

## Approaches in Teaching Literature through Language

<sup>a</sup>M Latha, <sup>a</sup>G Mohana Charyulu

<sup>a</sup>Associate Professors, Dept of English, K L University, Vaddeswaram, Guntur Dist. A.P. India.

---

### Abstract

Teaching Literature through language has become one of the most interesting aspect now-a-days. The traditional method of teaching literature through language is group work tasks for literary study. These tasks, they thought, usually help and supplement the learner to create a new and more effective learning. Especially there are many major changes are taken place in teaching literature over the last three decades. These changes in EFL contexts brought a new outlook in the study of literary texts and interpreting them. The present paper discuss in detail the changes that have been taking place and remedies for them.

#### KEYWORDS:

Literature, language, traditional method, EFL , literary texts

---

Teaching literature in L1 and L2 contexts is very critical and crucial in the age of technologically developed world. Generally Most of the teachers adopt the method of comparisons and contrasts between these two while teaching. The strategy they employ while teaching literature depends on the situation and their role while handling the context of the atmosphere. These changing roles of the teachers and the texts demands continuing and unresolved issues surrounding them in their explanations. Interactive and learner-centered approaches to teach literature in English Language Teaching class room is the common and general approach so far the teacher follow during these days. As the days are changing and the learner demands and more text centered and curriculum targeted learning, there is heavy load on teacher to strictly follow various methods in imparting quality based teaching. The traditional method of teaching literature through language is group work tasks for literary study. These tasks, they thought, usually help and supplement the learner to create a new and more effective learning. Especially there are many major changes are taken place in teaching literature over the last three decades. These changes in EFL contexts brought a new outlook in the study of literary texts and interpreting them. Before going to present my research paper titled “**Approaches in Teaching Literature through Language**” I limit myself to certain areas in my explanations because the area of the title is very vast and unlimited. I feel it is necessary to review the major forms of the scope and methodological innovations within the teaching of literature in order to get a sense of the need for which is currently taking place. It is important to review literature teaching in ELT classroom as it serves a visibly different education functions like transmitting information, developing logical skills in evaluating literature, discussions and etc.,

Firstly, as it is widely acknowledged, the lecturer's method of teaching literature is typically monologues. They work hard to transfer information from the text to learner through their lecture. It provides an uninterrupted opportunity for a learner to develop an individual interpretations and critical thought. The usefulness of the lecture is depended on how much notes is given, how many ideas are discussed, how effectively interacted with learners and so on. But little regard is given to different needs of the individual learners.

Secondly,

At the other end of a spectrum of pedagogic interaction, there are tutorials or research supervisions (often associated in Britain with Oxbridge, where the method of regular one-to-one exchange is a luxury still widely offered even at undergraduate level). Very often, the image of this technique is of an egalitarian process, open and eminently 'democratic'; its lack of apparent structure allows it to appear an ideally non-authoritarian, liberal mode of education. But interaction in dialogue is never completely 'unstructured'. It is possible to identify regularities in such dialogue here by drawing attention - using two slightly comic descriptions - to roles in these 'dialogue' sessions. One type of session might be called 'Socratic dialogue'; the other 'Freudian monologue'. In the 'Socratic dialogue', the philosopher asks repeated questions of a young person, who gives answers which are typically defective in some respect. The philosopher extends and adapts each answer, not only to show the young person its limitations, but also to offer new impetus to the philosophical dialectic. This analogy by no means exhausts what goes on in the Socratic dialogues in philosophy, of course; but the term does crystallize an interactional structure characteristic of supervision or tutorial teaching. By contrast, consider a type of dialogue that paradoxically might be termed 'Freudian monologue', because of its resemblance to what happens between the two people at a session of Freudian psychoanalysis. In this scenario, the student is asked by the supervisor to report on what she or he has been doing; the supervisor then sits back for an extended answer, while the student talks in detail about what she or he has read and thought.

Thirdly,

Workshops generally take the form of simulations, tasks and role-play. They involve, essentially, a concern to impose structure on learning-events, by specifying a task which offers students a clear idea of what they are supposed to do, and achievable goals or outcomes to motivate and direct the learning process. Workshops derive from recognition that to be requested to do or discuss something without it being clear what you are supposed to do can be a frustrating experience; not achieving many results in an assumption that you are not participating well, rather than that the class is ineffectively managed. Workshop methodology seeks to structure the process of a session in a way evident to everyone involved; it offers types of involvement and satisfaction to students unlikely to be available in classes structured either around passive, collective listening or around open conversational discussion. Discussion classes end, for example, when time runs out, often without even a provisional conclusion. The process of discussion itself displaces any other shared objective. Although capable students are likely to be able to assess the usefulness of what

they have learnt or experienced, less capable or motivated students may find difficulty in identifying benefits that can be fitted into the rest of their learning.

