

Exploring the Usefulness of Literature-based Writing Tasks on EFL College Students¹⁾

Ilsun Hyun (Hansung University)

Hyun, Ilsun. (2019) Exploring the usefulness of literature-based writing tasks on EFL college students. *Secondary English Education, 12(4)*, 147-165.

A resurgence of literature in EFL/ESL classes has drawn much attention for numerous benefits (Brumfit & Carter, 1986; Krashen, 1993; Lao & Krashen, 2000), but little empirical research has been conducted on the writing quality of L2 learners (Vandrick, 2003). This study examined the lexical complexity and verb use of ten EFL college students, adapting one-group quasi-experimental method. To analyze data, comparisons were made on the two different types of writing products of the students. The results found that the summaries of literary texts showed better language use than the opinion writing at a statistically significant level. That is, when the students summarized literary texts, they used more complex sentence structures and varied verbs over than when writing opinion writings. This finding presents a positive potential in improving L2 learners' writing quality and enriching their language use, opening a door to explore empirical benefits in literature use in L2 classes.

I . INTRODUCTION

Recent resurgence of literature use in L2 classes has gained much attention for its benefits (Brumfit, Brumfit, & Carter, 1986; Kay, 1982; Krashen, 1993, 2013; Lao & Krashen, 2000; vandrick, 2003; Young, 1996). Substantive studies have reached a consensus that literature clearly provides authentic input (Chen, 2006; Ghosn, 2002) and meaningful and enjoyable language-learning experiences (Lao & Krashen, 2000). Moreover, it motivates

¹⁾ This research was financially supported by Hansung University.

L2 learners' interests in L2 reading and writing (Ghosn, 2002; Kramsch, 1993). For example, Kramsch (1993) believed that the use of literature could support students with meaningful reading experiences that informational text could not. Lao and Krashen (2000) also claimed that literary texts could enhance language proficiency in the L2.

Despite the positive potential for the use of literature, it has played a peripheral role in most L2 contexts, and its integration into the language teaching context has faced critical challenges. With lack of insufficient teachers' training for pedagogically well-designed materials (Bobkina & Dominguez, 2014) and difficulties with assessing L2 learners' products based on literature (Hismanoglu, 2005; Kim, 2014), little evidence has been available on the usefulness of literature on improving L2 skills. Thus, few researchers have employed literature in L2 classes and identified its benefits in regard to improving foreign language skills (Kramsch, 1993; Lao & Krashen, 2000). The general consensus that has been reached is that the use of literary texts enhances L2 language proficiency (Lao & Krashen, 2000), and that literary texts play a pivotal role in providing meaningful reading experiences that informative texts rarely can (Kramsch, 1993).

Literary texts, furthermore, can contribute to the improvement of L2 learners' writing skills in ways that differ from other types of instructional materials. It has been believed that a distinctive connection exists between syntactic complexity and the writing quality of genres such as narrative and persuasive writing (Beers & Nagy, 2007). For instance, Beers and Nagy (2007) found that the relationship between words per clause and clauses per T-unit were different according to two genres. That is, a positive correlation was identified between narrative texts and clauses per T-unit, but a negative correlation was found with persuasive essays. Thus, reading literature in L2 classes is expected to contribute to improving writing quality in ways that differ from narrative or persuasive genres.

Nevertheless, scant research has focused on the extent to which reading literature provides benefits to L2 learners' writing skills (Vandrick, 2003). Topics of previous studies have included the attitudes of L2 learners toward literary texts used in teaching and learning English (Chen, 2006; Mart, 2016) and how to teach L2 students using literature (Schulz, 1981; Kim, 2004).

Few empirical studies are available on how reading literature affects the writing skills of L2 learners.

