



Hats off to critical thinking: An excursion into Jon Klassen's hat trilogy

Hilde Tørnby

Associate professor, Institutt for grunnskole- og faglærerutdanning, OsloMet
hildet@oslomet.no

Sissil Lea Heggernes

Associate professor, Institutt for grunnskole- og faglærerutdanning, OsloMet
silehe@oslomet.no

Emilia Andersson-Bakken

Associate professor, Institutt for grunnskole- og faglærerutdanning, OsloMet
emanb@oslomet.no

Ingvill Krogstad Svanes

Associate professor, Institutt for grunnskole- og faglærerutdanning, OsloMet
inksva@oslomet.no

Abstract

In this article, we explore power and perspectives as lenses for critical thinking embedded in Jon Klassen's fictional picturebook trilogy *I want my hat back* (2011), *This is not my hat* (2012), and *We found a hat* (2016). Drawing on ideas from critical literacy and democratic citizenship, we conduct a close reading of the picture-text interaction and selected visual features through a critical content analysis (Johnson et al., 2019). The scarcity of hats drives the narrative in the three books and may stimulate reflections on ownership. We argue that the different affordances of these picturebooks may prompt critical thinking regarding power relations and perspectives, and may be a step towards fostering critical thinking and encouraging democratic citizenship in young readers.

Keywords

Critical thinking, critical literacy, power, perspectives, democracy, citizenship, picturebooks, Jon Klassen

Picturebooks may be suitable training grounds for young readers to relate empathetically to others, and be part of a community (Nikolajeva, 2018). Being a democratic citizen involves sharing and negotiating for frequently limited resources. These negotiations include taking different perspectives to make the most appropriate decisions for all citizens and reflect the power structures in society. Considerate ways of being are a fundamental premise of any democracy, and understanding oneself as part of a commu-

nity is arguably a part of critical thinking (Bugge & Dessingué, 2022). Critical thinking, defined as “reasonable reflective thinking focused on deciding what to believe or do” (Ennis 2015, p. 32), often involves a normative aspect focusing on making good and wise choices (Bailin & Siegel, 2003). Critical thinkers are able to take different perspectives (Lim, 2015) and they are alert for alternatives and consider others' point of view before forming their opinions (Ennis, 2015). Furthermore, investigating power

and power structures (Fisher, 2011; Nussbaum, 2006; Roche, 2015) are important aspects of critical thinking.

With this backdrop, the aim of the article is to explore possibilities for power and perspectives as affordances for critical thinking embedded in Jon Klassen's picturebook trilogy *I want my hat back* (2011), *This is not my hat* (2012), and *We found a hat* (2016). In a previous study, we discovered 9–10-year-old children's ability for critical thinking in a classroom conversation about *We found a hat* (Andersson-Bakken et al., 2022). We observed that the core of the classroom dialogue centred around the dilemma of what to do with the hat presented in the book. Based on this experience, we became intrigued by looking at the role of hats as the only cultural object in an otherwise natural ecology. Through a content analysis (Johnson et al., 2019) of the works using the lenses of critical theory and literacy (Freire, 2014; Janks, 2010; Vasquez et al., 2019), we discuss the following question: *How does the use of hats in Klassen's trilogy embed affordances for critical thinking?* The research question is explored through the analytical categories *power* and *perspectives*.

Since our project regards hats, a few points about hats need mentioning. First, hats are frequently employed by authors of children's literature to represent a variety of meanings – for example, the wisdom of magicians and wizards in *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone* (Rowling, 1997), or amusement and chaos, as in Dr. Seuss's (1957) *The Cat in the Hat*. Moreover, hats are parts of a dress code and can, like clothes, be read as text. In class societies, items of clothing can be read as closed texts with a specific meaning, whereas in more fragmented societies, the meaning of clothes is more open (Crane, 2000, pp. 3–6). Traditionally, hats indicate social status (Crane, 2000, p. 67). Another function of hats has been to blur social boundaries, such as when workers started wearing the high-status top hat in the first half of the nineteenth century

(Crane, 2000, pp. 82–84). The choice of hats in Klassen's books may, therefore, be considered in the light of social power structures and, analysing them, as a way of “reading the world” (Freire, 2014).

