10 Theatrical Texts in Content and Language Integrated Learning

Alan Thompson
Gifu Shotoku Gakuen University, Japan

Abstract: This chapter describes an ongoing case study that investigates the use of excerpts from theatrical texts (ranging from ancient to modern and originating in multiple cultures) as resources in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at a Japanese university. After reviewing research on the suitability of literary texts for content and language learning, on the benefits of repeated aural/oral practice, and on learning effects related to dramatic process or performance, a rationale is presented. To wit, theatrical texts, as language learning materials, are engaging models of sustained spoken interactions which provide practice in hearing and producing the stress, rhythm, and intonation patterns of natural English, and raise awareness about grammar/meaning and pragmatics/use relationships. As resources for content learning, the texts serve as springboards for learning world cultural history and the role of theatre itself. The second half of the chapter includes a description of the teaching practice with a specification of the instruments used to observe the effect of learners hearing, practising, and considering the texts in aural/oral mode. This is followed by some preliminary findings—focusing on real-time learner responses, attitudes towards content and language learning through theatrical texts, and measurable gains in prosodic awareness and its effect on retention of content learning.

Keywords: theatre, content and language integrated learning, aural-oral learning, language learning, cultural history

The well-liked texts of literature have value in learning contexts. That is, they engage the imagination, sustain interest, and provide a valid context for encountering language in use—poetry for rhythm and intonation, plays for conversation, and even deliberately artful features of language for illustrating how grammar works (Brumfit & Carter, 1986; Falvey & Kennedy,

DOI: https://doi.org/10.37514/INT-B.2021.1220.2.10

1997; Teranishi et al., 2015). Theatrical texts, especially, are meant to entertain, and, unlike some prose and poetry, they usually do so without placing too great a cognitive burden on the receiver, who is, after all, conceived first and foremost as a viewer of a story unfolding on stage. Actors and fans alike are generally supposed to enjoy repeatedly hearing, reading, or reciting the lines of popular plays.

In language learning, willing or even gleeful repetition is a much sought-after state of affairs, so theatrical texts are apt for exploitation in language practice activities. And across the curriculum, greater familiarity with meaning- and culture-rich texts—and with their contexts and implications—can be conducive to the discovery of insights by the content learner. To take advantage of these inherent advantages, a set of learning materials has been developed using as its main resources adapted/translated excerpts from theatrical texts—ranging from ancient Roman comedy, through early modern English and French theatre, to modern Japanese and American plays (see Appendix A for a list of source materials). These are used in listening, reading-aloud, and improvisation activities, while supplementary material provides cultural context and prompts discussion.

The case study described in this chapter comprises a teaching practice (based on these materials) together with observations of the pedagogical effects. The teaching practice proposed here differs from many uses of literature in education in that it investigates the effectiveness of theatrical texts not primarily as reading materials but rather in the spoken mode for which they were intended, with an important aim being the enhancement of students' (noticing and production) abilities in listening, in reading aloud, and in rehearsed and semi-rehearsed speaking with natural prosodic features. Also, the focus is on the effect of the texts themselves, and not on the process nor the performance of drama (unlike Kao & O'Neill, 1998; Maley & Duff, 2005). Drama activities are welcome and natural complements to the use of theatrical texts and, as summarised below, evidence exists of their benefits. Yet, as the inclusion of drama activities as a set of manipulable variables was not felt to be feasible, there is no attempt to observe the effects of this or that method of dramatisation. The intent here, rather, is to observe the effect of learners hearing, practising, and considering the texts in aural/oral mode.

Language and Content Learning through Theatrical Texts

The aptness of literature for language and content learning has mostly been asserted, intuited, or presumed (and often disputed). There has been, however, some empirical support from a variety of educational contexts, at least for

relations that, even if not causal, show some promising concurrences between the experience of literary texts and language and content learning.