This study explored the effectiveness in utilizing literary texts to improvement of L2 college students' English writing quality regarding lexical complexity and verb sophistication. Adapting a one-group quasi-experimental research method, this study analyzed written products in summarization and opinion writings of 10 college students with a focus on lexical complexity and verb sophistication. To do this, two research questions were formulated as follows:

1. To what extent does the literature-based writing tasks affect syntactic complexity in the writings of L2 college students?
2. To what extent does the literature-based writing tasks affect verb sophistication in the writings of L2 college students?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Literature in L2 Instruction

The importance of literature use to L2 instruction has been highlighted since the mid-1980s (Brumfit, Brumfit, & Carter, 1986; Gajdusek, 1988; Kramsch, 1993; Hanauer, 2001). Multidimensional benefits from the use of literature range from improving L2 learners' linguistic and cultural knowledge (Lao & Krashen, 2000; Kramsch, 1993; Widdowson, 1979), empowering their creativity in writing and their motivation (Kramsch, 2013; Hanauer, 2001; Young, 1996) to critical thinking skill (Rocha, 2005; Yimwilai, 2015)

Accordingly, researchers have focused on how to implement literary texts into writing instruction for L2 learners (Lao & Krashen, 2000; Rosenblatt, 1994; Young, 1996). As a result, the implementation of literary texts has evolved differently according to class contexts. For example, whereas "extensive reading" has been prevalent in ESL classes employing literature (Day & Bamford, 1998, 2002; Day, Bamford, Renandya, Jacobs, & Yu, 1998; Nuttall, 1996), few attempts have been made to explore the interconnection

between reading literature and the improvement of L2 writing skills. Grabe (2001) pointed out a lack of empirical studies on the impact of reading for pleasure on improving L2 writing skills.

Moreover, few empirical studies have been conducted on teaching methods that employ a reading-to-write approach with literary texts in L2 classes (Huh, Lee, & Ha, 2018; Kim, 2004; O' Sullivan, 1991; Vandrick, 2003). For example, O' Sullivan (1991) suggested lively and interactive tasks comprehensively; among these were proposed "re-writing, scripting an episode for radio or TV, dramatizing what happened after the events in the story, writing an incident as a news report, writing the diary of a character in the text, writing a letter from one character to another, improvising a scene for live performance and interviewing one of the characters" (O' Sullivan, 1991, p. 5).

Vandrick (2003) suggested class discussions about themes, main characters, cultural plays, and response journals. Others have suggested integrated tasks based on literature such as reading journals and reading-to-write tasks to engage student participation (Kim, 2004; Huh, Lee, & Ha, 2018). These types of student-centered tasks can offer learners linguistic benefits, and literature appears to contribute to L2 learners' acquisition of vocabulary and grammatical structures (Spack, 1985; Van, 2009).

Despite the above-mentioned positive aspects and innovative ideas for utilizing literature in L2 instruction, L2 teachers often remain reluctant to use literature due to insufficient teachers' training for pedagogically well-designed materials (Bobkina & Dominguez, 2014). In addition, more training has been in needs for how to implement literature into classroom activities and how to test products based on literature (Hismanoglu, 2005; Kim, 2014). For instance, questions have been raised about formative assessment that is adapted for literary responses and about assuring reliability and validity; these are clearly critical concerns for evaluating L2 learners through literature-based L2 instruction.

2. Literature in L2 Writing

The use of literature in ESL/EFL courses can be traced back to the 1980s, when researchers mainly discussed how to teach a second language teaching with authentic materials. The discussion continued to including canonical literature and writing skills with an emphasis on communicative language teaching (Collie & Slater, 1987; Duff & Maley, 1990; Stern, 1985; Kramsch & Kramsch, 2000). With the recognition of the importance of “language through literature” (Belcher & Hirvela, 2000), substantive studies have been expanded with numerous models for teaching second/foreign languages and analyses of language acquisition based on literature.

To practice L2 writing skills by integrating literary texts, researchers proposed innovative activities such as reading dialogues, writing a diary, and responding to literature in a writing course (Brumfit, Brumfit, & Carter, 1986; Gajdusek, 1988). In addition, researchers have reached consensus that literature provides authentic sources whereby L2 learners acquire skills in vocabulary use in meaningful contexts as well as knowledge of linguistic structure (Spack, 1985; Duff & Maley, 1990; Van, 2009). For example, Duff and Maley (1990) highlighted the importance of literature use in language classes in terms of its linguistic, methodological, and motivational benefits.

Recently, researchers have rationalized their use of literature because of its efficacy for teaching discourse necessary for L2 learners. According to Belcher and Hirvela (2000), many writing teachers agree that using literature promotes analytical thinking skills and cultural learning. In addition, Hirvela (1998) believed that literature meets the needs of L2 learners for general literacy skills.

