linguistic analysis, summaries etc. Parkinson and Thomas explain every approach to literature to be equally represented in the FL classroom and each approach has its pros and cons regardless of how it is taught (pp. 26-35). Both Landmark and Wiklund (2012) and Parkinson and Thomas (2000) see literature, when used in a variety of ways be of great potential for the students. Parkinson and Thomas (2000) do however, warn against using older literature or poetry because the linguistic features in such works, in contrast to the more prosaic linguistic features used in traditional short stories or novels can affect grammatical structures and students’ understanding (pp. 40-46). Likewise Lundmark and Wiklund (2012) specifies certain parts as more important when reading literature, to give extra emphasis to the notion of characters and the goal of education in forming empathetic and democratic individuals i.e. functional moral citizens within a democratic society (pp. 14-17).

3. Theoretical perspective

The following sections will explain the different theoretical concepts which will be used to discuss the results of the empirical study.

3.1. Critical literacy

Langer (2005), Bruns (2001), and the Swedish curriculum emphasize cultural and social perspectives and how these shape individuals. Langer (2005) and Bruns (2001) also promote literature as a tool in helping pupils identify formation. Critical literacy can be useful when examining how the use of literature in the classroom can achieve the goals described by the Swedish curriculum, Langer (2005), and Bruns (2001).

Critical literacy, or literacy and power as Hilary Janks (2010) phrases it, can be divided into two perspectives: Michel Foucault’s theory of power and a neo-Marxist theory of power. The Marxist theory works with ideology as an integral part of class relations in terms of ethnicity, gender, and sexuality, for example. The neo-Marxist theory aims to uncover implied meanings
in discourse and texts. Janks (2010) explains that in societies worldwide, ideological ideas are enforced by institutions, something she calls “apparatuses”, and through these apparatuses, ideological ideas are formed into “common sense”, or norms. What critical literacy then wants is to show that this “common sense” is not something natural or neutral, but something which has been constructed to maintain certain social orders and power relations. These ideological apparatuses often serve one group at the expense of another (Janks, 2010, pp. 35-36).

Foucault focuses on the theory of power and truth. Power, according to Foucault, is not something negative but something which creates effects on us and affects our lives and how we live and act. Foucault is therefore interested in how texts used within the literacy classroom affect pupils (pp. 49-51).

Texts have designs on us. As consumers of textual meanings, we have to be able to see the truths that texts constitute and that constitute them and we have to be able to imagine their effects. Critical reading, in combination with an ethic of social justice, is fundamental in order to protect our own rights and the rights of others (Janks, 2010, p. 98).

According to Janks (2010), when we write we make strategic choices, both grammatically and lexically. These choices are made in order to fulfill the purpose and have the effect the writer wants it to have. Texts make the reader travel into the writer’s reality, both fictional and non-fictional. The effects of the text can be either good or bad (Janks, 2010, pp. 61, 64). Furthermore, Janks (2010) explains that discourse is something we have, and we are all positioned within one certain type of discourse where we feel comfortable. Texts which offend us are, therefore, most probably of a discourse we are not comfortable within and yet it is that type of discourse which creates opportunities to be critical, form/defend values and beliefs (pp. 71-72).

Using critical literacy as a theoretical framework is important due to its historical relation to education and how power structures in our modern society affects education’s role in holding on to or reducing social injustice and inequality (Bobkina & Stefanova, 2016, p. 683). Critical literacy can be seen throughout the Swedish curriculum and students’ knowledge and awareness of implied meaning. Critical literacy is of use in this study to see whether teachers apply goals in connection to the key elements of critical literacy, namely, critical thinking, ideology and identity. If cultural, ideological, and ethical factors are important for the informants, critical literacy must surely be as well.

3.2. Sociocultural theory

When describing sociocultural theory out of Säljö’s perspective, it is important to understand the meaning of the word culture. Roger Säljö (2010) explains culture as knowledge and ideas that we acquire when interacting with others, and the values we live by. Compared to animals, humans have the ability to create knowledge, and we primarily do this by using language. Knowledge can be physical, something tangible such as a ruler or a door, or it can be non-physical in the form of language or thoughts (pp. 29, 34-35). Out of the perspective of teaching, sociocultural theory is about how pupils are shaped by cultural tendencies and how these tendencies become tools to use in the pupils' everyday lives (p. 18).

According to Säljö (2010) it is through communication that one learns new things, not through biological processes. Because, as Säljö explains it, humans have not changed much biologically
for many decades, centuries or even millennia, but the human mind concerning knowledge and intellect has changed over time. These changes occur when humans interact with society and acquire new cultural knowledge and resources (pp. 19-20). It can then be said that this cultural knowledge is spread through sociocultural tendencies where we communicate, think and learn new things by the communication of culture (pp. 36-37).

The most important link between a teacher and a student according to Säljö (2010) is communication through language. In schools, teachers mediate knowledge which has already been interpreted by society (pp. 66-67). It is then important to see that texts, either read or written are all sociocultural activities that contain ideas and values. In order for teachers to mediate and pupils to understand these values and ideas, they need to inhibit a certain set of communicative rules and cultural practices to understand how to interpret the text. A text, however, can never stand aside from the context of communication but a text is a part of it (p. 186).

