

Relevance of Literary Texts to University Advanced-Level Reading Programs: Three Interactive Processes

Nihal Ameira *

Abstract

This paper aims at describing how levels of response to literary works (literary competence) interact with levels of communicative competence (CC) in learning a foreign language (FL). It attempts to highlight the importance of planning an advanced English reading program when learning a foreign language in relevance to EFL tertiary-level students of language and literature, and to those with a special interest in translation. The paper suggests that the student's competence in using language is more likely to be successful when the study of literary texts is related to reading skill developments. The aim is to highlight the interaction processes involved in reading and understanding literary works, and enhancing communicative competence. The suggestion is that literature -by the peculiar nature of its deployment of language, or 'universes of discourse' in terms of the linguistic, cultural, and literary experience inherent in each literary selection- will assist the student reader in vicariously experiencing the total communicative situation, and creatively utilizing the language capacity required for the successful uses of the TL. Such a reading program will govern the choice of the teaching method, which will involve specific criteria (linguistic, cultural, and educational) by which the teacher can be guided for the selection and grading of materials. The paper suggests a number of activities to illustrate its main theme and assessment techniques for the evaluation of students' learning and abilities to apply what they have learnt to improve their communicative competence.

Background

There may be many university-level EFL learners who regard literary study as an unnecessary indulgence in their field of specialization.

“Majoring in translation, why the hell should literary study be part of the advanced reading program?” is a typical question posed by some translation students. There are also the literature undergraduate students who also question the relevance of literary texts to the practical concerns of the advanced reading program. These students' remarks are revealing and apply to most of non-native English students (see, for example, Greenwood, 1989:92). What seems to put the EFL students off is that, motivated by examinations, they expect to deal with the

reading text as an extended reading comprehension, and focus mainly on obtaining the correct answer. Furthermore, lacking the necessary skills to read critically and negotiate different levels of meaning, EFL students seem to have a negative attitude to the text itself, and thus become reluctant readers. It may also be the case that they prefer the memorization of ready-made interpretations of texts to the enjoyment of developing their own skills of perception. If this is the case, we will continue having undergraduates whose critical abilities remain untapped and atrophied. These challenges, when combined with the difficulties posed by a partial knowledge of the TL, motivate the researcher to examine the defined course aims when planning advanced-level reading programs.

This paper supports the suggestion that literary selections provide an excellent content of an advanced reading program, which can best meet the language and future of academic needs of EFL undergraduates. The paper, however, suggests the planning of an integrated reading curriculum covering language and literary texts, without excluding other non-literary materials. Specifically, the purpose is to show the value of reading in the system of communication, and its relation to literary perceptions. The paper, thus, investigates the nature of communicative competence and its implications for the teaching of reading. It also proposes that there are vital advantages of including literary materials that would expose the students under consideration to authentic language interactions, providing them with the necessary “CC” that has to be acquired, and extending their reading competence to familiarity with literary perceptions. It also outlines a model involving pedagogical principles that will encourage the student readers to discuss, generalize, explore relationships, and form personal and reading responses to the texts they study. The paper presents a number of suggestions for the selection and grading of reading materials to be used, emphasizing the need for criteria to establish the suitability and usefulness of texts in relation to the relevant purposes of learning, and groups of learners. But, what is to be learned from the selection of texts is determined by how we teach these texts. Finally, the paper suggests ways in which the student readers’ progress is assessed and evaluated.

Literary study, in this paper, is any kind of writing in prose or verse which does not aim at communicating facts or information, but directs attention to the expressive nature of literary works and the varieties of language use that belong to different genres. It is important to include, in addition to literary texts, non-literary prose. The rationale is that while non-literary texts, are “representational in intention” (Newmark, 1988:6) and can sensitize students to what Widdowson (1983) terms the ‘conventional schemata of ordinary discourse, exposing students to both varieties of prose (literary and non-literary) will enhance their reading, literary, and communicative competences.

The Linguistic Component in the Advanced- Level Reading Program

What knowledge do EFL/ESL learners need in order to function communicatively? It is now axiomatic that “CC” be proposed as a general, theoretical base for foreign/second (F/S) language learning and teaching. (see, for example, Savignon, 1983; Bachman and Savignon 1986; Kramsch 1986; Sato and Kleinsasser 1999; among others). However, in examining descriptions of models of language, and definitions of “CC” proposed since the 1970s (as shown below), it seems that the notion of “CC” does not lack difficulties of transferring knowledge.