Suitability of Literary Texts for Language Learning

Literary texts are not unrepresentative of everyday language practice. All texts, approached without context, can be initially baffling, and since literature is often picked up and read in this way, it has a reputation for being "difficult" and "different," a distinction from other genres (such as social media chats, technical manuals, and advertising wordplay) that is perhaps not deserved. While literary and everyday texts alike contain many differences in register and style, corpus studies have found no empirical distinctions between them (e.g., Biber & Conrad, 2009) that would justify conceptualising "literary" and "everyday" as separate macro-genres. Rather, "what is distinctive about language use in literature, if anything is distinctive, is that far from being a highly specialised use of language, any register can be found in a literary text, and . . . typically a mixture of registers are indeed found"; "all of life is there" (Hall, 2015, pp. 31, 44). Likewise, metaphor and the supposed formal aspects of literature (e.g., parallelism, neologism) are all revealed to be common in everyday speech (Carter & McCarthy, 1995). Even the formal features of poetry—word truncation ("For *oft*, when on my couch I lie"[1]) or marked word order ("a train-band captain *eke was he*"[2])—are present in everyday speech, often for similar reasons—for example, rhythm ("see you this *aft*") or emphasis ("*this* I must see").

Literature may be said to differ in that, as Geoffrey Leech (1969) observes, it often carefully foregrounds certain linguistic features (by repetition, rhythm, or rhyme) to highlight meanings or set up, e.g., equivalences and contrasts, while everyday speech only does so occasionally and in a more clichéd manner ("No news is good news"). There is some evidence that these marked grammatical usages, repetitions, and literary features are more noticeable to the language learner than unmarked, more frequent wordings. Tomohide Ishihara and Akira Ono (2015), for example, report that with literary texts students' attention was drawn more to the surface structure of sentences (not only to the gist of the passage), and David Hanauer (2001) asserts that "the central argument for using poetry reading as a task is that poetry is a natural discourse context that directs the reader's attention to textual features . . . while staying within a meaning construction framework" (p. 298). It is

1 William Wordsworth, *Daffodils*.

2 William Cowper, *The Diverting History of John Gilpin*. (In unmarked order, the line might be "He was eke [also] a train-band [militia] captain.")

not unreasonable to assume that this foregrounding function contributes to form-focused learning, and does so not in isolation, but as an integral part of a meaning construction activity—following the story or thoughts of the author. The momentary struggle with a marked form, which is faced by the hearer/reader in order to keep up with the story, "helps learners notice linguistic properties of the input they otherwise might not notice" (Ellis, 1995, p. 89). Or, as Hanauer explains Henry Widdowson's (1975) idea, "the de-familiarization of language used in poetry destabilizes the learners' familiar relation of words to world and sets them on a search for gaps in their own linguistic knowledge of the target language" (Hanauer, 2001, p. 298).

The point that should be taken from the benefits asserted above is not that literary texts are superior to everyday speech for language learning, but that, like everyday language, they provide a necessary complement to the contrived texts that are often presented to language learners (used to foreground a given learning point), adding interest by virtue of their authenticity and inventive foregrounding of forms. In addition, literary texts are actually easier to manage in a learning situation than naturally occurring interactions, which can and are used to provide exposure to everyday speech. There are issues of difficulty and the need for contextualisation (see below)—and these are issues with everyday speech as well—but as Kazuko Takahashi (2015) asserts, literary texts are, even if simplified and adapted, authentic materials, made by authors with non-instructive intentions for real audiences.

A prime advantage of theatrical texts, specifically, is that they are, self-evidently, extended examples of conversations, and (based on their popularity with real-world audiences) they are presumed capable of sustaining interest, and therefore immersive. This is still probably the most common argument made in their favour, as texts "that evoke familiar experiences but 're-present' them in a new light and with greater clarity" (Falvey & Kennedy, 1997, p. 2). While other arguments, such as authenticity and form-focus, can bolster the case for theatrical texts, this argument for their use—that learners will enjoy the conversations—remains key.

Empirical investigation of impressionistic claims of learner enjoyment is theoretically possible, but valid constructs are elusive and teacher-researcher bias is a conspicuous concern. Some research, moreover, suggests obstacles and challenges to the use of literary texts: with their vocabulary range, complexity, non-standard usages, and cultural references, they are difficult and potentially bewildering, and therefore not enjoyable (Edmonston, 1995; Hall, 2015; Martin & Laurie, 1993).

Against these cautions, there is some evidence for the positive effects of Readers' Theatre (RT; reading aloud of a story in parts, dramatised or not) in

first language education, including improved attitudes to recreational reading (Smith, 2011) and greater expressiveness (Martinez et al., 1999). In additional language education, Muhammad Kabilan and Fadzliyati Kamaruddin (2010) noted enhanced learner understanding and increased interest and motivation to learn literature, while Carolyn La Von Bridges (2008) noted improved retelling skills. It is unclear if these effects are due to the use or appeal of literary texts, or to specific aspects of the activity of RT, i.e., repetitive reading aloud.

