AFTERWORD
L1 EDUCATION BETWEEN VON HUMBOLDT AND CHAT GPT

SANDER BAX, SJAAK KROON & MASSIMILIANO SPOTTI

Tilburg University

Abstract

L1 education has its main foundation in von Humboldt's concept of *Bildung* integrating the study of language and literature as a contribution to personal growth. Since this perspective gets less attention nowadays, it is argued that we need to re-invent L1 education as meaning-making in which not only offline texts but also all sorts of online products need to be taken as a starting point for learning to reason as an antidote to recent societal developments that in the long run might cause a potential threat to democracy as we know it. In addition, contemporary L1 education is also facing the challenges of globalization and digitalization. Globalization-induced mobility and immigration lead to, among other things, super-diverse classrooms that include a gamut of languages, cultures, and religions. In reaction, L1 education tends to take a rather narrow focus on national, or even nationalistic, contents in the field of language, literature, and culture, potentially leading to the exclusion of certain categories of students. Digitalization, booming business in educational contexts due to the COVID-19 pandemic, also poses challenges to L1 education. Students need to become digitally literate citizens to survive in the post-digital world they inhabit, and L1 education has both the tools and the means to help them acquire digital literacy skills and awareness. To shape L1 education in such a way that it can cope with these challenges, we need to base the L1 curriculum, its subject contents, and its didactic approach on research that starts where the teachers and students are, that is, in the classroom, and that takes their practical experiences seriously. The qualitative research methodologies developed within the International Mother Tongues Education Network can play a role in formulating a timely and successful L1 research program.

Keywords: *Bildung*, meaning-making, digital literacies, globalization, digitalization, qualitative research, teacher education

1.   INTRODUCTION

This afterword is not to summarize, once again, the contributions to this special is-sue. Rather, it aims at highlighting a few issues that came up in the various contribu-tions and that, taken together, paint a challenging portrait of the multifaceted school subject of L1 education.

Section 2 first goes into the concept of *Bildung*, being one of the main sources of L1 education but momentarily tending to fall into oblivion. Starting from a *Bildung* perspective, section 3 presents a vision of L1 education as meaning making that fits the need of preparing youth to become critical citizens in our present-day globalized societies. The consequences of globalization and digitalization for L1 education are dealt with in sections 4 and 5 and in section 6 we present some reflections on L1 curriculum development, research, and teacher education. We then conclude, in section 7, with a plea for classroom oriented, qualitative educational design research of L1 education as a basis for curriculum development and teacher training.

2.   L1 EDUCATION: COMBINING SUBJECT KNOWLEDGE AND BILDUNG

In 1999, John Hardcastle published 'Von Humboldt's Children: English and the for-mation of a European educational ideal' in *Changing English.* The article was written after he had participated in the 1995 FABER/IMEN conference *Mehrsprachigkeit und Schule in Europa: historische und international vergleichende Aspekte* (Multilingual-ism and education in Europe: Historical and international comparative aspects) in Hamburg, Germany. At that conference,

> [o]ne afternoon, during a seminar conducted entirely in English about standard lan-guage teaching in European multi-lingual schools, a German Professor remarked, half teasing, half mocking, 'Of course, we are all the children of von Humboldt...'. It struck me as faintly comical. At the time, to be truthful, I had no idea what she meant. English barely understands itself, and today we risk dismantling the potential for a unified ap-proach to language, literature and culture before we have adequately grasped what this might entail. (Hardcastle, 1999, 31)

In his article, Hardcastle stipulates the importance of being aware of the common European, and especially German origin of what is now the school subject L1. More specifically for Britain he claims that "[l]acking historical perspectives, contemporary rationales in English teaching have missed the scale of an earlier European vision that might be powerfully relevant to current debates" (Hardcastle, 1999, 31). Hardcastle then mainly discusses the German concept of *Bildung*, as it had been introduced by German thinkers like Herder and von Humboldt. This powerful pedagogical ideal fo-cuses on a general development of all human qualities, i.e., not only the acquisition of general knowledge, but also the development of moral judgment and critical thinking skills. As such it has contributed strongly to modern educational theories of individual development, and it lies behind a rationale for an education in language and literature as 'personal growth'. According to Hardcastle, the ideal of *Bildung* as personal development was never seen as something separate from the development

of the larger community. Rather, it "tied the processes of individual development to the supra-individual processes of collective (especially national—although, equally, it could be social class) development." (p. 37)

Hardcastle (1999, 37) further writes:

> Woven tightly into the fabric of the Bildungs ideal was a conception of an education in language and literature. Such a conception was also at the core of the ideal of individual self-cultivation and the development of the ethical and aesthetic consciousness. But at the same time, it tied linguistic and literary education institutionally to the project of national cultural reconstruction. At the national level the project was centrally and explicitly preoccupied with the formation of a unifying national identity. It might be assumed, then, that Bildung would concentrate exclusively on the national language and culture. It did not […].