To begin with, under sociolinguistic and ethnographic influences, Del Hymes’ (1971:267, 282) concept of “CC” describes the interaction between language use and the context of situation. Viewing language in terms of the communicative functions it has evolved to serve, Halliday (1975) is more interested in the idea of ‘potential’ (the communicative force of linguistic forms), and its link to the context of culture (ibid:44,52). It is suggested however that what is lacking in Hymes’ concept of “CC” (see Bachman and Savignon, 1986: 381) and in Halliday’s model (see Widdowson, 1978) is a kind of interaction between a knowledge of language and an ability to use it. From the point of view of discourse, Canale and Swain’s (1980: 41) theoretical framework of “CC” necessitates four kinds of knowledge:

Grammatical Competence, Sociolinguistic Competence, Discourse Competence and Strategic Competence (Canale and Swain’s Model (1980))

However, Savignon (1983:50) raises the important issue of the interactive nature of Canale and Swain’s (1980) four competencies since language strategies have unfortunately been treated as linguistic notions, on a par with the grammatical, sociolinguistic, and discourse categories.

In an attempt to resolve the problem of interaction between a knowledge of language and an ability to use it (see Figure2), “CC” is made workable, or as Widdowson, (2000:5) says, ‘ amenable to use’ by providing opportunities that would allow learners to engage with language by exploiting their existing knowledge as well as appropriate the language themselves for learning (ibid, 1998:713). The purpose “is to get learners to invest a general capacity for further learning” in the real world (ibid: 715).

Knowledge of Language

Capacity		
Systematic Knowledge of Usage “Linguistic Competence”	Interpretative Procedures	Schematic Knowledge of Use “ CC”

(Widdowson’s Model of “CC” (1984))

Definition of the Learner’s “CC” in the Normal System of Communication

Widdowson (1978: 248) sees “CC” as “a set of strategies or creative procedures” where meanings are negotiated at the discourse level whether spoken or written by the skillful deployment of shared knowledge of code and rules of language use, and asserts that what the F/S language learners need to develop in the learning process is a basic underlying capacity to learn.

The Reading Component in the Advanced-Level Reading Program

Reading, at an advanced level in particular, must have a major role in the system of communication. However, researchers (see, for example, Swaffar et al., 1991) contend that EFL/ESL university students experience problems in making the transition from skills acquisition courses to the reading of subject-specific texts. Kern (2000: 108-109) suggests, that the real issue of reading lies in the ‘creation of discourse’. To achieve this, reading requires of the EFL/ESL students particular skills which must be developed through teaching.

The Nature of Reading

Goodman describes reading as a “Psycholinguistic game”, or a “Psycholinguistic process” (1988:12), in that it “starts with a linguistic surface representation encoded by a writer and ends with meaning which the reader constructs”. Goodman, then, develops this idea arguing that successful readers “are both effective and efficient” (ibid). Firstly, they are effective readers in being able to construct a meaning of a text that is often determined by the degree of fit between the textual features of the text and the reader’s actual comprehension of the meaning intended by the writer. Secondly, Goodman argues that readers are efficient in being able to select minimal language cues from the page to predict meaning. Most importantly, Goodman continues, this selectivity is supported by past experiences and knowledge of the language. As suggested by Goodman (1988), Widdowson (1979b), and Grabe (1991), reading is a constructive as well as a selective process.

Attention, thus, focuses on three interactive and interdependent issues: the reader, the text, and the interaction of the reader and the text and beyond to the writer of the text (Alderson and Urquhart, 1984: Preface).

