1 Introduction

Christian Jones

This book is about using literature – defined in this book as plays, poetry or novels or texts adapted as screenplays in film or television – in the second language classroom. There have been a number of publications in favour of using literature for language learning since the 1980s (e.g. Brumfit and Carter 1986; Duff and Maley 1990; Carter and McRae 1996; Chan 1999; Hall 2005; Paran 2006; Teranishi, Saito and Wales 2015). There have also been a number of activities and materials developed for using various forms of literature in the second language classroom (e.g. Maley and Moulding 1985; Collie and Slater 1987; McRae and Vethamani 1999). It has been argued that literature can develop language awareness (e.g. Brumfit and Carter 1986; Jones and Carter 2011), help students to develop the 'fifth skill' of thinking in the second language (McRae 1991) and help to develop competences from the Common European Framework of References for Language (CEFR) (Jones and Carter 2011), which are used to measure proficiency in a number of second languages (Council of Europe 2001).

Alongside such theoretical arguments, there have been a small number of studies that have produced evidence which suggest that literature can be beneficial in improving communicative competence, language awareness and language acquisition. Gilmore (2011), for example, found that authentic materials in general can be more beneficial than textbooks in developing several key aspects of communicative competence among English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners when tested using a variety of quantitative measures. Although Gilmore's study was not focused on literature exclusively but authentic materials in general, we can certainly argue that, as a form of authentic material, literature may be similarly beneficial, if selected carefully. Lao and Krashen (2000) is one of many studies which present clear evidence that using literature in the form of graded readers for extensive reading has demonstrable benefits in terms of vocabulary acquisition and reading speed when compared with control groups that do not undertake extensive reading. Lin (2010) demonstrates how the use of Shakespeare's texts can develop language awareness in Taiwanese EFL learners, when using pre- and post-test measures in addition to qualitative data in the form of learner diaries. Other studies have sought to investigate the

effect of specific types of instruction, from an experimental, learner or teacher perspective. Yang (2002), for example, found a student-centred approach to literature to be more effective than a teacher-centred one, when measured on a pre- and post-test. Schmidt (2004) also found that German learners of English were more positive about the use of Shakespeare in their English lessons when teachers employed a more learner-centred approach. Surveys show that learners can have reservations about the importance of literature when learning a second language (e.g. Martin and Laurie 1993) but that they can also see real value in it for learning language (e.g. Bloemert et al. 2019). Teachers themselves can also express reservations about the benefits of using literature and can demonstrate a lack of awareness of different options available to them in terms of methodology (Paran 2008). This sometimes results in approaches whereby teachers resort to teaching literature as a subject rather than as an aspect of second language learning, which we believe it can be.

Despite the evidence mentioned in the studies reviewed above, Paran (2008) and Fogal (2015) note that in general there is still a lack of empirical research which investigates the effectiveness of literature for second language learning in general (see Teranishi et al. 2015 for a recent exception to this). Of the studies that do exist, even fewer have sought to investigate the effectiveness of literature either as a tool for developing awareness of spoken language or as a tool for developing speaking skills. Although at first glance it may seem odd to discuss literature in terms of its relation to spoken language and speaking skills, we wish to argue that this is a gap in the research. We do so for several connected reasons. Firstly, as mentioned previously, it is often claimed that many second language learning courses are closely linked to the CEFR. The CEFR contains expected competences at each level, and many of these are connected to literature. One such example is 'I can understand contemporary literary prose' (Council of Europe 2001: 5) from the B2 self-assessment grid reading descriptor. In order to show such understanding, learners are likely to need to be able to talk about literature and, to at least some degree, understand the representations of spoken language within it. Therefore, we can argue that there is a clear value in research which informs teachers about how they might use literature to work on CEFR competences such as the one mentioned.

Secondly, conversation is a major part of the daily language use undertaken by people (Thornbury and Slade 2006), and in addition, the development of speaking skills and awareness of spoken language are often of primary importance to learners of English as a second or foreign language (Meddings and Thornbury 2009). However, it can be challenging for teachers to access recordings of unscripted conversations to analyse or discuss in class and, unedited, they may not always make interesting or engaging texts for language learning (Cook 1998). Therefore, it has long been suggested (e.g. McCarthy and Carter 1995; Carter and McRae 1996; Carter 1998) that dialogues from literature

could provide interesting and useful models of spoken English that can also be used to develop speaking skills. This is because learners who are engaged with literary texts already have an interest in what characters are saying and in discussing the themes and ideas writers express as they interact with each other. Once engaged, there are also opportunities to encourage learners to notice features of the conversations within these texts. There is evidence that motivation (in this case via engaging texts), noticing and interaction are all important factors in language acquisition (Schmidt 1990; Long 1996; Dörnyei 2012).

