CHAPTER II

THE EQUIPPING MODEL: ITS NATURE AND IMPLICATIONS FOR LITERATURE TEACHING

2.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter we have shown how KLT and KLC share a mirror-image relationship with one another. We have argued that, of the various schools within KLC, it is the Navodaya school which has had a lasting impact on KLT. Further we have provided an account of the teaching based on the Navodaya model, drawn from historical and current sources. We have demonstrated that the Navodaya model is based on the provision of easy, ready-made interpretations of prescribed texts. In this thesis, such a model of teaching will be referred to as 'equipping'. This chapter attempts to define the term 'equipping', to analyse a few samples of such teaching, and to draw out the implications of this model for a literary pedagogy.

2.2 'Equipping': a definition and an explication

The term 'equipping', which so well captures the nature of the current KLT situation, was first used by Prabhu (1985) in describing various approaches to teaching English. In fact, this term refers to a general educational concept resting on the assumption that "what the learner needs specifically should be given to as directly and quickly as possible, instead of our
trying to enable him to learn those (or other) things for himself, when the need arises" (ibid:1). Prabhu argues that the equipping principle operates with the tenuous belief that "what the learner learns is (or ought to be) what the teacher teaches and that things taught and learnt directly (and specifically) are as effective as (or even more effective than) things which the learner learns as an indirect result of teaching" (ibid). Such a definition of the learning process which asserts that in any teaching, the teacher's input is equal to the learner's intake, treats the human mind as a tabula rasa that simply absorbs information/knowledge. Such an understanding of the learning process underlies statements like

(1) "The study of literature should lead to a heightened moral awareness.... If we prescribed texts which reflect the selfless sacrifices of the great patriots who dedicated themselves to the country during the freedom struggle, then, would it not contribute to the development of the students' sense of patriotism?" (Geetha 1975:33)

It is the same assumption viz. that readers automatically and unthinkingly take in the values inherent in a literary work that underlies our anxiety on finding adolescents reading pulp fiction. Friere (1972) describes
this equation between what learners are exposed to in the classroom and what they imbibe as "the 'banking' concept of education in which the scope of action allowed to the students extends only as far as receiving, filing and storing the deposits" (ibid:46). In this framework, education "becomes an act of depositing in which the students are the depositories and the teacher is the depoitor" (ibid:45).

Prabhu criticises the equipping principle as "ill-founded since equipping cannot be a matter of promoting an internal, holistic growth but only of providing him (the learner) with an inventory of things to store in his mind as happens with tourist phrase-books" (1985:1). Though the 'equipping' or the 'banking' concept of education has been questioned to the point of demolition, it is unfortunate that most of our teaching, KLT being no exception, continues to operate with this educationally unsound principle.

2.3 Analysis of samples from KLT

Having defined the term 'equipping' in general educational terms, we can now attempt to understand how exactly the equipping principle translates into
classroom terms by examining a few sources of data
the supplementary materials which teachers and students
have been using in the KLT set-up.

3.1 Sources in KLC
One source of such data consists of books written by
practising teachers like G.P.Rajarathnam (Hosagannada
Yashodara Charite, 1949 or Vene Samhara, 1964),
V.Seetharamaiah (Abhignana Shakuntala Nataka Parichaya,
1943) and H.M.Shankaranarayana Rao (Madhyama Vyoyoga:
Ondu Parichaya, 1958). All these writers have acknowledged
that the books originated in their classroom experience
and they all hope that they would be useful to students.
For instance, Shankaranarayana Rao writes in the preface
to his book

(2) "This little book has emerged from my
experience of teaching this play to P.U
students. ... If this book can be of some
help to these students, then my effort
has been fruitful" (1958).

What Rajarathnam (1964) has to say on the 'Gnapakaroopa'
series in his preface to Venee Samhara, leaves no doubt
in our minds about exactly why these books were written
and how they were being used:

(3) "This is the eighth in the 'Gnapakaroopa'
series, published by the Karnataka Sangha,
Central College. ... There has been this
practice in our college, of revising texts
that were taught during the course of the academic year, just a few weeks before the examination, for the benefit of the students. These 'revision lectures' attract students from our college as well as from other colleges. ... Thus since 1956 we started printing the synopses of these revision lectures and they were named Gnapakaroopa" (ibid:iii).

The approach of these books to the text is very much the approach that these teachers employed in teaching the text. All these books typically begin with a note on the writer giving his name, historical period, title, etc., ranging from about half-a-page to two pages. Next, there is a brief storyline, chapter or act-wise, depending on the genre, followed by a discussion of the Mulakathe, the original source from which the writer has borrowed the theme and how he differs from the original. What follows then is a detailed prose version of each unit of the text, rendered in modern Kannada, interspersed with a few, impressionistic comments. They conclude with a further 2-3 page recounting of the story, more briefly this time, along with more comments, essentially laudatory, on the theme.

It becomes clear from the above description that the approach to the teaching of literature in the 1940s and 1950s was identical with the literary critical approach
to literary texts that was prevalent at the time. The analysis also reveals some of the hidden assumptions with which they were working. Nearly 90% of each book deals with the content/theme of the literary work under discussion, merely providing the plotline. Significantly, very few quotations from the text are used and where they are, they are rendered, in single inverted commas, in modern Kannada. From the book-writer's admission, we can see that these books fulfilled adequately the most immediate need of answering questions in the examination.

