

MALTEPE UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

**A STUDY ON LITERATURE USE OF ELT
TEACHERS WITH AN ELT BACKGROUND AND THOSE WITH A
LITERATURE BACKGROUND IN THEIR READING CLASSES**

MASTER OF ARTS THESIS

AHMET ÖZKAN

101113101

Advisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Nejat TÖNGÜR

Istanbul, July 2013

T.C. Maltepe Üniversitesi
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü'ne,

15.07.2013 tarihinde tezinin savunmasını yapan Ahmet ÖZKAN'a ait "A Study on Literature Use of ELT Teachers With An ELT Background And Those With A Literature Background In Their Reading Classes" başlıklı çalışma, Jürimiz Tarafından Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programında Yüksek Lisans Tezi Olarak Kabul Edilmiştir.



Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hakan DİLMAN
(Başkan)



Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ümit SÖYLEMEZ
(Üye)



Yrd. Doç. Dr. Nejat TÖNGÜR
(Üye)
(Danışman)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost I would like to thank and express my utmost gratitude to my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Nejat TÖNGÜR. His constructive feedback contributed much to the completion process of the thesis. It would not have been possible to write this thesis without his help, support and patience.

I owe my sincere thanks to Assist. Prof. Dr. Hakan DİLMAN, head of ELT Department at Maltepe University, and Assist. Prof. Dr. Ümit SÖYLEMEZ.

I would like to thank Abdurrahman TANRIVERDİ, Ahmet SALMAN, Alper ÇAKMAK, Arif DEMİREL, Gökhan AÇIKEL, Muharrem KAYA, Mustafa YILMAZ, Sefa ÖZTÜRK and Yıldırım TEMEL for their contributions.

Also I would like to thank all instructors who participated in this study.

Finally, I owe special gratitude to my dear wife Kübra ÖZKAN and my children Enes and Elis for their understanding and love all the time.

ÖZET

Bu çalışma İngiliz Dili öğretmenlerinin kendi eğitim altyapılarına göre; Eğitim Fakültesi ya da Edebiyat Fakültesi; okuma derslerinde edebiyat kullanımı ile ilgili algılarının, inançlarının, bakış açılarının ve uygulamalarının farklılık gösterip göstermediğini saptamak için yapılmıştır. Çalışma aynı zamanda öğretmenlerin okuma derslerinde edebi metinleri ne ölçüde ve nasıl kullandıklarını, ne tür ekstra materyaller kullandıklarını, edebiyatı İngiliz Dili Eğitimine nasıl kattıklarını, eğitim altyapılarına bağlı olarak edebiyat kullanma ya da kullanmama ile ilgili esas sebepleri de ortaya koymayı amaçlamaktadır. Araştırma Türkiye’de hem devlet hem de vakıf üniversitelerinde çalışan 140 İngilizce okutmanı üzerinde gerçekleştirilmiştir. Veriler özellikle bu çalışma için tasarlanmış anket yoluyla toplandı. Elde edilen veriler SPSS (Sosyal Bilimler İstatistik Programı) yoluyla değerlendirildi. Bulgular Eğitim Fakültesi mezunu İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin aynen Edebiyat Fakültesi mezunu İngilizce Öğretmenleri gibi okuma derslerinde edebiyatın önemine ve gerekliliğine inandıklarını fakat edebiyat kullanımında kendilerini Edebiyat Fakültesi mezunları kadar yeterli görmediklerini ortaya koyuyor. Bulgular ayrıca müfredat sınırlamasının ve yetersiz ders saatlerinin de okuma derslerinde edebiyat kullanımına karşı engel oluşturduğunu ortaya koyuyor.

Anahtar kelimeler: eğitim altyapısı, İngiliz dili eğitimi, edebiyat, öğretmenlerin algıları, edebiyat kullanımı, edebi metin, öğretmenlerin inançları

ABSTRACT

This study has been conducted to determine whether ELT teachers' perceptions, beliefs, perspectives and practices about the use of literature depending on their educational background, Faculty of Education or Letters, vary during their teaching practices in reading classes. The study also aims to reveal to what extent and how often teachers use literary texts, what kind of extra materials they use, how they incorporate literature into ELT in their reading classes, and the underlying reasons as to why they use or do not use literature depending on their educational background. The study has been conducted with 140 preparatory class instructors working both at foundation and state universities in Turkey. The data have been collected through a questionnaire, specifically designed for the study. The data were evaluated on SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). The findings reveal that ELT teachers who graduated from Faculty of Education, like ELT teachers who graduated from Faculty of Letters, believe in the significance and necessity of literature in their reading classes, but do not see themselves as competent in literature use as teachers who graduated from Faculty of Letters. The findings also reveal that curriculum restriction and insufficient class time are a big hindrance against the use of literature in reading classes.

Key words: educational background, ELT, literature, teachers' perceptions, literature use, literary text, teachers' beliefs

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ÖZET	iv
ABSTRACT	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
ABBREVIATIONS	ix
LIST OF TABLES	x
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Statement of the Problem	1
1.2 The Purpose of the Study	3
1.3 Limitations of the Study	3
1.4 Literature Review	4
1.4.1 Reading Comprehension	4
1.4.1.1 Reading Comprehension Strategies and Studies	11
1.4.1.2 Reading Comprehension and Literature	21
1.4.1.3 Reflections of Teachers’ Beliefs and Perceptions on Their Teaching Reading Comprehension	37
1.4.2 Comparison of Curricula of ELT and Literature Departments in Turkish Universities	44
CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY	59
2.1 The Research Questions	59
2.2 Population and Sampling	60

2.3	Subjects.....	60
2.4	Data Collection Instrument	61
2.4.1	The Pilot Study	61
2.5	Data Collection Procedure.....	62
2.5.1	The Questionnaire	62
2.6	Data Analysis Procedure.....	66
2.7	The Analysis of Research Questions with Relating Items.....	68
	CHAPTER 3: RESULTS	70
3.1	Frequencies of the Items in the Questionnaire.....	70
3.2	The Results of the Descriptive Statistics of the Research Questions.....	81
3.3	The Results of the Items in the Questionnaire Based on the Research Questions	83
3.3.1	The Results of the First Research Question “What do teachers use for reading comprehension in addition to the activities in the course books?”.....	83
3.3.2	The Results of the Second Research Question “How do teachers demand literature involvement in addition to syllabi outside the class?”	87
3.3.3	The Results of the Third Research Question “Why do teachers use literature or literary works in their reading classes?”	89
3.3.4	The Results of the Fourth Research Question “Why do teachers use few or no literary works in their reading classes ?”	97
	CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION	107
	REFERENCES	115
	IMPLICATIONS FOR ELT.....	129
	CURRICULUM VITAE	131

ABBREVIATIONS

ELT:	English Language Teaching
EFL:	English as a Foreign Language
L1:	Native Language
L2:	Second Language
NRP:	The National Reading Panel
ODTU:	Middle East Technical University
SPSS:	Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
THE:	English Times Higher Education
TEFL:	Teaching English as a Foreign Language

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Curriculum of English Language and Literature Department at Istanbul University.....	47
Table 2	Curriculum of English Language and Literature Department at Hacettepe University.....	48
Table 3	Curriculum of English Language Teaching Department at Middle East Technical University.....	50
Table 4	Curriculum of English Language Teaching Department at Istanbul University.....	52
Table 5	Curriculum of English Language Teaching Department at Maltepe University.....	54
Table 6	Curriculum of English Language Teaching Department at Hacettepe University.....	56
Table 7	The Items of the Questionnaire.....	63
Table 8	Means and Standard Deviation Values of the Items.....	65
Table 9	Reliability Statistics of the Items in the Questionnaire.....	68
Table 10	Reliability Evaluation Criteria for α Value.....	68
Table 11	Frequencies of the Items in the Questionnaire.....	70
Table 12	Descriptive Statistics of the Research Questions.....	81

Table 13	Descriptive Statistics of the Related Items for the First Research Question “What do teachers use for reading comprehension in addition to the activities in the course books?”	84
Table 14	Descriptive Statistics of the Related Items for the Second Research Question “How do teachers demand literature involvement in addition to syllabi outside the class?”	88
Table 15	Descriptive Statistics of the Related Items for the Third Research Question “Why do teachers use literature or literary works in their reading classes?”	90
Table 16	Descriptive Statistics of the Related Items for the Fourth Research Question “Why do teachers use few or no literary works in their reading classes?”	97

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Statement of the Problem

In recent years, the need for language learning has increased as part of the globalization process in the world. Accordingly, in Turkey together with the demand for language learning, the demand for the teachers has increased as well. In addition to English Language Teaching (ELT) graduates in the field of teaching, the graduates of English Language and Literature, American Culture and Literature, Linguistics and Translation and Interpretation studies have been employed as English teachers in Turkey. Considering the number of ELT and English / American Literature departments, it is obvious that teaching of English profession mainly has drawn from ELT and Literature departments. These teachers, who receive education on different curricula at universities, display different practices, attitudes, priorities and beliefs in their professions. The researchers of English as a foreign language have recently begun to recognize the significance of how language teachers' beliefs influence the process of language teaching.

Freeman (1989) emphasizes the importance of beliefs in her statement, “we do not really see through our eyes or hear through our ears, but through our beliefs” (1989, p. 267). According to Chandler (1992), “. . . “the teacher, the students, and the materials all have prior histories before being integrated in the process of classroom life and the teacher

enters with already preconceived expectations, beliefs, and attitudes about classroom life” (p. 37). The teacher also enters with certain prior cognitive, physical, linguistic, and evaluative abilities.

In this respect, how teachers with different educational backgrounds view literature use as part of reading comprehension and their differences in teaching practices are explored. As Jack C. Richards (2006) states, “the role of the teacher in the language classroom is that of a facilitator, who creates a classroom climate conducive to language learning, and who provides opportunities for students to use and practice the language and to reflect on language use and language learning” (p. 23). Just at this point, this study explores whether teachers of English use extra materials in addition to the activities in the course books in reading comprehension lessons, or in any reading activity, how they apply their background education - whether literature or ELT - to using literature, how teachers demand literature involvement in addition to the syllabi, and the reasons why they use literature or why they do not. It is argued that if theoretical orientation is a major determinant of how teachers act during language instruction, then teachers can affect classroom practice by ensuring a theoretical orientation that is “reflective of current and pertinent research in the field” (Cummins, Cheek, & Lindsey, 2004, p. 183).

It is believed that there is a direct relation between using literature in reading comprehension and language learning. That’s why studying any type of literary text means studying language in use. From this respect, teachers’ different views,

assumptions, beliefs, expectations, practices on literature use determine the way they teach and the language in use.

1.2 The Purpose of the Study

This study aims to make an analysis of ELT teachers with different educational backgrounds, ELT or Literature, towards using literature in their reading comprehension classes. It specifically aims to see whether their educational background has an effect on choosing extra materials they use during their reading classes, whether they differ in the way they demand literature involvement in addition to the syllabi outside the class. Apart from these, this study aims to reveal the reasons why they use or do not use literature or literary works in their reading classes.

1.3 Limitations of the Study

The study is thought to reveal significant differences in the use of literature - as part of reading comprehension classes – on what ELT teachers with an ELT and literature background use for reading comprehension in addition to the activities in course books, how they demand literature involvement, why they use or why they do not use literature in their reading classes. Nevertheless, there is a limitation to be considered. Firstly, the number of participants is only 140 and only 8 universities are included in the study. Considering there are more than 170 universities in Turkey, both the number of participants and universities may be considered low. Another limitation is that literature use differs depending on the level of students. One other limitation is the exclusion of

the graduates of Linguistics and Translation and Interpretation departments who have been employed as ELT teachers in Turkey as well.

1.4 Literature Review

This literature review highlights perspectives of ELT teachers on using or not using literature in their reading classes and, if they do, how they demand literature involvement in addition to syllabi outside the class and sheds light on the perspectives of ELT teachers with an ELT background and those with a literature background. In this paper, first a general overview of literature as part of reading comprehension in ELT is presented and it is succeeded by the perspectives of ELT teachers. It also considers perspectives related to teaching English as a foreign language. The research included in this study shows the reasons why teachers use or do not use literature and literary works in their reading classes and also displays whether their choices are affected by their educational background. The purpose of this literature review is to emphasize the significance of language teachers' beliefs in influencing the process of language teaching as evident in existing literature. The literature review shows the studies on the topic to date, any significant findings by researchers and non – research based articles, their arguments and key concepts or theories arising from these works and methodologies used in developing the researches.

1.4.1 Reading Comprehension

Reading comprehension refers to “the process of simultaneously extracting and constructing meaning through interaction and involvement with the written language”

(Snow, 2002, p. 11). According to Iwai (2010), definition of reading comprehension is “constructing the meaning of the oral or written messages” (p. 125). Both definitions agree on reading comprehension as involving construction of meaning in which readers are able to understand the message of the text, but differ on the message source, where the former concentrates on written text and the latter indicates both oral and written text. Another definition of reading comprehension by Vellutino (2003) is “the ability to obtain meaning from written text for some purpose” (p. 51). In the context of this study, reading comprehension is considered as readers’ interaction and involvement with the written texts in English language. The significance of constructing meaning from text has led researchers to conclude that “the most important thing about reading is comprehension” (Block, Gambrell, and Pressley, 2002, p. 3).

Comprehension is part of literacy acquisition that comprises reading and writing, and is useful in developing understanding. Comprehension is the “process of building and maintaining a model of situations and events described in text” (McNamara, Miller and Bransford, 1991, p. 491). When students are able to comprehend written language, they can determine meaning from the text and have the capacity to infer what the text is conveying. While writing and reading are important parts of literacy acquisition, they do not involve critical brain applications compared to comprehension. The National Reading Panel (NRP) held in Washington, USA in 2000 explains the importance of comprehension to development of reading skills stating that comprehension facilitates both academic and lifelong learning, and that it contributes to a person’s ability to gain education (p. 13). For this reason, it is important for teachers to make sure that their students comprehend the written language.

Reading comprehension involves three attributes, namely reader, text, and activity (Snow, 2002, p.11). Readers are those who do the comprehending, the text refers to the element readers need to comprehend, while activity refers to the aspect students are engaged in to comprehend. Adding to the important elements, Flood, Lapp, and Fisher (2003) state that “reading comprehension has four critical variables, namely reader variables, text variables, educational context variables, and teacher variables” (p. 931). The reader variables include age, abilities and motivation, while text variables include genres of text studied, its type and features. Educational context reflects aspects such as learning environment, activities, social groupings, and purpose of the reading, while teacher variables include their knowledge, experience, attitude, and pedagogical approach to reading comprehension. Thus, Flood, Lapp, and Fisher (2003) emphasize the need to consider all these aspects to understand effective reading comprehension (p. 931).

Readers need to have varying abilities including cognitive capacities such as attention, memory, and critical analytic ability as well as motivation, knowledge and experiences to enable comprehension when reading. Required knowledge is in vocabulary which NRP (2000) identifies as critical to development of reading skills.

A reader who encounters a strange word in print can decode the word to speech. If it is in the reader’s oral vocabulary, the reader will be able to understand it. If the word is not in the reader’s oral vocabulary, the reader will have to determine the meaning by other means, if possible. Consequently, the larger the reader’s vocabulary, the easier it is to make sense of the text. (p. 13)

Other areas of knowledge are domain and topic, linguistic and discourse, and knowledge specific to comprehension strategies.

In the current reading environment, text includes both digital and printed text since sometimes readers may have access to digital texts and multimedia documents via computers in their classrooms or at home. Whether digital or printed, one important aspect of a text is that both forms of text have a significant effect of comprehension as the reader constructs meaning from the text. The reading path of printed texts is well established and you can certainly move around a text. With digital texts, however, the reading path is “to-be-constructed” by the reader (Kress, 2003, p. 152) because “the reader rather than the text is at the heart of reading process” (Nunan, 1995, p. 65).

Reading is not an automatic extraction of meaning and comprehension; rather it is a skill which requires readers to construct different representations of the text. This involves building mental models of understanding from the wording, base units, and idea units of the word (Chun and Plass, 1997, p. 64). According to Mayer (1993), a mental model is “a mental representation consisting of parts that interact with one another according to principle-based rules” (as cited in Chun and Plass, 1997, p. 64). Interpretation of digital text could be slightly complicated in comparison to conventional text because of non-learner presentations of text, but they offer the advantage of hyperlinks to definitions and opportunities to attain synonyms that could aid comprehension (Snow, 2002, p.14). Readers prefer the printed version of articles because of the sense of ownership provided by the printed text (Armitage, Wilson and Sharp, 2004, p. 18). According to Sellen and Harper (1997), “the critical differences have to do with the major advantages that paper offers in supporting annotation while reading, quick navigation, and flexibility of spatial layout” (p. 324). In recent years, researchers have drawn attention to significant differences between digital and printed text and called for more recognition among

educators about the cognitive differences between the two types of reading (Burke and Rowsell, 2008, pp. 445 - 456). Between digital and printed texts, comprehension may depend on the relationship between the reader, text, and activity.

Activity denotes the context into which reading occurs. Snow (2002) states, “reading does not occur in a vacuum; instead, reading occurs for a purpose and achieving some end, namely the activity” (p. 15). Readers could define the activity internally or externally. Some students may read to be able to answer questions asked by the teacher following reading, or they could read to fulfill an internal need to satisfy curiosity. Others may read to respond to questions encountered in a previous reading. For example, the ability to read academic texts is considered one of the most important skills that university students of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) need to acquire (Levine, Ferenz and Reves, 2000). Considering the statement, it is possible to claim that L2 students should be actively involved in the development of a wide repertoire of reading strategies which will help them to overcome difficulties when they encounter comprehension problems because “reading strategies are a tool for facilitating and extending comprehension” (Routman, 2003, p. 119). Reading could also leave readers with some questions requiring further reading. The aim of a reading activity is to encourage purposeful reading which will contribute to comprehension compared to when readers approach reading from a fun activity without a definite goal.