In spite of its numerous benefits, little empirical evidence about the effects of literature on writing classes has been published. Rather, previous studies have explored L2 students’ attitudes toward the use of literature in writing and reading tasks (Chen, 2006; Khabit, Derakhshan, & Rezaei, 2011; Kim, 2014; Mart, 2016; Murdoch, 2002; Oster, 1989; Rocha, 2005; Yimwilai, 2015; Yu, 2016). Recently, Yimwilai (2015) reported that the college students who were taught in a literature integrated L2 class achieved higher level of critical thinking compared to those in the traditional class. Moreover, the

teachers' role in literature-based L2 instruction has been discussed at great length. If a teacher selects texts appropriately in consideration of L2 students' proficiency and interest, he or she can avoid "frustrational reading" (Schulz, 1981, p. 44).

In addition, the teacher should balance teaching linguistic knowledge with literary textual elements. That is, he or she should include the teaching of literary components such as conflict, climax, and resolution (Kim, 2004; Rocha, 2006; Kramsch, 2013). Kim (2004) reported that a teacher in a literature-based language class should adopt a role as a provider, a communicator, a collaborator, and a facilitator. She also suggested that the teacher's role in teaching literature and language in an L2 class should differ from his/her role in traditional L2 class.

In summary, it seems clear that literature in L2 classes can offer students multifaceted benefits, helping them to acquire language, knowledge about the culture of the target language, and critical thinking skills. To accomplish this, EFL/ESL teachers should have expertise in designing curricula with appropriate activities, including those not only for understanding literary texts but also for initiating creative and critical thinking skills.

Therefore, despite the positive effects of literature use on L2 learners' writing improvement, little empirical evidence has been available about its effectiveness for L2 writing quality (Carter, 2007; Edmonson, 1997; Bobkina & Dominguez, 2014). This calls for further studies on the extent to which reading literature affects L2 writing skills in multifaceted aspects (Belcher & Hirvela, 2000; Vandrick, 2003).

III. METHODOLOGY

1. Participant

Ten students were recruited from the General English I. and they were seniors and juniors from six different departments. Their average age was 25, including six males and four females. Even though the proficiency level of the students was the novice level, they were motivated to learn English and had a high degree of willing to study English in this compulsory course.

The researcher particularly decided to recruit the senior and junior students as they were young adults who were mature enough to appreciate *The Great Gatsby* which was about betrayal, love and a young man’s dream. The demographic information of the students is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic Information of the Participants

Stage	Task	Demographic information	<i>n</i>
Gender	male		6
	female		4
Majors	Korean Literature		1
	English Literature		1
	social Science (administration, history)		2
	IT technology (computer, electronics)		2
	arts (dancing, design)		3
	mechanics		1
		Total	10

As seen in Table 1, the students were majoring in six different subjects. For this reason, it was expected to elicit diverse perspectives when discussing the story based on the students’ appreciation of the story.

2. Materials

1) Literary Texts

Regarding the literary texts, the students in this study read a edited version of *The Great Gatsby*, that was published as an ELT book, which was one of the Oxford Bookworms Library series at level 5 edition by the Oxford publishing company. The book targets for high schoolers in ESL classes for easy reading with shorter and simpler sentences than the original texts. Chen (2006) argues that selecting a book for children fits well when teaching L2 learners due to its simple and easy vocabularies and sentences structures. In addition, the chapter book has relatively short with easy sentences, so that the students at the novice level could read the texts without experiencing so-called “frustrational reading” (Schulz, 1981, p. 44).

Moreover, *The Great Gatsby* has been filmed twice. There have been two

movies that filmed the novel. That is the another reason for selecting this novel as the movies were useful in providing visual background for the texts of the book. Spack (1985) recommends choosing the literary texts which were filmed due to visual interpretation of the stories showing “costumes, scenery, and sounds of the works” (Spack, 1985, p. 710).

3. Procedures

1) Reading Literature

Twice a week for 75 minutes, the students worked on the literature-based reading and writing tasks and they were supposed to read the chapters at home. The researcher designed the reading literature with a focus on a student-centered tasks (Bibby & McIlroy, 2013; Kim, 2004). Thus, the class consisted of a group discussion, and individual presentations followed by a language focus.

