Teaching Digital Literature: a French Study
Exploring Didactic and Literary Approaches to the Introduction of Digital Literature in French High Schools

Introduction

The question of teaching digital literature in universities has already inspired numerous studies (Simanowski, Schäfer and Gendolla, 2010), and has even attained burning topicality since the publication of Scott Rettberg's textbook *Electronic Literature* (Rettberg, 2018), Leonardo Flores' online course *Three Generations of Electronic Literature*[i], and since the international conference organized in Coimbra in July 2019 entitled "Teaching Digital Literature"[ii]. However we lack empirical studies on the teaching of digital literature in high schools.

During a conference devoted to the teaching of literature in a digital environment, Serge Bouchardon urged teachers of French literature to "give digital literature an integral role in their teaching practices", insisting however on the challenges involved in doing so (2018). As a follow-up to experiments carried out in higher education (Saemmer, 2010) or in high schools (Bouchardon, 2014), based around works which were not specifically literary in nature (Lebrun & Lacelle, 2012), we aim to shed more light on the study of digital works in junior and senior high school classes, and to examine the process of didactic transposition required for the study of digital literature. Indeed, one of the specificities of this field is that digital literary works are rarely proposed as objects of study in schools, nor do they explicitly feature on the official French literature curriculum. Our goal is to more precisely determine what is meant by "the construction of the object of study" (Schneuwly & Dolz, 2009), basing our observations on the work done by high school teachers. Our study, which aims to provide a global analysis of observed teaching practices, is centered around ten pedagogical sequences conceived by teachers in French high schools.

We will try to establish how teachers deal with the various aspects of digital works, and identify the choices they make in terms of didactic transposition. Working with a limited number of sample cases, the challenge consists in clarifying the ways in which the teaching of a digital work fits in with that of more traditional literary works (Ronveaux & Schneuwly, 2007), but also in showing how teachers use their scientific and professional skills to apprehend and teach the specificities of digital literature.

After establishing our theoretical framework and describing the context of our research, we will present our analysis in four stages. We first analyze the process by which digital works

become part of a teacher's pedagogical project, and the different approaches teachers select to introduce these works to their pupils. Our attention subsequently turns to the objects of study, and particularly to the links created by teachers between digital works and literature, literacy or indeed the digital *milieu* specific to the pupils and the class in question. Renewing their traditional teaching methods based on the reading of an entire work, the teachers involved select various didactic options, which we then examine, along with the progression they envisage in order to enable their pupils to appreciate the chosen digital work. Finally we focus on writing practices, revealing the variety of literary writing practices proposed, as well as their firm connections with the studied works.

1.Theoretical Background

1.1. The stakes involved in the teaching of digital literature

In an article published in *Enseigner la littérature avec le numérique* (Brunel & Quet, 2018), S. Bouchardon insists on the reasons why digital literature should be studied in schools, while at the same time pointing out the difficulties which the teaching of digital literature entails, beginning with the need to master its specificities, its various forms and the fact that it is embedded in a digital environment (2018, p. 202). In spite of the difficulties faced by teachers, who must not only find ways in which to make rather unusual literary works fit into the curriculum, and accompany their pupils, who may feel a little disorientated in their reading of these works, but also even sometimes justify their choices to parents who may be somewhat reluctant, the teaching of digital literature indeed offers many stimulating opportunities.

- Revisiting certain notions introduced in literature lessons (the author, the text, the narrative, etc.), and teaching pupils to question writing practices. This is what I refer to as the "heuristic value" of digital literature.

- Developing teaching practices centered around digital literacy through the study of literature, thus endorsing the idea that "reading literature activates to the utmost the operations and codes which are susceptible to come into play in all reading activities" (Dufays, Gemenne et Ledur, 2015). Similarly, we might claim that reading digital literature helps students to develop digital literacy skills in a pertinent way, challenging the traditional use of the Digital in French classes – not only is literature taught in a digital environment, but students also learn about the digital environment through the study of literature.

