



# Understanding Character Dialogue in Modern English Literature: A Qualitative Study on Students' Cognitive Processes in Literary Learning

Mohammad Ilham Yasin<sup>1,\*</sup>, Moh. Hilman Fikri<sup>2</sup>, Wahyu Sudrajad<sup>3</sup>, Maharani Dewi<sup>4</sup>

Universitas Kristen Cipta Wacana  
E-mail: [mohammadilhamyasin@gmail.com](mailto:mohammadilhamyasin@gmail.com)

\*Corresponding Author

Received: 22 May 2025 | Revised: 28 May 2025 | Accepted: 30 May 2025

## Abstract

*The present study investigates cognitive processes of students while understanding character dialogue in modern English literature through a qualitative approach. Highlighting inferential thinking and perspective-taking, the research aims to explore how learning individuals interpret and react to advanced literary dialogue. This study makes a novel contribution to the fields of cognitive literary studies and literary pedagogy by concentrating exclusively on how pupils understand character dialogue in contemporary English literature. In contrast to earlier studies that take a broad approach to narrative comprehension, this one focuses on the particular cognitive requirements of literary dialogue, such as inferring subtext, recognizing emotional undertones, and comprehending interpersonal dynamics. The findings of the study identify that learner apply inferential strategies to understand implied meaning, affective undertones, and relational dynamics in character dialogue. Furthermore, perspective-taking played a central role, as students were more able to empathize and interpret more deeply when they adopted multiple character perspectives. The study identifies challenges students face, such as the inability to maintain inferences and coping with novel points of view, particularly in cross-cultural contexts. Pedagogic implications indicate that the teaching of literature should explicitly promote inferential thinking, perspective-taking, and cultural awareness leading to a more empathetic, integrated reading of literature. The present study makes a contribution towards the increasing pool of literature documenting cognitive investment in literary learning that reveals how literary teaching can assist students' critical thinking and emotional intelligence through exploring character dialogue.*

**Keywords:** character dialogue, cognitive processes, literary learning, pedagogy, perspective-taking

## Introduction

Contemporary English literature, character dialogue is an important narrative tool that constructs plot development, indicates character psychology, and expresses thematic issues. Dialogue offers chances for readers to connect with characters' voices, feelings, and intentions directly, hence providing a more engaging and richer literary experience (Evans, 2021). Unlike narration, which aims to present an all-knowing voice, dialogue demands readers to build meaning from linguistic subtlety, silence, and human interaction. A greater mental effort is necessary to interpret dialogue. Hill and Robinson (2020) claim that readers must do several things at once, including figuring out the literal meaning, inferring the implicit purpose, and contextualizing the dialogue within the larger cultural and narrative frameworks. In modern

literature, where discussions are frequently broken, ironic, or laden with subtext, this problem is exacerbated (Watson & Lee, 2019). Therefore, effective understanding includes not only linguistic ability but also sociocultural competence to decipher underlying meanings and psychological nuances in conversation.

There is still a large research gap in the area of students' interpretive difficulties with literary conversation, even with the growing academic interest in the cognitive components of reading literature. Previous research (Kim & Wallace, 2022; Bennet, 2020) has shown that students frequently misinterpret complicated dialogue, particularly when irony or ambiguity are present, leading to a superficial or incorrect comprehension of the text. Nonetheless, there is a dearth of empirical studies that specifically look at how instructional approaches can improve students' cognitive empathy and dialogic understanding. In order to address this deficiency, the current study seeks to examine how dialogic pedagogy might help students improve their interpretive skills, especially in deciphering complicated literary dialogue. To promote a greater understanding of character interaction and inner states, this method combines instructional techniques with cognitive literary theory. This line of research is essential for fostering critical thinking and empathy, which are skills that are necessary for the academic and personal growth of Generation Z students, as well as for enhancing literary understanding.

