

ARTICLE

Literary responses in Spanish adolescents: Adaptation, validation, and analysis of the Literary Response Questionnaire

Diana Muela-Bermejo¹  | Irene Mendoza-Cercadillo²  | Lucía Hernández-Heras¹ 

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Spanish adolescent literary education from the Reading Responses paradigm

The exploration of Literary Responses in international education has flourished as a prominent field of research since the late 20th century. This construct has been determined by the paradigm shift in literary education, which has questioned learning centered on the historical-social and biographical context of the author, giving way to formalist and structuralist conceptualizations, focused on the study of the text and its components. Since the 1970s, reception theory (based on the conceptions of Jauss, Iser, Gadamer, or Rosenblatt) has reoriented its focus to the reader, delving into how individuals construct the meaning of a text and the perspectives they embrace during the act of reading.

In Spain, the transition from biographical-contextual and structuralist approaches to literary education toward pedagogical methods centered on the reader's responses has faced a delay in its incorporation into the curriculum. The crisis of the so-called "traditional model" of teaching literature (Rodríguez Almodóvar, 1990) has been evident since the 1990s (Núñez Delgado, 2000), but at that time it had not yet been supplanted by a new educational approach centered on the reader (Colomer, 1991).

As a possible response to this crisis, it was proposed that the development of a specific *literary competence* be encouraged in the curriculum (Mendoza, 2010) that would regulate literary conventions and the reader's relationship with them (Colomer, 1991). Hand in hand, the need to train competent readers demanded the consolidation of reading habits, a "titanic" task for some (Rodríguez Almodóvar, 1990, p. 49) because literature

had lost weight, as a form of leisure, in the face of audiovisual culture. The verbal sign occupied a secondary place in favor of the globalization of the message and nonverbal reading procedures (Núñez Delgado, 2000) and young adults in Spain showed disdain for literature as a meaningful experience (López Valero, 1998).

Therefore, the didactics of literature began to defend an experiential approach to literary reading that would activate in the reader the construction of meaning through intuition, experience, and previous knowledge (Mendoza, 2010), in addition to stimulating hypertextual reading (Núñez Delgado, 2000). Within the framework of the LOGSE curriculum, the objective was to open literary education not only toward the internalization of concepts—up to that moment, literary history and stylistic resources—but also toward the consideration of reading attitudes and their consequences in reading habits, since "contact with the text must produce pleasure" (López Valero, 1998, p. 10). This new approach generated the need to analyze the motives, preferences, and tastes of Spanish readers, in order to select texts appropriately, taking into account the empathic identification with the characters and the fusion with the stories (Núñez Delgado, 2000).

Thus, at the beginning of the 21st century—with the advent of the new education curriculum LOE (Organic Law of Education)—the way was opened toward reflection on Literary Responses in Spain, with the aim of renewing, based on the results of empirical research, what were considered "worn-out and ineffective practices" in the classroom (Mata & Villarrubia, 2011). Using mainly qualitative methods (Margallo, 2013), Spanish educational research sought to collect children's reading responses in order to better understand how they experienced literature and thus reinforce their reading habits. The main line of research was the analysis of responses to picturebooks, at preschool

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.

© 2024 The Authors. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy* published by Wiley Periodicals LLC on behalf of International Literacy Association.

and primary school levels (Barreu & Dueñas, 2018; Colomer & Fittipaldi, 2012; Colomer & Margallo, 2013; Ruiz-Domínguez, 2014; or Colón & Tabernero, 2018). However, there is a significant literature gap in secondary education, especially in quantitative methods, where it is still a barren land.

Since then, and echoing this research, the Spanish curriculum advocates a dual perspective: making reading a source of pleasure and personal enrichment and getting adolescents to understand literary texts using basic knowledge about the conventions of each genre. Thus, *hyperconceptualization* is avoided and teachers and departments are entrusted with the creation of projects and practices that motivate students toward literary reading (Mata & Villarrubia, 2011) focused on the reader (Hernández Santamaría & De la Colina, 2023). The common horizon is the conception of the literary text as a mode of expression among other possible ones in people's lives (Lomas, 2023) so that readers understand its meaning through personal experiences that propitiate its fusion with fiction (Margallo & Munita, 2023). Nevertheless, the coexistence of methodological approaches (historicist-receptionist) seems to be defended in recent years, since it opens up this dual contextual and personal perspective of reader responses (Morales Lomas, 2023).

For this reason, we need new large-scale research to help explain how adolescents value a literary text, what type of reading responses they reflect, whether there are significant differences between groups or gender, and whether these responses can help to guide classroom practices that improve reading habits.

Instruments for the evaluation of Reading Responses: The LRQ questionnaire at the international context

Given the absence of instruments to evaluate the literary responses of adolescents in Spain (in contrast to the international context), it is essential to validate questionnaires with high replicability that can be used to answer the questions raised in the previous section. The aim is thus to describe the reading activities of young adults, considering them competent to provide valid descriptions of their experiences through psychometric tests (Miall & Kuiken, 1995; Van Schooten et al., 2001; Van Schooten & De Gloppe, 2003).

In the 1970s to 80s, Hynds (1985), Miall (1987), and Purves (1973) investigated the relationship between cognitive performance and the complexity of reading responses using psychometric tests, concluding that interpretation and comprehension were inseparable parts of the reading ability (Purves, 1973). Moreover, cognitive ability predisposed readers to a deeper perception of characters and their literary responses

(Hynds, 1985), but few questionnaires had been applied to ordinary readers (Van Schooten et al., 2001).

Thus, Miall and Kuiken (1995) developed one of the most widely used instruments for the analysis of literary responses: the *Literary Response Questionnaire* (LRQ), in the context of psychology studies at the University of Alberta (Canada). This instrument, created to facilitate the understanding of the variety of responses rather than to identify literary competence (Miall & Kuiken, 1995), makes it possible to measure differences among readers in their perception of texts. These researchers found low levels of literary interest on the part of their students, which apparently had little to do with teaching strategy and gender (except in Leisure Escape, in favor of females).

Subsequently, the LRQ has undergone adaptation and validation in various international contexts, demonstrating its high replicability. These adaptations have also aimed to enhance reading behavior, *indirectly* assessing the reader's values and motives for reading, as suggested by Miall and Kuiken (1995).

