

ELECTRONIC LITERATURE PEDAGOGIES

MARIA ENGBERG

*E*ducational models, institutional contexts, and policies in European higher education regarding electronic, or digital, literature were foregrounded in a series of activities centered at Blekinge Institute of Technology (BTH, Sweden) during the ELMCIP project. The activities were focused on an initial mapping of pedagogical efforts throughout Europe concerning electronic literature, led by the Principal Investigator (and author of this chapter) in collaboration with the BTH-based ELMCIP postdoctoral researcher. In addition, the BTH team, consisting of the Principal Investigator, Co-Investigator, postdoctoral researcher, and assistants, organized a themed workshop in 2011 that centered around the question of electronic, or digital, literature and pedagogy. This chapter will focus on the best practices that emerged out of that workshop, the research into pedagogical activities, and relevant published reports. The aim is to provide a basis for policy decisions in the field of education, the arts, and culture in Europe as we face the profound changes that the digital has brought about in these sectors.

DIGITAL LITERATURE AND PEDAGOGY WORKSHOP

During a three-day workshop in Karlskrona, Sweden (June 2011), invited teachers, researchers, and artists presented their experiences from teaching digital literary practice and theory from Europe, North America, and Australia. Leading up to the workshop and beyond it, the team at Blekinge Institute of Technology researched various institutions in Europe that include electronic literature or related digital artistic practices in their curriculum. The goal was to familiarize ourselves with the current state of teaching electronic literature in Europe. Further, the aim within the ELMCIP project was to understand how education enhances the creation of creative communities where the practice of electronic literature is taught and how educational models can help to develop and support literary and artistic practice in local environments, as well as across Europe.

The overall theme of the workshop was the examination of educational models of the study and practice of electronic literature, focused on the European context and drawing upon experience in the United States and Australia.

The invited pedagogues presented papers that ranged from addressing individual courses to presenting national concerns. There are still relatively few European examples of courses and programs that include electronic literature. Often, such courses exist in a diverse range of disciplinary contexts, and, thus, courses are informed by different theoretical and practical traditions. The presentations reflected upon the divergent landscape for teaching of electronic literature in Europe and elsewhere and, in so doing, presented some important lessons that can be taken from the level of the individual institutions into national and European guidelines for education.

The workshop presenters included: María Mencía (Kingston University, UK); Søren Bro Pold (Aarhus University, DK); Renée Turner (Piet Zwart Institute, NL); Jörgen Schäfer (University of Siegen, DE); Kate Pullinger (novelist, UK); Erling Björgvinsson (Malmö University, SE); Carolyn Guertin (University of Texas at Arlington, US); Serge Bouchardon (Université de Technologie de Compiègne, FR); Philippe Bootz (Université Paris 8 Vincennes Saint-Denis, FR), and Jay David Bolter (Georgia Institute of Technology, US). In addition, there were two roundtable discussions chaired by Principal Investigator Maria Engberg and Co-Investigator Talan Memmott (both Blekinge Institute of Technology) that included, in addition to some of the aforementioned presenters, Jerome Fletcher (University College Falmouth, UK), Joseph Tabbi (University of Illinois at Chicago, US), and Lissa Holloway-Attaway (Blekinge Institute of Technology). The presentations and the roundtable discussions touched upon a range of factors that determine the institutional, pedagogical, and creative dimensions of electronic literature in a learning context. While most examples were from tertiary education, examples from primary and secondary school education were presented as well.

A basic concern for the workshop as well as for some of the presenters was the presence of digital literature in education and the issue of disciplinary homes for e-lit in teaching and research. In his presentation, "In Search of Sustainability: Institutional and Curricular Limitations of Teaching Electronic Literature," Jörgen Schäfer (2011) posed the question of what is the state of teaching electronic literature in Germany, and, subsequently, what is its status as a subject within German literary studies? Schäfer presented a series of possible answers to those questions. The first was that electronic literature has become relatively invisible in recent years. The reason, Schäfer argued, is that German university structures