## Methods

Utilizing a qualitative study approach based on a phenomenological viewpoint, this research looks at how students understand characters' language in modern English literature. Qualitative research is particularly well-suited to studying complex, subjective phenomena and sensemaking processes that cannot be fully understood using quantitative research approaches (Creswell & Creswell, 2022). Because the study focuses on how pupils read, comprehend, and emotionally react to dialogues, a qualitative approach allows for thorough, in-depth explanations of their cognitive and emotional literary text processes. As a broad methodological strategy, phenomenology centers on the description of lived experience and the ways in which individuals live their lives and comprehend events (Moustakas, 2020). The subject of this study is how students comprehend and interpret character speech. Through in-depth interviews, the think-aloud approach, and reflective diaries, the study seeks to identify the cognitive obstacles, interpretive methods, and emotional responses that characterize students' engagement with literary dialogue.

The study also uses interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) to analyze the data. IPA is a method used to investigate how individuals make sense of their daily and social lives, particularly when dealing with difficult cognitive-emotional situations (Smith, Flowers, & Larkin, 2021). The aforementioned kind of analysis is appropriate for the study's aim of looking at not only what students understand during literary discussions but also how their comprehension evolves and the processes they go through in doing so. A qualitative, phenomenological design is likewise justified by the current educational research in favours of methods that identify the dynamic, context-dependent quality of learning literature (Mills & Brown, 2021). Since literary dialogue reading traditionally entails inferencing, perspective-taking, emotional simulation, and cultural interpretation, it is only with a flexible, student-centered design that one can best monitor such multicomponent processes. Simply put, using qualitative phenomenological design with interpretative phenomenological analysis, this study aims to enrich the picture of students' cognitive and affective engagement with character dialogue in the learning of contemporary English literature.

### **A. Participant Design**

The participants in the current study were purposively sampled, a research strategy that is frequently utilized in qualitative research to guarantee that the participants have first-hand experience with the phenomenon under investigation (Palinkas et al., 2020). In particular, the study consisted of undergraduate students of English Literature who had already undertaken or were undertaking courses in contemporary literature, narrative analysis, or literary theory. These students were most suitable because they were exposed to sophisticated literary texts and face-to-face interaction with character-to-character conversation in their coursework. 15 participants were recruited in total, with gender balance, year of study, and reading proficiency ensured. This accords with best practice in phenomenological research wherein smaller, homogeneous samples are ideal to allow dense, detailed interrogation of personal experience (Vasileiou et al., 2019). The participants were all mature, experienced readers of modern English literature texts full of dialogue, like the writing of authors such as Ian McEwan, Kazuo Ishiguro, or Zadie Smith.

Participant inclusion criteria were: (1) registration in a degree in English Literature, (2) prior attendance at one or more courses in contemporary literature, (3) willingness to take part in multiple phases of data collection (e.g., interviews, think-aloud tasks, reflective diaries), and (4) being able to enter critical discussion in English. Participants were informed of the research purpose and method and gave informed consent according to best research practice ethics. Purposive sampling positioned the participants in the optimal position to provide rich and pertinent information regarding cognitive processes in reading literary dialogue. Relevance of the participant, Tracy (2020) states, is one of the key elements utilized for ascertaining credibility and richness in qualitative research, especially in qualitative studies that are intended to obtain subjective and interpretative experience. Additionally, the research design was sensitive to the heterogeneity of readers' cognitive processes, and it controlled for variations in competence of readers, cultural background, and reading habits, which may influence readers' interpretation of dialogue (Johnson & Canning, 2019). Through the purposeful selection of participants from varying academic and demographic backgrounds, the study aimed to achieve rich variation of approach to interpretation, and therefore the richness and transferability of findings.