The take-home message of this historical perspective on (the origin of) the school subject L1 is that we might need an international and historical *tertium comparationis* to get to grips with what Peter Elbow in his challenging and very personal account of the school subject English called "a profession that cannot define what it is." (Elbow, 1990, v) The title of Elbow's book *What is English?* is, as he stipulates, "my answer, my summing up, my picture of the profession. This book is trying to paint a picture of a profession that cannot define what it is. I don't mean this as a scandal (…) (it) is probably a good thing." (ibid.), he then continues: "if we can't agree on a product, we can agree on a process: looking at how meaning is made." (ibid., 61) So Elbow suggests to the community of L1 teachers to do what they should teach their students to do: "Learning involves the making of meaning and the reflecting back on this process of meaning making." (ibid., 18; cited by van de Ven, 1996, 13-14)

3. L1 EDUCATION AND MEANING MAKING

A language user who uses his L1 is one of the many aspects of sociolinguistic sociation that go mostly unremarked in our daily doings. Most often, someone's use of L1 is considered natural in that it is something learnt by birth to a given family that inhabits a socio-cultural space inserted within a nation-state that has this very L1 as its official language. It is only when we do not 'walk the walk and talk the talk' of the Herderian equation outlined above, that is, it is when—for example—we are confronted with new means and new modes of communication in someone's L1 and/or with meaning negotiations and metapragmatic judgements about someone's L1 usage due to an L1 user's ethno-cultural, geographical or socio-economic background—that we come to realize that mastering an L1 for some may not be such a given as the equation above would have us to believe. Contemporary language users, secondary school students for instance, live in a 'heavily languagised world' (Jaspers & Madsen, 2016, 237) that is a world where they experience power imbalance brought in by those who own the right linguistic resources and manage to apply them normatively well to certain language functions. Further, this imbalance comes along

within a complex public sphere rooted into a set of online, always on and thus post-digital, media culture means of communication, such as digital platforms, that have become arenas of L1 regimentation, or lack thereof. The 'public sphere' where people live, belong to, and interact with one another through fleeting online digital based encounters, has thus transformed itself from a Habermasian public sphere where communal conversation could be facilitated, into a highly multidimensional space ruled by digital platforms that not only have become part of our daily social structure but have also reached an algorithm-driven supremacy that allows them to regulate the deep generic drivers of our social conduct. Contrary to what their omnipresence leads the masses to believe, their impact is all but democratic, if not even disruptive. To function as a student and later as a citizen in a public sphere of this kind, it requires critical and aware reading and viewing skills. L1 education is the obvious place to train students in these skills. More than it is currently the case, in L1 education we should therefore focus on strengthening students' media and digital literacies (Peeters & Bax, 2022) and on developing critical and aware reading skills (Heynders, 2022; Janssen & van Keulen, 2023).

At the same time, we see that current L1 education does not pay enough attention to these skills, and the Netherlands is no exception to this. A strong reading crisis has recently been identified (OECD, 2021; Meelissen et al., 2023) with, among others, Dutch students no longer being able to read 'deeply'. Current reading comprehension education seems to be insufficient because of its narrow focus on teaching reading strategies and its lack of meaningful content and cohesion (van Dijk & Stronks, 2022; SLO, 2022; Rooijackers, 2023). This phenomenon requires as a response an L1 education that teaches more than just knowledge and skills, but that also takes its social mission seriously. L1 education can also be regarded as 'identity work'. It is education that contributes to what is often called 'citizenship' in today's educational debate, a concept that, as was indicated earlier, is loosely based on the traditional concept of *Bildung*. In today's globally complex political landscape, the need for education in this domain is greater than ever. We see teachers prefer avoiding topics that are politically sensitive (Cassar, Oosterheert & Meijer, 2021, 657; Lozano Parra, 202, 93). This calls for education that confronts students with pluralism (Nieuwelink, 2023, 54) and teaches them to adopt democratic stances and attitudes (Cassar, Oosterheert & Meijer, 2021, 656).