The net result of all this is that learners do not need to read the prescribed text at all. What must have begun as well-meant,'additional support' has gradually made way for total mediation, by the teacher, between the text and its reader, the student of literature. Given the more powerful, extrinsic motivation created by examinations, which could very well be tackled solely by reading these supplementary materials, it is little wonder that the literary text has lost its primacy in our teaching. Instead, we have a tradition of teaching and learning largely based on a culture of 'secondary' or 'substitute texts' produced by teachers and/or critics.
3.2 Correspondence course lessons

This tradition of literary study based on 'substitute texts' created by experts can be seen most fully in the open university correspondence course schemes. In the absence of a live classroom, the criticism around the text has become the teacher for these students, who are educating themselves outside the formal channels. Considering that the ratio of students who pass the regular B.A./M.A., to those who go through the non-formal channels is nearly 1:4, we can imagine the widespread impact that this model has had and will continue to have on KLT. Further, ironically enough, I have seen even the regular students often depending on the correspondence course lessons/guidelines, to prepare for the examination.

On scrutiny, we find a common pattern and a certain uniformity of approach among most of these lessons, irrespective of whether the text is prose, poetry or drama, or whether the author belongs to the tenth or the twentieth century. Typically, these lessons also begin with a fairly lengthy biographical note on the writer, followed by a description of the context of the work. If it is an Old Kannada work, then the original source/s from which the author has chosen his theme is mentioned, followed by a discussion of how and
where he is different from the original. If it is a twentieth-century work written in modern Kannada, then, the socio-political context of the work and its literary climate are described, followed by a brief attempt to place the writer in the literary tradition. Usually all of this comprises the introduction to the work.

This introduction is followed by a detailed paraphrase in modern prose. Even a contemporary writer like Shivarama Karantha, who has written in modern Kannada, is not spared from this 'narration' treatment. Further an appendix indicating the kinds of questions likely to appear in the examination is provided. What typically comes next is a series of literary critical articles available on the work, which is in turn followed in some cases, by a few comments or critical remarks made by the tutors/lesson-writers. The length and quality of these write-ups vary from one tutor to another.

It might be useful to study an example closely to concretise the issues under discussion. Let us consider the Mysore University's Open University Correspondence course lessons. The II paper in the first year M.A. involves the study of a medieval poet or form. Let us examine the series of lessons on Bharathesha Vaibhava by Rathnakaravarni.
The first lesson begins with a brief note on the work and a longer note on the author and his time, followed by a summary of the first chapter of the work. This 6\1 page 'lesson proper' is followed by 48\1 pages of literary critical articles by various critics G.S. Shivarudrappa, Gokak V.K., R.S. Mugali and others. The note on these articles says

(4) "These articles are provided as extra reading to facilitate your study".

The series ends with a last lesson in which the lesson-writer expresses her own evaluation of the work. In other words, she has added one more literary critical article to the list, without discussing the views/opinions expressed in the other articles.

Obviously the tutors are operating with the assumption that their students at the M.A. level know how to read the text. This assumption has, in fact, been expressed.

(5) "The guidelines do not provide the meaning of every word, stanza or chapter of the texts. They are meant to throw light on problematic areas of confusion that you as mature readers face while reading. But these guidelines are neither the end nor the means. They are only meant to assist you in your reading" (Chandrashekhari : 1984).
What is regarded as given in this teaching situation comes through most specifically in G.H.Naik's note at the end of the last lesson (I M.A. Paper II: Raghavanka's Harischandra Kavya)

(6) "So far I have dealt with the poetic quality. ... merits and limitations of Harischandra Kavya. I hope this would provide the necessary guidance to you in your study of the work. ... If you have a difference of opinion with me, then it is important that you formulate it, solely based on the evidence provided by the text. That is the responsibility of the literary critic. And you must necessarily have this awareness as students studying literature at the M.A. level". (1984a)

If the tutors in fact assume that their students are trained readers who can examine other critics' opinions, why is it that most of them (with rare exceptions like G.H.Naik) provide such lengthy and detailed story-lines? Using the same space they could very well have provided the original text, instead. How can they assume that their instruction that the KLC materials in the lesson are meant to help the students' reading, will ensure that they really do?

No guidance is provided at any stage prior to the M.A. on how to make sense of differing opinions on a literary
text. Because the KLC model has percolated even to high-school teaching, we find that our students are capable of only accepting others' opinions and not questioning/arguing/debating these opinions. And so the rationale behind the M.A. course (even when it is right to expect that level of reading proficiency from an M.A. student) becomes unviable in reality.

But of more immediate interest for us here is the common assumption that these guidelines share with the books by Rajarathnam and others reviewed earlier, in continuing the tradition of teaching based on secondary sources.

2.3.3 The bazaar guide

Yet another standard source of such substitute texts is the widely-used 'commercial' guides. These 'guides are found particularly attractive because they provide in one book all the help that students need to answer questions on four texts (the money saved in this proposition is worth noting) and also because they are seen as the best substitute for the teacher in terms of the help they provide to face the examination.