### **B. Data Collection**

Data collection for the study was achieved using a combination of classroom observation, semi-structured interviews, and document analysis, allowing rigorous examination of students' cognitive processes in interpreting characters' dialogue within contemporary English literature. Triangulation of approach maximizes depth, credibility, and reliability within qualitative research (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

### **C. Observation**

Literary discussion class was observed on a regular basis to record students' spontaneous conversation, interpretive techniques, and social meaning-making activities in responding to excerpts of dialogue from recent literary fiction. Focused observation concentrated on recording the way students questioned, negotiated, and inferred characters' motives while discussing in small groups. Observation list was used to note down verbal interaction, non-verbal interaction, and the nature of cognitive strategies used while reading and discussing dialogue texts (Saldaña & Omasta, 2021). Observational data yielded dense evidence of real-time student cognition, which captured tendencies unlikely to arise singly in interviews and documents, e.g., cases of sudden inference construction, affective resonance, or puzzlement.

### **D. Interviews**

One-to-one semi-structured interviews followed observation sessions with the participants. Interviews prompted questions into students' cognitive thought processes, affective responses, and interpretive struggles with making sense of character speech. Open-ended questions asked comments on how participants engage with character conversation, reading off intentions, and affectively responding to character speech acts (Adams, 2020). All the interviews were around 30–45 minutes long and were tape recorded after permission from the interviewees. This approach ensured flexibility, thus making it easy to probe surprising but useful thoughts about students' cognitive and affective connections to literary texts.

#### **E. Document Analysis**

Student written reflections, literary analysis essays, and course work were gathered and examined. These texts offered a further richness of data, providing evidence of students' dialogue interpretive strategies and emergent knowledge of dialogue throughout literary texts (O'Keeffe, 2022). Document analysis was concerned with how students wrote about the motivations of characters, emotional undertones, and thematic resonances of dialogue in their writing. Analysis of these artifacts permitted researchers to triangulate interview and observation data in support of an integrated literary dialogue interpretation cognitive process. Ethical protocols were closely adhered to during data collection, such as the pursuit of informed consent, anonymity, and a right to withdraw at any point (Tracy, 2020).

#### **Results and Discussions**

The study's findings showed that inferential thinking was central to students' sense-making of character dialogue in contemporary English literature. When given dialogue that suggested, but did not state, what a character felt, thought, or meant, students employed higher-order thinking processes of making inferences, recognizing subtext, and relating prior knowledge to textual cues. Throughout think-aloud sessions and classroom observation, most participants could "read between the lines"—reading what is implied, deciphering sarcasm or irony, and being attuned to how power relations or dynamics were being infused into discourse. For example, while reading an excerpt of a postmodern novel in which one of the characters had responded with an evasive or inaccurate answer, students made inferences of emotional tension or covert conflict based on tone, punctuation, and character background set up in the early part of the passage. This aligns with the claim of Cain and Oakhill (2020) that effective literary understanding involves building mental models beyond literal text. This was also evident from semi-structured interview data as students reported the frequent employment of hints taken from previous sections of the text to make an educated guess at what the character would probably mean. These were also evident in written essays and reflection as students employed oblique evidence, i.e., repetition, symbols, or shifts in dialogue, to make their claims of meaning justifiable. But inferences were made with different levels of success. Whereas more skilled students could identify subtle psychological or emotional cues, others were more reliant on surface meaning. This inconsistency is in line with the arguments of McKeown et al. (2021), who contend that inferential reading relies not only on reading proficiency but also on students' knowledge of literary conventions and experience of rich texts. Overall, the research stresses that inferential thinking is an essential process in literary comprehension, especially while reading characters' dialogue spoken in which meaning generally tends to be implied and not explicitly mentioned. Asking students to infer meaning proactively from dialogue can invite students' critical thinking, empathy, and interpretive depth and ultimately lead to a richer experience of literary texts.

