

The Influence of Locality, Training and Teaching Experience on the Approaches to Teaching Literature

Ashairi Suliman

Department of Education Leadership and Policy
Faculty of Education
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
Malaysia

Melor Md Yunus

Department of Innovation in Teaching and Learning
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
Malaysia.

Mohamed Yusoff Mohd Nor

Department of Education Leadership and Policy
Faculty of Education
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
Malaysia

Abstract

Teaching and learning literature could be a daunting task for both instructors and learners. It requires teachers to employ suitable approaches and methodologies to ensure the effectiveness of the lesson. This serves as the main purpose of this study which is to discover the approaches employed by literature teachers. In addition, three significant dimensions will also be scrutinised which are locality, literature training and teaching experience. Utilizing questionnaire as the research instrument, this study involved 271 teachers as the respondents. Comparisons pertaining to the approaches employed based on locality, training and teaching experience were shown in the findings. To note, the majority of the respondents were found to be in favor of using simple terminologies as the most preferred approach. Meanwhile, the least favored approach was eliciting information from students. In addition, out of the three main variables, only teaching experience was found to show no significant difference. To summarise, locality, training and teaching experience may have significantly impacted teachers in selecting the approaches to be employed in a literature lesson. This may also assist in ensuring that the teaching and learning of literature reach its visions.

Keywords: English literature, approaches to teaching literature, literature training, locality, teaching experience

Cite as: Suliman, A., Yunus, M. M., & Nor, M. Y. M. (2019). The Influence of Locality, Training and Teaching Experience on the Approaches to Teaching Literature. *Arab World English Journal*, 10 (1) 31- 46.

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol10no1.3>

Introduction

In the English language subject, literature is an inevitable element embedded in its curriculum. It is regarded to be a form of art, combining the expression of meaning and linguistic repertoire. Chen (2012) asserts that literature enhances and nurtures the cultural knowledge of an individual as the inter-relation between language, culture and literature is prevalent and significant. Furthermore, it transforms a contextual form into abstract imagination by means of wonderful poetic devices. Similarly, Carter and Long (1991) believe that due to its importance in language learning, literature aids in developing students' cultural knowledge. Holding to these two premises, the association between language and literature is crucial as they complement each other in the learning process.

It is interesting to note that a number of countries in which English is not their official language have integrated the teaching of English literature in their schools. Novianti (2016) affirms that English literature study in Indonesia is highly inseparable from English language studies, and it does not differ much from other countries, where English is a foreign language. Chen (2012) points out that there is a reform and opening-up in promoting the teaching of literature besides learning English in China though it is less promising in the country. On top of that, Njagi, Muriungi & Peter (2014); Okwara, Shiundu & Indoshi (2009) affirm that English teaching as well as Literature teaching in Kenya are taught simultaneously via an integrated approach, implying that Literature would be the means of teaching English and vice versa. Other countries executing similar discipline include Turkey (Saka, 2014), Bangladesh (Farjana, 2016) and Romania (Padurean, 2015).

The wave is also indisputable in Malaysia. English literature has been made a compulsory component in the teaching of English syllabus since 2000. The literature component which is perceived as a means to elevate the proficiency level among Malaysian students encompasses various genres such as poem, short stories, drama and novel (Yusof, Lazim & Salehuddin, 2017; Suliman & Yunus, 2014). Two primary objectives demonstrated via the teaching of the component are engaging learners with enjoyable literary texts suitable to their language proficiency and enhancing creativity in being expressive. Muthusamy et al. (2017) state that the teaching and learning of literature in Malaysia is fast becoming a recognized force in acquiring language proficiency. Learning literature indirectly assists in developing English language mastery. Learners will be introduced to new words and poetic devices which are rarely uttered in daily conversations besides being able to explore different settings portrayed in the literary texts. These are some of the beautiful elements gained by learning literature.

Teaching literature might be easy as it is associated with language teaching as asserted by Chalikendy (2015) and Violetta-Irene (2015). However, this view is opposed by Novianti (2016) who claims that teaching canonical texts poses many challenges and needs to be undertaken well. On top of that, literature teaching would still pose a big challenge to schools as faced by teachers and students (Ortells, 2013; Tuncer & Kizildag, 2014). Even though literature is associated with language learning, there will be difficulties if suitable approaches and methodologies are not employed. This requires teachers to arm themselves with the skills needed to teach literature. The methodologies and approaches might differ from what is practiced in the language lessons because as claimed by Padurean (2015), English Literature should be approached differently since the

language used is too complicated. Hence, teaching approaches, methods and strategies employed in teaching literature should be suitable, varied, innovative and effective to maximize the teaching process (Chen, 2012; Yunus & Suliman, 2014; Hussein & Al-Emami, 2016; Muthusamy et al., 2017).

