

# Pursuit of Literary Competence: Past, Present, and Future

Takayuki NISHIHARA  
*Hiroshima University*

## Abstract

In English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classes that use literary texts, evaluating learners' literary engagement is necessary. Unfortunately, the evaluation of literary engagement is an under-researched process partly because the development of literary competence models has been insufficient to conduct such evaluation rigorously. However, there have been some significant recent developments in this field, which are expected to help establish an evaluation framework for EFL students. This review study identifies five specific problems with past literary competence models and examines how they are covered in the new models including the new framework of Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment (CEFR), CEFR-J, the Innsbruck model of literary competence, and Nishihara's (2015) model for designing an EFL literature test. It further addresses the issues to be explored by the literary competence studies in the future to create a literary engagement evaluation framework for EFL learners: development of scales and can-do descriptors related to literary competence, validity confirmation of literary competence models, scales, and descriptors, and the necessity to establish more multimodal and multifaceted literary competence models.

## 1. Introduction

When literary texts are used as teaching materials in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classes, it is essential to evaluate learners' engagement with the texts. While extensive research on teaching methods does exist, much less attention has been paid to the evaluation process itself (Hall, 2015; Hanauer, 1996; Lee, 2011). This<sup>1</sup> is largely due to the underdevelopment of literary<sup>2</sup> competence models<sup>3</sup> partly because researchers could not reach a consensus regarding what needs to be evaluated (or taught) in classes using literary material.<sup>4</sup>

Recently, new literary competence models (Atler & Ratheiser, 2019; Council of Europe, 2018, 2020; Nishihara, 2015; Paran, Spöttl, Ratheiser, & Eberharter, 2021) have been developed to address these issues. In addition to trying to unify the subcomponents of literary competence, it is hoped that the new models will help to create a framework for evaluating learners' literary engagement in EFL classes.

This paper has the following three aims:

- (1) To review the previous problems of literary competence models (past)

- (2) To examine how the new literary competence models cover the problems (present)
- (3) To discuss future requirements if literary competence studies are to develop an evaluation framework for learners' EFL literary engagement (future)

Section 2 reviews past literary competence models proposed independently in applied linguistics, linguistics, literary theory, and literature testing research, with a total of five problems identified. Section 3 summarizes new literary competence models, especially the new framework of Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment (CEFR) (Council of Europe, 2020), CEFR-J (Tono & Negishi, 2020), the Innsbruck model of literary competence (Atler & Ratheiser, 2019), and Nishihara (2015), discussing how the five problems are covered by these models. Section 4 addresses the topics literary competence studies will need to engage in the future to establish a framework for EFL literary evaluation.

## 2. Past

Various literary competence models have been developed from applied linguistics, linguistics, literary theory, and literature testing studies. However, all have had several difficulties that prevented them from being applied to evaluation practice in EFL classrooms. This section reviews the main literary competence models in these areas and identifies five issues.

In applied linguistics, the core obstacle is that literary competence has not been fully described. For example, Bachman's (1990) and Bachman and Palmer's (1996, 2010) communicative competence models include functional knowledge<sup>5</sup> as one of their subcomponents. This includes the knowledge of imaginative functions, which "enables us to use language to create an imaginary world or extend the world around us for humorous or esthetic purposes: examples include jokes and the use of figurative language and poetry" (Bachman & Palmer, 1996, pp. 69–70).<sup>6</sup> However, this is the only reference to a relevant feature of literary competence.

The CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001),<sup>7</sup> which has influenced foreign language education in various regions, also insufficiently describes literary competence.<sup>8</sup> For instance, although this framework refers to the ludic and aesthetic uses of language, the detailed description at each proficiency level was not developed. Furthermore, the framework associated literary competence with excellent foreign language skills. For instance, can-do descriptors related to literary competence were only found at the B2 level and above on the reading scale,<sup>9</sup> thus creating the widespread misunderstanding that literary engagement is only possible for learners possessing superior target language proficiency.<sup>10</sup>

In linguistics, literary competence models were presented in generative grammar and discourse analysis. Unfortunately, the problem of fragmented description arises here again. In generative grammar,<sup>11</sup> Grinder and Elgin (1973) discussed literary competence based on the assumption that literary and everyday language share the same syntactical rules. They proposed extensions of overlap

deletion and technique deletion<sup>12</sup> to explain the generation of literary language. However, these rules were the only literary contents included in their study,<sup>13</sup> and the discussion about literary competence did not make further progress in this academic field.

In discourse analysis, Stubbs (1983) presented the following description of literary competence:

Competent readers of stories are able to identify the plot, distinguish the plot from background information, summarize the story, discuss the adequacy of such summaries, decide whether two summaries are equivalent, identify borderline cases, and so on. This ability is part of our literary competence... (p. 195).