In the Dutch context, Van Schooten et al. (2001) translated and validated the LRQ for a younger audience (13–15 years) to assess the reading attitudes of adolescents. The study found that as students advanced through secondary school, their interest in reading decreased. Furthermore, they identified family background and socioeconomic status as the primary influencing variables, with higher income levels being linked to improved academic performance in literature.

In 2011, the LRQ was adapted to the Japanese context by Osanai and Okada, targeting an older age range of 9–17 years. Their sample predominantly consisted of females, and their factor analysis led to the proposal of a different structure, the LRQ-J. Their study concluded that mental health could be linked to literary responses, with no significant gender differences except in the aspect of Concern with the Author, where males showed a slight advantage. More recently, Nenadić and Oljača (2019) translated and validated the original LRQ into Serbian and complemented it with their new Receptiveness to Literature Questionnaire (UPK). Their aim was to classify responses into reader types, but their results raised questions about whether the LRQ and UPK could reliably differentiate between expert and nonexpert readers. To explore this, they considered readers with varying levels of receptivity, including those who do not enjoy reading and those who read frequently (Nenadić & Oljača, 2019).

Therefore, the outcomes of implementing the LRQ in an international context underscore two key issues. The first refers to the validity and high replicability of the test for analyzing the reading responses of both university readers (Miall & Kuiken, 1995; Nenadić & Oljača, 2019; Osanai & Okada, 2011) and adolescents (Van Gelderen et al., 2011), although it raised doubts in discerning, in the same sample, between expert and

nonexpert readers (Nenadić & Oljača, 2019). Second, it is observed that among the variables analyzed using the LRQ, gender and reading habits appear to yield contentious results, while lower socioeconomic status seems to have a detrimental impact on the depth of reading responses.

Consequently, our research starts, at the theoretical level, from the Reading Responses paradigm in the context of contemporary literary education, particularly within fiction readings. This paradigm revolves around the reader's autonomous definition of emotional and experiential responses, becoming the central element in the reading process. Simultaneously, it reflects the evolution of the Spanish literacy curriculum, shifting from a traditional focus on the author and text to a reader-centric approach for constructing meaning from literary texts. From an analytical standpoint, we employ a specialized measurement tool to delve into the reading experience through the prism of the reader's self-concept. The LRQ questionnaire, acknowledged and utilized internationally, is deployed for this purpose. Utilizing this tool enables us to assess the most pertinent variables within the Spanish context, capturing the literary responses of 14- to 15-year-old Spanish students who find themselves amidst the dynamic landscape of this paradigm shift in literary education.

Focus and objectives of this research

As explained in the theoretical framework, the latest Spanish educational curriculum LOMLOE (Organic Law 3/2020, of December 29, amending Organic Law 2/2006, of May 3, on Education) attempts to carry out the transformation of adolescent literary education based on reading responses. However, data from international reports show that it still does not achieve favorable results. According to PISA (2018), the average of Spanish adolescents in the reading test is significantly lower than that of the OECD and Europe, with better scores for the female gender and for students of higher socioeconomic status. These data are consistent with the study by the Spanish Federation of Publishers' Guilds (SFPG, 2021), which concludes that girls read more in their free time and in any type of format, and with those of Pérez Parejo et al. (2019) and Serna et al. (2017), who observe differences in reading habits in Spain in favor of females in contexts other than secondary education (university and school libraries). Specifically, students in the Aragon region present the fourth lowest reading enjoyment index in Spain, with significant differences according to gender and socioeconomic level similar to those of PISA and SFPG.

In light of the theoretical framework reviewed above and the data in these reports, our objective was to assess the replicability of the LRQ within a sample of Spanish adolescents and to determine the significance

of variables previously studied (gender, socioeconomic status, and reading habits) within our context. In doing so, we aimed to provide the educational community with a validated LRQ in our language and an analysis of the literary responses of 14- to 15-year-olds within our educational framework. In addition to these variables, we introduce one that has not been explored in previous research: pupils' enrollment in bilingual or monolingual pathways. Current educational legislation in Spain offers secondary school students the option of enrolling in a bilingual pathway (mainly English–Spanish) or in a monolingual pathway taught only in Spanish. Previous research has shown significant disparities between these two routes in terms of academic performance (Lahuerta Martínez, 2017; Madrid & Corral, 2018) and students' positive disposition toward learning, so some teachers consider it better to make bilingual teaching optional (Ardura & Senra-Silva, 2023). Therefore, we aim to examine whether these disparities extend to the literary responses provided by adolescents when using the LRQ.

In summary, the objectives of our research are as follows:

Obj. 1: To translate and cross-culturally adapt the LRQ questionnaire to Spanish in order to offer a reliable instrument for the analysis of adolescent literary responses.

Obj. 2: To factorially validate the LRQ questionnaire and measure its internal consistency in Spanish students aged 14–15 years.

Obj. 3: To analyze the responses of Spanish adolescents and compare the means obtained according to gender, socioeconomic status, bilingual or monolingual pathway, and the number of books read per year.

METHOD

Context and description of the sample

The study was carried out in the city of Saragossa (capital of Aragon, Spain). The questionnaire was sent to all the management teams of the public high schools, either through a Google form or through a paper copy (depending on how it was required by the center) together with the text explaining the research designed, its objectives, and compliance with the ethical code. It guaranteed the anonymous use of the data for purely research purposes, in accordance with Law 3/2018, of December 5, on Personal Data Protection and guarantee of digital rights and with Regulation 2016/679, RGPD. The management teams distributed them to the students, except in cases where they did not have family authorization to do so and decided not to participate. Four hundred

fifty students responded, but the final sample was formed by 413 ($n=413$), since we eliminated incomplete answers and those who did not accept the publication of the results.

To calculate the sample size required for representativeness, we followed the formula described by Corral et al. (2015, p. 154) for known and finite populations. With a confidence level of 95% and a maximum permissible error of 5%, at least 349 students were required, since the population of Saragossa students aged 14/15 years (3rd ESO) in 2022–2023 amounted to 3883, according to data from the IAEST (Aragonese Institute of Statistics). Our sample is therefore considered representative of the chosen population.

Of this final sample, 47.2% were boys and 52.8% were girls; 45.5% enrolled in a non-bilingual pathway, whereas 54.5% enrolled in a bilingual pathway. In terms of reading frequency, 28.6% of the students did not read any book per year; 49.6% read between one and four, and 21.8% read more than five. Finally, the lowest average gross per capita income in the area is 21950€, while the highest is 50018€ and the average is 29928€.

