

Thorpe, M. 1968. *Modern Prose*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Introduction.

Wallwork, J.F. 1965. Prose Literature in Africa, *ELT*, 14, 167-176.

Widdowson, H.G. 1984. *Explorations in Applied Linguistics* (pp. 137-173). oxford: oxford University press

Widdowson, H.G. 1983. Talking-shop: on literature and ELT. *ELT Journal* 37, 30 - 35.

Willis, M. 1988. What is the moral of the story? Teaching American literature in Japan. *Forum* 26 (4), 35-37.

Zyngier, s. 1988. Teaching a short story. *Forum* 26 (3), 22-25

Isenberg, N. 1990. Literary competence: The EFL reader and the role of the teacher. *ELT Journal*, 44, 181-190

Johnson, p. 1981. Effects on reading comprehension of language complexity and cultural background of a text. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15, 169-181.

Lewin, B.W. 1984. Reading between the lines. *ELT Journal* 38. 121-126.

Marshall, M. 1979. Love and death in Eden: Teaching English literature to ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly* 13, 331-340.

Mckay, S. 1982. Literature in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly* 16, 529-536.

Mckay, J. W. 1971. Developing Reading Skills Through Literature, In: Painte, H.W. (ed.) *Teaching Children and young people through literature*, IRA, 50-57

Morgan , 1950. English Teaching in Foreign Universities. *ELT* 1/2: 31-35

Pattison, B. 1954. Some notes on the teaching of literature. *ELT*, 8, 75-80.

Pattison B. 1963. The teaching of literature. *ELT*, 59-62.

Pattison, B. 1964. The literature lesson. *ELT*, 18, 59-62.

Povey, J. 1979. The teaching of literature in advanced ESL classes. In *teaching English as a second or foreign language*, Celce-Murcia, M&L. Mc Intosh (Eds), 162-186. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Spack, R. 1985. Literature, reading, writhing, and ESL: Bridging the gaps. *Tesol Quarterly*, 19, 703-726.

Spolsky, E. 1989. I come to bury Caesar, not to praise him: teaching resisting reading. *ELT Journal* 43. 173-179.

and innovation *ELT Journal*, 44, 215-221.

Catterson, J.H. (Ed.) 1970. *Children and literature*. IRA. 98-104

Cook, V.J. 1983. What should language teaching be about. *ELT Journal*, 37, 229 - 34.

Cowling, R.A. 1962. Observations on the teaching of English literature to foreigners *ELT* 8, 27-33.

Deyes, T. 1982. Discourse analysis and literary interpretation. *ELT Journal*, 36, 119-124,

Edwards, P. & D.R. Carroll. 1963. Teaching English literature to West African students. *ELT*. 18, 38-44.

Elliott, R. 1990. Encouraging reader-response to literature in ESL situations, *ELT Journal*, 44, 191-198.

Enricht, D.J. 1958. Splendures and miseries of a literature teacher, *ELT*, 13, 7-10.

Gajdusek, L. 1988. Toward wider use of literature in ESL: why and how. *TESOL Quarterly*, 22, 227-257.

Gardiner P.D.R & W.A. Gibson. 1971. *The design of prose*. NY. Charles Seribner Sons.

Gatbonton, E.C. & G.R. Tucker. 1971. Cultural orientation and the study of literature. *TESOL Quarterly*, 5, 137-143.

Gerver, U. 1990. Literary role play. *ELT Journal* 44, 199-203.

Hayes de Hunees, D. 1955. The teaching of English literature, *ELT*, 10,3-17.

Hivela, A. & J. Boyle. 1988. Literature courses and student attitudes. *ELT Journal* 42, 179-184.