Repeated Aural/Oral Practice in Language Learning

Despite an association with non-meaningful drills, the beneficial effects of frequent repetition on the development of language processing are increasingly acknowledged. As Nick Ellis (2002) states, "much of language learning is the gradual strengthening of associations between co-occurring elements of the language and that fluent language performance is the exploitation of this probabilistic knowledge" (p. 173). The same researcher is quick to note, however, that conscious registration or noticing (Schmidt, 1990) as well as explicit instruction play important roles in initiating these associations. In the field of communicative language teaching (CLT) methodology also, it is recognised that repeated practice is desirable but often lacking.

Although one component of fluency is automatic, smooth, and rapid language use, there are no provisions in current CLT methodologies to promote language use to a high level of mastery through repetitive practice. In fact, focused practice continues to be seen as inimical to the inherently open and unpredictable nature of communicative activities (Gatbonton & Segalowitz, 2005).

Elizabeth Gatbonton and Norman Segalowitz (2005) urge that repetitive practice be incorporated, to improve automaticity, in a way that preserves the communicative nature of language use. Aural/oral practice with theatrical texts might aid in attaining this goal. There is some empirical backing for the idea that the lack of conscious concentration that often accompanies frequent repetition may have benefits. Studies at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology have suggested that overly conscious analysis of input and practice material can hinder acquisition of morphological patterns, while relying on procedural memory (developed through repetition) leads to better results (Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2014).

Repetitive practice (rehearsing) with theatrical texts may be helpful in conscious learning as well, in assisting learners' noticing of linguistic features embedded in striking language usages, and providing opportunities for form-focused instruction and practice that are inherent in any first en-

counter with a conversation in a play. Over and above the benefits of literary foregrounding as outlined above, this kind of form-focused instruction (centred on a text) is integrated with later learning and practice activities (viz. conversations) that, in turn, resemble the conditions where the language is expected to be used, where the words and patterns need to be retrieved—a condition for what is known as *transfer appropriate processing* (Spada & Lightbown, 2008).

Further, the activity of repetitive practice, in and of itself, resembles the situations in which learners probably hope to use the skills they are gaining. Although the words "repetition" and "recitation" may bring to mind rather dull activities, there is much behaviour based on repetition that is central to participating in everyday conversation, which Deborah Tannen (1989) calls "involvement." As Geoff Hall (2015) paraphrases the idea, "repetition, 'echoing', representing the speech of others, . . . and other parallelisms [are present] in everyday conversation" (p. 34).

Positive effects of repetitive practice have been observed and reported. Miharu Fuyuno et al. (2014) observed a transfer of beneficial features of speaking (e.g., phrase stress, rhythm, and pauses) from practice on set recitation texts to spontaneous speaking skills. Motoko Ueyama (2017), similarly, noted that drama activities involving repeated practice improved Japanese learners' paralinguistic and prosodic proficiency. Some evidence from Readers' Theatre studies, in addition to the attitudinal effects noted above, suggest that repeated aural/oral practice leads to faster rates of reading aloud, fluidity, and phrasing (Bridges, 2008; Kabilan & Kamaruddin, 2010; Martinez et al., 1999). Similarly, Sandra Bidwell (1990), Jennifer McMaster (1998), and Timothy Rasinski (1988) cite research that demonstrates "that in order to develop fluency, students need opportunities for repeated reading of the same material" (McMaster, 1998, p. 578). The question for this study is whether using theatrical texts avoids the obvious pitfall of repetition identified by Jan Hulstijn (2001): "rereading or relistening to an old text will seldom be motivating to students because it does not contain any new information and therefore does not arouse their curiosity" (p. 283).

Effects Related to Dramatic Process or Performance

Dramatic investment (learners' attempts to think through, feel, and/or act out the mental and emotional states of the characters) is likely to attend any aural/oral practice with theatrical texts, and, although there is no attempt in this study to observe the effects of such investment, some of the intuited and attested benefits are summarised here.