One important set of reading activities occurs in the context of instruction (Snow, 2002, p. 16). The instruction context is important to the current study since the indicated reading comprehension occurs within the classroom setting where the instructor is likely

to define the activity and reading goals, and requires the students to follow the set activity. This activity represents a variety of abilities for the comprehension of students. According to Marshall (2004), instruction should begin and end with students, which means that teachers' understanding of students should form the basis of all instruction; and to understand students, teachers should know the way students learn, including the effect of earlier learning experiences on students' attitudes and willingness to become involved in new learning. And it should be noted that the primary consideration in reading instruction should be the needs and strengths of each child (Clay, 2002). However, the setting even in classrooms reflects a deeper meaning of context in reading since the circumstances may also include the student's socio-cultural and socio-economic background. Rayner, Foorman, Perfetti, Pesetsky and Seidenberg (2001) have found in their studies that children living in poverty tend to achieve weaker reading skills than do their more affluent peers. Socio-economic background influences reading comprehension in that it may affect students' ability to have access to reading materials or availability of reference texts and tools including computers and other instructional materials (Snow, 2002, p. 16).

Contrary to the popular theory that learning to read is natural and easy, learning to read is a complex linguistic achievement. That's why teaching reading is a complex process as well. Obvious variables such as student proficiency, age, L1 and L2 relations, motivation, cognitive processing factors, curriculum and materials, resources, instructional setting, and institutional factors all impact the degree of success of reading instruction (Grabe, 2004). Teaching reading comprehension is facilitated through various models and strategies that can guide students toward independent reading

(Biancarosa and Snow, 2006, p. 5). Teachers use various models to activate students' cognitive processes during reading to overcome comprehension barriers. Cognitive reasoning denotes use of mental processes leading to a conclusion or inferences from information (Anshakov and Gergely, 2010, p. 1). Inferencing is a cognitive process that utilizes "familiar attributes and contexts" to recognize something unfamiliar in reading (Paribarht and Wesche, 1999, p. 198). Such models are important in development of active thoughtful interaction between readers and the text, and vocabulary development used in the interaction (NRP, 2000, p. 15).

According to Ness (2009), comprehension monitoring, cooperative learning, graphic and semantic organizers, story structure, question answering, question generation, summarization, and multiple strategy instruction are among the strategies used by teachers to enhance reading comprehension. In comprehension monitoring, the focus point is to teach learners to be aware or conscious of their understanding when reading, learning, and being able to deal with challenges in understanding. In cooperative learning, readers work together to facilitate acquisition of learning strategies in reading. In another strategy, graphic and semantic organizers, graphic representations are used by the reader such as drawings or writing to show the meaning and relationships derived from the text read. Story structure involves responding to the questions of who, what, where, when, and why related to a plot on a text related to the characters, and events. In question answering, students respond to questions asked by the teachers and then teacher gives feedback on whether the answer is correct. In question generation, the reader asks himself or herself Wh- questions. In summarization strategy, the reader identifies and writes the main points gained from the text and may try to integrate the

ideas with others to derive meaning. And the last strategy is multiple strategy instruction in which a reader could use several of the mentioned strategies to evolve his/her reading comprehension with the teacher's assistance. Use of multiply strategy instruction requires flexibility on the part of the teacher and reader to accommodate the differences in several approaches (Ness, 2009, p. 144).

So, reading comprehension in language teaching is important as it enables the reader to construct meanings and understand the message within a text. Reading comprehension in learning is also significant, and is therefore central to an individual's ability to acquire education. Various models and strategies facilitate teaching reading comprehension.

All the models with definitions mentioned above may be used in the process of reading, considering individual differences among the learners. Obviously, students who possess reading comprehension strategies develop faster and teachers who have reading knowledge help students more.

1.4.1.1 Reading Comprehension Strategies and Studies

This section reviews various reading experiences as well as studies on reading comprehension. According to Rivers (1981), "reading is the most important activity in any language class" (p. 147). For a successful reading comprehension, readers need "a variety of highly flexible process called comprehension strategies" (May, 2001, p. 119). To address the problems in reading comprehension difficulties, Colorado (2007) suggests vocabulary development and teaching comprehension strategies for English language learners. It has been observed that "children with stronger vocabulary skills

tend to achieve stronger reading skills than do children with weaker vocabulary” (NRP, 2000). For the importance of vocabulary in a language Laflamme (1997) states;

Research conducted in the past ten years reveals that vocabulary knowledge is the single most important factor contributing to reading comprehension. Moreover, studies conducted on the importance of vocabulary instruction demonstrate that it plays a major role in improving comprehension. (p. 372)

So, children’s vocabulary appears to be stronger predictor of their reading comprehension skills.

English language learners experience a lot of difficulties in the development of English reading skills. Culturally different schemata, limitation of vocabulary knowledge, and use of first language are some examples of their challenges (Iwai, 2010). According to Pang and Kamil (2004), these challenges are “understanding implicit cultural knowledge and norms; developing metalinguistic awareness; learning to code switch and translate; dealing with political, cultural, and social dimensions of language status issues; negotiating disparities between home / community and school literacy practices” (p. 5). Many English learners find themselves translating English into their first language especially if their level of English comprehension is low, which limits students’ ability to think in English and contributes to their first thinking in the native language and then translating it into English. So, Richards and Rodgers (1998) maintain that “even though translation is still widely used throughout the world, no teaching methodology exists that supports it and many speak out against it” (p. 4). The outcome of such practice is that students’ comprehension level will be lower compared with those learners who think in English.

The application of reading comprehension strategies through reading experiences provides suggestions for teachers to explain the approach to their students in a manner that will facilitate the internalization and application which in turn will ensure enhanced text comprehension and independent reading. According to Colorado (2007), it is important for English language learners to attain reading comprehension skills, as these skills give them an opportunity to be able to grasp concepts in other subject areas including science, mathematics, or social studies. Without gaining reading comprehension skills, English learners at different levels of English proficiency will find it difficult to engage fully with materials of other areas. Therefore, English teachers will need to establish strategies that they can use to engage their students further into reading comprehension.

Reading strategies emphasize deliberate and intentional plans that are controlled by readers, which emphasize reasoning, critical thinking in constructing the meaning from the text.

Effective reading strategies that facilitate the comprehension of text also emphasize metacognitive awareness, whereby students are able to reflect whether they are able to understand or not. Researchers have found that good readers are active or strategic readers who use a variety of comprehension strategies before, during, and after reading a text. Good readers use comprehension strategies to facilitate the construction of meaning. These strategies include previewing, self-questioning, making connections, visualizing, knowing how words work, monitoring, summarizing, and evaluating. Researchers believe that using such strategies helps students become metacognitive readers. (McLaughlin and Allen, 2002, p. 10)

Such a reflection enables students to regulate and reconstruct meaning as they read. Researchers have identified various strategies for enhancing reading comprehension. One of them is the study of new texts from the beginning to the end. This strategy involves examining the covers of the text; author's other works, cover illustrations and

other texts that usually precede the actual text. This enables readers to identify clues for making inferences and predictions on the content of the text at the pre-reading stage. The strategy also enables readers to activate prior knowledge that is relevant to the context, as well as triggering questions about it. Supporting this, Pearman (2008) states that “comprehension is, in part, dependent upon the reader’s prior knowledge and its activation as the author’s words are read. During comprehension, readers associate the new information communicated by the text to information already in their minds” (p. 594). Comprehension requires readers to “engage in a cycle of predicting meaning based on prior knowledge, monitoring to see if that meaning results, revising guesses about upcoming meaning while reading, reflecting on the significance of the message, and then repeating the cycle as new information is processed” (Duffy, 2003, p. 65). Strategic learning during reading is all about monitoring reading and making sense. Skilled readers know how to monitor and keep track of whether the author is making sense by asking questions (Vacca, 2002, pp. 184 - 204). Evidently, such a strategy towards reading comprehension is mostly applicable in literary texts, and not in teacher / text instruction. As such, the use of literature, as well as a background in literature is meaningful to students’ ability to develop this strategy, thus facilitating understanding and enrichment in the process of acquiring meaning from the text.

Another strategy in reading comprehension involves the activation and application of prior knowledge. McKay and Moulding (1986) note that readers who apply prior knowledge to a text can acquire more meaning compared to readers who have no prior knowledge (p. 36). In this regard, literature and other programs for reading comprehension provide readers with extensive prior knowledge as well as enhancing

their ability to activate this rich prior knowledge to their current reading contexts. The extent to which students' readership determines the level of literature, language, human experience, natural world that they are able to apply to the text is emphasized by Anderson and Pearson (1984). Irvin, Lunstrum, Lynch and Shepard state that proficient learners build on and activate their background knowledge before reading (1996, p. 5).

Another important strategy for comprehending text is drawing inferences. Gunning (2008) believes it is important for teachers to ask a variety of questions during and after read alouds, which may involve recalling important details from the story, drawing conclusions and making inferences (p. 272). This is when students are able to apply prior knowledge, experiences as well as textual information in order to make important conclusions, opinions and interpretations during their interaction with the text. This is called a schema. According to Gunning (2008), a schema provides a framework of comprehending a story and making inferences that flesh it out. A schema also aids retention, as students use it to organize their reconstruction of events (p. 272).

The ability to make predictions is also an effective strategy towards effective reading comprehension. When reading, students will contemplate on what will occur next as the story develops. In this way they acquire the ability to anticipate the text as well as the ability to predict outcomes during the course of reading. Narvaez (2002) notes that narratives are more helpful to inferences and this is partly because readers have early and extensive practice in inferring from narratives and partly because everyday life is constructed much like a story (p. 166).

Narvaez (2002) maintains that students need to be taught both how to transfer the strategies that they know and how to apply these strategies automatically to their reading texts. Instructors need to ask questions that will lead the reader to make inference such as causal relations between elements of the text, predictions and explanations (Narvaez, 2002, p. 169).

According to McKay and Moulding (1986), effective comprehension also relates students to determine the importance of what they are reading to the overall development of the narrative. This strategy entails the identification of major themes and ideas in the course of their reading, as well as applying them in determining the difference between the significant and the non-significant elements of the plot. Determining the significant and non-significant elements in a text is fundamental to effective summarizing, synthesizing and analyzing information (pp. 89 - 109).

Summarizing, analyzing and synthesizing information from the text is also a fundamental strategy in reading comprehension, which enables readers to pay attention to the major elements of the content as well as evaluating for general understanding. Students use this strategy to integrate significant information and ideas and discard unnecessary and irrelevant elements in the text. This approach further enables students to acquire skills in retelling the narrative without excluding any key facts that are fundamental to the development besides understanding of the story. In summarizing, students take larger selections of text and reduce them to their bare essentials: the gist, the key ideas, and the main points that are worth noting and remembering. In analyzing the text, students examine the basic components and structure of the text along with grammar, language, craft, literary techniques and style used by the author. The

analytical approach enables students to guess the language and stylistic choices made by the author in the overall development of the narrative. Synthesis transcends the mere understanding of what happened in the narrative. It further proceeds with the overall integration of textual knowledge with prior knowledge and experience in order to develop new understandings and perspectives of the narrative (McKay and Moulding, 1986, pp. 89 - 109).

Another strategy for better comprehension of a text is when ELT teachers encourage students to develop and answer their own questions regarding the text they are reading, during, before and after reading exercises. Lilleberg (1995) draws attention to what students already know:

Most learning theories clearly recognize that learning occurs as you understand new things in terms of what you already know. Activities encouraging students to identify with what is to be read also encourages them to draw on what is already known about the topic. Drawing on what they already know can encourage them to expect reading to build on and enhance this personal background of experience. (p. 21)

Building on students' personal background of experience ensures that learners are more deeply and actively involved in the entire reading process and that they are able to recognize gaps in their comprehension of the text and identify areas where more clarifications are required for a more comprehensive understanding. Teachers encourage students to constantly apply the strategies in their daily work, to ask and answer questions, and to use their prior knowledge as they learn about the specific topic (Liang and Dole, 2006, p. 750). In addition, asking and answering questions related to the text makes it possible to make inferences and predictions as well as increasing a focus on the significant elements in the narrative. Further, questions by other readers have the

potential of stimulating dialogue and challenging the interpretations and inferences made by other students.

Biancarosa and Snow (2006) illustrate the importance of students' learning comprehension in relation to high school students, indicating that while many students can read words accurately they cannot comprehend what they are reading due to various reasons (p. 7). They lack the strategies required to render comprehension such as noticing and repairing misinterpretations or changing tactics based on reading purposes. Other readers who have knowledge of useful strategies may have difficulties such as applying the strategies beyond content area or application in specific subject areas, which affect their use of the strategies (Biancarosa and Snow, 2006, p. 9). Pressley (2002) agrees with the idea as he says "in general, students are provided with opportunities to practice comprehension strategies, but they are not actually taught the strategies themselves nor the utility value of applying them" (p. 241). These may confine their application of reading text into content area thus limiting comprehension.

Teachers have a critical role in the development of reading comprehension among English learners if the learners are to gain the proficiency required in literature to understand text not only in their English classrooms but in other classrooms as well (Antunez, 2002). As mentioned in the previous section, the role of teachers in assisting reading comprehension includes developing classroom and out-of-class strategies that enable learning such as comprehension monitoring, cooperative learning, graphic and semantic organizers, story structure, question answering, question generation, summarization, and multiple strategy instruction (Ness, 2009, p. 144). This involves

reading comprehension instruction where teachers spend lesson time instructing students on strategies that will enable reading comprehension.

A qualitative study conducted by Klingner, Urbach, Golos, Brownell, and Menon (2010) seeks the validity of this idea by observing the extent to which teachers' instructing third to fifth grade students promotes reading comprehension among students (p. 61). The study focuses on whether teachers engaged in reading comprehension instruction by giving students comprehension-related activities. The findings indicate that in the 124 observations of 41 teachers in 30 lessons, there is some form of comprehension instruction, which includes question asking, with teachers asking students questions about their reading. The questions are rote-level questions and comprised mostly of factual issues about the reading. In another observation of the same study in 49 lessons, researchers observe additional comprehension instruction on a certain strategy without giving explicit instruction. Students in these lessons mainly use prediction to enhance reading comprehension. Researchers do not observe any reading comprehension related instruction in 49 of the lessons observed. The research also indicates that these lessons lack in complex strategies such as finding main idea from a text or a summary. The conclusion of the study is that teachers have problems promoting reading comprehension in their students, and many miss opportunities to instruct reading comprehension strategies (Klingner, Urbach, Golos, Brownell and Menon, 2010).

Some other studies on reading comprehension instruction show what Klingner et al. have found remains true in classroom application. An observational study of reading comprehension instruction conducted by Durkin in 1979 finds that in 4,469 minutes

noted in the observation only about 20 minutes are used in reading comprehension instruction (Lavert, 2008, p. 41). The study notes that methods used in enhancing reading comprehension mostly are asking students questions (Lavert, 2008, p. 71). Teachers do not spend much time teaching comprehension strategies that students could implement. In this study, teachers mainly engage students in assignments and tests instead of teaching them how to understand the texts they read. The study shows lack of teaching comprehension skills as well as a decrease in comprehension instruction that contributes to lack of emphasis in reading comprehension noted in the classrooms under observation. Combining the findings of the two studies, it is evident that more than three decades after Durkin's study (1979), teaching reading comprehension remains a fertile area as teachers focus on reading comprehension strategies such as asking questions without teaching complex aspects of reading comprehension strategies.

Similar findings were replicated in 2000 by a study by Taylor, Pearson, Clark, and Walpole that finds minimal comprehension instruction and that teachers are engaged mainly in question asking as the primary mode of teaching comprehension (p. 121). Teachers also encourage students to read in small groups or as a class and then ask students to respond through writing journal articles or stories about their reading. During the question asking time, teachers are mainly engaged in simple questions with the researchers noting that only 11 out of the 70 teachers observed ask higher order questions and only 5 % of the participants provide reading comprehension instruction (Taylor et al., 2000, p.121).

In brief, developing the vocabulary of learners and providing them with rich schemata is significant in classroom contexts. Students' first language use is also significant. Teachers use various strategies in teaching reading instruction, and they also allocate some time to teach reading instructions. Previewing, self-questioning, making connections, visualizing, knowing how words work, monitoring, and summarizing are among reading strategies. But, the studies conducted indicate that teachers most commonly use asking questions to the students as a reading comprehension strategy, which is not adequate in teaching the complex aspects of reading comprehension strategies.

