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ABSTRACT
This chapter discusses the way in which teachers teaching literature in the Language B International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme incorporate film into their teaching. It presents findings from a mixed methods study, using a large-scale survey of Language B teachers (n=265) and case studies of three schools, incorporating lesson observations and teacher interviews. Analysis of the data relating to film revealed that teachers use film in their literature classroom fairly frequently, are aware of film as an important cultural artefact, and use a wide variety of filmed versions of the literature they taught. Films are used for a variety of purposes, from raising accessibility and helping learners to understand the plot to discussing issues of film adaptation. Using Eken’s framework, the main approaches to using film were identified as focusing on the literary and linguistic aspects of the film, rather than on the dramatic and cinematic aspects.

INTRODUCTION
Film has had a long history in the language classroom. Even before video became widely available for personal and educational use in the 1980s, language teaching professionals understood the way in which television could be used to support language learning. In various countries, projects were initiated that used live broadcasts as part of English teaching programmes (see Howse 1979; Hambrook, 1979; Tomalin, 1979; Tomalin, 1986). With the advent of video, it became easier to show whole films in the classroom, as well as to extract specific scenes from a film for analysis. Although at the beginning films were often used as ‘a bit of time-filling end-of-term entertainment’ (Voller & Widdows,
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1993, p. 342) or a relaxing filler for a Friday afternoon (Baddock, 1996; Goldstein, 2017), teachers of EFL and of other languages quickly embraced the affordances of the new technology, and applied the principles of language teaching methodology to the use of film. As Jennings (1996) points out, ‘the use of feature films in the language and literature classroom [became] more widespread as more facilities become available’ (p. 185). This happened both in the private sector and in the public sector. A variety of teachers’ handbooks and resource books on the use of video in the classroom became available (e.g. Allan, 1985; Lonergan, 1984; Cooper, Lavery, & Rinvolucri, 1991) as did collections of papers on video methodology (Geddes & Sturtridge, 1982; McGovern, 1983) and on using film in the classroom (e.g. Baddock, 1996; Stempleski & Tomalin, 2001; see Goldstein, 2017 for a history of various initiatives within the UK context; see Donaghy, 2015 for a history of film in education).

Over the years, various large-scale initiatives have been launched to encourage the use of film in language classrooms. Herrero (2016) describes a number of such initiatives in the north-west of England starting in the 1990s for incorporating film in the teaching of Modern Foreign Languages in the UK, which then culminated in the formation of the Film in Language Teaching Association (FILTA, http://www.filta.org.uk), embracing Community of Practice (CoP) principles. In the US, Kaiser and his co-authors (Kaiser, 2011; Kaiser & Shibahara, 2014; Gullette, Kaiser & Møller, 2016) have described the Library of Foreign Language Film Clips (LFLFC), and the ways in which the film clips in the LFLFC can be used for language teaching at different levels.

Eken (2003) provides a useful way of thinking about film in the foreign language classroom, utilising a four-part framework: literary aspects (e.g. narrative, characters); dramatic aspects (e.g. acting); cinematic aspects (e.g. camera angles, camera positions, sound, lighting); and language aspects (e.g. vocabulary, skills work). Using this framework reveals the variation in the extent to which different publications include a specifically cinematic point of view. Many of the publications on film in language teaching exhibit a predominant focus on content (mainly on plot and character, though sometimes also on theme), viewing this content as a springboard for language work. Voller and Widdows (1993), for example, focus almost exclusively on content. Although Williamson and Vincent (1996) include a short introduction to the teacher (which includes a brief overview of approaches to film criticism), and a short (1.5 pages) glossary of film terminology, the actual chapters on specific films (24 different films in all) do not include comments on filmic elements: the points made are almost exclusively about plot, theme and character. Workman (2006) includes worksheets which focus mainly on language and on content, though a number of the viewing tasks for different films focus on film techniques, the use of music to create mood, and so on. But the main thrust of the book is clear from its title: ‘Popular films for language use’.

Others include a greater focus on the cinematic/filmic elements. For example, Weisberg (2000) illustrates activities focusing on different film shots. Stempleski and Tomalin (2001) include specific activities that focus on filmic elements such as scripts, lighting (using stills to analyse lighting effects), understanding scripting conventions, and analysing trailers. Donaghy (2015) devotes large sections to cinematic issues. Viebrock (2016a), a collection of essays on the use of films in the EFL classroom, includes a long introduction (Viebrock, 2016b) focusing on a number of cinematic elements, and the various chapters each contains specific suggestions for the film it is dealing with. For example, Grimm (2016) highlights specific scenes that can be used ‘for both an introduction of cinematographic techniques and an analysis of their respective effects’ (p. 77). Importantly, the collection presents films not only from the US and the UK, but also from Australia, New Zealand and South Africa (and in fact includes more chapters about the latter group than about the former).