Teaching and learning foreign literature could be a daunting task for both the instructors and learners (Hussein & Al-Emami, 2016). This affirms that literature teaching and learning requires a distinguishable method for it to be mastered. Though it may be similar to language teaching and learning, the pedagogical and methodological aspects vary. As the use of literal meanings is common in literature, it may require special assistance from teachers to assist students' understanding. As revealed by Yunus and Suliman (2014), teachers lack ideas in making a literature lesson meaningful, and this is supported by Muthusamy et al. (2017) whose study showed that most teachers claimed that teaching literature is the most difficult thing to do. On the contrary, students might face difficulties to fathom a literary text as a result of limited language mastery as affirmed by Novianti (2016) and Sunardi et al. (2018), that limited language proficiency impedes students in understanding literary texts especially classical ones. In detail, the most common problem is the teachers' uneasiness to cope with a wide range of genres (poetry, novel, short stories, and drama) besides the absence of training in literature and the issue of literary jargon mastery (Berrarbi & Bahous, 2018). This leads to the foundation of this study. Locality, training and teaching experience are imperative in influencing teachers' approaches to teaching literature. This study intends to answer the following research questions:

- a. What is the comparison in the teaching approaches employed based on locality, training and teaching experience?
- b. What is the relationship between locality and teaching approaches employed?
- c. What is the relationship between training and teaching approaches employed?
- d. What is the relationship between teaching experience and teaching approaches employed?

Literature Review

Moody as cited in Hwang and Embi (2007) explains that the relevance of an approach is "to provide a framework, a sequence of operations to be used when we come to actualities". The right approach will aid teachers' teaching which in return leads to students' better understanding. There is a link between approaches and types of activities conducted in literature lesson. Whenever a teacher uses a suitable approach, it may affect students' interest in and comprehension of the lesson. Especially in the context of second language, literature should be taught using a different pedagogical approach for non-native speakers (Padurean, 2015). Therefore, it matters for the teachers to select the appropriate approaches in literature lesson. The four literature teaching approaches are as follows:

Information-based Approach

This approach relies heavily on teachers' giving students the input related to the lesson. According to Carter, as cited in Hwang and Embi (2007), this approach is seen to offer a source of information to the students and a means of imparting knowledge on literature. The teachers are required to provide students the needed input for them to engage in the lesson. Carter and Long (1991) also believe that the approach involves critical concepts, literary conventions, and meta-language which

entitle students to make use of the terms and concepts during their discussion of a literary topic. The input may vary in terms of historical, cultural, political and social aspects apart from the historical background of the text. This highlights the role of the teacher in providing input to the students. Lecturing, reading notes, giving critiques and explaining are among the activities listed under this approach.

Language-based Approach

This approach reiterates what Carter and Long (1991) describe as the Language Model. This approach entitles students' language proficiency and competency to be developed. It exposes students to the language and teachers will then need to introduce the language elements involved. This is seen to be a two-pronged approach in which literary texts cater language activities besides functioning as a source of knowledge and information. Too as cited in Rashid, Vethamani and Rahman (2010), asserts that, with the use of language-based approach, the focus shifted to the learner, the reading process and creating language awareness in the learners. This approach exposes learners to various kinds of language elements such as lexis, syntax, phonology, semantics and graphology. Poetry recital, debate, role play, prediction, ranking tasks and forum are among the suggested activities in this approach since it is more students-centred.

Personal-response Approach

As opposed to information-based approach, this approach emphasises students' roles in learning literature. Hwang and Embi (2007) assert that this approach emphasises on students giving responses about a text. Moreover, as students will have to respond to the issues discussed in the text, their personal development will indirectly be enhanced. The reason is to motivate and encourage students to read by making a connection between the themes of a text and his or her personal life and experiences (Talif, 1995). Students' responses are perceived to be personal as it deals with the affective aspect. For this approach, brainstorming, group discussion, writing students' reactions, question-discussion and journal writing are among the suggested activities.

Paraphrastic Approach

According to Hwang and Embi (2007), this approach deals with the surface of the text. It refers to paraphrasing or re-telling the text in a simpler version. The purpose of this approach is to ease students' understanding apart from translating it into another language. Talif (1995) argues that this approach assists beginners as it aids in formulating an initial idea of a text. In the context of Malaysian classrooms, some foreign literary texts may halt students' understanding as the language used is slightly different from what is commonly uttered. This requires paraphrastic approach to be applied. Hence, the suggested activities are retelling the text in a simpler language, translating using the mother tongue and reading the paraphrased version of the text.

Studies on Literature Approaches

In Romania, Padurean (2015) finds that literature teachers employed less student-centered learning and note-taking was the only student activity. In fact, 43% of the respondents claimed that they were never asked opinion on the text learnt. Farjana (2016) discovers a reliance on teachers and a preference for simplified versions of literary texts. In Malaysia, Hwang and Embi (2007) disclose that the paraphrastic approach was a popular approach to teaching literature among the teachers in their study. However, Rashid, Vethamani, and Rahman (2010) reveal that the information-based

approach was the most popular approach in eighteen secondary schools in Kelantan. Due to students' incompetency of the language, teachers had to resort to spoon-feeding the students in literature lessons.