and disciplinary organizations do not easily allow for electronic literature to be included into disciplines such as *Germanistik* (mainly because of a lack of German e-lit works) or in the context of other national philologies (in part because of the relative invisibility of e-lit). Another, more pertinent issue that Schäfer raised is that of e-lit's "institutional in-between identity," borrowing a term from Roberto Simanowski (2010, 231-248). Schäfer agreed with Simanowski's (2010, 231-248) argument that there is a tension between the "supra-departmental nature" of e-lit and the existing structures of German universities. This situation, Schäfer argued, is one that extends beyond Germany, and, therefore, the issue of the institutional home for e-lit is a general one. He suggested that there are four main affiliations in an international context of research and teaching of e-lit. These affiliations then shape the methods and epistemological frameworks for teaching e-lit. They are, Schäfer posed: 1) literary studies; 2) communications or media studies; 3) art and design schools or creative writing programs; and 4) computer science departments. Schäfer's mapping of the teaching and research contexts for e-lit internationally serves as a useful distinction between the main disciplinary contexts for e-lit at present. Of course, other configurations depend on the various national university structures. In Germany, Schäfer continued, a useful bridge for allowing for interdisciplinary study of e-lit would be to "reanimate" the so-called *Allgemeine Literaturwissenschaft* (or "general study of literature") of the 1970s and 1980s in German universities. Another would be to conduct interdisciplinary programs within *Medienwissenschaft*, such as Schäfer did with colleagues in the collaborative research center *Medienumbrüche* (or "Media upheavals") at the University of Siegen, 2002-2010. Within this center, Schäfer and his colleague Peter Gendolla taught various e-lit courses for undergraduate and masters level students. In closing, Schäfer pointed out, however, that the realities of existing university structures still largely hinder the kinds of transdisciplinary intersections that e-lit as a topic of study demands. The solution to this issue is, Schäfer suggested, international collaborations and networks.

Søren Pold (2011) from Aarhus University described how he and his colleague had moved into a general curriculum in digital aesthetics and away from digital literature. Thus, at Aarhus University, teaching "electronic literature [is] embedded in a broader framework of aesthetics and interface aesthetics." The programs address broader issues of digital culture, such as which kind of interfaces, software, institutions, business models, and art forms digital culture supports

and what the relations between art, technology, and business are. In addition, the specificities of what amounts to new cultural industries and practices emerging in Web 2.0 require different models of analysis and teaching. Such concerns include, but are not limited to, the more specific concerns of digital literature. Pold also addressed a similar problem as Schäfer, which is the relative lack of interest in digital literature within literary studies departments. This is indeed a recurring problem and a concern across the countries that we studied in the ELMCIP project, which I will return to at the end of the essay.

Serge Bouchardon (2011) from Université de Technologie de Compiègne (FR) presented the PRECIP project (*PRatiques d'ECriture Interactive en Picardie*), which was conducted during 2009 to 2012 in collaboration with the Picardie region in France. The project aimed at analyzing and supporting the development of digital writing practices. In particular, the project explored how digital writing could be taught in secondary schools and universities. Fifteen researchers in four labs in France studied the specificities of digital writing in order to propose modalities for teaching digital writing through conceptualization of teaching models. They also conducted actual experiments in various teaching environments ranging from secondary school and university education to senior citizens engaged in lifelong learning activities. Finally, the project presented a series of recommendations for educational policy.

The research team started from the overall research question: can an understanding of the theoretical level of the digital and the analysis of creative practices—both requiring reflexivity—have an impact on the quality of digital writing practices? The project's scientific goal was to study the specificities of digital writing and outline skills that would need to be taught. A model of three levels of the digital was proposed: theoretical, applicative, and interpretative. The operational goal was to develop innovative writing practices for education and lifelong learning. The hypothesis was that a thorough understanding of the theoretical level of the digital provides the reflexivity needed to develop digital writing practices. Such a claim is based on the idea that digital writing indeed *is* a specific form of writing whose properties can be taught. The PRECIP project postulated that creative practices, in particular digital literary practices, provide suitable examples of digital writing that allow for reflexivity. In particular, digital literature provides a lens that reveals the tensions between the different levels of the digital (theoretical, applicative, and interpretative). In a series of experiments, the PRECIP

project explored different modes of digital writing such as hypertextual writing, multimedia writing, collaborative writing, and interactive writing. These modules were taught, for instance, at a secondary school in Crépy-en-Valois, at Paris 8 in a bachelor level course on digital culture, at a masters level course at the University of Amiens, and in so-called digital public spaces (community-based centers providing citizens access to digital technology as well as learning opportunities).