Lastly,

Alongside these modes of interactive learning (which presuppose co-presence of students and teacher), it is necessary also to consider the increasing role played by self-access, distance learning materials, including hypertext software. These approaches, where available, have the effect of freeing students from the constraint of having to work together at the same pace, or in the same sequence; they can also provide a high degree of individualized learner-feedback. On the other hand, they displace (or even eradicate) the acquisition of social and interactional skills that are likely to come from the collaborative work which can take place in other methods traditionally valued in literature teaching.

These four methodological types make up a familiar menu of alternative processes available to teachers and course designers, to be combined selectively in any given educational course or programme. The existence of successful auto-didacts acts as a cautionary reminder that teachers facilitate and direct the realization of learning potential, rather than filling empty pots. Variation between methods provides diversity within an educational experience; and selection between them can also offer compromise solutions to practical problems of inadequate or diminishing resources, given that the methods presuppose different staff-student ratios and equipment overheads.

Within all the approaches (including distance-learning), nevertheless, there is an important recurrent question as regards the teaching of literature, quite apart from technical matters of student numbers, cost, and relative efficiency. Who sets the agenda for learning? This is made an important question by virtue of its connections with the claims most often made on behalf of literature courses: that they develop independent taste, critical judgement and personal moral values. In most teaching situations, the educational agenda is set largely by external bodies, including examination boards, and by conventions of the historical content and procedures of the field (in the case of literature courses, this generally means a mix of analytic skills with familiarity with a canon of texts). Partly, too, the syllabus agenda is circumscribed by the interests, customs and approach of individual teachers, who reflect their own educational experience (often, for example, teachers prescribe or recommend poems that they themselves like, not necessarily ones that students will like; and teachers commonly work in ways they feel comfortable with, rather than ways students are most likely to benefit from). This orientation of the syllabus towards the needs of the teacher, where it exists, conflicts with humanistic claims routinely made on behalf of the subject. It is especially likely to have important consequences where the educational experience of many of the staff (as in the case of expatriate staff, or staff uniformly of an older generation) differs significantly from the experience and aspirations of the students themselves.

It is also possible, however, to think of pedagogic approaches (such as some communicative language-teaching approaches, or, more radically, Freirean approaches to education) which seek to involve participants more actively in determining the content, method and purpose of their learning. Such approaches vary from local, small-scale initiatives, along the lines of exploring songs and other texts chosen by students on account of their relevance to the students' own perceived social identities or problems, through to more detailed and sustained philosophies and politics of education. What these approaches have essentially in common is that concrete needs and aspirations of the

learners are placed above historical orthodoxies of a given subject or interests and existing expertise of the teacher (which are made responsive to changing demands from students, whose own intellectual and social identities are engaged in the process of formulating what study means and what it should involve). The particular relevance of these questions is that, although studying literature has often been justified as a process of self-discovery through the formation of reading skills and tastes coupled with a consequent development of moral values, its methods have not always been consistent with these aims. For the view of literature as a mode of self-discovery to be tenable, appropriate teaching processes would have to be followed. Yet many of the methods which have evolved in the teaching of literature were developed in and for L1 situations, and are not clearly effective in L2 contexts. Teaching of literature in English needs as a result to acknowledge difficulties presented both by language and by cultural reference;

### **References:**

- Alderson, C. and A.H.Urquhart. (1984), *Reading in a foreign language* (London: Longman).
- Barnet, S. (1985), *A Short Guide to Writing about Literature* (London: Batsford).
- Benton, M., and P. Benton. (1990), *Double Vision: reading paintings... reading poems... reading paintings* (London: Hodder and Stoughton).
- Brumfit, C.J, and R.Carter (eds). (1986), *Literature and Language Teaching* (Oxford: OUP).
- Brumfit, C.J. and M.Benton (1993), *Literature Teaching Round the World* (London: Macmillan).
- Burton, G. and R. Dimpleby. (1990), *Teaching Communication* (London: Routledge).
- Carter, R. and J.McRae (eds) (1996), *Language, Literature and the Learner* (London: Longman).
- Durant, A. and N.Fabb. (1989), *Literary Studies in Action* (London: Routledge).
- Eagleton, M. (1983), *Feminist Literary Theory: a Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell).
- Eagleton, T. (1983), *Literary Theory: an Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell).
- Fabb, N, D.Attridge, A.Durant and C.MacCabe. (1987), *The Linguistics of Writing: Arguments between Language and Literature* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).
- Fabb, N, and A.Durant. (1993), *How to Write Essays, Dissertations and Theses in Literary Studies* (London: Longman).