Instrument

The initial LRQ consisted of seven factors validated by factor analysis: Leisure Scape, Story-driven Reading, Insight, Empathy, Concern with Author, Imagery Vividness, and Rejecting Literary Values (with their meanings developed in Miall & Kuiken, 1995, p. 4 and collected in Annex III, [Supporting Information](#)). It contained 68 indicators, whose design was based on items from other questionnaires (Purves, 1973—LTIM and TIM—Allerup, 1985; Tellegen & Coppejans, 1991; Tobin, 1986) and from studies of responses to open-ended questions (Jacobsen, 1982 and Dickerson, 1988; in Miall & Kuiken, 1995, pp. 2–3). Items were rated using a five-point Likert scale, where 1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree. Their factor analysis further revealed the existence of two superordinate factors: “Experiencing” (Empathy, Imagery Vividness, and Leisure Escape) and “Literal comprehension” (Story-driven Reading and Rejecting Literary Values). These authors also confirmed correlationally the psychological significance of the scales and demonstrated their high internal consistency (Miall & Kuiken, 1995, p. 9).

Following this, Van Schooten et al. (2001) undertook the translation, adaptation, and validation of the LRQ for a group of Dutch students aged 13–15 years. This involved simplifying the phrasing of specific items, employing confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for validation, and evaluating its internal consistency, all of which yielded excellent results. The variables

studied were gender, mother tongue, number of Dutch classes per week, school size, school library availability, and teacher education level. The first-order factorization of Miall and Kuiken (1995) was confirmed in the Dutch study, but the second-order factorization did not achieve satisfactory results, so they regrouped the factors into Trance (Story-driven Reading, Leisure Escape, Empathy, and Imagery Vividness) and Literary Interpretation (Insight, Concern with Author, and Rejecting Literary Values), with significant factor loadings (except for the Rejecting factor, with moderate loading).

For this study, the LRQ version for adolescents by Van Schooten et al. (2001) was translated into Spanish and subsequently validated, since we were interested in analyzing this same population in our country. We used the Beaton et al. (2000) protocol for the translation and cultural adaptation of all the items, with two direct reported translations T1 and T2, one consensus translation T12, two back translations BT1 and BT2, and one common translation T12' agreed upon by the translators and reviewed by a committee of experts. This version was distributed to a small sample of 20 students, who confirmed the readability and accessibility of the questionnaire. The final version was distributed to the participants and is attached as Annex I ([Supporting Information](#)). Then, factorial validation was conducted through exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and CFA, along with an analysis of internal consistency, and the corresponding data are presented below.

Data analysis

To validate the scale, a factor analysis (EFA and CFA) was performed after checking the assumptions of normality, linearity, and absence of multicollinearity in the data. All indicators showed a distribution close to normality, with skewness and kurtosis values within the threshold ± 2 . The matrix scatter plots and the bivariate correlations between items, below 0.90, showed linearity and absence of multicollinearity. Therefore, all indicators were considered suitable to be part of the validation process.

Principal axis factorization was used as the factor extraction method. Respecting the rotation method performed by Miall and Kuiken (1995) and Van Schooten et al. (2001), varimax was used. It was also decided to eliminate indicators with coefficients below 0.30 and communalities below 0.40.

Regarding the CFA (conducted using R software), the model fit was calculated using the following criteria (Hu & Bentler, 1995): TLI–NNFI values close to 0.90 (Byrne, 2001), CFI values above 0.90 (McDonald & Ho, 2002), AGFI and GFI values above 0.95, and SRMS values below 0.08 (Byrne, 2001) were considered

TABLE 1 Fit indices of the tested models.

	TLI–NFI	IFC	GFI	AGFI	SRMR	RSMEA
First-order factorization	0.982	0.983	0.980	0.979	0.063	0.063
Second-order factorization based on Miall and Kuiken (1995)	0.992	0.995	0.998	0.99	0.052	5.607
Second-order factorization based on Van Schooten et al. (2001)	0.91	0.923	0.883	0.885	0.093	0.190
Second-order factorization based on EFA	0.87	0.899	0.911	0.912	0.098	0.160

Abbreviation: EFA, exploratory factor analysis.

indicators of good fit. In addition, Cronbach's α coefficient was used to calculate the reliability of the scale and of each factor.

In the analysis of the results, parametric tests were utilized, considering that, in accordance with the central limit theorem, when the sample consists of hundreds of observations the distribution tends to approximate normality (Altman, 1995; Pardo & San Martín, 2014). However, the stem-and-leaf plots and histograms corroborated this assumption, as did the skewness and kurtosis values of the factors, which fell within the range of ± 1 (Mishra et al., 2019). The dichotomous variables (bilingual pathway and gender) were subjected to analysis using Student's *t*-test for independent samples involving two groups. Prior to this analysis, the equality of variances in the respective populations was examined using Levene's test. In instances where equal variances were not confirmed, the *t*-statistic was applied.

One-factor ANOVA (or its Brown Forsythe variant) was used to observe differences in means according to the variable books read per year. To establish the groups between which differences were found, Bonferroni and Games Howell post hoc tests were applied, as appropriate. To calculate the relationship between the variables age and socioeconomic status with the scale factors, correlations were established using Pearson's statistic. The effect size was calculated for each operation, considering the criterion values provided by López-Martín and Ardura (2022).

RESULTS

Exploratory factor analysis

To validate the appropriateness of conducting the EFA, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test (KMO) (0.899) and Bartlett's test of sphericity ($\chi^2_{2211} = 7532.61$; $p < 0.001$) yielded optimal results. As for the number of factors, since a deductive process was followed, the Kaiser criterion was discarded. The seven-factor structure was directly tested and confirmed by this statistical procedure, albeit with three minor variations (Annex IV, [Supporting Information](#)). The I2 indicator, which in the three questionnaires cited above is part of the dimension

Leisure Escape, became part of the factor Story-driven Reading. For its part, the I51 indicator, initially in the factor Imagery Vividness, should, according to the factor analysis, be included in the dimension Empathy. In the same way, the FEA forced the elimination of I61 because it had a communality < 0.40 and a factor loading < 0.30 . This distribution explains 52.69% of the variance.

