

2014

## An Investigation on Approaches Used by School Teachers in Teaching the Literature Components in EFL Classrooms/ English for Palestine Case

Khalid AbdulJaleel Dweikat

*Al Quds Open University/Palestine*, kdweikat@qou.edu

Ghada Shbietah

*An-Najah National University/Palestine*, ghada.shbietah@poe.qou.edu

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.aaru.edu.jo/jaou\\_edpsych](https://digitalcommons.aaru.edu.jo/jaou_edpsych)

---

### Recommended Citation

Dweikat, Khalid AbdulJaleel and Shbietah, Ghada (2014) "An Investigation on Approaches Used by School Teachers in Teaching the Literature Components in EFL Classrooms/ English for Palestine Case," *Journal of Al-Quds Open University for Educational & Psychological Research & Studies*: Vol. 2 : No. 7 , Article 11. Available at: [https://digitalcommons.aaru.edu.jo/jaou\\_edpsych/vol2/iss7/11](https://digitalcommons.aaru.edu.jo/jaou_edpsych/vol2/iss7/11)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Arab Journals Platform. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Al-Quds Open University for Educational & Psychological Research & Studies by an authorized editor. The journal is hosted on [Digital Commons](#), an Elsevier platform. For more information, please contact [rakan@aarj.edu.jo](mailto:rakan@aarj.edu.jo), [marah@aarj.edu.jo](mailto:marah@aarj.edu.jo), [u.murad@aarj.edu.jo](mailto:u.murad@aarj.edu.jo).

**An Investigation on Approaches  
Used by School Teachers in  
Teaching the Literature  
Components in EFL Classrooms/  
English for Palestine Case \***

**Khaled Abdel Jaleel Dweikat \*\***

**Ghada Shbietah \*\*\***

---

**\* Recieved: 1/11/2013 , Accepted: 29/12/2013.**

**\*\* Al-Quds Open University, Nablus Branch, Palestine.**

**\*\*\* An-Najah National University, Nablus, Palestine.**

## ملخص:

هدفت هذه الدراسة إلى التعرف إلى الأساليب التي يستخدمها معلمو اللغة الإنجليزية لتدريس النصوص والمكونات الأدبية في المنهاج الفلسطيني English for Palestine إضافة إلى التحقق من أثر الجنس والمؤهل والخبرة والتخصص على استخدامهم لهذه الأساليب والمناهج، وللإجابة عن أسئلة الدراسة ، استخدمت استبانة ضمت ٣٣ فقرة ووزعت على ٥٢ معلماً يدرسون اللغة الانجليزية في مدارس محافظة قلقيلية في الفصل الأول من العام الأكاديمي ٢٠١٢/٢٠١٣. أظهرت النتائج استخدام المعلمين لأكثر من أسلوب وطريقة، وبنسب متفاوتة تراوحت بين استخدام متوسط إلى عال. علاوة على ذلك، أظهرت النتائج أن الأسلوب المعتمد على المعلومات كان أكثر الأساليب استخداماً ، بينما أقلها استخداماً كان المنهج الأسلوبي. كما تبين عدم وجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية على المستوى الكلي، وعلى كل المجالات باستثناء المجال الثاني ”مجال الاستجابة الشخصية“ تعزى لمتغيرات: الجنس والتخصص والخبرة، بينما ظهرت فروق إحصائية على الدرجة الكلية للأساليب المستخدمة من قبل المعلمين تعزى للمؤهل. كلمات مفتاحيه: صفوف تعليم اللغة الانجليزية كلغة أجنبية، الأدب ، النهج أو الطريقة، منهاج اللغة الإنجليزية الفلسطيني.

## **Abstract:**

This study aimed at investigating the approaches used by English teachers in teaching the literature components in English for Palestine, in addition to investigating the effect of gender, qualification, experience and specialization on their use of these approaches. To answer the questions of the study, a 33-item questionnaire was used to measure the perceptions of 52 teachers who teach English in Qalqiliah secondary schools in the first semester of the academic year 2012/2013. The results revealed that the teachers tend to use more than one approach and that not all approaches are used at the same degree or level since teachers' use of approaches ranged from moderate to high levels in the literature lessons. Furthermore, the results revealed that the information-based approach was the most favored approach in the literature class while the stylistic approach scored the lowest level of use. Moreover, the study showed no statistically significant differences for the total degree, nor for any of the domains with the exception of the Personal-Response approach due to gender, specialization and experience. On the other hand, there were statistically significant differences on the total degree of approaches employed by teachers due to qualification.

**Keywords:** EFL classrooms, Literature, Approach, English for Palestine curriculum.

## **Introduction:**

In the Palestinian context, where English is learnt and taught as a foreign language, learning literature is undoubtedly neither easy nor motivating. Literature in such a situation does not occupy a predominant position in the English language curriculum. There is also an obvious misconception between English teachers who regard literature to be a minor component of the foreign language curriculum. These views mirror a noticeable separation between the study of language and the study of literature which has led to the limited role of literature in the Palestinian language curriculum on one hand, and in the English language classroom, on the other hand. However, literature is included in the new Palestinian English Curriculum “English for Palestine” in the eleventh and the twelfth grades. This indicates that the new curriculum has clearly limited literature and its supposed merits in English language classroom. Under these circumstances, literature might be deprived of its pedagogical tool that aids language teaching.

Talking about literature, a variety of types were represented by Kinneavy’s (1983) classification that includes expressive discourse, which focuses on personal expression such as letters and diaries ; transactional discourse , which focuses on both the reader and the message such as advertising and instructions ; and poetic discourse, which focuses on form and language such as short story drama and poetry(Cited in Savvidou , 2004). Another classification was proposed by Fakeye and Amao (2013) which includes prose, poetry, and drama.

Despite all positive views about literature and its importance as a powerful pedagogical tool, there are still many contradicting notions regarding the effectiveness of integrating literature into language classroom. Some questions arise on the competency that the learners should have in order to comprehend the literary texts they need to read. Other questions are centered on the impact of certain approaches used by some teachers when teaching the literature component in an EFL situation. Under such circumstances, the linguistic difficulties usually represent the most challenging barrier in

implementing literature to language teaching classrooms. Such difficulties might be attributed to the difficulty and complexity of certain literary texts which are often associated with the complexity of content with so much 'compression' in meanings and the language used is usually of 'high style' with all the 'loftiness' and 'grandeur' in the arrangement and use of words, sentence structures, conversation, metaphor and the like. Fakeye and Amao (2013) in this regard gave the example of poetry which, although appeals to the feelings and develops the emotional and imaginative aspects of man, seems to be the most difficult genre due to its ambiguity, obscurity, unfamiliarity of words and its elliptical nature.

Khatib et al (2011) outlined some criticisms of integrating literature into English language classrooms. These include syntax; specially when literary texts are loaded with complex structures; lexis, especially when literary texts are teeming with old and outdated; phonetics and phonology, especially when there is a deviation from normal phonetic and phonological system; semantics, especially when some words change semantically and block the learners' previous knowledge; selection of materials specially when various factors should be taken into account when it comes to selecting the materials such as learners' language proficiency, age, gender, background knowledge, in addition to some factors related to the text itself; unfamiliarity with certain literary genres and conventions; and finally the cultural barriers.

Furthermore, the difficulty of teaching literary components arises because learning literature in English always poses many language and cultural obstacles. One of these difficulties is that secondary school students do not feel motivated to read literary texts due to lack of language proficiency and inadequate supply of teaching materials (Yunus et al , 2013), the second is that literature is particularly complex and inaccessible for the foreign language learner and can even be detrimental to the process of language learning (Or, 1995), and the third is that the desire to broaden learners' horizons through exposure to classic literature usually has disappointing results.

