Utilizing Literary Reading Text in English Reading Classes for Science Majors: A Pilot Lesson to Assess Effectiveness and Student Responses[1]

Tae KUDO*, Hiroko SUGIMURA**

Abstract

This preliminary study explores the possibilities of the use of literary text for cultivating thinking skills, particularly logical and critical thinking skills. A pilot lesson was conducted utilizing a short story by Hemingway, "Cat in the Rain," which demands the use of reasoning because its simple style of writing produces textual gap. Students majoring in science were given seven tasks and questions concerning the story before class. In class, they discussed the story in a group based on their answers to the questions, and the teacher's only role was to facilitate each discussion. Before and after the lesson, the students completed questions on literary reading on a questionnaire. The results have revealed that the given text, which seems to have been an intellectually challenging one, brought about lively discussions among the students, although it was rather difficult for some of them to explicate; that collaborative reading led to misguided interpretation when it lacked a logical aspect; and that some of the students needed the teacher's intervention to seek one "correct" way of interpretation. Regarding future implications, the role of a teacher should be reconsidered in terms of facilitating the development of thinking skills.

I. Introduction

It seems that there has been a gradual decline in literary reading not only in Japan, but all over the world. According to an article in *The Washington Post* dated September 7, 2016, the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) reported: "In 2015, 43 percent of adults read at least one work of literature in the previous year. That's the lowest percentage in any year since NEA surveys began tracking reading and arts participation in 1982, when the literature reading rate was 57 percent" in the U.S. Considering the infinite distractions available on the Internet, as well as with other media that have greater appeal in general, and particularly with the younger generation, it is quite natural that literary reading is not always the first choice for entertainment.

Horace, the great Roman poet, once said that reading a work of literature would provide a reader with pleasure as well as an opportunity to learn a moral lesson, which can still be said of literary reading. Moreover, literary reading has additional benefits. Nowadays, according to many newspaper and journal articles as well as studies in psychology, literary reading influences a reader's feelings or emotions, and may create empathy, or Theory of Mind (Miall & Kuiken, 2002; Mar, et al., 2010; Kidd & Castano, 2013). Furthermore, neuroscience studies, which use advanced tools and devices such as MRI scanners to monitor brain activity to identify a possible positive relationship between literary reading and emotional changes, have been burgeoning recently (O'Sullivan, et al., 2015; Jacobs, 2015). Affective improvement that is attainable through literary reading has been explored and well documented in numerous psychological and neuroscience studies; on the other hand, there seem to be fewer research reports related to the effect literary reading has on a reader's thinking processes. In contrast to evaluating emotional responses, it is almost impossible to measure how thinking skills improve in the short time frame of one experiment. However, it cannot be denied that reading literature and being immersed in its fictional world can also have the effect of triggering a reader response that involves deepened insight into linguistic function and the exercise of judgment or evaluation of the text as well (Spitzer, 1948; Leech & Short, 2007; Zyngier & Fialho, 2010).

When it comes to research into methodology in English education in Japan, the key issues that are exclusively focused on are the four language skills: reading, listening, speaking, and writing. It is the authors' opinion that in English education there is a certain gap between the process of reception (reading and listening) and that of production (speaking and writing) (i.e., the actual mental processing of the information obtained: the sorting, understanding, reasoning, constructing individual opinions and reactions, and so forth). Indeed, it is an important aim in English edu-

cation to help a learner acquire specific skills and improve English proficiency, but another, perhaps equally essential, goal of English education is or should be to enhance a learner's competence in developing their own ideas or opinions regarding a given topic in English as a world language in an increasingly globalized world. Therefore, the authors have begun to develop a new English lesson that places more value on thinking skills, including logical reasoning and critical thinking, in the EFL classroom. For this purpose, the authors have focused on the connection between reading and thinking.

As already mentioned, the very nature of a literary text can spur a torrent of feelings on the part of a reader and, in addition, stimulate the process of reasoning. It is not a text that simply provides certain information a reader wants to know. When reading a journal or newspaper article, a reader is often seeking new information, so sometimes one simply scans or skims the information. On the other hand, literary text does not merely provide a reader with information. Rather, it precludes one from scanning or skimming. Louise Rosenblatt calls literary reading "an aesthetic experience" (Rosenblatt, 1995, p.32) where a reader goes through the process of "self-scrutiny" (p.215), an examination of one's own thoughts and feelings. Thus, one learns to "*think rationally within an emotionally colored context*" (p.217). The authors utilize this very nature of literary text to give learners opportunities to develop an objective point of view regarding a given text, which can further lead to the development of thinking skills (e.g., analytical skills, logical, reasoning, critical thinking, and so forth).