- Providing a partial solution for the type of pupil described by Marie-José Fourtanier as "the disarticulated reader" (2011). What kind of readers are pupils in today's schools, caught between their own cultural practices and references, and the universe of the works proposed for study in class (Lahire, 2004).

- Discovering and exploring the creations of the "Contemporary Extreme" movement. Introducing pupils to contemporary works, and therefore also to the corpus of contemporary digital literature, thus presenting them with the latest literary creations, inspired by

contemporary existential, ethical and technological issues.

- Initiating pupils to creative digital writing practices, as we shall see below (Bouchardon 2018).

Such are some of the very diverse stakes involved in the teaching of digital literature. These are similar to the goals of the teaching of French in high schools, notably developing in pupils a taste for both reading and writing practices, while inculcating in them a command of literary skills and a literary culture, as well as producing citizens capable of informed and pertinent digital practices.

1.2. Digital Literature

a. Digital Literature and its place in literary history

Digital literature has existed for more than six decades now, and descends from clearly identified lineages – combinatorial and constrained writing, fragmentary writing, sound and visual writing. It is important to place these literary practices in their context within literary history, and more particularly in that of of the *avant-garde* movements of the twentieth century: Dadaism, Surrealism, Lettrism, the *Nouveau Roman*, or *OuLiPo*, thus approaching digital literature from the perspective of the continuity of literary history, in the same way as literature is traditionally taught in high schools, and particularly in French high schools.

b. The Specificities of Digital Literature

Most critics in the field are in agreement as to the two principal forms of literature relying on digital supports: **digitized literature** and true **digital literature**, even if the boundary between the two forms is sometimes blurred, perhaps increasingly so.

Digitized literature most often consists in adapting existing, initially printed works to digital forms, which are said to be enriched or augmented in that they include added functionalities (annotations, search or sharing options), or multimedia content (videos, or iconographic elements), which enhance the reader's appreciation and understanding. The nature of the text itself remains basically unchanged, however. It can or could still be printed without its signification being altered.

In the second of these two literary forms (*digital literature*), created and designed by and for digital media, the nature of a text would undergo profound changes were it to be printed. "Digital-born[iii]" literary creation is currently flourishing in its various forms – hypertext fiction, animated poetry, works including automatic text generation or collaborative online creation. Authors invent and produce literary works specifically for digital media (computers, tablets and smartphones), and strive to exploit their characteristics, namely the multimedia or multimodal dimension, text animation, hypertext technology, and the potential for interactivity, but also geolocalization, notifications or even virtual reality. Digital literature is above all

experimental. In an online exchange with Joe Tabbi, Scott Rettberg evokes "a fundamentally experimental practice, in the scientific sense of experimentation"[iv].

1.3. Teaching digital works: The State of the Art

In the field of didactics, the teaching of digital literature has yet to produce any specific results, in spite of the fact that the way has been well-paved by several studies. Alexandra Saemmer et Nolwenn Tréhondart (2014) show that digital works provide a new form of pleasure for the reader, due to their sensorial dimensions (108), their manipulability, and the fact that the technical possibilities offered by digital platforms can lead to greater immersion of the reader in a work (113).

> The coupling of the succession of "activation" gestures and the image they produce is instrumental in fostering immersive practices, reproducing the possibilities offered by virtual reality – the reader is invited to physically mimic the "manipulation" gesture evoked in the text. (p.120)

Lebrun, Lacelle and Boutin insist on the need for formal teaching of multimodal literacy in a digital context (2012), pointing to the difficulties involved in reading such texts, which call on the reader to establish the links between the various pieces of information gathered. Lacelle and Lebrun specify the competencies which must be taught – being able to recognize the segmented nature of a message, to identify the coherence of information provided through different linguistic modes, to grasp the logic behind the meaning of a text (which is not necessarily presented in a linear fashion). Furthermore they recommend a better integration of digital texts in the teaching of traditional literacy, " the starting-point for helping pupils to construct or enrich their multimodal comprehension / production skills, should be the classic comprehension / production processes." F. Cahen, analyzing his classroom experimentation with the reading of digital works in *Les Cahiers pédagogiques* (2016*), brings to light the interest of confronting digital works with a more traditional corpus, thereby facilitating the study of literary language, or of the role of the reader, "the possibilties for interactivity lead to a debate on the place of the reader." (56).

