THOMAS ERI

A MULTILINGUAL BOOK CAFÉ AT THE SCHOOL LIBRARY

Contradictions between Literacy Discourses

INTRODUCTION

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

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

1. What types of contradiction occur in the book café?

A.N. Other, B.N. Other (eds.), Title of Book, 00–00.
© 2005 Sense Publishers. All rights reserved.

2. How do the teacher-librarian and the bilingual teachers respond to the contradictions?
3. How can teachers work to address and resolve systemic contradictions within literacy education?

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

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

TWO DISCOURSES OF LITERACY

School Literacy Discourse

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

The primary focus of school literacy in Norwegian educational policy is the teaching, learning and assessment of basic skills (Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2012). This is manifested in the National Curriculum as

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

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

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

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

The National Curriculum does not impose upon schools and teachers the use of a specific set of teaching, learning, and assessment strategies. Nevertheless, the autonomy of schools and teachers is becoming more restricted. The local education

authorities decide on specific teaching and assessment programmes to be used in all schools as standard in their district. For instance, in the Norwegian capital of Oslo, most primary schools use a localized and modified version of the "Early Years Literacy Programme", which originated in Australia, and "Guided Reading", which originated in New Zealand. These programmes use levelled books according to the pupils' reading skills, as determined by reading tests. The programmes also depend on pupils' homes to support and extend school literacy activities by giving them homework. Teachers use reading logs to track and control home reading. Parents document home reading activities by signing their name daily or weekly in the reading log. Parents are encouraged to use guided reading methods when they read with their children at home. These methods include for instance pre-reading strategies, asking predetermined questions related to the text, talking about pictures in the text, and doing grammar exercises such as finding nouns in the text. It is interesting to note that by the time these literacy programmes were adopted by local educational authorities in Norway (around 2006–2007), New Zealand and Australia, were ranked respectively fifth and seventh of 58 OECD countries in PISA (OECD, 2007, p. 47). This is statistically significantly above the OECD average. In comparison, Norway was ranked 25th of 58 OECD countries, which is statistically significantly below the OECD average.

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

Culturally Responsive Literacy Discourse

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

Texts are physical artefacts shared among people in specific but dynamic social and cultural contexts. The cultural context consists of a range of *cultural tools* that mediate human interactions and learning. The cultural tools are imbued with meaning and power by past use, they shape human activity and practices, but are

also reshaped through collective human actions and intervention. Hence, the myriad of literacy events going on both in and out of school are not separated from the human practices and activities in which they mediate (Russel, 2009, p. 18). Following this perspective, literacy education needs to be *responsive* to diverse, complex, and dynamic cultural and social contexts. However, how schools and teachers respond to cultural diversity can be laid out on a continuum from considering "diversity as a problem in literacy development to diversity as a resource in literacy development" (Nocon & Cole, 2009, p. 24). I refer to the resource discourse of diversity as a *culturally responsive literacy discourse*.

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

RESEARCH DESIGN

Context

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

The school participated in the Multiplicity project, a development project concerned with literature-based literacy education as a shared pedagogical practice among teachers, teacher-librarians/school librarians, and public librarians (See Eri & Pihl; Pihl, 2009, 2011; Tonne & Pihl, 2012; van der Kooij & Pihl, 2009). A teacher-librarian is defined as a person who holds a full qualification as a teacher and some qualification in librarianship based on continued in-service training. I was involved as a researcher in the Multiplicity project. When the teacher-librarian at the school told me that they planned to develop an extra-curricular multilingual book café at the school library, I became especially interested in exploring this innovation further because it was a teacher-initiated innovation developed by the teachers themselves. The head teacher gave a team of teachers the responsibility to plan and develop the book café. The team consisted of the teacher-librarian and a group of

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

Analysis

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

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

Another central point is that we can only study contradictions indirectly, through their manifestations such as dilemmas, and conflicts in human actions, interactions, and discourse. In CHAT, it is the interrelations and distinctions between the societal, the social, and the psychological levels that are of analytical interest (Kontinen, 2013; Langemeyer, 2006).

A MULTILINGUAL BOOK CAFÉ AT THE SCHOOL LIBRARY

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

Reading for Pleasure and a Reading Log

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

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

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

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

Day	*Title of the book*	*Signature parents*	*Teacher comment*
Monday			
Tuesday			
Wednesday			
Thursday			

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

The teacher-librarian told the parents at the book café: "the most important thing is not to fill out the reading log worksheets, but to spend time reading to your children

and make them read to you" (my translation). However, the log instructs the parent to sign every day that the child has read aloud and the parent has listened, and also that they have read to the child according to the instructions. The reading logs were checked and signed every week by the bilingual teachers during school time. Thus, the log is an instrument with which the teacher can control the child's and the parent's home reading.