Texts can be a great opportunity for students and teachers to work democratically, by reading and discussing for instance different cultural or political aspects of a text. Texts allow both students and teachers to be critical towards what the text wants to convey in society. This, according to Säljö (2010), would be difficult without the written language (p.188, 192). Sociocultural theory is relevant in accordance to the Swedish curriculum and the fostering of democratic citizens as a part of the Swedish society, but also due to the theory of how people learn. It is possible to say that sociocultural theory is predominant in Swedish education approaches, one example being the focus on communicative skills in the subject of English.

3.3. Motivational theory

Dishon-Berkovits (2014) examines in her study how different types of goals can affect motivation and learning outcome. She uses two different types of goals, achievement goal theory and goal setting theory. Achievement goal theory is future focused, and a goal set within the individual about learning outcome and performance, a goal can be either to learn for one’s own sake or to perform better than others. Goal setting theory is an external goal set by someone else. It can be either a performance goal which guides the individual towards a desired outcome, or it can be a learning goal to acquire a certain type of knowledge and strategies in order to successfully do a task (p. 328). Dishon-Berkovits (2014) found that performance goals could decrease students’ results; if students try to perform difficult and complex tasks without having the strategies and cognitive resources, they are bound to be unsuccessful. However, if a student already possesses these cognitive resources and strategies, the task can be successful. Therefore, if students are in need of learning, discovering and acquiring new knowledge, a learning goal is a better choice (pp. 329-330). Achievement goals according to Dishon-Berkovits (2014) can only be used in a beneficial way if the student is also provided with an assigned learning goal for the task (p. 332).

Dishon-Berkovits (2014) concludes that internal achievement goals are not the optimal goal a teacher can implement in a classroom. Students’ academic achievements can be shaped and made successful by teachers’ choices and implementations of learning goals rather than achievement goals (p. 337). This is due to the fact that learning goals focus on the “process of learning, not the outcomes” (p. 339).
4. Material and method

In this section, the method for this thesis will be presented as well as the selection of informants and the piloting of the survey. This section will also focus on the ethical aspects of performing an empirical study.

4.1. Method

The material that is used in this study was gathered using an online questionnaire. The purpose of the questionnaire was to investigate what goals teachers employ when teaching literature. Two different upper secondary schools in two neighboring Swedish counties were chosen in order to get enough data to analyse. Apart from the two specific schools, the questionnaire was also sent out to a Facebook group for teachers who teach English at upper secondary school. The questionnaire consists of closed questions which gathered quantitative data, and open-ended questions to gather qualitative answers. According to Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007) a questionnaire is a very useful tool to gather larger amounts of data and to reach out to a wider range of respondents. An online questionnaire can be sent anywhere without the researcher needing to be present (p. 317). The choice to use both closed questions where informants are restricted to multiple choice questions, together with open questions where the informants can express themselves freely, was due to the fact that the respondents should have the opportunity to elaborate on their choice. According to Cohen et al., closed questions are useful for statistical analysis while open questions enable “participants to write a free account in their own terms, to explain and qualify their responses and avoid any limitation of pre-set categories of response” (p. 321). However, Cohen et al. also point out that open questions can lead to information which is of no relevance to the study (p. 321-322). The qualitative data for this study is used to complement the quantitative data in order to get a broader picture of teachers’ assumed goals and their realization in the classroom.

A study performed in the Netherlands by Bloemert, Jansen, and van de Grift (2016) was an inspirational source when forming the different goals for the questionnaire. The goals described in their study were drawn from the CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference) and the curriculum of the Netherlands which is based on the CEFR.

4.2. Selection of participants

For this study the principals of two different upper secondary schools in two different counties in Sweden were contacted to see if their English teachers would be interested in participating in this study. The schools were chosen since there was an already established contact between the researcher and the schools, being a former student of one of them and having had VFU (VFU is to practice teaching through the teacher program) on the other. Only one of the principals sent the information forward to the English teachers of that school (school 1). The questionnaire (Appendix 1) and an information letter (Appendix 2) were sent out to the teachers of school 1 after permission was given by the principal. It was also sent to the principal of the second school (school 2), but no response this time. After one week, all of the teachers from

---

the selected school (1) had sent back their responses. To reach a higher number of participants the questionnaire and information letter was posted to a Facebook group for teachers of English at upper secondary schools in Sweden. In the end, the final number of questionnaires received for analysis was eight.

4.3. Method of implementation

Together with the questionnaire, an information letter was sent to the teachers with information about the study and how the material gathered from the respondents would be handled. By reading the letter and answering the questionnaire the informants agreed to be participants in the study. The questionnaire was sent out using Google Forms, an online tool to distribute and compile data received (see Appendix 1).