Drama activities are said to facilitate individual contributions to the learning environment, develop social competences, and enhance affective responses to learning (Dubois & Tremblay, 2015; Maley & Duff, 2005). Dramatisation, or simply pairing language with physical activity, aids in the internalisation of prosodic features (Dubrac, 2013), and "physical activity and emotional involvement . . . can lead to improved retention of language structures and vocabulary" (Giebert, 2014, pp. 141-142). Thus, practice with drama can lead to richer, more varied vocabulary (MacFadden, 2010).

There are also attested improvements in terms of psychological attitude—namely, students' perceived gains in self-confidence, spontaneity, and self-expression (Stern, 1983). Many have observed enhanced prosodic proficiency (e.g., Dubrac, 2013; Fuyuno et al., 2014; Ueyama, 2017) and heightened linguistic awareness (McMaster, 1998; O'Gara, 2008). Overall, drama appears to foster holistic and durable learning through physical and emotional involvement and reduces psychological obstacles to learning. Again, however, one must keep in mind that studies of the effects of drama have been conducted by teacher-researchers with an affinity for theatre and therefore susceptible to bias.

Learning Across the Curriculum through Theatrical Texts

Detailed consideration of the noted benefits of theatrical texts for content learning is beyond the scope of this chapter. Having said that, three general advantages can be stated and a brief illustration given of how theatrical material has been used by the author in a course on business communication.

The first advantage is that when theatre draws attention to relevant concepts in world cultural history (features of culture and their strengths, issues, and problems), it is through the experiences of the characters. Learning from these texts, then, is visceral as well as intellectual; the text is a way of gaining experience, not learning about experience. The second is that literature enables authentic participation in culture. In a CLIL framework, "an artistic activity paired with a language activity will allow the student to develop a multitude of competences, for example, to exercise his/her critical judgement, to display his/her creative thinking, and to communicate appropriately" (Dubois & Tremblay, 2015, p. 132; my translation). When using a theatrical text that is an authentic element of the culture, readers or reciters are, in Mikhail Bakhtin's (1981) formulation, taking part in discourse, in the ongoing conversations of others, through their encounter with the text, then by "expropriating it, forcing it to submit to one's own intentions and accounts" (p. 294). A third point is that intercultural diffusion through literature (such as reading the-

atrical pieces from a variety of cultures in English) is not in any way bizarre, but is rather a very commonplace condition. Itamar Even-Zohar (1978/2012) notes the disproportionately significant contributions of peripheral texts to most cultural milieux, while Claire Kramsch (1997) attests to the "thrill in trespassing [on] someone else's territory" (p. 256) which accompanies reading as a nonnative.

Specifically, the author has previously had success using theatrical texts to spur reflection on business communication strategies in a course for undergraduate university students. A scene from Molière's *The Imaginary Invalid*, where a doctor is seeking to take charge of a new patient, serves as an example of framing a meeting—including managing perceptions of self, business partner, and meeting objectives—through situational arrangements and speech patterns. The famous scene in Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* of a borrower and lender deciding the terms of a loan was used to show differing ways of managing a position in a negotiation—pressing for response, redirecting attention, and keeping a fall-back position. In contrast to prescriptive teaching of strategies for the various stages of business communication, students were encouraged to work out their own guiding principles as they considered the effects of differing personalities and strategies on the outcomes of the scene, and to apply those principles to situations that are nearer at hand.

The Teaching Practice

Rationale

In view of the promising concurrences between theatrical texts and CLIL learning noted above—that they provide authentic, meaningful, and integrated form-focused learning of content and language, that occasional marked or inventive wordings assist the learner in noticing form-function relationships (grammar-meaning and pragmatics-use relationships), and that interest sustained by the text enables repeated aural/oral practice—a teaching practice utilising play excerpts was imagined. The essence of this method is encouraging fascination and therefore repeated practice with the texts, and so the preparation of the texts, as learning materials, is a crucial step. By careful excerpting and by translation/adaptation, the materials sought to demystify texts that contained unfamiliar registers or cultural references, and explicit instruction of some cultural concepts and linguistic features was included to show how meanings in a story are developed in a theatrical text. The instructor also made clear to learners the underlying assumption that interest sustained by the text enables and encourages repeated practice, even to the

point, if learners were to "buy in" to the method, of developing familiarity and automaticity with the text sufficient for a polished performance.