To help L1 education focus more on media, digital literacies and – through that – on students' identities and their citizenship, several solutions have been suggested (see for example van Keulen & Spotti; Löfgren & Erixon; Ongstad in this special issue). One possible solution lies in the integration of reading and writing education with literature education. Good literature education can contribute to attentive reading, deep reading, and critical thinking (Facione, 2020; Koek, 2022) and offers starting points for improving students' reading skills. Currently, in the Dutch L1 curriculum, for instance, a rigid distinction between non-literary and literary reading exists, leading to both forms of reading being taught and assessed differently. This distinction

does not do justice to the complex media landscape we live in (Heynders, 2022) and is difficult to defend based on reading theories (cf. Kintsch, 1998).

This calls for a reading education in which experiencing and appreciating are meaningfully linked to understanding, analyzing, interpreting, and reasoning about the whole rich palette of texts with which our students, like ourselves, are confronted day in and day out in our media culture. If we integrate non-literary and literary reading and writing more strongly, the obvious thing to do so is following a didactic approach that is in line with recent subject didactic insights around 'literacy awareness', 'big ideas', and 'reasoning' (Mitchell et al., 2016; Bax & Mantingh, 2018, 2019; van Rijt et al., 2019; van Rijt, 2020).

The concept of literacy awareness is used in the Dutch educational context to underline that in L1 education our goal is to help students become better readers and writers and that we should do so by making them 'aware' readers and writers, that is, writers who are able to reason about and reflect on the process of reading and writing (in this case 'reading and writing of literature') (Meesterschapsteam, 2016; 2018; 2021. It is argued that in L1 education, students can acquire insights about language, literature, and communication from four different perspectives, i.e., a systems perspective, an individual perspective, a sociocultural perspective, and a historical perspective. All this is aimed at integrating the different components or domains of L1 education. Acquiring these insights through an educational intervention that is focused on 'reasoning with and about literature' teaches students to (critically) think, reason, and argue about texts in contemporary media culture (Mitchell et al., 2016; School & Bax, 2022).

Especially in the present post-digital era, training, analysis, interpretation, and reflection regarding the way our reading position is manipulated by narrative techniques is more important than ever (van de Ven, 2023). An integrated L1 curriculum for the future might therefore broaden insights gained from literature education to L1 education in general. Traditionally, reading literature is often connected to developing critical thinking and discussing the personal, moral, and ethical issues that are at stake in texts (Booth, 1988; Nussbaum, 1990; Hakemulder, 2000). There are several researchers who have shown that confronting others, other worlds, and other world views helps students increase their empathy and critical thinking skills (Koopman, 2016; Schrijvers, 2019; Koek, 2022).

Schrijvers (2019) investigates which design principles can be used to design an educational intervention that enhances 'insight in self and others' in students in secondary education in the Netherlands. In doing so, she discusses several studies that have suggested (and sometimes have shown) that reading literary fiction might improve students' (affective and cognitive) 'theory of mind' and might enhance 'narrative empathy'. Heynders (2023) adds another element to this, that is the element of imagination. She observes that students are becoming less comfortable with the 'rules of fiction'. Especially at a time of fake news (Araújo e Sá et al., 2023) and post-truth-led debates this observation becomes unsettling. Heynders argues that reading fiction teaches students strategies for thinking, consciously feigning, and

examining the world. Therefore, she argues that reading fiction is much needed in a democratic society where different voices want to be heard. The very act of reading fiction invites students to learn to reason, debate, and write. Heynders calls this the democratic principle of fiction: in the text, the reader is offered a perspective different from their own, but the reader can sympathize with that perspective for a while. In this way, readers learn to empathize with opinions and viewpoints that are different from those they (think they) hold:

> Fiction introduces us to multi-voicedness, in the sense that not only the author's intent, but also ideas of others can be noticed. When we read fiction there is, by definition, a dialogue that invites thought. (Heynders, 2023)

Heynders calls for a 'critical pedagogy of fiction' in which students learn how disagreement can be organized and she calls for 'fictional literacy' (Heynders, 2023). This calls for developing the L1 curriculum further by broadening up the palette of (media) texts that are studied, by crossing the borders of the distinction of fiction and non-fiction and by teaching students to acquire insights about narrative techniques, narrative empathy and fictionality in reading and writing all kinds of texts.