And finally, several studies in didactics focusing on the production of digital texts provide us with precious indications for our further reflection on the exploitation of digital works in literature classes; Lacelle and Lebrun have pointed to the needs of pupils when learning production skills, especially with regard to the weakness of their competencies in the reading and interpretation of the iconic mode. The PRECIP study has shown the benefits of studying digital writing in class, encouraging pupils to reflect on their own use of digital writing on social platforms.

Other studies focus on digital writing pactices instrumented by software (Petitjean, 2018; Cuin, 2015); they explore the pragmatic and semiotic specificities of the format, and emphasize the extent to which this "architext" (Souchier et al., 2003) conditions writing on the

screen, constitutes a subjacent framework offering a constrained environment and structures what is written. These studies are in our view essential prerequisites for the analysis of teaching practices centered around digital literature.

1.4. Introducing a new object for study into the classroom: defining a pedagogical process

In order to more clearly define what we mean by "digital works" as objects for study, we decided to analyse the work of teachers as a starting-point towards understanding how an object for study is constructed, following up on the methodologies put forward by the GRAFE group[v]. In this aim, we focused our attention more paticularly on the notion of the *sequence* (Ronveaux & Schneuwly, 2007), as the principal organizational element determining the object for study. On a more restricted scale (and particularly that of the teaching session), we also noted the pertinence of a secondary organizational element, the *teaching plan*, as a set of elements including teaching materials, instructions, and concrete conditions for the execution of a teaching situation designed in the aim of achieving a specific pedagogical objective (Cordeiro & Schneuwly, 2007). The two organizational elements guiding the activities of teachers described above will constitute the theoretical perspective from which we will analyze the processes of didactic transposition designed by the teachers.

2. Presentation of our Research

2.1. A design-oriented research group

Our research was carried out over a three-year period by a collaborative work team operating in the educational district of Nice in France. Teachers were invited to design and carry out teaching sequences in an autonomous manner, based on works and teaching resources suggested by researchers.

Our method was both descriptive and strategic. Our principal aim was to define and better understand the specificities of digital works as objects for study, and identify any observable phenomena occurring during the appropriation process. Our long-term goals are to provide tools for the teaching of digital works, notably to contribute to the reflection around the opportunities which it offers, as well as to to the didactic transposition process.

2.2. Presentation of the sequences carried out: works selected and levels

For this study, we have based our analysis on the professional documents povided by 7 teachers having participated in the experimental teaching of three different digital works. While this is not the place to give a detailed account of each work, we will briefly describe each of them. Marietta Ren's *Phallaina*[vi] is a succession of comic strips describing the itinerary of a character who develops a sense of the world's extraordinariness, and is able to interpret the

speech of whales, for example. Mathias Malzieu's *L'homme volcan*[vii] tells the story of a little boy who is passionate about the universe of Jules Verne. He accidentally falls into the crater of a volcano, then reappears to his sister in the form of a little crimson supernatural being. Serge Bouchardon's *Déprise*[viii] is the first-person narrative of a character undergoing a sort of crisis, a turning-point which manifests itself by a loss of control on the part of the reader over his / her reading process.

The pedagogical experimentation led by the teachers involved is composed of eight sequences, distributed as follows:

Teachers	Title of the work	Author(s)	Date	Class level[ix]	Code sequence
Céline and Charline	*Déprise*	S. Bouchardon	2018	1[e]	S1
Samuel	*Phallaina*	M. Ren	2018	5[e]	S2
Hélène	*Phallaina*	M. Ren	2018	5[e]	S3a
Claude	*L'homme Volcan*	M. Malzieu	2018	5[e]	S4
Hélène	*Phallaina*	M. Ren	2017	5[e]	S3b
Hélène	*L'homme volcan*	M. Malzieu	2017	6[e]	S5
Virginie (replacing Caroline)	*Déprise*	S. Bouchardon	2017	3[e]	S6
Caroline	*Déprise*	S. Bouchardon	2017	3[e]	S7

Almost all school levels were involved in the study of complete works, and *Déprise* was studied in both junior and senior high school classes.