Again, the description of literary competence ends up being fragmented: the description is limited to reading stories, with particular emphasis on the processing of plots. Stubbs (1983) also pointed out that “literary competence involves the ability to understand several different kinds of semantic relationship: between sentences and different kinds of proposition conveyed by them; and between what is said and what is implied” (p. 210). This definition embodies another problem in that it refers only to aspects related to general reading comprehension (i.e., there is no mention of genre-specific reading).

In literary theory, different ideal reader models<sup>14</sup> have been proposed following Barthes’s (1968/1977) famous declaration “The Death of the Author”<sup>15</sup> (e.g., implied reader (Iser, 1972/1974; Booth, 1961)<sup>16</sup>, informed reader (Fish, 1970), super-reader (Riffaterre, 1959), model reader (Eco, 1979), and narratee (Prince, 1971)).<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, various literary competence models have been proposed based on the abilities that ideal literary readers are expected to possess.<sup>18</sup> Hence, literary theory viewed literary competence as a construct independent of linguistic competence. Consequently, its scope was limited to interpretation of works, with little discussion about the relationship between literary competence (or its subcomponents) and linguistic competence and general reading ability. Furthermore, the subcomponents of literary competence differed greatly among the models, so researchers could not reach consensus about what constitutes literary competence. For example, Bierwisch (1965/1970) proposed a poetic competence model, which includes (1) the ability to produce poetic forms (such as rhyme and structure), to understand these forms as poetic, and to recognize deviations; and (2) the ability to judge deviant linguistic expressions as poetic. Culler (1975) holds that literary competence comprises the following seven components: (1) the knowledge that literary reading needs “to look at the language in new ways, to make relevant properties of the language which were previously unexploited, to subject the text to a different series of interpretive operations” (p. 114); (2) the rule of significance (to “read the poem as expressing a significant attitude to some problem concerning man and/or his relation to the universe” (p. 115)); (3) the convention of metaphorical coherence (words or concepts used in metaphors must match the metaphorical expression attempts); (4) the convention to read a literary text in a literary tradition that the text originally belongs to; (5) the convention of thematic unity (the work needs to be coherent at as many textual levels as possible); (6) the recognition of “binary oppositions as thematic devices” (p. 126);

and (7) the convention that “to read a text as literature is to read it as fiction” (p. 128). In turn, Riffaterre (1978) proposed a model that regarded literary competence as the ability of the reader to derive the overall meaning of the work through attention to ungrammatical linguistic expressions (or those that prevent smooth reading).<sup>19</sup>

Schauber and Spolsky (1986), drawing on Jackendoff (1983), also attempted to describe the abilities of good literary readers. Their model consists of three subsystems: linguistic, pragmatic,<sup>20</sup> and literary competence. They used the term *literary competence* in two senses: first, in a narrow sense (i.e., one subsystem), referring to the knowledge of conventions for interpreting literary texts, which is gained by acquiring experience and training (p. 20). In this definition, literary competence includes both structural aspects, such as the presence or absence of certain elements (rules), as in the case of *kigo* (seasonal word) in haiku, along with functional aspects related to typicality, such as the use of deviant expressions in a work (deviant expressions do not in themselves make the text literature, but literary texts tend to include such expressions). Hanauer (1997) proposed a poetic text-processing model based on this narrow sense of literary competence, which involves the ability to tell from the linguistic patterns that the text is a poem, to construct a mental representation by assigning meaning to those patterns according to the interpretive community<sup>21</sup> to which the reader belongs (Fish, 1980), and to summarize and write interpretations of poetic texts. The second, broad sense of literary competence by Schauber and Spolsky (1986) builds on the functioning of the three subsystems. The authors held that pragmatic competence was supported by linguistic competence, with literary competence in a narrow sense supported by pragmatic competence (pp. 21–22). However, they did not provide a detailed description of this relationship.

Literature testing research presented most concrete literary competence models with specific subskills or subcomponents. However, descriptions differed from one model to another, with researchers failing to construct a unified model.

- (1) knowledge of specific set novels, plays, poems considered ‘great works’;
- (2) knowledge of the culture within which those works were produced;
- (3) the ability to respond to any literary text with appreciation;
- (4) the ability to produce literary text in the form of creative writing;
- (5) the ability to respond to a variety of texts, literary and non-literary with sensitivity, recognizing the nature and communicative value of each;
- (6) the ability to write coherent essays;
- (7) the ability to teach literature in either original or simplified form at the preparatory or secondary level (Hawkey & Rezk, 1991, p. 86).