Also from France, Philippe Bootz (2011) from Université Paris 8 Vincennes Saint-Denis, presented a survey of teaching of digital literature in France: "From Literary Digital Creative Writing to Digital Literature Teaching in France: A Preliminary Survey." His survey mapped out the individual teachers and their activities in French learning environments from the late 1980s until the present day. Interviewing seven teachers in France who have been or are still active, Bootz asked questions about the context of the teaching and what materials and pedagogical methods were used. The main results indicated that teaching of digital literature happens in the context of courses devoted to a more general topic or as part of a creative writing course. The teaching generally used highly sophisticated writing software and therefore resulted in a series of post-course activities such as continuous seminars, writing activities, and publication of works. In addition, the teaching was most often closely linked to advances in research on digital literature. Many of the teachers are also prominent researchers and writers of digital literature in France such as Jean Clément, Jean-Pierre Balpe, Alexandra Saemmer, and Philippe Bootz himself. This is indeed common in the digital literature community internationally as well. One of the conclusions to be drawn from the survey, Bootz (2011) suggested, is that "the teaching of digital literature has a great deal of potential for dissemination in the teaching of creative writing where it would be very beneficial and well received."

A key component of the Karlskrona workshop was the creative practitioners' participation. A fair amount of teaching of digital literature and art is conducted by artists and writers in various teaching settings. It was paramount to the BTH study of educational practices in Europe to include their experiences in our research. Artists and writers were therefore invited to offer their experiences of teaching electronic literature, and one of the two panel discussions was devoted to the perspective of practitioners' experience of teaching digital literature. Kate Pullinger (2011), an author residing in the United Kingdom, presented the pedagogical communities that have become linked to her multimodal narrative work

Inanimate Alice (four episodes published between 2006 and 2008) with collaborator Chris Joseph. *Inanimate Alice* is taught in schools and universities, but the pedagogical communities have largely grown in primary and secondary schools, supported by teachers who see the work as an important teaching resource. Pullinger presented some of the student-made *Inanimate Alice*-inspired episodes that have been created in schools by young pupils all around the world. Numerous teachers in Australia and the United States, for instance, write blogs or entries on the *Inanimate Alice* Facebook page, relating the work that they do in bringing the issues of digital literacy into focus through the multimodal work. Readers are creating their own storylines, additional episodes, and are learning to express themselves differently by learning about multimodal narrative through *Inanimate Alice*. The communities and outputs appear on many different websites and blogs devoted to learning, such as Edmodo, a social learning platform. Working with Chris Joseph and Ian Harper, Pullinger has worked to facilitate the learning opportunities with *Inanimate Alice* by creating a teacher education pack, a booklet with starter activities, and curricular resources. The authors argue that the work addresses “government initiatives like the National Curriculum in England and Media Literacy outcomes in Canada which emphasize the important role technological skills play in all sorts of learning environments” and offers a way for teachers to integrate new media, or digital literacy, into the classroom (2005-2011). *Inanimate Alice*, with its still growing pedagogical communities, offers important insights for teachers and policy makers as to how digital literacy can be fostered. Reading and producing multimodal works are supported by the *Inanimate Alice* community as well as its authors through a series of writing tools, practices, and examples that carefully guide the readers into becoming confident makers.

Speaking from a media arts context, Renée Turner (2011) shared her experience of the institutional practices at the Piet Zwart Institute in Rotterdam, The Netherlands. From 2010 to 2011, Turner was the Course Director of the Master of Media Design and Communication program. Currently, she is the Director of the Piet Zwart Institute. Turner discussed the “legacy of intelligence” that the Institute has fostered throughout the years and the importance that the programs put on a combination of practice-based research methodologies and critical media theory. The aim is to support graduates whose “practice can move flexibly and fluently across a rapidly expanding field that continues to incorporate a range of hybrid practices” (Piet Zwart 2013). The curriculum at the Institute is characterized by

open and free culture. Open source and free software, wikis, and other highly collaborative, non-proprietary environments are central to the creative and learning atmosphere. Prototyping is a core part of the curriculum. They work with a large network of guest lecturers and other outside participants in the education as well as public projects and lectures that form part of outreach activities. Turner's presentation put emphasis on a shared problem of programs that seek to combine theory and practice. While many of the students at the Piet Zwart Institute Media Design and Communication program were tuned into network culture, not all were experienced programmers. Regular faculty continue to struggle to reconcile divergent student backgrounds and expectations as to how media literacy, and specifically coding, should be addressed within the program. Rather than requiring prerequisite programming knowledge, the program has chosen to focus on bringing different talents into the media arts environment so that students with various artistic and expressive talents and interests can learn from and with each other. This kind of environment of experimentation fosters cultural and technological innovation, Turner argued.