1.4.1.2 Reading Comprehension and Literature

Another issue to be probed into is the relation between literature and reading comprehension because "reading comprehension is important in all levels of education as it enables learners who are struggling with their academic and literary tasks to overcome their challenges" (Ness, 2009, p. 143). Comprehension is an important component of literacy acquisition that includes reading, writing and comprehension skills. Reading comprehension is one of the main important elements in English language learning for all students because it provides the basis for a substantial amount of learning in education (Alvermann and Earle, 2003, pp. 12-30). Accordingly, students need to be taught to use language in different areas of language such as reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Reading comprehension enables learners to acquire meaning from text in addition to having a capacity to understand the message content of the text. Though reading is not the only skill to be taught in the language classroom, it is

definitely one of the most important for many EFL learners (Carell, Devine, and Eskey, 1998). In general, there are two types of reading, that is, extensive and intensive reading. According to Richards and Rodgers (2003), extensive reading is reading book after book where the readers should focus on the meaning of the text, while it gives them general information of the text. Scrivener (2005) describes intensive reading as “reading texts closely and carefully with the intention of gaining an understanding of as much as possible” (p.188). According to Hafiz and Tudor (1989), the difference between extensive and intensive reading is as follows:

In intensive reading activities learners are in the main exposed to relatively short texts which are used either to exemplify specific aspects of the lexical, syntactic or discourse system of the L2, or to provide the basis for targeted reading strategy practice; the goal of extensive reading, on the other hand, is to ‘flood’ learners with large quantities of L2 input with few or possibly no specific tasks to perform on this material. (p. 5)

Hafiz and Tudor (1989) also state that “the pedagogical value attributed to extensive reading is based on the assumption that exposing learners to large quantities of meaningful and interesting L2 material will, in the long run, produce a beneficial effect on the learners’ command of the L2” (p. 5). Based on this understanding, Hafiz and Tudor’s study shows that ELT teachers with a background in literature may be more inclined to focus on emphasizing extensive reading of literary works by encouraging their students to read independently. The experiment conducted by Hafiz and Tudor (1989) includes learners enrolled in an extensive three month reading program. Findings from this investigation reveal a significant improvement in students’ performance especially in their skills in writing. The significant improvement after participating in the three month extensive reading program is attributed to increased exposure to

syntactic, lexical and textual features acquired through reading material that is more pleasure oriented.

Inasmuch as there are various approaches to use literary texts in the context of language learning, the extensive reading approach that is associated with reading many books both for general understanding and pleasure is, in some learning environments, integrated as part of ELT curriculum. This is because the integration enables learners to consolidate what they have previously learnt within linguistic rules as well as acquiring the idea of how language is applied in real life situations, which subsequently enhances their ability to apply language fluently. Brown (2001) explains that extensive reading is carried out "to achieve a general understanding of a usually somewhat longer text (book, long article, or essay, etc.)" (p. 313). Hedge (2003) claims that students are urged to read independently by using the resources within their reach (pp. 200 - 201). Whereas Day (2003) believes,

Extensive reading is an approach that sees reading not merely as translation or as a skill, but as an activity that students do for a variety of personal, social or academic reasons. Extensive reading can be blended into any EFL curriculum, regardless of that curriculum's methodology or approach. (p. 1)

Through extensive or intensive reading, students are exposed to lexical items that are embedded within natural linguistic applications (Brumfit and Carter, 1986). This exposure further enables language learners to gradually acquire meanings as native speakers do. Since they are contextualized, these texts provide learners with a wide variety of registers, text types and styles that are at different difficulty levels.

Here, literature gains importance since it may be used as one of the basic components of reading comprehension. Through reading various forms of literature, students are able to

develop a narrative schema, which is an embedded knowledge of the narratives structure or narrative grammar that can be as well applied in the comprehension of other narratives (Carrell, 1984, pp. 103 - 111).

Literature texts are usually organized in sequences of events where key characters face obstacles and pursue goals. Comprehension of text requires students to make inferences on the motives of characters as well as recognizing major themes. A basic comprehension of the structure of a narrative ultimately enables students to make predictions on the development of the story. According to Duke and Pearson (2002), good readers frequently make predictions about what is to come as they read (p. 56). It also enhances the ability to make inferences about events that have not been explicitly expounded upon, an approach that further enhances comprehension. According to Keene and Zimmermann (1997), when we read, we stretch the limits of the literal text by folding our experience and belief into the literal meanings in the text, creating a new interpretation, an inference (p. 147). It is also important to learn how to infer meaning when reading. As for drawing inferences and filling the gaps in the narrative, literary works are usually very convenient tools as they integrate implicit information.

Literary texts provide students with the opportunity to expand on the limits of the text by integrating readers' experiences and beliefs into meanings of the text. This facilitates students' ability to create new interpretations and inferences from the text. Hismanoglu (2005) expresses his own view as follows:

Literature can be useful in the language learning process owing to the personal involvement it fosters in the reader. Once the student reads a literary text, he begins to inhabit the text. He is drawn into the text. Understanding the meanings of lexical items or phrases becomes less significant than pursuing the development of the story. The student becomes enthusiastic to find out what happens as events unfold via the climax; he feels close to certain characters and shares their emotional responses. This can have beneficial effects upon the whole language learning process. At this juncture, the prominence of the selection of a literary text in relation to the needs, expectations, and interests, language level of the students is evident. In this process, he can remove the identity crisis and develop into an extrovert. (p. 55)

Yigiter, Saricoban and Gurses (2005) state that “reading is a psycholinguistic process in that, it starts with a linguistic surface representation encoded by a writer and ends with meaning which the reader constructs” (p. 124).). On his part, Alyousef (2006) describes reading as the interactive process between the reader and the text, which ultimately develops to automaticity or reading fluency (p. 64). In reading, an interaction between language, learners’ thoughts and their background knowledge occurs, which makes it important for students to have the ability to read with sufficient comprehension.

The role of literary works in improving reading comprehension has always been important. Yigiter, Saricoban and Gurses (2005) further observe that “without comprehension, reading would be empty and meaningless” (p. 124). Literature is regarded as an important source and foundation for authentic language that increases language awareness. Literature stimulates discussions and interactions and is a great source of motivation. It complies with and supports the fundamental objectives of ELT. Literary texts develop a learner’s knowledge of the language based on three critical levels. These are vocabulary, structure and textual organization. During reading, students have the opportunity of seeing various usages of the vocabulary which they have already learnt as well as encountering many expressions (Brumfit and Carter, 1986, p. 3). Cruz (2010) draws attention to the feature of literature as authentic material:

Literature can be regarded as a rich source of authentic material, because it conveys two features in its written text: one is language in use, that is, the employment of linguistics by those who have mastered it into a fashion intended for native speakers; the second is an aesthetic representation of the spoken language, which is meant to recover or represent language within a certain cultural context. (p. 2)

Supporting Cruz (2010), Hismanoglu (2005) points to the same aspect of literature in that, literary texts are authentic materials because most literary works are not exclusively developed for the basic goal of teaching language. That's why the author notes that "in a classroom context, learners are exposed to actual language samples of real life, real life like settings" (p. 54). Moreover, since the language in literary texts is usually intended for native speakers, students increasingly become familiar with diverse linguistic forms, meanings and communicative functions. Another factor is cultural enrichment, whereby literary texts provide rich opportunities for students to experience both verbal and non-verbal aspects of language communication. Short stories, novels and plays among others enable English language learners to understand the manner in which communication through language takes place (Hismanoglu, 2005, p. 59). Teaching literature enables students "to understand and appreciate cultures and ideologies different from their own in time and space, and to come to perceive traditions of thought, feeling and artistic form within the heritage the literature of such cultures endows" (Carter and Long, 1991, p. 2).

In a similar manner to Hismanoglu, Lazar (1993) suggests that literature motivates, offers access to cultural background, encourages language acquisition, expands language awareness, develops students' interpretative abilities and educates the whole person in so far as it enhances their imaginative and affective capacities (pp. 9-15).

Hismanoglu (2005) also observes that although texts are mostly fictional, they nonetheless provide colorful and comprehensive settings where interactions between characters from diverse regional and social backgrounds are described. Indeed, many native and non-native EFL teachers, and other members of the academic community assume that it is virtually impossible to teach the target language without teaching the target culture (Jiang, 2000, pp. 328 - 334). Sardi (2002) expounds on the importance of a cultural context in ELT by stating that “since culture and language are inseparable, English cannot be taught without the culture or rather one of the cultures in which it is embedded” (p. 101). In this sense, culture refers to basic social skills that facilitate successful communication with other members of the community with regards to audience, setting, genre and purpose. According to Lazar (1993), it is possible to avoid such cultural problems because “during teaching in any teaching situation, there are obviously some literary texts which are likely to present fewer cultural problems than others” (p. 62).

Culture also refers to the aesthetic nature of literature, fine arts, music and films, as well as attributing to the way of life of the target community such as institutional structures and interpersonal relationships at work, home or during leisure (Brumfit and Carter, 1986). In a similar manner to the relation between culture and language, literature, with its universal appeal and artistic literary qualities, reflects the culture of the society it belongs to. With works of literature, students gain knowledge in respect to the way that the characters perceive their world, such as through their thoughts, customs, feelings, traditions and possessions, as well as what they believe, enjoy or fear. Readers are also

able to understand how the characters behave and speak in different settings, thereby enriching the cultural dimension of their language learning.

Another factor described by Hismanoglu (2005), Lazar (1993) and also by Collie and Slater (1987) is language enrichment. Literary texts provide students with a wide variety of individual syntactic and lexical items with language enrichment. Through language enrichment, learners become increasingly familiar with numerous features of written language through reading extensive and contextualized texts. In this way, they acquire critical knowledge about discourse and syntax functions, diverse ways of connecting thoughts and ideas that will subsequently improve their own writing.

Another factor is that using literary texts in classroom contexts stimulates personal involvement and motivation among learners. By reading a literary work, students are increasingly drawn to the text, where understanding the phrases and lexical items is only secondary to story. Thus, learners become increasingly enthusiastic to discover what happens during the unfolding of events, identifying and sympathizing with some characters. The use of literature stimulates independent reading as students can read both in the class and at home using methods such as sustained silent reading (Collie and Slater, 1987). Ultimately, the process positively impacts the entire process of language learning. According to Lazar (1993), literature, which encourages language acquisition, expands students' language awareness and interpretation abilities, should be seen as an invaluable resource of motivating material and as a bridge to provide access to cultural background (p. 11).

Moreover, researchers have increasingly acknowledged the role of literature in language teaching as it provides important authentic foundations and contributes to students' cultural enrichment (Brumfit and Carter, 1986, pp. 5-15). Authentic literary texts suggest developing skills of students through literary works that have not been specifically developed for language learners, but should be published using the original language (Ellis and McRae, 1991). According to Hismanoglu (2005), cultural enrichment enables learners to quickly acquire the "codes and preoccupations that shape a real society through visual literary semiotic" (p. 54). Sell (2005) argues that "teaching literature provides learners with a truly cultural competence, equipping them with culturally-apposite pragmatic and socio-psychological components around which to build effective identities which will enable their socialization in the target culture and enhance the effectiveness with which they participate in that culture" (p. 90).

Collie and Slater (1987) suggest in their book that teachers who use literature in their ELT classrooms enhance students' horizons through providing them with classic literature knowledge. This also improves their overall cultural awareness and stimulates their creativity and literary imagination, which ultimately facilitates the development of a keen appreciation of literature. Pleasurable nature of literary works increases learners' motivation to read, thereby acquiring the ability to use learned language in real life contexts and also literature provides valuable authentic material, develops personal involvement and helps contribute the readers' both cultural and language enrichment (pp. 3-6). Reading literature enhances a learner's awareness of the language and language use. This is because literary texts present the language in applied discourse that

is set in a variety of social contexts (Brumfit and Carter, 1986). Brumfit and Carter (2000) further state:

Literature is one major aspect of culture, and many people wish to study it in its own right. In addition it is more cheaply and easily accessible than many other cultural phenomena, and - because it is often responsive to international movements - it may be easier to comprehend than other more locally-based art forms. It is this kind of argument which, for many people, justifies the inclusion of literary courses in education. (p. 25)

According to Langer (1997); “literature can open horizons of possibility, allowing students to question, interpret, connect, and explore” (p. 607).

Collie and Slater (1987) also note that reading comprehension may be more effective with the use of literary texts. In these literary texts, students can explore a variety of possibilities such as relationships, emotions, motives, and reactions, drawing on all dimensions of understanding the real world. This exploration also stimulates critical analysis, especially when teachers want students to analyze the characters, alternative courses of action and outcomes (p. 5). Collie and Slater (1987) further note that, “it is true that the ‘world’ of a novel, play, or short story is a created one, yet it offers a full and vivid context in which characters from many social backgrounds can be depicted” (p. 4).

Through literary orientation, Baumann and Ivey (1997) observe that students increasingly enhance their ability for word identification, reading fluency, reading comprehension as well as improving composition skills through literature (p. 244). This reaffirms the importance of a literary oriented foundation in the development of reading comprehension among EFL students. McKay (1986) states that, “the key to success in using literature in a language class seems to me to rest in the literary works that are selected” (p. 193).

However, Carrell, Pharis and Liberto (1989) state that there is insufficient or ineffective instruction in reading comprehension in many ELT contexts, so it limits the ability of the students to independently process text through cognitive and metacognitive training. Carrell, Pharis and Liberto (1989) also note that the gaps in instruction can be effectively sealed by increased incorporation of literary and intensive reading in ELT classroom contexts (pp. 646 - 678). Identified factors that impede students' reading comprehension include lack of fluency that is required to facilitate comprehension, lack of strategies needed for comprehension such as repairing miscues and changing tactics based on the purpose of reading. Readers with knowledge of such strategies may also be challenged by their inability to apply the challenges beyond the content area or specific subject areas (Biancarosa and Snow, 2006). Such challenges arise especially when learners have not been sufficiently exposed to a wide variety of texts that would enable them to apply their reading strategies in wider contexts. Another concern is the number of books students read. According to Anderson (1996),

The number of books students read significantly correlates with their improvement in reading comprehension. The amount of book reading is substantially correlated with improvement in reading comprehension. Students in an EFL setting can especially benefit from this constant exposure to reading books. (p. 116)

Anderson (1996) also maintains that in EFL countries, maybe the only exposure to English texts that students have may be from reading English texts in class (pp. 55-77).

A reading lesson usually starts at the literal level, where direct questions regarding the characters, settings and plot are posed, and are answered by making specific references to literature. Subsequent to mastering literal understanding, students proceed to the inferential level where interpretations and speculations must be made in regard to the

theme, setting and characters, particularly where they refer to the author's perspective. After these two stages, students are usually ready to participate in collaborative exercises they accomplish through sharing their reactions to various literary themes and cultural aspects. These subsequently enable learners to consolidate their knowledge in regard to language structures, coherence and cohesion, which further enhances both their writing and reading capabilities (Brumfit and Carter, 1986, p. 5). In achieving all these mentioned above, teachers have an important role. To increase comprehension among their students, ELT teachers aim at enabling them to understand and develop effective strategies for reading. The process is also sometimes facilitated by integrating a literature background and materials in ELT classroom contexts. While using literature, teachers should adopt a delicate curriculum balance between a literary orientation and instruction in skills and reading strategies. In achieving this goal, Hismanoglu (2005) recommends that "EFL teachers should adopt a dynamic, student-centered approach toward comprehension of a literary work" (p. 57).

According to Anderson (1996), if teachers do not see themselves knowledgeable in reading or literature then students will have a drawback (pp. 55-77). Therefore, if teachers have a background of literature, then they may have more confidence and knowledge to help improve students' English reading comprehension. Arib (2010) has observed that,

ELT teachers and teachers with a literature background tend to apply different beliefs about nature and function of reading comprehension and accordingly apply different methods in their classes. The difference in the methods of these two groups of teachers is, much probably, due to different educational backgrounds. (p. 36)

Considering the literary works and literature courses studied at undergraduate level at literature departments, teachers with a literature background may have more advantages in such a context. On the other hand, teachers with an ELT background may have difficulty in using literature as part of reading comprehension. The underlying reason is the absence of a literature based approach, without which most instruction in reading comprehension is restricted to the instructor's direct questions regarding the material that learners are supposed to comprehend. In such cases, most teachers rely on question asking strategies by asking students questions about what they have read. Most of such questions are rote-level and are based on factual issues about the content. Such strategies may not be adequate in ensuring that students acquire effective comprehensive skills since they do not provide opportunities for finding main ideas from the text or summarizing. However, with reading comprehension strategies learners read increasingly difficult materials, discover and explore textual meaning as well as reacting and expounding on the acquired meaning.

Various researches suggest that ELT teachers with a literature background use literary texts in order to teach language skills. In accordance, texts are used more as a tool rather than an end in themselves when teaching language skills. According to McKay and Moulding (1986) teachers with a literature background use literary texts as a means for teaching basic language skills such as speaking, reading, writing and listening as well as specific language areas such as grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation. Contributing to the idea, Rosenblatt (1993) says that teachers with a literature background are more capable of using text either for literary purposes or for practical application (pp. 308-315).

Despite obvious benefits of using literature in language teaching, its application is not entirely common in many ELT classrooms. Hismanoglu (2005) attributes this to a variety of factors:

Literature plays an important role in the English programs of many non-English speaking countries. However, there are some problems encountered by language teachers within the area of teaching English through literature. First, there are very few pedagogically-designed appropriate materials that can be used by language teachers in a language classroom. Second, there is a lack of preparation in the area of literature teaching in TEFL programs. Third, there is the absence of clear-cut objectives defining the role of literature in EFL. Many instructors try to include literature in their classroom, but lack the background and training in that field. (p. 65)

Supporting the factors mentioned above, Savvidou (2005) states that there is often reluctance by teachers, course designers and examiners to introduce unabridged and authentic texts to the EFL syllabus (p. 4).