- (1) understanding plain sense (general gist, specific meaning);
- (2) understanding context (author’s life, social background, historical background, cultural background, geographical background);

- (3) learning to empathize (feelings, characters, events, scenes, settings);
- (4) learning to appreciate (rhythm, sounds, character, setting, genre, plot, mood, themes, language, imagery, form);
- (5) learning to be creative (expressing feelings and moods; describing characters, settings, and events; using sounds, imagery, rhymes, rhythms);
- (6) learning the critical framework (New Criticism, structuralism, deconstructionism, Marxist criticism) (Spiro, 1991, pp. 44–45).

Although these two models share some common features, their descriptions do not match entirely. Thus, Hawkey and Rezk's (1991) model does not include a description about understanding the creative aspects of language, while Spiro's (1991) model lacks a reference to interpretation (the sixth item is relevant to interpretation, but it appears to target literary critics more than general readers). Consequently, teachers could not decide on which model to base their evaluation practice, and as a result, the proposed models were rarely used in English language teaching.

Some models, such as McRae's (1991), describe literary competence without referring to genre-specific reading traits.

- (1) the ability to make connections and cross-references;
- (2) the ability to quote and summarise constructively;
- (3) the ability to balance arguments and reach conclusions;
- (4) the ability to take subjective standpoints and relate them to objective criteria;
- (5) the ability to contextualise; and many others, depending on individual situations (p. 118).

This model, like Stubbs' (1983), comprises only general linguistic/reading abilities. Thus, teachers cannot use this model to assess learners' specific performance unique to literary engagement.

Some studies on literature testing restricted literary engagement to advanced English language learners. Henning (1992) thus asserted that literary interpretation is one of the skills that should be acquired in foreign language learning and developed detailed competence descriptors within the reading framework by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL).<sup>22</sup> In this model, foreign language proficiency is divided into eight levels—novice, novice high, intermediate, intermediate high, advanced, advanced plus, superior, superior plus—and the list of literary skills that learners should attain at each level is cataloged. However, this model adheres to the ACTFL's premise that literary works can only be read by learners already proficient in English. In fact, Henning's model assumes that learners at the novice level of literary competence must have reached an intermediate-to-high level of general reading comprehension proficiency. Consequently, no consideration has been given to the development of literary competence at the initial stage of learning English.

To summarize the discussion so far, previous models exhibit the following five issues:

- (1) There was a fragmented description of literary competence (applied linguistics and linguistics);
- (2) Literary engagement and its development were confined to advanced foreign language learners (applied linguistics and literature testing research);
- (3) Literary competence is sometimes defined solely by general linguistic/reading abilities (linguistics and literature testing research);
- (4) Literary competence is often defined only in terms of genre-specific traits, and the relationship to general linguistic/reading abilities is not considered (literary theory);
- (5) Researchers could not agree about what constitutes literary competence (literary theory and literature testing research).

Problems (3) and (4) may be integrated into one problem, that is, previous models failed to include both general linguistic/reading abilities and genre-specific traits. Schauber and Spolsky's (1986) and Spiro's (1991) models are exceptional in that both aspects were contained. The importance of considering both traits is discussed in Paran (2006), Sauro and Sundmark (2016), and Zyngier, Fialho, and do Prado Rios (2007).

### 3. Present

Recently, literary competence models have seen some significant advances. This section reviews these new studies and confirms that the problems of the past models identified in the previous section are being mitigated.

First, the CEFR renewed their framework (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume (Council of Europe, 2018, 2020)) and three scales related to literary competence ("reading as a leisure activity,"<sup>23</sup> "expressing a personal response to creative texts", and "analysis and criticism of creative texts") were presented. "Reading as a leisure activity" is a scale for "reading comprehension," which is a sub-activity for "reception" within the new framework.<sup>24</sup> "Expressing a personal response to creative texts" and "analysis and criticism of creative texts"<sup>25</sup> are positioned as scales for "mediating a text," which is a sub-activity of "mediation."<sup>26</sup> These three new scales provide specific can-do descriptors at each proficiency level, including the elementary level such as A1,<sup>27</sup> which can be taken as the first step in constructing an evaluation framework for literary engagement from the elementary to the advanced level.

Moreover, the CEFR-J, which is based on the 2001 CEFR but adapted to the Japanese context, provided a gradable evaluation framework for literary engagement: a scale for evaluating reading abilities that includes the following can-do descriptors from the introductory level onward.<sup>28</sup>

- (Pre-A1) I can recognize words in a picture book that are already familiar through oral activities;  
(A1.3) I can understand short narratives with illustrations and pictures written in simple words;

- (A2.1) I can understand short narratives and biographies written in simple words;
- (B1.2) I can understand the plot of longer narratives written in plain English;
- (C1) I can understand long and complex factual and literary texts, appreciating distinctions of style;
- (C2) I can read with ease virtually all forms of the written language, including abstract, structurally or linguistically complex texts such as manuals, specialized articles and literary works (CEFR-J).