2.3. Presentation of data and research questions

For this article, the first stage in our research, the teachers' sequence plans constitute our principal source of data, enabling us to provide answers to the following research questions:

1) What treatment is given by teachers to the different aspects of digital works?
2) What choices do the teachers make regarding didactic transposition?

In this aim, we chose to proceed with our analyses by combining our approaches, one of which is primarily literary and digital, the other mainly pedagogical.

3. Analysis

3.1. The introduction of digital works in the classroom

a. The integration of digital works in the curriculum and possible pedagogical orientations

All the teaching sequences were based around complete digital works, generally as part of a corpus of more traditional texts. The digital works in question were never treated as secondary works, with between 9 and 14 teaching sessions devoted to each one, proving that they were the object of detailed study within the respective pedagogical projects.

During the study sequences, as is the case with traditional sequential organization, reading and the interpretation of the written text is the dominant activity, while the place given to interpreting images and to writing is also important. The sessions devoted to the interpretation of images are justified by the fact that multimodal works are, by nature, composed of static or moving images, which explains this choice. However the importance of the sessions devoted to writing would seem to be the result of a pedagogical choice, these sessions bearing a close relation to the literary text studied (Tauveron & Sève, 2005), and constituting the final objective of the learning sequence, as we shall see at the end of our analysis.

Finally, we would like to draw your attention to one type of session which is inexistent in traditional learning sequences, and is devoted to the appropriation of the reading device or medium. Such sessions occupy a half-way position between technical discovery and discovery of the text, and seem to illustrate the interdependent relationship between reading practices and the medium involved (Goody, 2000; Chartier, 2012; Bros, 2015): the teachers seem to be aware of the fact that the media and devices used in digital literature require specific learning sessions, as we can observe in the following extract from our second sequence plan (S2), based on the study of *Phallaina*, "getting used to the tablet, discovering the application, learning how to surf and how to use the table of contents, scrolling".

b. The approaches to studying digital works selected by the teachers

We were able to identify three main (combinable) approaches to digital works:

- the approach by (literary) genre

> Samuel, working on *Phallaina*, gave the following title to one of his sessions: "at the crossroads between fantastic/ marvelous literature and science fiction".

- the approach by media (in their capacity as communicational genres)

> Caroline, working on *Déprise*, created a link between digital literature and video games, and gave the following title to one of her sessions: "The construction of 'playability'. The need for gradual learning with levels of difficulty as with

video games". Céline, also working on *Déprise*, created a link between digital literature and art, taking her pupils to see an exhibition by the TeamLab artist collective.

- the approach through the senses (multimodality)

Caroline emphasized "the sensorial journey of the netsurfing reader ", insisting on the coordination between touching, seeing and hearing. Hélène called one of her sessions "*a multimodal language*". She worked with her pupils on *Déprise* during two consecutive academic years, placing greater emphasis on multimodality during the second year.

These different approaches are indicative of the ways in which teachers conceive the experience of the reading of a digital work by their pupils. Do they prefer to base this experience around cultural references, in order to avoid disorientating the pupils too much, or on other dimensions (such as the sensorial dimension) so as to more clearly emphasize the originality of such a reading experience?

3.2. What is taught through the reading of digital works?

a. Teaching about literature? About literacy? About the digital world?