4. L1 EDUCATION IN A SUPER-DIVERSE GLOBAL ERA

Language diversity is an undisputable fact of life. As already witnessed in the Tower of Babel narrative in Genesis and the myth of how God gave the people of Dagestan their languages, it appeared right from the start of mankind and developed in such a way that monolingualism became the exception rather than the rule. Against this background, the Herderian formula of 'one nation - one people - one language' can be considered 'empirical fiction' rather than fact (Green & Erixon, 2020, 262). Still, it became foundational for the invention of so-called national languages and the historical project of L1 education, i.e., teaching the national standard language (and culture) of a country as a school subject to the country's citizens: a fatherland needs a mother tongue and education must provide it (Townson, 1992; Ahlzweig, 1994; Gardt, 2000).

L1 education in our contemporary super-diverse post-digital era is increasingly becoming a contested languagised arena. Whereas it originally started as an emancipatory project, i.e., teaching students the national language of their country of residence, often—and erroneously so as we may now say—referred to as their 'mother tongue', thus taking on board the label of 'mother tongue education' (Dutch: '*moedertaalonderwijs*', German: '*Muttersprachunterricht*'), it is now increasingly confronted with nationalist and populist political practices that consider the national language of a country mainly as a means to exclude 'others', be it asylum seekers, refugees, a valued skilled workforce, most commonly referred to as expats, and most recently in the Netherlands foreign students by reducing the number of available English Bachelor and Master programs. What once was a means to develop or literally 'civilize' the common people and make them participate in the public sphere, it

is now more and more used to build and promote an exclusive national canon of language and literature, thus becoming a problematic ideological vehicle.

At the same time processes of globalization and migration have led to increasingly multilingual and super-diverse classrooms filled with students for whom the national language of the country, which is central in L1 education, is either a second or foreign language (Spotti & Kroon, 2020; Spotti & Blommaert, 2022). For them, the standard language of the host country is not a given and is—at first sight— certainly not experienced as an instrument of emancipation. L1 education in the super-diverse classroom must meet the challenge of language diversity as opposed to strictly maintaining standard language norms as has been clearly indicated for the German context by Haueis and for the Australian context by Doecke, Parr and Owen in their contributions to this special issue. This challenge not only applies to the language as such but also to choosing the content of L1 education, as has been shown by Yandell and Hardcastle in their analysis of what goes on in an L1 literature class where not—for example—Shakespeare's *Macbeth* but Fabio Geda's *In the sea there are crocodiles*, the story of Enaiat, a boy from Afghanistan, and his experiences as a refugee, is dealt with.

One of the challenges for L1 education's future is to find a balance between the national—and increasingly nationalist—tendencies in society and the originally emancipatory project and potential of this very school subject.

5.   L1 EDUCATION IN A POST-DIGITAL ERA

Globalization and digitalization, as Appadurai (1996) predicted with his 'scapes' theorization, are two sides of the same coin. Whereas globalization has led to people's physical movement in time and space, digitalization enables people to connect, network, sociate, and liaise with each other through online devices irrespective of their actual location. The booming business of digitalization, especially through platforms like Facebook, X, TikTok, Instagram and what not, has meanwhile led to what can be called a digital media culture where students abundantly participate. The immersion in digital media culture no doubt has broadened students' lives, experiences, and possibilities. At the same time, however, it comes with risks for those who only have limited online media literacies and become unsuspecting victims of online media algorithms thereby facing the risk of losing their autonomy and agency as human beings.

Because of the COVID-19 pandemic—mainly but not only—education became closely connected to online approaches that made it possible to continue teaching also in times that educational establishments had to implement social distancing. It is still too early to determine the consequences that both Teams and Zoom lectures and meetings have had for our students, but initial research findings seem far from positive concerning the students' well-being and their learning achievements through online means (Lupton, 2021). As far as L1 education is concerned it is for example claimed that the recent low Pisa scores for reading comprehension in for

example the Netherlands are (at least partly) due to the digitalization of teaching-learning processes during the coronavirus crisis.