An analysis of these guides reveals that the same overall pattern that we found in the other two sources recurs here. Let us study the data provided by the
Subhash guide meant for the B.A., B.Sc., classes of the Bangalore University, for 1983-84 texts. There are guidelines on all the four texts - *Samakalina Kannada Kavithe-1*, *Kannada Abhignana Shakunthala*, *Karvalo*, and *Vichara Sahithya*. Here again the approach adopted to all four genres of literature is the same. Let us take a look at the chapter on *Shakunthala* for instance.

It begins with an introduction on what drama is and asserts that *Shakunthala* is one of the world's classics because other scholars have said so! It then goes on to provide the biography of Kalidasa, details about his life and works, followed by the gist of the play as a whole. Then each act is taken up, its story-line narrated and the meaning of each stanza is provided in modern Kannada prose—this is repeated for all the acts. The other part of the chapter on *Shakunthala* provides all the likely annotation questions, followed by the answers. Next, samples of essay-type questions are given. For instance, the Subhash guide has these questions: (1984: 52)

(7) a) Why did Dushyanta reject Shakuntala?
   What was its consequence?

b) What was the curse placed upon *Shakunthala*? How was she absolved of it?
c) How did Kanva send Shakunthala to her husband’s abode? What was the consequence?

d) Why did Shakunthala blame the king?

e) How was Shakunthala’s clandestine love affair responsible for her misery?"

(These questions are not very different from those found in the correspondence course guidelines—they are of the same nature and serve the same purpose). These five questions are then followed by just one essay, which is meant to serve as answer to all five questions. A series of character sketches providing merely the thematic content of the play concludes the guidebook. Thus, whatever the question, one can expect the same, narrative answer. The pattern repeats itself with the other three texts.

2.3.4 Summary of analysis

In our attempt to understand what constitutes the teaching model in KLT, we have examined three sources of data so far. We find that the teaching done in the 1940s and 1950s shared a lot with the then current Navodaya model of KLC in that both took the same approach to literary texts. Essentially the approach was introductory and descriptive, acquainting the reader/student with the text by giving the story along with a few appreciative comments by the critic/teacher.
Though KLC has moved away from this kind of criticism since the 1940s by giving primacy to the language of the text (the Navya school, for instance), this has not made much difference to KLT. So we find that the Navodaya framework as characterized above still dominates current teaching resulting in the continuation of the tradition, as evidenced by the examination of two other sources - the correspondence course guidelines and the bazaar guide - which are widely in use at present.

Such a bracketing of sources and mentioning Rajarathnam, Seetharamaiah, the correspondence course lesson-writers and the 'guide'-writers in the same breath may not, understandably, be acceptable to most of us. While most Kannada teachers would endorse the usefulness of the first two sources, they would decry the use of bazaar guides as scandalous and misleading. Such a distinction between these two classes of writers and books is made on the basis of the degree of sophistication that these various teaching critics have shown in interpreting the work. One can concede the distinction readily; but it does not invalidate our argument. It is obvious that there is a wide gap between Rajarathnam's *Venee Samhara: Gnapakaroopa* and the chapter (pp 73-179) in the bazaar guide on 'Shakunthala', (for one thing, Rajarathnam has got his spelling and punctuation invariably correct while the
guide-writers are not quite aware of these conventions!

If we really want to know how shallow and over-simplified the guide-writer's approach to a text is, we only need to compare their approach to a complex poem such as 'Nee heenga nodabyada nanna' by Bendre with O.L.Nagabhushanaswamy approach to teaching the same poem, outlined in Rujuvathu (No.11, 1983) which suggests a way of teaching that poem, yet preserving all its complexity and openness.

Conceding this difference, what we are trying to argue here is that the difference between Rajarathnam and the course lesson-writers on the one hand, and the guide-writers on the other, is only one of degree and not one of kind. While Rajarathnam's guide to Venēe Samhara is undoubtedly superior in that it provides an adequate and authentic gist of the play, the Subhash guide to Shakunthala is extremely inadequate and distorted. So while it is true that what each of these sets of writers advocates is of differing quality and sophistication, yet they share a set of common assumptions about literature and literature teaching. What follows is an attempt to draw out the various aspects of this common core of assumptions and to discuss the implications for literature teaching.
2.4 Implications of the equipping model for a view of the literary text

2.4.1 Text and the World

To understand the assumptions underlying the equipping model, we need to know, first of all, how the literary text and literature as a phenomenon are defined. Within this model, literary texts are considered valuable and worth reading for the truths they provide about the period which produced them, about the world in general or about human nature. In doing this, they express the particular vision and the individual insights of their authors. It is assumed that literature is about life, that it is written from personal experience and that this is the source of its authenticity. This 'commonsense' view of literature proposes a practice of reading in quest of expressive realism (Belsey 1980:2).

This is the theory that literature reflects the reality of experience as it is perceived by one (especially gifted) individual who expresses it in a discourse which enables other individuals to recognise it as true” (ibid:7).