Sidhu, Chan, and Kaur (2010) inform that teachers spent a lot of time on individual comprehension work, had lesser literary elements integration and lacked creativity in managing learning activities. In addition, Suliman and Yunus (2014) explain that their respondents preferred to use simpler terms in giving explanation as well as probing questions in the teaching process. Yunus and Suliman (2014) as well as Muthusamy et al. (2017) come to disclose that different preferred techniques and approaches in teaching literature such as note-copying, presentation, class discussions and autonomous learning. All these studies have demonstrated that different settings may opt for different approaches in teaching literature.

Locality Factor

The learning of English language in the rural area can be seen challenging because the students might have limited exposure to the target language. The integration of literature serves as a challenge especially to students with low English proficiency, even though it is a promising move in language and literature learning for Malaysian students (MELTA, 2012). Therefore, they face difficulties in learning English language in schools. Suliman and Yunus (2014) argue that the teaching and learning process may be affected by the surrounding the teacher is in. Yang (2014) claims that most rural teachers are young and have just graduated from schools. They might lack working experiences and might be novice in the teaching field. As opposed to schools in the rural area, urban schools recruit more highly qualified teachers and provide greater curricular variety and educational resources (Khattari et al. cited in Freeman & Anderson, 2005). Mahmud and Bray (2017) ascertain that since the costs of living are higher in urban than rural areas, the pressures on urban teachers may be higher and the teachers in turn exert pressures on their students. Furthermore, the quality of teachers is often lower in rural than urban areas because better qualified personnel prefer to live in cities.

In relation to the quality of rural area teachers, Lin (2011) argues that many rural teachers were found to be working in a more mechanical way than allocating time in preparing a lesson using various techniques. This may be due to the lack of facilities in rural schools, leaving teachers to employ more traditional methods in the lesson. This requires critical improvement to better the situation. U.S. Department of Education as cited in Hudson and Hudson (2008) states that rural and remote schools teachers may be isolated, requiring them to be supported, monitored and mentored. This highlights the positive sides of the rural area to the novices by focusing on the pre-service teachers level. This also describes the worrying situation occurring in rural schools which needs to be upgraded and improved.

Trained versus Non-trained

In the teaching of literature, it is deemed crucial for the teachers to equip themselves with proper training so they will be better prepared in teaching. The training encompasses both content knowledge and methodologies in making a lesson meaningful. It was also discovered earlier by Subramaniam, Hamdan and Koo (2003) that only 42% from the 500 respondents assured that they had sufficient methodological skills in teaching literature. Having said that, Yunus and Suliman

(2014) affirm that most respondents in their study relied heavily in getting students to copy notes from resource books. This indicates that teachers lack methodological and pedagogical skills that can be maximised in a literature lesson. Perhaps, this is caused by a lack of training that the teachers are in dire need of. Trainings are not only restricted to those obtained during student teachers' study years. In fact, on-going and continuous trainings are essential as they would be the avenue to disseminate more updated and current skills in teaching literature.

On another note, on-going training may develop the quality of teachers especially for those who are non-option English Language teachers. According to Goh and Kwong, as cited in Bipinchandra, Shah and Aziz (2014), sustained language training programmes are essential to improve the quality of non-option English language teachers. Indubitably, the courses and trainings will enable teachers to arm themselves and refresh their existing knowledge related to literature. Literature requires different ways of teaching, unlike any language lesson. Teachers need to vary their strategies to ensure students are engaged with the lesson. With proper training, teachers may be better in managing the lessons as well as arousing students' interest in literature lesson. Classroom practices are influenced by the interaction between teachers' beliefs and several dimensions such as schooling, professional training and contextual factor (Shah, Othman & Senom, 2017). Hence, getting involved in trainings and courses related to literature is highly recommended to exude a more positive learning environment.

Experienced versus Novice Teachers

It is imperative to get to the literal meaning of experienced and novice teachers. As defined by Hsu (2009), novice teachers are those who are still undergoing training, have just completed training, or have just commenced teaching and still have very little experience behind them. On the other hand, Gatbonton (2008) defines experienced teachers as those with many years of teaching experience behind them, at least four to five years. It can be deduced that novice teachers are new in the teaching field whereas experienced ones would have at least gained a few years of experience in the teaching industry. Novice may also infer to the ones still searching for the solid ground in teaching while at the same seeking assistance from experienced teachers. Abbas and Niloofar (2012) further define qualified teachers as those using their experience as the foundation in the strategies employed besides planning both long-term and short-term plans as opposed to the novices. Novice teachers were also found to see a class as a whole as compared to the experienced who perceived a class as comprising of unique individuals. However, Abbas and Niloofar (2012) mention that both teachers view the effect of motivation on their efficacy indifferently.