References:

- Adeyanju, T.K. 1978. Teaching literature and human values in ESL: Objectives and Selection. *ELT Journal*, 32, 133 - 138.
- Akyel, A.&E. Yalcin. 1990. Literature in the EFL class: a study of goal-achievement incongruence. *ELT Journal* 44, 174-180.
- Alptekin, Cem and Margaret. 1984. The question of culture: EFL teaching in non-English Speaking Countries. *ELTJ*, 38, 14-20.
- Arthur, B. 1968. Reading literature and learning a second language. *language learning*, 18, 199-210.
- Baird, A. 1976. The study and teaching of literature. *ELT*, 30, 281-286.
- Bottrall, R. 1953. The teaching of English poetry to students whose native language is not English. *ELT*, 8, 39-44.
- Brumfit, C.J. 1985. *Language and Literature Teaching*. Oxford: Pergamon Press Ltd.
- Brumfit, C.J. and R.A. Carter. 1987. *Literature and Language Teaching*. Oxford: OUP.
- Bullough, G. 1955. Analytical criticism in literature study. *ELT*, 9, 115-122.
- Blatchford, ch.H. 1974. Should literature be part of ESOL? *Forum*, 7, (4) 46-49.
- Carrell, P.L., J.C. Eisterhold. 1983. Schema theory and ESL reading pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17, 553-573.
- Carter, R. et al (eds). 1989. Literature and the learner: Methodological approaches. In *ELT documents: 130*. Modern English Publications & The British Council.
- Carter, R. & M.N. Long. 1990. Testing literature in EFL classes: Tradition

concern, language usage should be explored only to the extent that it is relevant to that experience.

- The least possible amount of teacher explanation is also one of the requirements of putting literary experience before the total verbal comprehension. Too much explanation is not only unhelpful, it might be distracting. A joke which has to be explained is not simply funny. When a teacher explains everything about a literary text, then there is nothing left for the learner to discover, learn and/or enjoy.

The proponents of the use of literature as resource for language learning (Maley 1989, Gajdusek 1988, Maley and Duff 1989, Carter Long 1987, ...) to make the integration of language and literature practically possible have developed a three-stage approach to the reading of a literary text. The purpose of the first phase or stage is to sensitize, prepare the student to find a way into the literary texts. They have devised lots of interesting activities. The reader may refer to these sources. There is, however, one important point: if we are not careful about quality and quantity of these activities, the activities which have been devised to 'warm-up' the student, may do nothing but 'worn-out' the student. The second series of activities have been composed for problem solving and search-for-meaning purposes. The ultimate purpose of the second phase is to involve the learner with the text to experience it as literature. The third stage, divergence or away -out -from -the -text phase breaks the learner from the present text and involves him/her with other text types and activities.

As it must be clear by now the use of literature for language learning purposes theoretically is justifiable and practically possible. We have the recipe and the required ingredients. The taste and quality of the cake we are going to bake in the classroom mainly belongs to and depends on our skills as a cook and the quality of the ingredients we use.

Spring, 1992.

Suggestions:

- Ample use should be made of prompts (brief, quick writings), non-verbal contexts, etc. to prepare the students for the literary texts;

- Translation of stories, poems, ... which the student is familiar with their content in his/her own mother tongue must be used. The use of this type of text converses the more usual situation where the familiar language is used to convey new information and experience. Reading a story or a poem in foreign language when you have already seen or heard it in your own language will not harm the literary experience. A literary experience is a quite repeatable experience. One important point about the use of translated or simplified version of texts is that we need to be sensitive to the fact that the process of translation or simplification has not spoiled the literariness of the original texts.

- The use of native literature produced originally in English is also helpful in developing literary experience prior to total verbal comprehension. If reading a non-native literature is similar to a journey in a strange foreign land, reading native literature in a foreign language is similar to a journey back to your childhood place.

- When we use a literary text for language learning purpose, we have to focus on those aspects of the text which are most responsible for its literariness. Pattison almost forty years ago referred to this point. She wrote: [We need to be] so occupied with those qualities as to be unconscious of the medium ... linguistic details need not be neglected, but should unobtrusively serve understanding of literary effects the author aimed at (1954: 75). Louw thirty five years later pushes the same point: it is argued that to achieve the primacy of literary experience in a language lesson, we need to observe three rules:

- The language teaching goal must be kept covert;

- The process of integration should only be pursued during the lesson for a brief period by means of a sub-routine;

- We need to focus on those segments at the core of literariness which tolerate teacher's interference (1989: 47 - 49)