Equally committed to practice as central to teaching activities was María Mencía (2011), a practitioner, teacher, and researcher from Kingston University in London (UK) who presented her 2005 project "Thinking through Practice," funded by the *Arts and Humanities Research Council* (AHRC). Mencía's work as an artist and a teacher centers on the practitioner's perspective on digital creative practices. Mencía teaches in Kingston University's Media and Cultural Studies (BA) program. In her presentation, Mencía reflected on the values and challenges of collaborative work models as well as the challenges of choosing the proper technological environment in order to fully instantiate an artistic concept. Primarily, she discussed practice-led research, in particular how the research methodologies are taught at university level and the benefits of practice-led or practice-based methods for research. In her own research as well as in her work as a teacher, prototyping and experimentation as a process of discovery are central. Mencía underscored emergent processes of learning technical skills that can accompany conceptual or theoretical insights, all reached through practice.

Carolyn Guertin (2011; The University of Texas at Arlington) offered her insights from teaching creative writing in the United States. She shared her experiences from teaching a wide range of students in creative writing and digital narrative. Many of the students, mostly at the graduate level, had poor computing

skills and came from low income families, and, therefore, access to computers had been a challenge for their development. This problem was addressed when Guertin set in place a tech-loan program to facilitate learning in her courses. Guertin described the difficulties of helping students to understand how to bring writing, visual elements, and code together. While students often could improve in each of the skills, the challenge lay primarily in teaching them the properties of multimodal literacy such as an awareness of interface and interaction and the understanding of narrative as “mapping” in a spatial sense. Guertin’s observations correspond with several of the workshop presenters who each were keenly aware of the importance of multimodal literacy skills for today’s communication environment. Equally important is the realization that digital literature, often multimodal in nature, can provide a fruitful field for exploring what it means to read and write, make images, code, and understand sonic expressions, etc.

Erling Björgvinsson from Malmö University and the MEDEA lab presented a course project involving editors of *Pequod* literary magazine, poets, interaction design masters students, and teachers. The project aimed at exploring different publication models for magazines in a changing media landscape. The result was a host of media productions evolving from a collaboration between the poets, the interaction between students and teachers, and the editors of the magazine. Björgvinsson discussed the complex negotiations of learning and communication throughout the production process. Björgvinsson summarized the outcomes of the project as a whole as knowledge gains in “how to work with multiple stakeholders and communicate between them; how to make up a language to bridge the gap between designer and client/poet; and, how meaning shifts depending on context and how materials are mixed, rather than focusing on usability issues.” Similar to the project that Bouchardon reported on, this was one in which literature became a lens through which students that study other topics than writing or literature could gain important learning insights. Particularly, since the project is “live,” the students gain knowledge on creative processes and aspects of particular languages of new media.

In addition to the experiences of individual teachers and pedagogues, we were interested in learning about curricular development at the university level. In particular, we sought to learn about how and for what learning purposes digital literature, digital writing, or literary arts that in some capacity use digital technology have been included in programs in cycle one or two at universities in Europe

and elsewhere in the world. The invited speakers (representing programs in the humanities and arts) in the workshop¹¹ discussed specific programs that devote substantial parts of their curriculum to digital literary arts in some form.

Scott Rettberg presented two models of integrating electronic literature into curricula: first, the New Media Studies track he developed within a literature program at the Richard Stockton College of New Jersey and, second, the broader Digital Culture program at the University of Bergen in Norway. Rettberg discussed the challenges and affordances of the two different situations: first, involving students trained within a traditional literary curriculum who sometimes had to overcome resistance to the idea that computational environments could also be literary environments and, second, involving students who were well-versed in encountering the computer as a device and social media environment but who might not have had as rich a familiarity with literary history. He also discussed differences in cultural contexts between the American and Scandinavian educational systems and their impacts on how electronic literature could be taught. Finally, he addressed the question of how to balance scholarly and theoretical work with creative and practical work in electronic literature courses.

Jerome Fletcher discussed the MA program in Performance Writing at University College Falmouth. The program offers a groundbreaking example of pedagogical collaboration between a leading arts center and a university. Arnolfini in Bristol, one of Europe's leading contemporary art and performance venues, houses the interdisciplinary MA, thus facilitating a strong focus on professional practice in an arts venue, rather than in the university. The program foregrounds research, theoretical inquiry, and self-reflective commentary, which are all embedded in practice-based teaching.