When teachers propose digital works to their students, are they mainly interested by the literary dimension, or do they aim to help their pupils become digitally-literate citizens? How is a link established with the history of literature? Is digital literature presented as an integral part of the vast history of literature, or rather as a form of expression for the extreme contemporary genre, its interest lying in the fact that it is a form which is currently being created? Some teachers begin by placing the digital creation for study on the timeline of literary history, or by emphasizing its intertextuality (e.g. Hélène with *l'Homme Volcan*). Others prefer to start by emphasizing the innovative reading experience the work offers (e.g. Virginie with *Déprise*). They all then endeavour to define what is meant by digital literature (what a digital work is, and how to read it).

Digital literacy requires the coordination of both technical and cultural (especially literary) knowledge. Do teachers place these resources in opposition, or do they recognize the need to combine the two? The technical aspect is by no means absent from the sequences conceived, as the teachers devote entire sessions to the appropriation of the tools (manipulation sessions). But if Samuel (S2) explicitly raises the question of the medium and the technical device, the coordination of the literary and digital dimensions is not always stressed (little emphasis is given to the "architextural" dimension of the writing tools, as if the tools were neutral). This no doubt remains one of the challenges for the teaching of digital literature, as the close links between cultural and technical knowledge are an aspect yet to be taken into consideration by teachers and institutions.

Does digital literature enhance our understanding of our digital *milieu* ("milieu" meaning that which lies both around and beween us)? Do teachers place digital works in

context in relation to their pupils' digital environment? No explicit links were established with usual writing practices, particularly those related to social media. However, several teachers insisted on the fact that these works make us think about the place of the Digital in our lives. A question raised by one of the teachers (working on *Déprise* with a class of sixteen-year-olds) about her sequence is emblematic in this respect: "In what manner does digital literature question our relationship to the digital world?" It is important to incite pupils to adopt a reflective attitude, and even to become enlightened users of the digital environment, a challenge which ties in with one of the stakes of digital literature.

b. Which elements of digital literature and which textual aspects are generally studied?

Several types of objects for study are selected for digital literature classes, some of them relatively constant when studying complete works, such as the main character(s) or the *genre* of the work in question. Other aspects are less frequently covered in traditional literature classes; for example our corpus raises an interest for the identity of the reader and his / her emotions. Although a strong involvement of pupils with the studied work is not a phenomenon which is specific to digital literature, this aspect does however seem to be intensified by the technical processes involved, as Saemmer and Tréhondart point out when they speak of "immersive reception" (2014). Teachers working with eleventh grade students insisted on this point:

> Even if they may be more disorientating for pupils than a traditional paper book, the choice of digital works, for which the appropriation methods are similar to those generally practised by a spectator, captures the attention of the least-skilled readers (because digital works are relatively short, interactive, and have tactile and visual dimensions – readers have to use a mouse and a webcam). (S1)

Finally, certain new study objects are selected, with all the teachers attaching importance to relaying the multimodality of digital works. In accordance with the recommendations of Lebrun and Lacelle (2012), they identified the complexity of the interlinking of the various elements, as well as the specificity of the different communicational modes, along with the diversity of fonts and their animation (Saemmer, 2014) as knowledge on which to focus their teaching, studying the signification of these aspects (S6, S3b). One last particuarity lies in the approach through specific questioning, addressed to both literature and the Digital, as presented above.

3.3. Text analysis: questions around the choice of pedagogical methods and progressivity in pupils' appropriation of the text

a. The pedagogical methods selected and rejected by the teachers

In the aim of more clearly defining the object for study, we shall focus at present on the reading methods selected by the teachers, so as to identify their pedagogical choices.

Our analysis firstly reveals certain elements of continuity – in more than 10 cases the digital works were studied in traditional text analysis sessions. What is most remarkable is that two new teaching methods emerged, as a response to a need for pupils to be accompanied in their reading of this new type of work. Indeed, even if pupils read them on devices with which they are very famliar, they are bewildered by and unsure of how to respond to digital works. Indeed, nearly all the teachers programmed an initial session devoted to accompanied reading at the beginning of their sequences. Thus pupils discovered the digital works in class, with teachers sometimes reading a text aloud at the same time as their pupils discovered it on their screens. The initial reading experience was in this way collective and shared. Additionally two teachers proposed "comprehension workshops" which involved pupils working on a passage, in the aim of not only more precisely grasping the literal sense but also understanding what the pupils identified in a very intuitive manner as the "atmosphere" (S2), that is to say the means used by the author for the reading of the text.