Regardless of the difficulty of teaching and learning certain literary texts such as poetry as discussed above, , the last decades have witnessed a growing interest in integrating literature into the foreign language curriculum in may

countries. Many methodologists and educators (Savvidou , 2004; Khatib et al , 2011; Ayanniyi , 2009; Hişmanoğlu, 2005; Talif ,1991; McKay ,1982; Aziz and Nasharudin ,2010; Carter and Long 1991)highlighted using literature in EFL and ESL classrooms as an integral part of language programs and curriculum that play a significant role in promoting linguistic competence , teaching structure, grammatical structures, word forms, common expressions, vocabulary, syntax, morphology, mechanics, stylistics, registers, and providing meaningful context sand authentic material.

On the other hand, other educators believe in the significant role of integrating literature into English language classes as a means to open the students' minds into different cultures to develop their cultural awareness and their critical thinking in one hand, and to help them become creative analytical learners (Ayanniyi , 2009; Simpson ,2004; Obediat ,1997; Savvidou ,2004; Van, 2009; Collie and Slater ,1990).Therefore, according to Spack (1985), the literary experience should not be denied to ESL students who are “intellectually and emotionally, if not linguistically and culturally, ready to examine literary works.

Savvidou (2004) examined different approaches to teaching literature to provide a rationale for an integrated approach to teaching literature in the language classroom based on the premise that literature is language and language can indeed be literary. The conclusion of this paper centered on the benefits of using literature in the EFL classroom. Apart from offering a distinct literary world which can widen learners' understanding of their own and other cultures, literature can create opportunities for personal expression as well as reinforce learners' knowledge of lexical and grammatical structure. An integrated approach to the use of literature in the language classroom offers foreign language learners the opportunity to develop not only their linguistic and communicative skills but their knowledge about language in all its discourse types.

Similarly, Gajdusek (1988) highlighted the importance of context in teaching a language for two reasons. The first one is the internal coherence by which each line interrelates with other lines to create an internally coherent meaning. Within this coherence, it is this self – sufficiency of a literary text

which engages the reader in interpretation, meaning negotiation and the generation of coherent discourse-based meaning, hence literature has highly interactive demands on learners. The second reason is the conscious patterning in which the language of a literary text is fashioned into recurring patterns of sounds, meaning and structures, connecting intellectual, emotional and physical experiences. Accordingly, discovering, exploring and appreciating these patterns would create a lot of reader-text interaction which is an essential feature of communicative competence. Maley (1989:12) listed the following reasons for regarding literature as a potent resource in the language classroom: universality, non-triviality, personal relevance, variety, interest, economy and suggestive power, and ambiguity.

With regard to literature teaching methodology, there are various terms used in connection to teaching methods, namely (a) Methodology – a broad, general term which can be described as “the study of pedagogical practice” or in short, how to teach, (b) Approaches – these are theories, beliefs and assumptions on how languages or other subjects are learned and should be taught, (c) Method – refers to how language specifically, is taught based on one particular approach, it is broadly defined, meaning it is not specific to any particular context, and (d) Techniques – these are items like exercises, activities and devices or strategies used in class and the term is usually, though not necessarily, more concerned with the roles and relationship between teachers and students ( Ghazali et al , 2009 : 52). According to Smith (1996), the instructional approach common to the learning literature in English should emphasize productive thinking while at the same time encouraging intellectual nonconformity and radicalism among readers. The use of this divergent approach can be helpful in encouraging learners to become active participants and not just passive learners in the learning process.

### **Approaches to Teaching Literature:**

Literary texts can be approached and taught in different methods or approaches. These approaches are essential for students, teachers and course designers in order to achieve the required objectives of improving second language proficiency. Ab .Rashid et al, (2010) suggested the following approaches for teaching literature.

1. **Language-based approach:** This approach is closely related to the Language Model presented by Carter and Long (1991) where literary texts are seen as means to helping students' improve language proficiency. This is done by providing them exposure to the target language and connecting them to specific vocabulary and other aspects of the language.
2. **Periphrastic approach:** This approach deals with the surface meaning of the text. It allows teachers to use simpler words and sentence structures compared to the more complicated ones in the texts and sometimes the teacher can translate it into other languages. This approach is suitable for beginners of the target language as it acts as a stepping stone in formulating original assumptions of the author's work.
3. **Information-based approach:** It demands a large input from the teacher. It describes the study of literature as "aesthetically patterned artifact endowed with the knowledge potentials philosophy, culture, morality, and humanities". Carter and Long (1991) further argue that it involves critical concepts, literary conventions and metalanguage and the students should be able to use such terms and concepts in talking and writing about literature. This approach is a way of teaching knowledge about literature where literature is seen as a medium to offer a source of information to students.
4. **Personal-response approach:** This approach is associated with Personal Growth Model proposed by Carter and Long (1991) as it aims is to elicit personal response and foster students' personal development. It focuses on learner's response to the author's text. This approach motivates and encourages students to read by making a connection between the themes of the texts studied and their personal life experiences.
5. **Moral-philosophical approach:** This is an approach which incorporates moral values across curriculum. The focus of this

approach is to discover moral values while reading a particular literary text (Diana Hwang & Amin Embi, 2007). It seeks to find the worthiness of moral and philosophical considerations behind one's reading.

- 6. The Stylistic Approach:** This approach deals with the use of language patterns in a text which creates a form of communication that conveys its particular messages. According to Niazir (2010), the stylistic approach provides a way of integrating two subjects, English language and Literature-in-English. In this approach, the teaching of literature and poetry in particular emphasizes the writer's choice of words and their functions, the structure and the deviation from the norms, the use of foregrounding and parallelism, and other figure of speech, the lexical cohesion and coherence in the texts and the grammatical patterns.

### **Statement of the problem:**

Over the last two decades, mainly after 1994 Oslo's Accord, which brought about the first Palestinian self-government, the educational system in Palestine has witnessed dramatic changes represented by teaching English from first grade instead of fifth grade in addition to implementing the first Palestinian Curriculum. On the other hand, and in terms of curricula, one of the big achievements in English teaching in Palestine recently has been the introduction of the first English school curriculum titled English for Palestine from grade one to twelve.

One of the general goals of teaching English as a foreign language as stated by the Palestinian Ministry of Education is to develop students' appreciation of literature. However, at present, it has been noticed that the literature component in English for Palestine is mostly taught in the eleventh and the twelfth grades; even it has not been taught communicatively as its study is limited to passing exams especially Tawjihi. Such limitations can be noticed from the lack of attention from both teachers and students. It is also noticed that literature lessons are mostly teacher- centered instead of being student- centered as it was concluded by Ramlan (2011) whose study

revealed that teacher-centered approach is used more than student-centered approach when teaching literature component. Moreover, some teachers still face problems with the best approaches to teach literature in EFL classrooms so as to help students to gain both language and appreciation of the literature itself. Furthermore, the researchers' personal communication with EFL teachers have revealed that the lack of skills or experience of teachers, the absence of practical guidelines or models and other related support resources usually pose significant problems when it comes to teaching the literature component. Under these circumstances and in the light of the need to consider literature a basic component of the Palestinian English curricula, this study came to investigate the approaches used by school teachers in teaching the literature component in EFL classrooms.

### **Questions of the study:**

The fundamental questions addressed in this study are:

1. What are teachers' perceptions of using different approaches to teach the literature component in English for Palestine curriculum?
2. What approaches are employed by secondary school teachers in teaching the literature component in Qalqilia classrooms?
3. Are there statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) between teachers' use of approaches due to gender, specialization, qualification and experience?

### **Purpose of the study:**

Since the introduction of the new English curricula, English For Palestine, there has been a need to investigate the changes that have been brought up with that curricula. Whilst the literature component in English aims at enhancing students' language proficiency, it is also geared for the purpose of generating the aesthetic part of the language that is personal response from students. However, it is noticeable that students in literature classes were seen to be passive and were unable to interact with the material critically and literature lessons were often too teacher – centered. Taking these considerations into account, the present study aims to gain a general overview of the approaches

used by secondary teachers in teaching the literature component in the Palestinian English curriculum so that it would be easier to formulate a way that help the teachers teach literature effectively and communicatively. It also aims at encouraging more research to be carried out to enhance the process of teaching literature.