2.4.2 Text and writer

The equipping view of literature teaching explains why the Kannada literature teacher always carries the burden of the author's biography and history as a necessary part of the text. The text is seen as a way of arriving at something outside it - such as
the worldview of the author, his/her experience of the particular time, etc. Understanding the text has therefore come to mean explaining it in terms of the author's intuitions, convictions and socio-political background. This attitude is so pervasive that we are conditioned to think that this is a natural way of reading the text. Hence we find ourselves always asking questions like "What does the author mean by this?" or "Has this idea been successfully conveyed by the writer?" The assumption that reading a text necessarily and only means reading it in relation to its author and his world comes through clearly in the following statement articulating the goal of teaching Old Kannada texts.

(8) "Giving a proper expression to the similarities and contrasts that prevail between literature and social environment, while enunciating the way in which the poets have responded to specific religious, social, political contexts (constitutes the goal of KLT at advanced levels)" (Gopalakrishnaiah 1985).

Therefore it is not accidental that the commonest way of writing about literature focusses on the author, his chronological development across works, as seen
in titles such as 'Yeats: The Man and His Work. We would rather trust the 'teller' than the 'tale'

2.4.3 **Text and meaning**

Given this preoccupation with commenting on a literary work in relation to its writer, reading the work naturally becomes a quest for the writer's intended meaning. Generally the best reading of a work is considered to be that which approximates most closely to that of the writer. We find attempts to read this meaning in the stated intentions of the author, which are often available in prefaces, biographies, autobiographies and other public sources. At other times, mostly in the case of contemporary writers, an attempt is made to find this 'guarantee of the meaning' (Belsey 1980: 18) of the text in the world we all know or in the author's perception of the world we know. This search for the 'guarantee' of the text's meaning leads us towards a single meaning, the meaning of the text. As teachers of literature, we feel particularly secure with definite and single meanings, understandably, as it suits our conveniences of teaching and testing.
There is also the related notion of the 'complete' meaning or a full understanding of the text. In our attempt to arrive at the meaning of the text, i.e., the 'right' meaning of the text (rightness being judged against the yardstick of the writer's intentions), it is logical that exhaustiveness of interpretation and knowledge about the text become criteria for judging the adequacy of the meaning. This again has enormous appeal to the teacher's sense of 'grading' while evaluating an answer. Hence we customarily find long introductions (often longer than the discussion on the text itself) in most approaches to literary texts, inside and outside the literature classroom.

2.4.4 Text as content

Literary texts in the equipping view of literature teaching become "commodities which the readers consume." (Barthes, quoted by Belsey 1980: 125). The 'spiritual' value which this commodity carries, usually seen as universal and eternal, inheres in the text itself; and the reading process is seen as a transmission agent which mysteriously conveys this value to the reader. "The literary text is not seen as a construct, the result of a process, but as the natural reflection
of the world it delineates or the spontaneous expression of its author's subjectivity" (Belsey 1980: 126). Belsey argues that because conventional criticism mystifies the process of the production of the text, it can only gaze in awe at the 'finished product' and so it becomes parasitic on literature and therefore unproductive. And she concludes (ibid: 127) "Ultimately expressive realist criticism can only reproduce the 'experience' of reading the text, and then comment, "yes, that's how it is, I feel it", or "that is not it at all".

The literary work is therefore widely treated on a par with history, as yet another source of data or information on the milieu of the writer's time and its cultural values. So the theme or content of the work is seen as all important. We find ourselves typically asking questions such as "What do Dickens' novels offer on the picture of his times?" which reflects our obsession with thinking of the work solely in relation to its writer. As a result we provide, without even doubting the validity of it, paraphrases of the works or translations of the work from one genre to another and from one dialect to another. In answer to a questionnaire on the study of Old Kannada works (Ankana 1980), six out of nine contemporary Kannada critics/teachers support the
notion of simplifying the original text by converting what is originally poetry into prose and translating it from Old Kannada into modern Kannada. Mugali (1980: 3) writes

(9) "The question of how Old Kannda literature should reach the common man could be breifly answered thus: by providing anthologies containing the best of such literature; and by supplementing them with simple prose translations and ample explicatory material".

Kanavi (1980: 5) writes

(10) "We can take these classics to the common man through good prose translations as also through arranging lectures by scholars who are capable of communicating the poetic beauty of these texts".

Seetharamaiah (1980: 6) opines

(11) "The great classics of yore should be made available to the public along with supplementary materials such as glossaries, simple interpretations, notes which render considerable assistance in explicating the texts and in recognising their literary merits".

Only three of the nine writers protest against this position and the strongest statement comes from Venkatasubbaiah (1980: 9)
(12) "Translating Old Kannada classics into modern Kannada is a unique insult and dishonour to those texts. It is an extremely competent technique of depriving the people of the beauty of Old Kannada texts."

The assumptions underlying the view expressed by the majority of writers in this debate has led to the practice of using substitute texts, thus denying primacy to the original text. This view of literature therefore results in reducing a literary text to its paraphrasable content, to the total exclusion of any consideration of the form/structure/language of the work in which and through which the writer has constructed his particular vision or message.