Meyer (2003) makes a comparison between experienced and novice teachers. He believes that the novices lack experiences to organise their thinking into useful constructs for making predictions about future events. On the opposite, the experienced teachers have well-developed knowledge bases and organizations that are responsive to multiple external and internal cues and are highly linked allowing for flexible patterns of organization and problem solving. He even adds that, through the strategies employed, novice teachers reinforce their conceptions of prior knowledge and its importance in learning to find out their students' prior knowledge. This opposes the practices of the experienced teachers because experienced teachers act intentionally when they assess their students' prior knowledge. In another view, Hattie (2003) claims that experienced teachers concentrate more on what they are doing and saying in a class, while the novices

concentrate more on students' behaviour. Thus, novices are more focused on students, unlike the experienced ones who perceive classroom management as their fundamental goal. This is agreed by Unal and Unal (2012).

Methodology

The study is quantitative in nature, employing a survey research design. A questionnaire was used in order to obtain the data. The instrument, which is a four-point Likert-scale questionnaire was adapted from Hwang and Embi (2007). The instrument of the study is made up of two sections, demographic profile of the respondents and the approaches employed in teaching literature. There are five questions in the demographic profile of the respondents namely gender, option, locality, teaching experience and literature training. Meanwhile, the construct on the approaches to teaching literature has thirteen items. Overall, there are eighteen questions in the instrument. A pilot study was conducted for reliability of the instrument. Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.88 obtained indicated the reliability of the instrument.

Regarding the samples of the study, 271 secondary school English teachers who teach English literature were invited to be involved in the study. They were selected based on cluster sampling. The data obtained were analysed using a statistical software. Descriptive statistics involving mean and frequency were generated in order for the comparison of each category to be made. Meanwhile, inferential statistics – T-test and ANOVA – were employed to determine the relationship between the variables. This is meant to investigate the differences between all categories and the approaches employed in teaching literature. The results are in the following section.

Findings and Discussions

Demographic Profile of the Respondents

This study involved 271 respondents and their profiles are as follows.

Table 1: *Demographic profile of the respondents*

Category	Sub-category	Number
Locality	Urban	119
	Rural	152
Training	Trained	157
	Not Trained	114
Teaching Experience	1 – 10 years	91
	11 – 20 years	77
	21 years and more	103

Comparison between Urban and Rural Area Teachers in Approaches Employed

Table 2: *Comparison in approaches employed based on locality*

No.	Approaches Employed	Urban Area	Rural Area
1	Elicit information from students about the text	3.07	3.07
2	Explain the content of the text	3.20	3.35
3	Ask students questions to check their understanding	3.21	3.40
4	Provide students with background information of the text	3.13	3.28
5	Encourage students to relate the text to their personal experiences	3.23	3.34
6	Elicit students' responses to the text	3.19	3.25
7	Encourage students to express feelings towards the issues in the text	3.18	3.30
8	Guide students to express opinions towards the text	3.13	3.30
9	Set language activities in the lesson	3.08	3.15
10	Generate language practice using the text	3.09	3.11
11	Re-tell the text to help students' understanding	3.20	3.32
12	Get students to tell the storyline of the text	3.10	3.21
13	Use simple terminologies to explain about the text	3.32	3.42

Table 2 shows the mean score for the approaches employed by teachers based on locality. It is prevalent that rural area teachers have higher mean score in comparison to urban teachers. In detail, teachers from the urban area were more interested to use simple terminologies to explain about the texts. This is also reflected in rural area teachers' findings. For the second most preferred approach, urban area teachers were in favour of encouraging students to relate a text to their personal experiences and asking students questions was ranked third. On the other hand, rural teachers' second most preferred approach was asking students questions while explaining the content of a text appeared to be the third most preferred approach. Regarding the lowest scoring item, both groups showed that eliciting information from students about the text was the least favoured approach. In fact, the other two lowest scoring items were similar, setting language activities and generating language practice using the text, which were ranked twelfth and eleventh. To prove the difference between the two localities and the approaches employed, the table below reveals the result.

The Relationship between Approaches Employed and Locality

Table 3: *T-Test result on locality factor*

Scale	Locality	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-Value	Sig.
Approaches Employed	Urban	119	3.164	.305	2.767	.006
	Rural	152	3.270	.322		

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the approaches employed by the respondents in terms of locality. There was a significant difference in the scores for the teachers in the urban area (mean=3.164, s.d.=.305) and those in the rural area (mean=3.270, s.d.=.322); ($t=2.767$, $p=.006$).