These two frameworks thus indicate that the problem where previous studies limited the development of literary competence to advanced foreign language learners—Problem 2—is being ameliorated. Moreover, these frameworks attempt to describe literary competence in relation to general linguistic/reading abilities by placing the relevant scales and can-do descriptors in the general English language proficiency description (improvement of Problem 4).

Although the new CEFR and CEFR-J reflect significant progress in establishing the evaluation framework for literary competence, the problem of fragmented description (Problem 1) remains. Atler and Ratheiser (2019) proposed a new model of literary competence in a foreign or second language—the Innsbruck model of literary competence (named by Paran et al., 2021). They acknowledged literary competence scales in the new CEFR framework, but argued that these scales failed to address all aspects of literary competence. They also pointed out that the overall picture of literary competence had not been clarified since the relevant scales were positioned in various places in the framework. Their model, which was proposed to describe literary competence in a holistic manner, consists of the five subcomponents listed below, the first subcomponent being the foundation of the model with improved literary competence coming about by developing the other four subcomponents in a well-balanced manner.

- (1) Reading competence and general linguistic competence in English (processing texts);
- (2) Emphatic competence: “the readers’ ability to personally relate to the characters in a text, their actions and reactions, emotions, thoughts, motives; their ability to connect with a text on an emotional level such as in ‘How would I behave in a similar situation?’ or ‘I think I would feel miserable under these circumstances’” (pp. 380–381);
- (3) Aesthetic and stylistic competence: “the ability to experience and appreciate a literary text and the literary principles of construction, i.e. the stylistics, it follows” (p. 381);
- (4) Cultural and discursive competence: “the learners’ ability to identify and work with the specific cultural freight and framing of a text and the discourses these pertain to” (p. 381);
- (5) Interpretive competence: “the ability to infer meaning from a work of literature” (p. 382).

These five subcomponents are taken as being closely interrelated (Atler and Ratheiser, 2019, p. 382).

Thus, this model attempts to solve Problem 1 (fragmented descriptions of literary competence), while also mitigating Problems 3 and 4 by referring to both general linguistic/reading abilities and genre-specific attributes in defining literary competence. In addition, this model also considers the

problem with previous studies that restricted improvement of literary competence to learners with advanced foreign language proficiency (Problem 2). The authors, by contrast, intend to develop literary competence in learners from the introductory stage of English education (the Pre-A1 stage in the CEFR) and, eventually, human resources with advanced literary competence in English (e.g., literary critics or scholars for whom English is not a native language).

Nishihara (2015) proposed a similar model, in which the following four points were to be considered when designing a literature test in EFL classrooms.

- (1) Most items should target the literal meaning comprehension of the text;
- (2) The test should include a limited number of specific text items for interpreting the text;
- (3) The test should include a limited number of specific text items for linguistic creativity involved in the text;
- (4) The test should include a limited number of specific test items for eliciting learners' personal meaning from the text and affective response to it (p. 118).

As with Adler and Ratheiser (2019), Nishihara (2015) focuses on general linguistic/reading comprehension as the key requirement for literary competence. However, Nishihara's list does not refer to a cultural component. Although Adler and Ratheiser's model includes professional English literature education in a foreign or second language, Nishihara's model focuses on general English language teaching (Paran et al., 2021). While recognizing its importance, Nishihara did not include this trait in the list, believing it should instead be addressed in professional literature education (p. 119).

Although the models slightly differ due to the difference in their focus, a unified view of literary competence is being created gradually (improvement of Problem 5). Paran et al. (2021) discussed future literature testing research based on Adler and Ratheiser's (2019) model, which is expected to further advance the unification of literary competence model.

#### **4. Future**

This paper pointed out the defects of previous literary competence models, observing that these issues are being addressed in recent developments. However, further research is necessary if teachers are to use these insights for evaluating students' literary engagement attainments in the classroom. Thus, this section discusses the direction such research needs to take.

First, it is necessary to develop scales and can-do descriptors related to literary competence. Although the CEFR and CEFR-J incorporated can-do descriptors invoke literary competence within their frameworks, the descriptions remain fragmented. Adler and Ratheiser (2019), in contrast, proposed a comprehensive literary competence model, but its descriptors remain undeveloped. Based on this model, and with reference to the CEFR and CEFR-J frameworks, it is necessary to develop specific can-do descriptors from the introductory proficiency level to the advanced level. In fact, Adler

and Ratheiser (2019) consider their model to be complementary to the new CEFR framework, finding it helpful in operationalizing the subcomponents of their model in the form of can-do descriptors.