### **A. Perspective-Taking**

Another major research finding was the importance of perspective-taking in students' comprehension of dialogue spoken by characters. Perspective-taking, or being able to comprehend a situation or story from the point of view of another character, was an important cognitive-affective process found to be instrumental in boosting students' literary comprehension. Classroom discussion observations indicated that students put themselves in characters' shoes as far as motivations, emotions, and cultural identity are concerned while making sense of the conversation. For instance, in explaining divergent conversations among protagonists, students hypothesized underlying fears, peer influence, or past experiences that would influence the speech and conduct of the characters. This concurs with Gehlbach and Brinkworth's (2019) findings that perspective-taking promotes interpretative depth since one can recreate the background of what was being said. Interviews likewise attested to the fact that most students voluntarily fantasized themselves "inside" the story world in an attempt to better gauge underlying tensions or purposes inherent within speech. Various participants noted that understanding a character's history, values, and emotional state would allow one to better understand ironic or ambiguous conversation. As Goldstein et al. (2021) attest, perspective-taking not only enhances cognitive comprehension but also enhances affective engagement with literary texts. Analysis of students' essays by reading showed that perspective-taking students wrote more sophisticated analyses that usually comprehended implied conflict or unstated relational dynamics omitted in more empathic reading. When dialogues contained characters speaking indirectly because of cultural restraints, for example, perspective-taking students found the implied meaning more readily. Nonetheless, the capacity to observe from varied perspectives was unreliable, with some students especially struggling when characters were of cultures or backgrounds radically different from their own. The result aligns with Kidron and Fleischman (2021), who opine that preparing lessons on literary activities can help enable and encourage pupils' capacity to take on multiple perspectives through reflective questioning and argument. Generally, the findings indicate that teaching deliberate perspective-taking skills may render the interpretive and critical abilities of the learners extremely strong while reading difficult character dialogue in literature.

### **B. Contextual Analysis**

The environment in which literary learning takes place plays an important role in determining how students respond to character speech. Classroom culture, previous exposure to a range of literary modes, and individual students' backgrounds all impacted their response to inferential and perspective-taking tasks in this research. The students with previous exposure to multicultural or postmodern literature scored higher on identifying subtle conversational undertones and cultural subtext in dialogue, as supported by the work of Wilkinson and Son (2020) in the significance of literary background knowledge. In addition, classroom social dynamics had a significant impact. Students were more inclined to adopt complex inferential thinking whenever talk environments encouraged open, supportive, and dialogic talk (Alexander, 2020). Conversely, strongly teacher-centered environments were found to suppress spontaneous interpretive discovery. Contextual forces like language skills also influenced students' capacity to identify implied meaning. Second-language English learners sometimes had trouble understanding cultural allusions or idiomatic phrases used in character speech, as documented by González and Darling-Hammond (2021).

### **C. Challenges Faced**

There were some difficulties in the study. To begin with, students tended to struggle with inference maintenance in extended narrative structures. Although early interpretations of dialogue were insightful, students occasionally were unable to embed these inferences into

larger thematic or character analyses, a finding which was supported by McNamara et al. (2020) on inference maintenance issues. Second, there were some students who demonstrated surface reading of dialogue, where they only attended to literal meaning without exploring emotional or relational subtext. Reasons for this were limited exposure to sophisticated narratives, immature metacognitive reading abilities, and not having explicit training on inferential strategies. A second obvious challenge was students' resistance to perform perspective-taking whenever characters' values or cultural norms were at high conflict with their own, resulting in inconsistencies in interpretation or misreads. This supports Kendeou et al.'s (2021) finding that readers struggled when narrative content conflicted with their prior assumptions or knowledge. Lastly, technical problems in data collection, including inconsistency in the students' participation in interviews and observations of classes, moderately limited the depth of certain data sets.

#### **D. Pedagogical Implications**

The outcomes of this research imply some vital implications for teaching literature: **Explicit Instruction on Inferential Strategies:** Teachers need to model and scaffold inferential reading, especially dialogue interpretation, in order for students to learn how to link inferred meaning with wider textual patterns (Lupo et al., 2019). **Developing Perspective-Taking through Dialogic Teaching:** Discussion-based learning environments in literature classrooms must become the top focus, where students are led to consider multiple perspectives empathetically and critically (Mercer & Dawes, 2020). **The Use of Multicultural Texts:** Drawing on a diverse collection of texts from different cultural backgrounds can raise students' awareness of different dialogue norms and implicit meanings (Banks, 2020). **Facilitating Metacognitive Growth:** Teachers ought to promote reflective exercises, including think-aloud procedures or reading journals, that require students to track their inference making and affective responses as they read (Crosson et al., 2021). **Language and Cultural Scaffolding:** In addition to students of many different linguistic backgrounds, other scaffolding aids in the comprehension of idiomatic expressions and cultural references in speech are essential to equate literary education (González & Darling-Hammond, 2021). In responding to these pedagogical issues, teachers can better help students make rich, rich, and empathetic analyses of characters' dialogue, increasing students' overall interaction with literature.