To enhance the development of these thinking skills, the authors chose a short story by Ernest Hemingway, "Cat in the Rain," which has a controversial ending concerning a cat. Linda Gajdusek, who also used one of Hemingway's short stories in class, says: "Hemingway is an especially interesting writer to work with in ESL because his deceptively 'simple' prose style makes especially strong demands on the reader to read carefully and validate inferences" (Gajdusek, 1988, p.234). The phrase, "his deceptively 'simple' prose style," is a simplified expression and may need further explanation. Hemingway is famous for his idiosyncratic style of writing called "iceberg theory," in which he intentionally omits specific information; if he wrote otherwise, the reader would be supplied with a more concrete image of a character or his emotions. Gajdusek describes literary text as lacking two crucial aspects that promote a reader's understanding: "physical context" and "explicit contextualization" (p.230). In this sense, the text "Cat in the Rain" requires considerably more mental effort on the reader's part because it is loaded with such textual gap and complexity.

Based on the results of pre- and post-surveys and the outcomes of group discussions, this article examines how science majors respond to literary text and how

literary text can be introduced and read in an EFL classroom to give the students an opportunity to practice reflecting and improve thinking skills.

II. Purpose

The ultimate goal in this research is to build an educational model using literary reading material that will cultivate thinking skills－logical and critical thinking in particular－on the part of the students. In this preliminary study, the authors were interested in exploring the following:

1) how often non-literature majors read literary works in their first language and their interest and attitudes toward them;

2) how these students will respond to an English lesson utilizing "Cat in the Rain" and whether the lesson will change how they view literary works; and

3) whether or not the pilot lesson, which involves collaborative reading, positively affects students' learning by enhancing a deeper understanding of the story and fostering the use of logical and critical thinking skills.

Furthermore, it should be noted that this study features a literary reading class conducted by a teacher who has been trained as a language teacher and not someone who specializes in literature. An additional, related goal of this research is to eventually create literary reading materials to improve thinking skills and related lessons that could be readily available to a variety of teachers, which will hopefully lead to an increase in the number of teachers who use literature in the EFL classroom.

III. Methodology

1. Participants

The trial lessons utilizing "Cat in the Rain" were conducted as one lesson in a Reading course, in the fall of 2015. Each class had an enrollment of approximately 30 students, and the same lesson was conducted in four different classes; in total, 112 students participated in this lesson. The Reading course is a required unified class, and the students are engaged in reading science-content-based texts intensively and extensive reading, such as graded readers, which is assigned as homework outside of class.

2. Questionnaires

In order to better understand how often and how much the students read for pleasure in their first language, a questionnaire was conducted in class before the trial lesson. When they were asked to complete the questionnaire, the students were not informed that they would read a piece of literature in English as part of the

course. Further, in order to assess students' reactions to reading an English literary text in class and determine how more teachers could effectively and more often adopt this type of text for use in the classroom, a similar questionnaire evaluating students' opinions was given to the students following the trial lesson.

IV. Pilot Lesson

1. Homework Assignment

One 90-minute class was available for the trial lesson. Two weeks prior to the lesson, the students were given "Cat in the Rain," with the title intentionally re-moved, along with vocabulary notes and a list of tasks and questions to complete as homework. The instructions asked the students to 1) read the story first, and then complete the tasks and answer the questions on the worksheet; 2) bring their own ideas to class, since many of the questions did not require "correct" answers; and 3) prepare for whole-class and small-group discussions that they would participate in two weeks later. The homework worksheet had a combination of seven tasks and questions listed in Japanese:

1. Write a brief summary of the story.
2. Draw a picture of the scenery described in paragraph 1.
3. What are the "wife" and "husband" called in the story and why?
4. Is the American couple happy or not, and why do you think so?
5. How many cats are there in the story?
6. Find some repetitive key words and phrases in the story and explain how that repetition influences the story.
7. Create paragraph 9 as you like.

It should be noted that the authors made attempts to avoid asking questions related to cultural aspects in the text, and instead asked questions that required answers supported by linguistic evidence.