Jon Klassen is an award-winning Canadian author and illustrator. Using hats as a plot-furthering device, the trilogy implicitly raises dilemmas of relevance to the child reader. The minimalist illustrations accentuate evocative details, such as the use of vibrant red in an otherwise soft colour palette, or the comic effect of an oversized hat on a small turtle. The first book, *I want my hat back*, follows a bear's search for his missing hat. He asks everyone if they have seen it, but they all say no. Only later does he realise that a rabbit he met was indeed wearing a hat. He accuses the rabbit of theft, and by the end the bear is wearing the hat, but now the rabbit is missing. In the second book, *This is not my hat*, a small fish states: “This hat is not mine. I just stole it”. Then, a bigger fish is introduced as the owner of this hat, and the reader follows the little fish's attempts at hiding as the big fish tries to find his hat. Eventually he does, but the fate of the little fish remains unknown. The third book, *We found a hat*, queries what two turtles should do with the one hat they find in the desert. They decide to leave it behind, but the final spread shows a dreamlike scene of them both wearing a hat.

To the best of our knowledge, there is little research on Klassen's authorship, as revealed by searches in the most established journals on children's literature¹. Gallagher and Kelly (2019) discuss how economical thinking can be taught through hat books focusing on scarcity. Two studies touch upon children's responses to hat books and focus on how children make inferences (Moses et al., 2015; Smith, 2018). This small amount of research, combined with a scarce research base on critical thinking and the reading of picturebooks (for exceptions, see Andersson-Bakken et al., 2022; Pantaleo, 2017; Roche, 2015; Tørnby, 2020), actualizes the topic of this article.

Literature, critical thinking and citizenship

Exploring how different affordances for critical thinking are embedded in picturebooks involves considering a reader's critical encounter with a text – in this context, fictional picturebooks. Nussbaum (2006) connects ideas of critical thinking to reading fiction. She points out that “citizens cannot think well on the basis of factual knowledge alone” (p. 390) but that “narrative imagination” is of great importance to understanding others, their emotions and thoughts, which is characteristic of responsible citizens. Nussbaum (2006) emphasises the ability to reason logically and understand diverging arguments in the process of developing citizenship, which are also critical thinking skills according to Ennis (2015) and Lim (2015). Nussbaum (2003; 2006) discusses the idea of citizenship through discussing what a citizen is capable of within the power structures established by society, particularly that of education and economic constraints (2003, 2006). Furthermore, she highlights the issue around people's possibilities to do and to be in a society that lacks resources (Nussbaum, 2006). This is in line with Dewey (2007) who raises a similar issue, the dilemma between the ideal that all voices should be heard and the fact that it is often people with resources that are heard. At the crux of this dilemma lies an uneven distribution of power. However, for critical thinking to be realized, students need to develop critical thinking habits (Dewey, 2007, p. 65). One way to prompt these qualities is to facilitate a critical approach to texts, revealing underlying power structures and different perspectives within the text, and between the text, the reader, and the world.

The last point brings us to Pablo Freire's critical pedagogy (Freire et al., 2014), in which critical literacy has its roots. Freire stresses the active and critical reader in his focus on unequal power relations and social issues. This view may seem somewhat political and far removed from reading pic-

turebooks for and with children. Working with critical literacy education, Janks (2010), however, distinguishes between politics with a big and small *p*, considering *Politics* as the handling of global or regional issues. Little *p* politics, on the other hand, is described as “the micro-politics of everyday life” (Janks 2010, p. 41) and relates to everyday small decisions about us and the people around us. Seeing critical reading within this little *p* context makes both the content of the text and the text in a larger context relevant in the work of developing critical thinking. Consequently, reading includes both “reading the word and the world” (Freire, 2014).