It is interesting to note that rural area teachers were more positive with the approaches in literature lesson. This finding opposes Mahmud and Bray (2017), who state that the quality of teachers is often lower in rural than urban areas because better qualified personnel prefer to live in cities. The findings are in line to Yang (2014) who claims that rural area teachers are commonly the novices who have been teaching for a few years. This may imply that they are very enthusiastic about teaching and willing to try various approaches that may suit their teaching best. Their ideas and suggestions may differ from the urban area teachers who are more into traditional pedagogical skills as proposed by Khattri et al. as cited in Freeman and Anderman (2005). This may also be reflected in the findings through the second most favoured approach by the urban area teachers, encouraging students to relate a text to their personal experiences. As they are more experienced in teaching, they can utilize this approach better, unlike the rural area teachers who might lack experience.

Talif (1995) proposes that using simple terminologies assists novice teachers as it aids in formulating an initial idea of a text. In addition, Berrarbi and Bahous (2018) assert that students are less encouraged to be exposed to linguistically or culturally complex texts by teachers. For students who have just started learning literature, they need something light and easy to read and comprehend. As literature revolves around poetic and literary devices which are uncommon among the students, teachers need to explain the text in a simpler version that could ease students' understanding. This further supports Carter and Long (1991) who claim that literature is teacher-centred in which teachers pass knowledge and information to the students. Hence, using simple terminologies in explaining a text is crucial for the benefits of the teaching and learning process. In relation to this, explaining the content of a text was also found to be among the favoured approaches to teaching literature in the context of this study.

Comparison between Trained and Non-Trained Teachers in Approaches Employed

Table 4: *Comparison in approaches employed based on training*

No.	Approaches Employed	Trained	Non
1	Elicit information from students about the text	3.12	3.01
2	Explain the content of the text	3.38	3.15
3	Ask students questions to check their understanding	3.43	3.17
4	Provide students with background information of the text	3.33	3.07
5	Encourage students to relate text to their personal experiences	3.38	3.17
6	Elicit students' responses to the text	3.30	3.11
7	Encourage students to express feelings towards the issues in the text	3.35	3.11
8	Guide students to express opinions towards the text	3.31	3.11

9	Set language activities in the lesson	3.16	3.06
10	Generate language practice using the text	3.14	3.05
11	Re-tell the text to help students' understanding	3.34	3.18
12	Get students to tell the storyline of the text	3.30	3.07
13	Use simple terminologies to explain about the text	3.45	3.27

Based on table 4, it is prevalent that those trained in literature were more positive with their approaches in literature lesson. It is interesting to note that though those trained were more positive with their approaches, both groups shared similar preferred approach. They agreed that using simple terminologies in explaining a text is a highly favoured approach in teaching literature. The trained group in addition also favoured asking student questions, explaining the content of the text and encouraging students to relate the text to their personal experiences. It also appeared similar for the non-trained group except for explaining the content of the text approach as they opted for re-telling the text to help students' understanding as their second most favoured approach. Both trained and non-trained teachers also showed that eliciting information from students about the text, setting language activities and generating language practice using the text are the three least favoured literature approaches. The significant difference between the two groups is shown in the following table.

The Relationship between Approaches Employed and Literature Training

Table 5: *T-Test result on training factor*

Scale	Literature Training	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-Value	Sig.
Approaches Employed	Yes	157	3.301	.327	5.022	.000
	No	114	3.117	.275		

Similarly, an independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the approaches employed by the respondents who have received literature training and those who have not. There exists a significant difference in the scores for the teachers with literature training (mean=3.301, s.d.=.327) and those without literature training (mean=3.117, s.d.=.275); ($t=5.022$, $p=.000$).

In comparing between those who have received literature training and those who have not, it appears that training indirectly prepares the teacher better. This is concurrent with MELTA (2012), that attending plays and literary events would indirectly add to literature teachers' experience. Furthermore, the Ministry of Education Malaysia (2013) encourages teachers to attend courses as trainings enable teachers to constantly develop their skills to the competency level expected of a teacher. This emphasises the critical need for teachers to arm themselves with the current and updated knowledge pertaining to teaching and learning which can be acquired through trainings. In addition, MELTA (2012) reports that due to the lack of training besides not majoring in literature itself, many English teachers were found to have low confidence in teaching the component.

Another favoured approach to teaching literature as shown by the respondents of this study is asking students questions as a means to check their understanding. Questioning approach is vital

as it helps teachers to identify the students' progress. As disclosed by Rashid, Vethamani and Rahman (2010), this approach is the avenue for teachers to countercheck students' learning process. Furthermore, it assists teachers to be more reflective on their teaching strategies. Students' responses may serve as indicators on the effectiveness of a lesson. Hwang and Embi (2007) also reveal that this approach emphasises on the students' giving responses about a text. Teachers should make full use of this approach as it is the platform for them to observe the effectiveness of their teaching. Moreover, the questioning approach is also prevalent in Sidhu, Chan and Kaur (2010); Suliman and Yunus (2014); Yunus and Suliman (2014).