While there was no intention to play down the importance of dramatic activities in drawing out learners' intrinsic resources and motivation (Maley & Duff, 2005), the present focus is directed elsewhere, namely, onto how the use of lively theatrical texts themselves enables or enhances the content to be learned/discussed, grammatical awareness, and prosodic features/patterns to be practised. Nonetheless, the teaching practice takes seriously the idea (suggested by Giebert, 2014 and others) that physical activity can help words and patterns be retained, not merely as isolated mental abstractions but as ingrained parts of the learner's physical routines and emotional temperament. Such physical activity may include moving, gesturing, as well as articulating stress, rhythm, and intonation, together with even moderate emotional involvement with repeated rehearsal of a part.

To summarise, when viewed within a CLIL framework, a teaching practice based on theatrical texts is proposed to have the following specific advantages.

As language learning materials, theatrical texts are engaging models of sustained spoken interactions,

- providing practice in hearing and noticing the phonetic and prosodic patterns of conversational English speech;
- motivating learners to practice producing natural English prosody—stress, rhythm, and intonation patterns; and
- (through the above practice) raising awareness about grammar/meaning and pragmatics/use relationships, and their relationships to prosodic patterns (e.g., stress, breath/intonation groups).

As resources for content learning, theatrical texts serve as spurs to learning through the examination of the play's cultural background, supporting a content syllabus covering world cultural history topics (including those such as slavery, roles of women/men, and attitudes towards medicine and science) and the development and role of theatre itself.

Deployment in Learning Environments

Following the adaptation or translation of texts for readers of multicultural backgrounds and the conception of learning points germane to the texts, a series of seven workshop-format lessons were developed. At the time of writing, four have been implemented.

The learning environments are i) an undergraduate CLIL course for English-language majors at a Japanese university, entitled *World Cultural History*

through Theatre, Poems, and Speeches (~10 students), ii) an English listening skills course at the same university (~35 students), and iii) an elective workshop series at an Australian university (~15 participants). In these venues, the theatrical texts are deployed (with background material and discussion activities, and with audio recordings—commercially available, public domain, or recorded as part of this project) in a series of learning activities. These activities are selected, sequenced, and recycled to suit the needs in each learning environment, and include:

- listening tasks (holistic and focused; with and without bi-modal reading accompaniment);
- shadowing and reading aloud;
- comprehension checks and meaning-focused explanations to repair comprehension gaps;
- practice in producing English prosodic patterns of stress, rhythm, and intonation;
- analysis and translation of repeated and/or pivotal lines in the text, and highlighting of relationships between prosody and grammar/pragmatics;
- rehearsed recitation and (quasi-)improvised performance; and
- group performances of excerpts with introductory and debriefing presentations dealing with the cultural contexts of the excerpts.

The activities put more focus on form (verbal, phrasal, and prosodic form) than there is commonly in Readers' Theatre. This was evidenced in more repetition and varied modes of practice, and activities aimed at noticing grammatical patterns and their relation to prosody. With such balanced emphases on form, meaning, and context, on listening ability and spoken production, than from one macro-activity (i.e., practice centred on the theatrical text), all the desiderata of regular and frequent repetition of input, meaning focus, and integrated form focus can feasibly be achieved.

Evaluation of the Practice

Summary of Data Collected

As the teaching practice is implemented, its effectiveness is being evaluated by a variety of qualitative probes and quasi-quantitative measures.

Qualitative

- real-time learner response (observations noted by researcher directly after each session)

- attitudes towards content and language learning through theatrical texts (probed by questionnaires modelled on Norton & Vanderheyden [2004]; see Appendix B)
- gains in content and language learning through theatrical texts (probed by questionnaires)

Quasi-Quantitative

- time spent practising language (measured by anonymous wide-angle classroom video)
- changes in listening comprehension level (measured by discrete item and integrative tests) and spoken production ability (measured by a recitation rubric)

At the time of writing, some of the qualitative data have been collected and analysed. The most significant findings are briefly reported below.

Real-Time Learner Response

Some of the observations of real-time learner response showed the benefits of participants perceiving and grappling with language features in the context of repetitive practice with theatrical texts. In an episode during the meaning-focused (story-focused) instruction phase with the author's adaptation of a scene from *Romeo and Juliet*, the underlined clause below caused some confusion.