The Role of Schemata in Understanding Discourse

The interactive character of reading involves a two-way process: bottom-up, or the micro level, and the top-down, or the macro level (see Brown and Yule, 1983:234). In the former, the reader is a text analyst, relying more on decoding lexical, semantic, orthographic, and syntactic features from the printed page. In the latter, the reader is a builder of the meaning of the text, relying on background knowledge of genre and topic rather than the text (see Hatim and Mason, 1990:226), and making predictions derived from the visual information available on the page. Recent research (e.g., Kern, 2000; Bell, 1991; Hatim and Mason, 1990; among others) in the EFL/ESL theory, however, has suggested that the reader draws simultaneously, but selectively, from all sources of knowledge that operate in bottom-up/top-down. It is a schema theoretic model (Bell, 1991:60) about knowledge, known to individuals as part of their previous experience about the world. From the point of view of gestalt psychologists (behaviour studied as undivided wholes), these schemata facilitate the use of this knowledge for predictions and inference purposes (Hirsch, 1988:40). Widdowson (1983:34), in this respect, states that schemas also enable us to relate new information (input data made available by bottom-up analysis) to already known information (schemata stored in memory). In this sense, new data help alert old information to start predicting in a top-down fashion. According to reading (and writing) researchers (see, for example, Kern, 2000), the interaction between previous knowledge and the information at hand looks like the characterization of presupposition in cohesive relations (a claim that I shall later try to substantiate). Of course, from the point of view of ‘givenness,’ Brown and Yule (1983) make plain that comprehension occurs as a result of two issues: (1) on the one hand, the reader can relate new information “theme” to given information “Rheme” (ibid:154,179-80); (2) the reader, on the other hand, is able to recognize a link, or interaction between what is being presented, and what has been inferred (ibid:260). This implies that the reader’s knowledge of the world is an important factor in controlling inferences.

The Role of Microstructure (Bottom-Up) and Macrostructure (Top-Down) in Understanding Discourse

The distinction between microstructure and macrostructure involves cohesion in text and coherence in discourse.

Cohesion is the propositional relation between parts of a discourse (Widdowson, 1979b:87), and the “locutionary force” of a speech act “through sentences which are linked by cohesion” (Bell, 1991: 163; original emphases). The text, in this sense, is held together by particular linguistic means, or cohesive devices, which help the readers to work out the meaning of sentences

and the kind of relationship the writer intends between two parts of his text. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976:17), cohesion is the set of semantic relations that link sentences and parts of sentences with what has gone before (anaphora) or with items yet to come (cataphora), enabling a passage to function as a semantic unit where one element presupposes the other in the sense that it cannot be comprehended except by recourse to it (ibid: 4). In William's (1983:36) view, to become effective readers, EFL/ESL learners must have the ability to recognize the five cohesive relationships in English (see Halliday and Hasan, 1976:16).

However, a text hangs together not only cohesively but also coherently. Coherence helps the reader to arrive at the writer's intended meaning (illocutionary act) to perform a function and to recognize and understand the organizational model and the different types of the patterns thought that underlie the text's organization. The student readers must also be able to evaluate and respond to the text (perlocutionary act) and employ a wide range of strategies (see Brown and Yule, 1983:223; Hatim and Mason, 1990:60; Bell, 1991:212-213). Coherence, further, enables readers to go beyond the discourse-producer's intended message by drawing possible inferences based on other notions (presupposition). Moreover, according to the cooperative principle (see Grice, 1975:45) and its associated four maxims (Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner of discourse), the correlation relationships between form and function and the violations of it can be interpreted by the reader (see Allen and Widdowson, 1974b).

The Interactive Roles in Text Processing

Written discourse is a communication process through which a writer and a reader negotiate meaning via the written text. In that interaction, the two interlocutors cooperate with various degrees to abide by a set of rules which refer to Grice's (ibid) four maxims. Successful communication in written language will crucially depend on the writer-reader shared knowledge related to universes of discourse. When the writer and reader of a given text employ different conventions, the contract between them falls apart and comprehension can suffer (Kern, 2000:109).

The Practical Abilities of the EFL/ESL Reader

Theoretical and practical research provides evidence in relating successful reading directly to general language proficiency in the TL (see, for example, Devine, 1988:261).