In other words, all the students were been assigned one chapter of the book and were required to present a chapter summary, an analysis of vocabulary use, structures. As a reflective writing, the students had to choose at least one quote that they liked best with clear explanation on their choices. The description of the literature-based reading and writing classes was presented in Table 2.

As seen in Table 2, reading was preceded by four stages with pedagogical tasks and activities. At the pre-stages, the students predicted the events in the chapters to be covered in class. Filling a story flow chart made the students picture the story line and expect the upcoming events. In addition, to keep the students motivated while reading the story, the researcher provided a movie clip which described the chapter in each class. Watching the clip before the presentation, the students could engage in an enjoyable group discussion. Next, at the while-stage, the students summarized chapters they were in charge of and analyzed texts with grammatical points such as vocabulary use and sentence structures. Some culture-specific idioms and words were supposed to be included in the presentation.

Table 2. Description of the Class

Stage	Task	Objectives	Activities
Pre-	prediction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · understanding a story flow · motivating students to read the story in earnest · finding the background of the story (e.g. times, seasons, facts, characters, information about the author) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · filling in the flow charts · watching a video clip showing the events of the chapters
While-	chapter presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · summarizing chapters · text analysis · personal-response writing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · summarization · paraphrasing
Post-	discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · comprehension questions · making connections with personal experiences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · scanning · skimming
Language Focus	language analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · explanation on grammar · vocabulary use in texts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · language focus · sentence structure · vocabulary use

Moreover, the students wrote a personal response to the chapters. In other words, the students were asked to reflect on what they felt while reading the chapters in their presentations. In fact, the reflection was to engage students' aesthetic appreciation of literature and aimed to increase personal growth through critical and creative thinking skills (Rosenblatt, 1983; Kramsch, 2013; Hanauer, 2001; Young, 1996).

At the post-stage discussion occurred with comprehension questions in groups. Lastly, the researcher explained grammar points and gave comments on the presentation, focusing on language use in texts. For example, vocabulary which is culturally used needs explanation not only for the meaning, but also the cultural background of the words.

2) Writing Tasks

Two writing tasks were given during the course. The first task required the students to summarize four chapters of the novel, *The Great Gatsby*. The first four chapters include information about the background of the story, such as seasons, places, and years. with the summarization task, the students were involved in re-reading and paraphrasing the text and this was expected to enhance the students' writing skills.

Hismanoglu (2005) argues that literature can be a good reproducing model which develops students' writing ability through paraphrasing, summarizing, and adapting the story to their own lives. In addition, Hismanoglu (2005) claims that summarization goes well with short stories when they include a chronological order as concrete literary devices.

Another writing task was writing an opinion paragraph about "Do you agree that English is an essential to getting a job?" The topic was decided for the students participating in this study since they were mostly seniors and juniors who were serious about studying English for the better jobs. Within thirty minutes, the students were required to complete their writing pieces with a clear topic sentence, supporting details, and concluding ideas. The question for writing opinion essays was included among the test items on the final exam.

4. Data Analysis

1) Writing Tasks

Twenty writing products in two genres: summaries and opinion writing were collected. Prior to the experiment, the researcher announced that the each writing accounts for ten points of the total credit scores. Regarding the summary, the students completed it for 40 minutes in class. The summary had to include main events from the chapter one to four of the book, covering the introduction, the main events and before the climax.

Concerning the opinion writing, the students had to write about the given question, "Do you agree that English is essential to get a job?" . The opinion writing asked the students to provide their ideas with clear topic sentences, details and concluding ideas. The students needed to complete it withing 30 minutes during the final exam.

2) Writing Quality

To analyzed the both writing products of the ten students according to the different genres, Lexical Complexity Analyzer (Lu, 2011, 2012) was utilized.

Previous studies adopted the lexical complexity for analyzing writing quality of L2 learners in multidimensional aspects with different indices (Kim, 2014; Lu, 2011, 2012). The selected indices included (a) lexical density (LD), (b) verbs to the total number of verbs (VV1/2), measure of lexical variation (NDW) and the ratio of the number of word type (T) to the number of words (N) in a text, which is TTR/CTTR. In terms of verb sophistication, the Syntactic Complexity Analyzer was also run (Kim, 2014; Lu, 2011, 2012) with indices measuring the quality of writing focused on verb use. The indices were (a) the number of sophisticated verb types (VS) (b) corrected VS (CVS) (c) verb variation (VV) (d) squared VV (SVV) and (e) corrected VV (CVV).