Comparison between Teaching Experiences in Approaches Employed

Table 6: *Comparison in approaches employed based on teaching experience*

No.	Approaches Employed	1-10	11-20	21 and above
1	Elicit information from students about the text	3.00	3.16	3.08
2	Explain the content of the text	3.35	3.38	3.16
3	Ask students questions to check their understanding	3.40	3.35	3.22
4	Provide students with background information of the text	3.21	3.26	3.19
5	Encourage students to relate text to their personal experiences	3.26	3.40	3.23
6	Elicit students' responses to the text	3.23	3.29	3.17
7	Encourage students to express feelings towards the issues in the text	3.23	3.29	3.23
8	Guide students to express opinions towards the text	3.21	3.25	3.22
9	Set language activities in the lesson	3.13	3.08	3.14
10	Generate language practice using the text	3.04	3.13	3.14
11	Re-tell the text to help students' understanding	3.34	3.31	3.18
12	Get students to tell the storyline of the text	3.14	3.21	3.15
13	Use simple terminologies to explain about the text	3.35	3.46	3.34

The third category looks into the teaching experience. Although the middle group (11 – 20 years) seemed to have higher mean score as compared to the other two groups, the choice of the most preferred approach between the groups differed. For the first group (1 – 10 years), the most favored approach was asking students questions whereas the other two groups (11 – 20 years and 21 years and more) were in favour of using simple terminologies to explain a text. This resembles the findings from the other categories earlier. Then, the 1 – 10 years group also obtained a high mean score for the following approaches – using simple terminologies and explaining the content approach besides re-telling the text to help students' understanding. The second group, however, opted for explaining the content of the text and encouraging students to relate the text to their personal experiences as their preferred approaches. The most senior group (21 years and more) were more inclined to encourage students to relate the text to their own experiences, encourage students to express feelings towards the issues in the text, ask students questions and guide students to express opinions towards the text. On the contrary, as elucidated from the earlier findings, all

three categories of teachers agreed that eliciting information from students about the text, setting language activities and generating language practice using the text were the three least favoured approaches to teaching literature. The table describes the difference between teaching experience and the approaches employed.

The Relationship between Approaches Employed and Teaching Experience

Table 7: ANOVA result on teaching experience factor

Variance	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between groups	2	0.321	0.160	1.583	0.207
Within groups	268	27.132	0.101		
Total	270	27.453			

The table above shows the relationship between teaching experience and approaches employed. However, the result revealed no significant difference between the three groups. This is shown via sig = 0.207 ($p > 0.05$) and F value (2, 268) = 1.583. Thus, it is indicated that there was no significant difference between teaching experience and approaches employed.

As reflected in the ANOVA result, there was no significant difference between the three groups of teaching experience. This reflects the finding by Sii Ling and Chen (2016) that years of teaching was not an influencing factor in deciding the teaching approaches to be employed. On the other hand, this finding refuted what have been claimed by Unal and Unal (2012) and Abbas and Niloofar (2012) regarding the difference between the experienced and novice teachers. The majority of the respondents revealed that the least favoured approach to teaching literature was eliciting information from students about the text. This may indicate that teachers still employ teacher-centred approaches. This reflects the finding by Carter and Long (1991) that literature is teacher-centred in which they pass knowledge and information to the students. In fact, this finding is similar to those in previous studies (Hwang & Embi, 2007; Suliman & Yunus; 2014).

The other two least preferred approaches are setting language activities and generating language practices. It is surprising to note that language activities are not highly favoured by the respondents of this study though Novianti (2016) affirms that the study of language has been inseparable from the study of literature. Irrefutably, literature is associated to language and one cannot discard the influence of language learning in literature. However, the respondents in this study might agree to Padurean (2015) who proposed that English literature should be approached differently because the language used is too complicated. Hence, they might believe that language learning should be excluded from literature leading them to employ less language-based approaches in the lesson. This may be misleading because Carter and Long (1991) emphasise that literature is able to enrich the cultural knowledge of students, which is an integral part in language learning. Thus, literature has a connection to language learning, and it is essential in understanding any literature lesson.

Conclusion

The results have revealed two fundamental findings of the study. First, the respondents of this study were more inclined to use simple terminologies in giving explanation about a literary text taught as compared to getting students eliciting information about the text. This emphasizes the reliance on teacher-centeredness as compared to focusing on students-centeredness. Secondly, in examining the significant difference among teachers with regard to locality, training and teaching experience, only two variables indicated significant difference. Teaching experience did not disclose any significant difference though the middle group (11 to 20 years of teaching experience) had the highest mean score. In addition, the rural area teachers and those who have received literature training were found to be more receptive of their approaches to teaching literature.