Second, it is necessary to confirm whether the proposed literary competence model and the can-do descriptors based on it will work. Learners' literary engagement in English should be evaluated using these tools in the actual classroom setting to expose any problems, such as evaluations being calibrated significantly higher or lower than expected. If such issues are detected, the literary competence model and can-do descriptors will have to be adjusted.

Third, it is necessary to verify whether the literary competence model covers essential elements. At present, the components of the model are becoming unified but, simultaneously, we need to continually reflect on the model's appropriateness. For example, a good literary readers' reading practice should be investigated to see if some essential features are lacking in the model. Furthermore, we must examine the correlation between indicators that are related to English language learning but have little to do with literary competence (such as the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC) scores) and the subcomponents of literary competence.<sup>29</sup> Low correlation values would support the model. However, if significantly high correlations are found between them, the selection of literary competence subcomponents will have to be reconsidered.

Fourth, we need to confirm whether a literary competence model comprises properly identified subcomponents. For example, extremely high correlations between the scores of questions targeting different subcomponents would facilitate simplification of the model through subcomponents integration. In this regard, Nishihara (2015) conducted an achievement test in a general English class using literature and found no strong correlation between the literal meaning questions, interpretation questions, and linguistic creativity questions (the highest correlation was  $r = .32$ , which was found between the literal meaning questions and the interpretation questions).<sup>30</sup> In the future, what Adler and Ratheiser (2019) call "emphatic competence" and "cultural and discursive competence" should also be added, after which the structure of the literary competence model needs to be confirmed by evaluating a variety of learners on different types of texts.

Finally, an evaluation framework for skills other than reading comprehension needs to be built. Because literary materials are often used for reading comprehension exercises, they have been discussed in relation to reading. However, we can, for example, sing a poem emotionally or experience a poem sung by others. Schmidt (1983) argues that literary works are not only written by authors and read by readers, but also mediated between both by publishers and editors. Moreover, readers write reviews of the works or exchange their opinions with friends after reading the text. Thus, the literary competence model must be multimodal and multifaceted.<sup>31</sup>

## 5. Conclusion

This paper has identified the problems of past literary competence models, showed that these problems are being improved through recent models, and discussed five future issues that literary

competence model research should investigate further to construct a framework for evaluating foreign language learners' literary engagement. As various advantages have already been pointed out about the use of literary texts in English as a Foreign/Second Language classrooms (e.g., Hanauer, 2001; Lazar, 2016; Scott & Huntington, 2007; Tomlinson, 1986), more teachers are expected to use literary materials in their classes. To have such classes work efficiently, improvement of evaluation (and teaching) practice is necessary,<sup>32</sup> to which the development of literary competence model can significantly contribute. Further relevant research is needed in the future.

### Notes

1. The difficulty of literary engagement evaluation is a long-standing issue (e.g., Protherough, 1991). The contradiction of evaluating the highly personal and creative act of literary reading using a certain standard has also been highlighted as a reason for the paucity of relevant research (e.g., Alderson, 2000; Parkinson & Thomas, 2004; Probst, 2004).
2. Literary competence model studies often use the terms *literary* and *poetic* interchangeably. This paper follows this convention.
3. This paper focuses on studies that describe literary competence in detail. Readers are referred to Delanoy (1991, p. 111), Sauro and Sundmark (2016, p. 417), and Para et al. (2021, p. 237), which defined this construct more succinctly.
4. Research on teachers' expected levels of literary competence (e.g., O'Neil, 1987) has also made significantly less progress.
5. According to Bachman and Palmer (1996), this is knowledge about "how utterances or sentences and texts are related to the communicative goals of language users" (p. 68).
6. Other communicative competence models also contain fragmentary descriptions related to literary competence such as grammatical and procedural competence in Durán (1988) and sociocultural competence in Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei, and Thurrell (1995) and Celce-Murcia (2008).
7. These are the guidelines the Council of Europe published in 2001 for foreign language learning, teaching, and assessment. Six foreign language proficiency levels were established for learners: A1 (the lowest level), A2, B1, B2, C1, and C2 (the highest level). For more information on this guideline, see Council of Europe (2001, 2018, 2020), and Tono and Negishi (2020).
8. However, this guideline has some noteworthy attempts for writing such as the presentation of can-do descriptors for creative writing, which cover poetry, narrative, and critiques of works.
9. The following can-do descriptors are included in the reading scale: "I can understand contemporary literary prose" (B2), "I can understand long and complex factual and literary texts, appreciating distinctions of style" (C1), and "I can read with ease virtually all forms of the written language, including abstract, structurally or linguistically complex texts such as manuals, specialized articles and literary works" (C2) (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 27).
10. As a result, research has shown that even novice EFL/L2 learners can benefit from literary works

and develop their literary competence in their target language (e.g., *Atler & Ratheiser, 2019; Chesnokova & van Peer, 2016; Scott & Huntington, 2007*).

11. In early generative grammar (the standard theory), literary competence was related to the rules of stylistic reordering (e.g., *Ohmann, 1964*). Chomsky (1965) stated that these rules should be distinguished from the grammatical transformation rules, “which are much more deeply embedded in the grammatical system (p. 127) (this distinction was maintained in Chomsky (1995, pp. 324–325)). Furthermore, Chomsky (1965) stated that these rules are rather rules of performance, which are out of generative grammar’s research interest, and “no apparent bearing ... on the theory or grammatical structure” (p. 127). Grinder and Elgin (1973), however, discuss these rules as extensions of the grammatical transformation rules. De Aguiar E Silva (1977/1981) takes a skeptical attitude toward discussing literary competence in the generative grammar framework.
12. “Overlap deletion is a transformation that applies within a body of poetic language when two phonologically identical sequences occur immediately contiguous to one another under specific conditions, and which operates to delete one of the pair of identical items” (p. 178). For example, e. e. cummings’ expression “... the ocean / wanders the streets are so / ancient...” (“There is a here and”) is based on the following two sentences “The ocean wanders the streets” and “The streets are so ancient.” Their identical part (“the streets”) is deleted and the rest part is concatenated into one sentence. Technique deletion is a transformation that deletes a specific word or phrase in a sentence as in “snowflakes round and round through air” where the verb is missing (p. 182).
13. Indeed, *Jacobs (1973)* and *Jacobs and Rosenbaum (1971)* argue that transformation rules alone cannot cover all the linguistic phenomena related to literature.
14. *Weimann (1975)* criticizes these reader models for their lack of specificity in what kind of readers they are intended for. *Zyngier (1999)* also points out that these models do not consider any readers who read literary works in a foreign or second language (p. 32).
15. This is a declaration that the reading of a text should be seen as the creation of new meanings by the reader, and not as an act of deciphering the author’s intentions.
16. Readers are reminded that the concept of implied reader is different between the two studies.
17. *Holb (1984)* and *Iser (1972/1974)* further introduce *Wolff’s (1971)* “intended reader.”
18. *Holb (1984)*, *Ensslin (2007)*, and *Atler and Ratheiser (2019)* introduce literary competence models developed in Germany.
19. This model depends on the concept of intertextuality. Readers are referred to *Kawaguchi and Okamoto (1998)* for the details of this concept.
20. This term means “readers’ competence to understand language in relation to its contexts” (*Schauber & Spolsky, 1986, p. 18*).
21. It refers to a group of people who share various assumptions about meaning and culture and read texts using common strategies (*Kawaguchi & Okamoto, 1998*).
22. This is one of the guidelines ACTFL developed for assessing foreign language proficiency.
23. This scale is related to a variety of texts besides literature, such as blogs, magazines, and

newspapers (Council of Europe, 2020, p. 58).

24. For the can-do descriptors for this scale, see Council of Europe (2020, pp. 58–59).
25. For the can-do descriptors for these two scales, see Council of Europe (2020, pp. 106–108). The latter scale is more intellectual and advanced than the former one.
26. *Mediation* is defined as follows:

In mediation, the user/learner acts as a social agent who creates bridges and helps to construct or convey meaning, sometimes within the same language, sometimes across modalities (e.g. from spoken to signed or vice versa, in cross-modal communication) and sometimes from one language to another (cross-linguistic mediation). (Council of Europe, 2020, p. 92)
27. The new CEFR framework (2018 and 2020 editions) consists of seven language proficiency levels. Pre-A1 level was added to the old framework (2001 edition). Unfortunately, the new framework does not provide descriptors for all the proficiency levels. There are no Pre-A1 descriptors for the scale “reading as a leisure activity.” The scale “expressing a personal response to creative texts” does not have descriptors for Pre-A1 and C2 levels, and the scale “analysis and criticism of creative texts” lacks Pre-A1 and C2 descriptors.
28. The CEFR-J has 12 language proficiency levels for learners: Pre-A1 (the lowest level), A1.1, A1.2, A1.3, A2.1, A2.2, B1.1, B1.2, B2.1, B2.2, C1, and C2 (the highest level). This framework also developed literature-related can-do descriptors for writing such as “I can write narratives” (B1.2) and “I can write summaries and reviews of professional or literary works” (C2).
29. By demonstrating that theoretically different concepts are unrelated empirically, we provide supporting evidence for the model representation, which bears a strong relation to validity issues in assessment (e.g., Kane, 2006; Messick, 1989). At the same time, however, we need to keep in mind that the correlation may not be attributed to the model itself but to the quality of test items used for the analysis.
30. Nishihara (2015) also examined items related to what Atler and Ratheiser (2019) called emphatic competence but failed to grade learners’ performance. As a result, its correlation with other subcomponents could not be estimated.
31. The new CEFR framework also includes can-do descriptors related to literary competence in the scale on sign language (Council of Europe, 2020, p. 164).
32. Anagnostopoulos (2003) noted that the format of literature testing affects learners’ literary reading processes. For instance, when the content of the test is limited to literal meaning of the text (e.g., Purves, 1990, 1992), the learners will be literary readers who focus only on superficial textual meaning.