In addition, Wilcoxon signed-rank analysis was run to examine any statistically significant differences in the writing quality of the ten paired writing products concerning syntactic complexity and verb sophistication.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The comparisons were made on the two types of writing products in terms of lexical complexity and verb sophistication according to indices adapted from the study of Lui (2012). Considering the low proficiency level of the students, the analysis focused on vocabulary level.

1. Lexical Complexity

Lexical Complexity Analyzer was run to analyze the lexical complexity of two writing products of the ten students according to six indices²⁾. The results of the analysis are summarized in Table 3.

As seen in Table 3, the complexity in the two writing products does not have much differences. Regarding the NDW, there is a notable difference

²⁾ LD (lexical density): the ratio of the number lexical words to the total number of words; LS (lexical sophistication); the proportion of relatively unusual or advanced words in the learners' text (Read, 2000, p. 203); NDW: measure of lexical variation is the number of different words; TTR(Type-token ratio): the ratio of the number of word type (T) to the number of words (N) in a text, CTTR (Corrected TTR)

between the two different genres-based writing products (e.g. summarization & opinion writing). In other words, the NDW of the summary writing is much higher than that of the opinion writing, which confirms the previous findings reporting that a literature-based reading and writing provides fruitful language input to L2 learners (Chen, 2006; Lao & Krashen, 2000).

Table 3. Comparison of Lexical Complexity Across Genres

Student	Genres	LD	LS1	LS2	NDW	CTTR	TTR
Boyoung	1	0.55	0.35	0.15	54	4.17	0.64
	2	0.56	0.25	0.19	59	4.72	0.76
JaeYoung	1	0.53	0.32	0.18	148	5.56	0.42
	2	0.56	0.16	0.16	75	4.42	0.52
MinGi	1	0.66	0.35	0.27	112	5.14	0.47
	2	0.67	0.21	0.21	58	4.14	0.59
SiWon	1	0.6	0.38	0.21	137	5.35	0.42
	2	0.67	0.21	0.21	58	4.14	0.59
DongHoon	1	0.65	0.56	0.2	124	5	0.4
	2	0.61	0.2	0.15	60	4.06	0.55
YoungKye	1	0.54	0.54	0.2	101	5.09	0.51
	2	0.6	0.21	0.18	73	4.81	0.64
DongMin	1	0.65	0.65	0.17	99	4.69	0.44
	2	0.63	0.4	0.27	73	4.54	0.57
SeHee	1	0.51	0.51	0.34	76	4.17	0.46
	2	0.53	0.15	0.11	46	3.73	0.61
JuMin	1	0.59	0.59	0.26	159	5.35	0.36
	2	0.54	0.2	0.15	60	4.45	0.66
EunHa	1	0.54	0.54	0.17	204	6.11	0.37
	2	0.64	0.09	0.07	60	3.81	0.73
Mean	1	0.573	0.479	0.215	121.4	5.06	0.499
	2	0.601	0.208	0.17	60.2	4.28	0.622

Note. Genres; type 1 refers to the summary of literary texts and type 2 does the opinion writings.

Wilcoxon signed-rank analysis was run to find any statistically differences in the paired values of the lexical complexity between the two collected written products. The results are presented in Table 4. As seen in Table 4, there exist statistically significant differences between the two writings concerning LS1 ($p = .005$), TTR ($p = .005$), CCTR ($p = .017$), NDW ($p = .007$), and the ratio of the word types (e.g., TTR, CCTR). These results indicate that the writing quality on literary texts could contribute to

improving L2 college learners' writing skills.

Table 4. Analysis of Lexical Complexity

indices (b) \ indices (a) ³⁾	LD(a)	LS1(a)	LS2(a)	NDW(a)	CCTR(a)	TTR(a)
	LD(b)	LS1(b)	LS2(b)	NDW(b)	CCTR(b)	TTR(b)
Z	-1.78	-2.805	-1.54	-2.701	-2.395	-2.809
Asym. Sig. (2-tailed)	.074	.005	.123	.007	.017	.005

Although the writing quality was analyzed with a focus on lexical complexity, the result confirms the positive impact of utilizing literature/literary texts in L2 writing classes, supporting the previous findings of the benefits in literature use to improving L2 writing skills (Mart, 2016).