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

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

Problems with the Reading Log

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

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

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

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

The second book café focused more on pupils performing with poems, songs, and short stories in the pupils' first languages Urdu, Turkish, Albanian, Arabic, and Tamil. The pupils proudly presented work they had done at home in the reading diary to the parents. After this session, the parents sat individually with their children. Some listened to their children reading, while others had conversations with their

children about the text. The book café ended with book lending and a social event just as the first time.

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

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

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

When the teacher team planned the book café, they did not include the public librarian from the branch of the public library in the close vicinity of the school. We should recall that the teacher-librarian was not primarily trained as a librarian. If the team had collaborated with the public librarian, it is possible that they would not have introduced the reading log in the first place. A public librarian's mandate is to stimulate reading engagement through voluntary reading, to serve the needs of the public, and to facilitate the development of democratic citizenship (UNESCO, 1994). A reading log is not part of the public librarian's professional toolbox. Unlike

teachers, public librarians are not obliged to rank and sort pupils. They are not under the same pressure to increase pupils' reading performance in standardized tests. These differences in *professional vision* (Goodwin, 1994) might be part of the reason why the teacher team did not consider collaborating with the public librarian.

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

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

Declining Parent Participation

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

> ***Teacher-librarian:*** What can be the reasons for the low response from parents to attend the book café that day? What have you heard about reasons?
> ***Bilingual teacher 1:*** The parents of (name) said they don't have time to participate. I tried to pressure them to get more information about why they couldn't find time. I found out that it is not completely true what they say.
> ***Teacher-librarian:*** You think there is something else behind it?
> ***Bilingual teacher 1:*** Yes. I think they just did not want to come.
> ***Teacher-librarian:*** They just said they didn't have time. We don't know more than that, so OK.
> ***Bilingual teacher 2:*** I have heard from parents that there have been many meetings in the evening lately and there was a soccer game the same day. The parents who have 3-4 children in school have to attend many parent–teacher conferences. Some said they did not have a babysitter.

> ***Bilingual teacher 1:*** I notice that when school starts in autumn, then the parents are eager to follow up on schoolwork, but at the end of the school year, they are very indifferent.
> ***Teacher-librarian:*** It has not seemed like a lack of babysitters has been a problem before.
> ***Bilingual teacher 2:*** Most of our parents work in the evening, at least some of them. Therefore, it can be difficult these days in relation to their work situation. Maybe there are no more babysitters left because of many parent–teacher conferences lately?

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

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

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

The teacher team aimed at empowering parents of minority-language pupils to become more involved in social reading activities. This is an important issue to be addressed by teachers. However, the teacher team placed the full responsibility on the parents for declining parent participation. They put the blame on parents even though it was the team who single-handedly defined the content and activity of the book café. Parents were not invited to participate in planning or evaluation. The teacher team acted according to a "discourse of deficit". The dominant school literacy discourse that endorses standardized and universal literacy education disregards parents' literacies. Instead, a discourse of deficit is promoted as the sole explanatory factor for educational failures putting the blame on pupils' "bilingualism, perceived parent apathy, lack of cognitive stimulation or lack of home literacy" (Gibbons, 2006, p. 66). The discourse of deficit is a false argument that "comes from examining only our own language or culture in detail and then

identifying certain aspects which other cultures lack" (Barton, 1994, p. 99). This is done without examining other possible ways that literacy is realized in social relationships and works as a community resource, for instance, in more oral literacy practices.

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

DISCUSSION

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

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

Acquisition and understanding of theoretical concepts are necessary for teachers to address tensions they experience in practice that arise from systemic contradictions in the educational system (Freire, 1972, p. 124). Knowledge of theoretical concepts such as "power relations," "contradictions," and "competing literacy discourses" is a precondition for reflexive interpretation (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2009, pp. 271-274). Reflexive interpretation involves critical self-reflection and attention to institutionalized power, discourse, and ideology. For example, the teacher team were partly able to resolve the problem with the reading log by abandoning its use after the first book café. However, they did not engage in critical self-reflection on how the school literacy discourse affected their cognition and pedagogical actions in an activity that they at the outset defined as culturally

responsive. The issue of declining parent participation at the book café is another illustrative example. I argue that the problem here is related to an uneven distribution of power between the teachers and parents that prevents parents from gaining influence and agency. Acting on power relations requires teachers to pay attention to institutionalized power and to engage in critical self-reflection.

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

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

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

REFERENCES

Alleklev, B., & Lindvall, L. (2000). *Listiga räven: läsinlärning genom skönlitteratur* [The cunning fox. Learning to read through fictional literature]. Falun: En bok för alla.

