CHAPTER VI

METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS IN AN ENABLING MODEL OF LITERATURE TEACHING

6.1 Introduction
This chapter is concerned with the methodological issues arising from the enabling, discourse-based, reading approach to literary study developed in the last three chapters. Starting from the analysis of an actual lesson representing the feeble strand in KLT, this chapter moves on to an examination of the pedagogic procedures implicit in recent innovations in text-book design. The last part of this chapter spells out the actual procedural criteria to be used in a full-fledged reading-based approach to literature teaching.

6.2 An explanatory note on the guidelines
It is important to bear in mind that the teaching procedures, strategies and other aspects suggested in this chapter are only indicative of the approach outlined and not exhaustive by any means. In other words, this chapter does not attempt to provide detailed procedural guidance to teachers as a Teachers' Handbook or a do-it-yourself manual would. This thesis holds that no book or research on methodology can suggest a pre-determined set of activities uniformly applicable to all teachers and learners. We can only suggest the larger criteria for the overall procedures or stages in the teaching and it is up to the teacher to use this guidance flexibly, independently and responsively to suit the constraints imposed locally by the classroom situation. In the same way,
No research on syllabus design can come up with a course-book on what to teach and what not to teach; at best it can provide a 'source-book' which teachers need to use selectively (N.S. Prabhu, private communication, November 1983). Instead of assigning a simple, mechanical and passive role to the teacher, this position envisions the teacher to be a thinking, self-reliant and dynamic experimenter who examines and questions outside theories and suggestions thereby strengthening his own classroom practice.

The procedures suggested here are not evolved on the basis of actual try-outs and experimentation. A project which begins from the classroom and theorises on the basis of such empirical data would result in a different thesis. Both because of the largely theoretical nature of this thesis as well as the practical difficulties of experimentation, some of the teaching procedures outlined here are only a logical working out into classroom terms of the theoretical premise adopted in this thesis.

6.3 The beginnings of a reading-based approach in KLT

6.3.1 A search for a feeble strand in KLT

Given the developmental approach that this thesis has taken to the research problem, it would be of interest to examine if there is any support for the practice of a reading-based approach to literature teaching in KLT. As we mentioned in chapter I, there are no primary sources which describe
current KLT and hence we have had to depend on KLC to locate possible sources of support. We have indicated earlier the mutually influential and cyclic nature of the relationship between KLC and KLT, and established the reasons that legitimise considering KLC as a source of information on KLT. Our present examination of KLT using KLC as a guide is being done with the complete awareness that KLC no longer shares a mirror-image relationship with KLT.

Nevertheless it still seems possible to turn to KLC expecting it to throw light on possible sources of support in KLT as there are still a number of Kannada teaching critics. When we turn to KLC, we find the discourse-based approaches, which constitute only a submerged strand in KLC, being represented in the work of post-Navya critics writing currently. We are not claiming the same degree of correspondence in the thrust of current KLC and KLT, as we did for the Navodaya period. However, it is possible that just as a feeble strand exists in KLC as manifest currently in the work of the post-Navya work, there is also a parallel strand within KLT, though it may not be as strong as it is in KLC. It is as yet a truly submerged strand but with a potential for growth as many of these teaching critics belonging to the post-Navya school happen to be teaching at the university (e.g. D.R. Nagaraja, K.V. Nareyana, K. Ram. Nagaraja), who have and will be influencing coming generations of Kannada teachers.
Accordingly one such teaching critic, H.S. Raghavendra Rao, belonging to the post-Navya tradition was identified and his teaching was selected for observation. The criteria for selection were: one, that he is a post-Navya critic who is teaching; two, that he teaches at the undergraduate level (National College, Jayanagar) which this thesis has used as a case study; and three, equally importantly, that he was willing and open to observation and discussion. This exercise in classroom observation has served as the basis for the larger comments and generalisations that are made on the feeble strand within KLT that lend some support to a reading-based approach.

6.3.1.1 Primacy of the literary text

In keeping with its discourse-base, this alternate model makes the literary text primary in the classroom. This stands out in sharp contrast to the classroom practice within the equipping model known for its 'flight from the text', typically ignoring the original text and instead functioning on the basis of secondary texts comprising the teacher's paraphrase of the text. Within the feeble strand, on the other hand, whatever message is arrived at or context-oriented associations made take root from the literary text which is THE focus of attention in the classroom. For instance, in one of his classes, H.S. Raghavendra Rao (II B.A./B.Sc. combined class, general Kannada, text: Kuvempu's 'Devaru ruju madidanu', August 31, 1985) used very varied
techniques to draw attention to the text. First, he read out the entire poem twice; then each stanza was repeated once at first; followed by each stanza being divided into sets of 2 or 3 lines and whenever questions about the meaning of a word or line were asked by the teacher, he repeated reading out those lines. For instance, consider this interaction in which the text has been used to provide the context for making sense of a word in the poem:

T : (reads out the line) "who are skipping?" why are

S₁ : చేస్తే.
T : ఆంధురంలో ఎదురులు కాని? ఆంధురంలో ఎదురులు, కాని ఆడతా ఇప్పటి, అంతా ఇప్పటి? (pause) అందా ఇప్పటి? (silence)

S₂ : కాక అప్పడ మాత్రమే.
T : (accepting the answer and reformulating it) కాక అప్పడ మాత్రమే.