2. Verb Sophistication

The analysis was conducted on the verb sophistication across the seven⁴⁾ indices and the results are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5. Comparison of Verb Sophistication Across Genres

Student	Genres	VS1	VS2	CVS1	VV1	VV2	SVV1	CVV1
Boyoung	1	0.08	0.08	0.2	11.08	0.20	2.35	0.74
	2	0	0	0	6.00	0.14	1.73	0.91
JaeYoung	1	0.10	0.51	0.51	19.61	0.17	3.13	0.55
	2	0.12	0.24	0.34	11.53	0.17	2.40	0.62
MinGi	1	0.13	0.64	0.57	12.41	0.14	2.49	0.55
	2	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.45	0.11	1.49	0.62
SiWon	1	0.08	0.31	0.40	21.35	0.17	3.27	0.53
	2	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.45	0.11	1.49	0.62
DongHoon	1	0.03	0.03	0.12	9.82	0.1	2.22	0.52
	2	0.14	0.43	0.46	3.86	0.14	1.39	0.61
YoungKye	1	0.03	0.03	0.13	14.7	0.2	2.71	0.65
	2	0.07	0.07	0.19	10.29	0.18	2.27	0.73

³⁾ (a) of the indices refers to one of the literature summary; (b) refers to opinion essay.

⁴⁾ VS1, VS2 (Verb variation - I, II) refers to the number of nouns to the total number of verbs, and that of the verbs to the total number of verbs respectively; SVV1 (Squared VV1), CVV1(Corrected VV1)

DongMin	1	0.03	0.03	0.12	13.36	0.14	2.58	0.51
	2	0.35	2.12	1.03	8.47	0.15	2.06	0.57
SeHee	1	0.09	0.18	0.3	4.55	0.12	1.51	0.52
	2	0.07	0.07	0.18	9.6	0.3	2.19	0.75
JuMin	1	0.08	0.39	0.44	17.02	0.13	2.92	0.46
	2	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.10	0.18	2.01	0.73
EunHa	1	0.05	0.14	0.26	26.37	0.14	3.66	0.53
	2	0.14	0.14	0.27	3.57	0.14	1.34	0.77
Mean	1	0.07	0.23	0.24	15.06	0.15	2.68	0.55
	2	0.08	0.30	0.30	7.03	0.16	1.83	0.69

Wilcoxon signed-rank analysis was run to find any further differences in the paired samples of writings between the summary of literature and the opinion writing. The results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Analysis of Verb Sophistication

indices (b) \ indices (a) ⁵⁾	VS1(a)	VS2(a)	CVS1(a)	VV1(a)	SVV1(a)	CVV1(a)	VV2(a)
	VS1(b)	VS2(b)	CVS2(b)	VV1(b)	SVV1(b)	CVV1(b)	VV2(b)
Z	-2.05	-.652	-.866	-2.49	-2.39	-2.807	.000
Asym. Sig. (2-tailed)	.838	.515	.386	.013	.017	.005	1.00

Table 6 shows the existence of statistically significant differences in verb sophistication between the two writing products according to the three indices. That is, the verbs to the total number of verbs between VV1(a) and VV1(b) have statistically significant differences ($p = .013$). In addition, significant differences exist both in VS2 and SVV1. These results imply that the writing quality regarding the verb sophistication was different at a statistically significant level when the students wrote the summaries of literature.

VI. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This study suggests the importance and the need for including literary texts for teaching EFL students as a method for motivating writing tasks.

⁵⁾ (a) of the indices refers to one of the literature summary; (b) refers to opinion essay.

Indeed, statistically significant differences were found in the quality between literature-based summaries and opinion writings of the same students regarding lexical complexity and verb sophistication. Moreover, the students produced more various verbs in the literature-based summary than when they wrote the opinion writings. As the increase in the variety of verb usage is an indicator of an advanced writing level (Grant, 2000), it implies that literature-based writing tasks may induce L2 learners' writing skill to reach its highest level.