At the micro level of abstraction (bottom-up processing), researchers (e.g., Eskey and Grabe, 1988:225) contend that fluent readers must have large

vocabularies and learn how basic word meanings “can take on unexpected meanings”, and “how context may affect their connotational auras” (Kern,2000:76,102). They need to know and manipulate “the rules that govern syntactic relations and clause structure” (Eskey and Grabe, 1988:226) so that they can understand the propositional content of the F/S language text (Devine,1988:264) and get at the core (Kernel) of sentences (ibid). Kern (2000:78), however, suggests that students need to “attend not only to both vocabulary and syntax, but also to the complex interactions between the two”. Williams (1983:36), for example, suggests that Halliday and Hassan’s (1976) markers of cohesive relationships, and their functions across sentences and paragraphs, seem to be an essential part in the student reader’s decoding skills. Semantically, discourse markers help the reader to have “a better grasp of the ways in which writers use words to create and maintain textual relationships by exploiting features like hyponymy and synonymy” (Cooper,1984:131). Syntactically, discourse markers make linkage between propositions (Lubelska, 1991:569). In fact, Demel’s (1990:285) study in L2 reading provides evidence that a significant relationship exists between overall reading comprehension and comprehension of coreferential ties. Within their knowledge of the cohesive signals, Hatim and Mason (1990:217-218), further, assert that readers(especially translation students) need to understand and refer “to the way subsequent discourse re-uses previous themes or plans.

WHAT IS SPECIAL ABOUT LITERARY TEXTS IN THE ADVANCED READING PROGRAM?

It could be argued that particular features of literary works promote the learners’ linguistic competence. At the usage level, reading a literary text can provide students with the opportunity to explicitly analyze grammatical patterns to appreciate the function of simple and complex grammatical structures, recognizing their role in creating texture in adjacent clauses and sentences. From the point of view of discourse, studying literary texts provides unique opportunities for student readers to develop their textual competence Literature and translation students can approach a broader concept of lexical cohesion.

In addition to developing linguistic knowledge at the usage level, reading literary material, if properly presented, can help in the development of "CC". In Hatim and Mason's (1990:226) view, translators should be "constantly aware of the need to reconstruct the entire gestalt of the text from the individual fragments". However, getting the students to read and view the literary work as a whole implies the possibility (especially for translation students) of expressing the work's overall intentionality rather than feeling obliged to a given line. In this case, it could be argued that literary material is a rich source for providing the student readers with that opportunity to identify and examine a whole range

of communicative situations. Literary texts encourage a dynamic interaction between reader-text-and external world in the course of which the reader is constantly trying to form a coherent picture of the text. An example of such an interaction is: “A Martian Sends a Postcard Home” by Craig Rain (1979), a contemporary English poet that does not conform with our expected frames of reference. (The word ‘telephone’ is represented in a different way as something that sleeps and snores)

Students’ literary competence, (i.e. their understanding of the appropriate literary conventions which mark a text) can also be improved. Students of literature and translation can be exposed to the total communicative situations and environment of different kinds of discourse. Take, for example, the spoken mode. Literary texts serve to raise learners’ awareness of the ways that lexical items are employed to end conversations, to identify the main topic, or underlie a significant theme, and how silences and pauses are also employed in conversations as deliberate strategies to produce power, suspension, and threats (see the famous ending of Samuel Beckett’s play “Waiting for Godot”, 1956:94). Furthermore, the effects of literary functions of repetition as opposed to those of non-literary are the result of an iconic relationship between form and meaning. In literary texts, the function of repetition is motivated to create and reinforce deeper levels of meaning. In non-literary texts, repetition is used as a rhetorical strategy in the art of persuasion, and an aid to memorability of key ideas (e.g., advertising). For example, the poem “A Martian Sends a Postcard Home” could be compared to a non-literary text, involving directions on how to use the telephone at a public place to recognize the different functions of literary and non-literary texts, and the nature of language organization in related discourse types. Literary competence, then, implies an awareness of certain stylistic characteristics and conventions involved in different genres, allowing student readers to direct their attention to the form of the work (e.g. grammar, vocabulary, stylistic features, etc.) that interact with the writer’s intention. Literary competence, therefore, allows the ability to relate different text types to each other, within and outside the literary tradition.

A Model for Methodology: An Alternative Pedagogic Approach

This section suggests and justifies a pedagogical model for methodology. The activities suggested below can be carried out both in class and as assignments at home.