4.3.1. Piloting the study

Before the questionnaire was sent out to the respondents, it was piloted. The purpose of a pilot study is to increase the “reliability, validity, and practicability of the questionnaire” (Cohen et al. 2007, p. 341). McKay (2006) explains that piloting a survey increases the value of the survey especially when using a group “who are similar to the group that will be surveyed” (p. 41). For the pilot, two teachers who both have taught or are teaching English at upper secondary school were asked to participate, and both accepted. Each participant was asked to send feedback about the questionnaire. The pilot showed that the participants had interpreted the questions as they were intended and had answered accordingly. There was no comment of ambiguity, however there was an issue of language where Google Chrome if used in Swedish showed “övrigt” instead of “other” as a choice. The questionnaire consisted of 14 questions (see Appendix 1), two questions regarding gender and years of practice. Four questions were mandatory closed questions where the respondents were to choose on a Likert scale ranging from 1-6, regarding the likelihood of them using a certain goal in their teaching. For the closed questions the respondent had to rate a statement of applied goal: 1 – never use this type of goal in their teaching, 3 – sometimes, and 6 – often use this type of goal in their teaching. After each there followed an open-ended question where the respondents could choose to comment on their response. If teachers responded that they never use the described goal, they were given a multiple-choice question about why that goal was not implemented. For the multiple-choice questions the choice “other” reason was added if none of the choices corresponded to the respondents’ reason. Find the complete questionnaire see Appendix 1.

4.4. Method of analysis

After three weeks the completed questionnaires were gathered and printed, general information regarding gender and years of practice was analyzed using a nominal scale. An ordinal scale was used to analyze questions 1a, 2a, 3a, and 4a (Cohen et al., 2007, p. 502). The data was further analyzed to see whether there was a correlation between informants’ responses to questions 1a, 2a, 3a, and 4a and their responses to the b and c questions. The respondents were coded into Teacher A-H. The open-ended questions (b) were categorized according to an emerging pattern of realization in the classroom. The results of the questionnaire are presented in section 5 below.
4.5. Reliability and validity

Reliability and validity in a quantitative study can be divided into internal or external reliability according to McKay (2006), external validity deals with to which extent the findings can be “generalized to a wider population” (p. 12). While external reliability regards the replicability of the study (pp. 12-13). Internal validity deals with the design of the study and if different variables could affect the result of the study. Internal reliability relates to the analysis of the data collected and whether another researcher analyzing the same data would come to the same conclusions (p. 12). Since data has been collected from more than one group of teachers, some representability of the wider population can be ensured despite the limited number of participants. For qualitative data, dependability is important, to achieve this, it is important for the researcher to explain in detail the procedures of the study (p. 14). A detailed explanation of the procedure is explained in the method section and an appendix of the questionnaire is attached to this study. Generalizability is the idea underlying both quantitative and qualitative research to ensure reliability and validity. For quantitative data, this can be ensured through “statistical procedures, which verify that the results obtained were not due to chance” (p. 14). For qualitative data, the number of informants is generally limited, and generalizability, therefore, becomes difficult to achieve (p. 14). Given the low number of participants in this study, statistically significant data and generalization regarding the wider population may be difficult to achieve. However, since data was collected from several communities in Sweden, it did reach a wider population and does meet some of the requirements, though the number of participants are still limited.

4.6. Ethical aspects

All researchers must bear in mind the ethical issues of the much-needed knowledge acquired by informants in empirical studies. One difficulty is to balance this need of knowledge and the risk of threatening “subjects’ rights and values” (Cohen et al., 2011, p. 75). Through informed consent individuals can make the choice if they want to be participants or not after “being informed of facts that would be likely to influence their decision” (Cohen et al., 2007, p. 52). In order to try and avoid potential ethical problem, a letter of consent in the form of an information letter was sent to all informants in this study. The information letter consisted of information about purpose and procedure, that all information would be anonymized, and that in participating in the study would mean that the informants has agreed to take part. The information letter is included in the Appendix of this study (see Appendix 2).

5. Results

The results of the questionnaire will be presented according to the categorization of different goals realized or not realized in the EFL classroom (1a, 2a, 3a, 4a) as presented in section 4.4. Section 5.1 will present to what extent teacher say they teach a certain goal when teaching of literature. Section 5.2 will address whether the goals are realized or not in the classroom. The data will be presented using tables for an easier overview of the respondents’ answers.

5.1. What goals do teachers apply?

The overall result of the study showed that teachers do in fact apply most of the goals in question for this study. By looking at the data it is clear that most teachers find all goals important to
work with and they are sometimes - often implemented in their own teaching. When given the statement “I work with text analysis as the goal; the storyline, how characters develop and recognising and distinguishing text types (articles, abstracts, novels etc.)” only one teacher answered “1” meaning never, one teacher answered “2” which is in between never and sometimes, one teacher answered “3”, sometimes, two answered “4”, and two answered “5” meaning often. Below a presentation of the results for each statement will be presented.

Table 2: I work with text analysis as the goal; the storyline, how characters develop and recognising and distinguishing text types (articles, abstracts, novels etc.). On a Likert-scale between 1-5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As table (2) shows, the average mean of the informants’ responses adding to 3.63 means that teachers sometimes use this type of goal in their teaching rather than never using it. Neither is it clear that this goal is often used in teachers’ literature education in the EFL/ESL classroom. The informant, Teacher C responded that the goal was never used in the classroom. Teacher G responded with 2, in-between never and sometimes.

Table 3: I work with the context as the goal; historical, cultural, and social aspects of a literary work. Including literary periods and information about the author. On a Likert-scale between 1-5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table (3) the informants’ responses show a higher average mean score for this goal of 4.25 it can, therefore, be said that many of the informants represented in this study are likely to work with this goal in their own classroom. The lowest score was represented by Teacher A and Teacher C who answered 3 meaning sometimes.