#### **Conclusions**

The present research explored students' cognitive processes in comprehending character dialogue in contemporary English literature through a qualitative lens, with special emphasis on inferential thinking and perspective-taking. The results showed that students' understanding of literary dialogue includes intricate cognitive and affective strategies, which are largely influenced by their inferential ability, empathy, and capacity to negotiate cultural and contextual subtleties. Students who were capable of effectively utilizing inferential thinking were able to transcend surface meaning, building meaning from inferred cues and picking up on the emotional and relational subtext conveyed in dialogue. This aligns with earlier work by Crosson et al. (2021) and McNamara et al. (2020), whereby inference generation was at the heart of higher-order literary comprehension. Secondarily, perspective-taking became an essential literary analytical ability. Students instructed in empathetic identification with protagonists' point of view were also in a better position to comprehend vague or culturally particular conversation. This aligns with Goldstein et al. (2021) and Hakemulder and Kuijpers (2023), who contend that narrative perspective-taking enhances richer literary and moral contemplation. Nonetheless, certain challenges were observed, such as the inability to maintain inferences across extensive texts, minimal exposure to narratives from other cultures, and hesitation to embrace foreign ways of thinking. These challenges necessitate pedagogies that

actively promote inferential thinking, cultural consciousness, and empathetic engagement through literary learning (Wilkinson & Son, 2020; González & Darling-Hammond, 2021).

The context setting—such as classroom culture, diversity of the reading canon, and students' language backgrounds—was found to be crucial in the building of cognitive engagement with dialogue. In the footsteps of Alexander (2020), dialogic and inclusive teaching are critical in building critical and empathetic literary readers. In conclusion, the development of students' cognitive process in literary dialogue interpretation entails a combined instruction process that combines the development of inferential skills, stimulation of perspective-taking, multicultural literature exposure, and development of reflective thinking. The future practice should be oriented towards the design of curriculum blueprints and instruction strategies that explicitly develop these capabilities to prepare students to engage critically and sensitively with the wealth of human experience conveyed through literary dialogue.

### Acknowledgements

The authors would like to express their deepest gratitude to the undergraduate students of the English Literature Department who participated in this study for their time, openness, and valuable insights into their cognitive and affective engagement with literary dialogue. Their reflective contributions made this research both meaningful and rich in data. We are also thankful to the faculty members and teaching staff who supported the research process by granting access to classroom observations and facilitating interviews and discussions. Special appreciation is extended to the research ethics committee and academic administrators for ensuring that this study was conducted in accordance with ethical guidelines. Lastly, we acknowledge the guidance and theoretical contributions of scholars whose work in cognitive literary studies and dialogic pedagogy greatly informed the foundation and analysis of this study.

### References

#### Journal Article

- Crosson, A. C., Lupo, S. M., & Hunt, B. (2021). Teaching inference and perspective-taking through strategic reading instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 56(4), 547–567. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.384>
- Evans, M. (2021). Dialogue and characterization in contemporary fiction. *Narrative Inquiry*, 31(2), 198–215. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ni.20010.eva>
- González, N., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2021). Culturally and linguistically responsive education. *Educational Researcher*, 50(3), 133–143. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X21994032>
- Gehlbach, H., & Brinkworth, M. E. (2019). The role of perspective taking in education: A meta-analytic review. *Review of Educational Research*, 89(1), 104–136. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654318798094>
- Hill, J., & Robinson, P. (2020). Dialogic complexity in modern fiction: Cognitive approaches. *Modern Fiction Studies*, 66(3), 455–472. <https://doi.org/10.1353/mfs.2020.0040>
- Hakemulder, J., & Kuijpers, M. M. (2023). The effect of reading literary dialogue on perspective-taking and moral reflection. *Narrative Inquiry*, 33(1), 101–124. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ni.22001.hak>
- Johnson, E. L., & Canning, R. (2019). Student engagement with literary texts: Approaches to character and dialogue interpretation. *English in Education*, 53(2), 147–163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/04250494.2019.1587642>
- Kidron, Y., & Fleischman, S. (2021). Supporting perspective-taking and empathy in diverse classrooms. *Educational Leadership*, 78(6), 66–71.