Schematic Competence Activities (A Pre-Reading Stage):

Direct explanation and lead-in discussion of the upcoming texts can help the student readers to become familiar with the content and form of the reading selection, allowing them to bring past schemata to bear upon what they are

reading. Pre-reading activities can help students activate and build their own background knowledge through student generated predictions, and text-previewing activities. Following his schema activation, they should be allowed the opportunity to apply the newly gained background knowledge to the interpretation of similar texts. They need to keep the related prior knowledge in memory while they are reading. Finally, they need to actively make inferences that link new to the given for post-reading creative and critical applications.

Systematic Knowledge Activities (During Reading)

Explicit instruction in text structure and analysis of linguistic choices can facilitate learning from text. The analytic activities may proceed from the grammatical to the lexical aspects of cohesion, and be built on a hierarchical basis, from easy to difficult. Student readers also need to work on the meaning of complex grammatical sentences. Prediction is, indeed, an essential psycholinguistic strategy that facilitates the interaction between knowledge accumulated in the brain and text-based knowledge.

Reading and Critique Writing (Post- Reading Activities)

The value of reading lies in what the student is able to do with what he reads. Thus, a form of writing which may be practiced with reading at an advanced undergraduate level is the critique assignment (see Appendix).The goal is to develop analysis, synthesis, and evaluation skills. However, critiques of advanced undergraduates will be treated as a basis for critical discussion in class. Critique writing will involve the following components:

Summary Activities

Students provide a brief summary of the assigned reading selection. However, it is necessary for students in this section to consider the purpose and audience (what the author is trying to communicate to his intended audience. The context (situation) and subject matter (topicality) are, indeed, included. Such details are important to the author's message.

Personal Response Activities (Analysis)

Having identified what the author's illocutionary act (i.e. his intention/purpose), students can then go on to examine how the author says what he intends to say. Students, here, are required to show an understanding of the author's message(s) and method, or style. In order to do so, they are asked to find out what gives the text its particular qualities. Indeed, students here are encouraged to examine both linguistic and literary issues in the assigned text. In other words, they concentrate on lexical choices (Semantic field) and connotations of the lexis. They should pay attention to the use of certain types of

words and word classes (Grammar), and the author's use of other constructions in phrases and sentences (Syntax). They should also focus on how the text fits together (Cohesion) and the ways in which linguistic items give a sense of coherence and texture to the text. Students are also asked to examine the use of sound features (Phonology), and other rhetorical devices, and focus on the layout of the text. More importantly, students should discuss the effects that the above linguistic features can create; how they provide insights into literary interpretation. For example, if the assigned text is a poem, students in this part of the critique assignment are expected to show what it is that marks it out as belonging to this specific genre: how poets manipulate language to express themselves; how they experiment with language by deviating from the general rules for the creation of poetic meaning. In the critique assignment, student readers will also need to examine the ways in which authors use language to create their tone, mood, and setting.

It is necessary for students to consider all the above elements when they analyse texts. However, they should be able to justify their choice of any of them in their analysis, and use specific examples from the text to show how language is used in order to create the effects desired. That is to say, they are asked to read critically, weighing, for example, an author's claims and interpretations against evidence provided in the author's text. The analytic structure of the text can be explained and taught through language activities which engage students in the process of reconstructing the author's creation of discourse. Classroom discussion can provide a valuable forum for exposing different personal responses. They try to explore relationships between literary and non-literary texts by writing down the qualities which differentiate literary from non-literary texts. By studying a variety of texts in the way discussed above, the student readers will be encouraged to construct their own frameworks to evaluate the effectiveness of their texts.

Reader Response Activities (Synthesis)

At this stage, students' responses can be very individual, and students have the freedom to express their own ideas about what the text means to them. For example, the student readers learn to put together (synthesize) the things that seem important to them, orally and by writing. They take the responsibility to construct a text by writing ideas that develop, extend, and complement the author's text. They learn to project the author's points of view and evaluate, accept, or reject a particular point of view according to their context or experience, expressing the reason for the way they feel the way they do. They relate the content of the text to their personal life and experience (see Rossenblatt, 1978:24), their understanding of reality, and to the experiences of other writers. Consequently, the student readers can make links to present

events, and generalize from features of the given literary text to features of the literary tradition or non-literary selections. For example, a unit involving three contrasting texts which, however, are linked by a unifying theme (e.g., alienation) can be presented in a modern poem, in which aspects of ordinary life are viewed through the eyes of a visitor from another planet. A second literary text (e.g., "An Ancient Legend of Ireland" in Nolan-Woods and Foll, 1986: 94-102) is then presented, in which the story-teller presents a view of heroic life of long ago, aspects of which may appear alien to the present day reader. A third literary text (e.g., "A Dramatic Sketch from Nolan-Woods and Foll", *ibid*: 99-101) gives the reader an insight into a modern form of alienation.