In addition, following the models of Miall and Kuiken (1995) and Van Schooten et al. (2001), a second-order factorization was tested that did not match any of the structures of the previous validations, as was the case of Nenadić and Oljača (2019). The bifactor structure extracted by the EFA, which yielded a KMO of 0.843, grouped the factors Insight, Leisure Escape, Concern with Author, Empathy, Story-driven Reading, and Imagery Vividness into one factor and Rejecting Literary Values into another.

Confirmatory factor analysis

Initially, the first-order structure extracted by EFA was tested, which generated outstanding indices. Next, although EFA had proposed another structure, the second-order factorizations proposed by Miall and Kuiken (1995) and Van Schooten et al. (2001) were also subjected to unweighted least squares analysis. The proposal that obtained the best results (Table 1) was that of Miall and Kuiken (1995), since the Dutch translation and the one extracted by our CFA presented insufficient indices in practically all the fit criteria. However, Miall and Kuiken (1995), while comfortably exceeding the minimum requirements of the TLI–NFI, CFI, GFI, AGFI, and SRMR, had an RSMEA that fell far short of the criterion. It can be concluded that the seven-factor structure, albeit with the three previous modifications, is very stable, while the second-order structure is rather questionable. Therefore, the mean comparison tests will be carried out on the first-order factorization.

As for the internal consistency of the scale, the overall Cronbach's α was 0.969. The reliability of all factors was very close to 1 (Annex V, [Supporting Information](#)), which shows that LRQ is an instrument with excellent internal consistency.

LRQ results in the analyzed Spanish context

First, the results show indifference or disinterest in literary reading among Spanish adolescents (Annex VI, [Supporting Information](#)). In Factor 1 (Leisure Escape), the data reveal negative and indifferent positions toward reading as a leisure escape ($\bar{x} = 2.7$, $\sigma = 1.36$). The percentage of responses to I4 ("When I have free time, my favorite activity is reading a novel") was 73.4% in 1 and 2 and only 11.6% in 4 and 5, which highlights that few consider reading as their main leisure. They neither wish to have more time to read literature (I11, with 69.5% against or indifferent) nor consider that literature helps them to disconnect from their problems (I3, with 68.7% disagreeing or indifferent). It seems, therefore, that we are still immersed in a situation of crisis in literary reading, similar to that observed by researchers at the end of the last century. Unfortunately, the desired change in motivation among professionals to effectively address and overcome this persistent challenge does not seem to have occurred.

In Factor 2 (Story-driven Reading), most students favor story-driven reading or reflect neutrality toward it ($\bar{x} = 3.58$, $\sigma = 1.24$). Thus, 63.2% state that "The type of literature I like best is literature that tells an interesting story" (I12), 63.4% agree or strongly agree with the statement "I find it difficult to read a novel in which nothing seems to happen". Similarly, half of the respondents (54.2%) consider that their main interest when reading a novel is to know what happens to the characters (I13) or to know how the story develops (I14, with 50.6% agreement). Disagree was less selected by respondents (with values between 10% and 23%). Surprise at an unexpected ending (I16) appears as one of the strongest reasons for literary appreciation (with 71% agreeing). Thus, Spanish adolescents do not show a notable interest in esthetic readings. Instead, they prefer to select books based on the plot and the succession of events that lead to a surprising ending.

In Factor 3 (Insight), all items were answered by between 60% and 70% of respondents with disagreement or indifference ($\bar{x} = 2.85$, $\sigma = 1.3$). A minority of 30% acknowledged that literary texts aided them in comprehending their negative emotions (I20). Additionally, most did not perceive themselves in literary characters (I28, 65.1%) and did not draw parallels between their life and events in literary texts (I30, 64.4%). Looking at it from a different angle, most respondents did not indicate an improved understanding of a literary text when relating it to their personal concerns (I33, 62.6%). Consequently, our findings suggest that literary reading tends to lead only a small percentage of students to recognize previously unnoticed qualities in themselves or in their world.

In Factor 4 (Empathy), similar response patterns persist ($\bar{x} = 2.53$, $\sigma = 1.38$; 27.5% agreement, 19% neutrality

and 53.5% disagreement). Most respondents do not exhibit projective identification with fictional characters, as only 21.3% agree with the statement "Sometimes I feel that I have almost become a character I have read about in fiction" (I34). For I40, "I sometimes have imaginary dialogues with fictional characters," the values are even more pronounced, with 80.42% expressing indifference or disagreement (67.31% between 1 and 2). Hence, adolescents tend to refrain from fully immersing themselves in the text, resulting in less transparent reading responses. Instead, they opt to keep a certain distance from the fiction.

Factor 5 (Concern with Author) also shows uniform results in all its items ($\bar{x} = 2.34$, $\sigma = 1.23$). The majority of respondents do not express interest in a historicist-authorial approach to literary education, with an average of 58.23% disagreeing with all related items. Neutrality stands at 22.7% and agreement at only 19.1%. Specifically, a mere 12.9% agree with statement I46 ("One of my main interests in reading literature is to learn about the author's themes and concerns"), and 14.3% with I43 ("One of my main interests in reading is to learn about the different genres of literature"). Similar response patterns are observed for the other items (I48 or I47). From a didactic standpoint, the historicist approach appears to be reaching a point of exhaustion in terms of its appeal to adolescents. This indicates the necessity to either transition toward more reader-centered approaches or establish a coexistence that extends beyond the exclusive transmission of knowledge by the teacher.

As for Factor 6 (Imagery Vividness), the responses are scattered ($\bar{x} = 3.04$, $\sigma = 1.41$; 37.2% disagree, 42.4% agree and 20.3% neutral). Those that place more responses between 1 and 2 are I55 ("Often, when I read literary texts, descriptions of smells suggest colors to me, descriptions of colors suggest feelings, and so on") and I53 ("Sometimes I think I can draw a map of the places I have read about in a work of fiction"), with 47% disagreeing. The other items closely align with the dimension's mean, indicating that over 62.7% of students do not vividly imagine the literary world, encompassing feelings, sounds, or smells. Thus, a considerable number of students exhibit indifference or minimal involvement with this facet of literary reading. The results indicate possible differences between the groups in this factor, which will be studied further in the mean comparison tests.