Mother: *(entering)* Juliet, are you up?

Juliet: *(surprised)* Oh, mother.
Yes, madam. I am not well.

Mother: Are you sad about your cousin's death,
Or that the villain lives that killed him?

Juliet: What villain, madam?

A wording of the line that conforms to basic sentence patterns might be "the villain that killed him lives" (with the relative clause "that killed him" adjacent to the head noun "the villain"), and this wording might be less challenging for learners. However, as the relative clause is easily distinguished as a unit prosodically (as an intonation-breath group), the line was translated in a way that preserved the displaced relative clause of the original, with the objective that the challenge of comprehension would help to enhance learners' grammatical sensitivity (namely, here, to seek antecedents for relative

clauses).[3] Therefore, learners were told that "In poetry and song the phrases sometimes move around. Listen and look for the words that are related in meaning." In this way, as was asserted by Widdowson (1975) and by Hanauer (2001), de-familiarisation through poetry destabilised learners "and set them on a search for gaps" in their understanding, possibly leading to more retentive learning.

In the questionnaire responses, learners explicitly stated that searching for ways of understanding a text is aided by the practice of hearing and producing the prosodic features of the text, indicating that they were aware of the importance of prosody in revealing grammar/meaning and pragmatics/use relationships.

Attitudes towards Content and Language Learning through Theatrical Texts

In the questionnaires, students in the CLIL course and the listening skills course self-reported that they spent more time directly engaged in aural and oral practice than they had in previous comparable learning situations. This impression awaits corroboration from the wide-angle classroom video, but is plausible, due to the nature of the activities, most of which require repeated work (analysis or practice) with texts that are longer than those usually found in language learning materials, and appear to be capable of sustaining interest.

Gains in Content and Language Learning through Theatrical Texts

In the questionnaire responses after a session practising a scene from Lorraine Hansberry's *A Raisin in the Sun*, learners reported on the impact the sessions had regarding content and language. In the early familiarisation tasks (listening, shadowing, and comprehension checks), the lines that attracted attention during practice and the lines that were remembered verbatim after practice were those that contained exceptions to basic grammatical language patterns (of the type that might be used in learning materials), as underlined below:

> Beneatha: Oh I like George all right, Mama. <u>I mean</u> I like him enough to go out with him <u>and stuff</u>, but—

3 The line in Shakespeare's original has a similarly displaced relative clause:

> Lady Capulet: Well, girl, thou weep'st not so much for his death,
> As that the villain lives that slaughtered him.

Ruth: What does *and stuff* mean?

Beneatha: Mind your own business.

Mama: Stop picking at her, Ruth.

Beneatha: Oh, I just mean I couldn't ever really be serious about George. He's so shallow.

Ruth: Shallow–what do you mean he's shallow? He's rich!

A feature that these remembered lines share is that they were prosodically distinguished from the rest of the conversation, which suggests that repeated listenings and training in prosodic awareness may be assisting in the identification and comprehension of these phrases.

If we turn our attention to content learning, which for this text was focused on the culture and perceptions of African Americans in the US, it was clear that learners also showed sensitivity to the cultural questions raised by characters' words and actions without direction from the instructor. Several lines in the text prompted learners to make independent observations or pose questions. Some comments revealing learners' responses to cultural aspects from the play are listed below:

"Daughter argues hardly [strongly] with Mama."

"Beneatha wants to be free, to go out, to experience."

"Mama said 'God willing!' a lot."

"Mama was afraid of god."

"Beneatha thinks follow God or not follow God is decide[d] yourself."

In response to this play excerpt, learners also perceived in the text (of characters or implied by the author) attitudes relating to slavery, to religious freedom, and to arranged marriages.

Conclusion

These preliminary findings illustrate that there is promise for the idea of using theatrical texts as a basis for Content and Language Integrated Learning. Several concrete effects can plausibly be attributed to the special conditions entailed by engagement with theatrical texts.

- More time was spent engaged in aural/oral learning in the target language—due perhaps to interest being sufficiently sustained for extended and repeated analysis and practice.
- Linguistic patterns were noticed in their prosodic form, assisting with their retention—due perhaps to the primary mode of reception of these texts being aural/oral.
- Unfamiliar linguistic patterns were comprehended inductively, with and without assistance by the instructor—due perhaps to the de-stabilising effect of marked poetic patterns, and to greater attention to aural/oral prosodic form.
- Content learning points (aspects of cultural history) were observed independently, without indication by instructors—due perhaps to sheer fascination with the theatrical texts.