b. Two epistemological pathways

The progression within the sequences also reveals an itinerary allowing the teachers to define certain notions or to place emphasis on certain aspects of the work. Two alternative pathways can be observed in the teachers' sequences:
- the sequence begins by an analysis of the text before dealing with the multimodal and interactive dimensions;
- the sequence begins by an appreciation of the work in all its compexity (including the multimodal and interactive dimensions), followed by an analysis of the text (in the linguistic sense).

Are these two pathways representative of a strategy to reassure pupils (or even parents), sometimes disorientated by digital literature? In both cases, the teachers endeavour to *reveal* the literariness of these works, helping their pupils to consider works which *a priori* do not meet the classic criteria of literariness (an unstable text, the multimodal dimension, material intervention by the reader) as literary. In the two pathways mentioned above, the teachers attempt to displace the notion of literariness in order to create *an interactive literary experience*.

3.4. The writing practices developed in the sequences

Once again our analysis of the characteristics of the sessions devoted to writing conceived by the teachers will remain a global one. We do not however wish to neglect this aspect, since, as we have emphasized, the important place given to writing activities was one of the specificities of the sequences studied.

a. The evolution of the sessions and of the writing activities

Whereas reports and studies about current writing practices stress that these often intervene only in the final evaluation session of a teaching sequence, writing activities in the sequences making up our sample were more frequent, and took place at different stages within the sequences. They were positioned after a number of reading sessions, the pedagogical

project thus seeming to contribute to the aim of training pupils to be attentive to certain specificities when reading digital works in order to help them to constitute a pool of resources to be used in creative digital production activities. Indeed, it should be pointed out that the writing sessions were principally designed for the production of texts for the screen, even if this tendency was not an exclusive one in any of the sample sessions.

b. Characteristics of creative digital writing practices

What is somewhat striking in the instructions given for writing, is that they do not invite pupils to reflect upon the role of the writing tool or software in the writing activity (the "architextural"dimension mentioned above). The tools used were however very different, and a considerable diversity of writing practices and formats can be observed: Ebooks in epub format (S4); vidéos in mp4 format (S3), diaporamas (S7), non-linear arborescences with Twine to write a scenario (S1). This led to the creation of an "interactive immersive work", with the help of multimedia professionals.

In the case of the Ebook, there were references to traditional paper books such as successive pages, but with illustrations and videos inserted into the pages. This is an example of an enriched work, or a work which is augmented by a multimodal dimension.

The videos, inspired by *Phallaina,* reveal some very interesting experiments and reflections on the medium. A4 sheets showing drawings with speech bubbles are taped next to one another. The video sequence sweeps over the pages in a left-to-right movement to tell the story. In this animated video, the codes of the traditional paper cartoon book are revisited in the form of a "scrolling graphic novel", recreated using audio-visual and sound flows.

The diaporamas used by the pupils to stage their own *Déprise* invite the reader to participate in a playful examination of the signifier, in a tale which is partly narrative and partly poetic. These are examples of interactive animated multimedia presentations, playing on the notions of spatiality and temporality.

In the scenarios created with Twine, the pupils are guided towards a choice of sequences, in a non-linear interactive narrative.

The interactive and multimedia solutions proposed produced very diverse forms of writing, using formats (epubs imitating books, videos, diaporamas, arborescent graphs) with both inherent constraints and potentialities.

The teachers aimed to encourage their pupils to transfer the various content and forms studied in the digital works to their writing activities, and to do this using similar writing forms to those of the studied works. Overall, three main notions were transferred from the pupils' analysis of the works to their writing activities – a sensorial and multimedia universe (the intersemiotization of media), animation and temporality (the different ways of playing with the

notion of time), interactivity and the author-reader relationship (between control and loss of control, grasp, and loss of grasp).