Table 4: I work with the readers own thoughts and ideas regarding the text. On a Likert-scale between 1-5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As table (4) shows, the average mean of the informants’ responses 4.38 is not much higher than the second goal stated in table 2. However, considering that six out of eight respondents chose 5 -often, it is still the goal where the highest number of informants grade the goal as being an often-used goal in the classroom. One informant, Teacher C responded with a 2 which is significantly lower, between never and sometimes, and one informant, Teacher F answered 3, meaning sometimes.

Table 5: I work with novels for language acquisition. Reading as much as possible to enhance students’ vocabulary. On a Likert-scale between 1-5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In table (5) the informants’ responses show an average mean score of 3.75 indicating that this is a goal that is sometimes realized in the classroom. However, there are still two informants who responded that this is a goal they often implement. Teacher F answered 2 which is the lowest score for this goal, meaning between never and sometimes.

5.2. Are the goals realized or not?

The open-ended questions as to how this goal is realized or not in the classroom generated a multitude of different responses as can be seen in the table below. Generally, the respondents who responded lower than a “3” did not give explanation to how this goal is realized in their classroom but gave reasons such as “not relevant” or “not interesting” for not realizing this goal in their teaching.

Table 6: Teacher responses to question 1b and c. If text analysis is your goal, how often is this realized in your teaching and is it more common in English 5, 6 or 7? If it differs, why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>I work with text analysis in all three courses (perhaps more in English 6 and 7). We work with novels, normally one/semester and write reading-logs, reviews, and open book tests where the students analyze the novels in class. We also use articles and write for example summary-response essays and reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>When it comes to fiction, I often start with shorter texts such as short stories etc. before letting students read an entire novel (especially in English 5). In English 6, and especially 7 the students can read more scientific texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>I always discuss the genre of the text we are reading, or the students are writing, pointing out distinctive features but go in to more detail in English 6 and English 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Through reading literature over several weeks at a time and specific assignments connected to text analysis in English 5 and 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>I use a progression where we define terms and look at them briefly in ENG5, go more into depth in ENG6 and put the most focus on it in ENG7. I’d say that I've used it the most in ENG6 though.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>No I practise this in all levels (both 5,6,7).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several of the responses, A, B, D, in table (6) give thorough explanations to how often the goal is realized in their teaching and also specific methods of approaching this goal. Other answers such as “No I practice this in all levels (both 5,6,7)” does not really answer the question asked. Teacher H and G responded to why this goal is not realized in the classroom as “Not relevant”. In regards to teacher H, this is somewhat confusing due to the grading of a 5 on the scale of how often this goal is used in the classroom. Teacher C gave the reason “not interesting” as to why this goal was never used in teacher C’s teaching.

Table 7: Teacher responses to question 2b and c. If you work towards the context goal how often is this realized in your teaching and is it more common in English 5, 6 or 7? If it differs, why? How do you work with the context goal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>I work with the context goal predominantly in English 6. We study literary periods, read texts from authors of these periods and compare.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B  More in English 6, because in that course it's part of the core content. Then, students have to put what they read in to context, I often go through different literary periods during class.

C  To give the students a different input to a certain period of time. Often in English 6 and 7.

D  Context is always important but more so in English 6 and 7 when discussing literature. I try to give my students, in all courses, context in the form of "authentic" situations. These situations could be something they will come across depending their chosen program.

E  Every time we do a reading project, both in Eng 5 & 6 (two times a year).

F  The most common in ENG5 & 7. I always work with it to some extent when working with literature, although this is where the focus mostly lays in ENG5 & 7. In ENG7 I usually work with postcolonial literature and that's the reason why there, whereas in ENG5 it is a bit difficult for the students to work with analysis.

G  I work with time periods and themes (segregation, war) etc..

H  Depending on the level- in 5 I normally mention this depending the texts used! In 6 I go more to depth! In 7 I normally study the Classics

Table (7) shows the answers of the only open-ended question in the questionnaire where all the informants chose to answer. Teacher A and B tend to put most effort into this goal in English 6, with Teacher B emphasizing that it is a part of the core content. Teacher C and G emphasize time periods as what is realized in the classroom. Furthermore, Teacher G also adds social aspects, such as segregation as realized in the classroom. Teachers D and F realizes this goal in all of their courses, though adding to that it depends on the level of language skills in English 5 (Teacher H). Furthermore, teacher H responded to why this goal was not realized in the classroom by stating that it is “Not relevant”.

Table 8: Teacher responses to question 3b and c. If you work towards the reader goal how often is this realized in your teaching and is it more common in English 5, 6 or 7? If it differs, why? How do you work with the reader approach?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The students are always asked to give their opinion on the texts we read. They are also asked to motivate why they like a text or not. Especially when working with novels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>I do this in all my classes. In English 5 I often divide it so that the students get to reflect about different aspects of a text (some students relate the text to their own experiences and others to the outside world etc), while in English 6, students more have to think about all the aspects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>If we are working with literature or texts found in news media, Point of view is always one part of the assignment. It is important that students understand that there is always a Point of view. In English 7 I devote more time to this by working specifically with linguistics, distinguishing between objective and subjective language. This is not something I would discuss or demand of my English 5-students. I have, however, discussed it at times with my English 6-students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Through discussions with their peers, both in Eng 5 &amp; 6 (I don't teach Eng 7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>It is always touched upon and the students are encouraged to reason for their opinion through examples. In ENG5 the students are sometimes given the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
assignment to write a letter to the author where they are to share their thoughts and ideas with him/her.