Rosenblatt's distinction (1978:24) between 'efferent' reading is related to the above suggestion. In efferent reading, the reader is concerned with what (s)he will carry away. In aesthetic reading the reader's primary concern is with what happens during the actual reading process. Exploring the usage of a text which is being approached efferently is in keeping with the aim of using a text to gain information. Since in aesthetic reading the experience is the primary

A definition of literature

Literature mean different things to different people: a set of books, a set of pre-mediated principles, masterpieces produced by well-known writers, and so on. When we intend to use literature as a resource for language learning none of the above definitions help. In an EFL situation and for the purpose mentioned above, we may define literature as that process of reading which leads to literary experience. This purposeful and functional definition of literature may not please everybody. We may have to put, as Arthur referred to, a dime-store novel next to or even higher than a masterpiece which has been produced according to accepted conventions of literary tradition.

The use of literary experience as the only criterion for text selection has far reaching implications for selection and presentation of literary text in EFL programmes. This leads me to this important question that: how can literature help foreign language learning goals and still remain an enjoyable experience, that is, literature? This question forces us to face a dilemma.

A literary text may be used as a resource to serve a secondary purpose only if it evokes a literary response, i.e. its primary purpose. However, this will not be possible if we do not know the language of the text. If a learner knows the language of the text, that is, its structures, vocabulary, etc., then the text loses its value as a language learning device and if the learner has problems with its structure, vocabulary, etc., the text as a piece of literature becomes inaccessible. This dilemma which many refer to, in order to question the use of literature for language learning purpose does not exist at all. It is basically a truism based on a number of fallacies:

It is assumed that a literary experience becomes possible only when we understand all the structures and vocabulary of the text. It is assumed that the whole meaning lies in the text and this meaning is inviolable and static. It is assumed that language learning starts and ends with the text. In other words, if a text has no new word or structure, it has no value for language learning purpose.

When we use literature for language learning purpose we need to concentrate on literature in such a way that it evokes literary experience and eventually more competent mastery of the language in the learner. The crucial point here is that we have to find ways to enable the student to read the literature with total involvement and at the same time use literary experience precede and make language learning incidental to an enjoyable reading of the texts.

text and conventional pattern practice could be more effective, but whenever genuine interpretative and sense-making procedures of language use is the main concern, there is a room for literary discourse and need for integration. A better understanding of the following concepts will justify the use of literature for language learning purposes: reading process, literary experience, distinction between the literature studied as a discipline or subject and literature as a resource for language learning purposes, priority of literature over language in the integration of language and literature, and a definition of literature.

Reading process

The earlier theoretical work by Goodman and Smith in the sixties, Rosenblatt in the seventies, and Carrel and Eisterhold in the eighties has revealed the complex nature of reading process.

We have come to note that in the act of reading, the text holds only part of the meaning and it is only a stimulus to activate the process of reading. For Rosenblatt, the act of reading is an event in time, involving a specific reader, and a specific time and place, and if any of these changed there is a different event and a different experience. Hence, while a text may not be involving for an individual at a certain time, later the same person by bringing additional experience to the text, may find it involving (Rosenblatt, 1978).

Literary experience

Reading a literary text is even more demanding and involving than reading a non-literary text. When you read a work of literature there is no relevant physical context, no explicit contextualization, you have to suspend your own physical world and using all your linguistic and intellectual power, all the interpretative and sense-making procedures of language use in order to create another world, living and existing next to your own. This enjoyable act is referred to as literary experience. We know that the primary purpose of any work of literature is this type of pleasure, pleasure which is the outcome of experiencing two worlds simultaneously. Literature has been used to teach morals, philosophy, science, political ideologies, ... in all these, however, literature succeeds only when it succeeds as literature. A boring story, a shallow play, a poor poem can not teach anything, because it fails in its primary purpose.

segregation of language skills in the language courses and disintegration of language and literature studies.

Though I have no intention of discussing that claim further, I am, however, very much committed to the belief that the disintegration of language and literature studies and the dismissal of the latter from the language classroom is mainly a methodological and attitudinal problem and it is a very good example of an unhealthy relationship between theory and practice. When certain social changes in the study of English as a foreign language caused the shift of emphasis from purely educational to mainly utilitarian purposes, when certain development in the psychology of learning made us conscious of the importance of relevancy and usefulness, when modern studies in the structure of language indicated that the language of literature is deviant from the norm, we misunderstood, overgeneralized, and jumped to the conclusion that literature is difficult, irrelevant, not useful; and we need to exclude it from the language learning classroom.