Critical reading demands a distance to the text in which the reader first engages emotionally or analytically (Wallace, 2003), trying to explore the text from different perspectives. This includes examining historical and cultural contexts and influences (Hintz et al., 2019; Short, 2019), as we do in this study when seeing hats in light of different contexts within the fictional worlds. Reading a book critically thus means reading the text closely:

[...] investigating what texts mean and how they work, understanding the relationships between texts and significant ideologies or social systems and experiences such as gender or race, placing texts within literary or cultural histories, and examining specific elements such as a text's themes, literary devices, production, structure, language, uses or reception. (Hintz et al., 2019, p. 29)

Our aim is that a close reading of Klassen's books enters into a critical dialogue with the texts that may offer potential insights for readers (Short, 2019, p. 11), rather than reading against the text. According to Iser (1978) any text has empty spaces which have potential for meaning-making in the reader. An active reader fills in these empty spaces, or gaps, and in doing so, creates meaning in interaction with the text through filling gaps (Iser, 1978). The interaction between pic-

tures and words in picturebooks can leave multiple gaps (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2006). In an interview with Klassen, the idea of gaps between pictures and text is emphasized, and he says that teachers describe his books as “great books to teach the concept of inference, as they have gaps and get the audience involved” (Aziz et al., 2014, p. 61).

Our analysis of Klassen’s hat trilogy draws on our theoretical preconceptions outlined in the previous section. To address opportunities for critical thinking, we explore notions of power and perspectives related to citizenship in the trilogy. In picturebooks, these can be conveyed through focalisation, the social processes of characters and closure (Short, 2019, p. 16). We examined who has power and how the story is resolved. We conducted a close analysis of the hat and related visual features, such as the colour, shape, and positioning, using visual tools for critical analysis (Painter et al., 2013), in addition to the picture-text interaction (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2006). For our purpose, analysis of the interaction between the fictional characters and their graduation or size, are used to detect distribution of power.

The power of hats

All three books in Klassen’s trilogy include the word ‘hat’ in the title: *I want my hat back*, *This is not my hat* and *We found a hat*. Despite being different types of hats, the hat is always at the centre as a scarce commodity. As such, they are valuable objects of desire and contention. In the following, we first investigate how the different hats may represent power and offer unique perspectives thus, embedding critical thinking and democratic citizenship. Later in the analysis we will return to the ideas of perspectives.

Traditionally hats are associated with position and rank in a society, signalling power and hierarchy (Crane, 2000). The focal point of the first book, *I want my hat back*, is a red conical hat.

Conical hats have a long history as a symbol of wisdom, status, and authority. Today, however, it might look like a party hat that the bear has worn to a birthday party, but as late as the 1950s, conical hats were used to penalise disobedient school children or slow learners (Grundhauser, 2015). In *This is not my hat*, a bowler hat is the coveted object. The bowler hat was first used by hunters and gamekeepers but was later adopted by both working class and upper-class men (Crane, 2000, p. 84). In the last book, *We found a hat*, two turtles find an open tall crown cowboy hat. The cowboy hat, which receives its more traditional shape by creasing and pinching it, is also worn by different groups in society and was originally designed to provide shade from the sun. This practical purpose has led to its ubiquitous use, and it can be considered the most popular of these hats today.

These three kinds of hats are included in the trilogy, possibly indicating three nuances of power. In the first book, for instance, the strongest animal, the bear, sets the rules wherein the animals of the picturebook abide. Linking the type of hat to power, which can be considered as what Freire referred to as “reading the world” (2014), a development can be traced throughout the trilogy. Starting with the conical hat, this could represent high status in terms of wisdom, but it is also used to exert power and ridicule. The striking red colour may be associated with power and danger, but also wealth or revolution (Mørstad & Tschudi-Madsen, 2021). Here, it most likely represents a hat of power and danger, belonging to the biggest and strongest animal. Despite its glaring visibility, the rabbit with the red hat is not recognised by the bear at first, who stares into space above the rabbit.

As the picture on page 7 shows (Klassen, 2011), not only does the lack of eye contact reveal the power structures (Short, 2019), but also, comically, the inattentiveness of the bear. The rabbit, on his part, denies any knowledge of the missing hat, possibly to avoid execution of power from

the much larger bear. Graduation or size is used to display power structures in visuals (Painter et al., 2013), while the red letters of the rabbit's statements may both link him to the hat and underline the danger he is in. The likely violent ending indicates the strongest and largest animal's abuse of power to get what he thinks belongs to him.