At that point, the findings of this study could provide baselines for designing the English course for the freshmen students who had been immersed in reading academic texts only due to preparing for the college admission exam in Korea. As suggested, reading books written for children can be a good start (Chen, 2006), or watching movies with books could be triggering ways to encourage EFL students to read more books in their target language (Spcak, 1985; Goctu, 2017; Ismaili, 2013). Not only does such instruction prompt higher-order thinking skills (Rocha, 2005, Ismaili, 2013), but it contributes to students' motivation in reading and writing in English (Rocha, 2005; Vandrick, 1997), and fits into a communicative approach. To follow these methods, teachers need supportive help from their peers and workshops for designing a curriculum based on literature from choosing appropriate literature and how to teach it in L2 class.

The findings of this study, nevertheless, were too limited to be generalized. The small sample size and the short period of time for the experiment limited the application of the findings to the general population. Further study needs to consider including various writing tasks with different genres to be able to compare their written products with the literature-based ones at various proficiency levels. Despite the abovementioned limitations, it seems to be clear that the literature-based writing could have the potential to improve EFL students' writing quality.

In short, developing an English curriculum which utilizes literary texts needs to be considered at the college level. L2 teachers thus should definitely provide EFL learners with opportunities to appreciate literary works and experiences of personal growth in creative and critical thinking through group discussion (Rosenblatt, 1983; Kramsch, 2013; Hanauer, 2001;

Young, 1996). Moreover, learners can improve their writing quality by taking a cue from the authentic language use in literary texts (Spack, 1985; Van, 2009). Additionally, the literature itself could be a good writing model (Nuttall, 1996; Spack, 1985), as an authentic and motivational language source for L2 students to utilize for compositions (Bibby & McIlroy, 2015; Hanauer, 2001; Kramersch, 2013).

REFERENCES

- Beers, S., & Nagy, W. (2009). Syntactic complexity as a predictor of adolescent writing quality: Which measures? Which genres? *Reading and Writing, 22*(2), 185–200.
- Belcher, D., & Hirvela, A. (2000). Literature and L2 composition: Revisiting the debate. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(1), 21–39.
- Bibby, S., & McIlroy, T. (2013). Literature in language teaching: What, why, and how. *The Language Teacher, 37*(5), 19–21.
- Bobkina, J., & Dominguez, E. (2014). The use of literature and literary texts in the EFL classroom' between consensus and controversy. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 3*(2), 248–260.
- Brumfit, C. J., Brumfit, C., & Carter, R. (1986). *Literature and language teaching*. Oxford University.
- Carter, A. (1986). *Linguistic models, language and literariness*. In R. Carter & G. J. Brumfit (Eds.) *Literature and Language Teaching* (pp. 110–132). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carter, R. (2007). Literature and language teaching 1986–2006: A review. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 17*(1), 3–13.
- Chen, Y. M. (2006). Using children's literature for reading and writing stories. *Asian EFL Journal, 8*(4), 210–232.
- Collie, J., & Slater, S. (1987). *Literature in the classroom*. Cambridge: CUP. stylistics.
- Day, R. R., & Bamford, J. (2002). Top ten principles for teaching extensive reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 14*(2), 136–141.
- Day, R. R., & Bamford, J. (1998). *Extensive reading in the second language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Day, R. R., Bamford, J., Renandya, W. A., Jacobs, G. M., & Yu, V. W. S.

- (1998). Extensive reading in the second language classroom. *RELC Journal*, 29(2), 187–191.
- Duff, A., & Maley, A. (1990). *Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Edmonson, W. (1997). The role of literature in foreign language learning and teaching: Some valid assumptions and invalid arguments. *AILA Review*, 12, 42–55.
- Gajusek, L. (1988). Toward wider use of literature in ESL: Why and how. *TESOL Quarterly*, 22(2), 227–257.
- Ghosn, I. (2002). Four good reasons to use literature in primary school ELT. *ELT Journal*, 2(56), 172–179.
- Goctu, R. (2017). Using movies in EFL classrooms. *European Journal of Language and Literature*, 3(2), 121–124.
- Grabe, W. (2001). Reading–writing relations: Theoretical perspectives and instructional practices. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading–writing connects* (pp. 15–47). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Grant, L., & Ginther, A. (2000). Using computer–tagged linguistic features to describe L2 writing differences. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(2), 123–145.
- Hanauer, D. (2001). The task of poetry reading and second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 22(3), 295–323.
- Hismanoglu, M. (2005). Teaching English through literature. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 1(1), 53–66.
- Hirvela, A. (1998). Journeys through literature. *English for Specific Purposes*, 3(17), 320–326.
- Ismaili, M. (2013). The effectiveness of using movies in the EFL classroom—a study conducted at South East European University. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 2(4), 121–132.
- Huh, M. H., Lee, J., & Ha, H. S. (2018). EFL Writing development through repetition of literature–reading writing tasks. *The Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 34(4), 53–74.
- Kay, S. (1982). Literature in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16(4), 529–536.
- Kim, H. R. (2004). What works with struggling EFL learners?: The use of literature and E–mail writing for L2 literacy development. *Foreign*