The gains and losses of using digital media in L1 education are clearly shown by van Keulen and Spotti in their contribution on the development and implementation of a digital game for teaching historical literature. Through using a digital game, lessons could go on during the pandemic and that is clearly a gain. However, it is also clear that students missed out on each other's interactions and, in the field of L1 literature, they have missed both reading and discussing the novel under study with their fellow students and their teachers.

For L1 education the current trend of digitalization means that it must determine how digitalization and online teaching procedures can be integrated in classroom activities both in relation to the school subject's content and its didactics, without losing the students' interest and commitment. In addition, L1 education should contribute to making students digitally literate and to help them become readers and writers/speakers and listeners in the 21st digital media culture, i.e. helping them to gain and further develop agency and voice as an antidote to fake news and Chat GPT texts, and a prerequisite to democracy that is increasingly under pressure globally.

6.   INVESTIGATING L1 EDUCATION FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

Given the great challenges that digitalization and globalization offer for L1 education and given the pressing reading crisis (that we encounter in several countries), there is an urgent need to rethink the curriculum of L1 education. In the Netherlands, this process is currently in operation. As with all other school subjects, the L1 curriculum is determined by societal influences. We can think of societal and political ideas about the importance and the goals of language education. In the 1980s and 1990s for instance, the communicative paradigm in L1 education gained dominance at the expense of the literary-grammatical paradigm, because that was seen as better suited to a democratic society in which students needed to be empowered (van de Ven, 1996). Today, we see how the paradigm of 'literacy awareness' is emerging in an era where there is consensus on the idea that the reading crisis must be reversed and that we need to work on citizenship development in education. In the slipstream of this, a productive interaction is emerging between insights from research in the different related scientific domains and educational practice.

Ideas on how literacy is best tested also influence what the curriculum looks like. If policymakers want to see testable and measurable results regarding the state of L1 education, this can lead (as has been the case for decades in the Netherlands, for example) to a culture in which literacy is tested with standardized tests. Partly because of that testing culture, deeper reading and writing—reading and writing with insight—has faded into the background. The focus on *Bildung* has also faded away for the same reasons, because 'citizenship skills' are less easy to define and are impossible to test in a quantitative way.

Both above developments have serious repercussions on how we should think about L1 educational research that wants to have an impact on educational practice. In Haueis' contribution to this special issue, it is argued that, although some elements of L1 education might improve due to the dominance of quantitative methods in the learning sciences, we see the content of the school subject, its pedagogical content knowledge, and the concrete design of educational materials getting far less attention in such research. Given the fact that much educational research situates itself within a (neo-)positivistic framework in which hypotheses, measurements, and proof are the most important, we think that it is good to emphasize that educational practice can benefit a lot from educational design research that stays closer to the praxis of the teacher and the classroom (Plomp & Nieveen, 2013; van den Akker et al., 2006). We are convinced that anthropological and ethnographic forms of educational research offer promising perspectives. Within such a research design, we can analyze small-scale, qualitative case studies in which the words and the actions of teachers and students are taken seriously as what they are. This methodological framework would call for close reading of 'thick description' (Geertz, 1973) of classroom situations and for analyzing key incidents that offer a key to unlock the meaning of day-to-day classroom practices (Kroon & Sturm, 2007).

This calls for a research program for the benefit of education, that regards the teacher not only as a research subject but focuses on close collaboration with teachers-as-researchers (Anderson, Herr & Nihlen, 1994; Green & Bloome, 1997; Stenhouse, 1975; Bax, 2023). It would be important that the research we conduct in such program stays close to the reality of the classroom, takes the practical professional knowledge (Andersen-Levitt, 1987) of the teacher into account in a serious way, and formulates deliverables that teachers find recognizable, reasonable, and usable. There is a need for insights coming from real observations of teaching and learning, a way of doing research that was at the heart of IMEN's research endeavor.

7. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We conclude that there is an important future for 'IMEN knowledge' and for 'IMEN methodology'. In the educational sciences, there is a need for small-scale, qualitative case studies that focus on real life classroom situations and emphasize the activities of both teachers and students, that have an eye for the practical knowledge of the teacher and that want to know what is actually happening when teachers teach, and children learn. Because of this need for insights coming from real observations of teaching and learning, we might call for a close reading of thick descriptions of classroom situations, using key incidents and triangulation in new forms of educational anthropology and ethnography.