Robson (1989) argues that due to its syntactic and lexical difficulty, literature is seen to be able to do “little or nothing to help students to become competent users of the target language” (p. 25). Consequent to increased emphasis on language forms, teaching concerns for proficiency in communication have emerged in ELT contexts. It is observed that even in contemporary contexts, there are wide gaps between the literature class and the language class with the former being taught more like a specialized subject. The situation is reflected by the significant rise in English departments where the curriculum largely prioritizes the functional language forms for specific purposes. Within such a pedagogical approach, the assumption is that studies in literary English have minimal bearing on the EFL students’ needs to support a functional command of the language. The tendency is further reinforced when English language for specific

purposes becomes more acceptable while literature in general is considered as minimally relevant to the needs of students (McKay and Moulding, 1986, pp. 89 - 109).

Collie and Slater (1987) observe that literature has continued to gradually disappear from ELT classrooms (p. 10). Schultz (2002) has a similar concern as he states “literature and authentic literary texts disappear from language classrooms” (p. 35). Many colleges are increasingly focusing on training teachers in the instrumental functions of language, with decreasing focus on training in the overall aesthetic understanding and appreciation of language. This suggests that the curriculum of ELT Departments mostly focus on pedagogy where the students are instructed in the correct language forms.

According to Lin and Guey (2004), the reason why the use of literature in language classrooms has significantly declined is because “literature has not been given due consideration at many colleges and universities because many educational institutions have put their main emphasis on practical language skills at the expense of literature” (p. 2). In many traditional ELT classrooms where teacher centered approach is used, students are largely unengaged and fail to develop fundamental analytical and interpretative skills required to learn language use through literature effectively. So, the underdevelopment of these fundamental skills is the result of their limited exposure to literary texts that would be important in developing their reading comprehension skills (Lin and Guey, 2004, p. 5).

Lin and Guey (2004) also claim that in cases where literature is used in the language classroom, the approach is also teacher centered, which further inhibits the potential of

literary texts in improving reading comprehension skills among English language learners. Further, language teachers characteristically use literary texts in a presentation form, thus failing to provide opportunities for learners to proactively engage with the text (p. 3).

However, the advantages of literature in the ELT classroom can only be utilized when teachers use material that is relevant and appealing to the learners. This can be accomplished by using activities that promote reader response, involvement as well as a concrete integration between literature and language.

In the Turkish context, where English is a foreign language, the ability to read between the lines is a challenging task for teachers as it is for the students. Language teachers need to help students to be equipped with the cultural context that facilitates the ability to decipher literary texts. Such a rich cultural context, which is provided by extensive reading of literary contexts not only enhances students' ability to comprehend texts, but also makes it possible for language teachers in ELT to provide guidance to students due to their deep awareness of the cultural context of the language (Elioglu, 1992).

A variety of literary experiences, that is, metacognitive awareness, activation and application of previous knowledge, drawing inferences, making predictions, summarizing, analyzing and synthesizing information, developing and answering their own questions while reading literary texts, have been mentioned. Literature is significant in facilitating reading comprehension. Using literary material that is relevant and appealing to learners in order to gain from the advantages of using literary texts in teaching reading comprehension is also a valuable asset.

The review finds that teacher related attributes significantly influence their instruction in reading comprehension. Such attributes include values, beliefs and accumulated knowledge about literature use, reading comprehension and the application of effective reading strategies. Literature is an important component of reading comprehension, it is an authentic material; it motivates students and contributes to cultural enrichment. Therefore, it is possible to make the assumption that teacher attributes may be shaped by their background, ELT or Literature, on shaping their perspectives on the importance and application of effective reading comprehension strategies and using literature or not during the classes. As such, it is possible to make the assumption that teacher attributes may be shaped by their background, such as if they have an ELT or literature background that shapes their perspective on the importance and application of effective reading comprehension strategies and using literature or not during the classes.

1.4.1.3 Reflections of Teachers' Beliefs and Perceptions on Their Teaching Reading Comprehension

Teachers' perspective plays an influential role in determining their professional behavior, that is, the ways they plan their lessons, the kinds of decision they make, and the methods they apply in their classrooms (Khonamri and Samili, 2010, p. 97; Quirk, Unrau, Ragusa, Rueda and Lim, 2010, p. 94; Chang, 2011, p. 18). A primary source of teachers' classroom practices is their belief system which consists of information, attitudes, values, expectations, theories, and assumptions about teaching and learning that teachers build up over time and bring with them to the classroom (Richards, 1998,

p. 66). In addition, teachers' beliefs not only influence the way teachers teach, but also what they decide to teach with.

The ability to read in another language with easy comprehension and fluency should be cultivated in progressive stages, and practiced at first with carefully selected material which students can read with ease and enjoyment. What ease means here should be understood as comprehensible, that is, appropriate for students' level of understanding. According to Anderson, "reading is an active, fluent process which involves the reader and the reading material in building meaning. Meaning does not reside on the printed page" (1999, p. 55). Grabe (1995), on the other hand, asserts that ". . . reading is an active process of comprehending where students need to be taught strategies to read more efficiently" (p. 377).

A quantitative study on teachers' beliefs about students' reading motivation and teachers' behavior in classroom conducted by Quirk, Unrau, Ragusa, Rueda and Lim (2010) reveals the relationship between teachers' viewpoints and their teaching behavior. It indicates that teachers' beliefs about motivating students to read could be reliably measured. In addition, significant relationships are found between teachers' beliefs about motivating their students to read and how they teach self-efficacy (p. 113).

Another quantitative research by Khonamri and Salimi (2011) in Mazandaran, Iran, shows how teachers' beliefs about reading strategies in English as a foreign language and the impact of their beliefs on their teaching activities confirm the importance of teachers' beliefs (p. 104). This study explores a questionnaire and self-reports to see teachers' beliefs on reading strategies. However, since little research is available on the

relationship in English language teaching as a second language, the study seeks to construct an indication of teachers' beliefs and actual instructional practices in developing reading comprehension. The results show a connection between teachers' beliefs in the importance of building reading strategies to reading comprehension and their approaches in teaching reading strategies in reading classes. Findings, thus, confirm the existence of a relationship with a discrepancy in self-reports and classroom behavior. The researchers sum that if teachers are able to see the gap between likely practice and actual practice, it will contribute to improvement in reading comprehension (Khonamri and Salimi, 2011, p. 105). Accordingly, teachers' beliefs are directly or indirectly reflected in their teaching, activity or material choice in reading comprehension classes.

Another research at the University of South Dakota, Vermillion, USA explores the effect of teachers' perceptions on classroom practices. It is a study on perceptions of ELT teachers' about four research-based components of reading instruction (Bunt, 2009, p. 6). The study indicates that teachers believe in the importance of comprehension, vocabulary, fluency, and independent reading as four research-based components of reading. Significant to the current research is the finding that a strong relationship exists between teachers' perception of their knowledge and beliefs about the importance of the four components, and classroom practices. The researcher also notes that knowledge base and beliefs predict the way the teachers use their time in the classroom (Bunt, 2009, p. 14). As to teachers' beliefs, Johnson (1999) states that, "teachers' beliefs have a powerful impact on the nature of teachers' reasoning since the ways in which teachers

come to conceptualize themselves as teachers and develop explanations for their own classroom practices tend to be filtered through their beliefs” (p. 31).

Oakley (2011) conducts a study using survey and semi-structured interviews assessing practices of teachers of 10 to 12 year-old children in Western Australian schools (p. 279). An aspect of the study that makes it relevant to this discussion is that it considers teachers’ perceptions in assessing reading comprehension strategies. Western Australian schools apply reading comprehension strategies as part of the school curriculum. Oakley’s research explores whether teachers are able to assess the use of reading comprehension strategies and plan for appropriate teaching since effective assessment is necessary in order to plan appropriate teaching. The study focuses on the perceptions of teachers involved in reading comprehension and their self-reported practices in assessment of related strategies. Findings show that many of the teachers attempt to teach reading comprehension strategies and less than 40 % of the teachers in the study teach metacognitive skills that enable self-monitoring of meaning. The result makes it clear that teachers with more teaching experience are more likely to teach reading comprehension strategies compared to teachers with fewer teaching years or to those fresh from college (Oakley, 2011, p. 285). Sometimes teachers indicate a lack of confidence in the assessment of reading comprehension strategies and they feel unprepared to handle the assessment. The study links levels of confidence in assessment to years of practice and professional development that teachers receive. Among teachers who gain their confidence through long years of work, the researcher suggests that such teachers’ confidence could be misplaced since it is not gained through professional development. Another aspect that could contribute to the confidence of teachers working

for long years is that they mainly teach a narrower range of cognitive strategies, an aspect that could lead to simpler assessment requirements. This study contributes to the current discussion by indicating the effect of teachers' confidence on appreciation of reading comprehension strategies. The emerging conclusion is that teachers who feel confident with their knowledge of reading comprehension strategies are likely to engage in teaching such practices (Oakley, 2011, pp. 279-293).

Gibson (2009) conducts a research as part of her master's thesis examining whether teachers' perceptions contribute to reading comprehension (p. 7). Teachers in kindergarten through eighth grade are surveyed on their perceptions of strategy based reading instruction's effectiveness for improving reading comprehension. In the study, Gibson (2009) finds that teachers' perceptions of strategies contribute to the possible use of reading comprehension strategies in teaching and strategy based reading instruction helps teachers differentiate the teaching of reading. It also supports many types of readers by explicitly teaching and modeling reading comprehension strategies. The study explores the effectiveness of strategy based reading instruction for improving student reading comprehension. Additionally, it examines teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of this approach. The more teachers have knowledge about reading comprehension strategies, the more they apply them in their classes. The research concludes that teachers' acceptance about a strategy's usefulness in improving reading comprehension contributes to the use of the strategy and strategy based reading instruction is an effective way to improve reading comprehension. Results indicate that the teachers enjoy using this method and that it is an effective way to improve reading comprehension (Gibson, 2009, p. 12).

Woolley (2011) confirms the influence of teachers' perceptions by stating that when teachers have inadequate understanding of the uses of comprehension strategies and have limited perceptions of the challenges students are having, they are unlikely to contribute effectively to addressing poor reading comprehension. Inadequacies in teacher perceptions could contribute to students' poor performance in reading comprehension, since they are not prepared to meet students' challenges. Being aware of students' needs in reading comprehension, and being aware of related strategies could help teachers and students improve on reading comprehension (Woolley, 2011, p. 23).

Teachers' awareness of reading comprehension strategies can enable them to identify appropriate reading comprehension strategies. A research conducted by Sargusingh-Terrance (2008) shows contribution of teachers' perceptions to their teaching. The research investigates reading comprehension instruction in Saint Lucia school, New Zealand, and the explanations teachers provide about perception of factors that contribute to students' failure in main idea comprehension test. The study targets teachers in fifth grade who participate in semi-structured interviews and regular observations in reading comprehension lessons. Teachers' perceptions as to the factors which contribute to students' failure are teachers' inability to instruct, poor student decoding and comprehension abilities, and inadequacy of the main idea test. Teachers' inability to instruct is noted by teachers as a significant factor contributing to students' failure. Teachers are indeed engaged in some reading comprehension strategies, but rely mostly on question answering and sometimes combine question answering with other reading comprehension strategies. Teachers also use summation to engage students in reading comprehension, with 7 out of 16 lessons observed showing using of summation

as the dominant strategy. Use of questioning, though dominant, is mostly seen in the assessment of reading text, but it emerges as a combined model for teaching reading comprehension and assessment. The research suggests the benefits that can emerge if teachers are more aware of their students and utilized strategies that are more effective in meeting these needs (Sargusingh-Terrance, 2008, p. 25).

The research by Klingner et al. (2010) suggests that reading comprehension instruction emerges from the role of teachers who should be able to identify opportunities for instruction and use them (p. 71). The results of the research show that teachers sometimes do not know what to do, or they do not take an initiative toward development of reading comprehension strategies. The study leads to the conclusion that teachers' identification and use of strategies facilitating reading comprehension may be hampered by teacher-related attributes such as teachers' attitude and beliefs about reading comprehension and implementation of reading comprehension strategies (Klingner et al., 2010, pp. 123-146).

As for the use of literature in reading comprehension, August and Shanahan (2000) note that, the function of literature in ELT classrooms depends on teaching approaches that are prevalent within language learning. Another reason why some teachers consider literature inappropriate for teaching purposes may be found in the common beliefs about literature and literary language. "Firstly, the creative use of language in verse and prose often deviates from the conventions and rules which govern standards, non-literary discourse as in the case of poetry where grammar and lexis may be manipulated to serve orthographic or phonological features of the language. Secondly, the reader requires

greater effort to interpret literary text since meaning is detached from the readers' immediate social context" (Savvidou, 2005, p. 4).

Apparently, teachers' perspectives in determining how they plan lessons as well as how they teach the strategies they apply in classrooms are important. A variety of studies have been conducted to determine the influence of teachers' existing beliefs and perspectives about teaching reading comprehension with a specific note on the perspectives of ELT teachers with an ELT background and those with a literature background, and the pros and cons of using literature. These studies have found out that there is a relationship between teachers' beliefs about motivating their students to read and how they teach self-efficacy. In addition, studies have revealed that teachers' perceptions of reading comprehension strategies contribute to the use of these strategies during their classes.

1.4.2 Comparison of Curricula of ELT and Literature Departments in Turkish Universities

Teachers' beliefs, practices and attitudes are important since they have a reflection on their teaching processes. They are closely linked to teachers' practices, and they shape students' learning environment and influence student motivation and achievement. Though there may be variations, certain beliefs and practices are seen more prominent than others among ELT teachers with the same educational background. It is not just the students' needs, classroom and school background factors that determine teachers' beliefs and attitudes; teachers' background is also important. Teachers' beliefs and practices are expected to be associated with their background characteristics, especially

with their professional education. Besides shaping teachers' personal beliefs and individual practices directly during their teaching process, different educational background has indirect effects on beliefs and practices and a more general impact on overall characteristics of teaching. Since teachers' beliefs about their students and learning are formed by their prior language learning and teaching experiences, these beliefs structure the knowledge base for teaching. Meijer et al. (1999) regard prior experiences as part of the teachers' background variables that potentially affect teachers' practical knowledge. In that respect, the curricula of the ELT and Literature departments are quite different from each other, which is to be probed into under this heading.

The comparison of the curricula of literature and ELT departments gives a perspective to understand the background knowledge of teachers with ELT and literature background. In recent years, researchers have come to an agreement on that teachers' personal beliefs on teaching as well as their perceptions play a crucial role in their classroom practices (Borg, 2003, p. 82). Richards and Rodgers (2001) assert that teachers possess assumptions about language and language learning, and that these provide the basis for a particular approach to language instruction (p. 165). According to Johnson (1994), research on teachers' beliefs reveals three basic assumptions. Firstly, "teachers' beliefs influence their perception and judgment", secondly, "teachers' beliefs play a role in how information on teaching is translated into classroom practices" and thirdly "understanding teachers' beliefs is essential to improving teaching practices and teacher education programs" (p. 439).

Although teacher education programs have been in existence for a long time, language teacher education is a relatively recent development (Day, 1991). As far as language teacher education in Turkey is concerned,

The situation is rather complex because not only English language Teaching (ELT) graduates but also non-ELT graduates, who have graduated from programs related to English language, such as English Language and Literature, American Culture, Linguistics, and Translation and Interpretation are employed to teach English. Although all these groups of teachers have a certain extent of training on foreign language culture, there may be differences among these teachers in terms of what they already bring to the classroom. (Gonen and Saglam, 2012, p. 30)

The curricula of ELT and literature departments are different from each other in some ways. In this context, the aim of this study is to examine the course curricula and to compare them due to the assumption that ELT and Literature graduates are employed more as teachers of English than graduates of Linguistics, and Translation and Interpretation departments. In this study, a curriculum is taken as what is expected to be learned as well as how it is taught. One of the most commonly used definitions of curriculum is “what counts as valid knowledge” (Bernstein, 1973, p. 85). Course curriculum in ELT departments aims at equipping teacher candidates with the field information, teacher education and school training, whereas literature departments aim at developing expertise in students on literature. In addition, literature departments also aim at improving students’ sensitivity and taste in the general sense of language and literature (Genc and Bada, 2005). The curricula of English Language and Literature departments of Hacettepe and Istanbul University are included in this study because Istanbul University is the first Language and Literature department in Turkey founded in the late 1930’s and Hacettepe is among the first Language and Literature departments in Turkey and their curricula form a basis for other literature departments. At the

University of Istanbul and Hacettepe, English language and literature programs include, through a study of major authors, literary works and movements.

Table 1 Curriculum of English Language and Literature Department at Istanbul University

First Year	Second Year
Introduction to English Literature	Critical Approaches to English Literature
Mythology in English Literature	English Theatre
Applied Textual Studies 1	Popular English Literature
Outlines of English Literature	Selected Works in English Literature
Textual Analysis	16th Century English Literature
Applied Textual Studies 2	Milton and his Time
Fantasy Fiction	17th Century English Literature
Composition I	Composition II
	Short Story
	Literature and Performing Arts
Third Year	Fourth Year
18th Century English Novel	Contemporary English Theatre
Introduction to Literary Criticism	20th Century English Novel
Shakespeare and his Time	Edwardian Literature
Literary Studies	Special Topics in English Literature
19th Century English Poetry	Research in English Literature
Contemporary Literary Criticism	Chaucer and his Time
Victorian Novel	Contemporary English Poetry
Interdisciplinary Studies	Postmodern Novel
Cultural Studies	Contemporary Literature and Culture
Comparative Literature	Western Literatures

<http://www.edebiyat.istanbul.edu.tr>

Of the total 38 lessons above during the 4 year education at the literature program of Istanbul University, all lessons (92 %), with the exception of composition and interdisciplinary studies, are literature-related lessons. The main focus of the program is literature, and in addition to literature there is a composition lesson which may be more related to language itself.