Here the teacher reads out a line, asks a question about a particular pronoun reference. When he finds the answer too general, he persists and reformulates his question and demands a specific answer which forces the students to go back to the text to find the answer in the line previous to the one quoted by the teacher. Thus the teaching is based on the text all along, paying close attention to how the language of the poem is structured in the body of the work.
Also, because it was a lyric poem, the teacher felt the need to establish its sense of rhythm, a feel for the poem by his repeated reading of the whole poem or parts of it. In addition, the text served as a constant point of reference for the entire interaction in the class, thus establishing a certain continuity and coherence. Further, the constant reference to the text by way of reading it aloud, was helpful for, many of the students did not have a copy of the text in front of them and this reading out helped even those students to participate in the interaction. At times the text was read aloud to draw the wandering attention of some students in the class. Even though the teacher repeated reading out the lines aloud for classroom management purposes, it only contributed to the focus and coherence of a lesson that was based on a close reading of the text and the well-directed interaction that such a focus provides.

6.3.1.2 Process - orientation

The close attention paid to the text helped the teacher to illustrate how he had arrived at the meaning of a word/phrase/line in the poem, thereby providing a certain process-orientation to his approach to the literary text. This concern for illustrating his own processes of meaning-making by relating his meaning to the textual cause was often carried out involving the students in a process of interaction through very pointed questioning. Consider
this piece of classroom interaction in which the teacher effectively drives home the notion of enactment of meaning or mimesis that is basic to poetry:

T: (reads out) "होते तीन तीन देशपादस", तुम 'तीन' मतलब 'तीन' ठहराता. 'तीन', तुम 'तीन' ठहराता. तुम 'तीन' ठहराता?
(again quickly re-reads the line with obvious length on 'तीन').
(Then provides a very fast reading of the same line replacing 'तीन' with 'तीन') 'तीन' तीन देशपादस" तीनांकण?

S₁: तीन तीन तीन....

S₂: तीन तीन तीन....

T: तीन तीन तीन.... तीन तीन तीन.... तीन तीन तीन.... 'तीन' तीन तीन तीन....

Here the teacher first focuses attention on a particular line in the poem and reads it aloud with extra emphasis and length on the word 'aagasa'. Then he asks why this particular word has been chosen by the poet. Without pausing for an answer he goes on to provide another clue and he asks why the poet has not used the cognate 'gagana' in the place of 'aagasa'. In the same breath, the teacher reads the same line aloud replacing 'aagasa' with 'gagana' at an obviously faster pace which contrasts with his earlier reading and questions why the word 'gagana' is not preferred by the poet. There are two attempts by learners to grapple with the question and they almost provide the answer, at which point the teacher formulates their thought and summarises the notion of enactment. As we can see from this interaction, the teacher is inductively taking the
learners through a process of meaning-making to reach the end that he himself has already seen.

While a large majority of teachers use the lecture mode in the Kannada classroom, here even within the lecture mode, the teacher was attempting to create some scope for interaction by raising questions, juxtaposing varied answers, etc. In the process there were many instances when the teacher, using the context of this poem, was dealing with the varied processes of interpretation. What in fact was happening was that the teacher who had already read and interpreted the poem for himself (as it should be) was now guiding the learners to the meaning/s that he had created in his reading of the text. In other words, he was playing the role of a superior reader, who was attempting to demonstrate with the help of the students how he arrived at his interpretation. He was guiding them, taking them through the route that he had, as a reader, already traversed. And this journey, in which the teacher was the guide, was undertaken ensuring some amount of involvement on the part of the students, keeping them alive to the possibility of other routes, short cuts and possibilities and yet finally taking them along the road that he had already explored.

So far we have examined the feeble strand in KLT to look at some of its positive aspects. Firstly, we find that this approach preserves the particularity of the literary
text by making it central to classroom activity. Secondly, this close attention to the text makes it possible for the teacher to display the processes of reading which he employs as a reader. This orientation to the text provides greater scope for an interactive situation in the classroom in which a dialogue can take place, anchored in the text. Whereas a message-oriented approach which focusses on the product of interpretation alone necessarily provides scope for answers that are in the form of opinions, which do not lend themselves for a reasoned debate, thereby being intrinsically unsuited for an interactive teaching situation. Finally, to the extent that this approach involves the learners in the process of meaning creation (even if it is the creation of the teacher's meaning), the feeble strand offers greater potential for the development of a reading-based approach compared to the dominant model in KLT.