In the Dutch situation, we see a strong focus in recent years on deepening and broadening educational design principles about *reasoning* and *critical thinking* and their effects on students' development in the domain of citizenship and character, on their (digital) media literacy and on their literacy awareness (see e.g. Dera et al.,

2023). This research shows that domain-specific reasoning can be transposed to other domains in education. This new body of research will hopefully inspire workshops, professional learning communities and teacher development teams in which new educational material is developed *with* and *for* teachers. The research can also inspire teacher training institutions to redesign their programs to be more in line with the new ideas about the L1 curriculum.

REFERENCES

Ahlzweig, C. (1994). *Muttersprache – Vaterland. Die deutsche Nation und ihre Sprache* [Mother tongue – fatherland. The German nation and its language]. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag. https://doi.org/ 10.1007/978-3-322-94137-4

Andersen-Levitt, K.M. (1987). Cultural knowledge for teaching first grade: An example from France. In G. Spindler & L. Spindler (Eds.). *Interpretive ethnography of education at home and abroad* (pp. 171-194). Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Anderson, G.L., Herr, K. & Nihlen, A.S. (1994). *Studying your own school. An educator's guide to qualitative practitioner research.* Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Corwin Press.

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Araújo e Sá, M. H., Gerwers, F., Gintsburg, S. & Spotti, M. (Coord.) (2023). Covid, migrants and minorities in teacher education: A fake news observatory to promote critical thinking and digital literacy in times of crisis. E-handbook for teachers and teacher educators. CoMMiTTEd, Erasmus+ Project 2020-1-DE01-KA226-HE-005742. https://doi.org/10.48528/jbw5-0807

Bakhtin, M.M. (1981/1975). *The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays.* Edited by M. Holquist, translated by C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bax, S. (2023). Dreaming of a research program for the benefit of education. Educational design research into domain-specific reasoning. In G. van der Laan et al. (Eds.), *Educational utopias. Liber amicorum Prof. Dr. Alkeline van Lenning* (pp. 261-272). Tilburg: Open Press Tilburg University.

Bax, S., & Mantingh, E. (2018). Een web van twintigste-eeuwse literatuur: Naar een didactiek voor literatuurgeschiedenis van de twintigste eeuw [A web of twentieth-century literature: Towards a didactics for twentieth-century literary history]. *Nederlandse Letterkunde 23*(3), 257-286. https://doi.org/ 10.5117/NEDLET2018.3.003.BAX

Bax, S., & Mantingh, E. (2019). 'Tjeempie! "Wat zou er zijn met die moderne schrijvers": Literatuurhistorisch redeneren met Liesje in Luiletterland [*Tjeempie!* "What could be wrong with those modern writers?": Literary-historical reasoning with *Liesje in Luiletterland*]. *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse taal- en letterkunde 135*(2), 100-127. https://doi.org/10.5117/TNTL2019.2.003.MANT

Booth, W. (1988). *The company we keep. An ethics of fiction.* Berkeley: University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520351981

Cassar, C., Oosterheert, I. & Meijer, P.C. (2021). The classroom in turmoil: teachers' perspective on unplanned controversial issues in the classroom. *Teachers and Teaching 27*(7), 656-671. https://doi.org/ 10.1080/13540602.2021.1986694

Dera, J., Gubbels, J., van der Loo, J. & van Rijt, J. (Eds.) (2023). *Vaardig met vakinhoud. Handboek vakdidactiek Nederlands* (Skilled in subject content. Handbook Dutch didactics). Bussum: Coutinho.

D'Hoker, E. (2022). *Leerlingen en literatuur. Hoe vaardige lezers vormen* (Students and literature. How to form skilled readers). Tielt: Lannoo Campus.

Elbow, P. (1990). *What is English?* New York, Urbana, Ill.: MLA & NCTE.

Facione, P.A. (2020). Critical thinking and why it counts, 2020 update. Retrieved from http://www.insigthassesment.com.

Gardt, A. (Ed.). *Nation und Sprache. Die Diskussion ihres Verhältnisses in Geschichte und Gegenwart.* (Nation and language. The discussion on its historical and contemporary relationship). Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures.* New York: Basic Books.