### **Significance of the study:**

Teaching literature seems to be a controversial issue that raises a few important questions such as: what is the current situation like in the literature classroom? How is the literature component in English taught in schools? Are teachers well-equipped with knowledge and methodology for teaching literature? The situation above shows a state that needs immediate intervention. Hence, this study, which is in line with the effort undertaken by the Ministry of Education, is guided by three reasons:

1. It is the researchers' hope that the findings of this study would lead to effective strategies for teaching of literature using the best approaches.
2. It is hoped that the findings of this study will be of practical pedagogical implications especially for teachers of English for Palestine syllabus, curriculum designers, and decision –makers at the Ministry of Education.
3. It is hoped that the findings of the study will have some valuable recommendations for future research.

### **Definition of Terms:**

- **English for Palestine:** Is an up-to-date communicative English curriculum which has been specially written and developed in consultation with local and international ELT experts for schools in Palestine. The 12 levels systematically develop competence in the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing). Additionally, it provides grammar practice and motivating and rewarding activities including games, songs and learning experiences to encourage students to become confident users of English.
- **Approach:** Theoretically well-informed positions and beliefs about

the nature of language, the nature of language learning and the applicability of both to pedagogical settings (Brown, 2001).

- **Literature:** Traditionally, literature is defined by genre (novels, plays, short stories, poetry, essays), by modes of discourse (narrative, expository, argumentative, descriptive), by time periods (Elizabethan, Restoration, Victorian), by nationality (British, American), or by quality (traditional, classics). Literature involves communication of some type of meaning, through a particular medium, in this instance language. It is any text, verbal and/or visual, that offers the possibility for aesthetic reading or viewing and listening (Talif, 1991: 23-25).
- **EFL Classroom:** A situation in a country where English is not the dominant language. Students share the same language and culture. The teacher may be the only native English speaker they have exposure to. Outside the classroom students have very few opportunities to use English. For some, learning English may not have any obvious practical benefit. Students have limited exposure to English-speaking culture, most often through a distorted links like TV or music.

(<http://oupeltglobalblog.com/2011/07/12/how-esl-and-efl-classrooms-differ/>)

### **Limitations of the study:**

There are four major limitations to this study:

1. The study focuses only on the literature component in English for Palestine curriculum.
2. It is limited to the teachers from Qalqiliah secondary schools who filled the questionnaire. .
3. The results of the study, accordingly, will apply only to the respondents and schools that are directly involved in the investigation.
4. The lack of research studies in the area of teaching literature

in EFL in Palestine may restrict the inferences which might be drawn.

### **Literature review:**

Several studies have been conducted to investigate the effect of using different approaches and methods to teach literature in many countries. Some of these studies attempted to investigate teachers' and /or students' perceptions and attitudes towards using specific approaches in teaching the literature component in ESL or EFL classrooms.

**Fakeye and Amao (2013)** examined the effects of instruction in stylistic and thematic approaches on students' achievement in poetic literature. The participants in the study were SS11 students in Akure metropolis. Findings revealed that there was a significant main effect of treatment on students' achievement in poetry and no significant main effect of gender on students' achievement in poetry. Based on these findings, it was recommended that teachers should adopt stylistic and thematic approaches in the teaching of poetry in particular and literature in general. Similarly, Yunus et al (2013) investigated teachers' perceptions on the use of visual aids (e.g., animation videos, pictures, films and projectors) as a motivational tool in enhancing students' interest in reading literary texts. Fifty-two secondary English teachers in Kapit, Malaysia were selected. Five of the respondents were also randomly selected for the interview. The results indicated that most teachers had positive perceptions of the use of visual aids which seems to generate students' creative and critical thinking skills.

**Ab. Rashid et al(2010)** outlined the approaches and strategies employed by teachers in teaching the literature component to less proficient students in selected secondary schools in Kelantan, Malaysia. Triangulation involving the questionnaire as the primary data and classroom observation and semi-structured interview as the secondary data was used. Findings showed that the information-based approach is popularly employed by teachers, followed by moral-philosophical approach and periphrastic approach. It was found that information-based approach most suits their students' level. The least employed was language-based approach. Interestingly, the five approaches for teaching literature have been employed at a moderate to high level in

the literature lessons. Likewise, Hwang and Embi (2007) aimed to identify approaches employed by teachers to teaching the literature component in selected secondary schools in Sabah. The study was conducted with a population of 112 English teachers. A total of 87 teachers responded to the questionnaire; whereas, in a related case study, an English option teacher (a TESL graduate) and a non-option teacher (a History graduate) were observed for four weeks and then be interviewed. Findings showed that the periphrastic approach is popularly used by teachers, followed by the information-based approach and the moral-philosophical approach. The findings indicated that teaching approaches are largely influenced by students' language proficiency, attitudes, the exam-oriented culture, the prescribed literary materials and the number of students in the classroom.

**Talif (1991)** aimed to determine the present situation concerning the teaching of literature in ESL in Malaysia with particular reference to the Class Reader Program. The objective was to develop two proposed course designs for the teaching of literature in ESL at the secondary school level. Results revealed that the respondents were not adequately prepared to teach the literature component; thereby, establishing the need for teaching literature in ESL courses in teacher education programs. In relation to this finding, two proposed course designs which cater for the integrated language and literature teaching programs were developed as an initial and practical response toward this undertaking.

**Aziz and Nasharudin (2010)** investigated the approaches used to teach literature in ESL classrooms in Sekolah Johor Bahru. The sample involved 60 students who were divided into two groups equally to be taught literature using two different approaches and given a questionnaire to be answered at the end of the lesson. An interview was also done with the teacher to reinforce the findings. The study revealed weaknesses and strengths in both approaches. It was concluded that the language-based approach was the most preferred approach by the students in this group depending on how teachers manipulate the situation to suit students' needs.

**Lim and Omar (2007)** identified the techniques adopted among the teachers teaching poetry in the upper secondary schools in the Tawau town

area. The techniques put forward in this study were Language Based Approach, Personal Response- Based Approach, Stylistic Approach, Information- Based Approach and Moral -Philosophical Approach. The survey research targeted forty-five English language teachers teaching the literature component to secondary students. It was found that the Moral Philosophical Approach was the most preferred while the Stylistic Approach was the least preferred technique. It was also discovered that some techniques advocated under each approach specified in this study were more preferred than others.

**Ainy (2011)** conducted an empirical study among a group of learners who had decided that the genre of poetry was also the most complicated and fearsome of areas. The results revealed that the practice of reading poetry following a language based stylistic method can do wonders for a student. This is because in this approach, the material was chosen on the basis of whether it is appropriate to students' interests and will stimulate a high level of personal involvement initiating motivation and points of attraction. This approach also included techniques which were concerned more directly with the study of the literary text itself.

**Parmar and Barot (2009)** investigated the problems faced by teachers of standard 9<sup>th</sup> in teaching poetry in the subject of English for standard IX in Gujarati Medium schools in Vadodara city (India). The sample consisted of 30 teachers who responded to a questionnaire and an interview. The study revealed that majority of teachers having problems in recitation of poetry and they used the traditional method based on reading and explaining. Due to lack of facility for poetry teaching in the schools, it was found out that teachers couldn't use different facilities for poetry teaching like language lab, projector, C.D., and Tape recorder.

**Hişmanoğlu (2005)** examined the use of literature as a popular technique for teaching the basic language skills (i.e. reading, writing, listening and speaking) and sub -skills (i.e. vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation). Results revealed that when selecting the literary texts to be used in language classes, the language teacher should take into account needs, motivation, interests, cultural background and language level of the students. Results also revealed some problems encountered by language teachers. First, there are very few pedagogically-designed appropriate materials that can be used by language

teachers in a language classroom. Second, there is a lack of preparation in the area of literature teaching in TESL / TEFL programs. It was concluded that teachers should select appropriate language teaching method, teaching techniques, and classroom activities.