Let me state in passing that being long in profession has both positive and negative effects on the practice and thinkings of a person. The negative side is that you get used to digging in certain holes because of the practical commitment and comfort of digging the old holes. you may not wish to come out and start digging new ones. The positive side of it is that no matter how far away you kept yourself from the main stream of events and how emotionally uninvolved you were, you have a wide spectrum of events, developments in your head, you do remember many ideas put in the shade, many successful beliefs pushed down from the pedestal, new heroes raised and horizons opened. Your memory like the pages of the leading journals in the field, records ups and downs of many issues in the profession. For instance, on the topic of this writhing, literature in EFL situations, it is not difficult to note how long-forgotten writings of Morgan (1950), Bottrall (1953), Pattison (1954: 63, 64), Enricht (1958), all in the fifties, are revived and form the backbone of the writings of Brumfit, Carter, Lazar, S.Mackey, Maley, Povey, Spack, and Widdowson in the eighties. Another positive side of being long in a profession is that, if you are wise, you learn not to be obstinate in your views and not to overgeneralize. And I have no intention of overgeneralizing here. For instance, on the question of the integration of language and literature studies I am not making the claim that literature is the cure for all ills of languages learning. Obviously, whenever the manipulation of certain formal aspects of language is the main and immediate concern, non-literary

Literature courses

Language teaching has, for many years, been able to draw upon sophisticated discussion of teaching methodology. Even a discipline, Applied Linguistics, has been created to systematize the discussions. Literature teaching, unlike language teaching, has rarely been self-conscious about criteria for syllabus design and teaching methods. Literature teaching honours tradition and traditionally there are two basic approaches to the teaching of literature:

(a) Literary Critical Approach which mainly focuses on the literariness of the text, using intuition. For this approach to succeed we need to assume that our students have already attained a high level of language competence and familiarity with the literary conventions.

(b) Stylistic Approach. In this approach the assumption is that the root of literariness is in the language. It makes descriptions in terms of parallelism, deviancy, prominence, etc.

Neither of the above approaches to the study of literature will help when we intend to use literature for language learning purposes. These two approaches, in addition to the perfect mastery of the foreign language, demand a good knowledge of literary conventions, potentiality, sensitivity to literary appreciation. These two approaches follow deep-rooted standardized practices for the text selection and classroom presentation.

The prevailing thinking and practice in the literature courses may be summarized as follows: There is little difference between mother-tongue literature and English as a foreign literature. The principles and even techniques used in the teaching of one's own literature are transferable to that of foreign literature. In the selection of literary texts the principle of "the 'best' from each period, school, writer or country, ordered chronologically" is practised. In presenting these texts, the other people's, or often the teacher's own appreciation is lectured upon and information about literary concepts, terms, principles passed to the students. One gets the impression that real use of language and genuine appreciation of a literary text both happen after the completion of these courses. That may be the answer to the question why many learners in these situations expect their problems to be solved in higher courses of the study and believe that more of the same is the answer. In its turn, this attitude explains the mushrooming of ever higher and higher courses of study in most of EFL situations.

The prevailing thinking summarized above seems to be responsible for the

language learning, in EFL situations, unlike ESL situations, where the learners may rarely get a chance to get involved in a genuine dialogue with a native speaker this is not so crucial an objective, instead, ability to read and write assumes higher importance in EFL and specifically in EAP (English for Academic Purposes). Research also supports the claim that writing skill is very important at these situations, and too much emphasis on social interactions may be harmful to the development of a solid writing skill, so essential to the success in academic studies. At present, writing skills receive the least useful practice and attention in English Language and Literature Degree Programmes.