This study has suggested that teachers teaching literature need to vary their approaches in order to arouse students' interest towards a lesson. There are various approaches to teaching literature that can be employed by teachers. Lively approach such as conducting performance activities may also be employed to cater to students who are interested in arts performance. Regardless of locality, training and teaching experience, teachers should be more optimistic and dare to take risks in employing different kinds of approaches in teaching literature since relying on one approach may not better the teaching and learning process. Future research may look into areas such as activities conducted in the literature lesson besides teachers' attitudes towards literature and their relationship with locality, training and teaching experience. Furthermore, future studies may also look into students' perspectives and how they perceive literature lesson based on locality, gender and types of school.

All in all, this study has shown that locality, training and teaching experience had impacts on the selection of approaches to teaching literature. This may affect the process of teaching and learning literature. Teachers have a crucial role in the teaching and learning process. Teachers are the centre of an educational journey and play a crucial role in engaging students in the learning process (Suliman, Nor & Yunus, 2017). Teachers are welcome to attend any courses and training to update themselves with current approaches and methodologies pertaining to literature teaching. This is even reinforced by the Ministry of Education Malaysia (2013), stating that ever since teachers enter the pre-service training, they will be given the best training possible up to the point of their retirement. Hence, this highlights the needs for teachers to always keep abreast with the relevant knowledge and skills in order to uphold the quality of the education system.

About the Authors

Ashairi Suliman is a postgraduate student in the Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia. Majoring in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL), he obtained his Masters and B. Ed. from Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia too. His research interest includes the educational policy development, Teaching English as Second Language (TESL) and ICT. (ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2796-9965>)

Dr Melor Md Yunus is an Associate Professor and Deputy Dean of Research and Innovation at the Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia. She is best known for establishing the integration of ICT in teaching and learning English as a Second Language research. (ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7504-7143>)

Dr. Mohamed Yusoff Mohd Nor is a senior lecturer in the Department of Education Leadership and Policy at the Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia. Graduated from University of Malaya, he is best known in the area of educational planning and research, educational leadership as well as management and change management.

References

- Abbas, A. Z. & Niloofar, A. S. (2012). Experienced and Novice Iranian Teacher's Perceptions as to the Effect of Intrinsic Factors on Teacher Efficacy. *Basic Research Journal of Education Research and Review*, 1, 4 – 14.
- Berrarbi, A. & Bahous, A. (2018). Introducing Short Stories in EFL Classroom to Explore Culturally Diverse Issue. *Arab World English Journal*, 2, (1), 103 – 116.
- Bipinchandra, J. S., Shah, P. M. & Aziz, J. A. (2014). Proficiency Standards of Melaka Non-Optionist in-Service Teachers. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 5, (6), 110 - 117.
- Carter, R. & Long. M. (1991). *Teaching Literature*. London: Longman.
- Chalikendy, M. A. (2015). Literature: A Natural Source of Teaching English in ESL/EFL Classrooms. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 4, (6), 224 – 234.
- Chen, Z. (2012). Characteristics and Strategies of Literature Teaching in the EFL Context in China. *International Journal of Electronics and Communication Engineering*, 5, (3), 35 – 43.
- Farjana, K. M. A. (2016). Preference of the Learners towards Literature Based Materials in the Present Textbook of Classes IX and X in Bangladesh. *Language in India*, 12, 30 – 45.
- Freeman, T. M. & Anderman, L. H. (2005). Changes in Mastery Goals in Urban and Rural Middle School Students. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 20, (1), 1 - 12.
- Gatbonton, E. (2008). Looking Beyond Teachers' Classroom Behaviour: Novice and Experienced ESL Teachers Pedagogical Knowledge. *Language Teaching Research*, 12, (2), 161 – 182.
- Hattie, J. (2003). *Teachers Make a Difference. What is The Research Evidence?* Australian Council of Educational Research.
- Hsu, R. (2009). Investigating Novice and Experienced Teachers' Motivational Strategies Use in Secondary EFL Setting in Taiwan. Master's Thesis Unpublished. Ming Chuan University.
- Hudson, P. B. & Hudson, S. M. (2008). Changing Pre-Service Teachers' Attitudes for Teaching in Rural Schools. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 33, (4), 67 – 77.
- Hussein, E. T. & Al-Emami, A. H. (2016). Challenges to Teaching English Literature at the University of Hail: Instructors' Perspective. *Arab World English Journal*, 7, (4), 125 – 138.
- Hwang, D. & Embi, M. A. (2007). Approaches Employed by Secondary School Teachers to Teaching the Literature Component in English. *Jurnal Pendidik dan Pendidikan*, 22, 1 – 23.
- Lin, Y. (2011). Turning Rurality into Modernity: Suzhi Education in Suburban Public School of Migrant Children in Xiamen. *The China Quarterly*, 206, 313 – 330.
- Mahmud, R. & Bray, M. (2017). School factors underlying demand for private supplementary tutoring in English: urban and rural variations in Bangladesh. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 37, (3), 1 – 11.
- MELTA (2012). A Report on the Roundtable discussion “The Role of Literature in The Malaysian English Language Classroom”. MELTA Symposium on Research in English Language Arts and Literature. University of Malaya, 24 November.
- Meyer, H. (2004). Novice and Expert Teachers' Conceptions of Learners' Prior Knowledge. *Science Teacher Education*, 88, (6), 970 – 983.

- Ministry of Education Malaysia. (2013). Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013 – 2025. Putrajaya.
- Muthusamy, C., Salleh, S. M., Michael, A. S., Arumugam, A. S. & Thayalan, X. (2017). Methods Used in Teaching and Learning of Literature in the ESL Classroom and Adult Learners' Attitude. *Journal of Applied Linguistic and Language Research*, 4, (2), 17 – 25.
- Njagi, M. W., Muriungi, C. K. & Peter, C. A. (2014). Effectiveness of Professional Development on English and Literature Teachers in Selected Schools in Tharaka-Nithi and Meru County, Kenya. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 4, (8), 142 – 148.
- Novianti, N. (2016). English Literature Teaching: An Indonesian Context. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6, (1), 42 – 49.
- Okwara, M. O., Shiundu, J. O. & Indoshi, F. C. (2009). Towards a Model of Integrated English Language Curriculum for Secondary Schools in Kenya. *Educational Research and Review*, 4, (5), 301 – 309.
- Ortells, E. (2013). Teaching English as a foreign language in Spanish secondary schools: The value of literature. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 12, (1), 91 – 110.
- Padurean, A. N. (2015). Approaches to Teaching Literature in EFL Classrooms. *Journal of Romanian Literary Studies*, 6, 195 – 200.
- Rashid, R. A., Vethamani, M. E. & Rahman, S. B. A. (2010). Approaches Employed by Teachers in Teaching Literature to Less Proficient Students in Form 1 and 2. *English Language Teaching*, 3, (4), 87 – 99.
- Saka, F. O. (2014). Short stories in English language teaching. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching*, 1, (4), 278 – 288.
- Shah, S. S. A., Othman, J. & Senom, F. (2017). The Pronunciation in ESL Lessons: Teachers' Beliefs and Practices. *Indonesia Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6, (2), 193 – 203.
- Sidhu, G. K., Chan, Y. F. & Kaur, S. (2010). Instructional Practices in Teaching Literature: Observations on ESL Classrooms in Malaysia. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 3, (2), 54 – 63.
- Sii Ling & Chen, S. E. (2016). Types of English Literature Teaching Approaches Preferred by Teachers in Secondary Schools in Miri, Sarawak. *International Journal of Language Education and Applied Linguistics*, 4, 1 – 14.
- Subramaniam, G., Hamdan, S. I. & Koo, Y. L. (2003). The Incorporation of the Literature Component in the Malaysian ESL Syllabus for Secondary Schools: A Study of Pedagogical Implications. In Subramaniam, G. (Ed.), *Teaching of Literature in ESL/EFL Contexts*. Petaling Jaya: Sasbadi Sdn. Bhd.
- Suliman, A. & Yunus, M. M. (2014). A Glimpse on the Re-Introduction of Literature in Malaysian Secondary Schools. *International Journal of Languages and Literatures*, 2, (2), 151 – 164.
- Suliman, A., Nor, M. Y. M. & Yunus, M. M. (2017). Dual Language Programme in Malaysian Secondary Schools: Glancing Through the Students' Readiness and Unravelling the Unheard Voices. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 17, (4), 128 – 145.
- Sunardi, Akil. M., Arafah, B. & Saliya, K. (2018). Looking at the Shared Conception of Teaching Literature in an Indonesian ELT Setting. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 9, (2), 316-327.
- Talif, R. (1995). *Teaching Literature in ESL Malaysian Context*. Kuala Lumpur: UPM Press.
- Tuncer, H. & Kizildag, A. (2014). Pre-Service EFL Teachers' Attitudes towards the Use of Literature in Practice Teaching. *International Journal of Language Academy*, 2, (3), 170 – 185.

- Unal, Z. & Unal, A. (2012). The Impact of Years of Teaching Experience on the Classroom Management Approaches of Elementary School Teachers. *International Journal of Instruction*, 5, (2), 41 – 60.
- Violetta-Irene, K. (2015). The Use of Literature in the Language Classroom: Methods and Aims. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 5, (1), 74 – 79.
- Yang, Y. (2014). Study of the Urban and Rural Education's Fairness in the Field of Public Service. *Chinese Studies*, 3, (1), 4 - 7.
- Yunus, M. M. & Suliman, A. (2014). Information & Communication Technology (ICT) Tools in Teaching and Learning Literature Component in Malaysian Secondary Schools. *Asian Social Science*, 10, (7), 136 – 152.
- Yusof, S. M., Lazim, Z. M. & Salehuddin, K. (2017). Teacher Trainees' Perspectives of Teaching Graphic Novels to ESL Primary Schoolers. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 23, (3), 81 – 96.