Finally, with factor 7 (Rejecting Literary Values) almost half disagree (45.9%), but 25.3% are neutral and 28.8% agree ($\bar{x} = 2.73$, $\sigma = 1.33$). This reflects a higher proportion of students who reject literary values or feel indifferent to them (54.1%), compared to less than half who value them socially. However, on a theoretical level, students do not completely reject literary criticism. For example, only 12.6% believe that less should be discussed or written about literature (I60), and merely

20.3% perceive literature as socially irrelevant (I64). Furthermore, just 27.8% feel that less time should be dedicated to teaching literature (I66), and 23.5% associate the rejection of literary reading with the overbearing guidance of mediators (I67). Therefore, our findings do not suggest that the existing curricular decisions in Spanish literary education are the main cause of indifference to literary reading, as evident in the responses to I62 ("I do not like Language and Literature in high school because most of the texts I have to read I had not chosen on my own"), where 61.7% either disagree or are neutral. Instead, the rejection primarily revolves around the historicist approach and, more notably, other leisure activities that overshadow literary reading.

Next, mean comparison tests were carried out to assess whether the students grouped into the variables chosen offered different mean responses for each factor. First, the means were compared according to gender, with higher values in girls (Table 2). These differences were significant (Student's *t*-test, *t* as the homoscedasticity assumption was not met) in Insight (Levene=7.58; $p=0.006$; $t'=4.71$; $p=0.000$; $d=0.45$), Leisure Escape (Levene=11.58; $p=0.001$; $t'=5.55$; $p=0.000$; $d=0.53$), Empathy (Levene=11.26; $p=0.001$; $t'=4.36$; $p=0.000$; $d=0.42$), Story-driven Reading (Levene=8.80; $p=0.003$; $t'=2.63$; $p=0.008$; $d=0.26$), and Imagery Vividness (Levene=8.01; $p=0.005$; $t'=4.13$; $p=0.000$; $d=0.40$), although with a small effect size (Cohen's *d*) in all cases except Leisure Escape, which was moderate. The results suggest that girls primarily consider literary reading as a leisure activity more than boys. Furthermore, albeit to a lesser extent, girls exhibit a greater inclination toward story-driven reading, engage with literature on a personal and empathetic level, and experience narrative imagery with heightened intensity.

Second, the results suggest that the students in a bilingual pathway have a significantly higher mean than the students in a non-bilingual group (Table 3), although with a small effect size. Student's *t*-test: Insight (Levene=0.287; $p=0.92$; $t=3.182$; $p=0.002$; $d=0.313$), Leisure Escape (Levene=0.697; $p=0.404$; $t=3.392$; $p=0.001$; $d=0.333$), Concern with Author (Levene=2.815; $p=0.094$; $t=3.430$; $p=0.001$; $d=0.337$), Empathy (Levene=1.343; $p=0.247$; $t=1.998$; $p=0.046$; $d=0.198$), Story-driven Reading (Levene=2.137; $p=0.145$; $t=2.638$; $p=0.009$; $d=0.260$), and Imagery Vividness (Levene=0.005; $p=0.942$; $t=3.633$; $p=0.000$; $d=0.356$). It appears that students following a bilingual pathway tend to view literary reading as a form of leisure escape more than their counterparts in non-bilingual itineraries. Additionally, they display a heightened interest in historical and author-centered approaches to literary education, a deeper emotional connection with literary characters and a more intense immersion in narrative imagery.

Third, the mean comparison tests showed that the variable that most strongly determined the mean of the responses to the different factors was the number of books read per year. For this purpose, a one-factor ANOVA test or its Brown Forsythe variant was performed, with significant differences in: Insight (Levene=2.15; $p=0.118$; $F=71.87$; $p=0.000$), Concern with Author (Levene=0.45; $p=0.641$; $F=18.32$; $p=0.000$), Empathy (Levene=0.62; $p=0.538$; $F=54.87$; $p=0.000$), Leisure Escape (Levene=4.50; $p=0.012$; $F=138.39$; $p=0.000$), Story-driven Reading (Levene=17.31; $p=0.000$; $F=33.53$; $p=0.000$), and Imagery Vividness (Levene=9.15; $p=0.000$; $F=53.38$; $p=0.000$). As the number of books read increases, the mean of each factor is significantly higher (Bonferroni and Games-Howell test, in its

TABLE 2 Descriptive statistics of the *t*-test procedure according to gender.

Factor	Gender	<i>M</i>	DT	Desv. error mean
Insight	Male	36.54	12.86	0.93
	Female	43	14.94	1.01
Leisure Escape	Male	24.02	9.45	0.68
	Female	29.66	11.16	0.76
Empathy	Male	18.40	7.22	0.52
	Female	21.84	8.78	0.59
Story-driven Reading	Male	31.10	8.31	0.60
	Female	33.10	6.93	0.47
Imagery Vividness	Male	22.39	8.31	0.60
	Female	26.06	9.65	0.65
Rejecting Literary Values	Male	21.72	7.50	0.54
	Female	21.96	7.14	0.48
Concern with Author	Male	22.83	8.75	0.63
	Female	23.82	9.57	0.65

TABLE 3 Descriptive statistics of the t-test procedure according to group.

Factor	Group	<i>M</i>	DT	Desv. error mean
Insight	Non-bilingual	37.34	13.84	0.05
	Bilingual	41.87	14.40	0.93
Leisure Escape	Non-bilingual	24.94	10.43	0.79
	Bilingual	28.53	10.73	0.69
Empathy	Non-bilingual	19.29	7.87	0.60
	Bilingual	20.93	8.49	0.55
Story-driven Reading	Non-bilingual	31.02	8.17	0.62
	Bilingual	33.02	7.16	0.46
Imagery Vividness	Non-bilingual	22.43	9.07	0.69
	Bilingual	25.72	9.10	0.59
Concern with Author	Non-bilingual	21.58	8.51	0.65
	Bilingual	24.68	9.44	0.61

TABLE 4 Multiple comparisons assuming equal variances: Bonferroni's method.