2. In-class Discussions

All of the participating students completed the required homework. The lesson was divided into two sections, a 45-minute small-group discussion and a 25-minute whole-class discussion. The students were divided into their regular small groups of four or five, in which they always work. To facilitate the group discussion, a leader was chosen in each group, and the leader was provided with a flow chart to help them lead the discussion, while a note taker was chosen to keep notes for that group. In addition, the students were reminded that they would individually complete a reflection sheet at the end of the class, so they should take notes when encountering different and/or interesting opinions during the group and class discus-

sions.

Using the sequence on the flow chart, the leader in each group began their session, beginning with checking whether anyone in the group had any questions about the specific English used in the story, such as complicated sentences or grammatical points. Unexpectedly, none of the students in any of the four classes had questions about the English. A very small number of students asked about the Italian expressions in the story. This lack of questions was particularly surprising considering that the students usually have numerous questions when reading science-content texts. During the group discussion, they were to talk about all of the seven tasks and questions that they had completed as homework, exchange ideas, and discuss why and how they had come up with their insights. Though the teacher was accessible to offer help whenever necessary, the groups worked remarkably well independently, which rarely occurs in regular classes.

After the group discussion, the teacher went through the same seven tasks and questions using a whole-class discussion format to facilitate the exchange of students' ideas from their group discussions with others in the class. After both discussions, the students were given time to reflect on this learning experience and complete the post-lesson questionnaire, which, as stated before, was similar to the questionnaire completed prior to the lesson.

V. Results

1. Pre-lesson Questionnaire

Of the 112 students who participated, 82 had read literary works for pleasure after entering high school, which means the majority had read literature in their first language in the past five or six years. Table 1 shows how often the 82 students had read books. More than half of them had read one book or fewer a year, which indicates that the students do not have well-established reading habits even in their own language.

Table 1   Frequency of pleasure reading since high school entry ($n=82$)

Frequency	Number	%
More than one/week	5	6.1
More than one/month	21	25.6
More than one/year	21	25.6
Other (fewer than one/year)	35	42.7

Next, using a Likert Scale of 1 through 4, the students who have had reading experiences were asked to rank how much they agree or disagree with each state-

ment regarding the book(s) they read. As the results in Table 2 show, about 40% of the students had trouble understanding how to interpret stories, and more than half of the students read the stories as if they were a character in the story. More than half of the students responded positively to the last question and indicated that they tried to build images of the stories they read in their minds.

Table 2   How students read literary works (*n*＝82)

Statement	Agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree
1) When reading literary works, sometimes I do not understand how I should interpret the story.	9.8%	30.5%	42.7%	17.0%
2) When reading literary works, sometimes I read the story as if I were someone in the story.	29.3%	36.6%	24.4%	9.7%
3) When reading literary works, I try to build the image of the story in my mind.	53.7%	37.8%	4.8%	3.7%

Finally, all of the students, regardless of their reading experiences, were asked to rank the following four statements regarding perceptions of reading and logical thinking. The results are shown in Table 3. Nearly half of the students indicated that they believe logical thinking skills are necessary to understand what they read in the university reading course, while one-fifth of the students agreed that such skills are essential for reading literary works. More than 75% of the students indicated that they find it difficult or somewhat difficult to interpret literary works.

Table 3   Perceptions of thinking processes associated with reading literature prior to the trial lesson (*N*＝112)

Statement	Agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree
1) Logical thinking skills are necessary to understand literary works.	20.0%	58.2%	17.2%	4.5%
2) It is difficult to interpret literary works.	32.7%	45.5%	18.2%	3.6%
3) Logical thinking skills are necessary to understand passages and essays (that are customarily read in the Reading course).	44.5%	44.5%	9.1%	1.8%
4) I'd like to learn English by utilizing English literary works.	17.3%	41.8%	19.1%	21.8%

2. Students' Responses and Reactions to the Pilot Lesson

One student had previously read "Cat in the Rain" prior to the lesson, but he said that he barely remembered the story, and 109 participants in the trial lesson had never read the story before. Two students did not answer the questions. Table 4 shows the two most significant difficulties the students experienced when they read the story independently. Approximately half of the students indicated that "under-

standing the plot" was the most difficult item. The second most common difficulty was "understanding symbolical meanings or symbols." Students who chose "other" as difficulties expressed difficulty sorting out and identifying who all of the pronouns represented in the story because there were too many characters to remember.