Whereas the social status indicated by the conical hat is ambiguous, the bowler hat in the second book rather more clearly sets one "social" group apart from others. Desiring what is clearly not his, the smaller fish uses the power of words to justify his attempts at exerting power over a bigger fish through theft. He asserts his claim to the hat through the argument that, even though he knows that it is wrong to steal and that the hat is not his, he is "going to keep it. It was too small for him anyway. It fits me just right" (Klassen, 2012, p. 20). This line of reasoning embeds the dilemma of the right of ownership: Should a resource belong to the one who owns it or the ones who can make use of it? Considering Ennis's definition of critical thinking as "reasonable reflective thinking focused on deciding what to believe or do" (Ennis, 2015, p. 32), the little fish prompts discussions about what it should do and what would be the right choice in this context (Bailin & Siegel, 2003).

Symbolically, the idea of power is challenged by the smaller fish. In this fish habitat the larger animal has more power similarly to the forest world in *I want my hat back*. Ownerships of hats are linked to size and possibilities of execution of power, be it through brute force or clever arguments. This may be understood as little *p* politics in the book and can pave the way for discussions of big *P* politics at a later stage (Janks, 2010). The strength to take or challenge power, albeit with fatal consequences, is related to ideas of revolution and the right to take power (Freire et al., 2014). Furthermore, the movement from using brute force to take the hat in the first book, to using clever words to justify taking the hat in the

second one, can be seen as a development towards democracy (the next step being critical testing of the fish's arguments!). The right of ownership of a coveted resource – the hat – is cast in doubt by the smaller fish, but eventually reclaimed by the big fish, as with the shifting social status of the bowler hat in the human world (Crane, 2000). The readers, for their part, are left unaware of what happens to the little fish. One possible outcome is that the big fish eats the little fish. Another possible outcome is that the little fish is hiding in a place where the big fish cannot find him.

In the third book, *We found a hat*, the distribution of power between the animals is more equal. First and foremost this is seen in the two characters, the two turtles, and their equal size, which may support the argument that in the animal world, power is related to size. The plot is presented through an alternation between the narrator's voice and dialogues between the two turtles, both giving the impression of an equal distribution of power and unity. The open tall crown cowboy hat found in the desert may, as mentioned previously, represent a commoner's hat. Noticeably, there is a shift from the pronoun 'I' in the two first books to 'we' here, and the word 'together' is repeated throughout. Here, both turtles like the hat, and they discuss a possible solution. In this way they demonstrate critical thinking by considering alternatives and the other's point of view (Ennis, 2015). "It looks good on both of us. But it would not be right if one of us had a hat and the other did not" (Klassen, 2016, p. 9). The hat looks the same on both turtles, even if it is too big for them. If hats represent power, the idea of wearing the hat may skew the power balance. From here, they decide to leave the hat, despite both liking it. The hat is often positioned between the turtles or all alone on the page, indicating that this commoner's hat belongs to no one or to the community. Through the book, we can follow the turtles and their longing for the hat, but neither of them execute power over the other.

Hats through multiple perspectives

One dimension of critical thinking is to consider different perspectives (Ennis, 2015; Lim, 2015). In this section we analyse how the text allows for taking different perspectives through exploring the trustworthiness of the narrator. Furthermore, we consider how to create possibilities for understanding the other. When pictures and words in picturebooks expand or contradict one another, engagement with the gaps provides affordances for critical discussions of differing perspectives (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2006). Meanwhile, the simplicity of the written text of the trilogy creates a naive impression that lends room for narrative imagination. There are still underlying complexities, casting the trustworthiness of the narrator in doubt. This doubt and ambiguity cater for different interpretations. The visuals provide more details or diverging truths, for instance in book three, where the turtle says he is thinking about ‘nothing’ while the picture reveals that he is looking back at the hat (Klassen, 2016, p. 23–24). The discrepancy between the information in the image and the words may lead the readers to question the narrators’ trustworthiness. Consequently, affordances for critical thinking around the little *p* politics of everyday lives are embedded, as it is up to the reader to consider who to trust (Janks, 2010; Vasquez et al., 2019).