Lissa Holloway-Attaway discussed the curriculum of the Literature, Culture, and Digital Media cycle one program at Blekinge Institute of Technology (2003-2012). Like many programs offering courses in digital literature and writing, it grew out of an English department that offered courses in various literary subjects. BTH has long had a profile in Applied IT, and, therefore, over time the courses included various aspects related to media, digital technology, and the changing concept of literacy. The evaluation of English in Sweden by the then

11 Scott Rettberg (University of Bergen, NO); Jerome Fletcher (University College Falmouth, UK); Lissa Holloway-Attaway (Blekinge Institute of Technology); and Jörgen Schäfer (University of Siegen, DE)

Swedish National Agency for Higher Education praised the interdisciplinary and innovative direction that the program evidenced. Answering to continuous social and cultural changes, the program was replaced by the Digital Culture and Communication program in 2012. Both programs foreground the importance of creative and critical practice as a process of learning that accompanies and fosters students' development of critical and analytical skills that are suited for digital culture. Digital literature figures in the program both as a creative practice to be studied in its own right as well as a heuristic tool to explore digital multimodal writing. As Holloway-Attaway also pointed out, the programs pushed at the very notion of what disciplinarity means in a changing university world. It became clear that English as a discipline, defined according to Swedish university regulations and traditions, could no longer sustain the need of a much broader methodological and content-based approach to contemporary culture. Consequently, the subject of Digital Culture was established at BTH during the spring of 2010, and the new cycle one program at BTH offers a Bachelor of Science in Digital Culture.

The direct outcomes from the workshop included, among others, video documentation and additional material published in the ELMCIP Anthology of European Electronic Literature and in the ELMCIP Knowledge Base. They form part of a continuously growing resource of teaching materials as well as discussions about pedagogical issues concerning digital writing. During the workshop, I worked with David Prater, the postdoctoral researcher working on the project, to interview several of the participants about their teaching experiences. We asked about particular moments of revelation or insight that have informed their thinking about pedagogy and digital literature as teachers or as researchers. The answers formed part of the material for a critical article, published in *TEXT Journal of Writing and Writing Courses* (Engberg and Prater 2012). The article, "Flash Points: Reading Electronic Literature as a Metaphor for Creativity," explores the possibilities suggested by the idea of the "flash point" (Hayles 2008) as a metaphor for creativity that can inform teaching models. We reflect on our own teaching practice as well as on our theoretical discussions about the self-reflexive nature of some digital literary works. The foregrounding of materiality and form in those works can be reflected back into a process of learning by reading and creating that fosters creativity and multimodal literacy skills. Furthermore, as several of the workshop participants also noted, collaboration, learning

digital media skills through experimentation and prototyping, and extended, networked creative processes point to some of the particularities of learning in and with digital media. These particularities render ineffective many traditional pedagogical models that are now used in universities, demanding instead that the teacher facilitates cooperative learning environments that also include the teacher in the learning process.

The teaching of digital literature mirrors the fundamental changes in the humanities and arts—and across the university as a whole—in response to phenomena such as globalization and digitization. At the workshop in Karlskrona, Jay David Bolter (Georgia Institute of Technology and, at the time, Guest Professor at Blekinge Institute of Technology) spoke about the profound impact on university structures and disciplines of digitization. Bolter discussed the contexts for teaching literature, arguing that there is a wide repertoire of interpretive methods: close reading, semiotic analysis, cultural studies (in various forms), and so forth. While there have been changes concerning theoretical models and a widening of study objects in literary studies to include other cultural products, overall, Bolter argued, literary studies is still very text-based. Either you study texts and write about them (as a student or a researcher), or you study other media forms *as* texts and then produce texts about them. Bolter foregrounded the fact that many of the teachers, practitioners, and students within the field of digital literature produce new forms or use new techniques for analysis but that this highly multimodal production is not reflective of literary studies at large, despite recent pushes for what is sometimes called digital humanities. In the US, and in Europe, text consumption and production really still is the understanding of what constitutes a literary education.