Students create their own discussion questions.

Several informants, teacher A, B, and F, in table (8) express this goal to be realized whenever fiction or other types of literature is used in the classroom. Teacher F expresses that “it is always touched upon”, teacher A responds similarly “students are always asked to give their opinion”. Teacher B simply states that this is something which is done in all of the classes. Teachers E and G express different ways in which this goal is realized in the classroom, such as creating discussion questions and discussions in groups. The response of teacher D is difficult to analyze, this informant seems to state that what is realized in the classroom is the way different texts are narrated and used objectively or subjectively which does not correspond to the goal ascribed for this question namely, students’ own thoughts and ideas regarding a text. Teacher C, who graded this goal as a 2 on the scale, has not given any explanation to whether this goal is or is not realized in the classroom. Teacher H who graded this goal as a 5 on the Likert-scale on how often this goal is used in the classroom chose to not answer and explain how this goal is realized, but on the other hand stated it as “Not relevant” when responding to why the goal is not realized in the classroom.

Table 9: Teacher responses to question 4b and c. If you work towards the language goal how often is this realized in your teaching and is it more common in English 5, 6 or 7? If it differs, why? How do you work with the language goal?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>When reading texts the students are always asked to note words which they do not fully understand or know how to use. In English 7 they create their own vocabulary lists and in English 5 I often do it for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>I often let students pick out words or expression from texts that they find difficult. I do it in both English 5 and 6, but hopefully in English 6, they have a larger vocabulary already.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>More often in English 5, as the only goal. Read more for pleasure only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Every time the students are made to read something they have to work with the language of the text, no matter what text. High-lighting vocabulary and language is always important and therefore something my students have to work with. The way we work with the language and vocabulary can differ but the overall goal is the give the students the tools to find the &quot;answers&quot; (to the new Word or grammar rule) themselves. I will not simply give it to them. In English 6 and 7 I work only in English and make my students do the same; they should be able to discuss language in English. In English 5 I would let them use Swedish if necessary but try to encourage them to define new words or rules in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Students in Eng 5 &amp; 6 make lists of words they don't know and look them up in an Eng-Eng dictionary. At the end of the project, they get a vocabulary check test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>I work with the language goal mainly through more scientifically written material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>I do this in all levels and of course language improves both vocabulary and grammar!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers A, B, D, and E in table (9) all express that they work with vocabulary by looking up words and expressions (teacher B) while studying a text. Teacher E also states that it is common that the students receive a vocabulary test after finishing a text. Teacher D also emphasize that
the goal is student oriented, because students should be given the tools to find the answers themselves and that there is an escalation in regard to how much they should be able to use the target language for each course. Teacher C’s answer was rather ambiguous but could be understood as, that the goal is more common in English 5 than in English 6 and 7 where focus shifts towards reading for pleasure rather than language acquisition. Teacher F states that this goal is more commonly used when working with scientific texts. Teacher H states that this goal is realized in all courses, it can be assumed that what teacher H means is that texts, not language, improve both vocabulary and grammar. Teacher H also marked this goal as “Not relevant” as to why this goal is not realized in the classroom. Teacher G has chosen not to respond to this question and has not given any response as to why this goal is or is not realized in the classroom.

6. Discussion

The following sections include a discussion on method (6.1) and the discussion of the results where the results are discussed in relation to the theoretical framework and the background (6.2). The limitations of the study are presented in section 6.3.

6.1. Method discussion

The chosen method of a questionnaire relies on the informants understanding of the questions and the researcher’s ability to ask unambiguous questions. It also relies on the informants’ willingness to respond to the questionnaire. Since the aim of the study was to examine to what extent teacher apply certain goals, it was equally important to understand how and if these goals are realized or not. Because of both the researcher’s and the informants’ limited time the questionnaire was restricted in the amount of open-ended questions. To construct the questionnaire to be easy to answer and take less time had the purpose of enabling more respondents to have time to answer the questionnaire and thus receiving a larger number of responses. However, only one of the two schools who had been asked to participate answered, this generated five responses to the questionnaire. Therefore, the questionnaire was also published in a Facebook group for teachers in English which in turn generated three responses.

Question 1b in the questionnaire unlike the other “b” questions asked the question, “how often is this realized in your teaching” instead of asking “how is this realized in your teaching”, this in turn affected the responses to rather reflect whether it is often-, sometimes-, or never used in the classroom which then makes question 1 redundant. If the word often had been removed, it would probably have generated the response that were sought for. Therefore, it can be said that there was some ambiguity in the questionnaire which a second pilot might have prevented.

The informant, teacher H answered, “Not relevant” to the C-questions about why a goal was not realized in the classroom even though the respondent had claimed that the goal was sometimes or often used in teacher H’s teaching. It is possible that the respondent had misunderstood that this question was a non-mandatory question and directed to those who did not use this goal in their teaching. Another note to make about informant H is that on every stated goal the response is (5) which begs to question whether this is actually the informants view on how much this goal is realized in their teaching or if the informant took “the easy way out”.
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6.2. Result discussion
In this section the results will be discussed in relation to the background and the theoretical framework. The section will be divided into two parts. The first part 6.2.1 will discuss what goals teachers do apply in their teaching, the second part 6.2.2 will discuss how these goals are realized or not.