In *I want my hat back*, the bear – the protagonist – is looking for his hat. The bear searches for the red pointed hat and takes it and, in doing so, possibly eats or kills the rabbit. It may seem evident that the hat belongs to the bear. However, a critical reader may discover that we only have the bear’s own word for it being his hat. Maybe the ownership of the red pointed hat can be questioned because the squirrel asks if the bear has “seen a rabbit wearing a hat?” (Klassen, 2011, p. 30). The bear says no, adding “I would not eat a rabbit” (Klassen, 2011, p. 30), answering a question he was never asked. The visuals depict the bear sitting,

wearing the red hat, and surrounded by broken branches, potential remnants of a fight. The gaps between the pictures and words give the reader room to discover and investigate different perspectives. One interpretation is that the bear is a herbivore, but another is that the bear neither reflects on whether actions are harmful to others, nor takes responsibility for them. This limited perspective taking aligns with Bailin and Siegel’s (2003) understanding of critical thinking and the artwork fosters such thinking when the reader must consider the choices that are made, such as eating the rabbit. It may also provide “freedom to reach out in the imagination, allowing another person’s experience into oneself” (Nussbaum, 2006, p. 392).

Through narration the reader sees the world of the other and sympathizes with them. Perhaps the little fish’s explanation in *This is not my hat* seems trustworthy when he informs the readers that he has in fact stolen the hat he is wearing. The fish speaks directly to the reader and invites us in on his scheme. The little fish acknowledges the problems of stealing, reflects on his actions, and carves out a potential to think critically about “deciding what to believe or do” (Ennis 2015, p. 32) for himself and for the reader in terms of considering whether it was a good and wise choice (Bailin & Siegel, 2003) to steal the hat. The ensuing dilemma involves the little fish’s argument that the hat was too small for the big fish, whereas, the big fish likes his hat and wants it back, creating conflicting views and considerations of others’ points of view (Ennis, 2015). The little fish explains his plan to escape from the big fish by hiding “where the plants are big and tall and close together” (Klassen, 2012, p. 20). “Nobody will ever find me” (Klassen, 2012, p. 26), he states. However, the tail of the large fish is depicted in the seaweed where the little fish is hiding. The big fish returns with the hat, but, even if the author has stated that the little fish has been eaten, there is no clear textual evidence of this interpretation (Aziz et

al., 2014, p. 62). Nor is there any revelation of the big fish's thoughts, since he never speaks. So, the reader is left not knowing if the little fish is still in the seaweed or if the big fish may have eaten it. If the big fish ate the small fish, a different question surfaces: Is it wrong to eat the small fish? Furthermore, is being eaten a reasonable punishment for a petty crime? On the other hand, however, this is normal behaviour in the animal world, fish eat other fish. Here there is a tension between real life and fiction that opens up for critical thinking.

In the first two books, the ending implies that there has been a physical fight, whereas in the third book, *We found a hat* (Klassen, 2016), the turtles find a hat together. The turtles then discuss what to do with it: "But there is only one hat. And there are two of us" (Klassen, 2016, pp. 5-6). Thus, the dilemma involves the consequences of taking the hat: "But it would not be right if one of us had a hat and the other did not" (Klassen, 2016, p. 12). Understanding the other and "imagin[ing] the situation of a person different from themselves" (Nussbaum, 2006, p. 387) is important in developing citizenship. When both turtles desire and want the hat, a dilemma is exposed for the reader: How will their longing for the hat allow for the future of their friendship? Even if the turtles decide to leave the hat behind and try to forget about it, the impossibility of forgetting the hat and the desire for it is communicated in the visuals, for instance, when the turtles cannot seem to stop thinking about the hat. At one point, one of the turtles is seen moving back towards the hat (Klassen, 2016, pp. 29-30), but reconsiders and returns without the hat when his friend describes what he is dreaming about. In his dream, they both have hats. One way to interpret this is that they choose the friendship over the hat and that this speaks of taking the other's perspective and conscious ways of being in the world. How one acts towards others is important because it constitutes the premises of community and togetherness

(Tørnby, 2020, pp. 113-114). The response to the question of how one acts towards others is closely connected with the ability to see different perspectives (Nussbaum, 2006). Engaging with the picture-text interaction and dilemmas of these three books may nurture the reader's understanding of perspectives and power structures, enabling a deepened sense of citizenship.