Quantitative evaluative measures and further qualitative findings are anticipated and will be reported in a subsequent study.

References

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). Discourse in the novel (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). In M. Holquist (Ed.), *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin* (pp. 259-422). University of Texas Press.

Biber, D., & Conrad, S. (2009). *Register, genre, and style*. Cambridge University Press.

Bidwell, S. M. (1990). Using drama to increase motivation, comprehension, and fluency. *Journal of Reading*, *34*(1), 38-41.

Bridges, C. L. (2008). Effects of readers' theatre on English language learners: A strategy for oral language and reading improvement. *TNTESOL Journal*, *1*, 20-29.

Brumfit, C., & Carter, R. (1986). *Literature and language teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (1995). Discourse and creativity: Bridging the gap between language and literature. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H. G. Widdowson* (pp. 303-322). Oxford University Press.

Dubois, J., & Tremblay, O. (2015). L'enseignement par le théâtre en classe de français au Québec: État des lieux et pistes didactiques. *Lidil. Revue de linguistique et de didactique des langues*, *(52)*, 129-152.

Dubrac, A. L. (2013, July 8). *Using theatre techniques in the language classroom* [Conference presentation]. 8th Drama and Education IDEA World Conference, Paris.

Edmonston, W. (1995). The role of literature in foreign language learning and teaching: Some valid assumptions and invalid arguments. *AILA Review*, *12*, 42-55.

Ellis, N. C. (2002). Frequency effects in language processing: A review with implications for theories of implicit and explicit language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *24*(2), 143-188.

Ellis, R. (1995). Interpretation tasks for grammar teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, *29*(1), 87-105.

Even-Zohar, I. (2012). The position of translated literature within the literary polysystem. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (pp. 199-204). Routledge. (Original work published 1978)

Falvey, P., & Kennedy, P. (1997). *Learning language through literature: A sourcebook for teachers of English in Hong Kong*. Hong Kong University Press.

Fuyuno, M., Hama, N., Myall, J., & Yukimaru, N. (2014). Effects of the experience of English recitation on Japanese EFL learners: Towards multi-modal English speaking skills education. *Annual Review of Language Learning and Teaching*, *4*, 15-28.

Gatbonton, E., & Segalowitz, N. (2005). Rethinking communicative language teaching: A focus on access to fluency. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *61*(3), 325-353.

Giebert, S. (2014). Drama and theatre in teaching foreign languages for professional purposes. *Recherche et Pratiques Pédagogiques En Langues de Spécialité. Cahiers de l'Apliut*, *XXXIII*(1), 138-150.

Hall, G. (2015). *Literature in language education*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Hanauer, D. I. (2001). The task of poetry reading and second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *22*(3), 295-323.

Hulstijn, J. H. (2001). Intentional and incidental second language vocabulary learning: A reappraisal of elaboration, rehearsal and automaticity. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 258-286). Cambridge University Press.

Ishihara, T., & Ono, A. (2015). The effects of literary texts on students' sentence recognition: Translation tasks and comprehension tasks. In M. Teranishi, Y. Saito, & K. Wales (Eds.), *Literature and language learning in the EFL classroom* (pp. 140-150). Palgrave Macmillan.

Kabilan, M. K., & Kamaruddin, F. (2010). Engaging learners' comprehension, interest and motivation to learn literature using the reader's theatre. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, *9*(3), 132-159.

Kao, S.-M., & O'Neill, C. (1998*). Words into worlds: Learning a second language through process drama*. Ablex.

Kramsch, C. (1997). Guest column: The privilege of the nonnative speaker. *PMLA*, *112*(3), 359-369.

Leech, G. N. (1969). *A linguistic guide to English poetry*. Longman.

MacFadden, P. (2010). *Using theatre arts to enhance literacy skills at the second grade level* [Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Irvine and University of California, Los Angeles]. ProQuest. https://search.proquest.com/docview/822194466

Maley, A., & Duff, A. (2005). *Drama techniques: A resource book of communication activities for language teachers* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Martin, A. L., & 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.