6.2.1. Applying goals to teaching literature in English

The overall picture of the results shows that most teachers to some extent do work with the stated goals in the questionnaire. To work with the goal of text analysis, which is stated in the core content for both English 6 and 7, was represented by six out of eight teachers. Thus, the question arises as to whether the two other informants intentionally disregard the curriculum, which Parkinson and Thomas (2000) say is often the case. Text analysis is also an important part of critical literacy as described by Janks (2010), to give students the tools to understand how society constructs norms and ideological ideas. Furthermore, text analysis as a goal can show how texts can affect pupils and what meaning these texts wants to convey to the reader.

The goal of context, working with historical and cultural aspects including literary time periods, features prominently for the English 6 in the Swedish curriculum for upper secondary school. The aim for the subject of English is also for students to “develop knowledge of living conditions, social issues and cultural features in different contexts” (p. 1). Four out of eight informants graded this goal as often used in their teaching of literature. Two informants responded (3) sometimes and two informants responded 4 between sometimes and often. A possible reason for this could be that this goal, in particular is only stated for English 6. However, as it is also a part of the aim of the subject, the notion of culture and living conditions can be covered without the use of literature. And yet, in accordance with Alemi (2011), reading literature is advantageous when it comes to cultural enrichment and personal involvement. It is through language and texts that teachers can work democratically with students, especially through cultural and historical aspects, according to Säljö (2010). This is in alignment with the Swedish curriculum and also in alignment with the responses of the informants. This goal can also be focused as a learning goal. According Dishon-Berkovits (2014), a learning goal is the most efficient goal to help students develop new knowledge. In the context goal, students need to acquire new knowledge, learn new things, and discover new knowledge by themselves and in communication with the teacher. How the informants worked with this goal in their teaching will be discussed in section 6.2.2.

Working with the goal of the reader perspective where the reader’s own thoughts and ideas regarding texts are in focus was the goal that produced the highest average mean score. Six of the eight informants graded this goal as often used in the classroom. It was however surprising that one of the informants graded this goal as never used and another as sometimes used in the classroom. This is surprising since the curriculum for English in courses 5 and 6, which advocate for discussions regarding content, themes and ideas are the guidelines the teachers should follow. To not use the reader goal is arguably to disregard research by Bruns (2001), Lundahl (2012) and Langer (2005) who promote the importance of communication and the student-centered classroom where students’ own understandings, feelings and ideas are in focus. The study, however, does not promote answers to understand whether the teachers are aware of disregarding the curriculum or not. Sociocultural theory generally and Säljö (2010) specifically advocate the importance of communication and its crucial role in learning. Some of this knowledge has been, as Säljö (2010) explains, already interpreted by teachers, and,
therefore, it is important for students to add their own opinion and interpretation. Another informant answered sometimes, which, thus, indicates that even though it is a goal which is sometimes used, it is not a goal which is in focus. If students are not given the opportunity to discuss and show their understanding of a text, the task connected to the text may become ambiguous and too difficult. This is in line with Dishon-Berkovits’ (2014) discussion about performance goals and learning goals: learning goals allow the student to discover new knowledge which can then be applied to a more complex task, while the performance goal only shows a desired outcome and not how to acquire the knowledge needed.

The stated goal of working with novels for language acquisition and reading as much as possible to enhance students’ vocabulary was a goal which was sometimes used. As stated in the results section; however, there were two informants who categorized this goal as used often. There are no directions in the curriculum on how students should enhance their vocabulary or even to achieve language acquisition. Therefore, it leaves open the possibility for the teachers to choose whether they want to use novels for this purpose or not. On the other hand, it is clear that many of the informants do choose to work with novels for this specific purpose. As explained by Alemi (2011), literature has not seen as highly relevant in language teaching, focus was on linguistic features and grammar, and not the context of how and where these features occur, namely in texts. However, nowadays this negative view on literature has shifted. Due to the fact that one informant responded (2) it could be possible that this attitude towards literature may still have some resonance within the school system of today. To read novels for language acquisition could be applicable as a learning goal, as Dishon-Berovits (2014) describes that a learning goal is a process of learning to understand new things. Janks (2010) speaks about critical literacy and to uncover implied meanings in discourse and texts, so does the Swedish curriculum therefore discussions regarding texts would benefit students’ ability to understand and located implied meanings. In order for students to understand and find these underlying meanings they also have to have the opportunity to acquire the understanding of language and written texts.

All of the different goals stated have different reasons to be a part of the teaching of literature in the Swedish EFL/ESL classroom, as the background and the theoretical framework show. All of the above goals are, according to the informant’s used more or less, and only teacher C answered never on one of the goals. In the next section the respondents’ answers to how these goals are realized in the classroom will be discussed.