In Table 1, the department curriculum comprises the analysis, study, and discussion of various types of literature, literary terms and movements, mythology, and periods of English Literature. The aims of the department, as expressed in their website, are to familiarize the students with key literary concepts, especially to analyze and comment on short stories, drama and poetry, and to make them think about “what makes a text literary” through a close analysis of chosen literary texts. In brief, they aim to cover a wide range of areas in English literature, literary and cultural theory (www.edebiyat.istanbul.edu.tr).

Another sample is Hacettepe University, one of the most popular and the oldest literature departments in Turkey.

Table 2 Curriculum of English Language and Literature Department at Hacettepe University

First Year	Second Year
Study Skills and Research Techniques	Speech and Communication Skills
Mythology	Life and Society in Britain
Classical Literature	British Popular Culture
Introduction to Literature	British Poetry and Prose I
Sources of British Literature	Short Story
Introduction to Britain I	British Novel I
Introduction to Britain II	Introduction to Cultural Studies
Third Year	Fourth Year
Translation III	Literary Theory and Criticism I
British Drama I	Literary Theory and Criticism II
Shakespeare	Post-colonial English Literature
British Drama II	British Drama III
British Poetry and Prose	British Drama IV
British Poetry and Prose III	British Poetry and Prose IV
British Novel II	British Poetry and Prose V
British Novel III	British Novel IV

<http://www.ide.hacettepe.edu.tr>

Of the total 30 lessons above during the 4 year education at the literature program of Hacettepe University, 26 lessons (86,6 %) are literature lessons. The main focus of the program is literature, and in addition to literature there are 4 lessons (13,3 %) which are more related to language itself. As stated in their web site, more specifically, a study of Greek and Roman mythologies, a study of classical Greek and Roman literature with textual examples, the study of political, social, religious, philosophical and literary developments in Britain, British prose and poetry, British drama, the development of British novel during the course of history, and the rise and development of literary criticism are within the scope of this program (www.ide.hacettepe.edu.tr).

As for ELT Departments, the first university in ELT programs is Middle East Technical University. Depending on the results of "World University Rankings Top 400 2012-2013" on October 3, 2012 announced by English Times Higher Education (THE) with respect to the overall score achieved; Middle East Technical University ranks 203rd in the world (www.ncc.metu.edu.tr). Apart from the program of Middle East Technical University (ODTU), the programs of Istanbul University, Maltepe University and Hacettepe University are mentioned successively because Istanbul and Hacettepe Universities are among the most popular universities, and Maltepe University is where this study is being carried out.

In general, the aim of ELT departments, including Middle East Technical University, Istanbul University, Maltepe University and Hacettepe University, is to take the latest developments in the field of ELT into consideration, besides providing with a solid foundation in the English language, methodology, educational sciences, linguistics,

and literature. All education faculties virtually follow a standardized curriculum, set by the Counsel of Higher Education. But they may differ in their choice of elective courses, examinations, materials and course books.

Table 3 Curriculum of English Language Teaching Department at Middle East Technical University

First Year	Second Year
Contextual Grammar I	English Literature II
Advanced Reading and Writing I	Linguistics II
Oral Communication	Contrastive Turkish-English
Listening and Pronunciation	Approaches to ELT
Introduction to Literature	Second Foreign Language III
Introduction to Education	Educational Psychology
Turkish I	Instructional Principles & Methods
Written Expression	Instructional Technology & Materials Development
Second Foreign Language I	Drama Analysis
Introduction to Information Technologies	Oral Expression & Public Speaking
Contextual Grammar II	ELT Methodology I
Advanced Reading & Writing II	
Oral Communication Skills	
English Literature I	
Linguistics I	
Second Foreign Language II	
Third Year	Fourth Year
Language Acquisition	Materials Adaptation and Development
ELT Methodology II	English Language Testing & Evaluation
Advanced Writing & Research Skills II	School Experience
Principles of Kemal Ataturk I	Translation
Novel Analysis	Practice Teaching
Teaching English to Young Learners	The English Lexicon
Teaching Language Skills	Guidance
Principles of Kemal Ataturk II	
Classroom Management	
Community Service	
Turkish Educational System	

<http://www.fle.metu.edu.tr>

Of the total 45 lessons above during the 4 year education at the ELT program of Middle East Technical University, only 5 lessons (11,1 %) are literature lessons. The focus of the program is on the learning and teaching of the language with its components. As stated in their website, the aim of ELT Department of Middle East Technical University is to take into consideration the latest developments in the field, to provide a solid foundation in the English language, English literature, methodology, educational sciences and linguistics in order to make students fully qualified teachers of English in in primary, secondary and tertiary educational institutions (www.fle.metu.edu.tr).

**Table 4 Curriculum of English Language Teaching Department at
Istanbul University**

First Year	Second Year
Grammar in Context	Language Teaching Methods I
Turkish I: Writing Skills	Linguistics I
Advanced Reading and Writing	Approaches to ELT
Listening and Pronunciation	Translation
Oral Communication Skills	Expressive Skills
Introduction to Education	History of Turkish Education
Effective Communication Skills	Methods of Teaching
Turkish II: Writing Skills	English Literature I
Grammar in Context II	Linguistics I
Advanced Reading & Writing II	Approaches in ELT
Listening and Pronunciation II	Instructional Principles & Methods
Oral Communication Skills	Language Acquisition
Lexicology	Methods of Scientific Research
Educational Psychology	Cultural Studies
Third Year	Fourth Year
Teaching Language Skills I	Material Analysis and Development in EFL
Literature and Language Teaching I	Applied Linguistics
Second Foreign Language I	Course Book Analysis
Drama	School Experience
Classroom Management	Gender Studies
Teaching Foreign Languages to Children I	Professional Development
Translation II	Ataturk's Principles and History of Turkish Revolution II
Teaching Foreign Languages to Children II	Assessment and Evaluation in EFL
Teaching Language Skills II	Comparative Education
Literature and Language Teaching II	Current Topics in ELT
Second Foreign Language II	Critical Thinking Skills in EFL Teaching
Sociolinguistics	
Community Service	
Assessment and Evaluation	
Ataturk's Principles and History of Turkish Revolution I	

<http://egitimdeyapilanma.istanbul.edu.tr>

The aim of the Department of English Language Teaching at Istanbul University is to give an insight to its students to be able to question from a scientific perspective the theoretical and applied knowledge about the field, to be able to evaluate it from a critical

point of view, to be able to watch closely the developments in the field through professional activities, to have proficiency in English language in line with the Language Proficiency levels prescribed by the Council of Europe and to be able to formulate projects and activities for a more efficient foreign language teaching (www.egitimdeyapilanma.istanbul.edu.tr).

**Table 5 Curriculum of English Language Teaching Department at
Maltepe University**

First Year	Second Year
Computer I	Instructional Principles and Methods
Introduction to Educational Sciences	English Literature I
Contextual Grammar I	Linguistics I
Listening and Pronunciation I	Approaches to ELT I
Advanced Reading and Writing I	English-Turkish Translation
Oral Communication Skills I	Oral Expression and Public Speaking
Effective Communication	History of Turkish Education
Turkish Language I Written Expression	English Literature II
Computer II	Linguistics II
Educational Psychology	Approaches to ELT II
Contextual Grammar II	Language Acquisition
Listening and Pronunciation II	Academic Research Methods
Advanced Reading and Writing II	Teaching Technologies and Material Design
Oral Communication Skills II	Special Teaching Methods I
Lexical Competence	
Turkish II: Oral Expression	
Third Year	Fourth Year
Classroom Management	Principles of Ataturk and History of Turkish Revolution I
Second Foreign Language I	School Experience
Teaching English to Young Learners I	Guidance
Special Teaching Methods II	Second Foreign Language III
Teaching Language Skills I	Language Teaching Materials Evaluation
Literature and Language Teaching I	Special Education
Drama	English Language Testing & Evaluation
Measurement and Evaluation	Principles of Ataturk and History of Turkish Revolution II
Second Foreign Language II	Turkish Educational System and School Management
Teaching English to Young Learners II	Comparative Education
Teaching Language Skills II	Teaching Practice
Literature and Language Teaching II	
Practicing Public Service	
Turkish-English Translation	

<http://egitim.maltepe.edu.tr>

The language education of the Department of English Language Teaching at Maltepe University aims to develop a program which raises awareness in a multilingual, multicultural world, which eases the communication among cultures, which develops language awareness towards English syntax, discourse and concepts, which applies current language teaching approaches with the help of technology. It also aims to train individuals who are inquisitive, critical towards themselves and the world, equipped with sufficient subject-matter knowledge and also teachers who apply current methods and approaches in foreign language education, become good models in the classroom to their students (www.egitim.maltepe.edu.tr).

**Table 6 Curriculum of English Language Teaching Department at
Hacettepe University**

First Year	Second Year
Introduction to Education	Teaching Principles and Methods
Turkish I: Written Communication	English Literature I
Contextual Grammar I	Linguistics I
Advanced Reading and Writing I	Approaches to ELT I
Listening and Pronunciation I	English-Turkish Translation
Oral Communication Skills I	Oral Expression and Public Speaking
Effective Communication Skills	History of Turkish Education
Computer I	Measurement and Evaluation
Educational Psychology	English Literature II
Turkish II: Oral Communication	Linguistics II
Contextual Grammar II	Approaches to ELT II
Advanced Reading and Writing II	Research Skills
Listening and Pronunciation II	ELT Methodology I
Oral Communication Skills II	Language Acquisition
Lexical Competence	
Computer II	
Third Year	Fourth Year
Classroom Management	Principles of Kemal Ataturk I
Teaching English to Young Learners I	Special Education
ELT Methodology II	Guidance
Teaching Language Skills I	Materials Adaptation and Development
Literature and Language Teaching I	School Experience
Drama	Second Foreign Language III
Second Foreign Language I	Principles of Kemal Ataturk II
Teaching English to Young Learners II	Comparative Education
Turkish - English Translation	Turkish Education System & School Administration
Teaching Language Skills II	Testing and Evaluation in EFL Teaching
Literature and Language Teaching II	Practice Teaching
Community Service	
Instructional Tech. & Materials Development	
Second Foreign Language II	

<http://www.elt.hacettepe.edu.tr>

As expressed in their website, the English Language Teaching Department at Hacettepe University aims to train prospective teachers of English who are conscious, responsible and guided by modern principles of education, and are armed with the skills used in contemporary education and have acquired the ability to design lessons that are compatible with technological changes (www.elt.hacettepe.edu.tr).

Of the total 54 lessons above during the 4 year education at the ELT program of Istanbul University, only 4 lessons (7,4 %) are literature and literature-related lessons. The situation is no different at Maltepe University, where only 4 lessons (7,2 %) out of 55 are literature-related lessons. Another ELT department, Hacettepe University, has 55 lessons during the 4 year period and out of 55 lessons only 4 (7,2 %) are literature-related lessons.

Considering the points mentioned above, it is clear that ELT departments aim to focus on training teachers equipped with latest developments on teaching, language use, current methodological practice, new technologies in the classroom, and teacher development. On the other hand, literature departments aim to focus on creating graduates, not specifically teachers, who know key literary concepts, who are competent in English or American literature, who can analyze a literary text, who knows about literary movements, and who also know much about the rise and development of literary criticism. In accordance with their aims, the percentage of literature, between 90 % and 95 %, and related courses are dominant in the curricula of the literature departments. The remaining 5 % - 10 % is related to language teaching. Likewise, the situation is reversed in the ELT departments because the percentage of courses related to language

teaching is between 90 % and 95 %, whereas the percentage of literature and related lessons is only between 5 % - 10 %. Naturally, the differences in the curricula of ELT and Literature departments reflect on the graduates. Their classroom practices are affected by their background education.

CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

In this chapter the methodological procedure followed to collect data including the research questions, population and sampling, data collection instruments and data analysis procedure will be introduced.

2.1 The Research Questions

The aim of this study is to put forward the perceptions and practices of English language teachers with an ELT and literature background about the use of literature in reading comprehension and to see if their views and practices during their teaching process are affected by their educational background. The reasons why they use or do not use literature or literary works are within the scope of the study. It is assumed that as far as using literature in classroom is concerned, there will be differences. Thus, the study seeks to find answers to the following questions:

- 1 - What do teachers use for reading comprehension in addition to the activities in the course books?
- 2 - How do teachers demand literature involvement in addition to syllabi outside the class?
- 3 - Why do teachers use literature or literary works in their reading classes?
- 4 - Why do teachers use few or no literary works in their reading classes?

2.2 Population and Sampling

The population in this study involves 140 non-native English language instructors from 4 state and 4 foundation universities. The instructors chosen as the population of the study are from Medeniyet University, Yeditepe University, Uskudar University and Suleyman Sah University in Istanbul, Orhan Gazi University in Bursa, Adnan Menderes University in Aydın, Yalova University in Yalova and Balıkesir University in Balıkesir.

Convenience sampling method has been chosen in this study to supply the appropriate sample and on the assumption that “convenience sampling method includes participants who are readily available and agree to participate in a study” (Frey, Carl and Gary, 2000, p. 131). As Grace (2013) suggests,

Convenience sampling is a method from statistics that researchers use to gather information from the population. One of the main advantages of convenience sampling is the cost effectiveness. It is pretty much inexpensive to organize and maintain. The group that participates is usually ideal and the researchers can confirm that the group represented is proportioned. Convenience sampling allows the researcher to select a random group of people especially when there is no list of the population available. Also the researchers can control the size of the random group selected. They can also ensure that the selected group of people has the appropriate characteristics. (para.1)

So, convenience sampling method has been used in this study.

2.3 Subjects

The instructors of English as a foreign language classes at the universities’ English preparatory schools in Turkey have been chosen for the study. 73 participants have an ELT background whereas 67 have a literature background.

2.4 Data Collection Instrument

In this study, a questionnaire has been designed from scratch to gather data about the perceptions and practices of English instructors with different educational backgrounds- ELT or literature- towards literature use in their reading classes at preparatory schools of universities. In the questionnaire prepared by the researcher, a 5-Lickert scale is used.

The questionnaire consists of 50 questions exclusively designed to get relevant answers to show whether perception and practices of literature use of ELT teachers with an ELT and literature background differ. At the top of the questionnaire, a brief introduction giving information about the aim of the study, asking for cooperation, and ensuring that all the answers will be kept confidential have been added to make the study more meaningful for the participants.

2.4.1 The Pilot Study

The pilot study of the questionnaire was conducted on 20 instructors among the instructors of the Preparatory School of Suleyman Sah University in Istanbul with the aim of designing the layout of the questionnaire accordingly. In the pilot study, there were 58 questions in the questionnaire.

After the pilot study, it was seen that some adjustments needed to be made. Some questions which might lead to ambiguity were redesigned and reworded; some questions which were only repetition of previous questions and some others which had little relevance to shed light on the issues being researched were omitted. In addition, the order of the questions was rearranged to collect them under the same factor to which

they belong while analyzing. As a result of this process, the questionnaire has been constructed.

2.5 Data Collection Procedure

After making necessary adjustments, the participant universities have been determined in accordance with the convenience sampling method, and it has been found out that 8 universities are suitable to conduct the questionnaire. Afterwards, the questionnaire has been printed out and handed out to the instructors in those universities. A total number of 140 questionnaires have been handed back to the researcher. Since the questionnaires are to be completed on a voluntary basis, not all the questionnaires handed out have been handed back, so the number of participants for each university differs.

2.5.1 The Questionnaire

Many researchers prefer to use a Likert-type scale because it's very easy to analyze statistically (Jackson, 2009, p. 89). Therefore in this part, 5-Likert scale (from 1=totally agree to 5=totally disagree) has been applied. The instructors have been asked about their literature practices in their reading classes, what they use for reading comprehension in addition to the activities in the course books, if they demand literature involvement, whether using literature has a positive effect on their students' language learning process, whether they use literature or literary works or not, the underlying reasons and their general beliefs as to using literature, and why they do not use literature. The items of the questionnaire are given in Table 7 below.

Table 7 The Items of the Questionnaire

Dear Colleague,

The aim of this questionnaire is to get English teachers' perceptions and practices on the research "A Study on Literature Use of ELT Teachers with an ELT Background and Those with a Literature Background in their Reading Classes". Your responses will be kept strictly confidential and will only be used in this study. I appreciate your valuable contributions.

Please circle the appropriate choices and provide the necessary information below.