6.3.1.3 Teacher-centred interactivity

We can now turn to some of the problematic features of this approach within the feeble strand in KLT. While as an approach to the literary text it is satisfactory, the problems arise from some of the pedagogic assumptions upon which it bases itself.

The first of these has to do with the assumption that a demonstration model of teaching in which the teacher
demonstrates his own processes of interpretation will lead to the learner's greater ability to interpret literary texts. In his role as a superior reader, the teacher is in fact providing both the process and the product of his interpretation. Even though there was a considerable amount of student involvement as evidenced by the interactive nature of the class, it was still a teacher-centred interactivity. To the extent that the teacher provides both the process and the product and involves the learners in this process he is better and more useful to learners than a teacher who does not. Yet the assumption on which this kind of teaching rests can be questioned. While it might just be possible that some of the abler learners might infer the more general principles behind the teacher's interpretation and thereby quite by chance make a transfer of skills/strategies into their own reading, we cannot assume that all the students will be able to do this. And what we expect from an adequate approach to literary pedagogy is that it enables a large number of students to become competent readers by design and simply not only those who would learn anyhow, irrespective of the method. Considering that reading and interpreting a work is essentially done as a first-person activity and not at a second remove, we need to examine how the supportive base that exists minimally in KLT could be strengthened to achieve maximal results.
6.3.1.4 Imposition of teacher's meaning

In addition, the fact that the teacher provides the processes behind his literary critical product, however laudable and convincing it is, does not absolve him of the problem of imposition. This method does not encourage the student sufficiently to confront the text without mediation; instead, it forces the learner to look at the text through the teacher's filter, thereby undermining the individual reader's personal response. The fact that the teacher chose to read the whole poem aloud twice instead of letting the learners grapple with it in their own way is indicative of this thrust. As no rendering of the poem is neutral to the intended meaning of the reader, the teacher's reading conveyed his interpretation to the listeners. In the earlier chapters we have already outlined the crucial nature of the personal response of the reader and the specific the experience of/world that he brings to bear while reading.

The power of this argument came home to us in a team-teaching experience using the workshop mode with a set of postgraduate students. The range of interpretations and the possible arguments the students offered to justify their interpretation were an eye-opener for the teachers, who had to concede that there were possibilities of meaning other than their own.

Even though the reader and his intuitive base need not be glorified, we cannot deny that intuitive response is
invariably always the starting point for any meaningful interpretation. Perhaps the assumption that every work must be understood by every learner exhaustively and thoroughly underlies attempts at providing the complete meaning/s of the text. But it is common knowledge that in a classroom, differential competence and heterogeneity is the rule rather than the exception. Hence it is important that teachers of literature accept provisional, tentative and incomplete interpretations from learners. We can achieve this by finding ways of converting the current interactivity which is essentially teacher-fronted into a more learner-centred interactivity which gives the individual learner his legitimate status as a reader in literature teaching.

In conclusion we can say that the feeble strand in KLT fulfils the criteria of the primacy and particularity of the literary text, and orientation towards the processes of reading. However, since it is the teacher's meaning that is the focus of the classroom interaction, leading to imposition and teacher-centred interactivity, the feeble strand cannot qualify to be an adequate approach to literature teaching. But since the feeble strand does offer a minimal base, we need to strengthen it with the pedagogic principles to be described in the last part this chapter.
6.4 Innovations in text-book design

Having examined the classroom practice that represents the feeble strand in KLT, we can now turn to some recent innovations in materials production in KLT. The aim of this exercise is not so much to assess these materials for their teach-ability as to infer the methodology implicit in these innovative attempts. We shall therefore be examining two sources of data - the new P.U.text produced by a teachers' association and a forthcoming 'sourcebook' by an informal group of four teachers. In order to understand the immediate context which led to these innovative attempts, we shall be reviewing the P.U.text used from 1981-1986.

6.4.1 The old P.U. text-book

This text which was prescribed in 1981 for detailed study at the P.U. level was called Sahitya Samideepa. At the outset one can see that the claim implicit in the title, that the text consists of literary pieces, is not borne out. There does not seem to be much difference between the prose section of this text and the non-detailed text, which is a collection of discursive essays by A.R.Mitra. For instance, in the prose section, we do not find any example to represent the short story genre.

Typically the lessons have the following structure: The 'text' is preceded by a short, 3-4 line gist of the major thrust of the text. Then, the text is followed by a
a brief biographical note on the author and his works, with a mention of the original source of this particular excerpt. This note is normally accompanied by a brief glossary providing the meanings of a few 'difficult' words. Apart from these 'support' materials and a sentence in the preface to the text-book, acknowledging the fact that teachers' co-operation is essential to achieve the objectives of the text-book, the teacher is left to cope with the situation largely by himself.