Finally, it is important to acknowledge that conversations in literature are not, of course, identical to unscripted conversation. Literature, by its nature, aims to create an illusion of reality, and the purpose of literary dialogues are not the same as the transactional and social functions of conversations in the real world. However, it is also true that conversations in literature contain many features we find in the spoken language used by real speakers, and this, combined with their potential to provoke discussion as engaging texts, makes them useful as classroom material.

Despite such arguments, as noted previously, little research exists which provides evidence to support or refute them. Teachers may therefore understand such arguments in theory but wonder if they work in practice. Research can help to provide such an evidence base and either support or refute such theoretical positions. This volume seeks to address these gaps in the research by presenting a collection of studies focused upon the ways in which literature can enhance awareness of enhance awareness of spoken language and develop speaking skills. We have sought to produce evidence from studies which take a qualitative, quantitative, or mixed-methods approach to data analysis and which have been undertaken in a range of English as a second or foreign language settings. This is in order to make the data more robust and also to allow readers to find studies which are linked to a context with which they are familiar. All chapters are linked by a common question: how can literature enhance awareness of spoken language or develop speaking skills?

The studies in Part I of the book explore literature as a vehicle for developing awareness of spoken language. In this section, Byrne and Jones examine dialogues from a literature corpus in comparison with a spoken corpus in order to understand the extent to which literary dialogues offer a plausible and useful model of conversation. Tomlinson then examines how literature can be used as part of a text-driven approach in order to develop an awareness of pragmatic uses of spoken language. He does so by asking teachers in a range of contexts to evaluate materials taking this approach. Jones and Cleary examine the effects on input enhancement when using televised literature (Sherlock) to develop students' awareness of common features of spoken language. Iida continues the work from Chapter 2 on corpora but instead focuses on students'

composed haiku poems and the features of spoken language they contain. Iida argues that haiku can play an important role in enhancing awareness of spoken language. For the last chapter in this section, Zhao and Liu report on a classroom-based action research study which employed screenplays. They use such materials to test the extent to which such films can develop awareness of pragmatic features of spoken English.

Part II explores the use of literature as a means of developing speaking skills. McIlroy examines the effects of discussing poetry at different levels of familiarity with learners in Japan. Her results show the potential which poetry can have as an aid to discussion and development of conversation strategies in class. Shelton-Strong analyses group discussion from literature circles, whereby learners discuss texts they have read. His research shows the potential for such group discussions to contain many language learning opportunities. Finally, Fogal and Pinner examine the language-related episodes produced by students to measure changes in lexical complexity on the speech of learners as they discussed literature.

While we recognise that many activities could involve both raising awareness of spoken language and developing speaking skills, the division of chapters into these parts will be one that many teachers and researchers recognise and that allows readers to find chapters which most relate to their interests quickly and easily. Explicit links are made between the chapters within each section and between different sections so that readers can see how each relates to the central theme. For example, the skill of noticing can be developed by analysing spoken language in literary dialogues (Chapter 4) and via discussion of literary texts (Chapter 9). Following all chapters, conclusions and implications are given for both teaching and research.

We hope that taken together, the studies will provide evidence which can inform teachers as they make choices in the classroom as well as furthering the research in this area.

References

Bloemert, J., Paran, A., Jansen, E. and Grift, W. V. D., 2019. 'Students' perspective on the benefits of EFL literature education', *The Language Learning Journal* 47(3): 371–384.

Brumfit, C. and Carter, R. 1986. *Literature and Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carter, R. 1998. 'Orders of reality: CANCODE, communication, and culture', *ELT Journal* 52(1): 43–56.

Carter, R. and McRae, J. 1996. *Language, Literature and the Learner: Creative Classroom Practice*. London: Longman.

Chan, P. K. 1999. 'Literature, language awareness and EFL', *Language Awareness* 8(1): 38–50.

Collie, J. and Slater, S. 1987. *Literature in the Language Classroom: A Resource Book of Ideas and Activities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, G. 1998. 'The uses of reality: A reply to Ronald Carter', *ELT Journal* 52(1): 57–63.

Council of Europe, 2001. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. 2012. *Motivation in Language Learning*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Duff, A. and Maley, A. 1990. *Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fogal, G. G. 2015. 'Pedagogical stylistics in multiple foreign language and second language contexts: A synthesis of empirical research', *Language and Literature* 24 (1): 54–72.