More importantly, students should be encouraged to produce creative responses; they should not replicate their instructors' views. Part of our pedagogy, indeed, must encourage 'points of view' or what Elliott (1990:191) calls 'genuine responses' to texts. This shift from the arbitrary personal-response to an academic-oriented reader-response would generate intellectual challenge, promote reading proficiency, and offer individual insight and perspective. The process may also develop the students' writing skills and make them familiar with literary conventions.

The Selection of Literary Texts

The selection of literary texts should include such headings as educational, cultural, and linguistics. The decision on these criteria must involve factors such as the teacher's experience and judgment, in fact, the student's interest and needs should be the paramount concern.

The Educational Factors

The purpose of a particular course is the most important factor to be taken into account. The criteria for selection and use of literary works must lead to a recognition of the needs and interest of particular groups.

The Cultural Factors

At advanced levels of reading, dealing with different cultural experiences will not only activate the students' schemata but also enrich it through proper interaction provided that sufficient time is given to the building of the requisite schemata through the pre-reading stage. Pedagogically, these texts will be graded according to complexity, for example, by starting with relatively simple literary texts from which student readers may generalize to ordinary life.

The Linguistic Factors

The instructor must be sensitive to the needs of the students and the aims specified. For example, a text can be selected because it stimulates students to

interpret the author's message. Selected texts should represent a variety of genres that would expose students to organizational patterns and devices that they need to recognize in academic literary and non-literary texts. Selections can be "graded by focus" in which the focus is on one or more of the rhetorical functions.

The Assessment Scheme in the Proposed Reading Program

Reading tests will address linguistic, reading, and literary levels of competence. Firstly, assessment measures will include the students' ability to make connections among textual elements, and interpret those connections to make inferences, and to recognize the connotative value of words. Testing involves assessing the students' ability to show an understanding of the genre, style, and content of a text and to generate expectations about the purpose of the writing. They must show ability to reach conclusions, contextualize, and evaluate. Testing techniques will also consider how much of a frame of reference they can use in comparing and contrasting the texts studied. Secondly, assessment measures, in this program, will include testing the student readers' ability to integrate writing into the assessment of reading.

Conclusion: Implications and Recommendations

The implications of the provision of literary texts into the advanced reading syllabus may fall into four major concerns. Firstly, since the message in a text is dependent on the student reader's ability to relate the new input to his own existing knowledge as well as to his purpose in reading, it is necessary to maximize the role of the pre-reading phase. Secondly, the major concern in teaching reading is no longer seen as providing a collection of skills and abilities. Rather, the focus of attention is now on discourse skills, i.e. the process of learning, or what Widdowson (1996:67) calls "autonomous learning." This also implies that the student readers' own experience has become of primary importance. The third implication highlights a concern for issues of negotiation and interaction among participants "to invest the language with their own personalities", making language purposeful, or "a reality for learners." (Widdowson, 1998:715) Finally, students' autonomy can be shown in the way they evaluate and respond to literary and non-literary texts as well as in their ability to transfer what is learnt to wider contexts.

In the light of what has been said thus far, it is recommended that student readers should be made fully aware of the nature of objectives of the advanced-level reading course, i.e. the relevance of the inclusion of literary selections to their present and future needs. It is equally important that course materials, methodology, and students' achievement be evaluated at the end of the program by the instructor and the students themselves. There is, also, a pressing need for

offering more advanced reading instruction and practice than it is the case at present, especially for students majoring in translation and in literature, who need to be fluent readers for their academic future. In the new century, reading is bound up with the general process of education. I would argue that an important educational goal is to enhance students' learning through reading. Reading research should aim at the improvement of the advanced reading skill.