## References

- Alderson, J. (2000). *Assessing reading*. Cambridge University Press.
- Anagnostopoulos, D. (2003). Testing and student engagement with literature in urban classrooms: A

- multi-layered perspective. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 38, 177–212.
- Atler, C., & Ratheiser, U. (2019). A new model of literary competences and the revised CEFR descriptors. *ELT Journal*, 73, 377–386.
- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford University Press.
- Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice*. Oxford University Press.
- Bachman, L. F. & Palmer, A. S. (2010). *Language assessment in practice*. Oxford University Press.
- Barthes, R. (1977). The death of the author. In R. Barthes *Image-music-text* (S. Heath, Trans., pp. 142–148). New York: Hill & Wang. (Original work published 1968)
- Bierwisch, M. (1970). Poetics and linguistics (P. H. Salus, Trans.). In D. C. Freeman (Ed.), *Linguistics and literary style* (pp. 96–115). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston. (Original work published 1965)
- Booth, W. C. (1961). *Rhetoric of fiction*. University of Chicago Press.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2008). Rethinking the role of communicative competence in language teaching. In E. A. Soler & M. P. S. Jordà (Eds.), *Intercultural language use and language learning* (pp. 41–57). Berlin: Springer.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6, 5–35.
- Chesnokova, A., & van Peer, W. (2016). Anyone came to live here some time ago: A cognitive semiotics approach to deviation as a foregrounding device. *Versus*, 122, 1–18.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Council of Europe (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge University Press.
- Council of Europe (2018). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Companion volume with new descriptors*. Council of Europe.
- Council of Europe (2020). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Companion volume*. Council of Europe.
- Culler, J. (1975). *Structuralist poetics: Structuralism, linguistics and the study of literature*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- de Aguiar E Silva, V. M. (1981). *Gengonoryokuto bungakunoryoku: Seiseishigakuno Kanoseinitsuite* [Linguistic competence and literary competence: A possibility of generative poetics] (I. Taniguchi (Trans.)). Hiroshima, Japan: Keisuisya. (Original work published 1977)
- Delanoy, W. (1991). Assessing textual understanding and literature learning in ESL. In C. Brumfit (Ed.), *Assessment in literature teaching* (pp. 106–113). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Durán, R. (1988). Validity and language skills assessment: Non-English background students. In H. Wainer & H. Braun (Eds.), *Test validity* (pp. 105–127). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Eco, U. (1979). *The role of the reader: Explorations in the semiotics of texts*. Indiana University Press.
- Ensslin, A. (2007). *Canonizing hypertext: Explorations and constructions*. London: Continuum.
- Fish, S. E. (1970). Literature in the reader: Affective stylistics. *New Literary History*, 2, 123–162.