Thoughts from the top of our hats

Through our excursion into Klassen's universe, we have indicated some possibilities of unveiling power and perspectives as part of critical thinking. Conceptualizing what the world may look like from a different perspective is an important aspect of citizenship (Nussbaum, 2006). Moreover, the distribution of power and resources involve dilemmas that challenge a democratic society (Nussbaum, 2003). All three books describe a desire for hats, and as a scarce resource their very presence challenges the characters. Consequently, dilemmas of lying, stealing, and protecting a friendship arise through the artwork. Universal dilemmas regarding what constitutes righteous behaviour and healthy citizenship unfold.

If hats represent valuables and power, there is an uneven distribution of value and power in books 1 and 2, whereas there is an equal distribution in the third book. In the third book, the protagonists are turtles, animals who move at a slow speed. In this context, they stop, try on and think when they find the hat in the desert, which may indicate that critical thinking necessitates time. Similarly, building sustainable democracies and sound citizens takes time, seeing multiple perspectives and showing care and consideration (Ennis, 2015; Nussbaum, 2006). Hats off to Jon Klassen's artwork and his universe of animals that may lead the way in providing a deeper insight into what it means to be human.

Notes

- 1 *International Research in Children's Literature (IRCL)*, *Children's Literature in Education*, *New Review of Children's Literature and Librarianship*, *Journal of Children's literature*, *Bookbird*, *Jeunesse: Young People, Texts, Cultures*, *Nordic Journal of ChildLit Aesthetics*, *CLELE: Children's Literature in English Language Education*. In addition to this, we searched in Google Scholar and Oria, a local Norwegian database.

Bibliography

- Dr. Seuss (1957). *The Cat in the Hat*. Random House, Houghton Mifflin.
 Klassen, J. (2011). *I want my hat back*. Candlewick Press.
 Klassen, J. (2012). *This is not my hat*. Walker Books and subsidiaries.
 Klassen, J. (2016). *We found a hat*. Walker Books Ltd.
 Rowling, J.K. (1997). *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*. Bloomsbury.

References

- Andersson-Bakken, E., Heggernes, S. L., Svanes, I. K., & Tørnby, H. (2022). «Men da blir det urettferdig for dem som ikke får!»: Bildebøker som utgangspunkt for kritisk tenkning på barnetrinnet [“But then it will be unfair for those who do not get!” Picturebooks as a starting point for critical thinking in primary school]. *Acta Didactica Norden*, 16(2).
- Aziz, S., Arnold, J. M., & Sableski, M.-K. (2014). Falling through a hole and wearing the hat of imagination and ingenuity: A conversation with Jon Klassen. *Journal of Children's Literature*, 40(2), 59.
- Bailin, S., & Siegel, H. (2003). Critical thinking. In N. Blake, P. Smeyers, R. Smith, & P. Standish (Eds.), *The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of Education* (vol. 9, pp. 181–193). Blackwell.
- Bugge, H. E., & Dessingué, A. (2022). *Å tenke kritisk sammen: Kritisk tenkning i dialogiske undervisningspraksiser* [Thinking Critically Together: Critical Thinking in Dialogic Teaching]. Cappelen Damm Akademisk.
- Crane, D. (2000). *Fashion and its Social Agendas: Class, Gender, and Identity in Clothing*. University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (2007). *Democracy and Education*. Echo Library.
- Ennis, R. H. (2015). Critical thinking: A streamlined conception. I M. Davies & R. Barnett (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Critical Thinking in Higher Education* (pp. 31–47). Springer.
- Fisher, A. (2011). *Critical Thinking: An Introduction* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Freire, P. (2014). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed: 30th Anniversary Edition* (Thirtieth anniversary edition). Bloomsbury. <https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.ezproxy.oslomet.no/lib/hioa/detail.action?docID=1745456>.
- Gallagher, J. L., & Kelly, E. (2019). Economic Thinking with Jon Klassen's Animal Hat Books. *Social Studies and the Young Learner*, 32(2), 16–18.
- Grundhauser, E. (2015). *The dunce cap wasn't always so stupid*. <https://www.atlasobscura.com/articles/the-dunce-cap-wasnt-always-so-stupid>
- Hintz, C., Tribunella, E. L., & Hintz, C. (2019). *Reading Children's Literature: A Critical Introduction* (2nd ed.). Broadview Press.
- Iser, W. (1978). *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Janks, H. (2010). Language, power and pedagogies. In N. H. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Language Education* (pp. 40–61). Multilingual Matters.