2.5 Implications of the equipping model for a view of literature teaching

2.5.1 Methodology

Within the framework of the equipping model, notions about how literature should be taught are very consistent with notions about what constitutes literature. Following from the definition that literature is 'a slice of life', literature teaching considers its main area of operation to be life and ways of living. But because the meaning and experience of life is different for different people, there is a large area of the subjective in any interpretation and discussion of literature. Teachers have intuitively
known this basic character of literature and hence have resisted any notion of a method, seen as an attempt to curb this subjectivity. The text becomes a peg on which teachers hang their favourite theories on life and literature and the classroom serves as a platform for the personal expression of the teacher. The fact that the same text often provides the basis for the expression of very different, frequently opposing, worldviews explains the widespread association of impressionism, vagueness, lack of rigour and 'the gift of the gab' (in more common parlance) with literature teaching. In short, literature teaching does not enjoy the status of a respectable discipline.

Secondly, because the text is seen as a repository of cultural values (as most of the prescribed texts are conventionally, highly valued texts titled 'classics'), an aura of mystery and sacredness surrounds these texts. Any 'cold-blooded', analytic work is seen to militate against the sanctity of the work. Therefore the teacher, in order to preserve this sanctity, puts the text on a pedestal and talks about the text, around the text and about what has conventionally been accepted and appreciated as the meaning/value of the text. This has created a well-established set of canonical texts and a body of received interpretations, whose value for pedagogy has never been questioned.
Also because the literary work is always considered in relation to its writer, literary study has come to be equated with the study of various writers, and with any and all information about their life and works. In addition, literary study has had to take responsibility for cultural education, particularly at the college level. After S.S.L.C., students branch out into various specialisations like the Sciences, Humanities and Commerce and at this level they do not study general subjects like History or Social Sciences (except the Arts students who for these subjects). In the absence of subjects like Social Studies, which could have shared the burden of disseminating cultural awareness, literary study has had to shoulder this extra responsibility. This accounts for the tendency among teachers to use the literary text as a forum for dealing with cultural aspects.

Describing the teaching of Old Kannada texts at the advanced levels, Narayana (1980a: 31) writes

(13) "Since only excerpts from Old Kannada literature are prescribed, the student does not have to acquaint himself with the whole text. Indeed, there is no motivation for him to study the entire work. Nothing more than a perusal of the prescribed texts is called for. A study of critical works written on the
selected texts will suffice. This is revealed by the fact that critical material is in greater demand in libraries than the original texts."

This description applies just as aptly to the teaching of any text and we can therefore generalize that dealing with a text necessarily involves dealing with the literary criticism on the text. Such an equation between literary study and reading 'books on books on books' was not very prevalent in the model offered by the Pundit Approach. This practice is attributed to the influence of English literature teaching on Kannada teaching (private communication: K. ram. Nagaraja, Tharanath 1985). Masthi (1968) describes one of his English literature teachers, thus

(14) "Mr. Hunter taught us Shakespearean drama. His mode of teaching was different in that he assumed that students were conversant with the play (Tempest). A student who was not thus armed could not understand anything. It was not as if this mode of teaching was confined to the post-graduate students. Even the honours students had to go through the same rigamarole. My understanding of the situation is that students did not derive any benefit from these lessons. Probably this is why most of
Good teaching in this framework, then, is dependent on the level of information/knowledge that a teacher brings to bear on the text, while the text itself recedes to the background. All these factors together have led to a situation in which literature teaching is not distinguished from the teaching of other subject areas. The literary text is seen to be on a par with the science or the history text in that both are considered to be pieces of information or content. In the teaching of the science text, the entire focus is on transferring the concepts/notions to the learners; and the teacher, if he has to, uses various means to do this - rephrasing, simplifying, translating the content/facts of the text. The same approach is taken to the literary text and the same processes of simplification are adopted, thus leading to the creation of 'substitute texts', described earlier in the chapter.

2.5.2 Aims and Objectives
A statement about aims and objectives should ideally precede a statement of methodology. But as pointed out in Chapter I, the issue of objectives is sidetracked within KLT. It is either taken for granted and left
unstated; or when stated, it is done in unclear and inexplicit terms. In this section, we shall attempt to understand the objectives of KLT as it is practised, by taking the inferred methodological model to its logical end. This indirect reconstruction might give us a more authentic picture of the objectives that the equipping model operates with.

Literary texts are seen as important in their role as carriers of cultural values and consequently the text has become a means to the larger end of educating students about our cultural heritage. It is assumed that these values are unambiguously in the text for anyone who reads it; it is further assumed that that value is the same for every reader and hence the attempt to move towards a single and complete meaning, the adequacy of which is measured against the writer's, intended meaning. Even when a plurality of meanings is conceded now and then, the focus is still on the meaning or the product of reading the text, and not the process employed in arriving at that meaning. If some students manage to grasp the method behind the interpretations presented, it is quite by chance and not as a result of principled teaching in which this element is systematically built in.
The objective of teaching in such a model is to help the learners to understand and interpret the writer's message, seen as the source of the value, contained in the finite number of texts prescribed for study. The approach believes in enriching learners' interpretation of the text by providing directly, more sophisticated and exhaustive interpretations which they themselves could never produce. The assumption here is that if the objective of literature teaching is to help learners to interpret/evaluate the text better, then, it is best and most easily done by actually spoonfeeding or equipping them with the better interpretations or evaluations of the teacher himself or with other sources such as literary criticism.