- Fish, S. E. (1980). *Is there a text in this class?: The authority of interpretive communities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Grinder, J. T., & Elgin, S. H. (1973). *Guide to transformational grammar: History, theory, practice*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Wilson.
- Hall, G. (2015). *Literature in language education* (2nd ed). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hanauer, D. (1996). Academic literary competence testing. *Journal of Literary Semantics*, 25, 142–153.
- Hanauer, D. (1997). Poetic text processing. *Journal of Literary Semantics*, 26, 157–172.
- Hanauer, D. I. (2001). The task of poetry reading and second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 22, 295–323.
- Hawkey, M., & Rezk, L. G. (1991). Developing literary competence: A ‘skills’ approach to teaching and testing literature. In C. Brumfit (Ed.), *Assessment in literature teaching* (pp. 84–92). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Henning, S. D. (1992). Assessing literary interpretation skills. *Foreign Language Annals*, 25, 339–355.
- Holb, R. C. (1984). *Reception theory*. New York: Methuen.
- Iser, W. (1974). *The implied reader: Patterns of communication in prose fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*. London: The Johns Hopkins University Press. (Original work published 1972)
- Jackendoff, R. (1983). *Semantics and cognition*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Jacobs, R. A. (1973). *Studies in language*. Lexington, MA: Xerox College Publishing.
- Jacobs, R. A., & Rosenbaum, P. S. (1971). *Transformations, style, and meaning*. Lexington, MA: Xerox College Publishing.
- Kane, M. T. (2006). Validation. In R. L. Brennan (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (4th ed., pp. 17–64). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Kawaguchi, K., & Okamoto, Y. (1998). *Saishin bungakuhihyo yogo jiten* [A new dictionary for literary criticism]. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- Lazar, G. (2016). Literature and language teaching. In R. H. Jones (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and creativity* (pp. 468–482). London: Routledge.
- Lee, C. D. (2011). Education and the study of literature. *Scientific Study of Literature*, 1, 49–58.
- McRae, J. (1991). *Literature with a small “l”*. London: Macmillan.
- Messick, S. (1989). Validity. In R. Linn (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (3rd ed., pp. 13–104). New York: Macmillan.
- Nishihara, T. (2015). Achievement tests for literary reading in general EFL reading courses. In M. Teranishi, Y. Saito, & K. Wales (Eds.), *Literature and language learning in the EFL classroom* (pp. 115–130). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ohmann, R. (1964). Generative grammars and the concept of literary style. *Word*, 20, 423–439.
- O’Neil, G. P. (1987). Literature. *American Association of Teachers of French National Bulletin*, 13, 16–17.
- Paran, A. (2006). The stories of literature and language teaching. In A. Paran (Ed.), *Literature in language teaching and learning* (pp. 1–10). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Paran, A., Spöttl, C., Ratheiser, U., & Eberharter, K. (2021). Measuring literary competence in SLA.

- In P. Winke & T. Brunfaut (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition and language testing* (pp. 326–337). London: Routledge.
- Parkinson, B., & Thomas, H. R. (2004). *Teaching literature in a second language*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Probst, R. E. (2004). *Response & analysis: Teaching literature in secondary school* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Protherough, R. (1991). Assessing response to literature. In C. Brumfit (Ed.), *Assessment in literature teaching* (pp. 9–15). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Purves, A. C. (1990). Testing literature: The current state of affairs. In Office of Educational Research and Improvement (Ed.), *Testing and assessment, special collection 1* (pp. 1–2). Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills.
- Purves, A. C. (1992). Testing literature. In J. A. Langer (Ed.), *Literature instruction: A focus on student response* (pp. 19–34). Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Prince, G. (1971). Notes toward a category of fictional narratees. *Genre*, 4, 100–106.
- Riffaterre, M. (1959). Criteria for style analysis. *Word*, 15, 154–174.
- Riffaterre, M. (1978). *Semiotics of poetry*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Sauro, S., & Sundmark, B. (2016). Report from Middle-Earth: Fan fiction tasks in the EFL classroom. *ELT Journal*, 70, 414–423.
- Schauber, E., & Spolsky, E. (1986). *The bounds of interpretation: Linguistic theory and literary text*. Stanford University Press.
- Schmidt, S. J. (1983). The empirical science of literature ESL: A new paradigm. *Poetics*, 12, 19–34.
- Scott, V. M., & Huntington, J. A. (2007). Literature, the interpretive mode, and novice learners. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 3–14.
- Spiro, J. (1991). Assessing literature: Four papers. In C. Brumfit (Ed.), *Assessment in literature teaching* (pp. 16–83). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse analysis: The sociolinguistic analysis of natural language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Tomlinson, B. (1986). Using poetry with mixed ability language classes. *ELT Journal*, 40, 33–41.
- Tono, Y., & Negishi, M. (Eds.). (2020). *The CEFR-J resource book: Reference level descriptions and test development*. Tokyo: Taishukan-shoten.
- Weimann, R. (1975). ‘Reception aesthetics’ and the crisis in literary history. *Clio: A Journal of Literature, History, and the Philosophy of History*, 5(1), 3–35.
- Wolff, E. (1971). Der intendierte Leser: Überlegungen und Beispiele zur Einführung eines literaturwissenschaftlichen Begriffs. *Poetica*, 4, 141–166.
- Zyngier, S. (1999). The unheard voices: A reader model for students. *Language Awareness*, 8, 30–37.
- Zyngier, S., Fialho, O., & do Prado Rios, P. A. (2007). Revisiting literary awareness. In G. Watson & S. Zyngier (Eds.), *Literature and stylistics for language learners: Theory and practice* (pp. 194–209). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.