Further reflection

Thus, thanks to this study, we have been able to observe the extent to which the pedagogical sequences conceived by the teachers create links between digital works and more traditional literary corpora. By choosing to integrate their sequences directly after their initial sequences devoted to more traditional corpora, the teachers placed the digital works chosen for study within a continuum, allowing them to refer to notions learnt previously as prerequisite knowledge for the sequences devoted to digital literature. Within these sequences, they encouraged pupils to create links with traditional works recognized by school programs, and by doing so not only enhanced their pupils' capacity to establish generic and historical links, but also conferred greater legitimacy to the introduction of digital works into the classroom. Conversely, we could point out that fewer links were established between digital literary works and the pupils' own private writing practices, a sign that the teachers found the idea of addressing this subject a bit more delicate.

Thus, thanks to this study, we have been able to observe both a strong desire on the part of the teachers involved to create a continuum between the teaching of digital works and their more traditional practices, and the careful attention they paid to the specificity of these digital works, inspiring them to demonstrate genuine professional creativity, as well as to pay close attention to the progression of their pupils in these new reading practices.

References

Augé, Claire. "Écriture collaborative numérique et appropriation d'une œuvre patrimoniale". *Le Français Aujourd'hui*, vol. 200, no1, pp. 57-66, 2018.

Bouchardon Serge. *La valeur heuristique de la littérature numérique*, Hermann, Paris, 2014.

Bouchardon Serge. "Pourquoi enseigner la littérature numérique" ?. *L'enseignement de la littérature avec le numérique*, edited by Magali Brunel and François Quet, Bruxelles, Peter Lang, pp. 203-218, 2018.

Bouchardon Serge and Cailleau Isabelle . "Milieu numérique et *lettrés* du numérique"., *Le français aujourd'hui*, *n°200* "Écriture numérique : la conversion du littéraire ? ", Magali Brunel and Anne-Marie Petitjean (coord.), Paris, Armand Colin, pp. 117-125, 2018.

Bros Frédérique. "Devenir e-*lettré* : quels leviers et voies d'accès à l'écrit à l'heure de la littératie numérique ?". *Savoirs* n°38, 2015/2, Paris, L'Harmattan, pp.73-90, 2015. http://www.cairn.info/revue-savoirs-2015-2-page-73.htm

Brunel Magali and Quet François (dir.). *L'enseignement de la littérature avec le numérique*, Bruxelles, Peter Lang, 2018.

Cahen Françoise. "Mais là, on sort un peu du cadre, non ?". *Les Cahiers pédagogiques*, *n°42,* 2016. https://www.academia.edu/34974810/Mais_là_on_sort_un_peu_du_cadre_non

Chartier Roger. "Qu'est-ce qu'un livre ? Métaphores anciennes, concepts des lumières et réalités numériques". *Le français aujourd'hui*, 2012/3, n°178, pp. 11-26, 2012. https://www.cairn.info/revue-le-francais-aujourd-hui-2012-3-page-11.htm

Cordeiro Glaís Sales and Schneuwly Bernard. "La construction de l'objet enseigné et les organisateurs du travail enseignant". *Recherche et formation*, n°56, pp. 67-80, 2007. https://journals.openedition.org/rechercheformation/903

Cuin Hélène. "Un dispositif d'approche multimodale de la lecture littéraire, lecture spectature et lecture littéraire en classe de seconde". *Revue de recherches en littératie médiatique multimodale* n°1, 2015. https://doi.org/10.7202/1047795ar

Dufays Jean-Louis, Gemenne Louis and Ledur Dominique. Pour *une lecture littéraire. Histoires, théories, pistes pour la classe*, [1996], Bruxelles, De Boeck, (3ᵉed.) 2015.

Fourtanier Marie-José. "Dislocation et "figurativisation" dans les dispositifs de lecteurs". *Revue pour la recherche en éducation, Actes de colloque ACFAS 2010, acte 4, La lecture sous toutes ses formes : pluralité des supports, des processus et des approches*, Ottawa, pp. 48-54, 2011.