Factor	Books read (<i>I</i>)	Books read (<i>J</i>)	Difference between means (<i>I</i> – <i>J</i>)	Typical error	Sig.	η^2
Insight	None	Between 1 and 4	–9.70*	1.43	0.000	0.260
		5 or more	–20.70*	1.73	0.000	
	Between 1 and 4	None	9.70*	1.43	0.000	
		5 or more	–11.01*	1.56	0.000	
	5 or more	None	20.70*	1.72	0.000	
		Between 1 and 5	11.01*	1.56	0.000	
Concern with Author	None	Between 1 and 4	–4.75*	1.02	0.000	0.082
		5 or more	–7.07*	1.23	0.000	
	Between 1 and 4	None	4.75*	1.02	0.000	
		5 or more	–2.32	1.11	0.114	
	5 or more	None	7.07*	1.23	0.000	
		Between 1 and 5	2.32	1.11	0.114	
Empathy	None	Between 1 and 4	–3.61*	0.85	0.000	0.211
		5 or more	–10.69*	1.03	0.000	
	Between 1 and 4	None	3.61*	0.85	0.000	
		5 or more	–7.08*	0.93	0.000	
	5 or more	None	10.69*	1.03	0.000	
		Between 1 and 5	7.08*	0.93	0.000	

*Statistically significant mean differences.

case) and with a large effect size, except in the case of Concern with Author (Tables 4 and 5). Hence, the reading habit exerts a significant influence, characterized by a substantial effect size, in adolescents to better discern and comprehend their own and others' qualities, fostering a stronger connection with literary characters, and shaping their perception of literary reading as a leisure activity.

Finally, Pearson's parametric correlations revealed no significant relationship between age or socioeconomic status and any of the factors. In our study, these

variables did not influence the mean responses of the Spanish adolescents who completed the LRQ (Annex VII, Supporting Information).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Our results show that the LRQ in Spanish, when applied to a sample of 14- to 15-year-old adolescents, serves as an effective psychometric tool for assessing students' literary responses. With this contribution, we address

TABLE 5 Multiple comparisons not assuming equal variances: Games-Howell test.

Factor	Books read (I)	Books read (J)	Difference between means (I–J)	Typical error	Sig.	η^2
Leisure Escape	None	Between 1 and 4	–8.25*	0.92	0.000	0.403
		5 or more	–19.36*	1.13	0.000	
	Between 1 and 4	None	8.25*	0.92	0.000	
		5 or more	–11.12*	1.08	0.000	
	5 or more	None	19.36*	1.13	0.000	
		Between 1 and 5	11.12*	1.08	0.000	
Story-driven Reading	None	Between 1 and 4	–5.33*	0.95	0.000	0.141
		5 or more	–7.63*	0.96	0.000	
	Between 1 and 4	None	5.33*	0.95	0.000	
		5 or more	–2.30*	0.68	0.003	
	5 or more	None	7.63*	0.96	0.000	
		Between 1 and 5	2.30*	0.68	0.003	
Imagery Vividness	None	Between 1 and 4	–6.02*	1.03	0.000	0.207
		5 or more	–11.84*	1.06	0.000	
	Between 1 and 4	None	6.02*	1.03	0.000	
		5 or more	–5.82*	0.88	0.000	
	5 or more	None	11.82*	1.06	0.000	
		Between 1 and 5	5.82*	0.878	0.000	

*Statistically significant mean differences.

the first objective by contributing to fill the existing gap regarding quantitative studies on adolescent Literary Responses in Spain. So far, qualitative methods have taken precedence, particularly in Early Childhood and Primary Education (Barreu & Dueñas, 2018; Colomer & Fittipaldi, 2012; Colomer & Margallo, 2013; Colón & Tabernero, 2018; Ruiz-Domínguez, 2014).

As suggested by Miall and Kuiken (1995), the LRQ is useful to better understand the variety of literary responses rather than to identify literary competence. Moreover, it indirectly provides insights into the underlying factors contributing to students' disinterest in reading, as we will discuss below. Regarding the process of translation and cultural adaptation into Spanish, we did not find potentially hindering features of the original, as suggested by Nenadić and Oljača (2019) and Osanai and Okada (2011). It seems, then, that the adaptation of Van Schooten et al. (2001) for the adolescent population is clear to be validated in other languages.

Furthermore, our factor analysis proves, in relation to Objective 2, the strong replicability of the LRQ in different contexts and ages. Its internal consistency is high and the first factorization seems very stable, as Miall and Kuiken (1995), Nenadić and Oljača (2019) and Van Schooten et al. (2001) pointed out. Along these lines, we also question the second-order factorization, as concluded by Nenadić and Oljača (2019), Osanai and Okada (2011) and Van Schooten et al. (2001), which seems much weaker also in Spanish.

Regarding the analysis of adolescent literary responses (Objective 3), we observe low levels of interest among our students, in alignment with the findings of Miall and Kuiken (1995) and Van Schooten et al. (2001). Literary reading does not rank as the primary leisure activity for the majority of our students, with only one-tenth of them favoring it. Two-thirds exhibit a preference for story-driven reading, and an unexpected ending stands out as one of the most prominent reasons for their appreciation of literary reading. In addition, Spanish students do not reflect, for the most part, an approach to literary reading that guides the recognition of unknown qualities in the reader or their environment, and they do not show projective identification with fictional characters. Nor do they vividly imagine the literary world through the senses, and the two-thirds-one-third disagreement–agreement ratio seems to hold on these factors. As far as reflections on literary education are concerned, students are not interested in a historicist-authorial approach to literary reading, although the rejection for literary values is less than the disapproval for this didactic approach.

Therefore, our results continue to show the students' disdain for literary reading as a meaningful experience, which López Valero (1998) pointed out decades ago. The curricular changes in Spain following the introduction of LOMLOE (2020) have reduced the emphasis on the historicist-authorial approach in literary education, aligning more closely with the current interests

of students, but they have not yet succeeded in sufficiently motivating students.

The mentioned shift may not sufficiently inspire reader responses based on intuition, personal experiences, and empathetic engagement with characters and narratives (López Valero, 1998; Margallo & Munita, 2023; Mendoza, 2010; Núñez Delgado, 2000). In line with Mata and Villarrubia's (2011) proposals, professionals could consider designing motivational practices in literature that resonate with adolescents' preferences for leisure and communication in contemporary spaces like mass media, social networks, and multimodal resources (Hernández Santamaría & De la Colina, 2023). Integrating peer mediation, exemplified by booktubers and social reading networks, can enhance the exploration of personal experiences with literature. The Learning Situations in the LOMLOE curriculum support this approach, offering methodological suggestions for teachers to adopt this perspective.