6.2.2. The realization of goals in teaching literature in English

Most of the informants gave in-depth answers as to how the stated goals were realized in their teaching. Whenever an informant graded a goal to be less frequently used in the classroom (1) or (2), they had the opportunity to give a reason as to why this goal was not used/little used. The respondents’ answers to the goal of text analysis show an awareness of what Dishon-Berkovits (2014) calls learning goals. This means that the respondents describe a gradual escalation in difficulty for the students and the knowledge they are expected to acquire. Both teacher C and G responded to this goal as being “not interesting” or “not relevant”, a possible reason for this, could be, that the curriculum is too ambiguous. Since the curriculum does not say specifically that teachers ought to teach students to identify texts, it does, however, say that students should meet different forms of text. These can be formal texts in different forms such as scientific texts and also more abstract types of texts. In order
to be able to understand the meaning of a text, Säljö (2010), Janks (2010), Bruns (2001) and Langer (2005) assert that communication, variety of methods, and understanding the discourse of a text is vital for interpretation and personal growth. Also, in the curriculum English 5, 6 and 7 advocate that students should be able to understand the underlying meanings of a text, and, it can be argued that this becomes difficult if a student is unable to identify the genre of a text. Therefore, it can be questioned whether or not the informants who stated that this goal is “not relevant” and therefore not realized are also disregarding the curriculum in the same way described by Parkinson and Thomas (2000).

For the context goal, the respondents had very different ways of describing how this goal is realized in their teaching. Teachers A, B and D responded that they generally applied this goal in English 6 and C and G emphasized historical time periods as the main context. These five responses, if linked to the curriculum could draw the conclusion that these informants realize this goal mainly in English 6, where authors and literary time periods are stated as a core content. However, teachers C and D also state that this goal is realized in English 7 as well. Teacher H describes a gradual progression of the context goal depending on the students’ level of language. Teacher F however realizes this goal mainly in English 5 and 7, which is somewhat surprising since it is only made explicit in English 6 in the curriculum of English. All of the informants answered the question about how this goal is realized, which indicates the importance of the goal. And the goal is important due to the fact that the Swedish curriculum states that students should be given opportunity to develop their “knowledge of living conditions, social issues and cultural features in different contexts” (Skolverket, 2011a, p. 1). This is something that both Bruns (2001) and Langer (2005) conform: it is through literature we understand other people. Säljö (2010) advocate studying texts in accordance to the democratic process the curriculum advocates for, that texts can be a great opportunity to work with democratic values in the classroom. According to the core content there should also be discussions regarding themes and ideas of literary works, which teacher G emphasizes by stating that the theme of segregation in historical context is an example of what is worked with and realized in the classroom. Alemi (2011) also states that literature brings cultural enrichment, authentic material and personal involvement, here teacher D lifts the notion of authentic situations or context, which in turn could be linked to the students’ programs (or personal lives). Many of the respondents show yet again an awareness of the learning goal theory where the informants tend to show an awareness of the need to slowly develop students’ knowledge in the form of steady progression.

The goal concerning the reader’s own thoughts and ideas regarding a text was the goal which received the highest average mean score of all the goals. The goal was realized in numerous ways: by students creating discussion questions, stating opinions and in group discussions. All teachers except teacher D responded to the question in a manner that was directly linked to how this goal was realized, while teacher D discusses narration and subjectivity or objectivity of texts rather than the opinions and thoughts of the students. Teachers A, B, E, F and G tend to work toward the curriculum, which promotes the use of oral discussions that work with content, themes and ideas. This is also in line with Langer’s reader-response approach as described by Lundahl (2012), where the reader’s understanding should be in focus rather than an accepted interpretation of a literary work. Janks’ (2010) critical literacy can be useful here to see how pupils understand one text differently, and how one text affects people differently. By using discussions, as several of the informants say they do, they also engage in democratic practice, which schools are obligated to do, and as Säljö (2010) emphasizes, that texts can provide the opportunity and encourage the democratic practice within the classroom. Teachers C and H chose not to respond to this question. Even though teacher H marked this goal as
used *often*, the question of how it was realized was not mandatory and was not answered by teacher H. Teacher C on the other hand gave this goal a low value and it would have been interesting to see why that was. However, teacher C did not explain why this goal is not realized in their teaching.

The language goal (to use novels to help students enhance their language skills) raised quite varied responses from the informants, stretching from less frequently used to *often* used goal. However, the informant who stated that the goal was rarely used added that the goal was more commonly realized using scientific texts rather than fictional texts. Previously as Alemi (2011) has mentioned language development was mostly taught through linguistic features for instance grammar, and was less associated with authentic texts. In recent decades the benefits of literature in English language learning have become better known. In particular, it enriches the language and allows students to interact with a language that is varied and idiomatic. Due to the different responses to how this goal is realized it is possible to see that the informants have different ways to implement this goal. To use texts or novels to help students develop their language skills is a learning goal described by Dishon.Berkovits (2014), where the students have to understand what they are reading before they can continue onto more complex tasks.

7. Conclusion

The aim of this study was to examine which goals teachers apply when teaching literature in the Swedish EFL classroom at the upper secondary level. It also sought to investigate to what extent these goals were actually realized in the classroom. The research questions were as follows:

- What goals do teachers in Sweden apply to the teaching of literature in the EFL classroom?
- Are these goals realized or not in their teaching practice, and what reasons are there to explain how these goals are realized or not realized in class?