Besides literary studies, another key context for digital literature can be found in media studies, digital media, or digital culture studies. Bolter's department, now called the School of Literature, Media and Communication, is representative of many similar departments that now integrate digital literary arts. It started as a traditional English department that did service courses for the rest of Georgia Institute of Technology. Communication, literary, and film studies existed within the English program, which were later joined by a science and literature section. Finally, digital media made its mark on the department, which today has developed advanced degrees in digital media. The archaeological layers of the department Bolter describes are similar to what can be found in depart-

ments throughout Europe, the United States, and elsewhere. The issue of where the disciplinary home of digital literature can be found thus becomes apparent. Simanowski (2010, 235) argues that digital literature “is still in search of an academic discipline that understands it as its own genuine subject of research.” For Bolter, the answer is to not subsume digital literature within an academic discipline but rather to integrate a series of creative forms (games, narrative, film, etc.) into digital media studies. This is similar to the current approach of departments such as my own at Blekinge Institute of Technology (where digital culture is the umbrella discipline) and the Digital Culture program of the Department of Linguistic, Literary, and Aesthetic Studies at the University of Bergen, to mention just two of the ELMCIP partners.

Interestingly, despite the massive public interest in so-called MOOCs (Massive Open Online Courses) at the time of writing this essay, almost without exception, the phenomenon of online education rarely entered into the conversations and presentations at the workshop. In the electronic literature community, writ large, there are some interesting projects and artistic interventions into online teaching. There are many experimental online alternatives to traditional education; one is the UnderAcademy College which was started by Talan Memmott, ELMCIP Co-Investigator at BTH. It was characterized in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* blog—Wired Campus—as a way to re-envision how liberal arts education is delivered. More centrally to the ELMCIP project activities, it is clear that the project partners and the digital literature teaching community internationally often represent various ways in which to re-envision, change, and challenge existing structures for education.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

To conclude, on the basis of the BTH-led activities on issues related to pedagogy and digital literature, we wish to offer some recommendations for policy makers, educational institutions, and organizations, as well as for individual pedagogues and teachers. It is already clear that the teaching of digital literature in Europe, and elsewhere, happens across disciplinary boundaries and in varied contexts, from media studies, literary studies, and digital culture studies to arts, media technology, and performance. The inclusion of digital literature in university curricula serves as a lens to new methods of learning, to the inclusion of practice-based teaching models in theoretical contexts, to a broadening of what is consid-

ered media arts and creative writing, and to the wider issue of changing literacies in a digital media age. Quite clearly, these are all fundamental shifts to school and university education that are ongoing, profound, and with great impact for future settings for learning.

The networked teaching and research communities that support and disseminate digital literary arts at present can serve as a model for how interdisciplinary, international, and cross-methodological collaboration can function. Based on our research, it is clear the rigidities of national educational disciplinary structures, different in each country, nevertheless hinder the development of new curricular models. Furthermore, existing structures fail to take into account the multimodal and multidisciplinary nature of most digital work. Digital literature as a networked creative community and as a teaching community therefore exposes some of the rigidities of national constructions of university examinations, disciplinary programs, or structures for hiring and tenure that are not able to fully recognize cross-disciplinary work.

Beyond educational concerns, digital literature can also serve as a model for how to address contemporary digital culture as well as the challenges for education to address the digital skills needed for current and future job market, which the European Commission has identified as one of the key areas for Europe's 2020 agenda (an EU strategy to deliver smart, sustainable, and inclusive growth for the future). A part of the Europe 2020 strategy is *Creative Europe*, the EU program for Europe's cultural and creative sectors for 2014-2020. The program foregrounds the digital age and globalization as key factors that cultural and creative sectors must engage with. The digital shift is seen as a challenge and a tremendous opportunity which changes how "cultural goods are made, managed, disseminated, accessed, consumed and monetized." Furthermore,

this change and the continually evolving technology requires a massive adjustment across Europe by much of the cultural and creative sectors and the acquisition of new knowhow—which is currently very limited and dispersed—in terms of how to promote cultural works and engage with new audiences in the digital age ("Impact Assessment" 2011).

As Europe 2020 initiatives are shaped—such as the "Digital Agenda for Europe-European Commission" (2013) which foregrounds both digital skills as a key area for further efforts and educational efforts in Europe 2020 that emphasize the importance of digital literacy ("Agenda" 2010)—it is clear that a sophisticated

understanding of digital literacies will be needed in the coming European educational efforts to shift toward education for new skills and jobs. In the effort of procuring best practice examples, digital literature as a networked international community that spans creative and educational communities can provide key insights into the processes of teaching digital literacies at a high level. In addition, the understanding of digital media as a key creative platform, not just an arena for technical innovation, is paramount for a Europe that desires to compete in the new global economies in the coming decades. In addition, ELMCIP, as a research project and an example of how research activities and networks function in a global and networked age, can serve as a model for restructuring of universities that still remain locked into disciplinary structures that do not foster cultural innovation.