Green, B. & Erixon, P.-O. (2020). Understanding the (post-)national L1 subjects: Three problematics. In B. Green & P.-O. Erixon (Eds.). *Rethinking L1 Education in a Global Era* (pp. 259-285). Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-55997-7

Green, J. & Bloome, D. (1997). Ethnograpy and ethnographers of and in education: A situated perspective. In J. Flood, S.B. Heath & D. Lapp (Eds.). *Handbook of research on teaching literacy through the communicative and visual arts* (pp. 181-202). New York: Macmillan.

Hakemulder , J. (2000). *The moral laboratory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing. http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/upal.34

Hardcastle, J. (1999). Von Humboldt's children: English and the formation of a European educational ideal. *Changing English 6*(1), 31-45, DOI: 10.1080/1358684990060104

Heynders, O. (2016). *Writers as public intellectuals: Literature, celebrity, democracy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137467645

Heynders, O. (2023). Lessons in reading. *Diggit Magazine 7-7-2023.* Retrieved from https://www.diggitmagazine.com/articles/lessons-reading

Janssen, N. & van Keulen, R. (2023). Redeneren en inzichten verwerven over literatuur (Reasoning and acquiring insights about literature). Retrieved from https://didactieknederlands.nl/handboek/2023/05/redeneren-en-inzichten-verwerven-over-literatuur/

Jaspers, J. & Madsen, M.L. (2016). Sociolinguistics in a languagised world: Introduction. *Applied Linguistics Review 7*(3), 235-258. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2016-0010

Kidd, D.C. & Castano, E. (2013). Reading literary fiction improves theory of mind. *Science 342*(6156), 377-380. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1239918

Koek, M. (2022). *Think twice. Literature lessons that matter*. Doctoral dissertation Amsterdam University.

Koopman, E.M. (2016). Effects of "literariness" on emotions and on empathy and reflection after reading. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts 10*(1), 82-98. https://doi.org/10.1037/aca0000041

Kroon, S. & Sturm, J. (2007). International comparative case study research in education: Key incident analysis and international triangulation. In W. Herrlitz, S. Ongstad & P.-H. van de Ven (Eds.). *Research on mother tongue education in a comparative international perspective. Theoretical and methodological issues* (pp. 99-118). Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789401204965_006

Langer, J. (1990). Understanding literature. *Language Arts 67*(8), 812-816.

Langer, J. (1994). Focus on research: A response-based approach to reading literature. *Language Arts 71*(3), 203-211. https://doi.org/10.58680/la201425191

Lozano Parra, S. (2022). *The school as a playground for educational friction: Understanding democracy in Dutch secondary education.* Doctoral dissertation Utrecht University. https://doi.org/10.33540/1365

Lupton, D. (2021). Contextualising COVID-19: Sociocultural Perspectives on Contagion. In: Lupton, D. and Willis, K. (2021). *The COVID-19 Crisis: Social Perspectives*. London: Routledge.

Meelissen, M. R. M., Maassen, N. A. M., Gubbels, J., van Langen, A. M. L., Valk, J., Dood, C., Derks, I., In 't Zandt, M. & Wolbers, M. (2023). *Resultaten PISA-2022 in vogelvlucht* (PISA-2022 results in a nutshell). Enschede: Universiteit Twente. DOI: 10.3990/1.9789036559461

Meesterschapsteam Nederlands (2016). *Manifest Nederlands op school: Meer inhoud, meer plezier, beter resultaat* (Manifest Dutch in education: More content, more fun, better results). *Levende Talen Magazine 103*(2), 38. Retrieved from https://lt-tijdschriften.nl/ojs/index.php/ltm/article/view/1556/1165

Meesterschapsteam Nederlands (2018). *Visie op de toekomst van het curriculum Nederlands: Versie 1.5* (Vision on the future of the Dutch curriculum: Version 1.5). Retrieved from https://nederlands.vakdidactiekgw.nl/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2018/02/Visie-Curriculum-Nederlands-Meesterschapsteams-1.5-definitief.pdf

Meesterschapsteam Nederlands (2021). *Bewuste geletterdheid in perspectief: kennis, vaardigheden en inzichten* (Conscious literacy in perspective: knowledge, skills and insights). Retrieved from https://nederlands.vakdidactiekgw.nl/publicaties

Mitchell, I., Keast, S., Panizzon, D. & Mitchell, J. (2016). Using 'Big Ideas' to enhance teaching and student learning. *Teachers and teaching 23*(5), 596-610. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2016.1218328

Nieuwelink, H. (2023). Bevorderen van veerkrachtige democratische gezindheid: een pleidooi voor het versterken van burgerschapsonderwijs (Promoting resilient democratic dispositions: a case for strengthening citizenship education). Amsterdam: Hogeschool van Amsterdam.