The results show that among the informants who participated in this study most of the goals stated are in one way or another realized in the classroom, even if novels or other types of fiction are not the target text for a particular goal. However, several of the respondents’ answers also showed that working with literary time periods, which is a part of the core content of English 6, is often taught in English 7 instead. This means that the students who attend programs where English 7 is not a mandatory subject are perhaps not always provided with the knowledge the curriculum states they should be provided with. Many of the informants also show an understanding of students’ ability to acquire new knowledge through the use of progression.

Very few of the respondents disregarded any of the goals. The only goal where more than one respondent answered that a goal was used less frequently than *sometime* was with the text analysis goal. The informant gave reason that the goal was “not relevant”. This gives cause to question whether this is a conscious choice to disregard this goal or if they do actually realize the goal in their teaching without knowing that they do.
7.1. Future research

Future research in the area of literature in the EFL classroom would be of value for both teachers and authors of the curriculum of English, it could help to clarify what is expected of teachers’ literature education. The result of this study shows that there are teachers who disregard from aspects of the core content of the curriculum and that there is an uncertainty among some teachers in regard to how literature can and should be used in the classroom. Further research could help provide a deeper understanding of what aspects teachers are supposed to include in the literature classroom. Another point to make is that a study with a larger number of informants could show a different result and would make generalizations more reliable. However, this study did not provide the time to be able to do a study at a larger scale. Therefore, further empirical studies of this sort could pin-point teachers’ views, opinions and habits when teaching literature at upper secondary schools in Sweden.
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Appendix
Appendix 1 - Questionnaire

The teaching of literature in the EFL/ESL classroom at upper secondary schools in Sweden.

Part 1 is some general information about yourself.

Part 1 - I am...

- Female
- Male
- Prefer not to say

How many years have you been teaching. Write a number.

________________________________________

Part 2 - you will find statements related to goals applied to the teaching of literature. You should then respond to each statement by filling in the corresponding scale, to express the extent to which you believe that these goals are applied in your own teaching. In other words, on a scale from 1 - 5: 1 means never applied; 3 - sometimes; and 5 often. After each statement you are able to give a brief explanation (section b) about how this goal is realised in your own teaching. If the goal is not applied in your teaching, please choose a reason why in section (c) for each question.

1. I work with text analysis as the goal; the storyline, how characters develop and recognising and distinguishing text types (articles, abstracts, novels etc.).

1 2 3 4 5
Never Sometimes Often

1b. If text analysis is your goal, how often is this realised in your teaching and is it more common in English 5, 6 or 7? If it differs, why? How do you work with text analysis? Answer briefly.

1c. If the text analysis goal is NOT realised in your teaching, give reason why below. Note that you can choose more than one reason or choose "other" if none of the choices apply to you.

- Lack of time
- Too difficult for the students
- Not interesting
- Not relevant
- Other

2. I work with the context as the goal; historical, cultural and social aspects of a literary work. Including literary periods and information about the author.

1 2 3 4 5
Never Sometimes Often
2b. If you work towards the context goal how often is this realised in your teaching and is it more common in English 5, 6 or 7? If it differs, why? How do you work with the context goal? Answer briefly.

2c. If the context goal is NOT realised in your teaching, give reason why below. Note that you can choose more than one reason or choose "other" if none of the choices apply to you.

   o Lack of time
   o Too difficult for the students
   o Not interesting
   o Not relevant
   o Other

3. I work with the readers own thoughts and ideas regarding the text.

   1 2 3 4 5
   Never Sometimes Often

3b. If you work towards the reader goal how often is this realised in your teaching and is it more common in English 5, 6 or 7? If it differs, why? How do you work with the reader approach? Answer briefly.

3c. If the reader goal is NOT realised in your teaching, give reason why below. Note that you can choose more than one reason or choose "other" if none of the choices apply to you.

   o Lack of time
   o Too difficult for the students
   o Not interesting
   o Not relevant
   o Other

4. I work with novels for language acquisition. Reading as much as possible to enhance students' vocabulary.

   1 2 3 4 5
   Never Sometimes Often

4b. If you work towards the language goal how often is this realised in your teaching and is it more common in English 5, 6 or 7? If it differs, why? How do you work with the language goal? Answer briefly.

4c. If the language goal is NOT realised in your teaching, give reason why below. Note that you can choose more than one reason or choose "other" if none of the choices apply to you.

   o Lack of time
   o Too difficult for the students
   o Not interesting
   o Not relevant
   o Other
Appendix 2 – Information letter/ Letter of consent

Hej!

Syftet med undersökningen är att få utökad kunskap om vilka mål engelsklärare på gymnasiet har med sin undervisning i litteratur, samt hur dessa står i relation till det som beskrivs kring litteratur i kursplanerna för engelska på gymnasiet. Enkäten är anonym och endast jag har tillgång till den information som ges. När studien är klar kommer all information att raderas.

Att delta i undersökningen är frivilligt och du kan när som helst välja att avstå från att delta. Genomförande av enkäten innebär att ni samtycker till deltagande i studien. Examensarbetet presenteras i form av en uppsats vid Högskolan Dalarna.

För mer information kan du kontakta nedanstående ansvariga
Vimmerby 2017-09-04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marie Oskarsson</th>
<th>David Gray</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Handledare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>070-xxx xx xx</td>
<td>023-77 86 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:dgy@du.se">dgy@du.se</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Höskolan Dalarna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Höskolegatan 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>791 88 Falun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>