**Ghazali et al (2009)** explored students' attitudes towards the texts used in the program, the challenges faced in reading these texts and the type of texts students prefer to read. It also discussed the teaching strategies used in class, their effectiveness as well as the methods favoured by students. The study was carried out in two schools in Kemaman, Terengganu involving 110 students. Questionnaire and interview were used as the research instrument. Findings suggested that students generally had positive attitudes towards the text selection although they were less enthusiastic about the teaching methods used by teachers. A large majority of students also reacted positively towards using a variety of activities during literature lessons, probably to reduce monotony and boredom in class.

**Ramlan (2011)** explored the teaching approaches that English language teachers use when teaching literature, the reasons behind the selection of approaches being used and also the differences between the teaching approaches used by teachers teaching in rural and urban secondary schools. The respondents were 149 English language teachers who have been teaching English language subject in secondary schools. It was found that teacher-centered approach is used more than student-centered approach when teaching literature component. The teaching approaches employed in class were greatly determined by their students' level of proficiency in the language. The reason was mainly because the students did not have the competency in language, so it was hard to approach literature through student-centered way.

**Chacko and Wan Yahya (2007)** attempted to discover the perceptions of learners in the Malaysian context toward the instructional approach used in teaching literature. The sample was confined to 100 learners of literature in English in an urban secondary school. The findings of the survey showed that the respondents agreed to most of the pedagogical assumptions used in the teaching of literature in English. An analysis of the perceptions of the respondents showed a significant difference for two determinants across gender. The female respondents perceived the sociopolitical and mythological

determinants to be more important in the learning of literature in English than their male counterparts.

**Nasr (2001)** demonstrated how the analysis of the language of poetic selections could be the basis for TEFL lessons. Sample selections from the poetry of two Lebanese American poets namely Ameen Rihani's *The Chant of Mystics* and Gibran Kahlil Gibran's *The Prophet* were used. It was concluded that the incorporation of more literature into the language syllabus, lead education to be "on the threshold of a new phase in the history of language teaching and that the variety of selections in a content-based approach makes this approach attractive.

**Li and Seedhouse (2010)** evaluated the innovative introduction of a story-based approach in EFL classrooms with young learners in Taiwan. Transcripts of lessons were examined using the conversation analysis approach combined with Cameron's task framework. The results showed that in the story-based lessons there were more variations of interaction patterns, and overlapping occurs more frequently. The findings suggested that the story-based approach created entertaining environments which stimulated a higher level of intrinsic motivation and engagement from pupils.

The review of the previous literature appears to provide empirical evidence that there is no one single approach or method to teaching the literature component in EFL classrooms. Furthermore, the studies above showed a dearth of local and Arab studies on the investigation of approaches used by school teachers in teaching the literature components in EFL classrooms. To the best of the present researchers' knowledge, this study might be one of the first studies in Palestine to investigate the approaches used by school teachers in teaching the literature components in the Palestinian EFL classroom. Although the results of the reviewed foreign studies may not be particularly applicable to the Palestinian context, they were fruitful and instrumental for the researchers' construction and adaptation of the data collection questionnaire.

### **Sampling, Instrumentation and Procedure:**

The sample consisted of 52 English language teachers in Qalqiliah secondary schools in the academic year 2012/2013. The background of these

teachers ranged from novice to experienced teachers and from major to non-major in the area of English language teaching as some of them specialized either in literature or in linguistics and translation in addition to methods of teaching English. Moreover, the respondents were varied in terms of qualification, gender, specialization, and years of experience as shown in Table (1) below.

**Table (1)**

**Distribution of Sample According to Study Independent Variables**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Class</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage %</b>
<b>Gender</b>	Male	22	42.3
	Female	30	57.7
<b>Qualification</b>	Two - year Diploma	6	11.5
	BA	41	78.8
	MA	5	9.65
<b>Experience</b>	Less than 5 years	14	26.9
	5-9 years	17	32.7
	10-14 years	9	17.3
	15 and more	12	23.1
<b>Specialization</b>	Literature	17	32.7
	Linguistic & Translation	7	13.5
	Methodology	28	53.8
<b>Total</b>		<b>52</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Instrumentation:**

To achieve the objectives of the study, the researchers used a 33-item questionnaire adapted from Allen, Frohlich, and Spadas (1984) in addition to using previous literature (Ab. Rashid et al, 2010) and the researchers' own experience in the field of teaching. The questionnaire consisted of two sections; the first focused on demographic profile such as gender, experience, qualification and specialization whereas the second consisted of 33 items that covered six domains / approaches: information-based approach, personal-response approach, language-based approach, the periphrastic approach, the moral-philosophical approach and the stylistic approach. The scores of responses to each item were calculated according to a five-point Likert scale,

in which strongly agree=5 points, agree=4 points, undecided = 3, disagree = 2 points and strongly disagree = 1 point.

### **Validity of the Questionnaire:**

To ensure the validity of the questionnaire, it was rated by a jury of experts in the field of TEFL and Education at the Faculties of Education and Arts at An-Najah National University in addition to 3 supervisors working in Qalqiliah Directorate of Education. The questionnaire, then, was piloted on 10 teachers with similar level of proficiency. The purpose of the pilot study was to determine whether the questions were comprehensible and can be interpreted by the teachers as they are intended measure. The teachers who were involved in the pilot study were excluded from the actual research. The respondents' comments and the jury's suggestions were taken into consideration to modify and improve the questionnaire's content and wordings by omitting, adding or rephrasing items bringing the number of items from 45 to 33.

### **Reliability of the Questionnaire:**

The reliability of the questionnaire as calculated through Cornbach Alpha formula was (0.79) which is acceptable for the purpose of the study.

### **Procedure:**

The final draft of the questionnaire was given to Qalqiliah Directorate of Education to be distributed through the main office of the directorate. It took about three weeks for the instrument to be distributed, collected, and returned to the researchers. The total number of the returned questionnaires was 70 and only 52 were analyzed because 18 questionnaires were excluded as their responses were neither consistent nor complete.

### **Data Analysis:**

The data collected were analyzed using (SPSS) to provide answers to the questions of the study. Means, frequencies, standard deviations, t-tests for Independent Samples, One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), and LSD Test for distance comparisons were used to find out descriptive statistical analysis. To analyze the findings, the researchers used the following scale to represent the estimation level of teachers' responses.

4.5 - and more :Very High	4 – 4.49 :High	3-50–3.99 :Medium
3- 3.49 Low	less than 3 : Very Low	

### Results and Discussion:

This study aimed at identifying the approaches employed by secondary school teachers in teaching the literature component in the New English Language Curriculum. It also aimed at identifying the effect of gender, qualification, experience and specialization on the use of these approaches. To accomplish the aims of the study, the researchers analyzed the data in accordance with the study questions and the results were as follows:

**1-Results related to the First Question. *What are teachers' perceptions of using different approaches to teach the literature component in English for Palestine?*** To answer this question, the researchers used means and standard deviations as shown in Tables (2,3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8).

**Table (2)**  
**Means and Standard Deviations of Information-Based Approach**

No.	Item	Means	standard deviations	Estimation level
1.	Elicit information from the students about the text.	4.51	0.58	Very High
2.	Explain the content of the text to the class.	4.48	0.78	High
3.	Ask questions to check students comprehension of the text.	4.65	0.59	Very High
4.	Provide students with background knowledge.	4.55	0.57	Very High
<b>Total Degree</b>		4.55	0.49	Very High

Table (2) shows that the total degree of teachers' responses on the first domain "Information-Based Approach" was (4.55) which suggests a very high level of use. The highest means was given to the item "I ask questions to check students comprehension of the text" which scored (4.65) and this means that

teachers tend to use a lot of questions as a means to help students to use terms and concepts when talking and writing about literature. This result agrees with Ab. Rashid et al(2010) whose study found that the information-based approach was popularly employed and favored by teachers in the literature classroom. The result also agrees with Hwang and Embi (2007) who found that the periphrastic approach is popularly used by teachers, followed by the information-based approach .On the other hand, this result disagrees with Fakeye and Amao (2013) who found that teachers should adopt stylistic and thematic approaches in the teaching of poetry in particular and literature in general.