2.5.3 The teacher and the critic role identity in the equipping model

As KLC has predominantly concerned itself with text interpretations and evaluation, KLT has drawn from it extensively. Earlier in the thesis, we have shown that KLC and KLT have shared a cyclic relationship with one another, and that it was a historical fact that most critics were also teachers. As a result, it is possible for us to conclude that such a role identity between the teacher and the critic is purely a curious fact of history. But within the equipping framework, given the aim of supplying students with better interpretations,
the teacher would still be drawing from the critic (even if the historical coincidence had not occurred) as the critic is more likely to come up with better interpretations than the teacher. The point being argued here is that the role identity between the teacher and the critic is not merely historical but conceptual as well, the equation being, the teacher is to the learner inside the classroom what the critic is to his reader outside it.

2.6 Reasons for the prevalence of the equipping model

At this point we need to understand why it is that the equipping model, which over-simplifies the essentially complex processes of learning, is so deep-rooted in our culture, and accepted and nourished by it so widely. There is an entire spectrum of reasons ranging from inherent cultural traits to very specific educational situations. However in this discussion, we shall restrict ourselves to the educational end of the spectrum.

Education itself can be seen as an instrument for the perpetuation of those cultural values which maintain the status quo in our society. Accordingly it is considered important to provide the kind of education which would guide learners towards cultural conformity, monism
rather than cultural diversity and plurality.

Identifying this tendency towards convergence and conformity in the context of our selection of textbooks, R.K. Manipal (1984: 33) writes

(15) "We need to remind ourselves time and again that our syllabuses, text-books, teaching and evaluation are (in fact) in tune with the aims and objectives of our education system and that these aims and objectives are in turn controlled by the vested interests of our class-based society.

Thus we can declare without any hesitation that our education has become a cruel instrument which demands an unquestioned acceptance of whatever is imposed upon us. It converts us into slaves of a tyrannical culture".

But even while arguing against the equipping notion of education, the solution that R.K. Manipal proposes argues only for an alternate set of facts/texts to equip learners with rather than against the notion of equipping itself. Consider, for instance, these comments on the primary school text-book:

(16) "As soon as the student enters a primary school the text welcomes him with 'Isha' and 'Ganapa' rather than 'Patra' and 'Choma'. The bullock
carts driven by his father and other elders become untouchable in his text book. On the other hand, the chariot of the village deity beckons him with enticing charm. The labourers who toil in the fields and factories are replaced by a smiling sage, ever ready to give his blessings and boons" (ibid : '2).

Here one set of facts/aspects which are considered alien/elitist are set up against another set which are considered more familiar, more 'easy to relate to' and it is argued that the latter are more desirable items to provide to the students. Hence instead of making a radical critique of the equipping model, this position only argues for a different set of values for imposition.

Freire, who does make a radical critique of the 'banking concept of education', writes "In this view, man is not a conscious being; he is rather the possessor of a consciousness; an 'empty' 'mind' passively open to the reception of deposits of reality from the world outside" (1972 : 49). In the 'banking'/equipping' view of education, therefore, reality is seen as a static, unchanging entity over which the individual consciousness has no control. Consequently education becomes a process
by which individuals are trained to accept reality as it is rather than to question or alter it.

2.1 Summary
If education is seen as an instrument to perpetuate conventional values, we need to examine how such a view is translated into a literary pedagogy. In this approach, the objective of teaching literature is to develop in the learners a taste for literature, commonly referred to as 'literary sensibility'. Sensibility and taste are considered unchanging and eternal, free from the constraints of time and space. Consequently literary study has focussed on training learners to conform to what is conventionally accepted and valued as 'literary' and tasteful. Thus literary training has come to mean informing learners about what constitutes classics in the literature and about established literary critical opinion on these texts.

Given this emphasis on knowledge, the teacher is seen as the source of all information on the literary text and the student as the receiver of this information. The process of teaching itself consists of transmitting the meaning of the text and knowledge about it, orally through lectures and in writing, through 'notes' meant to facilitate performance in the examination. As we have seen, the teacher provides a paraphrase along with his interpretation which is more often than not an echo of one
of the following sources, depending on the calibre of the teacher - the author's claimed/intended meaning; the interpretation of a well-established critic; the one provided by the text-book writer as 'notes' for the lesson, or the interpretation provided in a popular 'guide'. The learner who is usually not required to read and make sense of the text by himself simply accepts these interpretations imposed by the teacher and reproduces them in the examination. The examiner who is instructed to expect a 'generalized' answer from individual testees (implicit in the provision of a model answer' as a yardstick for assessment) gives maximum marks to answers close to the model answer, thus streamlining the possibility of personal response and varying interpretations.