- Janks, H. (2013). *The importance of critical literacy*. In *Moving Critical Literacies Forward* (pp. 32–44). Routledge.
- Johnson, H., Mathis, J., & Short, K. G. (2019). *Content Analysis of Visual Images in Books for Young People*. Routledge.
- Kress, G., & Van Leeuwen, T. (2006). *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Lim, L. (2015). Critical thinking, social education and the curriculum: Foregrounding a social and relational epistemology. *Curriculum Journal*, 26(1), 4–23.
- Moses, L., Ogden, M., & Beth Kelly, L. (2015). Facilitating meaningful discussion groups in the primary grades. *The Reading Teacher*, 69(2), 233–237. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1392>
- Mørstad, E., & Tschudi-Madsen, S. (2021). Fargesymbolikk [Symbolism of Colors]. I *Store norske leksikon*. <https://snl.no/fargesymbolikk>
- Nikolajeva, M. (2018). Emotions in picturebooks. In B. Kümmerling-Meibauer (Ed.), *The Routledge Companion to Picturebooks* (pp. 110–118). Routledge.
- Nikolajeva, M., & Scott, C. (2006). *How Picturebooks Work*. Routledge.
- Nussbaum, M. (2003). Capabilities as fundamental entitlements: Sen and social justice. *Feminist economics*, 9(2–3), 33–59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1354570022000077926>
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2006). Education and Democratic Citizenship: Capabilities and Quality Education. *Journal of human development*, 7(3), 385–395. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649880600815974>
- Painter, C., Martin, J. R., & Unsworth, L. (2013). *Reading Visual Narratives: Image Analysis of Children's Picture Books*. Equinox.
- Pantaleo, S. (2017). Critical thinking and young children's exploration of picturebook artwork. *Language and Education*, 31(2), 152–168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2016.1242599>
- Roche, M. (2015). *Developing Children's Critical Thinking Through Picturebooks: A Guide for Primary and Early Years Students and Teachers*. Routledge.
- Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978). *The Reader, the Text, the Poem: The Transactional Theory of the Literary Work*. Southern Illinois University Press.
- Short, K. G. (2019). Critical content analysis of visual images. In H. Johnson, J. Mathis, & K. G. Short (Eds.), *Critical Content Analysis of Visual Images in Books for Young People* (pp. 3–22). Routledge.
- Smith, J. (2018). Reading *I Want My Hat Back* by Jon Klassen. Encounters over seven months: One child, one book, one adult. *Forum for Comprehensive Education*, 60(3), 271–278. <https://doi.org/dx.doi.org/10.15730/forum.2018.60.3.271>
- Tørnby, H. (2020). *Picturebooks in the Classroom. Perspectives on Life Skills, Sustainable Development and Democracy & Citizenship*. Fagbokforlaget.
- Vasquez, V. M., Janks, H., & Comber, B. (2019). Critical Literacy as a Way of Being and Doing. *Language Arts*, 96(5), 300–311.
- Wallace, C. (2003). *Critical Reading in Language Education*. Springer.