In the absence of explicit guidelines for methodological procedures and adequate support materials that focus on the text, the teacher is most likely to paraphrase the text and provide his own interpretation to learners using the lecture mode. Such texts, because they do not accord primacy to the text and because they lend themselves to the imposition of the teacher's meaning, only help to perpetuate the equipping model described earlier in this thesis.

6.4.2 The new P.U. text-book

The new text-book Sahithya Samakshana in use now, has come out as a reaction to the earlier text-book. Possibly because of the shared dissatisfaction about the old text and a higher level of self-consciousness about the problem, this text is a definite improvement on the older text. Many of the claims made about the choice of texts are fully
borne out. The texts chosen are identifiably 'literary', varied and representative of genres and periods. From the first reports that are received, teachers seem to welcome this text because of its highly interesting texts.

Further the preface provides an account of the processes and criteria behind the production of this text-book. A first picture of the objectives of the teaching emerges from this account. Yet it is not stated explicitly enough and hence a lot needs to be inferred. In addition, there is also for the first time, an acknowledgement of the need to train/orient teachers for teaching this text. But it stops short and remains a recommendation to the P.U. Board. Hence this syllabus also remains, by and large, a teaching content syllabus which eschews considerations of methodology.

In common with the earlier text-book, the lessons in this text also begin with the biographical note and glossary. Interestingly they move on to two more sets of questions— one set based on a close reading of the text and another set of higher order questions tapping the critical and inferential ability of learners. The first set will help the learner to study the text more carefully; thus establishing the primacy and particularity of the text in the reading process. These questions also have the potential
of facilitating the learner to answer the second set which draws on his interpretive ability. Thus the new P.U. text fulfils one of the criteria of reading-based approach viz, according primacy to the text and thereby constitutes an improvement on the earlier text.

However, it fails to fulfil the other criteria of reading-based approach. As we have shown the new text-book does not indicate the methodological criteria to be followed in teaching the text. Given the absence of explicit guidelines, and the power of habitual and deeply conditioned notions of teaching, it is very likely that teachers will use these support materials more as a testing device than a teaching device. It is quite likely that the teacher will continue to 'explain' the text through the lecture mode before using these questions in the class. If this happens, then these questions lose their potential for process-orientation as learners will only be attempting to relate the answers to the teacher's meaning which is already imposed on them. Thus the interactivity that is likely to ensue will only be teacher-centred, limiting the potential of process-orientation to an exploration of the teacher's meaning.

Thus even when the new text-book constitutes a definite improvement on the older text-book in terms of its choice of texts, adequacy of support material and text-orientation,
it still does not ensure the fulfilment of the other
criteria of a reading-based approach like learner-centred
interactivity and the view of reading as a first-person
activity, thereby still operating within the equipping
paradigm.

6.4.3 **A source-book by a team of teachers**

Having perceived some common ground in their approaches to
literature teaching, a team of four practising teachers of
literature - both Kannada and English (see Appendix E for
more details) are working as a team to explore their
implicit pedagogy. This attempt has taken the form of
producing a 'source-book' (as opposed to a 'course book')
which would translate their ideas into classroom terms.
The forthcoming 'book' (as yet only a cyclostyled collection
of lessons being circulated through informal channels among
teachers) consists of a set of short stories and poems
in Kannada which are followed by a whole range of questions
on each text. These lessons are preceded by an introduction
which makes explicit the objectives of the lesson-writers
the background to this attempt and a note on the methodology
envisioned for the successful implementation of their model.

When we examine the support material (see Appendix E), we
find that these writers provide a wide-ranging set of
questions which can be used by a beginner and a trained
reader alike. Further, all the questions are entirely
focussed on the text, with more attention being paid to the 'form-al' aspects of the text rather than its content. There is an attempt here to make the questions as neutral and open-ended as possible, by suggesting various possibilities of meaning in any given context. The methodology envisaged by these writers requires that these questions form the input for teaching; i.e. the entire process of teaching centres around discussing these or such other questions raised by participants in small groups.

This analysis of the team's 'source-book' reveals that this attempt at materials production comes closest to the theory and practice of a literary pedagogy argued in this thesis, in terms of fulfilling criteria such as according primacy to the text, process-orientation, learner-centred interactivity and the pursuing of learners' meanings.