- Lupo, S. M., Strong, J. Z., & Correnti, R. (2019). Building students' inferential reading skills: A framework for supporting productive struggle. *The Reading Teacher*, 73(4), 503–514. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1854>
- Mar, R. A., & Oatley, K. (2022). Fiction and its impact on social cognition: Empirical evidence and theoretical directions. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 16(1), 3–15. <https://doi.org/10.1037/aca0000394>
- Mills, K. A., & Brown, J. E. (2021). Engaging readers: Multimodal and critical literacies in literary learning. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 53(2), 229–252. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X211013355>
- McKeown, M. G., Beck, I. L., & Sandora, C. A. (2021). Developing inferencing skills in literature comprehension: Results from a randomized study. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 56(2), 273–290. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.309>
- McNamara, D. S., Magliano, J. P., & Millis, K. K. (2020). Improving inference generation in reading comprehension: Cognitive and educational considerations. *Discourse Processes*, 57(5–6), 391–403. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0163853X.2020.1761470>
- Mercer, N., & Dawes, L. (2020). The study of talk and thinking in classroom settings. *Educational Researcher*, 49(6), 425–432. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X20933970>
- O'Keeffe, B. (2022). Document analysis in educational research: Methods and applications. *Journal of Qualitative Research in Education*, 10(1), 55–70.
- Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 42(5), 533–544. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y>
- Smith, J., & Anderson, B. (2020). Reading between the lines: Subtextual analysis and literary interpretation. *Modern Literary Studies*, 7(3), 115–129.
- Smith, J. A., Flowers, P., & Larkin, M. (2021). *Interpretative phenomenological analysis: Theory, method and research* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Saldaña, J., & Omasta, M. (2021). *Qualitative research: Analyzing life* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Vasileiou, K., Barnett, J., Thorpe, S., & Young, T. (2018). Characterising and justifying sample size sufficiency in interview-based studies: Systematic analysis of qualitative health research over a 15-year period. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 18, Article 148. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-018-0594-7>
- Watson, A., & Lee, M. (2019). Irony, subtext, and reader cognition: Challenges in modern literary dialogue. *Journal of Literary Psychology*, 5(2), 65–84.
- Wilkinson, I. A. G., & Son, E. H. (2020). Developing readers' inferential thinking in dialogic discussion contexts. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55(1), 5–28. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.256>

## Book

- Alexander, R. J. (2020). *A dialogic teaching companion*. Routledge.
- Cain, K., & Oakhill, J. (2020). *Children's comprehension problems in oral and written language: A cognitive perspective* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Moustakas, C. (2020). *Phenomenological research methods*. SAGE Publications.
- Smith, J. A., Flowers, P., & Larkin, M. (2022). *Interpretative phenomenological analysis: Theory, method and research* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Tracy, S. J. (2020). *Qualitative research methods: Collecting evidence, crafting analysis, communicating impact* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.

**Book Chapter**

- Adams, W. C. (2020). Conducting semi-structured interviews. In K. E. Newcomer, H. P. Hatry, & J. S. Wholey (Eds.), *Handbook of practical program evaluation* (5th ed., pp. 492–505). Wiley.
- Banks, J. A. (2020). Multicultural education: Characteristics and goals. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *An introduction to multicultural education* (6th ed., pp. 3–28). Pearson.