**Table (3)**  
**Means and Standard Deviations of Personal -Response Approach**

No.	Item	Means	standard deviations	Estimation Level
1.	Ask students to relate what they read to their personal experience.	4.25	0.71	High
2.	Elicit students' response to a text.	4.27	0.60	High
3.	Encourage students to express their feelings towards what they experience in the text.	4.32	0.79	High
4.	Observe students' interaction with the events and issues in the text.	4.19	0.66	High
5.	Allow students to discuss relevant examples to what they read.	4.21	0.72	High
6.	Encourage students comments and discussion of the text.	4.33	0.58	High
<b>Total Degree</b>		4.26	0.49	High

Table (3) shows that the total degree of teachers' responses on the second domain Personal -Response Approach was high as the means was (4.26). The item "I Encourage students comments and discussion of the text" scored the highest means (4.33) which indicates that the teachers are used to motivating students to have their own comments on the literary texts and encouraging them to have some discussions regarding the themes of the literary texts so as to have more classroom interaction between the teacher and the students and between the students and the literary texts as well. This result seems to be consistent with Li & Seedhouse (2010) who found that the story-based approach provided more interaction patterns and created entertaining

environments which stimulated a higher level of intrinsic motivation and engagement from pupils. The result also agrees with Ainy (2011) who stressed the importance of selecting activities and techniques to stimulate students' involvement and initiate motivation and attraction.

**Table (4)**  
**Means and Standard Deviations of Language-Based Approach**

No.	Item	Means	standard deviations	Estimation Level
1.	Give the students prediction exercises.	4.12	0.70	High
2.	Set different language activities related to the text.	3.86	0.99	Medium
3.	Encourage students to participate in the process of analyzing the text.	4.11	0.79	High
4.	Encourage role- play.	4.09	0.89	High
5.	Motivate students to write summaries.	4.13	0.72	High
<b>Total Degree</b>		4.06	0.59	High

Table (4) shows that the total degree of teachers' responses on the third domain Language-Based Approach was high (4.06). The highest means was scored by the item "I motivate students to write summaries" while the item " I set different language activities related to the text" scored the lowest means (3.86). This result suggests that the teachers believe in the importance of motivating students to write summaries in which they can express their linguistic knowledge and their understanding literature although these teachers in some situations cannot choose the best appropriate activities that can help them in teaching the literary component. This result seems to be against Ghazali et al (2009) who reported that the majority of students in his study reacted positively towards using a variety of activities during literature lessons, probably to reduce monotony and boredom in class. The result also seems to disagree with Hişmanoğlu (2005) whose study found that teachers should select appropriate language teaching method, teaching techniques, and classroom activities. Furthermore, this result disagrees with Ab. Rashid et al( 2010) who found that the least employed approach was the language-based approach. However, this result seems to agree partially with that of Parmar

and Barot (2009) who found that the teachers in their study could not use different facilities for poetry teaching like language lab, projector, C.D., and Tape recorder. Moreover, the result agrees with Ainy (2011) who concluded that following a language based stylistic method can do wonders for a student.

**Table (5)**  
**Means and Standard Deviations of Periphrastic Approach**

No.	Item	Means	standard deviations	Estimation Level
1.	Reread the text to students to help them understand.	4.01	1.06	High
2.	Use simple items to explain what the story is about.	4.62	0.49	Very High
3.	Relate the title to the text and the events.	4.35	0.56	High
4.	Discuss the author’s implications in the text.	3.80	0.91	Medium
5.	Get students to tell the story line of the text.	3.94	0.75	Medium
6.	Ask students to write the main ideas of the text.	3.90	0.80	Medium
7.	Encourage students to state simply a similar situation.	3.68	0.92	Medium
<b>Total Degree</b>		4.04	0.47	High

Table (5) shows that the total degree of teachers’ responses on the fourth domain **Periphrastic Approach** was high (4.04) . The highest means was scored by the item **“I use simple items to explain what the story is about”** which scored (4.62). This result agrees with Hwang and Embi (2007) who found that the periphrastic approach was popularly used by the teachers in their conducted study. Such a result might be due to the fact that teachers mostly tend to use a lot of simplifications and explanations to help the students understand the literature component in particular and any teaching point in general as they believe this to be one of their major roles. This result seems to agree with Parmar and Barot (2009) who found that the majority of teachers used the traditional method based on reading and explaining.

On the other hand, Table (5) reveals that three items were medium in terms of means and level of response. These items were, " *I discuss the author's implications in the text*", " *I get students to tell the story line of the text*" and " *I ask students to write the main ideas of the text.*" The medium score of responses here may indicate that the teachers do not use a lot of activities or techniques to help the students give the main ideas, the themes and the story line of the text. This may deprive the students of a good opportunity to improve their proficiency of language as a means to achieve the objective of integrating language and literature in one teaching program or course.

**Table (6)**

**Means and Standard Deviations of Moral -Philosophical Approach**

No.	Item	Means	standard deviations	Estimation Level
1.	Incorporate moral values in lessons.	4.25	0.68	High
2.	Ask students what lessons they learned from the text.	4.27	0.80	High
3.	Get students to search for moral lessons in the text.	4.06	0.75	High
4.	Raise students' awareness of values stated in the text.	4.18	0.70	High
5.	Help students formulate a moral message to tell it to others.	4.11	0.64	High
<b>Total Degree</b>		4.17	0.58	High

Table (6) shows that the total degree of teachers' responses on the fifth domain **Moral -Philosophical Approach** was high with a means of (4.17). The highest means was scored by the item "**I ask students what lessons they learned from the text**" which scored (4.27). This result indicates that the teachers tend to ask students some question or use some activities that require students to express their personal feelings and understanding regarding the literary text they have studied. It seems, then, that the result agrees with Ab .Rashid et al (2010) who found that the moral-philosophical approach was among the most favored approaches in the literature classroom and that teaching literature should aim at developing students' language and thinking

skills and also generating students’ personal response and appreciation. Again, the result seems to agree with that of Hwang and Embi (2007) who found that the moral-philosophical approach was the third approach employed by teachers in his study.

**Table (7)**  
**Means and Standard Deviations of Stylistic -Approach**

No.	Item	Means	standard deviations	Estimation Level
1.	Encourage students to imitate language items used in the text	3.96	0.90	Medium
2.	Get students to identify any linguistic features from the text that help them understand the lesson	3.83	0.92	Medium
3.	Guide students to compare the language of the author with the language of ordinary use	3.75	0.89	Medium
4.	Encourage students to look for implied meaning of the text	3.83	0.92	Medium
5.	Notice the special use of structure and vocabulary	4.03	0.90	High
6.	Encourage students to use the new language to talk about similar situations in real life	3.83	1.17	Medium
<b>Total Degree</b>		3.88	0.66	Medium

Table(7) shows that the total degree of teachers’ responses on the sixth domain **Stylistic -Approach** was medium with a means of (3.88). The highest means was scored by the item “ *I notice the special use of structure and vocabulary* “ which scored (4.03) . From this means, it might be concluded that this approach was the least favored approach by teachers of English in Qalqiliah District. This result seems to disagree with Fakeye and Amao (2013) who recommended that teachers should adopt stylistic and thematic approaches in the teaching of poetry in particular and literature in general. However, the result agrees with Lim and Omar (2007) who found that the Stylistic Approach was the least preferred technique. Such contradictory results might be explained by the fact that this approach requires integrating two subjects, English language and Literature in English classroom so as

to study language in literature. Such objective, although seems promising, might be unattainable because of the difficulty of certain literary texts such as poetry, and because of the lack of linguistic competence on the part of the students. In this regard, the result as well as the previous interpretation could be interpreted by saying that the teaching of literature and poetry in particular could be a difficult task due to the writer's choice of words and their functions, the structure and the deviation from the norms, the use of parallelism, and other figure of speech, the lexical cohesion and coherence in the texts and the grammatical patterns as well.