Martinez, M., Roser, N. L., & Strecker, S. (1999). "I never thought I could be a star": A reader's theatre ticket to fluency. *The Reading Teacher*, *52*(4), 326-334.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology. (2014, July 21). *Try, try again? Study says no: Trying harder makes it more difficult to learn some aspects of language, neuroscientists find*. ScienceDaily. https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2014/07/140721142211.htm
McMaster, J. C. (1998). "Doing" literature: Using drama to build literacy. *The Reading Teacher*, *51*(7), 574-584.
Norton, B., & Vanderheyden, K. (2004). Comic book culture and second language learners. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 201-221). Cambridge University Press.
O'Gara, P. (2008). To be or have not been: Learning language tenses through drama. *Issues in Educational Research*, *18*(2), 156-166.
Rasinski, T. (1988). Making repeated readings a functional part of classroom reading instruction. *Reading Horizons*, *28*(4), 250-254.
Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *11*(2), 129-158. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.129
Smith, D. M. (2011). *Readers theatre: Its effectiveness in improving reading fluency, student motivation, and attitudes toward reading among second-grade students* [Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University]. Penn State Electronic Theses and Dissertations for Graduate School. https://etda.libraries.psu.edu/catalog/12019
Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. (2008). Form-focused instruction: Isolated or integrated? *TESOL Quarterly*, *42*(2), 181-207.
Stern, S. L. (1983). Why drama works: A psycholinguistic perspective. In J. Oller & P. Richard-Amato (Eds.), *Methods that work* (pp. 207-225). Newberry House.
Takahashi, K. (2015). Literary texts as authentic materials for language learning: The current situation in Japan. In M. Teranishi, Y. Saito, & K. Wales (Eds.), *Literature and language learning in the EFL classroom* (pp. 26-40). Palgrave Macmillan.
Tannen, D. (1989). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*. Cambridge University Press.
Teranishi, M., Saito, Y., & Wales, K. (Eds.). (2015). *Literature and language learning in the EFL classroom*. Palgrave Macmillan.
Ueyama, M. (2017). Sougouteki komyunikeesyon nouryoku wo mezasita nihongo onsei kyouiku: Italia ni okeru nihongo engeki katudou no jissen kara [Japanese phonetic instruction aimed at comprehensive communication ability: Implementing Japanese language drama activities in Italy]. *Nihongo onsei komyunikeesyon [Japanese Phonetic Communication]*, *5*, 35-70.
Widdowson, H. G. (1975). *Stylistics and the teaching of literature*. Longman.

Appendix A: List of Source Materials Used

Plautus, *Mostellaria* (*The Ghost*), c. 200 BCE
William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, c. 1594–96

William Shakespeare, *The Merchant of Venice*, c. 1596–97
Molière, *Le Malade Imaginaire* (*The Imaginary Invalid*), 1673
Miyazawa Kenji, *Tsuchigami to Kitsune* (*Earthgod and Fox*), 1934
Lorraine Hansberry, *A Raisin in the Sun*, 1959

Appendix B: List of Questions Probing Content and Language Learning through the Theatrical Text *A Raisin in the Sun*

The language of the text:

[While answering this question, don't look at the script. Don't worry: it's not a test.]

Do you remember any lines? If so, write them here, as well as you can remember.

- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____

[You can look at the script again now. But don't change the lines you wrote above.]

Were some lines difficult for you? If so, write the difficult lines or phrases here. (You can also add a comment about why they were difficult if you like.)

- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____

Your character:

- What character (role) did you play?
- What did your character want?
- What did your character fear?

What did you learn about the world?

- What is interesting about the world of *A Raisin in the Sun**? (*African-American Chicago, 1950s, 60s)

- What was strange or different* about this scene?
  (*if you compare it to your world & your life?)
- What about this scene was the same, or similar, to your life?

Your experience:

- Did you enjoy reading this scene? (no! 1 2 3 4 5 yes!)
- Did you enjoy listening & shadowing to this scene? (no! 1 2 3 4 5 yes!)
- Did you enjoy speaking this scene? (no! 1 2 3 4 5 yes!)
- Would you like to use theatrical texts again?
- Do you think using this theatrical text was helpful in learning English? Why or why not?
- Do you think using this theatrical text was helpful in learning about the culture of another time and place? Why or why not?