An empirical study is recommended to explain how much contribution literary selections as well as cultural aspects can contribute to the students' language skills in general, and reading skills in particular. Such an inquiry would make use of the results obtained.

أهمية النصوص الأدبية في برامج القراءة المتقدمة في المرحلة الجامعية

نهال عميره، قسم اللغة الانجليزية، كلية الآداب والعلوم، جامعة البتراء، عمان، الأردن.

ملخص

يهدف هذا البحث إلى تبيان أهمية الاستجابات الأدبية (الكفاية الأدبية) في تطوير الكفاية التواصلية في اللغة الأجنبية التي يتعلمها الدارس بما يؤدي إلى اقتراح منهجية محددة لمواد القراءة المتقدمة في برامج تعليم اللغة الإنجليزية لطلبة الجامعة في تخصص اللغة الإنجليزية وأدائها وطلبة اللغة الإنجليزية /الترجمة. ويقترح البحث أهمية تطوير المقدرة اللغوية لدى الطالب وذلك بربط دراسة النصوص الأدبية بمهارات القراءة. ويسلط البحث الضوء على عمليات التفاعل في كل من القراءة وفهم الأعمال الأدبية لكون الأدب (بطبيعة توظيفه للغة أو الخطاب بجوانبه اللغوية والثقافية والأدبية المتأصلة في كل نص أدبي) يساعد الطالب على تمثيل مجمل المواقف التواصلية وإلى تطوير القدرة اللغوية اللازمة لتحقيق الاستخدام الناجح للغة الهدف. ويؤمل أن يساعد المنهاج المقترح على اختيار طرق التدريس المتضمنة لمقاييس لغوية وثقافية وتربوية لاختيار المادة المناسبة وتدرج مستوياتها. كما يقدم البحث مقترحات عملية محددة حول الموضوع، وأساليب لتقويم ما يتعلمه الطلبة وقدرتهم على استخدام ما تعلموه في فهم وتحليل مختلف النصوص.

* The paper was received on Oct. 31, 2007 and accepted for publication on June 29, 2008.

References

- Alderson, J.C. and Urquhart, A.H. (Eds.). (1984/1986). *Reading in a Foreign Language*. London and New York: Longman.
- Allen, J.P.B. and Widdowson, H.G. (1974b). "Teaching the communicative use of English." *IRAL*, 12 (1): 1-21. Reprinted in R.L. Mackay and A. Mountford (Eds.), *English for Special Purposes 1978* (pp.56-77). London: Longman Group Limited.
- Bachman, L. and Savignon, S. (1986). "The Evaluation of communicative Proficiency: A Critique of the ACTFL Oral Interview." *The Modern Language Journal*, 70 (iv): 380-90.
- Beckett, S. (1956). "Waiting for Godot." In D. Hudson, *English Critical Essays: Twentieth Century 1958* (pp.324-32). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bell, R.T. (1991/1995). *Translation and Translating*. London and New York: Longman.
- Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983/1987). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Canale, M. and Swain, M. (1980). "Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing." *Applied Linguistics*, 1 (1): 1-47.
- Cooper, M. (1984). "Linguistic Competence of Practised and Unpractised Non-Native Readers of English." In J.C. Alderson and A.H. Urquhart (Eds.), *Reading in a Foreign Language* (pp. 122-35). London: Longman.
- Demel, M.C. (1990). "The Relationship between overall reading comprehension and comprehension of coreferential ties for second language readers of English." *TESOL Quarterly*, 24 (2): 267-92.
- Devine, J. (1988/1998). "The relationships between general language competence and second language reading proficiency: implications for teaching." In P.L. Carrell, J. Devine, and D.E. Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive Approaches to Second Language Reading* (pp. 260-77). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eskey, D.E. and Grabe, W. (1988/1998). "Interactive models for second language reading: perspectives on instruction." In P.L. Carrell, J. Devine, and D.E. Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive Approaches to Second Language Reading* (pp. 223-38). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Goodman, K.S. (1988/1998). "The Reading Process." In P.L. Carrell, J.Devine, and D.E. Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive Approaches to Second Language Reading* (pp. 11-21). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grabe, W. (1991). "Current developments in second language reading research." *TESOL Quarterly*, 25 (3): 375-406.
- Greenwood, J. (1989). "The Problems of Purity: Observations on Prescribed Texts with Special Reference to Greece." In *Literature and the Learner: Methodological*, in ELT Documents: 130 (pp. 90-111). Modern English Publications in association with the British Council.
- Grice, H.P. (1975). "Logic and Conversation." In P. Cole and J.L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics, 3: Speech Acts* (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1975). *Learning how to mean: Explorations in the development of language*. London. Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hatim, B. and Mason, I. (1990/1997). *Discourse and the Translator*, London: Longman.
- Hirsch, E.D., Jr. (1988). *Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Hymes, D.(1971). "Competence and Performance in Linguistic Theory." In R. Huxley and E. Ingram (Eds.), *Language Acquisition: Models and Methods* (pp. 3-28). London: Academic Press.
- Kern, R. (2000). *Literacy and Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kramersch, C. (1986). "From Language Proficiency to Interactional Competence." *The Modern Language Journal*, 70 (iv): 366-72.
- Kramersch, C. and Kramersch, O. (2000). "The Avatars of Literature in Language Study." *The Modern Language Journal*, 84 (iv): 553-73.
- Lubelska, D. (1991). "An. Approach to Teaching Cohesion to Improve Reading." *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 7 (2): 569-97.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *Approaches to Translation*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Nolan-Woods, E. and Foll, D. (1986). *Advanced Reading Skills*. London: Penguin Books.