As a result our students of literature, at least a considerable number of them, are unable to read a literary text on their own and arrive at a plausible interpretation. Adiga writes about this (1980 : 28-9):

(17) "But the most shameful thing is that even post-graduates in Kannada are incapable of appreciating an Old Kannada classic by reading it according to its metrical norms. ... Our syllabus should enable learners to become competent readers of Old, Medieval and Modern Kannada poetry by the time they become matriculates!"
As our students have not been trained in reading and interpreting a text, and in articulating their personal responses and questions, they are content to accept the interpretation provided by the teacher, thus abandoning their own groping attempts at understanding. Ramadas, who goes beyond the literature classroom and rightly attributes this passivity and inaction to larger cultural forces, writes (1975: 52):

(18) "It is ridiculous to expect our students
to develop a rational and critical outlook while forcibly imposing upon them the inert ideas of a stagnant and static culture. Students who are barely literate wax eloquent about Kannada language and literature. The fact that even a simple novel is beyond their comprehension; that they abhor the very idea of reading is a sad commentary not merely on our text books. It is a harbinger of the downfall of a culture which is socially irrelevant."

Having shown how the equipping model which aims at conformity is not educationally a viable proposition in the context of literature teaching, we shall explore an alternate model for KLT in the next chapter.
CHAPTER II: Notes

(1) संक्षेप नमको मनोभाव सुन्दर हम १२ दिना... लगभग दूसरे
समयंका नेपाल ज्ञात थिए। किन्तु आफ्नो भविष्यका मार्गमा आफ्नो
परम्परागत स्वाभाविक नेपालमा इशुल पैरोस्त्रो आफ्नो भविष्यका
पृथकपृथक दृष्टिलाई आफ्नो सम्बन्धमा अजाना ? (केस 1975: 33)

(2) यह मुख्यतः ६० वर्षसार्वजनिक मानवीय इतिहासका अनुसार
जानकारी संक्षेपी रूपमा व्यक्त हुने। यसलाई मृत्युप्रकाशका माध्यम
उपयोग गर्न सकिन्छ तथा, रात्रिजलका माध्यमले प्रसारित गर्न सकिन्छ।
(सार्वजनिक ो 1958:3)

(3) सुचारु ललित ललितका संग्रहमा नेपालका वित्तीय अवस्था
अनुसारमा... लगभग नेपालका वित्तीय अवस्था हो। तस्बिर वित्तीय अवस्था
नेपालका साझेदारीको हाल र उद्योगको हाल जोडिएको हो।
मात्र वित्तीय अवस्था मानवीय इतिहासका माध्यमले प्रसारित गर्न
सकिन्छ तथा इतिहासका माध्यमले प्रसारित गर्न सकिन्छ। कारण सरकार
लोकसम्पर्कमा इतिहासका माध्यमले प्रसारित गर्न सकिन्छ। (केस 1964: iii)

(4) का संवृत्तताले वाग्निको अनुसार, आफ्नो पेशाका अर्थक्रममा आफ्नो
पेशाको अर्थक्रममा आफ्नो पेशाको (मुख्यत: तथा तथा तथा तथा तथा)

(5) सफल तथा असफल नेपालको वित्तीय अवस्था, वित्तीय अवस्था,
राजनीतिक आधार प्रमुख राजनीतिक आधार, राजनीतिक आधार प्रमुख
राजनीतिक आधार प्रमुख राजनीतिक आधार प्रमुख राजनीतिक आधार प्रमुख
राजनीतिक आधार प्रमुख राजनीतिक आधार प्रमुख राजनीतिक आधार (केस 1984)
(6) ಸಾಮ್ರಾಜ್ಯ "ಗಳು" ಸ್ಥಳದ "ವನ್ನು" ಸಾಮರ್ಪಿಕಸಾಗಿಸಿ... ಗಾತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ
ಪ್ರಭಾವವು ಅಂತ್ಯವಾಗಿತ್ತದೆ. ಅಂದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಮೂಲತಃ ಕಾರ್ಯ
ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧನವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ... ಸಂದರ್ಭ
ವಿವರಣೆಗೆ ತುಂಗಭದ್ರ ಸಾರ್ವತ್ರಿಕ ಸಮಸ್ಯಾಸ್ಥ್ಯ ಕಾಲೇಜ್ ಅಂದರೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿ
ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಅಪೂರ್ವಮೈತ್ರೆ ಸಹಾಯಕರು ಅತ್ಯಂತ ಆಧ್ಯತ್ಮ ಅಂದರೆ ಗರ್ಭದಾದ್ಯ
ಇಂಧನ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯ ಮೊದಲಾದದ್ದೆ ಎಂದು ವಿಜ್ಞಾನಿಸಿದರೆ ಮನಃ.
ಅಂದರೆ ಸ್ವತತ್ವ ಮೂಲಕ ವಿಭಿನ್ನ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಗಳು ಅಂತ್ಯವಾಗುವ. ೧೦.೦೦ ಕೋಟಿಯ ಅನುಕೂಲಿತ
ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕ ಪ್ರಮುಖ ಅಂತ್ಯ ಅಂತ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಲೋಗುಡು. (ಸೋಮಾರ್ 1984).

(7) ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಶ್ವಸಿತವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕಿಸಿದರೆ ಎರಡು ವ್ಯಾತಿತವಾಗಿ?