Having inferred the criteria underlying recent innovative attempts in text-book design, we shall now proceed to discuss in depth some larger methodological issues and specific classroom procedures that would lead to a fuller realization of the objectives of the literary pedagogy outlined earlier in the thesis.
5.5  Methodology: some considerations

5.5.1  Learning to read by reading

The central question here is how exactly do we impart the reading processes involved in interpreting texts to our learners. In our quest for an answer to this question, the existing models, as we have already seen, do not provide us much help. The predominant equipping model does not deal with the question as it is a non-issue within its framework which considers a literary text as an end in itself and hence is content to equip the learners with readymade interpretation. However the feeble strand in KLT which also operates with the 'transmission mode' (Barnes 1976) does consider this issue. It believes that we can improve the reading processes of the learner by demonstrating how a superior reader like the teacher reads, by providing the product as well as the process of a superior reader's interpretation. But this assumption that a teacher's reading processes directly influence a learner's is questionable. Reading, like the other language skills or for that matter like any other skill, can only be learnt by actually doing it: i.e. by reading. Acquisition of any skill is practice-oriented; one becomes more adept and skilled only by actually deploying whatever ability one already has. The findings from the applied linguistic research on reading also emphasize this aspect of learning to read, that it is essentially a first-person activity. Therefore the reading ability
of the reader can only be improved when the reader/learner becomes the centre of our reading course and only when his reading processes, however inadequate they may be initially, are taken into account and built up.

Given the predominance of the 'transmission mode' in our context in which the teacher who is the repository of all knowledge transmits this knowledge to the learners through the lecture mode, one should guard against the danger of converting reading into a knowledge area about which the teacher gives a discourse. In other words, the current trend of teaching about the literary text (biographical, historical knowledge about the writer and his world) should not be replaced with teaching about the reading of literature. There is sufficient work on reading literature of the kind that will appeal to teachers who want to teach about reading. Approaches such as Brooks' 'Understanding Poetry' (1976) and Trilling's 'The Experience of Literature' (1967) take a deductive line of thinking and attempt to use various literary texts as exemplifications of various elements such as imagery, metaphor, point of view, etc.

This is not to deny the value that such attempts have for a trained reader who can dialogue with these writers. But if our objective is to teach how to read, then, this approach poses problems. By being deductive, i.e. by
using literary texts as illustrations of predetermined analytic categories, it takes away the joy of discovery and the totality of response we find in the inductive mode, which is the most intrinsically motivating factor that makes a learner read. Secondly, it militates against the basic criteria of literature teaching, that it should take into account the subjective and personal nature of literary experience, by imposing an external fiat as to what to look for in a literary text. Further this approach fails to do justice to the meaning potential of the literary text by reducing it to a mere illustration of a given element under discussion. Finally, by concentrating on various elements of the literary text deductively, this approach lends itself fully to the lecture mode. Even a brilliant lecture focussed on the conventions of reading and the elements of the art of literary writing is still no guarantee that the students can read a new literary work on their own and relate it to their own experience of life, literature and language. Hence it is argued here that the stress should be on teaching literature itself or better still, the learning of literature (Widdowson 1984).

Learner-centred interactivity: the workshop mode

If the focus of our pedagogy should be on the learning of literature, then the learner has to become central to our classroom. This emphasis on the learner is by no means new or unique to the literature class. If there is
one single paradigm shift in education in the past few decades, that concerns the move from teacher-centredness to learner-centredness and hence there is no need for us to rehearse those arguments here; instead we can take them as given. However, what might be new is the reinforcement that learner-orientation has received on the basis of considerations of a literary pedagogy, as outlined in this thesis. Apart from this larger educational perspective, the perspective of this thesis that the reading of literature is essentially a first-person activity argues for a central place for the learner in a literature classroom.

Though the starting point for classroom activity is the subjective response of the learners, our aim is not to preserve this response intact and deify the learner; that would defeat our aim of enabling learners to assess their subjective responses against shared literary conventions, a knowledge of which constitutes literary competence. By confronting this subjective response with other responses, we can force the reader to re-read the text. Therefore the entire activity of learning to read literature consists in repeated reading of the text provoked by rival interpretations. A literary pedagogy which aims at developing literary competence in the learner has therefore necessarily to be learner-oriented to fulfil these educational and literary criteria.
6.5.3 The teacher as collaborator