The foreignness of foreign languages

Those who learn a foreign language which, by definition, is not used in their environment or community, develop special feeling and attitude towards that language. This attitude makes a more objective treatment of that language somehow a natural feature of its use. Classroom atmosphere and procedures, analytical approaches to the text, close reading, as well as, un-or semi-conscious pattern practice drills could be partly responsible for the development of this attitude. No matter how fluent your performance and how correct your 'usage', you are always conscious of the fact that you are using a list of formulas and what you perceive is first a formula though you have no problem in encoding or decoding these notations, they are notations. They are, so to speak, outside you. There is no vision behind them and most often they do not even appear in your cognition. The perception is habitual and automatic. You apprehend objects only as symbols, shapes with imprecise extensions. As Shklovsky refers to, somehow similar attitude in our everyday life: "We see objects as if they were enveloped in a sack. We know what a subject is by its configuration. We see only its silhouette. The object thus perceived fades and does not leave even a first impression; ultimately even the essence of what it was is forgotten."

Though this type of habitualization and automatization is quite common in our everyday life and can be very useful at the early stages of learning a foreign language, it may, however, devour any sensitivity and creativity at the later more advanced stages of language learning. Language courses at present encourage this type of automatization. Inclusion of real content and imaginative language of literature in the language-skill courses will be very useful.

but we also need to explain and exploit the interconnection between all these courses.

In such a multi-purpose programme language-skill courses play a pivotal role. There is, however, a tendency to teach these skill courses in complete isolation from both 'content' courses and 'literature' courses. The Limited English Proficiency (LEP) of their students forces them to switch into their mother tongue, and thus lose the precious opportunity to learn either.

I have already explained a useful relation between language courses and content courses (Banan-Sadeghian, 1994). I have concluded that language skill courses may benefit from the real content of the 'content' courses and become more natural and incidental to content learning; and content courses become more helpful by being sensitive to the limited English proficiency of their students.

In this paper, I shall confine myself to the description of the relation between language courses and literature courses and their prevailing teaching methodology. I will then explain reasons for the ever-widening gap between these two groups of courses. At the end I shall make a number of practical suggestions to narrow the gap between these two groups of courses. More specifically, I shall focus on the use of literature as a resource for language learning purposes.

The language-skill courses and skills segregation

Language courses in the B.A. Degree programmes are taught prior to the 'content' and literature courses to remedy high school English programmes. Prevailing thinking of the sixties lured the programme designers to offer isolated language-skill courses. Language courses were labeled as Reading, Writing, Conversation, and Grammar courses. Had it not been for learning in spite of teaching, integration in spite of segregation, the modest success which some students achieve through these programmes, would have been even less. Neither the syllabi nor the prevailing methodology of these courses prepare their students for the 'content' or literature courses.

Superficial interpretation of 'communicative competence'

One of the reasons that cause the majority of the students fail to use their limited English to benefit from their literature and content courses, is the superficial understanding of communicative competence. This ability has been equated with fluency in conversation and ability for social interactions. Though this ability is essential for fluency with language at early stages of

J. Banan - Sadeghian
Allameh Tabataba'ei University

Why and How of Language and literature Integration in EFL Situations⁽¹⁾

Introduction

The degree programmes in English language and literature, offered in many EFL situations in non-English speaking countries, traditionally pursue two major objectives: the mastery of the language and the appreciation of its literature. The prevailing practice in these situations is that language courses are offered first to further the students language competence and remedy their school English. The literature courses then follow to acquaint them with English literature. This practice and commitment to certain conventional language and literature teaching methodology have widened the gap between these two groups of language and literature courses. The natural continuity and integration between language and literature studies more often do not actualize. In the language courses, the students get a detailed knowledge of language structures, learn to manipulate these structures and forms; in the literature courses, students are exposed to information about literature and to the descriptions of the others' appreciation of that literature.

To ensure the comprehensiveness of the programme and its sensitivity to the acknowledged utilitarian needs of its students, the programme designers add a few content courses, e.g. linguistics and ELT methodology, to give the students a knowledge of linguistics and an introduction to the methodology of teaching English as a foreign language. It is not difficult to justify the inclusion of these courses in the programmes of this kind. In any multi-purpose programme, however, not only do we need to justify each individual course,

1 - An earlier version of this article was read to IATEFL conference Lille, France, 1992.