1. I use extra reading comprehension materials besides reading comprehension activities in the course books.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
2. I use poems for the reading comprehension activities.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
3. I use extracts from poems for the reading comprehension activities.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
4. I use short stories for the reading comprehension activities.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
5. I use extracts from short stories for the reading comprehension activities.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
6. I use novels for the reading comprehension activities.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
7. I use extracts from novels for the reading comprehension activities.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
8. I use theatre plays for the reading comprehension activities.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
9. I use extracts from theatre plays for the reading comprehension activities.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
10. I encourage students to read literature/literary works outside the class.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
11. I ask students to read literature/literary works as part of the lesson outside
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
12. I encourage students to read extra reading comprehension materials during the class time.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
13. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it is motivating.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
14. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it improves reading skills.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
15. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it improves listening skills.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
16. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it improves writing skills.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
17. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it improves speaking skills.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
18. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it improves vocabulary.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
19. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it is a valuable complement to classroom material.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
20. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it offers a good deal of cultural information.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
21. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it expands students' language awareness.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
22. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it develops students' interpretative abilities.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
23. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it sparks curiosity.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
24. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because students become more productive and creative through literature.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
25. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it stimulates students' language acquisition.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
26. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities learning English because literature helps students to become more actively involved intellectually in learning English
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree

27. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities learning English because literature helps students to become more actively involved emotionally in learning English.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
28. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because literature provides excellent stimulus for group work.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
29. I only use the reading comprehension activities in the course books.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
30. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because of large number of students in my classes.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
31. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because of insufficient class time.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
32. I use few or no extra literary works for the reading comprehension activities because reading comprehension activities in the course books are sufficient for the students.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
33. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I do not feel confident about how to teach with literary works.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
34. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I do not feel competent about how to teach with literary works.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
35. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot have an access to literary works.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
36. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot decide which literary works are appropriate for the students.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
37. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot find literary works which are appropriate for students' age.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
38. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot find literary works which are appropriate for students' interests.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
39. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot find literary works which are appropriate for students' level of English.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
40. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot find relevant work to life experiences of students.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
41. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because literary works are only appropriate for 'literary-minded' students.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
42. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because materials can be very difficult linguistically, and therefore demotivating for the average student.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
43. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because use of literature may rely too heavily on the teacher to paraphrase, clarify and explain, resulting in very little student participation.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
44. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because students are dependent on ready-made interpretations from the teacher.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
45. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because the language used in literary works sometimes deviate from the conventions of Standard English, which may cause a problem for language learning.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
46. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because literary texts are full of old and outdated vocabulary not practiced in contemporary English.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
47. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because activities with literary works require background knowledge for each student.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
48. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because language of literary works is different from contemporary English.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
49. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities as part of the lesson outside the class because I cannot check what students are doing.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree
50. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities as part of the lesson outside the class due to restrictions of the curriculum.
1. Totally agree 2. Agree 3. Not sure 4. Disagree 5. Totally disagree

In the data collection procedure, mean scores and standard deviation values have been calculated for the scale items, which are shown in Table 8 below.

Table 8 Means and Standard Deviation Values of the Items

	Mean	Standard Deviation
1. I use extra reading comprehension materials besides reading comprehension activities in the course books.	2,50	1,86
2. I use poems for the reading comprehension activities.	3,90	1,50
3. I use extracts from poems for the reading comprehension activities.	3,74	1,69
4. I use short stories for the reading comprehension activities.	2,63	1,87
5. I use extracts from short stories for the reading comprehension activities.	2,29	1,75
6. I use novels for the reading comprehension activities.	3,31	1,75
7. I use extracts from novels for the reading comprehension activities.	3,03	1,84
8. I use theatre plays for the reading comprehension activities.	3,64	1,70
9. I use extracts from theatre plays for the reading comprehension activities.	3,59	1,74
10. I encourage students to read literature/literary works outside the class.	1,36	1,03
11. I ask students to read literature/literary works as part of the lesson outside the class.	2,19	1,73
12. I encourage students to read extra reading comprehension materials during the class time	2,80	1,82
13. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it is motivating.	2,46	1,73
14. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it improves reading skills.	2,13	1,65
15. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it improves listening skills.	3,33	1,66
16. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it improves writing skills.	2,29	1,75
17. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it improves speaking skills.	2,91	1,69
18. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it improves vocabulary.	1,77	1,55
19. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it is a valuable complement to classroom material.	2,01	1,64
20. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it offers a good deal of cultural information.	1,87	1,58
21. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it expands students' language awareness.	1,90	1,56
22. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it develops students' interpretative abilities.	2,09	1,60
23. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it sparks curiosity.	2,16	1,65
24. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because students become more productive and creative through literature.	2,26	1,65
25. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it stimulates students' language acquisition.	2,14	1,66
26. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because literature helps students to become more actively involved intellectually in learning English.	2,14	1,59
27. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because literature helps students to become more actively involved emotionally in learning English.	2,24	1,67
28. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because literature provides excellent stimulus for group work.	2,79	1,59
29. I only use the reading comprehension activities in the course books.	3,39	1,90
30. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because of large number of students in my classes.	2,80	1,86
31. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because of insufficient class time.	2,27	1,73
32. I use few or no extra literary works for the reading comprehension activities because reading comprehension activities in the course books are sufficient for the students.	3,49	1,48

33. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I do not feel confident about how to teach with literary works.	4,01	1,45
34. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I do not feel competent about how to teach with literary works.	4,06	1,37
35. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot have an access to literary works.	4,33	1,21
36. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot decide which literary works are appropriate for the students.	3,91	1,63
37. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot find literary works which are appropriate for students' age.	3,91	1,56
38. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot find literary works which are appropriate for students' interests.	3,71	1,71
39. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot find literary works which are appropriate for students' level of English.	3,63	1,71
40. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot find relevant work to life experiences of students.	3,47	1,67
41. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because literary works are only appropriate for 'literary-minded' students.	3,71	1,75
42. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because materials can be very difficult linguistically, and therefore demotivating for the average student.	2,76	1,82
43. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because use of literature may rely too heavily on the teacher to paraphrase, clarify and explain, resulting in very little student participation.	2,89	1,81
44. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because students are dependent on ready-made interpretations from the teacher.	2,86	1,74
45. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because the language used in literary works sometimes deviate from the conventions of Standard English, which may cause a problem for language learning.	3,29	1,69
46. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because literary texts are full of old and outdated vocabulary not practiced in contemporary English.	3,59	1,74
47. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because activities with literary works require background knowledge for each student.	3,06	1,79
48. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because language of literary works is different from contemporary English.	3,29	1,79
49. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities as part of the lesson outside the class because I cannot check what students are doing.	3,61	1,57
50. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities as part of the lesson outside the class due to restrictions of the curriculum.	2,16	1,63

According to Table 8, mean scores of the items range from 4,33 to 1,36. The lowest means score has been calculated for the item 10, “*I encourage students to read literature / literary works outside the class*” (1,36), and the highest mean score has been calculated for the item 35, “*I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot have an access to literary works*”(4,33).

2.6 Data Analysis Procedure

Data analysis is a systematic method of examining data gathered for any research investigation to support conclusions or interpretations about the data (Fitzpatrick and

Wallace, 2006). One of the generally known designs of research is quantitative research. Quantitative research is a means for testing objective theories by examining the relationship among variables (Creswell, 2008). For this study, quantitative data have been gathered via a questionnaire. The data in this study have been evaluated on SPSS 15.0 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) and Office Excel. Non-experimental research in the Descriptive Method has been used; means and standard deviations have been calculated and evaluated. A descriptive method is used in this study “to provide a picture to the researcher and the reader of situations as they naturally occur” (Burns and Grove, 2005, p. 233).

The reliability of the questionnaire is calculated through quantitative research design to gain Cronbach’s Alpha Statistics. Validity and reliability are two important aspects to approve and validate a quantitative research. Validity is defined as “the extent to which inferences made from assessment results are appropriate, meaningful, and useful in terms of the purpose of the assessment” (Gronlund, 1998, p. 226).

Reliability in quantitative research is viewed as “synonymous to dependability, consistency, reproducibility or replicability over time, over instruments and over groups of respondents” (Bowling, 2009, p. 166). Reliability can be understood as “the ability of the test scores to be replicable – for example from one test occasion to another” (Hamp, 2003, p. 163). Cronbach’s Alpha (α) is a measure of internal consistency and is used to show the reliability of the study; as in table 9 below which shows reliability statistics of the study.

Table 9 Reliability Statistics of the Items in the Questionnaire

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items
0,882	50

Table 10 Reliability Evaluation Criteria for α Value

α Value	Reliability of the Instrument
$0.00 \leq \alpha < 0.40$	No reliability
$0.40 \leq \alpha < 0.60$	Low reliability
$0.60 \leq \alpha < 0.80$	Quite reliability
$0.80 \leq \alpha < 1.00$	High reliability

2.7 The Analysis of Research Questions with Relating Items

The questionnaire on “A Study on Literature Use of ELT Teachers with an ELT and Those with a Literature Background in Their Reading Classes” has 50 items and 4 research questions which define the scope of the study. These are arranged as mentioned below:

- 1 - What do teachers use for reading comprehension in addition to the activities in the course books?
- 2 - How do teachers demand literature involvement in addition to syllabi outside the class?
- 3 - Why do teachers use literature or literary works in their reading classes?
- 4- Why do teachers use few or no literary works in their reading classes?

The first research question “What do teachers use for reading comprehension in addition to the activities in the course books?” covers 9 items which are: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9.

The second research question “How do teachers demand literature involvement in addition to syllabi outside the class?” covers 3 items which are: 10, 11 and 12.

The third research question “Why do teachers use literature or literary works in their reading classes?” covers 16 items which are: 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 28.

The fourth research question, “Why do teachers use few or no literary works in their reading classes” covers 22 items which are: 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49 and 50.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

This chapter includes statistical analysis in accordance with the points of view of the subjects on literature use in their reading classes depending on their educational background.

3.1 Frequencies of the Items in the Questionnaire

Table 11 **Frequencies of the Items in the Questionnaire**

	Totally Agree + Agree		Not Sure		Totally Disagree + Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Q1	82	58,57	11	7,86	47	33,57
Q2	22	15,71	33	23,57	85	60,72
Q3	33	23,57	22	15,71	85	60,72
Q4	76	54,28	14	10,00	50	35,72
Q5	87	62,15	16	11,43	37	26,42
Q6	44	31,42	30	21,42	66	47,14
Q7	58	41,43	22	15,71	60	42,86
Q8	35	25,00	25	17,86	80	57,15
Q9	38	27,14	23	16,42	79	56,43
Q10	123	87,85	9	6,43	8	05,72
Q11	92	65,72	13	9,29	35	25,00
Q12	65	46,43	24	17,14	51	36,43
Q13	76	54,29	26	18,58	38	27,14
Q14	91	65,00	19	13,57	30	21,43
Q15	38	27,14	41	29,29	61	43,57
Q16	87	62,14	16	11,43	37	26,43
Q17	53	37,85	40	28,57	47	33,57
Q18	111	79,28	4	2,86	25	17,86
Q19	98	70,00	13	9,29	29	20,71
Q20	105	75,00	9	6,42	26	18,57
Q21	102	72,85	13	9,29	25	17,86
Q22	91	65,00	22	15,72	27	19,29
Q23	89	63,27	21	15,00	30	21,43
Q24	83	59,28	26	18,57	31	22,15
Q25	91	65,00	18	12,86	31	22,14
Q26	87	62,14	26	18,57	27	19,29
Q27	85	60,72	23	16,43	32	22,85
Q28	52	37,14	51	36,43	37	26,43
Q29	52	37,14	9	6,42	79	56,43
Q30	68	48,57	18	12,86	54	38,57
Q31	87	62,14	17	12,14	36	25,71
Q32	25	17,85	56	40,00	59	42,14

	Totally Agree + Agree		Not Sure		Totally Disagree + Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Q33	19	13,57	31	22,14	90	64,29
Q34	15	10,71	36	25,71	89	63,57
Q35	10	7,14	27	19,29	103	73,57
Q36	29	15,71	18	12,86	93	66,43
Q37	25	17,85	26	18,57	89	63,58
Q38	35	25,00	20	14,28	85	60,72
Q39	36	25,71	24	17,15	80	57,14
Q40	36	25,72	35	25,00	69	49,28
Q41	37	26,43	16	11,43	87	62,15
Q42	67	47,86	23	16,42	50	35,71
Q43	61	43,57	26	18,57	53	37,86
Q44	58	41,43	34	24,28	48	34,29
Q45	41	29,28	38	27,14	61	43,57
Q46	38	27,15	23	16,43	79	56,43
Q47	54	38,57	28	20,00	58	41,43
Q48	47	33,57	26	18,57	67	47,85
Q49	28	20,00	41	29,28	71	50,72
Q50	88	62,86	23	16,43	29	20,71

Frequencies of the items in the questionnaire are presented in Table 11 above.

For item 1, *'I use extra reading comprehension materials besides reading comprehension activities in the course books'*, 82 (58,57 %) out of 140 participants who take part in the study mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 47 participants (33,57 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 11 participants (7,86 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 2, *'I use poems for the reading comprehension activities'*, 22 (15,71 %) participants mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 85 participants (60,72 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 33 participants (23,57 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 3, *'I use extracts from poems for the reading comprehension activities'*, 33 (23,57 %) participants mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 85 participants (60,72 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 22 participants (15,71 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 4, *'I use short stories for the reading comprehension activities*, 76 (54,28 %) participants mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 50 participants (35,72 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 14 participants (10 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 5, *'I use extracts from short stories for the reading comprehension activities*, 87 (62,15 %) participants mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 37 participants (26,42 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 16 participants (11,43 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 6, *'I use novels for the reading comprehension activities*, 44 (31,42 %) participants mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 66 participants (47,14 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 30 participants (21,42 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 7, *'I use extracts from novels for the reading comprehension activities*, 58 (41,43 %) participants mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 60 participants (42,86 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 22 participants (15,71 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 8, *'I use theatre plays for the reading comprehension activities*, 35 (25 %) participants mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 80 participants (57,15 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 25 participants (17,86 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 9, *'I use extracts from theatre plays for the reading comprehension activities*, 38 (27,14 %) participants mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 79 participants (56,43 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 23 participants (16,42 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 10, *'I encourage students to read literature/literary works outside the class,* 123 (87,85 %) participants mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 8 participants (5,72 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 9 participants (6,43 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 11, *'I ask students to read literature/literary works as part of the lesson outside the class,* 92 (65,72 %) participants mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 35 participants (25 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 13 participants (9,29 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 12, *'I encourage students to read extra reading comprehension materials during the class time,* 65 (46,43 %) participants mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 51 participants (36,43 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 24 participants (17,14 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 13, *'I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it is motivating,* 76 (54,29 %) participants mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 38 participants (27,14 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 26 participants (18,58 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 14, *'I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it improves reading skills,* 91 (65 %) participants mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 30 participants (21,43 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 19 participants (13,57 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 15, *'I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it improves listening skills,* 38 (27,14 %) participants mark “totally agree and

agree” whereas 61 participants (43,57 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 41 participants (29,29 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 16, *‘I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it improves writing skills*, 87 (62,14 %) participants mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 37 participants (26,43 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 16 participants (11,43 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 17, *‘I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it improves speaking skills*, 53 (37,85 %) participants mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 47 participants (33,57 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 40 participants (28,57 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 18, *‘I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it improves vocabulary*, 111 (79,28 %) participants mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 25 participants (17,86 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 4 participants (2,86 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 19, *‘I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it is a valuable complement to classroom material*, 98 (70 %) participants mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 29 participants (20,71 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 13 participants (9,29 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 20, *‘I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it offers a good deal of cultural information*, 105 (75 %) participants mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 26 participants (18,57 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 9 participants (6,42 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 21, *'I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it expands students' language awareness*, 102 (72,85 %) participants mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 25 participants (17,86 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 13 participants (9,29 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 22, *'I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it develops students' interpretative abilities*, 91 (65 %) participants mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 27 participants (19,29 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 22 participants (15,72 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 23, *'I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it sparks curiosity*, 89 (63,27 %) participants mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 30 participants (21,43 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 21 participants (15 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 24, *'I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because students become more productive and creative through literature*, 83 (59,28 %) participants mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 31 participants (22,15 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 26 participants (18,57 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 25, *'I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it stimulates students' language acquisition*, 91 (65 %) participants mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 31 participants (22,14 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 18 participants (12,86 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 26, *'I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because literature helps students to become more actively involved intellectually in*

learning English, 87 (62,14 %) participants mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 27 participants (19,29 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 26 participants (18,57 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 27, *‘I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because literature helps students to become more actively involved emotionally in learning English*, 85 (60,72 %) participants mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 32 participants (22,85 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 23 participants (16,43 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 28, *‘I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because literature provides excellent stimulus for group work*, 52 (37,14 %) participants mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 37 participants (26,43 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 51 participants (36,43 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 29, *‘I only use the reading comprehension activities in the course books*, 52 (37,14 %) participants mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 79 participants (56,43 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 9 participants (6,42 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 30, *‘I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because of large number of students in my classes*, 68 (48,57 %) participants mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 54 participants (38,57 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 18 participants (12,86 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 31, *‘I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because of insufficient class time*, 87 (62,14 %) participants mark “totally agree and

agree” whereas 36 participants (25,71 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 17 participants (12,14 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 32, *‘I use few or no extra literary works for the reading comprehension activities because reading comprehension activities in the course books are sufficient for the students*, 25 (17,85 %) participants mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 59 participants (42,14 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 56 participants (40 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 33, *‘I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I do not feel confident about how to teach with literary works*, 19 (13,57 %) participants mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 90 participants (64,29 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 31 participants (22,14 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 34, *‘I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I do not feel competent about how to teach with literary works*, 15 (10,71 %) participants mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 89 participants (63,57 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 36 participants (25,71 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 35, *‘I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot have an access to literary works*, 10 (7,14 %) participants mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 103 participants (73,57 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 27 participants (19,29 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 36, *‘I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot decide which literary works are appropriate for the students*, 29

(15,71 %) participants mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 93 participants (66,43 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 18 participants (12,86 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 37, *‘I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot find literary works which are appropriate for students’ age*, 25 (17,85 %) participants mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 89 participants (63,58 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 26 participants (18,57 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 38, *‘I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot find literary works which are appropriate for students’ interests*, 35 (25 %) participants mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 85 participants (60,72 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 20 participants (14,28 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 39, *‘I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot find literary works which are appropriate for students’ level of English*, 36 (25,71 %) participants mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 80 participants (57,14 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 24 participants (17,15 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 40, *‘I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot find relevant work to life experiences of students*, 36 (25,72 %) participants mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 69 participants (49,28 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 35 participants (25 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 41, *‘I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because literary works are only appropriate for ‘literary-minded’ students*, 37 (26, 43 %) participants mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 87 participants

(62,15 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 16 participants (11,43 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 42, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because materials can be very difficult linguistically, and therefore demotivating for the average student*, 67 (47,86 %) participants mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 50 participants (35,71 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 23 participants (16,42 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 43, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because use of literature may rely too heavily on the teacher to paraphrase, clarify and explain, resulting in very little student participation*, 61 (43,57 %) participants mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 53 participants (37,86 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 26 participants (18,57 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 44, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because students are dependent on ready-made interpretations from the teacher*, 58 (41,43 %) participants mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 48 participants (34,29 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 34 participants (24,28 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 45, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because the language used in literary works sometimes deviate from the conventions of Standard English, which may cause a problem for language learning*, 41 (29,28 %) participants mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 61 participants (43,57 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 38 participants (27,14 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 46, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because literary texts are full of old and outdated vocabulary not practiced in contemporary English*, 38 (27,15 %) participants mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 79 participants (56,43 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 23 participants (16,43 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 47, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because activities with literary works require background knowledge for each student*, 54 (38,57 %) participants mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 58 participants (41,43 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 28 participants (20 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 48, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because language of literary works is different from contemporary English*, 47 (33,57 %) participants mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 67 participants (47,85 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 26 participants (18,57 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 49, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities as part of the lesson outside the class because I cannot check what students are doing*, 28 (20 %) participants mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 71 participants (50,52 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 41 participants (29,28 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 50, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities as part of the lesson outside the class due to restrictions of the curriculum*, 88 (62,86 %) participants mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 29 participants (20,71 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 23 participants (16,43 %) mark 'not sure'.