Alvesson, M., & Sköldberg, K. (2009). *Reflexive methodology: New vistas for qualitative research* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Anderson, K. J., & Minke, K. M. (2007). Parent involvement in education: Toward an understanding of parents' decision making. *The Journal of Educational Research, 100*(5), 311–323. http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/JOER.100.5.311-323

Apple, M. W. (2000). Between neoliberalism and neoconservatism. Education and conservatism in a global context. In N. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education. Critical perspectives* (pp. 57–77). New York and Abingdon: Routledge.

Auerbach, E. R. (1989). Toward a social-contextual approach to family literacy. *Harvard Educational Review, 59*(2), 165-182. http://dx.doi.org/10.17763/haer.59.2.h23731364l283156

Bakken, A., & Elstad, J. I. (2012). *For store forventninger?: Kunnskapsløftet og ulikhetene i grunnskolekarakterer* [Too High Expectations?: The Knowledge Promotion and Inequalities in Primary Grades], Vol. 7/2012 (p. 277). Retrieved from http://www.udir.no/Upload/Rapporter/2012/NOVA_slutt.pdf?epslanguage=no

Bakken, A., Frøyland, L. R., & Sletten, M. A. (2016). *Sosiale forskjeller i unges liv* [Social differences in the lives of youth], Vol. 3/2016. Retrieved from http://www.hioa.no/Om-HiOA/Senter-for-velferds-og-arbeidslivsforskning/NOVA/Publikasjonar/Rapporter/2016/Sosiale-forskjeller-i-unges-liv

Barton, D. (1994). *Literacy: An introduction to the ecology of written language*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Barton, D., & Hamilton, M. (1998). *Local literacies: Reading and writing in one community*. London & New York: Routledge. http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203448885

Biesta, G. J. J. (2011). *Learning democracy in school and society: Education, lifelong learning, and the politics of citizenship*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6091-512-3

Bæck, U. D. K. (2010). Parental involvement practices in formalized home–school cooperation. Scandinavian *Journal of Educational Research, 54*(6), 549-563. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2010.522845

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Davies, B., & Bansel, P. (2007). Neoliberalism and education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 20*(3), 247-259. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09518390701281751

Dressman, M. (1997). Congruence, resistance, liminality: Reading and ideology in three school libraries. *Curriculum Inquiry, 27*(3), 267-315. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03626784.1997.11075493

Engeström, Y., & Sannino, A. (2011). Discursive manifestations of contradictions in organizational change efforts: A methodological framework. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 24*(3), 368-387. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09534811111132758

Eri, T., & Pihl, J. (2016). The challenge of sustaining change: Contradictions within the development of teacher and librarian collaboration. *Educational Action Research*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2016.1147366

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison.* London: Allen Lane.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. London: Penguin.

Gee, J. P. (2000). The New Literacy Studies. From 'socially situated' to the work of the social. In D. Barton, M. Hamilton & R. Ivanič (Eds.), *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context* (pp. 180-196). London & New York: Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2004). *Situated language and learning: A critique of traditional schooling*. New York and London: Routledge.

Gibbons, P. (2006). *Bridging discourses in the ESL classroom: students, teachers and researchers.* London: Continuum.

Giroux, H. (2011). *On critical pedagogy*. New York & London: Bloomsbury.

Giroux, H. (2016). Pedagogies of disruption and the challenge of social justice under regimes of neoliberalism. *Revista Hipótese, 2*(1), 58–79.

Goodwin, C. (1994). Professional vision. *American Anthropologist, 96*(3), 606-633. http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/aa.1994.96.3.02a00100

Grimaldi, E. (2011). Neoliberalism and the marginalisation of social justice: The making of an education policy to combat social exclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 16*(11), 1131-1154. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2010.548105

Hedegaard, M. (2003). Cultural minority children's learning within culturally-sensitive classroom teaching. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society, 11*(1), 133-151. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14681360300200164

Hoëm, A. (2010). *Sosialisering - kunnskap – identitet* [Sosialization – knowledge – identity]. Vallset: Oplandske bokforlag.

Hull, G., & Schultz, K. (2001). Literacy and learning out of school: A review of theory and research. *Review of Educational Research, 71*(4), 575-611. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00346543071004575

Janks, H. (2010). *Literacy and power*. New York: Routledge.

Kontinen, T. (2013). A Gramscian perspective on developmental work research: Contradictions, power and the role of researchers reconsidered. Outlines. *Critical Practice Studies, 14*(2), 24.

Langemeyer, I. (2006). Contradictions in Expansive Learning: Towards a Critical Analysis of Self-dependent Forms of Learning in Relation to Contemporary Socio-technological Change. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 7(*1).

Limberg, L., & Alexandersson, M. (2003). The school library as a space for learning. *School Libraries Worldwide, 9*(1), 1-15.