**2-Results related to the Second Question.** To answer the second question “*What approaches are employed by secondary school teachers in teaching the literature component in Qalqiliah classrooms?*”, the means and standard deviations of all domains were calculated and the results are shown in Table (8).

**Table (8)**  
**Means and Standard Deviations of All Domains**

No.	Domain	Mean	standard deviations	Estimation Level
1.	Information Based Approach	4.55	0.49	Very High
2.	Personal– Response Approach	4.26	0.49	High
3.	Moral-Philosophical Approach	4.17	0.58	High
4.	Language – Based Approach	4.06	0.59	High
5.	Periphrastic Approach	4.04	0.47	High
6.	Stylistic Approach	3.88	0.66	Medium
<b>Total Degree</b>		4.16	0.39	High

Table (8) shows that the total degree of all domains and approaches was high as the means was (4.16) and that the “**Information-Based Approach**” scored the highest estimation level with a mean score of (4.55) while the “**Stylistic Approach**” scored the lowest level of estimation with a mean score of (3.88). This result indicates that there is no single approach to teaching the literary component and each individual teacher may use more than one approach depending on many factors such as the type of literary text, the difficulty of the text, the number of the students in the class and the linguistic ability of the students. This particular result agrees with Ab. Rashid et al (2010) who found that five approaches for teaching literature have been employed at

a moderate to high level in the literature lessons and that the information based approach was the most favored approach in the literature class. At the same time, this result disagrees partially with Ab. Rashid et al (2010) who found that moral philosophical approach was the second favoured approach while the second favored approach in this study was the Personal-Response Approach.

**3-Results related to the Third Question.** To answer question “*Are there statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) between teachers’ use of approaches due to gender , specialization , qualifications and experience ?*”, the researchers divided this question into four sub-questions:

A-” *Are there statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) between teachers’ use of approaches due to gender?* To answer this question, the t- Test for Independent Samples was used and table (9) shows the results.

**Table (9)**  
**T-test for Independent Samples of Teachers’ Use of Approaches Due to Gender**

Domain	Gender	N	Mean	S. D	t	Sig.*
Information-Based Approach	Male	22	4.52	0.60	-0.378	0.707
	Female	30	4.57	0.39		
Personal-Response Approach	Male	22	4.09	0.51	-2.263	0.028*
	Female	30	4.39	0.44		
Language – Based Approach	Male	22	3.95	0.67	-1.173	0.246
	Female	30	4.15	0.51		
Periphrastic Approach	Male	22	4.00	0.36	-0.568	0.573
	Female	30	4.07	0.55		
Moral-Philosophical Approach	Male	22	4.02	0.66	-1.573	0.122
	Female	30	4.28	0.50		
Stylistic Approach	Male	22	3.86	0.63	-0.146	0.884
	Female	30	3.88	0.68		
<b>Total</b>	Male	22	4.07	0.45	-1.366	0.178
	Female	30	4.22	0.34		

**\*The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.**

Table(9) shows no statistical significant differences at ( $\alpha =0.05$ ) on the total degree of the approaches employed by teachers due to gender.

As for the individual domains, there were no statistical significant differences at ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) level on all the domains except the second one the Personal– Response Approach and these differences were in favor of the females. This means that the female teachers tend to use the Personal – Response Approach more than the males which might be due to the point that such approach mostly aims to elicit personal response and foster students’ personal development as a means to achieve self-empowerment. This result seems to agree with Fakeye and Amao (2013) whose study revealed no significant effect of gender on the achievement of students in poetry as a result of using stylistic and thematic approaches. On the other hand, this result disagrees with Chacko and Wan Yahya (2007) who found a significant difference for two determinants across gender in favor of the females who perceived the sociopolitical and mythological determinants to be more important in the learning of literature in English than their male counterparts.

**B-” Are there statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) between teachers’ use of approaches due to Qualification?** To answer this question, One Way ANOVA Test was used, and tables (10, 11 and 12) show the results.

**Table(10)  
Frequencies, Means and Standards Deviations of Approaches Due to Qualification.**

Domain	Qualification	N	Mean	S.D
Information Based Approach	Diploma	6	4.46	0.92
	B.A	41	4.53	0.42
	M.A	5	4.8	0.27
Personal–Response Approach	Diploma	6	4.02	0.34
	B.A	41	4.26	0.5
	M.A	5	4.57	0.43
Language – Based Approach	Diploma	6	3.6	0.73
	B.A	41	4.07	0.53
	M.A	5	4.52	0.52
Periphrastic Approach	Diploma	6	3.85	0.32
	B.A	41	4	0.46
	M.A	5	4.57	0.4
Moral-Philosophical Approach	Diploma	6	3.6	0.52
	B.A	41	4.2	0.55
	M.A	5	4.56	0.38

Domain	Qualification	N	Mean	S.D
Stylistic Approach	Diploma	6	3.8	0.37
	B.A	41	3.86	0.68
	M.A	5	4.03	0.79
<b>Total</b>	Diploma	6	3.89	0.41
	B.A	41	4.15	0.36
	M.A	5	4.51	0.38

**Table (11)**

**Results of One Way ANOVA for the Approaches Due to Qualification**

Domain	Source of variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Information Based Approach	Between Groups	0.370	2	0.185	0.768	0.469
	Within Groups	11.797	49	0.241		
	<b>Total</b>	12.167	51			
Language – Based Approach	Between Groups	0.793	2	0.397	1.715	0.191
	Within Groups	11.337	49	0.231		
	<b>Total</b>	12.130	51			
Language – Based Approach	Between Groups	2.339	2	1.170	3.781	0.030*
	Within Groups	15.158	49	0.309		
	<b>Total</b>	17.498	51			
Periphrastic Approach	Between Groups	1.657	2	0.828	4.127	0.022*
	Within Groups	9.835	49	0.201		
	<b>Total</b>	11.491	51			
Moral-Philosophical Approach	Between Groups	2.774	2	1.387	4.711	0.013*
	Within Groups	14.428	49	0.294		
	<b>Total</b>	17.202	51			
Stylistic Approach	Between Groups	0.161	2	0.080	0.180	0.836
	Within Groups	21.929	49	0.448		
	<b>Total</b>	22.090	51			

Domain	Source of variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Total	Between Groups	1.040	2	0.520	3.709	0.032*
	Within Groups	6.870	49	0.140		
	<b>Total</b>	7.910	51			

\* **The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.**

Table(11) shows statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) level on the approaches employed by teachers due to qualification. As for the variable domains, there were no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) level on the first, second and sixth domains, while there were statistical significant differences at ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) on the approaches employed due to qualification on the third, fourth and fifth domains. In order to explore the differences between the means of qualification, LSD test for post hoc comparisons was used and the results are shown in table(12).

**Table (12)**

**Results of LSD Test for Post Hoc Comparisons**

**On Third, Fourth and Fifth Domains with Regard to the Total Degree.**

Domain	Qualification	Diploma	B.A
Language-Based Approach	Diploma		
	B.A		
	M.A	-0.92000*	
Periphrastic Approach	Diploma		
	B.A		
	M.A	-0.71429*	-0.56446*
Moral-Philosophical Approach	Diploma		
	B.A	-0.60976*	
	M.A	-0.96000*	
<b>Total</b>	Diploma		
	B.A		
	M.A	-0.61710*	

Table (12) shows that the differences in all the domains and the total degree were between (2- year Diploma) and ( M.A) and the differences were in favor of M.A holders. Also, there were differences on the fourth domain (Periphrastic Approach) between ( B.A ) and ( M.A) holders in favor of ( M.A) holders. This result might be explained by the fact that MA holders seem to have more educational background and more theoretical knowledge in terms

of teaching English in general and teaching literary components in particular since MA students study courses on how to teach literature. This result seems to agree with Talif (1991) who found that the respondents were not adequately prepared to teach the literature component; thereby, establishing the need for teaching literature in ESL courses in teacher education programs.