Goody Jack. *The Power of the Written Tradition*, Washington and London, Smithsonian Institution Press, 2000.

Lacelle Nathalie and Lebrun Monique. "La littératie médiatique multimodale : réflexions sémiologiques et dispositifs concrets d'application". *Forum lecture, Les apprentissages littéraciques avec les médias numériques,* 2014. http://www.forumlecture.ch/redaktionsbeitrag_2014_2.cfm

Lahire Bernard. *La culture des individus : dissonances et distinction de soi*, Paris, La Découverte, 2004.

Lebrun Monique and Lacelle Nathalie. "Le document multimodal : le comprendre et le produire en classe de français". *Œuvres, textes, documents : lire pour apprendre et comprendre à l'école et au collège, Repères*, Élisabeth Nonnon and François Quet (dir.), n°45, pp. 81-95, 2012.

Meirieu Philippe, Kambouchner Denis and Stiegler Bernard. *L'école, le numérique et la société qui vient*, Paris, Fayard/Mille et une nuits, 2012.

Petitjean Anne Marie. "Écrits collaboratifs en classe de littérature, Expériences d'écriture sur pad au collège et au lycée". *L'enseignement de la littérature avec le numérique, edited by* Magali Brunel and François Quet, Bruxelles, Peter Lang, pp. 181-202, 2018.

Rettberg Scott. *Electronic Literature*, Polity Press, 2018.

Ronveaux Christophe and Schneuwly Bernard. "Approches de l'objet enseigné. Quelques prolégomènes à une recherche didactique et illustration par de premiers résultats". *Éducation et didactique*, n°1, 2007.

Saemmer Alexandra. "Lire la littérature numérique à l'université : deux situations pédagogiques". *Études de linguistique appliqué* n°160, pp. 411-420, 2010. http://www.cairn.info/revue-ela-2010-4-page-411.htm

Saemmer Alexandra. *Rhétorique du texte numérique. Figures de la lecture, anticipations de pratiques*, Villeurbanne, Presses de l'Enssib, 2015.

Saemmer Alexandra and Tréhondart Nolwenn. "Les figures du livre numérique augmenté au prisme d'une rhétorique de la reception". Françoise Paquienseguy and Sylvie Bosser (ed..) *Études de communications*, *langages, information médiations : le livre numérique en question*, no4, pp. 107- 128, 2014.

Schneuwly Bernard and Dolz Joaquim (eds.). *Des objets enseignés en classe de français*, Rennes, Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2009.

Simanowski Roberto, Schäfer Jörgen and Gendolla Peter, eds. *Reading Moving Letters. Digital Literature in Research and Teaching.* Bielefeld, Transcript, 2010.

Tauveron Catherine and Sève Pierre, *Vers une écriture littéraire, ou comment construire une posture d'auteur à l'école : de la GS au CM2*, Paris, Hatier, 2005.

Notes

[i] Spring 2019: http://leonardoflores.net/elit/?fbclid=IwAR2Yk0Eku_EOMJRpXrHttnf9lLp1881Mp27zs5MZghmEDPTH_jco9SN0E8U

[ii] TDLIC-2019: Teaching Digital Literature International Conference, https://matlit.wordpress.com/2019/02/16/teaching-digital-literature-international-conference-call-for-papers/

[iii] "Digital-born" (Hayles, 2008, 120).

[iv] https://www.facebook.com/jill.rettberg/videos/522434064169

[v] https://www.unige.ch/fapse/grafe/

[vi] http://phallaina.nouvelles-ecritures.francetv.fr

[vii] https://apps.apple.com/fr/app/lhomme-volcan/id488128649

[viii] http://deprise.fr

[ix] French pupils are on average 11 years old in 6^e (Grade 6), 12 years old in 5^e (Grade 7), 14 years old in 3^e (Grade 9) and 16 years old in 1^e (Grade 11).