While the ELMCIP project concludes its HERA-funded activities in June 2013, the researchers will continue to share and build on the knowledge and models that we have mapped out as well as on our own pedagogical practice. Among the planned activities is participation in the E-Poetry festival in London, June 2013, during which Engberg and Memmott will both present at a special seminar on digital literature and pedagogy. Several of the members of the ELMCIP project are also members of the Nordic Digital Culture Network which started its activities in 2009. It is primarily devoted to teaching and pedagogy through organizing summer seminars for students, sharing teaching resources, and facilitating teacher and student exchanges among the partner universities. Some researchers in the ELMCIP project are also active as teachers in the Erasmus European Digital Literature Intensive Program at the Complutense University in Madrid, Spain. There are also several other networked activities in the realm of teaching and pedagogy among the ELMCIP partners, connecting to other parties in Europe and the rest of the world. The ELMCIP Knowledge Base will continue to be a resource that documents and sustains these networks beyond the HERA grant activities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- “Agenda for New Skills and Jobs: A European Contribution towards Full Employment, An.” 2010. Strasbourg, France. The commission to the European parliament, the council, the European economic and social committee and the committee of the regions.
- Björgvinsson, Erling. 2011. “Poetic Mediation across Practices and Institutions: Sailing with Pequod together with Poets and Interaction Designers.” Paper presented at ELMCIP Electronic Literature and Pedagogy Workshop, Karlskrona, Sweden.
- Bootz, Philippe. 2011. “From Literary Digital Creative Writing to Digital Literature Teaching in France: A Preliminary Survey.” Paper presented at ELMCIP Electronic Literature and Pedagogy Workshop, Karlskrona, Sweden.
- Bouchardon, Serge. 2011. “Teaching Digital Writing through Digital Literature—Case Studies in Schools, Universities and Digital Public Spaces.” Paper presented at ELMCIP Electronic Literature and Pedagogy Workshop, Karlskrona, Sweden.
- “Commission Staff Working Paper Impact Assessment.” 2011. DG Education and Culture. Brussels, European Commission.
- “Digital Agenda for Europe-European Commission.” 2013. <<http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/digital-agenda-europe>>.
- Engberg, Maria, and David Prater. 2012. “Flash points: Reading Electronic Literature as a Metaphor for Creativity.” *TEXT: Journal of Writing and Writing Courses* April.
- Guertin, Carolyn. 2011. “Seeing Story and Mapping Narrative.” Paper presented at ELMCIP Electronic Literature and Pedagogy Workshop, Karlskrona, Sweden.
- Hayles, N. Katherine. 2008. *Electronic Literature: New Horizons for the Literary*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Mencía, Maria. 2011. “Thinking through Practice.” Paper presented at ELMCIP Electronic Literature and Pedagogy Workshop, Karlskrona, Sweden.
- Piet Zwart. 2013. “Master Media Design and Communication.” Accessed January 12, 2013. <<http://pzwart.wdka.nl/media-design/>>.
- Pold, Søren Bro. 2011. “Electronic Literature as Interface Criticism.” Paper presented at ELMCIP Electronic Literature and Pedagogy Workshop, Karlskrona, Sweden.

- Pullinger, Kate. 2005-2011. "Teach with Alice." Accessed January 12, 2013. <<http://www.inanimatealice.com/teach.html>>.
- . 2011. "Inanimate Alice: a Pedagogical Community." Paper presented at ELMCIP Electronic Literature and Pedagogy Workshop, Karlskrona, Sweden.
- Schäfer, Jürgen. 2011. "In Search of Sustainability: Institutional and Curricular Limitations of Teaching Electronic Literature." Paper presented at ELMCIP Electronic Literature and Pedagogy Workshop, Karlskrona, Sweden.
- Simanowski, Roberto. 2010. "Teaching Digital Literature: Didactic and Institutional Aspects." *Reading Moving Letters: Digital Literature in Research and Teaching. A Handbook*, edited by Roberto Simanowski, Jürgen Schäfer, and Peter Gendolla. Transcript Verlag.
- Turner, Renée. 2011. "Feral Disciplines & Hybrid Codes." Paper presented at ELMCIP Electronic Literature and Pedagogy Workshop, Karlskrona, Sweden.