3.2 The Results of the Descriptive Statistics of the Research Questions

Table 12 Descriptive Statistics of the Research Questions

	Graduated from						P
	ELT Department			Literature Department			
	Mean	±	Standard Deviation	Mean	±	Standard Deviation	
What do teachers use for reading comprehension in addition to the activities in the course books?	3,09	±	1,30	3,28	±	1,33	0,418
How do teachers demand literature involvement in addition to syllabi outside the class?	2,37	±	0,81	2,14	±	0,84	0,109
Why do teachers use literature or literary works in their reading classes?	2,50	±	0,77	2,38	±	1,07	0,468
Why do teachers use few or no literary works in their reading classes?	3,15	±	0,72	3,52	±	0,76	0,004*

*p<0,001

Considering how the graduates of ELT and Literature departments have responded the questions above, it is clear that they develop positive attitudes toward using extra materials including literature apart from those in the course books. With a score of 3,09 in ELT graduates and 3,28 in Literature graduates, they both agree on using literature in addition to the reading activities in course books.

There is no considerable difference between the graduates of ELT and Literature departments in how they demand literature involvement in addition to the syllabi outside the class. The scores are 2,37 in ELT graduates and 2,14 in Literature graduates.

And there is no considerable difference between the graduates of ELT and Literature departments regarding the reasons why teachers use literature or literary works in their reading classes. The scores are 2,50 in ELT graduates and 2,38 in Literature graduates.

Considering Table 12 above, scores of the responses regarding the reasons why teachers use few or no literary works in their reading classes display a high significant difference ($p < 0,001$). The score for ELT graduates is 3,15 and 3,52 for Literature graduates. That means their reasons differ as to why they use literature or literary works or why they do not.

3.3 The Results of the Items in the Questionnaire Based on the Research Questions

In this study, there are 4 research questions covering 50 items of the questionnaire. The research questions are given in the Methodology section. These 4 questions are explained with the related items below.

3.3.1 The Results of the First Research Question “What do teachers use for reading comprehension in addition to the activities in the course books?”

The first research question “What do teachers use for reading comprehension in addition to the activities in the course books?” covers 9 items which are: 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8, and 9. The items can be seen in Table 13 below.

Table 13 Descriptive Statistics of the Related Items for the First Research Question “What do teachers use for reading comprehension in addition to the activities in the course books?”

Related Items in the Questionnaire	ELT Department (73)						Literature Department (67)					
	Totally Agree + Agree		Not Sure		Totally Disagree + Disagree		Totally Agree + Agree		Not Sure		Totally Disagree + Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. I use extra reading comprehension materials besides reading comprehension activities in the course books.	47	64,38	5	6,84	21	28,76	35	52,23	6	8,95	26	38,80
2. I use poems for the reading comprehension activities.	15	20,54	18	24,65	40	54,79	7	10,44	15	22,38	45	67,16
3. I use extracts from poems for the reading comprehension activities.	18	24,65	13	17,80	42	57,53	15	22,38	9	13,43	43	64,17
4. I use short stories for the reading comprehension activities.	44	60,27	10	13,69	19	26,02	32	47,76	4	5,97	31	46,26
5. I use extracts from short stories for the reading comprehension activities.	47	64,38	10	13,69	16	21,91	40	59,70	6	8,95	21	31,34
6. I use novels for the reading comprehension activities.	21	28,76	15	20,54	37	50,68	23	34,32	15	22,38	29	43,28
7. I use extracts from novels for the reading comprehension activities.	25	34,24	14	19,17	34	46,57	33	49,25	8	11,94	26	38,80
8. I use theatre plays for the reading comprehension activities.	18	24,65	15	20,54	40	54,79	17	25,37	10	14,92	40	59,70
9. I use extracts from theatre plays for the reading comprehension activities.	21	28,76	14	19,17	38	52,05	17	25,37	9	13,43	41	61,19
Average	28,44	38,95	12,66	17,34	31,88	43,67	24,33	36,31	9,11	13,59	33,55	50,07

This research question of the study is based on whether instructors' educational background, ELT or Literature, has any effect on what materials they use in their reading classes apart from the reading activities in the course books.

For item 1, *'I use extra reading comprehension materials besides reading comprehension activities in the course books'*, 47 (64,38 %) of ELT graduates who take part in the study mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 21 ELT graduates (28,76 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 5 ELT graduates (6,84 %) mark 'not sure'. 35 (52,23 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 26 Literature graduates (38,80 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 6 Literature graduates (8,95 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 2, *'I use poems for the reading comprehension activities'*, 15 (20,54 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 40 ELT graduates (54,79 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 18 ELT graduates (24,65 %) mark 'not sure'. 7 (10,44 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 45 Literature graduates (67,16 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 15 Literature graduates (22,38 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 3, *'I use extracts from poems for the reading comprehension activities'*, 18 (24,65 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 42 ELT graduates (57,53 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 13 ELT graduates (17,80 %) mark 'not sure'. 15 (22,38 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 43 Literature graduates (64,17 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 9 Literature graduates (13,43 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 4, *'I use short stories for the reading comprehension activities'*, 44 (60,27 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 19 ELT graduates (26,02 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 10 ELT graduates (13,69 %) mark 'not sure'. 32 (47,76 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 31 Literature graduates (46,26 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 4 Literature graduates (5,97 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 5, *'I use extracts from short stories for the reading comprehension activities'*, 47 (64,38 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 16 ELT graduates (21,91 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 10 ELT graduates (13,69 %) mark 'not sure'. 40 (59,70 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 21 Literature graduates (31,34 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 6 Literature graduates (8,95 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 6, *'I use novels for the reading comprehension activities'*, 21 (28,76 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 37 ELT graduates (50,68 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 15 ELT graduates (20,54 %) mark 'not sure'. 23 (34,32 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 29 Literature graduates (43,28 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 15 Literature graduates (22,38 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 7, *'I use extracts from novels for the reading comprehension activities'*, 25 (34,24 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 34 ELT graduates (46,57 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 14 ELT graduates (19,17 %) mark 'not sure'. 33 (49,25 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree"

whereas 26 Literature graduates (38,80 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 8 Literature graduates (11,94 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 8, ‘*I use theatre plays for the reading comprehension activities*’, 18 (24,65 %) of ELT graduates mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 40 ELT graduates (54,79 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 15 ELT graduates (20,54 %) mark ‘not sure’. 17 (25,37 %) of Literature graduates mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 40 Literature graduates (59,70 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 10 Literature graduates (14,92 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 9, ‘*I use extracts from theatre plays for the reading comprehension activities*’, 21 (28,76 %) of ELT graduates mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 38 ELT graduates (52,05 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 14 ELT graduates (19,17 %) mark ‘not sure’. 17 (25,37 %) of Literature graduates mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 41 Literature graduates (61,19 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 9 Literature graduates (13,43 %) mark ‘not sure’.

3.3.2 The Results of the Second Research Question “How do teachers demand literature involvement in addition to syllabi outside the class?”

The second Research Question “How do teachers demand literature involvement in addition to syllabi outside the class?” covers the items 10, 11, and 12. Table 14 below indicates the percentages.

Table 14 Descriptive Statistics of the Related Items for the Second Research Question “How do teachers demand literature involvement in addition to syllabi outside the class?”

Related Items in the Questionnaire	ELT Department (73)						Literature Department (67)					
	Totally Agree + Agree		Not Sure		Totally Disagree + Disagree		Totally Agree + Agree		Not Sure		Totally Disagree + Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
10. I encourage students to read literature/literary works outside the class.	61	83,56	7	9,58	5	6,84	62	92,53	2	2,98	3	4,47
11. I ask students to read literature/literary works as part of the lesson outside the class.	43	58,90	10	13,69	20	27,39	49	73,13	3	4,47	15	22,38
12. I encourage students to read extra reading comprehension materials during the class time.	35	47,94	13	17,80	25	34,24	30	44,77	11	16,41	26	38,80
Average	46,33	63,46	10	13,69	16,66	22,82	47	70,14	5,33	7,95	14,66	21,88

According to the frequencies of item 10, ‘*I encourage students to read literature/literary works outside the class*’, 61 (83,56 %) of ELT graduates mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 5 ELT graduates (6,84 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 7 ELT graduates (9,58 %) mark ‘not sure’. 62 (92,53 %) of Literature graduates mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 3 Literature graduates (4,47 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 2 Literature graduates (2,98 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 11, *'I ask students to read literature / literary works as part of the lesson outside the class'*, 43 (58,90 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 20 ELT graduates (27,39 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 10 ELT graduates (13,69 %) mark 'not sure'. 49 (73,13 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 15 Literature graduates (22,38 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 3 Literature graduates (4,47 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 12, *'I encourage students to read extra reading comprehension materials during the class time'*, 35 (47,94 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 25 ELT graduates (34,24 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 13 ELT graduates (17,80 %) mark 'not sure'. 30 (44,77 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 26 Literature graduates (38,80 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 11 Literature graduates (16,41 %) mark 'not sure'.

3.3.3 The Results of the Third Research Question "Why do teachers use literature or literary works in their reading classes?"

The third research question "Why do teachers use literature or literary works in their reading classes?" covers the items 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28. The items can be seen in Table 15 below.

Table 15 Descriptive Statistics of the Related Items for the Third Research Question “Why do teachers use literature or literary works in their reading classes?”

Related Items in the Questionnaire	ELT Department (73)						Literature Department (67)					
	Totally Agree + Agree		Not Sure		Totally Disagree + Disagree		Totally Agree + Agree		Not Sure		Totally Disagree + Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
13. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it is motivating.	32	43,83	23	31,50	18	24,65	44	65,67	3	4,47	20	29,85
14. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it improves reading skills.	49	67,12	9	12,32	15	20,54	42	62,68	10	14,92	15	22,38
15. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it improves listening skills.	20	27,39	26	35,61	27	36,98	18	26,86	15	22,38	34	50,74
16. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it improves writing skills.	45	61,64	12	16,43	16	21,91	42	62,68	4	5,97	21	31,34
17. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it improves speaking skills.	23	31,50	28	38,35	22	30,13	30	44,77	12	17,91	25	37,31
18. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it improves vocabulary.	60	82,19	4	5,47	9	12,32	51	76,11	0	0,00	16	23,88
19. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it is a valuable complement to classroom material.	47	64,38	13	17,80	13	17,80	51	76,11	0	0,00	16	23,88
20. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it offers a good deal of cultural information.	54	73,97	9	12,32	10	13,69	51	76,11	0	0,00	16	23,88
21. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it expands students' language awareness.	53	72,60	10	13,69	10	13,69	49	73,13	3	4,47	15	22,38

Related Items in the Questionnaire	ELT Department (73)						Literature Department (67)					
	Totally Agree + Agree		Not Sure		Totally Disagree + Disagree		Totally Agree + Agree		Not Sure		Totally Disagree + Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
22. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it develops students' interpretative abilities.	47	64,38	14	19,17	12	16,43	44	65,67	8	11,94	15	22,38
23. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it sparks curiosity.	45	61,64	16	21,91	12	16,43	44	65,67	5	7,46	18	26,86
24. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because students become more productive and creative through literature.	43	58,90	16	21,91	14	19,17	40	59,70	10	14,92	17	25,37
25. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it stimulates students' language acquisition.	44	60,27	14	19,17	15	20,54	47	70,14	4	5,97	16	23,88
26. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because literature helps students to become more actively involved intellectually in learning English.	43	58,90	18	24,65	12	16,43	44	65,67	8	11,94	15	22,38
27. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because literature helps students to become more actively involved emotionally in learning English.	41	56,16	18	24,65	14	19,17	44	65,67	5	7,46	18	26,86
28. I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because literature provides excellent stimulus for group work.	30	41,09	24	32,87	19	26,02	22	32,83	27	40,29	18	26,86
Average	42,25	57,87	15,87	21,73	14,87	20,36	41,43	61,84	7,12	10,63	18,43	27,51

For item 13, *'I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it is motivating'*, 32 (43,83 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 18 ELT graduates (24,65 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 23 ELT graduates (31,50 %) mark 'not sure'. 44 (65,67 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 20 Literature graduates (29,85 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 3 Literature graduates (4,47 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 14, *'I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it improves reading skills'*, 49 (67,12 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 15 ELT graduates (20,54 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 9 ELT graduates (12,32 %) mark 'not sure'. 42 (62,68 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 15 Literature graduates (22,38 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 10 Literature graduates (14,92 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 15, *'I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it improves listening skills'*, 20 (27,39 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 27 ELT graduates (36,98 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 26 ELT graduates (35,61 %) mark 'not sure'. 18 (26,86 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 34 Literature graduates (50,74 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 15 Literature graduates (22,38 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 16, *'I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it improves writing skills'*, 45 (61,64 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree

and agree” whereas 16 ELT graduates (21,91 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 12 ELT graduates (16,43 %) mark ‘not sure’. 42 (62,68 %) of Literature graduates mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 21 Literature graduates (31,34 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 4 Literature graduates (5,97 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 17, *‘I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it improves speaking skills’*, 23 (31,50 %) of ELT graduates mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 22 ELT graduates (30,13 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 28 ELT graduates (38,35 %) mark ‘not sure’. 30 (44,77 %) of Literature graduates mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 25 Literature graduates (37,31 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 12 Literature graduates (17,91 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 18, *‘I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it improves vocabulary’*, 60 (82,19 %) of ELT graduates mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 9 ELT graduates (12,32 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 4 ELT graduates (5,47 %) mark ‘not sure’. 51 (76,11 %) of Literature graduates mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 16 Literature graduates (23,88 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. None of the Literature graduates mark ‘not sure’.

For item 19, *‘I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it is a valuable complement to classroom material’*, 47 (64,38 %) of ELT graduates mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 13 ELT graduates (17,80 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 13 ELT graduates (17,80 %) mark ‘not sure’. 51

(76,11 %) of Literature graduates mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 16 Literature graduates (23,88 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. None of the Literature graduates mark ‘not sure’.

For item 20, *‘I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it offers a good deal of cultural information’*, 54 (73,97 %) of ELT graduates mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 10 ELT graduates (13,69 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 9 ELT graduates (12,32 %) mark ‘not sure’. 51 (76,11 %) of Literature graduates mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 16 Literature graduates (23,88 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. None of the Literature graduates mark ‘not sure’.

For item 21, *‘I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it expands students’ language awareness’*, 53 (72,60 %) of ELT graduates mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 10 ELT graduates (13,69 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 10 ELT graduates (13,69 %) mark ‘not sure’. 49 (73,13 %) of Literature graduates mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 15 Literature graduates (22,38 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 3 Literature graduates (4,47 %) mark ‘not sure’.

For item 22, *‘I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it develops students’ interpretative abilities’*, 47 (64,38 %) of ELT graduates mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 12 ELT graduates (16,43 %) mark ‘totally disagree and disagree’. Besides, 14 ELT graduates (19,17 %) mark ‘not sure’. 44 (65,67 %) of Literature graduates mark “totally agree and agree” whereas 15 Literature

graduates (22,38 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 8 Literature graduates (11,94 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 23, *'I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it sparks curiosity*, 45 (61,64 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 12 ELT graduates (16,43 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 16 ELT graduates (21,91 %) mark 'not sure'. 44 (65,67 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 18 Literature graduates (26,86 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 5 Literature graduates (7,46 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 24, *'I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because students become more productive and creative through literature*, 43 (58,90 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 14 ELT graduates (19,17 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 16 ELT graduates (21,91 %) mark 'not sure'. 40 (59,70 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 17 Literature graduates (25,37 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 10 Literature graduates (14,92 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 25, *'I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because it stimulates students' language acquisition*, 44 (60,27 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 15 ELT graduates (20,54 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 14 ELT graduates (19,17 %) mark 'not sure'. 47 (70,14 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 16 Literature graduates (23,88 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 4 Literature graduates (5,97 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 26, *'I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because literature helps students to become more actively involved intellectually in learning English*, 43 (58,90 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 12 ELT graduates (16,43 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 18 ELT graduates (24,65 %) mark 'not sure'. 44 (65,67 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 15 Literature graduates (22,38 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 8 Literature graduates (11,94 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 27, *'I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because literature helps students to become more actively involved emotionally in learning English*, 41 (56,16 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 14 ELT graduates (19,17%) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 18 ELT graduates (24,65 %) mark 'not sure'. 44 (65,67 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 18 Literature graduates (26,86 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 5 Literature graduates (7,46 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 28, *'I use literature / literary works for the reading comprehension activities because literature provides excellent stimulus for group work'*, 30 (41,09 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 19 ELT graduates (26,02 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 24 ELT graduates (32,87 %) mark 'not sure'. 22 (32,83 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 18 Literature graduates (26,86 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 27 Literature graduates (40,29 %) mark 'not sure'.