Table 4   Difficulties in reading the story

Difficulty	Number
Identifying the meaning of a word in the context	32
High frequency of difficult words	18
Length of each sentence	4
Understanding the plot	44
Understanding a character's feelings	19
Understanding symbolical meanings or symbols	35
Understanding the ending	27
Understanding the overall meaning of the story	26
Other	7

The next reflection item determined whether the students had engaged in the group discussion; 108 out of 110 students responded positively. Students used a Likert Scale 1 through 4 to rank how group discussion helped them understand the story better or how it led them to an answer to a question they may have had. Altogether, 101 students agreed or somewhat agreed that the group discussion was helpful, making it clear that group work helped lead to a deeper understanding of the story. Most, but not all, of the reasons why the students felt group work had been helpful are listed as follows (translated by the authors):

· It was interesting to hear other people's opinions because it deepens my understanding and we all think and interpret differently.
· Through the group discussion, I understood something I had not understood while reading alone.
· Listening to completely different ideas from mine, I realized that this story has a lot of controversies.

The students are accustomed to reading science-content texts, which are based on facts and data. When asked to compare the science-based texts they usually read in the format of essays in the textbook with the Hemmingway story in terms of difficulty, 24 students stated that they found the essays in the textbook more difficult, while 83 found the story more difficult. Common reasons for their opinions follow (translated by the authors).

· The essays in the textbook are more difficult because
   -there is a lot of terminology in the essays that is difficult to understand

even in Japanese, and

-it is difficult to guess the meaning because there are too many difficult words.

・The story is more difficult because

-it is difficult to understand emotions that are described with symbolical meanings or symbols,

-it is not necessary to interpret a character's feeling when reading the essays,

-there is no correct answer- the essays in the textbook have correct answers, and

-the essays in the textbook have a clear outline, but the story does not have such a structure, so it is not easy to follow the plot.

Finally, the students responded to the question about whether they thought the story was interesting or not; 95 of the students responded positively, while 13 thought otherwise. Space for writing free comments was provided at the end of the questionnaire.

3. Post-lesson Questionnaire

As stated previously, the students were asked to rank four statements similar to the statements they ranked before the lesson. The results are shown in Table 5. Wilcoxon signed-rank test was also conducted (See Tables 6-13). Regarding statement 1, it was indicated that fewer students believed logical thinking skills are necessary to understand literary works, including the story read in the lesson, $z = -2.600$, $p = .009$. As for statement 2, after the lesson, more students indicated that they felt it was difficult to interpret literary works, including the story, $z = -2.788$, $p = .005$. No significant difference was observed between pre- and post-lessons regarding statement 3, $z = -1.057$, $p = .291$. Finally, concerning statement 4, it was confirmed that the students had more interest in learning English using English literary works after the pilot lesson, $z = -3.725$, $p = .000$.

Table 5　Students' perceptions of reading and critical thinking after the pilot lesson ($N = 112$)

Statement	Agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree
1) Logical thinking skills are necessary to understand literary works, including this story.	16.5%	46.8%	29.4%	7.3%
2) It is difficult to interpret literary works, including the story.	43.1%	46.8%	9.2%	0.9%
3) Logical thinking skills are necessary to understand passages and essays (that you read in the Reading course).	43.1%	40.3%	13.8%	2.8%
4) I'd like to learn English utilizing English literary works like this story.	29.6%	38.9%	25.9%	5.6%

Table 6   Descriptive statistics for the statement 1

	N	Mean	SD
Pre-lesson	112	2.0625	.73865
Post-lesson	110	2.2727	.82294

Table 7   Test statistics for the statement 1

	Post-lesson-Pre-lesson
Z	−2.600[a]
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.009

a. Based on negative ranks

Table 8   Descriptive statistics for the statement 2

	N	Mean	SD
Pre-lesson	112	1.9286	.80218
Post-lesson	110	1.6727	.67876

Table 9   Test statistics for the statement 2

	Post-lesson − Pre-lesson
Z	−2.788[a]
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.005

a. Based on positive ranks

Table 10   Descriptive statistics for the statement 3

	N	Mean	SD
Pre-lesson	112	1.6786	.71300
Post-lesson	110	1.7545	.79201

Table 11   Test statistics for the statement 3

	Post-lesson − Pre-lesson
Z	−1.057[a]
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.291