The variable that most determines the responses to the different factors is the number of books read per year. As this increases, the mean is higher, with a large effect size. The reading habit significantly improves literary responses, which suggests several approaches. First, this could call into question the elimination of compulsory reading in secondary school. Even if these readings are a combination of free choice and heritage literature, the more books adolescents read, the better literary readings they experience. It does not seem, therefore, consistent with this result to relegate literary reading to a form of optional leisure, since it could significantly limit students' experiences. Second, neither does it seem appropriate to limit compulsory reading to heritage texts, as historicist curricula have maintained for decades, nor the Reading Plans of the centers would benefit their students more by also leaving an important place for multimodal Young Adult Literature, which in Spain still occupies a clearly secondary place. Third, this effect size introduces the possibility of classifying readers according to LRQ, as proposed by Nenadić and Oljača (2019), even if in their context it was not significant. Therefore, we suggest investigating Spanish students' literary competence (Mendoza, 2010), reading habits, and LRQ responses across various grade levels. This study could provide valuable information to educators seeking to understand the factors that contribute to the decline in interest in literature among high school students.

On the other hand, our results point out (in line with those of Pérez Parejo et al., 2019; PISA, 2018; Serna et al., 2017; SFPG, 2021) that girls in secondary school spend more time reading and their responses are more positive than those of boys, especially in the conception of reading as a leisure escape (which was also observed by Miall & Kuiken, 1995). Moreover, students enrolled

in bilingual itinerary present significantly higher means than those in non-bilingual pathways, which continues the findings of Ardura and Senra-Silva (2023), Lahuerta Martínez (2017) and Madrid and Corral (2018). The literary responses also hint at this segmentation of the students in Spain, which leads us to reflect on whether it may be fostering a lower interest in literary reading due to feedback from students with negative literary responses grouped in the same itinerary.

Finally, age and socioeconomic status did not emerge as significant variables in our study, contrasting with the findings of Van Schooten et al. (2001). However, it is essential to expand our sample to various Spanish contexts to determine whether these factors truly have no bearing on literary responses in Spain.

Consequently, enhancing the literary responses of adolescents requires a multifaceted approach that considers their interests and takes advantage of the possibilities of the digital age and new forms of communication. Beyond the abovementioned recommendations, there is an opportunity to introduce nonfictional readings in Spain, a practice already embraced in other countries like the United States but relatively scarce in our nation. This expansion could diversify reading options for students less connected to fiction. Establishing connections between these approaches and providing readings with a mediator who instills enthusiasm for the texts is becoming more prevalent in Spanish primary schools. However, in secondary education, the widespread practice still leans toward autonomous reading by the student. The exportation of conversational methods proven effective in earlier stages of education could potentially enhance literary responses in Spain, presenting outcomes distinct from the LRQ in the decades to come.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research has been carried out within the framework of project ECOLIJ S61_23R consolidated group, Communicative and Literary Education in the Information Society, Children and Youth Literature in the construction of identities (Government of Aragon, University of Saragossa, Spain). We are grateful to Dr. Diego Ardura of the Spanish University of Distance Education (UNED) for his advice during this research.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

ORCID

Diana Muela-Bermejo  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6162-6603>

Irene Mendoza-Cercadillo  <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-0956-0731>

Lucía Hernández-Heras  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0247-1573>