These arguments for the centrality of the learner and for a focus on reading processes confront us with the question of the teacher's role in the literature classroom. The teacher in this situation has to stimulate and organise these processes using effective classroom dynamics. His role is essentially that of a collaborator in the 'common pursuit' of meaning creation, which calls for a radically different mode of interaction with learners. The entire teaching has to be much more exploratory in nature, more of an experimental activity keeping itself open and flexible enough to take into account the differing and unpredictable responses of the learners. The pedagogy becomes productive only when it is able to draw out these responses and set up interaction between them. But it cannot be an interactivity based solely on the teacher's questions, as found in the feeble strand in KLT, in which the whole class was engaged in the pursuit of the teacher's meaning. We need to set up a kind of interactivity that is learner-centred, based on questions, doubts and differences that arise in the process of the learners learning to read. Hence what is needed is a 'participatory pedagogy' (Prabhu 1985) in which all learners participate, with the teacher collaborating, in the search for textual meaning.
The arguments for a participatory pedagogy are strengthened by the research on small group interaction which report on the positive influence of small groups on the process and quality of learning. Given the literary criterion of encouraging first-hand and personal response, small groups have particular value as forums where tentative and exploratory views are articulated. Barnes and Todd (1977), reporting on their study of communication and learning in small groups, write "It has become clear to us in the course of this study that the allocation of power affects how people take part in the formulating of knowledge. The effect of placing control of relevance in the hands of one person is to emphasise his content frame, and this will affect profoundly the basis upon which others participate. If on the other hand alternative frames are open to negotiation this will influence not only who takes part but also the knowledge which is celebrated. Thus, what is learnt by discussion in a group of peers will be different in kind as well as content from what is learnt from teachers. When the criteria of relevance are negotiated and not imposed, the content frames which participants develop in the course of the negotiation are likely to bear more directly upon the learner's actions since they will be idiomatically related to the frames through which he is currently interpreting the world around him" (ibid : 126). If we want every learner to participate
meaningfully, then small group interaction, now increasingly referred to as the 'workshop mode,' seems best suited to achieve our objective of developing learners' reading processes.

Methodological procedures for a reading-based pedagogy

In this section we will indicate the general methodological procedures to be used in the classroom to realize a reading-based literary pedagogy. The first point to be made is that every classroom is unique and every teacher creates with his students a particular classroom ethos. Given this uniqueness and the unpredictability of classrooms, the question of providing readymade procedures to be rigidly applied does not arise. At best only the general methodological criteria that govern classroom procedures can be provided. It is for every teacher to interpret these criteria and translate them into actual techniques. However a few procedures based on the criteria of a focus on reading processes, learner-centred interactivity and the collaborative role of the teacher - are suggested as illustrations of classroom activity. These procedures are offered as samples, not models, of such classroom activity.

Formulating a possible methodology for 'theory-revision' in the context of teacher training, a process in which teacher-trainees relate their intuitions derived from
classroom practice to the findings of academic research. Ramani (1986) posits four general processes: articulation, confrontation, examination and reformulation. These processes of theory-revision are comparable to the processes of meaning-making involved in literary interpretation. We shall therefore be using these terms to refer to the processes that should be encouraged in a literature classroom. In the remaining part of this chapter, we shall be spelling out the sequence of stages as specific guidelines to teachers which aim to facilitate these processes. This is not to suggest that each stage is uniquely linked to a particular process or that each process is confined only to a particular stage. Further, as Ramani (ibid) suggests these processes do not occur in a particular linear order; one may be provoked by another, just as one may simply facilitate another. To maximally exploit the procedures under each stage suggested below, the teacher should sensitively monitor his own interventions in a way that supports the occurrence of these processes rather than pre-empt them.

6.1 Stage 1: 'Reader Meets Text'

It is important that at the very first stage the reader meet the text and interact with it at whatever level he can. In trying to grapple with the text unaided and unmediated, he will bring to bear on his reading whatever
strategies and processes he already possesses. He will also perceive the experience presented in the text holistically and try to understand it in terms of his own knowledge and experience of the world. The process of reading thus initiated, by the extrinsic pressure of the classroom, will now become intrinsically motivating for the reader as he will have invested considerable time and energy coming to terms with the experience that the text presents.

In this stage the teacher should in every possible way remain unobtrusive, without making any attempt to mediate the process of interaction between text and reader. It is important here, for instance, that the teacher does not read the text aloud to the class before the students attempt to read the text silently, at their own pace and time. If the teacher reads aloud, he is through his reading, imposing a certain interpretation on the learners; the same strategy of reading aloud can be used at some other stage to advantage, if the teacher wants to illustrate a certain rhythmic pattern or the possibility of multiple meanings depending on where the reader pauses. But what is a supportive activity in that context becomes pre-emptive in this stage as it directs the reader towards the teacher's meaning, thereby interfering in the learner's own effort at meaning-making.
6.6.2 Stage 2: Articulation of responses.
After learners have engaged in the process of reading the text, it is necessary that they attempt to formulate the product of their reading in the form of first impressions and subjective responses. It is essential that the teacher play his role very alertly and sensitively at this point. He should encourage them to explore and be tentative about their responses. He should not at this stage expect fully worked out, coherent argumentation or expression of response. He should be alert enough to exploit possibilities of consensus or polarization of views on the text to create higher and more generalizable levels of confrontation. The teacher should not at this point dismiss extreme positions or squash opposition or provide his own assessment of views expressed, as any of these acts will stifle the process of thinking and diminish the pedagogic potential of confrontation of views. These views can be collected by fairly general, neutral and open-ended questions such as "What is the theme of this work?" and "How do you like this poem?".