Ministry of Education and Research. (2006). *Knowledge promotion Oslo: The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training*. Retrieved from http://www.udir.no/Stottemeny/English/Curriculum-in-English/Curricula-in-English/.

Nocon, H., & Cole, M. (2009). Relating diversity and literacy theory. In L. M. Morrow, R. Rueda & D. Lapp (Eds.), *Handbook of research on literacy and diversity* (pp. 13-31). New York & London: The Guilford Press.

Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. (2012). *Framework for Basic Skills. Oslo: Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training*, Retrieved from http://www.udir.no/contentassets/fd2d6bfbf2364e1c98b73e030119bd38/framework_for_basic_skills.pdf.

OECD. (2007). *Executive Summary PISA 2006*. Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/pisa/pisaproducts/39725224.pdf

OECD. (2009). *PISA 2009 assessment framework: key competencies in reading, mathematics and science*. Paris: OECD Publications.

Opheim, V., Gjerustad, C., & Sjaastad, J. (2013). *Jakten på kvalitetsindikatorene: sluttrapport fra prosjektet 'Ressursbruk og læringsresulter i grunnopplæringen'* [Hunting for quality indicators: final report of the project 'Use of resources and learning outcome in primary and secondary education]. Rapport (NIFU: online), Vol. 23/2013. Retrieved from http://www.nifu.no/files/2013/05/NIFUrapport2013-23.pdf

Pihl, J. (2009). Interprofessional cooperation between teachers and librarians. Analysing theoretical and professional arguments for cooperation in an era of globalization. In M. O' Dowd & H. Holmarsdottir (Eds.), *Nordic voices: Teaching and researching comparative and international education in the Nordic countries* (pp. 41-59). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Pihl, J. (2011). Literacy education and interprofessional collaboration. *Professions and professionalism, 1*(1), 52-66.

Pihl, J. (2012). *Multiplisitet, myndiggjøring, medborgerskap: Inkludering gjennom bruk av biblioteket som læringsarena* [Multiplicity, empowerment, citizenship: Inclusion through the use of the library as an arena for learning]. Oslo: Oslo and Akershus University College.

Ratner, C. (2015). Neoliberal psychology: A macro cultural psychological analysis. In A. Larrain, A. Haye, M. Morgan, G. Sullivan & J. Cresswell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the international society for theoretical psychology*. Toronto: Captus Press. Retrieved from http://www.sonic.net/~cr2/Neoliberal%20Psychology.htm.

Roe, A. (2008). *Lesedidaktikk: etter den første leseopplæringen* [Reading didactics: after the first literacy program]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Russel, D. R. (2009). Texts in contexts. Theorizing learning by looking at genre and activity. In R. Edwards, G. Biesta & M. Thorpe (Eds.), *Rethinking contexts for learning and teaching. Communities, activities and networks* (pp. 17-30). Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Sannino, A., & Nocon, H. (2008). Special issue editors' introduction: Activity theory and school innovation. *Journal of Educational Change, 9*(4), 325-328. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10833-008-9079-5

Sleeter, C. E. (2012). Confronting the marginalization of culturally responsive pedagogy. *Urban Education, 47*(3), 562-584. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0042085911431472

Street, B. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sullivan, A., & Brown, M. (2015). Reading for pleasure and progress in vocabulary and mathematics. *British Educational Research Journal, 41*(6), 971-991. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/berj.3180

Sørlie, K., Havnen, E., & Ruud, M. E. (2010). *Levekårsutvikling og flytting på Fjell i Drammen* [Living conditions and mobility at Fjell in Drammen]. NIBR-rapport 2010:21. Retrieved from http://www.nibr.no/filer/2010-21._w_.pdf.

The European Parliament and Council. (2008). *The recommendation on the establishment of the European Qualifications Framework for lifelong learning*. EU Law and Publications. Retrieved from http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2008:111:0001:0007:EN:PDF.

The Norwegian Agency for Quality Assurance in Education (NOKUT). (2014). *The Norwegian Qualifications Framework for Lifelong Learning (NQF)*. Retrieved from http://www.nokut.no/Documents/NOKUT/Artikkelbibliotek/Norsk_utdanning/NKR/20140606_Norwegian_Qualifications_Framework.pdf.

Tonne, I., & Pihl, J. (2012). Literacy education, reading engagement, and library use in multilingual classes. *Intercultural Education, 23*(3), 183-194. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2012.701424

UNESCO. (1994). UNESCO Public Library Manifesto. Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org/webworld/libraries/manifestos/libraman.html

van der Kooij, K. S., & Pihl, J. (2009). Voices from the field negotiating literacy education in a multicultural setting In H. Holmarsdottir & M. O' Dowd (Eds.), *Nordic Voices: Teaching and Researching Comparative and International Education in the Nordic Countries* (pp. 167-179). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(1), 20–32. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022487102053001003

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