REFERENCES

- Allerup, P. (1985). *Why I like to read – Statistical analysis of questionnaire data*. Danish Institute for Educational Research.
- Altman, D. G., & Bland, J. M. (1995). Statistics notes: The normal distribution. *BMJ*, 310(6975), 298. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.310.6975.298>
- Ardura, D., & Senra-Silva, I. (2023). El impacto de la obligatoriedad de los programas bilingües en las actitudes y percepciones sobre la educación bilingüe de profesorado de asignaturas de contenido de educación secundaria. *Revista de Educación*, 1, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.4438/1988-592X-RE-2024-403-607>
- Barreu, A. I., & Dueñas, J. D. (2018). ¿Nuevos públicos para el libro álbum? Experiencias de recepción en educación primaria. *Anuario de Investigación en Literatura Infantil y Juvenil*, 16, 47–62. <https://doi.org/10.35869/ailij.v0i16.1339>
- Beaton, D. E., Bombardier, C., Guillemin, F., & Bosi Ferraz, M. (2000). Guidelines for the process of cross-cultural adaptation of self-report measures. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*, 25(24), 3186–3191. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00007632-200012150-00014>
- Byrne, B. M. (2001). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS: Basic concepts, applications, and programming*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410600219>
- Colomer, T. (1991). De la enseñanza de la literatura a la educación literaria. *Comunicación, Lengua y Educación*, 9, 21–31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02147033.1991.10820954>
- Colomer, T., & Fittipaldi, M. (2012). *La literatura que acoge: Inmigración y lectura de álbumes*. Banco del Libro/Gretel.
- Colomer, T., & Margallo, A. M. (2013). Las respuestas literarias a álbumes ilustrados en contextos multiculturales. *Lingvarvm Arena*, 4, 23–39.
- Colón, M. J., & Tabernero, R. (2018). El álbum sin palabras y la construcción de una comunidad lectora en la biblioteca pública. *Ocnos*, 17(3), 31–41. https://doi.org/10.18239/ocnos_2018.17.3.1796
- Corral, Y., Corral, I., & Franco, A. (2015). Procedimientos de muestreo. *Revista Ciencias de la Educación*, 46, 151–167.
- Hernández Santamaría, L., & De la Colina, M. (2023). La educación literaria, un proceso complejo. *Fuentes Humanísticas*, 35(66), 21–39. <https://doi.org/10.24275/AEPA6749>
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. (1995). Evaluating model fit. In R. Hoyle (Ed.), *Structural equation modelling: Concepts, issues and applications* (pp. 76–99). SAGE.
- Hynds, S. (1985). Interpersonal cognitive complexity and the literary response processes of adolescent readers. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 19, 386–402.
- Lahuerta Martínez, A. C. (2017). Syntactic complexity in secondary-level English writing differences among writers enrolled on bilingual and non-bilingual Programmes. *Porta Linguarum*, 28, 67–80. <https://doi.org/10.30827/Digibug.54003>
- Lomas, C. (2023). Enseñar literatura en tiempos revueltos. El deseo de leer y la educación literaria. *Revista Curriculum*, 36, 27–50. <https://doi.org/10.25145/j.curricul.2023.36.02>
- López Valero, A. (1998). La nueva configuración en la enseñanza de la Lengua y la Literatura (Educación Secundaria). *RIFOP: Revista Interuniversitaria de Formación del Profesorado*, 31, 23–33.
- López-Martín, E., & Ardura, D. (2022). El tamaño del efecto en la publicación científica. *Educción XX1*, 26(1), 9–17. <https://doi.org/10.5944/educxx1.36276>
- Madrid, D., & Corral, S. (2018). La competencia escrita de alumnos de programas bilingües y no bilingües de educación secundaria. *Revista Mexicana de Investigación Educativa*, 23(76), 179–202.
- Margallo, A. M. (2013). Cuestiones metodológicas en torno a la investigación de las respuestas lectoras a álbumes ilustrados. *Cultura y Educación*, 25(4), 467–478. <https://doi.org/10.1174/113564013808906780>
- Margallo, A. M., & Munita, F. (2023). El nuevo currículo: Una oportunidad para la educación literaria. *Textos Didáctica de la Lengua y la Literatura*, 100, 27–32.
- Mata, J., & Villarrubia, A. (2011). La literatura en las aulas. Apuntes sobre la educación literaria en la enseñanza secundaria. *Textos de Didáctica de la Lengua y la Literatura*, 58, 49–59.
- McDonald, R. P., & Ho, M.-H. R. (2002). Principles and practice in reporting structural equation analyses. *Psychological Methods*, 7, 64–82. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.7.1.64>
- Mendoza, A. (2010). La competencia literaria entre las competencias. *Lenguaje y Textos*, 32, 21–33.
- Miall, D. S. (1987). Learning in autonomous student groups: Learning predictor of satisfaction. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 13, 175–183. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-491X\(87\)80031-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-491X(87)80031-7)
- Miall, D. S., & Kuiken, D. (1995). Aspects of literary response: A new questionnaire. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 29(1), 37–58.
- Mishra, P., Pandey, C. M., Singh, U., Gupta, A., Sahu, C., & Keshri, A. (2019). Descriptive statistics and normality tests for statistical data. *Annals of Cardiac Anaesthesia*, 22(1), 67–72. https://doi.org/10.4103/aca.ACA_157_18
- Morales Lomas, F. (2023). Bases teóricas para la educación literaria. *Álabe Revista de la Red de Universidades Lectoras*, 28, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.25115/alabe28.9146>
- Nenadić, F., & Oljača, M. (2019). Individual differences in literary reading: Dimension or categories. *Psihologija*, 52(2), 179–196. <https://doi.org/10.2298/PSI180130035N>
- Núñez Delgado, M. P. (2000). El papel de la lectura en la enseñanza-aprendizaje de la literatura en la educación secundaria. *Textos de Didáctica de la Lengua y la Literatura*, 25, 77–94.
- Osana, H., & Okada, H. (2011). Construction of the literary response questionnaire for Japanese (LRQ-J). *The Japanese Journal of Psychology*, 82(2), 167–174. <https://doi.org/10.4992/jjpsy.82.167>
- Pardo, A., & San Martín, R. (2014). *Análisis de datos en ciencias sociales y de la salud II*. Síntesis.
- Pérez Parejo, R., Gutiérrez Cabezas, A., Soto Vázquez, J., Jaraíz Cabanillas, F., & Gutiérrez Gallego, J. (2019). Hábitos de lectura de los estudiantes de la Universidad de Extremadura (España). Aproximación estadística. *Investigación Bibliotecológica: Archivonomía, bibliotecología e información*, 33(79), 119–147. <https://doi.org/10.22201/ibi.24488321xe.2019.79.57980>
- Purves, A. (1973). *Literature education in ten countries: An empirical study*. Wiley and Sons.
- Rodríguez Almodóvar, A. (1990). La educación española en Enseñanzas Medias. In *I Congreso de la SEDLL* (pp. 49–54). University of Seville.
- Ruiz-Domínguez, M. M. (2014). Estrategias metaficcionales y respuestas lectoras: Estudio exploratorio. *Ocnos*, 11, 45–69. https://doi.org/10.18239/ocnos_2014.11.03
- Serna, M., Rodríguez, A., & Etxaniz, V. (2017). Biblioteca escolar y hábitos lectores en Educación Primaria. *Ocnos*, 16(1), 18–49. https://doi.org/10.18239/ocnos_2017.16.1.1205
- Spanish Federation of Publishers' Guilds. (2021). Memoria 2021. https://www.federacioneditores.org/img/documentos/memoria_2021.pdf
- Tellegen, S., & Coppejans, L. (1991). *Verbeeldend lezen*. NBLC.
- Tobin, A. R. (1986). A study of the effectiveness of literature instruction demonstrated in two samples of high school juniors. Unpublished Master's thesis, Kean College of New Jersey.
- Van Gelderen, A., Oostdam, R., & Van Schooten, E. (2011). Does foreign language writing benefit from increased lexical fluency? Evidence from a classroom experiment. *Language Learning*, 61(1), 281–321.
- Van Schooten, E., & De Glopper, K. (2003). The development of literary response in secondary education. *Poetics*, 31(3–4), 155–187. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-422X\(03\)00029-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-422X(03)00029-9)

Van Schooten, E., Oostdam, R., & De Glopper, K. (2001). Dimensions and predictors of literary response. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 33(1), 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10862960109548101>

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Diana Muela-Bermejo (PhD) is an Associate Professor at the University of Saragossa in Department of Specific Didactics, Language and Literature Didactics Area, ECOLIJ Research Group, Saragossa, Spain; email: dmuela@unizar.es

Irene Mendoza-Cercadillo is a Graduate Student in Hispanic Philology and Master in Teacher Training in Secondary Education, University of Saragossa, Spain; email: imendozacercadillo@gmail.com

Lucía Hernández-Heras (PhD) is an Assistant Professor at the University of Saragossa in Department of Specific Didactics, Language and Literature Didactics Area, ECOLIJ Research Group, Saragossa, Spain; email: lhernandezheras@unizar.es

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information can be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of this article.

How to cite this article: Muela-Bermejo, D., Mendoza-Cercadillo, I. & Hernández-Heras, L. (2024). Literary responses in Spanish adolescents: Adaptation, validation, and analysis of the Literary Response Questionnaire. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 00, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.1328>