6.6.3 Stage 3: Examination of subjective responses
Having collected the first round of fairly tentative and impressionistic responses, it is necessary to sharpen these responses and examine them more deeply, in the context of the text which is the 'public court of appeal' (Roiger 1983) for all participants. Therefore a few questions asking them to substantiate their first responses with
reference to the text should be provided to the students. Such questions should be general enough to capture within their frame, most of the responses and yet at the same time be able to force the reader's attention back to the text. In search of an answer to these questions, each learner examines the text more closely this time, fully aware that he has to publicly share his answers with others and hence moves closer to the text in order to use it for substantiation. This common set of 4-5 questions also helps to establish the focus of discussion in the class and makes for better management of time and opportunities for the negotiation of interpretations.

After some exposure to this method, it is possible for us to visualise training the learners to ask their own questions—the most urgent questions on the text foregrounded by the text itself; and through discussion arrive at manageable lists of issues and questions which can be focussed upon in separate sessions. But till the learners are able to do this, the teacher should provide this kind of support—of identifying the salient and urgent issues/aspects of their response and converting them into questions. After the first two stages, the teacher, with the help of the class (if that is possible), can choose to examine using the workshop mode, specific conventions and/or elements associated with the chosen genre of text, provided these conventions and issues are inductively arrived at in the context of the work itself. For instance, consider the set of questions on
This is only an example of a possible range of questions; the aim is to refocus the attention of the reader on the various aspects of the story by asking very specific questions, on the theme, the attitude and structuring of the story. While one set of questions focuses on the chronology of events and the restructured presentation of these events and the impact this has on the story, another set focuses on the point of view and narrative voice. The third set deals with the locales for the various events and attempts to relate them to the writer's point of view. The next set of questions are concerned with characterization in the story and through this device approach the central conflict of the protagonist and links it up with the title. Another set of questions, by zooming in on what appear to be disparate details, attempts to relate these details to the writer's total message/vision. Yet another attempts to size up the writer and his unstated attitudes through the varied linguistic styles adopted by the writer in various parts of the text. The last set of questions requires the reader to make a comparative study of the various stories of the same writer.

But this is not to suggest that the teacher should use all these questions in the class, because we have adopted the premise firstly, that the questions should be closely linked to the subjective responses that come up in stages 1 and 2:
secondly, that there are no correct and complete answers to such questions, and hence exhaustiveness or coverage is not at issue. In addition, parameters of any classroom such as the number of students, their motivation and literary background, their present level of reading and the time available determine which of these aspects need to be focussed upon and in what depth. It is for this reason that the teacher has to thoughtfully use the procedures, activities and questions suggested in this section, adhering only to the larger criteria outlined here and making the necessary alterations to suit the immediate needs of his classroom.

6.4 Stage 4: Confrontation and negotiation of interpretations

We can visualise 3-4 further levels within this stage in which confrontation of views takes place - in small groups, in large groups, with the teacher and with the critic. Once the individual learner has attempted to answer our set of questions, then either in pairs or in small groups of 4 or 5, he could be asked to share his answers. Within the group, the learner is bound to confront other views which may confirm his own view or challenge it. Because he has already spent time and effort trying to relate to the text, rather than abandon his own interpretation, he will necessarily go back to the text when he is faced with a differing point of view, to find justification for the other view/s. This necessarily involves re-reading the text in a more focussed
and critical way than was involved in the earlier stages. This process of working with his own peers provides a non-threatening atmosphere for the learner to share his interpretation. Also this collaborative process of resolving differing interpretations within the group creates a concerted effort in which individual learners can learn considerably from each other. But the teacher needs to ensure compulsory individual participation in these groups. Secondly, he also needs to make clear that each group should report both consensus and divergence in their answers. He needs to reassure them that differences, being legitimate and productive, should not be ignored. Here again the teacher needs to be very cautious not to pre-empt any debate, any opportunities for confrontation. In the team-teaching experience in which I had participated, in a workshop session discussing a short poem by S.Balu Rao, we refused to give the students the meaning of the word 'jurbani' which was about the only difficult word in the poem. Withholding the meaning generated a robust debate around it. Further, providing a gloss based on the dictionary meaning of the word would reduce the meaning/s that it may acquire from the specific way it is used by the writer, thereby reducing its fundamental multi-dimensionality to a unitary one.

Having discussed their answers in small groups, the learners now come back together and the discussion in each group is summed up and presented by a group spokesman and there is a
plenary discussion conducted with the active moderation of
the teacher. After seeking the view of each group, the
moderator should allow a few clarificatory and reaction
questions judiciously, keeping in mind the continuity of
the discussion and not allowing for any digression. Further
he has to highlight and draw attention to important contra-
dictions.