a. Based on negative ranks

Table 12   Descriptive statistics for the statement 4

	N	Mean	SD
Pre-lesson	112	2.4643	1.02164
Post-lesson	109	2.0734	.87883

Table 13   Test statistics for the statement 4

	Post-lesson − Pre-lesson
Z	−3.725[a]
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000

a. Based on positive ranks

VI. Discussion

Three issues were explored in this study: 1) how often non-literature majors read literary works in their first language, and their interest and attitudes toward them, 2) how these students would respond to an English lesson utilizing a literary work, "Cat in the Rain," and whether the lesson would change how they regard literary works, and 3) whether or not the lesson, based on collaborative reading, would help them develop a deeper understanding of the story and enhance students' logical and critical thinking skills.

First, the pre-lesson questionnaire revealed the fact that not many students have strong reading habits even in their first language. Their exposure to literature was limited; however, they did not appear to have negative attitudes toward understanding literary works, since fewer than half of the students agreed or somewhat agreed to the statement "When reading literary works, sometimes I do not understand how I

should interpret the story." Most of the students seemed to read the story as if they were in the story themselves trying to relate to the characters. Most of the students also read the story building the image of the story, which suggests "immersion" might have been occurring. However, it can be concluded that these students are not frequent or experienced readers, since the survey showed that only 26 students read more than one book per month for pleasure and 56 students read fewer than one book per year, while the rest did not read at all. These results are not very surprising considering the fact that literature reading rates have generally been decreasing, as stated earlier in this paper.

Second, regarding the students' perceptions of reading literature and thinking skills, one possible reason why more students thought logical thinking skills were not essential to understand literature might be that the discussions in the class were very open and most of the students' opinions and ideas were accepted as unchallenged "right" answers, which might have made them feel like "every answer is OK." The students are usually supposed to find one "right" answer in regular reading classes, which may seem "logical" for the students. While fewer students think logical thinking skills are necessary to understand literature, more students find it difficult to interpret literary works. One of the reasons why the students had difficulty interpreting the story may be because this was written by Hemingway, and he used the "iceberg theory," his writing style in his stories, which gives a lot of room for different interpretations. As described previously, the students have not established reading habits for pleasure even in their first language. Of particular note is that after the lesson, the percentage of the students who indicated that they would like to learn English utilizing literary works like "Cat in the Rain" increased by 12%.

Finally, the students' reflections show that collaborative reading played an important role in this trial lesson. Of 110 students, 109 of them stated that both the group and class discussions had changed their personal opinions and/or modified their understanding of the story, and they listed specific examples of how they had been influenced by other students' comments. It raised their interest in literature and helped them better understand the story. By exchanging their opinions and ideas based on the tasks assigned prior to the lesson, the students were able to help each other and even identify some of the more implicit messages embedded in the text, manipulate them, and finally, in some cases, form a consensus on one message through their discussions. Yet, despite all of this collaboration, the students sometimes still felt that interpreting and evaluating the story was difficult.

It is worth noting again that this literary reading lesson was conducted, or rather facilitated, by a teacher of language, not by a teacher who specializes in literature. When reading a text written outside a reader's own culture, one should

know some cultural assumptions or background knowledge to understand the text in its specific context. In this sense, the role of a teacher is important in the EFL classroom. The language teacher is a provider of such information. In a typical reading class, the language learner is inclined to view the teacher as the person who concludes the class with the one "right" way to read or interpret the text. Some teachers of literature may also be inclined to lecture about the "correct" interpretation of the material and define the author's intentions for the students. In this lesson, however, intentionally, the teacher did not give any background cultural information related to the story and did not explain any linguistic aspects or interpretations of the story. The teacher was in the classroom primarily as a facilitator, offering aid if necessary, with the expectation that the students' collaborative work would encourage more logical and critical thinking skills and suffice to help students understand the text. However, looking at the students' answers on the task worksheet, some of them clearly misunderstood that "American girl" and "wife" were different people in the story. Others wrote paragraph 9, a continuation of the story, simply based on their imaginations, without any references to the story plot, which in some cases showed a lack of understanding and appreciation of the literary text they had just read.