C-” *Are there statistically significant differences at (  $\alpha = 0.05$ ) between teachers’ use of approaches due to experience?* To answer this question, One Way ANOVA was used, and tables (13,14 ) show the results

**Table (13)**

**Frequencies, Means and Standards Deviations of the Approaches Due to Experience.**

Domain	Experience	N	Mean	S.D
Information-Based Approach	Less than 5	14	4.59	0.35
	5-9	17	4.69	0.35
	10-14	9	4.5	0.45
	15 and more	12	4.35	0.75
Personal–Response Approach	Less than 5	14	4.21	0.49
	5-9	17	4.38	0.45
	10-14	9	4.31	0.46
	15 and more	12	4.11	0.57
Language – Based Approach	Less than 5	14	4.13	0.61
	5-9	17	4.16	0.47
	10-14	9	4.04	0.49
	15 and more	12	3.87	0.77
Periphrastic Approach	Less than 5	14	3.98	0.32
	5-9	17	4.09	0.6
	10-14	9	4.08	0.4
	15 and more	12	4.02	0.51
Moral-Philosophical Approach	Less than 5	14	4.24	0.61
	5-9	17	4.28	0.47
	10-14	9	4.24	0.55
	15 and more	12	3.88	0.68
Stylistic Approach	Less than 5	14	4	0.62
	5-9	17	3.97	0.67
	10-14	9	3.56	0.71
	15 and more	12	3.82	0.64

Domain	Experience	N	Mean	S.D
<b>Total</b>	Less than 5	14	4.19	0.39
	5-9	17	4.26	0.39
	10-14	9	4.12	0.22
	15 and more	12	4.01	0.51

**Table (14)**

**Results of One Way ANOVA Test for the Approaches Due to Experience.**

Domain	Source of variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Information Based Approach	Between Groups	0.84	3	0.281	1.191	0.323
	Within Groups	11.32	48	0.236		
	<b>Total</b>	12.16	51			
Language Based Approach	Between Groups	0.57	3	0.192	0.798	0.501
	Within Groups	11.55	48	0.241		
	<b>Total</b>	12.13	51			
Language Based Approach	Between Groups	0.70	3	0.234	0.668	0.576
	Within Groups	16.80	48	0.350		
	<b>Total</b>	17.50	51			
Periphrastic Approach	Between Groups	0.11	3	0.038	0.160	0.922
	Within Groups	11.38	48	0.237		
	<b>Total</b>	11.49	51			
Moral-Philosophical Approach	Between Groups	1.32	3	0.441	1.335	0.274
	Within Groups	15.88	48	0.331		
	<b>Total</b>	17.20	51			
Stylistic Approach	Between Groups	1.33	3	0.443	1.024	0.390
	Within Groups	20.761	48	0.433		
	<b>Total</b>	22.090	51			
<b>Total</b>	Between Groups	0.481	3	0.160	1.037	0.385
	Within Groups	7.428	48	0.155		
	<b>Total</b>	7.910	51			

\* **The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.**

Table (14) shows that there were no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) with regard the approaches employed by teachers due to experience. As for the individual domains, there were no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) level on all domains. This result means that the all teachers , regardless of their years of experience were able to employ different approaches in teaching the literature component as a means to integrate literature into the English language classes. Such result seems to be consistent with Ramlan’s (2011) who outlined that the teaching approaches employed in class were greatly determined by students’ level of proficiency in the language , and , according to Hişmanoğlu (2005), the language teacher should take into account needs, motivation, interests, cultural background and language level of the students at least to compensate the lack of experience.

**D-” Are there statistically significant differences at( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) between teachers’ use of approaches due to specialization?** To answer this question, One Way ANOVA Test was used, and tables (15,16 and 17 ) show the results :

**Table (15)**  
**Frequencies, Means and Standards Deviations of the Approaches due to Specialization**

Domain	Specialization	N	Mean	S.D
Information-Based Approach	Literature	7	4.44	0.58
	Linguistic& Translation	17	4.39	0.67
	Methodology	28	4.66	0.34
Personal–Response Approach	Literature	7	4.25	0.41
	Linguistic& Translation	17	4.24	0.79
	Methodology	28	4.27	0.45
Language –Based Approach	Literature	7	3.9	0.53
	Linguistic& Translation	17	4.17	0.72
	Methodology	28	4.13	0.58
Periphrastic Approach	Literature	7	3.83	0.42
	Linguistic& Translation	17	4.49	0.65
	Methodology	28	4.06	0.39
Moral-Philosophical Approach	Literature	7	4.11	0.57
	Linguistic& Translation	17	4.37	0.45
	Methodology	28	4.16	0.62

Domain	Specialization	N	Mean	S.D
Stylistic Approach	Literature	7	3.66	0.67
	Linguistic& Translation	17	4.07	0.83
	Methodology	28	3.95	0.59
<b>Total</b>	Literature	7	4.034	0.32
	Linguistic& Translation	17	4.29	0.56
	Methodology	28	4.2	0.38

**Table (16)**  
**One -Way ANOVA for the Approaches due to specialization**

Domain	Source of variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Information Based Approach	Between Groups	0.717	2	0.358	1.534	0.226
	Within Groups	11.450	49	0.234		
	<b>Total</b>	12.167	51			
Language – Based Approach	Between Groups	0.009	2	0.004	0.018	0.983
	Within Groups	12.122	49	0.247		
	<b>Total</b>	12.130	51			
Language – Based Approach	Between Groups	0.650	2	0.325	0.945	0.396
	Within Groups	16.848	49	0.344		
	<b>Total</b>	17.498	51			
Periphrastic Approach	Between Groups	2.164	2	1.082	5.684	0.006*
	Within Groups	9.327	49	0.190		
	<b>Total</b>	11.491	51			
Moral-Philosophical Approach	Between Groups	0.335	2	0.167	0.486	0.618
	Within Groups	16.868	49	0.344		
	<b>Total</b>	17.202	51			
Stylistic Approach	Between Groups	1.246	2	0.623	1.465	0.241
	Within Groups	20.844	49	0.425		
	<b>Total</b>	22.090	51			

Domain	Source of variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Total	Between Groups	0.445	2	0.222	1.460	0.242
	Within Groups	7.465	49	0.152		
	<b>Total</b>	7.910	51			

**\* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.**

Table (16) shows that there were no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) with regard to the approaches employed by teachers due to specialization. As for the variable domains, there were no statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) on all domains except the fourth domain (Periphrastic Approach). In order to explore the differences between the means of specialization, LSD test for post hoc comparisons was used and the results are shown in table (17).

**Table (17)**  
**LSD Test for distance comparable for the**  
**(Periphrastic Approach)**

Domain	specialization	Literature	Linguistic & Translation
Periphrastic Approach	Literature		
	Linguistic & Translation	-0.65786*	
	Methodology		-0.42857*

**\* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.**

Table (17) shows that the differences were between (Linguistic & Translation) level and (Literature and Methodology) level, and the differences were in favor of (Linguistic & Translation) level. This result might be explained by saying that the periphrastic approach allows teachers to use simpler words and sentence structures compared to the more complicated ones in the texts and sometimes the teacher can translate into other languages. Thus teachers whose specialization was linguistics and translation seem to be more capable of employing this approach than other teachers even those who specialized in literature or methodology.