At this point the teacher can also provide his interpreta-
tion/answers to the questions as another reader of the text.
By now the students are in a position to debate with the
teacher because they have a point of reference, i.e. their
own interpretation, to compare the teacher's with. The
teacher can further supplement his own critique with that
of established literary critical opinion and ask learners
to study the processes involved in formulating that opinion
and to assess it in terms of their own product.

Reformulation of revised interpretations
This is a stage which is often ignored or underplayed in
most workshop sessions. It is important that the teacher
insist on this process of articulating and reformulating
the learner's interpretation on the basis of the activities -
the confrontation and negotiation - that have taken place
in the previous stage. This process calls for the ability
to re-view one's starting point of response and then compare
it with the now strengthened or modified interpretation
based on well-argued grounds. Further this is best done in
writing, as this demands greater clarity of thought and commitment. Also this mode of individual answering provides the essential feedback that a teacher requires to assess the previous session and to plan the next. Therefore specific writing tasks can be prepared by the teacher and allocated to different learners, with each learner or group of learners handling a different task from the other. This variety of tasks has the potential to cover a wider range of interests and activities which complement one another's work and generate considerable interest and discussion.

Teacher competence and Teaching competence

So far we have dealt with criteria that determine the basic procedures of a literature lesson and described the roles played by the teacher and the learners in this pedagogy. We have been largely concerned with the role of the teacher as a facilitator who promotes the various processes of articulation, confrontation, examination and reformulation that lead to better reading ability in learners. In other words, we have suggested a few ways in which the teacher needs to use his teaching competence, i.e., his ability to teach, in his role as a collaborator. This competence needs to be strengthened by teacher competence i.e., the teacher's own competence in and mastery of the subject area, viz., the reading of literature. For efficient and well-directed collaboration, the teacher will have to put to use his superior reading ability during the course of the lesson. Now the question before us is exactly how does a teacher do
this. What is the nature of preparation he needs to handle the more exploratory workshop mode of teaching?

By now it must have become clear that in this mode of teaching there is no one single input slot for the teacher in which he can, without any interruptions, give a one-sided discourse that constitutes his own interpretation. The workshop mode of teaching demands a much more challenging use of the teacher's competence as a reader because of the flexible, often unpredictable and growing nature of the discussion in the class. To be able to do this adequately - i.e. to come in on crucial points of discussion by identifying real blocks or problem areas in the text and highlighting the issues for further discussion, the teacher has to have a very intimate knowledge of the text. It is only his familiarity with the text that will help him in anticipating problems and prepare for them to the extent he can. What follows from this is that the teacher has first of all to read the text as a reader and be aware of both the product and the process of his reading, as exhaustively as he can.

He can further enrich his reading by comparing it with established literary critical opinion. He should study the context of the work and the author. He should attempt to do a micro- and macro-analysis of the text and be familiar with the textual aspects of the work. He should also be aware that these micro- and macro-levels are different for
different genres. In his attempt to understand the text, the tools provided by the Discourse-based approaches in English and Kannada are helpful in laying bare the processes of reading. More importantly, they also provide the tools necessary to ask pointed questions, offer solid ground for textual questions, which help to objectify the underlying processes of reading. This base helps in extending the teacher's own range and depth of reading which is a direct input to the questions and tasks he can generate for use in the classroom. Having such a wide repertoire of questions and tasks on a given text which can later be linked up with learner responses is the greatest asset for the teacher, in making quick and on-the-spot decision: in improvising questions while conducting the workshop. Another aspect the teacher has to bear in mind is the use of technical terms and the metalanguage of literary criticism which inevitably occurs in any discussion. Clarity about terms in the minds of teachers and learners is essential if discussions have to be fruitful. But here again the teacher is in no position to predict which terms will occur in any given discussion. Therefore access to a dictionary, a reference book, an encyclopaedia, a glossary of technical terms, etc, will be an added help to the teacher if used productively without losing sight of the text and the immediate procedural criterion.
It is very important for the teacher to be rooted in the text - to be text-based and not text-limited, as it is the text that provides the common ground, the objective base against which negotiation of meaning/s can take place. It is in this process of creating meaning from the text that interpretations can be judged as conforming to or aberrant from the literary conventions of reading shared by the literary community. Even though we begin with the intuitive response of the reader, this subjectivity is tempered by the need to share one's interpretation with others. This public sharing and communication of meaning requires that the reader conform to the 'rules of the game' and follow the conventions of reading literature as literature. An awareness of these constituent conventions is best brought in a context of argumentation, in which polarized views and assumptions about the literary text are put forward. The knowledge of these conventions which is largely tacit is made explicit in a climate of debate and argumentation. This objective knowledge of reading conventions which is triggered off by a process of intuitive understanding of these conventions in the act of reading the text and debating publicly about it, in turn, sharpens the reader's ability to read other texts, thereby leading to the development of literary competence, which is the central objective of the literary pedagogy envisaged in this thesis.