Nussbaum, M. (1990). *Love's knowledge. Essays on philosophy and literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

OECD. (2021). *21st-century readers. Developing literary skills in a digital world*. Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/publications/21st-century-readers-a83d84cb-en.htm https://doi.org/10.1787/a83d84cb-en

Peeters, E. & Bax, S. (2013). Leren de wereld te lezen. Op weg naar een intermediale literatuurdidactiek (Learning to read the world. Towards an intermedial didactics of literature). *Vooys 41*(4), 6-16.

Plomp, T. & Nieveen, N. (Eds.) (2013). *Educational design research.* Enschede: SLO.

Rooijackers, P. (2023). *Oog voor diep begrip. Onderzoek naar tekstbegrip van vwo-leerlingen* [An eye for deep understanding. Research into text comprehension of pre-university education students0.Doctoral dissertation, Utrecht University.

School, P. & Bax, S. (2022), *Big Ideas voor de kunstvakken* (Big ideas for the art subjects). Tilburg: Fontys Master Kunsteducatie.

Schrijvers, M.S.T. (2019). *The story, the self, the other: Developing insight into human nature in the literature classroom*. Doctoral dissertation Amsterdam University.

SLO (2022). *Vakspecifieke trendanalyse (Nederlands)* [Subject-specific trend analysis (Dutch)]. www.slo.nl/thema/vakspecifieke-thema/nederlands/vakspecifieke

Spotti, M. & Kroon, S. (2020). Educational environments as contested multicultural discursive spaces: toward the enregisterment of identities into conditions of immobility. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses 15*(4), 347-353. https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2020.1830999

Spotti, M. & Blommaert, J. (2023). Sociolinguistics and superdiversity: Innovations and challenges at the offline-online nexus. In F. Meissner, N. Sigona, & S. Vertovec (Eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Superdiversity* (pp. 107-120). https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780197544938.013.10

Stenhouse, L. (1975). *An introduction to curriculum research.* London: Heinemann Educational.

Townson, M. (1992). *Mother-tongue and fatherland. Language and politics in German*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.

van den Akker, J., Gravemijer, K., McKenney, S. & Nieveen, N. (Eds.). *Educational design research*. London: Routledge.

van Dijk, Y. & Klaver, M.-J., Stronks, E. & Hamel, M. (Eds.) (2022), *Omdat lezen loont. Op naar effectief leesonderwijs in Nederland* (Because reading pays off. Towards effective reading education in the Netherlands). Amsterdam: Pica.

van de Ven, I. (2023). Attentional modulation in literary reading: A theoretical-empirical framework. *Orbis Litterarum*, 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1111/oli.12431

van de Ven, P.-H. (1996). *Moedertaalonderwijs. Interpretaties in retoriek en praktijk, heden en verleden, binnen- en buitenland* (Mother tongue education. Interpretations in rhetoric and practice, present and past, at home and abroad). Doctoral dissertation Utrecht University. Groningen: Wolters Noordhoff.

van Keulen, R. (2021). Theorie en praktijk van historisch literatuuronderwijs: een vignettenonderzoek (Theory and practice of historical literature teaching: a vignet study). *Pedagogische Studiën 98*(1), 6-26.

van Keulen, R. & Bax, S. (2021). Literatuurhistorisch redeneren: Hoe leerlingen met redeneerdidactiek literatuurhistorische inzichten kunnen verwerven. (Reasoning about historical literature: How students can acquire insights in historical literature through a reasoning didactic approach). *Kunstzone. Tijdschrift voor kunst en cultuur in het onderwijs* 4, 16-18.

van Rijt, J. (2020). *Understanding grammar: The impact of linguistic metaconcepts on L1 grammar education.* Doctoral dissertation Radboud University Nijmegen

van Rijt, J., de Swart, P., Wijnands, A. & Coppen, P.-A. (2019). When students tackle grammatical problems: Exploring linguistic reasoning with linguistic metaconcepts. *Linguistics and Education 52*(1), 78-88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2019.06.004