## **Conclusion:**

This study aimed to investigate the approaches used by English teachers in teaching the literature components in EFL classrooms in Qalqiliyah secondary schools in addition to investigating the effect of gender, qualification, experience and specialization on their use of these approaches. The results of

this study indicated the teachers tend to use more than one approach depending on many factors such as the type of literary text, the difficulty of the text, the number of the students in the class and the linguistic ability of the students. This means that there is no single approach to teaching the literary component as it is the case with teaching English in general. However, not all approaches are used at the same degree or level since teachers' use of approaches ranged from moderate to high levels in the literature lessons. Here, the information based approach was the most favored approach in the literature class while the stylistic approach scored the lowest level of use. Furthermore, the study showed no statistically significant differences on the total degree and on all the domains except the second domain the Personal– Response Approach due to gender, specialization and experience. On the other hand, the study revealed statistically significant differences on the total degree of approaches employed by teachers due to qualification and no statistical significant differences on the first, second and sixth domains. Consequently, and based on the previous findings, it might be inferred that EFL teachers should be familiar with all approaches to be used with students of lower, intermediate and high abilities so as to help them understand the literary component and encourage students to become active participants. Doing so, teachers can manage teaching the literature component linguistically and communicatively while taking into consideration the different linguistic abilities and individual differences of students.

## **Recommendations:**

**Based on the results of the study, the researchers recommend the following:**

1. Literature should be taught at early stages and not only at the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grades so as to familiarize pupils with the literature component and its vital importance to English.
2. Teachers should be trained on how to employ different approaches in their EFL classes while considering the students' linguistic abilities and individual differences and preferences as well.
3. To generate students' creative and critical thinking, teachers are advised to use a variety of techniques and activities so as to make their teaching more effective. In this case, they are advised to use different facilities including language lab, projector, C.D, and tape recorder.
4. Students' interests and needs should be taken into account when choosing the approaches and activities as it is essential to stimulate students' personal involvement and motivation.
5. Further research is recommended in which observations and interviews are used for data collection in addition to the questionnaire.

## References:

1. Ab. Rashid , Radzuwan; Vethamani , Malachi Edwin; Abdul Rahman, Shireena Basree.(2010). Approaches Employed by Teachers in Teaching Literature to Less Proficient Students . ELT. Vol. 3, No. 4; December 2010. [www.ccsenet.org/elt](http://www.ccsenet.org/elt).
2. Ainy, Salma.(2011). A Reflection on the Use of Poetry in Developing Reading Comprehension in an EFL Classroom. ELTED Vol. 14.
3. Ayanniyi, M.(2009).Effect of advance organizer on students' achievement and their attitude to poetic literature (Unpublished PhD Thesis). University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
4. Aziz, Marzilah A. & Nasharudin, Sharifah Nadia Bt Syed (2010). An Investigation On Approaches Used To Teach Literature In The ESL Classroom: A Case Study Of Johor Bahru. Unpublished Article. Retrieved from <http://eprints.utm.my/11115/>
5. Brown, D. H. (2001). Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy. New York: Longman.
6. Carter, R & Long, M. (1991). Teaching Literature, Longman
7. Chacko , John Roy and Wan Yahya , Wan Roselezam.(2007). Learners' Perceptions of the Instructional Approach Used in the Teaching of Literature in ESL Classrooms: A Study of Malaysian Secondary Schools. AsiaCall Online Journal (ISSN 1936-9859) Vol. 2 No. 1.
8. Collie, J. and S. Slater. 1990. Literature in the Language Classroom: A Resource Book of Ideas and Activities. Cambridge: CUP.
9. Fakeye David O., Temitayo A. Amao (2013). Enhancing Poetic Literature Instruction Through Stylistic and Thematic Approaches. Studies in Literature and Language, 6(2), 1-6. :<http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/sll/article/view/j.sll>.
10. Gajdusek,L. ( 1988 ). Toward wide use of literature in ESL: Why and how . TESOL Quarterly, 22(2) :227-257.
11. Ghazali, Siti Norliana; Setia, Roszainora; Muthusamy , Chitra, Jusoff , Kamaruzaman (2009) .ESL Students' Attitude towards Texts and Teaching Methods Used in Literature Classes. English Language Teaching, Vol. 2, No.4. [www.ccsenet.org/journal.html](http://www.ccsenet.org/journal.html).

12. Hişmanoğlu, Murat.( 2005 ). Teaching English Through Literature . Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies Vol.1, No.1, (pp.53-66).
13. Hwang , Diana and Embi, Mohamed Amin.(2007). Approaches Employed by Secondary School Teachers to Teaching the Literature Component in English. Jurnal Pendidik dan Pendidikan, Jil. 22, 1–23, 2007
14. Khatib ,Mohammad ; Rezaei , Saeed; Derakhshan ,Ali.(2011). Literature in EFL/ESL Classroom. English Language Teaching. Vol. 4, No. 1; March . [www.ccsenet.org/elt](http://www.ccsenet.org/elt)
15. Li , Chen-Ying and Seedhouse ,Paul.(2010). Classroom Interaction in Story-Based Lessons with Young Learners. The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly June 2010 Volume 12, Issue 2.
16. Lim, Bridget Suk Han and Omar, Suhaida (2007). *Approaches adopted in the teaching of poetry for the upper secondary school students in Tawau town area*. In: The Second Biennial International Conference on Teaching and Learning of English in Asia : Exploring New Frontiers (TELiA2), 14-16 June 2007.
17. MacKay,S. (1982)Literature in the ESL classroom. TESOL Quarterly , 16( 4):526- 529.
18. Maley, A. (1989). “Down from the Pedestal: Literature as Resource” in Literature and the Learner: Methodological Approaches. Cambridge: Modern English Publications.
19. Nasr, N. (2001). The use of poetry in TEFL: Literature in the new Lebanese curriculum. Revista de Filología y su Didáctica, 24, 345-363.
20. Niazir, N. (2010). How to study literature: stylistic and pragmatic approaches. New Delhi: Sarup and Sons.
21. Obediat, M. (1997) . “Language vs. Literature in English Departments in the Arab World” in English Teaching Forum.
22. Or, Winnie Wing-fung (1995). “Reinstating literature in the EFL syllabus”. In Thinking language : issues in the study of language and language curriculum renewal. Editors : Kitty P. Y. Wong and Christopher F. Green. Hong Kong : Language Centre, Hong Kong

- University of Science and Technology, <http://repository.ust.hk/retrieve/1190/thinklang12.pdf>
23. Parmar , Rajeshkumar V. & Barot, H. M.(2009). Problems of Teaching Poetry in English. Indian e-Journal on Teacher Education (IEJTE).Volume 1, Issue 2.(53-64).
  24. Ramlan, Najah Binti . (2011). Teaching Approaches Employed by Secondary School Teachers in Teaching Literature Component in English. A project report submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of Master of Education (TESL), Faculty of Education Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.
  25. Sanchez , Hugo Santiago.(2009) . Building up Literary Reading Responses in Foreign Language Classrooms. ELTED Vol. 12.
  26. Savvidou, Christine. (2004). An integrated Approach to the teaching of literature in the EFL classroom. The Internet TESL Journal ,X, 12. Retrieved March , 2010 from :[http: //itesj.org/](http://itesj.org/)
  27. Simpson, P. (2004). Stylistic: a resource book for students. London: Routledge.
  28. Smith, A. Accelerated Learning in the Classroom. Stamford: Network Educational Press, 1996. AsiaCall Online Journal (ISSN 1936-9859) Vol. 2 No. 1 November 2007.
  29. Talif, Rosli. (1991). Teaching Literature in ESL in a Malaysian Context (Proposed INSET Course Designs for Literature in ESL Instruction). Thesis submitted to the University of Nottingham for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy .
  30. Van,T.T.M.( 2009). The relevance of literary analysis to teaching literature in the EFL classroom. English Teaching Forum, 3: 2-9.
  31. Yunus, Melor MD.; Salhi , Hadi; John ,Dexter Sigan . (2013 ).Using Visual Aids as a Motivational Tool in Enhancing Students' Interest in Reading Literary Texts. Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Education and Educational Technologies (EET '13), 114-117.