- Sato, K. and Kleinsasser, R. (1999). "Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): Practical Understandings." *The Modern Language Journal*, 83 (vi): 496-517.
- Savignon, S.J. (1983/1997). *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice*. Reading: M.A: Addison-Wesely (1983). Sydney, NSW, Australia: McGraw-Hill (Second Edition 1997).
- Scarcella, R. and Brunak, J. (1981). "On speaking politely in a second language." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 27: 59-75.
- Swaffar, J.K., Arens, K.M., and Byrnes, H. (1991). *Reading for Meaning: An Integrated Approach to Language Learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Widdowson, H.G.(1978). *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1979a). "Interpretative procedures and the importance of poetry." In *Explorations in Applied Linguistics* (pp. 153-62). London: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1979b). *Explorations in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1983). *Learning Purpose and Language Use*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1998). "Context, Community, and Authentic Language." *TESOL Quarterly*, 32 (4): 705-16.
- Widdowson, H.G. (2000). "On the Limitations of Linguistics Applied." *Applied Linguistics*, 21 (1): 3-25.
- Williams, R. (1983). "Teaching the recognition of cohesive ties in reading a foreign language." *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 1 (1): 35-53.

APPENDIX

The Critique Assignment

(Reading and Writing)

The critique assignment is an example of a text written to be read. It has a coherent structure which involves an introduction, a conclusion, and structured paragraphs linked by discourse markers. The style is formal, and the author's intention is to present an argument in a coherent way.

Goal: to develop analysis, synthesis, and evaluation skills in Advanced-level university students.

Guidelines:

I- Summary

- 1- Read carefully the reading selection.
- 2- Summarize the reading. Exclude some details which are not important to the author's message.
- 3- Present the author's view rather than your own.
 - Less than one page.

II- Personal Response (Analysis)

- 1- Analyse the reading and select the major theme(s), or message(s) presented in reading. Consider the author's message(s) and method.
- 2- Examine the part of the text in relation to the whole, clarifying functions and interrelationships, and calling attention to symbols, words, sound effects, tone, figurative devices, and motifs.
- 3- Select specific examples from the text to support the analysis.
 - At least one page.

III- Reader Response (Synthesis)

- 1- Evaluate the reading by expressing your Agreement or disagreement with the them(s) of the reading. Support your position by providing examples or alternatives.
- 2- Record your impressions, comments, and reasons why you react strongly/lightly to the reading, providing examples where necessary.

- 3- Consider the writer's degree of success. Here, your opinion ultimately depends upon your personal response to the text. With reference to your own experience and background knowledge, you can interpret and respond to the writer's message.
- At least one page.

FORM:

Use standard grammar and English (slang is not appropriate).