- Languages Education*, 11(2), 125–148.
- Kim, H. R. (2014). Dialogue journal writing through a literature-based approach in an ESL setting. *English Teaching*, 58(4), 293–318.
- Kim, J. Y. (2014). Predicting L2 writing proficiency using linguistic complexity measures: A corpus-based study. *English Teaching*, 69(4), 27–51.
- Khabit, M., Derakhshan, A., & Rezaei, S. (2011). Why & why not literature: A task-based approach to teaching literature. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 1(1), 213–218.
- Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kramsch, C. (2013). Culture in foreign language teaching. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 1(1), 57–78.
- Kramsch, C., & Kramsch, O. (2000). The avatars of literature in language study. *The Modern Language Journal*, 84(4), 553–573.
- Lao, C. Y., & Krashen, S. (2000). The impact of popular literature study on literacy development in EFL: More evidence for the power of reading. *System*, 28, 261–270.
- Lu, X. (2011). A corpus-based evaluation of syntactic complexity measures as indices of college-level ESL writers' language development. *TESOL Quarterly*, 45(1), 36–62.
- Lu, X. (2012). The relationship of lexical richness to the quality of ESL learners' oral narratives. *The Modern Language Journal*, 96(2), 190–208.
- Mart, C. T. (2016). The use of literature in language teaching. *Journal of Educational and Instructional Studies in the World*, 6(2), 77–83.
- Murdoch, G. (2002). Exploiting well-known short stories for language skills development. *IATEFL LCS SIG Newsletter*, 23, 9–17.
- Nuttall, C. (1996). *Teaching reading skills in a foreign language* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Heinemann.
- O' Sullivan, R. (1991). Literature in the language classroom. *The English Teacher*, 20, 1–7.
- Oster, J. (1989). Seeing with different eyes: Another view of literature in the ESL class. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(1), 85–103.
- Read, J. (2000). *Assessing vocabulary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Rosenblatt, L. M. (1994). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP.
- Schulz, R. A. (1981). Literature and readability: Bridging the gap in foreign language reading. *The Modern Language Journal*, 65, 43–53.
- Spack, R. (1985). Literature, reading, writing and ESL: Bridging the gaps. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(4), 703–721.
- Van, T. T. M. (2009). The relevance of literary analysis to teaching literature in the EFL classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 3, 2–9.
- Vandrick, S. (1997). Reading and responding to novels in the university ESL classroom. *The Journal of the Imagination in Language and Teaching*, 4, 104–107.
- Vandrick, S. (2003). *Literature in the teaching of second language composition*. In B. Kroll. (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamic of second language writing* (pp. 263–283). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Yimwilai, S. (2015). An integrated approach to teaching literature in an EFL classroom. *English Language Teaching*, 8(2), 14–21.
- Young, A. (1996). Introducing critical thinking at the college level with children's stories. *College Teaching*, 44(3), 90–93.
- Yu, H. J. (2016). College students' perceptions about the connection between English reading and writing in L2 reading-based writing. *Studies on English Language & Literature*, 42(4), 254–262.

Examples in: English

Applicable Languages: English

Applicable Levels: Tertiary Education

Key words: literature, writing tasks, writing quality

Hyun, Ilsun (Assistant Professor)

Institute of Liberal Arts Education

Hansung University

Samsun St. 16, 116

SeoungBuk Gu, Seoul

E-mail: astella77@gmail.com

Received in July 25, 2019

Reviewed in August 10, 2019

Revised version received in October, 15, 2019