Gilmore, A. 2011. '"I prefer not text": Developing Japanese learners' communicative competence with authentic materials', *Language Learning* 61(3): 786–819.

Hall, G., 2005. *Literature in Language Education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jones, C. and Carter, R. 2011. 'Literature and language awareness:Using literature to achieve CEFR outcomes', *Journal of Second language Teaching and Research* 1 (1): 69–82.

Lao, C. Y. and Krashen, S. 2000. 'The impact of popular literature study on literacy development in EFL: More evidence for the power of reading', *System* 28(2): 261–270.

Lin, H. W. 2010. 'The taming of the immeasurable: An empirical assessment of language awareness', in Paran, A. and Sercu, L. (eds.), *Testing the Untestable in Language Education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 191–216.

Long, M. 1996. 'The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition', in Richie, W. and Bhatia, T. K. (eds.), *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. San Diego: Academic Press, 413–468.

Maley, A. and Moulding, S. 1985. *Poem into Poem: Reading and Writing Poems with Students of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Martin, A. L. and Laurie, I. 1993. 'Student views about the contribution of literary and cultural content to language learning at intermediate level', *Foreign Language Annals* 26(2): 188–207.

McCarthy, M. and Carter, R. 1995. 'Spoken grammar: What is it and how can we teach it?', *ELT Journal* 49(3): 207–218.

McRae, J. 1991. *Literature with a Small 'l'*. London: Macmillan.

McRae, J. and Vethamani, M. E. 1999. *Now Read On: A Course in Multicultural Reading*. London: Routledge.

Meddings, L. and Thornbury, S. 2009. *Teaching Unplugged: Dogme in English Language Teaching*. Surrey: Delta Publishing.

Paran, A. 2006. *Literature in Language Teaching and Learning*. Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages Inc.

2008. 'The role of literature in instructed foreign language learning and teaching: An evidence-based survey', *Language Teaching* 41(4): 465–496.

Schmidt, I. 2004. 'Methodische vorgehensweisen und schülerinteresse: Bericht über ein empirisches forschungsprojekt' [Methodological approaches and pupil interest: Report on an empirical study], in Schabert, I. (ed.), *Shakespeare Jahrbuch* 140. Bochum: Verlag und Druckkontor Kamp Gmbh, 196–211.

Schmidt, R. 1990. 'The role of consciousness in second language learning', *Applied Linguistics* 11: 129–158.
Teranishi, M., Saitō, Y. and Wales, K. 2015. *Literature and Language Learning in the EFL Classroom*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Thornbury, S. and Slade, D. 2006. *Conversation: From Description to Pedagogy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Yang, A. 2002. 'Science fiction in the EFL class', *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 15(1): 50–60.

Part I

Literature and Spoken Language

2 The Realism of Conversation in Literature

Shelley Byrne and Christian Jones

This chapter analyses conversations from a corpus of literature in order to uncover the extent to which these conversations contain typical features of spoken language, such as vague language and discourse markers. Such features have long been identified as key features of spoken language in corpora based on unscripted conversations (Carter and McCarthy 2017). The extent to which naturally occurring spoken language is similar to and different from literary conversations has been researched within the field of stylistics (e.g. Hughes 1996; Semino and Short 2004), but the extent to which conversations in literature could provide a useful model for learners of English as a Foreign Language and English as a Second Language (EFL/ESL) is less clear. Drawing upon corpus data from the CLiC Dickens corpus (Mahlberg et al. 2016) and the BYU-BNC spoken corpus (Davies 2004), this chapter seeks to explore how often common features occur and whether the frequency of occurrence is significant in comparison to data from unscripted conversations. We also explore the data qualitatively to examine whether the functions of common spoken language features differ or are similar. In doing so, we hope to uncover the extent to which conversations in literature can offer a plausible model of spoken English for EFL or ESL learners.

Introduction

Research in corpus linguistics has helped to describe common features of conversational language. We now commonly talk of spoken as well as written grammar (e.g. Biber et al. 1999; Leech 2000; Carter and McCarthy 2006; Rühlemann 2007; Timmis 2013), and there is an understanding that conversations cannot realistically be compared with written language on identical terms. To give examples of such differences, conversation is normally co-constructed (McCarthy 2010), it can contain forms which function differently from those in writing such as vague language, and it is often subject to rapid topic shifts (Carter