(8) ಒಂದು ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಮತ್ತು ದೃಢವಾದ, ಸಮಾಧಾನೀಯ ಅಥವಾ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಲ್ಲದ
ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ತಾರು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ, ಅಥವಾ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥನಗುಣ
ಪ್ರ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ, ವಿಭಿನ್ನ ಪ್ರಮಾಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೆಯ್ಮನ್ ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಅಥವಾ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಲ್ಲದ
ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯಾದರೂ (ಸೋಮಾರ್ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯ, 1985)

(9) "ಆಡಾ" ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಸಾಮರ್ಪಿಕ ಸ್ಥಳ, ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲೊಂದು ಎರಡು ಸಾಧ್ಯ
ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಿಗೆ ತಿಳುವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದು ಸಾಧ್ಯ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು
ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳು, ಅಂತ್ಯಆರ್ಥಿಕ ವೈಶಿಷ್ಟ್ಯತ್ತು, ಸದ್ಯ ಸಾಮರ್ಪಿಕಸಾಗಿಸಿತು.
(ಭೂತಕ 1980:3)
(15) समग्रे नेत्र जीर्ण दृष्टि ज्योतिषपतिपासून, भारतीय साहित्यात वर्णनात नेत्राश्रयी, समग्रे नेत्र शैलीत्रांमध्ये दिसते. भारतातील साहित्यात, ती तीन कुपल चर्चेः नेत्राश्रयी यांचे वर्णन. समग्रे नेत्र तीन अटाल्या सुमारे तीन ऑनलाइन नेत्राश्रयी नववर्णन. ती नेत्राश्रयी मुख्य अर्थात् अंतर्गत यांचे वर्णन नेत्राश्रयी अथवा शैलीत्रांमध्ये दिसते. समग्रे नेत्र एक दिलास म्हणजेच नेत्राश्रयी.
(विकास 1984: 33)

(16) स्वयंचर क्षेत्रीय शैलीत्रांमध्ये माणूसांना सुमारे तीन नेत्राश्रयी जाती. समग्रे नेत्र शैलीत्रांमध्ये दिसते. आजपर्यंत 'श्लोकाश्रयी' अश, शुद्धता अश, अपावद अश एकठी तंत्रांमध्ये सुमारे तीन नेत्राश्रयी जाती. समग्रे नेत्र 'श्लोकाश्रयी' अश, शुद्धता 'श्लोकाश्रयी' अश, अपावद अश एकठी तंत्रांमध्ये सुमारे तीन नेत्राश्रयी जाती. शुद्धता 'श्लोकाश्रयी' अश, अपावद अश एकठी तंत्रांमध्ये सुमारे तीन नेत्राश्रयी जाती.
(विकास 1984: 12)

(17) सातवें शतकाच्या सर्वांतर्गत नेत्राश्रयी 'श्लोकाश्रयी' अश, शुद्धता अश, अपावद अश एकठी तंत्रांमध्ये सुमारे तीन नेत्राश्रयी जाती. सातवें शतकाच्या सर्वांतर्गत नेत्राश्रयी 'श्लोकाश्रयी' अश, शुद्धता अश, अपावद अश एकठी तंत्रांमध्ये सुमारे तीन नेत्राश्रयी जाती. सातवें शतकाच्या सर्वांतर्गत नेत्राश्रयी 'श्लोकाश्रयी' अश, शुद्धता अश, अपावद अश एकठी तंत्रांमध्ये सुमारे तीन नेत्राश्रयी जाती.
(विकास 1980: 28-9)
(18) ಇದು ಸೌಲಭ್ಯವನ್ನು ಹಾಸುಸಹಾಯದ ಮೂಲಕ ಸರ್ವೇಕ್ಷಣದ ಸಾಮರ್ಥ್ಯವನ್ನು ಬೆಳೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಹಾಸುಸಹಾಯದ ಪ್ರಾಪ್ತಿಯೊಂದಿಗೆ ಶೀಲಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಕಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಕವೊಂದು, ಸಾಮರ್ಥ್ಯವನ್ನು ಬೆಳೆಸಲು ಸಾಧಾರಣವಾಗಿ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಕನನ್ನು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಾಮರ್ಥ್ಯವನ್ನು ಬೆಳೆಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ... ಇದು ನಿತ್ಯ - ನಿತ್ಯ ಮೇಳವನ್ನು ಸಂತಾನಾನುಷ್ಟಿಯ ವಿಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಳೆಸುವುದು ಮತ್ತು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾದ ಸಹಾಯದ ವಿಧಗಳಾಗಿ ಮೇಳವನ್ನು ಸಂತಾನಾನುಷ್ಟಿಯ ವಿಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಳೆಸುವುದು. ಇದನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ಅನುಪ್ರೇಕ್ಷಣೆಯು ಮತ್ತು ಹಾಸುಸಹಾಯದ ಪ್ರಕಟದ ಮೇಲೆ ಸಂತಾನಾನುಷ್ಟಿಯ ವಿಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಳೆಸುವುದು. ಸಾಮರ್ಥ್ಯವನ್ನು ಬೆಳೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯನ್ನು ಸಂಯೋಜಿಸುವುದು, ಸಾಮರ್ಥ್ಯವನ್ನು ಬೆಳೆಸುವುದು. ಸೌಲಭ್ಯದ ವಿಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಳೆಸುವುದು.