Critical Literature Pedagogy: A Perspective from an EFL Setting

Muzakki Afifuddin[1] and A. Effendi Kadarisman[2]

[1]*Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang*
[2]*Universitas Negeri Malang*

Abstract: The paper aims at exploring the existence of Borsheim-Black, Macaluso, and Petrone's concept of Critical Literature Pedagogy (2014) from the learners' perspective in an EFL Setting. As a new concept in the teaching of Literature, it aims at encouraging the readers to stand with and against the literary texts. Reading *with* the literary text means that the readers need to be familiar with the traditional approaches to literature from comprehending storylines to developing thematic interpretation. On the other hand, reading *against* the literary text challenges readers to reach beyond the text, read between the lines, and discover power promoted and hidden in the text. Within the Literature classrooms in EFL settings, this concept raises several challenges from the learners' linguistic competence in English and from the learners' literary competence. This paper then raises the question on the existence of critical literature pedagogy in EFL settings and tries to discover evidence that the EFL learners may have possessed a certain level of critical literacy within the process of reading literary texts. Furthermore, this paper hopefully concludes that Critical Literature Pedagogy may become a standard approach in the teaching of literature in EFL settings that promotes literary analyses that are closer to the learners' milieu.

1 INTRODUCTION

Critical thinking has been developed as a framework of teaching and assessing students' achievement in learning since Bloom drafted the Taxonomy of Educational Objectives in 1956. Then in 2001, Kratwohl et al. (2002) revised the taxonomy into the Revised Bloom's Taxonomy. The taxonomy later is applied within the teaching of functional literacy or the linguistic skills of English. While the taxonomy covers the knowledge dimension and the cognitive process dimension, many language teachers use the cognitive process dimension taxonomy to deal with the process of teaching, while the knowledge dimension becomes neglected even though it is as important as the cognitive process dimension. All that can be said is that the cognitive process dimension taxonomy is more observable than the knowledge dimension taxonomy.

The knowledge dimension taxonomy of the revised taxonomy covers the factual knowledge, conceptual knowledge, procedural knowledge, and metacognitive knowledge. The latter involves knowledge about cognition in general as well as awareness of and knowledge about one's own cognition. This kind of self-knowledge and self-awareness about the world which become the basis of Paulo Freire (2000) in developing his idea on Critical Literacy. There is a need to understand the pedagogical situation where some education seems to be oppressing learners with some knowledge that the learners do not want to encounter unintentionally, Critical Literacy becomes a liberation of power and identity within pedagogy. In the language pedagogy perspectives, this kind of liberation of power and identity becomes eminent especially in the foreign language pedagogy. The foreign language pedagogy has been and can be a real pressure towards the learners as well as the teachers just because they are unable to reach a certain expectation while the world demands these people to learn and be able to perform the foreign language linguistic skills or literacies such as reading, writing, speaking, and listening. On the other hand, critical literacy views the previous literacies as social practices in which texts are not seen as neutral texts but noticeable with designated interests and concealed agenda. Such texts are easily found in the foreign language pedagogy. Those texts sometimes bring foreign socio-cultural bound

2877

contexts and vocabulary that are not easily understandable in the learners' context. In this context, a study by Ko (2013) shows that critical literacy helps the teachers and the learners to question the status quo of the foreign language texts and challenge the existing knowledge and the social order within the foreign language texts.

Another kind of the noticeably-not-neutral texts are the literary texts. The literary texts which are semiotically rich, in this post-modern era, become a certain discourse that can be constructed, deconstructed, and reconstructed to represent certain locality and identity of the readers, in this case, as the learners. This certain complexity is then seen by Borsheim-Black, Macaluso, and Petrone as a challenge in pedagogical perspective (2014). They developed a theory on Critical Literature Pedagogy.

Discovering a deeper complexity of the teaching of Literature in an English Foreign Language Setting, observing on how Critical Literature Pedagogy is applied in an EFL Setting, this study tries to be one of the pioneers in the study by raising the following problems:

1. At what extent do the classrooms of literature in the EFL setting include the dimensions of Critical Literature Pedagogy?
2. Are the learners in the classrooms of Literature in the EFL setting provided with space and time to perform competences required by the dimensions of Critical Literature Pedagogy?

2 LITERARY REVIEW

2.1 The Teaching of Literature in EFL Setting

Carter and Long (1991) theorize that the common practice of literature pedagogy or the teaching of Literature in EFL setting holds that Literature is seen as a cultural model of English, as a language model of English, or as a media for learners' personal growth. The first perspective values literature as a means of accumulated wisdom that has been taught and felt within a culture. Through this perspective, the learners are expected to come to perceive tradition of thought, feeling, and artistic form within the heritage that the literary texts bring. The second perspective justifies literature as a language model; that the teaching of literature promotes language development. This perspective puts the learners in touch with subtler and more creative uses of language. The proponents of this model argue that language is only a literary medium. Since literature

is made from language, the more learners can understand a language, the better the learners will understand the literary texts. The last perspective aims at helping the learners to achieve an engagement with the reading of literary texts. This kind of engagement can be seen through the enjoyment of reading and love for literature as they continue to engage with literature throughout their lives. This perspective is seen rewarding since it results from learning how to appreciate the literary texts and from engaging a certain competence that is already within the learners.

Carter and Long furthermore distinguish between the study of literature and the use of literature as a resource. The study of literature involves reading literature within an academic institutionalized setting purposes of obtaining some qualifications in literary studies, while using literature as a resource suggests a less academic though no less serious approach to the reading of literature. The latter approach perceive literature as a special source for personal development and growth—for encouraging greater sensitivity and self-awareness and greater understanding about the world. As a resource, literature provide legitimate and valuable linguistic opportunities to the language teacher and allow many of the most valuable exercises of language learning that can be the case with many language teaching texts. However, this approach discourages engagement towards literary texts since learners will need the knowledge *of* literature and knowledge *about* literature.

Knowledge *of* literature is related to the pleasure and enjoyment towards literary texts. The teachers usually aim to impart personal pleasure in reading literary texts by providing emotional experiential involvement knowledge *of* literature. On the other hand, knowledge *about* literature is related to the accumulation of facts about literary contexts, dates, authors, titles of texts, names and conventions, literary terms, etc. However, if a teacher focuses only on the knowledge *about* literature, there is usually little concern with how to use such information to read literature to oneself and to learn how to make one's own meanings. Thus, to encourage an engagement towards the knowledge *of* literature and the knowledge *about* literature, the teachers need to trigger it through the selection of literary texts to which learners can respond enjoyably and be interested to learning the knowledge *about* literature. This way of teaching literature may challenge learners with low interest towards literature, especially those who learns literature in other language setting, and the more

successful learners are probably those who develop the necessary linguistic and literary competence.

2.2 Literary Competence

The term Literary Competence, which was introduced by Jonathan Culler (1975), refers to a person's implicit, internalized knowledge of the rules of literature. Literary competence is the poetics that every reader of literature possesses to approach the literary texts. Literary competence is a way of reaching an interpretation towards the literary texts. Culler underlines the naturalness of the interpretation that the readers may find in the "illusion of reality". However, in the process of finding the interpretation, the readers, especially readers who are from different ages or different geography of the setting of the literary texts, may find themselves demystifying the literary texts and develop their own interpretation. This reader-oriented characteristic of literary competence requires learners to possess various implicit, internalized knowledge of rules of literature, plenty of acquaintance with literary texts, and abundance amount of guidance.

On this, Van der Pol (2015) mentions that Culler suggests a literary work has meaning only when it is read, or listened to, in a particular way; when it is read ''as literature''. The notion of literary competence does not presume, however, that there is just one proper (competent) way to read literature. If in an interpretative community the practices of reading literature are that readers may interpret works in a variety of ways, then that is a fact about literary competence. Literary competence therefore is both a characteristic of readers (an internalized story grammar) and a description of that competence (a descriptive grammar or poetics). In an EFL setting, Kayad (2015) specifically defines literary competence—as a part of the literary literacy—as an adequate knowledge of literature in English, moving beyond the basic knowledge of literary terms and concepts toward the understanding of literature in its broader sense, including curricula.

Since competence underlies a certain performance, to observe the literary competence, one must require activities that can initiate the performance of the competence, such as by reading aloud. In her research, Van der Pol furthermore proves that Culler's literary competence can be used in an educational design experiments to make explicit the implicit readings of young children, showing what informs their responses, interpretations and solutions to particular textual problems by reading picturebooks aloud (2015). Another study by Edenburg shows that literary competence is associated with recall, and it provides the basis for identifying a text outside of its original context (2010).

Culler's perspective of Literary Competence is similar to Carter and Long's perspective on the knowledge *about* literature. Culler did not mention much about enjoyment towards literary texts, which is related to knowledge *of* literature. This is a big concern since, in English as a foreign language setting, the teaching of literature faces a diversity of approaches whether the teachers want to teach knowledge *of* literature or knowledge *about* literature or both knowledge are introduced but in a limited space and time.

Focusing on the combination of knowledge *of* literature and knowledge *about* literature, Jane Spiro (1991) developed a concept of literary competence that covers them. Spiro's concept of literary competence is built by six indivisible aspects: (1) informed appreciation of literature, (2) ability to respond appropriately to all literature in the target language, (3) ability to analyse and define responses in literature, (4) ability to relate literature to one's personal experience/to empathize with text, (5) ability to place literature within a wider social/cultural/linguistic context, and (6) enjoyment of literature. As a holistic concept, this concept of literary competence can embrace both knowledge *of* literature and knowledge *about* literature and also embrace all learners of literature in any setting.

However, the indivisibility of the aspects is still questionable. In the teaching of Literature in EFL setting, the aspects may not surface at all times. This appearance of literary competence in teaching of literature in an EFL setting results a few studies documenting it. The studies so far have been concerned with the need of literary competence, the role of the teachers in improving learners' literary competence, and methods to teach literature in EFL setting. On his study, Isenberg (1990) illustrates how a learner with a limited knowledge of English and with limited literary experience can approach the analysis of a poem and arrive at a relatively complex understanding of its meaning with the help of the teacher who manages the literary texts given within a syllabus.

Furthermore, within the modern teaching of literature, reader response is seen as the best method to reveal learners' literary competence. A study by Fialho (2007) provides a convincing evidence about the use of reader response to reveal learners' process of interpreting the literary texts. Through the reader

response, the learners undergo the process of foregrounding and refamiliarization to come to an interpretation of the literary texts. On the other hand, these learners also develop a new perspective on the world around them and themselves through interpreting literary texts.

Another study that uses reader response towards literary texts is by Afifuddin (2014). This study focuses on how the EFL learners respond towards English poems. As a result, being very far from the real context of English culture and experiences, these learners engage to the English literary texts in their own ways. These learners show that they have developed their linguistic competence as well as their literary competence by being able to engage themselves to the texts through different perspectives of socio-cultural background. Within this perspective, the evidence shows that these EFL learners are capable of applying a certain aspect of literary competence in engaging to the English literary texts.

Lastly, a study by Davis, McElhone, and Tenore (2015) supports the use of reader-texts interaction in the process of reading comprehension. The interaction is in the concept of dialogue between the reader and the texts that develops critical thinking and discovery of self-identity of the readers. Due to the criticality of the interaction, readers may even resist on the meaning and develop new meanings within the boundary of their own perspectives and identities along with authorial, contextual, and disciplinary contexts. This dialogic interaction is considered as learners' critical-literacy-based approaches.

2.3 Critical Literature Pedagogy

Thus, the combination of literary competence and critical literacy applied in the teaching of literature may become a new focus in literature pedagogy in EFL setting. Reader response as the means of the learners' literary competence may also provide a certain discovery of learners' self-identity that, in an EFL setting, these students may not fathom the canonicity of the literary texts, but they can fathom the literary texts in their own ways.

The combination of the use of canonical literature and critical literacy is developed into a new approach of pedagogy called Critical Literature Pedagogy (Borsheim-Black, et al. 2014). Critical Literature Pedagogy (CLP) weaves together two stances: reading with and against a text. Reading with a text includes familiar approaches of comprehending storylines, analysing literary devices, making personal connections, understanding historical contexts, and developing thematic interpretations. Typically, however, literature instruction stops at this stance, which, while sufficient for most traditional standards and assessments, does not call into question ideologies of texts—those values or beliefs that help to frame and form the text and our reading and teaching of it. In addition to reading with the canonical texts, CLP asks learners to read against them to examine how they are embedded in and shaped by ideologies.

Moreover, although CLP contrasts reading against and with texts, CLP does not actually see these two ways of reading as dichotomous. CLP sees reading with texts as incorporated by reading against texts whereby the relationship between these ways of reading text are reciprocal—learning to read with the texts might be seen as necessary to being able to read against them. Also, CLP sees that deep thinking and engagement related to reading against texts for critical literacies lead to stronger skills related to reading with texts for academic literacies.

These non-dichotomous perspectives of reading which are brought by CLP promote certain key ideas that are divided into five dimensions of canonicity, contexts, literary elements, reader, and assessments. The following table shows the dimensions and the key idea of each dimension. The following table is simplified due to the limitation of the study. For your information, all of the dimensions have the with-and-against perspectives in approaching the literary texts.

Table 1: Simplified Dimensions and Key Ideas from CLP (Modified from Borsheim-Black et al. (2014))

Dimension	Key Idea from CLP
Canonicity	No text is ideologically neutral.
Contexts	Literary canons have typically privileged white and male voices; counterstories can make dominant ideologies visible.
Literary Elements	Themes of canonical novels often reinforce dominant ideologies about topics like class, achievement, sexual orientation, etc.
Reader	Readers from culturally dominant backgrounds often struggle to identify and question dominant ideologies because they often remain invisible to individuals in privileged positions.
Assessments	Readers connect critical understandings of issues in canonical novels to similar issues relevant to other contexts.

CLP thus encourages learners to question canonicity to examine any ideological reasons on why certain literary texts are considered canonical but others are not. CLP also encourages learners to

utilize their identity as one of the convincing reasons in reading the literary canons. The distance between the learners and the context of the literary canons in EFL setting can be a space for CLP as a new pedagogical approach that accepts the distance.

2.4 Previous Studies

Two studies have inspired this paper. The first study is a thesis by de Klonia (2015) with an EFL setting in Sweden. The study focuses on examining how teachers and students value a certain criteria and aspects in connection to what literature is used in the class. Through two empirical web-based questionnaire surveys, the results show that the participating teachers valued practical characteristics, such as level of difficulty, higher than conceptual characteristics, such as the sexual orientation of an author or character, when choosing what literary works to teach because the latter seem to be problematic and not suitable for secondary school students. The results also show that both teachers and students think that critical and ethical discussion of the chosen works is very important in the classroom.

Another study is also a thesis by Myers (2018). She focuses on developing a thorough rationale for valuing CLP, outlining methods for integrating its principles, and shedding light on both the advantages and challenges that doing so can bring to an English classroom in an English as first language setting. The study concludes that CLP still need evaluation due to the risks involved in the implementation. However, CLP is still a very essential approach in the teaching of literature in English as first language setting.

The studies above provide this paper a starting point and a difference in the focus and the limitation of the study. While the setting of the first thesis is in an EFL setting but the socio-cultural background is close to the texts' socio-cultural background being discussed in the classroom, this paper presents an EFL setting but with a very far socio-cultural background from the texts' socio-cultural background. While the thesis uses web-surveys for gaining the data, this paper uses observation in gaining the data similar to the way the second thesis gains the data. However, the setting of the second thesis is in an English as a First Language setting, and classroom action research is also applied to gain more data.

3 METHODOLOGY

This study employs qualitative research design since this study combines text analysis, observation, and interview in gaining the data of the study. The data of the study are taken from two classrooms of English Literature in English Letters Department in Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang. The setting is believed to represent the teaching of Literature in EFL setting. To represent diversity of the data, the observed classrooms are from different semesters and different subjects. The first classroom to be observed is the course of Basic Analysis of English Prose which mostly has the fourth semester students. The other classroom to be observed is the course of Advanced Analysis of English Poetry which mostly has the sixth semester students. Although the data are taken only within a limited time—only in two or three meetings—the findings are believed to be able to answer the problems of the study.

In gaining the data, the study starts by reading the syllabi of the courses. Then the study continues with observing the classrooms to discover the existence of CLP. Lastly, the study is required to interview the lecturers of the courses to gain the last data. The, after all data are gained, they are being analysed through the CLP dimensions to reach the solutions to the problems of the study. What must also be mentioned is that the researcher of the study is an observer, not one of the lecturers of both courses.

4 DISCUSSION

4.1 The Syllabi and the Objectives of the Courses

By the name of the courses, it is obvious that the courses have different texts to use and focus on different objectives. The Basic Analysis of English Prose (BAEP) course uses English prose such as short stories and novels while the Advanced Analysis of English Poetry (AAEP) course uses English poems as the texts to be discussed in the classroom. Both lecturers of the courses have had the experience of teaching Literature in the setting for at least 5 years and have been teaching in the setting for at least 10 years. Both courses have 14 effective meetings with one additional meeting for middle semester assessment and another additional meeting for final semester assessment. Both courses

are a continuation of previous courses; BAEP is a continuation of Introduction to English Literature course given when the students are in the third semester while AAEP a continuation of Literary Theory course given in the fifth semester.

According to the syllabi, the courses have different objectives. BAEP course focuses on introducing the students to the internal literary elements of English prose and to the basic analysis on the internal elements of English prose especially on discovering the internal elements and relating all the internal elements to the theme of the selected English short stories. Based on the interview, the lecturer chooses to limit the texts to only short stories aside from the other sub-genres such as novellas, and novels because he assumes that the length of the latter genres may distract the students' enjoyment and engagement to the literary texts. He also underlines that the objectives of the course are on identifying the internal elements of the English prose and relating the discovered literary elements to the theme of the texts. So, if he uses novellas or novels, he assumes that there will be too limited time to be able to provide the students all the materials and activities he has prepared since the course only has 14 effective meetings.

On the other hand, AAEP course focuses on applying certain literary theories or approaches as perspectives in analysing the selected English poems. As a continuation of the Literary Theory course, AAEP provide the students the space to apply the theories learned from the Literary Theory course and the Schools of Literary Criticism course the students take alongside the AAEP course. Based on the interview, the lecturer chooses several poems to be analysed individually and in groups within the perspectives of the schools of literary criticism such as structuralism, formalism, feminism, Marxism, and other schools. Each poem is discussed and analysed in different meetings to enable the students to explore the poem through the perspectives of different schools.

Looking at the syllabi and the objectives, the courses are within different dimensions of Critical Literature Pedagogy. The BAEP course still limits itself within the dimension of Canonicity, Contexts, and Literary Elements while the AAEP course, since it is an advanced course, it focuses on the more complex dimensions of Reader and Assessment. This finding shows that the syllabi and the objectives of the two Literature courses in this particular EFL setting have covered the dimensions of CLP although one of the courses does not follow CLP key ideas. The BAEP course does not introduce

the students to question the ideologies within the literary canons provided by the lecturers while the AAEP course introduces the students to question the ideologies within the literary canons provided.

4.2 The Classrooms

One of the important findings in the study is the size of the classrooms. The size of those classrooms is considered big based on the quantity of the students. Each classroom contains around 40 to 45 students with around 30% - 40% male students compared to 60% - 70% female students. The age of the students are around 19 to 21 years old. As an EFL setting, this condition is quite common especially in the teaching of content courses such as Literature. Facing this kind of challenge, on the interview, the lecturers mention that it is challenging to be able to reach the intended objectives of each meeting. Based on the interview, the interest of the students towards literary works diverges. The curriculum of the university obliges the students to take literature or linguistics as their major in finishing their undergraduate thesis. So, what happens in the classroom of the BAEP course, these fourth semester students are still at their intersection of choices to take literature or linguistics as their major. The choices will be decided when they enter the fifth semester. The diverging choices affect the atmosphere of the BAEP classroom. Based on the observation, a lot of students do not show interest in reading the short stories provided by the lecturer. In a lecturing style meeting, many students seem uninterested to the topic of "setting in a story" presented by the lecturer at the time of the observation. It is probably due to the complexity of understanding setting as an essential element of a story. The students' disinterest continues when the students are in a workshop style meeting. When the lecturer asks the students to mention the setting and the effect of the setting to the characterization within the short story from Ambrose Bierce entitled "The Haunted Valley", many students find it difficult to discover. This challenge may also be affected by the high-level of language of the literary canon used as the data source of the analysis. At this level, linguistic competence become one of the competences needed to read the literary canon. However, at this stage, the students' critical literacy and literary competence may appear to approach towards the literary text although the students may have not been aware of their innate critical literacy and literary competence.

Different findings are discovered in the AAEP course classroom. The students of the classroom are mostly from the sixth semester. These students are already focusing on Literature major so the interest towards the topic being discussed in the classroom is high. The need to master the literary theories and understand the way in analysing the selected poems through the perspectives of literary theories and criticism is also high. The students' need and interest towards the course is shown by their activeness in the classroom in group discussions and their writing. The possible challenge in this classroom is the students' inability to understand each theory completely to use it as a perspective in analysing the literary texts because of the limited time and space. This challenge is in accordance with the key ideas of the CLP dimension of assessment that the students must have critical understandings of issues of the literary text that can be assessed and compared with similar issues within the schools of literary criticism.

Through the findings about the classrooms, it is discovered that the dimensions of the CLP are applied. The curricula and the classrooms represent all the dimensions of CLP although not in both classrooms. This concludes that the students are already given the space and time to engage with the literary texts through the dimensions of canonicity, contexts, and reader. However, the dimensions of literary element and assessment are more demanding to be engaged with since the space and time provided are limited. The students will need more time and space to engage with the literary elements and assessment outside of the classroom.

4.3 The Reading with and against Literary Text

The last finding that is related to the CLP within the classroom is the existence of the reading for ideology: the reading with the literary text and the reading against literary text. Considering the key ideas of each CLP dimensions and the curriculum and the situation in the classrooms, the concept of reading with and against literary text may demand a careful planning. However, there is the possibility of the existence of reading with and against the literary text although the key ideas are not explicitly taught in the classroom since the students may have possessed certain literary competence. The literary competence may reside within the students' unconsciousness due to the result of experience, reading exposure, and socio-cultural background.

The ability to read with and against the literary text depends on the classrooms exposure towards the key ideas within each dimension of Critical Literature Pedagogy (CLP). Thus, the study discovers that CLP has not been introduced to the students in the BAEP course based on several findings. The BAEP course focuses on providing lecturing and workshops for the students to internalize the provided materials. The workshops are done in focused group discussion method, so the students can brainstorm for answers and possibilities of interpretation. The results of the focused group discussion are in the forms of individual reader responses that may provide individual interpretation and personal engagement towards the literary texts. The lecturer tries to challenge the students to engage with the literary texts and unintentionally enters the framework of CLP when he requires the students to discover and analyse the literary elements. However, for the fourth semester students, the possibility of the students to read against the literary text is minimal since the instructions have not reached into personal interpretation yet.

Therefore, the CLP has not become the basis of the BAEP course. The course has not reached the dimension of canonicity completely since the course does not provide the time and space to question the merit of the literary text. Based on the interview, the literary texts being discussed in the classroom are the lecturer's choices based on the canonicity within American Literature for example Ambrose Bierce's "The Haunted Valley" and Bret Harte's "A Mother of Five". It is possible that the students question the merit of the literary texts, but it is not within the classroom discussion. The course has also not reached the dimension of contexts since the course does not explore on the literary texts' contexts. The course has reached the dimension of literary element since the course focuses on providing the students with the knowledge about literature and the ability to read with the literary texts only, without providing the students with the ability to read against the literary texts since the latter ability needs more knowledge. The course has not completely reached the dimension of reader since the students have not had a formal time and space to engage themselves with the literary text in in the process of interpretation. However, within their reader responses, the study finds that the students have performed this kind of engagement in their interpretation towards the literary text because they possess certain literary competence. The class also has not reached the dimension of assessments since the class still focuses on providing the students the

ability to do basic analysis on the literary elements of literary texts, but not advanced analysis on the literary texts using literary criticism theories.

On the other hand, the findings discovered from the AAEP course provide different perspectives. The course focuses on applying literary criticism theories towards literary texts especially within the genre of poetry. Several prominent poems are used in this course such as John Keats' "To Autumn", Elizabeth Bishop's "One Art", Thomas Hardy's "Channel Firing", and Robert Hayden's "Those Winter Sundays". The course provides the student space and time to internalize the literary criticism theories with focused-group discussion, individual quizzes, and group presentations on applying the theories after the middle of the semester. The lecturer tries to challenge the students to use the theories that they have got from the previous semester and from the other course that focuses on discussing the schools of literary criticism. The lecturer tries to be open to the students' interpretations and analysis although she may have had her own preferences of interpretation and analysis.

Based on the key ideas of CLP, the course has already provided space and time for the students to engage with and explore the literary text. However, from the students' reader responses, the students have not had a chance to engage themselves in questioning the canonicity of the literary texts provided in the classroom. The course has explored into the dimension of contexts since some of the theories being used in the classroom approach contexts such as the history, society, or biography of the author. The course has also encountered the dimension of literary elements since the students must use the literary elements as a starting point of the analysis to identify whether the literary elements present a certain ideological agenda. The course has also explored the dimension of reader since certain parts of the reader responses provide engagement with the readers identity. Lastly, the course is within the dimension of assessment since the students are provided with literary criticism theories to interpret literary texts, however, the students have not had a chance to relate the literary criticism theories with certain ideologies or their own ideologies.

Thus, the course has provided space and time to engage with the four dimensions of CLP. The dimension of canonicity is not being questioned in this course because the students focus much further on the application of the theories of literary criticism which concerns more on the dimensions of contexts, literary elements, readers, and assessment. When the

lecturer gives the students freedom to assess and engage with the literary works, unintentionally, the lecturer has provided the students space and time to read with or against the literary text.

In comparison, the recent findings show that both courses are within the dimensions of Critical Literature Pedagogy. However, each course covers different dimensions and different approach in reading the literary text. The table below shows the comparison between the courses.

Table 2: The Existing Dimensions of CLP.

Courses	BAEP		AAEP	
Dimensions	Read With	Read Against	Read With	Read Against
Canonicity	✔	-	-	-
Contexts	✔	-	✔	✔
Literary Elements	✔	-	✔	✔
Reader	-	-	✔	✔
Context	-	-	✔	✔

5 CONCLUSIONS

This paper has presented an evidence on how the classrooms of Literature in an EFL Setting have already been within Critical Literature Pedagogy. The findings have provided the conclusion that the lecturer as the instructor and the department as the curriculum developer have unintentionally explored the dimensions of Critical Literature Pedagogy. The students as the learners are also provided space and time to perform the reading with and against literary text which is required by the dimensions of Critical Literature Pedagogy. However, not all levels of students are able to perform the competence since the objectives of the classrooms are different.

The findings also have proved that providing the learners' engagement toward literature becomes an important element in the teaching of Literature in any kind of setting. Besides learners' reading exposure, the learners' sociocultural background, gender, or enjoyment towards reading the literary text can become crucial elements in the learners' engagement with the literary text. Paran (2008) says that the contribution of literature in foreign language learning is not only influenced by the role of the teacher but also the role of the task and the role of the reader. He also says that learners who have been exposed to positive experiences with literature, and who are given the opportunity to read literature and respond to it, both benefit linguistically and enjoy the experience. Additionally, this paper suggests the curriculum developer of Literature classrooms

especially in a foreign language setting can apply Critical Literature Pedagogy to increase students' power and identity in engaging with foreign language literary texts. This paper also suggests that instructors of literature classrooms especially in a foreign language setting to be aware of the learners' literary competence because the learners may also link their literary competence to engage with critical literacy and thus becomes a complete Critical Literature Pedagogy.

REFERENCES

Afifuddin, M., (2014) "Ethnocentrism in Understanding Literature from Other Culture (Proceeding)." *The Seventh International Conference on Applied Linguistics: Language Varieties and Language Teaching in Multiethnic Setting.* Balai Bahasa Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung.

Borsheim-Black, C., Macaluso, M., and Petrone, R., (2014) "Critical Literature Pedagogy: Teaching Canonical Literature for Critical Literacy." *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy* 58(2) pp. 123–133.

Brumfit, C., (1991) *Assessment in Literature*. Macmillan Publishers Limited. London.

Brumfit, C. J., (1983) *Teaching Literature Overseas, Language-Based Approaches*, Pergamon. Oxford.

Carter, R., and Long, M. N., (1991) *Teaching Literature*, New York, Longman Group UK Limited.

Culler, J., (1975) *Structuralist Poetics*, Routledge, London.

Davis, D. S., McElhone, D., and Tenore, F. B., (2015) "A Dialogic Account of Reader–Text Interactions." *English Teaching: Practice & Critique*, Vol. 14 Issue 3 pp. 335 – 349.

De Klonia, K. K., Lindgren, A., and Danielsson K. M., (2015) *The Potential Role of Critical Literacy Pedagogy as a Methodology When Teaching Literature in Upper Secondary School in Sweden.* School of Education, Culture and Communication, Mälardalen University Sweden. http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1078472/FULLTEXT01.pdf

Edenburg, C., (2010) "Intertextuality, Literary Competence and the Question of Readership: Some Preliminary Observations," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, Vol 35.2, pp. 131-148.

Fialho, O. C., (2007) "Foregrounding and Refamiliarization: Understanding Readers' Response to Literary Texts." *Language and Literature*, Vol 16 (2) pp. 105–123.

Freire, P. and Macedo, D., (2000) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Gilroy, M. and Parkinson, B. (1996). "Teaching Literature in a Foreign Language." *Language Teaching*, 29, pp 213 – 225

Isenberg, N., (1990) "Literary Competence: The Reader and The Role of The Teacher." *ELT Journal*. Volume 44/3, pp. 181-191.

Kadarisman, A. E., (2015) *From Description to Explanation: Essays in Linguistics and Applied Linguistics.* The Linguistic Society of Indonesia. Jakarta.

Kayad, F. G., (2015). "Teacher Education: English Language and Literature in a Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Environment." *Education Research and Perspectives*. Volume 42; pp. 286 – 328.

Kennedy, X. J. and Gioia, D. (2002) *An Introduction to Poetry; Tenth Edition.* Longman, New York.

Ko, Mei-Yun, (2013) "A Case Study of an EFL Teacher's Critical Literacy Teaching in a Reading Class in Taiwan," *Language Teaching Research*, pp. 17: 91.

Krathwohl, D. R., (2002) "A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy: An Overview." *Theory into Practice*, Volume 41, Number 4, pp. 212 -218.

Mikkonen, J. (2015). "On Studying the Cognitive Value of Literature." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*. 73:3. The American Society for Aesthetics.

Myers, L. C., (2018) *Reading Against the Grain: English Education Through the Lens of Critical Literature Pedagogy.* University of Tennessee Honors Thesis Projects. http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_chanhonoproj/2186

Paran, A., (2008) "The Role of Literature in Instructed Foreign Language Learning and Teaching: An Evidence-Based Survey." Language Teaching, 41:4, pp. 465–496.

Scofield, M., (2006) *The Cambridge Companion to the American Short Story.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Spiro, J., (1991). "Assessing Literature: Four Papers." In C. J. Brumfit, *Assessment in Literature*, London, Macmillan Publishers Limited.

Van der Pol, C., (2012) "Reading Picturebooks as Literature: Four-to-Six-Year-Old Children and the Development of Literary Competence." *Children's Literature in Education* 43, pp. 93–106.