and McCarthy 2006). It is clear that to develop an understanding and ability to take part in conversations, learners need a realistic model of them. While dialogues feature in almost all coursebooks, at times, the reality of such conversation is compromised in order to illustrate a particular language point. As a result, the dialogues they contain can seem contrived and unnatural (e.g. Jones, Byrne and Halenko 2017). One alternative to this is to base dialogues on data from spoken corpora (see McCarthy and McCarten 2018 for examples of this in practice). Another possible alternative model is to draw upon dialogues found in literature (see also Chapter 3, this volume, for an example of working with literary conversations in a text-driven approach), a model which seemingly is promising given the increased accessibility of large, free and online literature repositories such as Project Gutenberg (Hart 2019). Such example dialogues, if they can be shown to contain at least some common features of speech, have the potential to be both interesting and motivating when viewed from a pedagogical perspective (McRae 1991; Carter and McRae 1996). Many learners read literature in their first and second language (either in the original or a simplified form), and we thus assume that many will have an interest in the dialogues contained within novels, short stories or plays. Conversations in literature and in real life do, of course, have a fundamentally different purpose, something we discuss further in the next section. In literature, a dialogue may be pushing the plot forward, telling us something about a character or developing a theme. In real life, conversation is likely to have either a predominantly transactional or social purpose and frequently a mixture of both (see Carter and McCarthy 1997 for examples). The aim of this chapter is, therefore, to investigate the extent to which dialogues in literature contain some typical features of conversations and how these function. In doing so, we hope to discuss whether such dialogues offer a plausible model of conversation for learners of English although we exercise caution in drawing identical, 'like-for-like' comparisons between literature and speech given the diachronic changes spoken language use undergoes over time and are conscious not to assume that features of modern-day speech are fully replicated and modelled in older literary texts.

Although arguments have previously been made for the use of literary dialogues to teach spoken English (e.g. Carter 1998), we are not aware of any studies which have drawn upon large corpora of literature to analyse the features of spoken English these dialogues contain in order to assess the model they provide for English language learners. This chapter attempts to address this by examining data from CLiC (Corpus Linguistics in Context 2018), a large corpus containing both Dickens' novels and a large nineteenth-century corpus and, one which allows us to look at both quoted data (character speech) and non-quoted data (text which is not character speech). We also make comparison to the spoken (conversation) section of the BYU-BNC corpus (Brigham Young University–British National Corpus, Davies 2004).

Previous Research

There have been a number of studies which have compared dialogues in fiction to unscripted conversation. Such research has uncovered both differences and similarities between such texts. We will first discuss key differences found.

Short (1996) analyses dialogues in plays in comparison with unscripted conversations. One key difference he notes is that performance features such as hesitation marked by filled pauses ('er') or unfilled pauses and false starts are in general more frequent in unscripted conversation. When they do occur in fictional dialogues, they tend to have a different function. Pauses in conversation buy speakers time, mark pauses and/or hold the floor, while in literature, Short argues, they often function differently. A pause by a character may, for example, be used to build up tension between speakers or to tell us that a character is hesitant and nervous. Leech and Short (2007: 128–134) provide a useful analysis of conversation and dialogue in fiction. They also discuss hesitation and suggest that because in unscripted conversation, participants will tend to overlook (and probably expect) this, such features may be omitted from fictional dialogues without too much impact upon the realism of dialogues expected by readers. They also suggest that other features, such as discourse marking or the tendency for conversation to use fewer complex sentences, may occur with less frequency in fictional dialogues. This is because, in general, writers do not aim for a fully realistic representation of conversation but rather an 'illusion of real conversation' (Leech and Short 2007: 132), which serves a purpose in the fictional world they create. Dialogues are in fiction to tell us about characters or to signal a plot or thematic development and not to fulfil what Halliday and Matthiesen (2013) suggest are ideational, textual or interpersonal metafunctions. In other words, speakers use language to express some content, to link it to the ongoing conversation and to express it in a way that helps to oil the wheels of a conversation, depending on who the interlocutor is. Short (2012: 21) also shows that, in the fictional world, an author has many more options when representing what speakers say, which are unlikely to be employed by speakers in conversations. When writers report speech, Short shows that an author is able to use:

> direct speech ('Just go now' he said grumpily), free indirect speech (She should get out now), indirect speech (grumpily he told her to leave) narrator's presentation of a speech act (grumpily he ordered her out) or a narrator's presentation of voice (He spoke grumpily).

Although speakers in conversations could, in theory, use similar options, it is far more likely that they will simply report what others have said directly (He said 'go now'), indirectly ('He said I needed to go now') or in summary ('He was saying I should go') and add comments or views on what they are reporting (see Carter and McCarthy 2006 for a discussion of this in spoken corpora).