VII. Conclusion

This study revealed the fact that the students do not read literature very often, even in their first language. On the other hand, though they found it difficult to interpret the literary text, the students were engaged in extensive independent logical and critical thinking processes in order to actively participate in the discussions in the trial lesson. Furthermore, the majority of the students enjoyed this new experience. They may not have realized that they needed logical and critical thinking skills from the experience, but many different ideas were shared, and there is no doubt that the lesson profoundly stimulated their thinking.

The authors point out that when using literary text as language study material, there is a delicate balance between "teaching" too much and allowing students to process their own interpretations. When students tackle literary works completely on their own, the context may not be decoded or interpreted correctly, partly because it is beyond the reader's experience and partly because it is beyond their linguistic ability. Despite these challenges, the authors argue that literary text should not be "taught" by the teacher. The very nature of literature makes it open to a variety of interpretations, and the readers should be encouraged to delve into their own personal interpretations. This pilot lesson was successful in the sense that, even with the teacher working as a facilitator and not directly "teaching" the material, the students were fully engaged in all of the tasks and discussions as they shared their

various interpretations of the story with others, a process that, in itself, was motivating for the students.

However, two issues need to be addressed in future studies. First, because of the lack of direct explanation by the teacher, especially related to some linguistic and cultural points, some students did not understand the story completely, even after group discussions. In future studies, the authors would like to explore the extent to which a teacher should explain basic information related to the literary material, as well as how much linguistic information to provide to support students in their understanding of the material. Another issue that needs to be explored in future studies is the fact that the students tended to agree with others' opinions, rather than challenging each other's ideas more critically. Perhaps a wider variety of questions and tasks, or simply more experience with this learning format, may stimulate more exchange and active analysis of ideas, which would help foster logical and critical thinking skills.

Literary works are generally underutilized in English language classrooms and are not readily accessible to the average English language student, in particular students who are majoring in non-literature fields such as the science majors in this study. Considering the results of this pilot lesson with literature, the authors conclude that it would be worthwhile to establish a concrete lesson format for English language teachers to refer to when using literary works for language teaching. To further assist language teachers, there is a need to compile a diversified list of literary works suitable for students with a variety of English language proficiencies that teachers may select from and utilize to enhance English language learning, encourage logical and critical thinking skills, and motivate students in English language classes.

References

Gajdusek, L. (1988). Toward wider use of literature in ESL: Why and how. *TESOL Quarterly, 22(2),* 227-257.

Hemingway, E. (1925). Cat in the Rain. *In Our Time.* New York: Scribner.

Ingraham, C. (2016). The long, steady decline of literary reading. *The Washington Post.* https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2016/09/07/the-long-steady-decline-of-literary-reading/?utm_term = .166f48a0749f (Last accessed on September 21, 2018).

Ishimura, S. (2006). *Nyumon hajimeteno tokei kaiseki.* Tokyo Tosho.

Jacobs, A. M. (2015). Towards a neurocognitive poetics model of literary reading in Roel Willems ed. *Cognitive Neuroscience of Natural Language Use.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 135-195.

Johnson, D., Johnson, R., & Holubec, E. (1994). *The New Circles of Learning: Cooperation in the Classroom and School.* Assn for Supervision & Curriculum.

Kidd, D. C., & Castano, E. (2013). Reading fiction improves Theory of Mind. *Science 342,* 377 -380.

Leech, G. & and Short, M. (2007). *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose.* 2nd ed. Edinburgh Gate, Pearson Education Limited.

Mar, R. A., Oatley, K., Djikic, M., & Mullin, J. (2011). Emotion and narrative fiction: Interactive influences before, during, and after reading. *Cognition and Emotion,* 818-833.

Miall, S. and Kuiken, D. (2002). A feeling for fiction: Becoming what we behold. *Poetic 30,* 221-241.

O'Sullivan, N., Davis, P., Billington, J., Gonzalez-Diaz, V., & Corcoran, R. (2015). Shall I compare thee: The neural basis of literary awareness, and its benefits to cognition. *Cortex 73,* 144-157.

Rosenblatt, L. (1995). *Literature as Exploration.* 5th ed. New York: Modern Language Association.

Spitzer, L. (1948). *Linguistics and Literary History.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Takeuchi, O. & Mizumoto, A. (2012). *Gaikokugo kyoikukenkyu handbook.* Shohakusha.

Zyngier, S. & Fialho, O. (2010). Pedagogical stylistics, literary awareness and empowerment: A critical perspective. *Language and Literature 19(1),* 13-33.