3.3.4 The Results of the Fourth Research Question “Why do teachers use few or no literary works in their reading classes?”

The fourth research question “Why do teachers use few or no literary works in their reading classes?” covers the items 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, and 50. Table 16 below indicates the answers given to questions related to this research question.

Table 16 Descriptive Statistics of the Related Items for the Fourth Research Question “Why do teachers use few or no literary works in their reading classes?”

Related Items in the Questionnaire	ELT Department (73)						Literature Department (67)					
	Totally Agree + Agree		Not Sure		Totally Disagree + Disagree		Totally Agree + Agree		Not Sure		Totally Disagree + Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
29. I only use the reading comprehension activities in the course books.	24	32,87	7	9,58	42	57,53	28	41,79	2	2,98	37	55,22
30. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because of large number of students in my classes.	35	47,94	12	16,43	26	35,61	33	49,25	6	8,95	28	41,79
31. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because of insufficient class time.	45	61,64	9	12,32	19	26,02	42	62,68	8	11,94	17	25,37
32. I use few or no extra literary works for the reading comprehension activities because reading comprehension activities in the course books are sufficient for the students.	10	13,69	33	45,20	30	41,09	15	22,38	23	34,32	29	43,28
33. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I do not feel confident about how to teach with literary works.	15	20,54	19	26,02	39	53,42	4	5,97	12	17,91	51	76,11
34. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I do not feel competent about how to teach with literary works.	13	17,80	22	30,13	38	52,05	2	2,98	14	20,89	51	76,11
35. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot have an access to literary works.	7	9,58	14	19,17	52	71,23	3	4,47	13	19,40	51	76,11
36. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot decide which literary works are appropriate for the students.	16	21,91	14	19,17	43	58,90	13	19,40	4	5,97	50	74,62
37. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot find literary works which are appropriate for students' age.	12	16,43	22	30,13	39	53,42	13	19,40	4	5,97	50	74,62
38. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot find literary works appropriate for students' interests.	20	27,39	17	23,28	36	49,31	15	22,38	3	4,47	49	73,13

Related Items in the Questionnaire	ELT Department (73)						Literature Department (67)					
	Totally Agree + Agree		Not Sure		Totally Disagree + Disagree		Totally Agree + Agree		Not Sure		Totally Disagree + Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
39. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot find literary works which are appropriate for students' level of English.	21	28,76	19	26,02	33	45,20	15	22,38	5	7,46	47	70,14
40. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot find relevant work to life experiences of students.	25	34,24	22	30,13	26	35,61	11	16,41	13	19,40	43	64,17
41. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because literary works are only appropriate for 'literary-minded' students.	22	30,13	10	13,69	41	56,16	15	22,38	6	8,95	46	68,65
42. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because materials can be very difficult linguistically, and therefore demotivating for the average student.	35	47,94	16	21,91	22	30,13	32	47,76	7	10,44	28	41,79
43. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because use of literature may rely too heavily on the teacher to paraphrase, clarify and explain, resulting in very little student participation.	37	50,86	16	21,91	20	27,39	24	35,82	10	14,92	33	49,25
44. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because students are dependent on ready-made interpretations from the teacher.	34	46,57	20	27,39	19	26,02	24	35,82	14	20,89	29	43,28
45. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because the language used in literary works sometimes deviate from the conventions of Standard English, which may cause a problem for language learning.	24	32,87	24	32,87	25	34,24	17	25,37	14	20,89	36	53,73
46. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because literary texts are full of old and outdated vocabulary not practiced in contemporary English.	23	31,50	17	23,28	33	45,20	15	22,38	6	8,95	46	68,65
47. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because activities with literary works require background knowledge for each student.	35	47,94	19	26,02	19	26,02	19	28,35	9	13,43	39	58,20
48. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because language of literary works is different from contemporary English.	28	38,35	23	31,50	22	30,13	19	28,35	3	4,47	45	67,16
49. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities as part of the lesson outside the class because I cannot check what students are doing.	20	27,39	23	31,50	30	41,09	8	11,94	18	26,86	41	61,19
50. I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities as part of the lesson outside the class due to restrictions of the curriculum.	41	56,16	16	21,91	16	21,91	47	70,14	7	5,97	13	19,40
Average	24,63	33,75	17,90	24,52	30,45	41,71	18,81	28,08	9,13	13,42	39,04	58,27

According to the results of the item 29, *'I only use the reading comprehension activities in the course books'*, 24 (32,87 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 42 ELT graduates (57,53 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 7 ELT graduates (9,58 %) mark 'not sure'. 28 (41,79 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 37 Literature graduates (55,22 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 2 Literature graduates (2,98 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 30, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because of large number of students in my classes'*, 35 (47,94 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 26 ELT graduates (35,61 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 12 ELT graduates (16,43 %) mark 'not sure'. 33 (49,25 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 28 Literature graduates (41,79 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 6 Literature graduates (8,95 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 31, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because of insufficient class time'*, 45 (61,64 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 19 ELT graduates (26,02 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 9 ELT graduates (12,32 %) mark 'not sure'. 42 (62,68 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 17 Literature graduates (25,37 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 8 Literature graduates (11,94 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 32, *'I use few or no extra literary works for the reading comprehension activities because reading comprehension activities in the course books are sufficient for the students'*, 10 (13,69 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 30 ELT graduates (41,09 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 33 ELT graduates (45,20 %) mark 'not sure'. 15 (22,38 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 29 Literature graduates (43,28 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 23 Literature graduates (34,32 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 33, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I do not feel confident about how to teach with literary works'*, 15 (20,54 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 39 ELT graduates (53,42 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 19 ELT graduates (26,02 %) mark 'not sure'. 4 (5,97 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 51 Literature graduates (76,11 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 12 Literature graduates (17,91 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 34, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I do not feel competent about how to teach with literary works'*, 13 (17,80 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 38 ELT graduates (52,05 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 22 ELT graduates (30,13 %) mark 'not sure'. 2 (2,98 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 51 Literature graduates (76,11 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 14 Literature graduates (20,89 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 35, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot have an access to literary works'*, 7 (9,58 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 52 ELT graduates (71,23 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 14 ELT graduates (19,17 %) mark 'not sure'. 3 (4,47 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 51 Literature graduates (76,11 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 13 Literature graduates (19,40 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 36, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot decide which literary works are appropriate for the students'*, 16 (21,91 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 43 ELT graduates (58,90 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 14 ELT graduates (19,17 %) mark 'not sure'. 13 (19,40 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 50 Literature graduates (74,62 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 4 Literature graduates (5,97 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 37, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot find literary works which are appropriate for students' age'*, 12 (16,43 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 39 ELT graduates (53,42 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 22 ELT graduates (30,13 %) mark 'not sure'. 13 (19,40 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 50 Literature graduates (74,62 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 4 Literature graduates (5,97 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 38, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot find literary works which are appropriate for students' interests'*, 20 (27,39 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 36 ELT graduates (49,31 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 17 ELT graduates (23,28 %) mark 'not sure'. 15 (22,38 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 49 Literature graduates (73,13 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 3 Literature graduates (4,47 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 39, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot find literary works which are appropriate for students' level of English'*, 21 (28,76 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 33 ELT graduates (45,20 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 19 ELT graduates (26,02 %) mark 'not sure'. 15 (22,38 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 47 Literature graduates (70,14 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 5 Literature graduates (7,46 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 40, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because I cannot find relevant work to life experiences of students'*, 25 (34,24 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 26 ELT graduates (35,61 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 22 ELT graduates (30,13 %) mark 'not sure'. 11 (16,41 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 43 Literature graduates (64,17 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 13 Literature graduates (19,40 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 41, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because literary works are only appropriate for 'literary-minded' students'*, 22 (30,13 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 41 ELT graduates (56,16 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 10 ELT graduates (13,69 %) mark 'not sure'. 15 (22,38 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 46 Literature graduates (68,65 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 6 Literature graduates (8,95 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 42, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because materials can be very difficult linguistically, and therefore demotivating for the average student'*, 35 (47,94 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 22 ELT graduates (30,13 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 16 ELT graduates (21,91 %) mark 'not sure'. 32 (47,76 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 28 Literature graduates (41,79 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 7 Literature graduates (10,44 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 43, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because use of literature may rely too heavily on the teacher to paraphrase, clarify and explain, resulting in very little student participation'*, 37 (50,86 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 20 ELT graduates (27,39 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 16 ELT graduates (21,91 %) mark 'not sure'. 24 (35,82 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 33 Literature graduates (49,25 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 10 Literature graduates (14,92 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 44, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because students are dependent on ready-made interpretations from the teacher'*, 34 (46,57 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 19 ELT graduates (26,02 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 20 ELT graduates (27,39 %) mark 'not sure'. 24 (35,82 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 29 Literature graduates (43,28 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 14 Literature graduates (20,89 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 45, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because the language used in literary works sometimes deviate from the conventions of Standard English, which may cause a problem for language learning'*, 24 (32,87 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 25 ELT graduates (34,24 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 24 ELT graduates (32,87 %) mark 'not sure'. 17 (25,37 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 36 Literature graduates (53,73 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 14 Literature graduates (20,89 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 46, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because literary texts are full of old and outdated vocabulary not practiced in contemporary English'*, 23 (31,50 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 33 ELT graduates (45,20 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 17 ELT graduates (23,28 %) mark 'not sure'. 15 (22,38 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 46 Literature graduates (68,65 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 6 Literature graduates (8,95 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 47, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because activities with literary works require background knowledge for each student'*, 35 (47,94 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 19 ELT graduates (26,02 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 19 ELT graduates (26,02 %) mark 'not sure'. 19 (28,35 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 39 Literature graduates (58,20 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 9 Literature graduates (13,43 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 48, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities because language of literary works is different from contemporary English'*, 28 (38,35 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 22 ELT graduates (30,13 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 23 ELT graduates (31,50 %) mark 'not sure'. 19 (28,35 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 45 Literature graduates (67,16 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 3 Literature graduates (4,47 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 49, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities as part of the lesson outside the class because I cannot check what students are doing'*, 20 (27,39 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 30 ELT graduates (41,09 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 23 ELT graduates (31,50 %) mark 'not sure'. 8 (11,94 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 41 Literature graduates (61,19 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 18 Literature graduates (26,86 %) mark 'not sure'.

For item 50, *'I use few or no literary works for the reading comprehension activities as part of the lesson outside the class due to restrictions of the curriculum'*, 41 (56,16 %) of ELT graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 16 ELT graduates (21,91 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 16 ELT graduates (21,91 %) mark 'not sure'. 47 (70,14 %) of Literature graduates mark "totally agree and agree" whereas 13 Literature graduates (19,40 %) mark 'totally disagree and disagree'. Besides, 7 Literature graduates (5,97 %) mark 'not sure'.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

With regard to literature use of ELT teachers with an ELT background and those with a literature background, this study has revealed some significant conclusions. To start with, ELT Teachers both with an ELT and literature background are not contented with the reading activities in the course books, that is, they do not think reading comprehension activities are sufficient. But ELT graduates use extra reading comprehension materials a little more than Literature graduates do.

Both ELT and Literature graduates are hesitant about using poems for reading comprehension activities, but ELT graduates use poems more than Literature graduates. Both ELT and Literature graduates do not use extracts from poems for reading comprehension activities. ELT graduates use short stories more than Literature graduates. And the number of Literature graduates who do not use short stories for reading comprehension activities is much higher than ELT graduates. Though both groups of teachers use extracts from short stories, the number of Literature graduates who do not use extracts from short stories is higher. As to the use of novels for reading comprehension activities, it can be said that the number of Literature graduates who are in favor of using novels is slightly higher when compared to ELT graduates. This may be because novel is one of the most fundamental components of Literature Departments, which may mean that ELT teachers with a literature background are or feel that they are

competent and confident in using novel as a tool for teaching practices. Both groups of teachers use extracts from novels more when compared to novels, but the number of Literature graduates who use extracts from novels is higher than ELT graduates. Considering the use of theatre plays and extracts from theatre plays, both groups think that they are not so suitable for reading comprehension activities.

Literature graduates encourage students to read literature or literary works outside the class, whether as part of the lesson or not, more than ELT graduates. But when it comes to encouraging students to read extra reading comprehension materials during the class time, both groups think in the same way, that is, they have doubts as to the use of extra reading comprehension materials during the class time. Instead, Literature graduates see literature as a complement to reading comprehension classes.

ELT teachers with a Literature background find literature more motivating than ELT teachers with an ELT background. But, the number of participants who use literature because it improves reading skills is higher in ELT graduates. Both groups agree on the fact that literature improves listening skills, but the number of participants who do not believe that literature improves listening skills is higher in Literature graduates. Both ELT and Literature graduates think that literature improves writing skills but the number of participants who do not think that literature improves writing skills is higher in Literature graduates. As to speaking, literature graduates believe in the benefits of literature or literary works on improving speaking skills more than ELT graduates. Both ELT and Literature graduates think literature improves vocabulary, but the number is higher in ELT graduates. However, considering the number of the participants who do

not think that literature improves vocabulary, the number of Literature graduates is higher.

Literature graduates see literature as a valuable complement to classroom material more than ELT graduates. Both groups of teachers think that literature offers a good deal of cultural information, but the number of participants who do not think literature offers a good deal of cultural information is higher in Literature graduates. Both ELT and Literature graduates think that literature expands students' language awareness, but the number of participants who do not think literature expands students' language awareness is higher in Literature graduates.

Teachers with an ELT and Literature background both think that literature develops students' interpretative abilities, sparks curiosity, and helps students to become more productive and creative. However, the number of participants who do not think that literature sparks curiosity is higher in Literature graduates. The number of Literature graduates who think that literature stimulates students' language acquisition is higher when compared to ELT graduates.

The number of Literature graduates, who think that literature helps students to become more actively involved intellectually and emotionally in learning English, is slightly higher than ELT graduates. The number of participants who see literature as a stimulus for group is higher in ELT graduates.

ELT teachers, both with an ELT and Literature background, do not only use the reading comprehension materials in the course books since they do not think that those materials

are sufficient, but also use extra materials. Even so, the number of ELT graduates who use extra materials is higher.

As to the reasons why they do not use literature or literary works, both groups of teachers see insufficient class time as a big hindrance against using literature. But they do not see large number of students as a big hindrance against using literature.

Though both groups of teachers see themselves confident and competent about how to teach with literary works, ELT teachers with a literature background see themselves more confident and competent when compared to ELT teachers with an ELT background. Both groups of teachers say they can have an easy access to literary works, even so; the number of Literature graduates who say that they can easily have an access to literary works is higher. But it can be said that ELT graduates are more hesitant when compared to Literature graduates.

In deciding which literary works are appropriate for students, which works are appropriate for students' age, interest, level and which works are relevant to students' life experiences, Literature graduates have no difficulty and they have confidence about what they are doing but ELT graduates can be said to be hesitant. They are not clear in their answers; they are a little bit confused. Both groups of teachers do not think that literary works are only appropriate for literary-minded students, but the number of Literature graduates who do not think that literary works are only appropriate for literary-minded students is higher.

Nearly half of both ELT and Literature graduates think that literary works are linguistically difficult and therefore demotivating for the average student, but the

number of participants who think otherwise is higher in Literature graduates. ELT teachers with an ELT background think that literature is a great burden to them since it is the teacher's role to paraphrase, clarify, and explain in detail the literary work, which requires extra information about the literary work itself, about the author, about the period in which it is written. It is dependent to ready-made interpretations from the teacher, which seems difficult to ELT teachers with an ELT background. These are all the factors that make it hard for ELT teachers with an ELT background to do, which is why some of them avoid doing so. On the other hand, since Literature graduates see themselves competent, they do not think in the same way, they do not see paraphrasing, clarification and explaining literary works as a burden. ELT graduates see literature or literary works as an activity dependent on ready-made interpretations from the teacher more than Literature graduates.

Both ELT and Literature graduates do not think that language used in literary works deviate from the conventions of Standard English, which may cause a problem for language learning, besides both groups do not think that literary texts are full of old and outdated vocabulary but the number of Literature graduates is higher in both items, which means that they are more rigid in their answers when compared to ELT graduates.

The number of participants who believe that activities with literary works require background knowledge for each student is higher in ELT graduates in comparison to Literature graduates. But the number of ELT graduates who think otherwise is not little. Literature graduates do not think that background knowledge is necessary for the activities with literary works.

Literature graduates do not think that language of literary works is different from contemporary English, but some ELT graduates think that language of literary works is different from contemporary English and some others are not sure about this. ELT graduates can be said to be hesitant, on the other hand Literature graduates are quite clear in their beliefs. The number of ELT graduates who say that they cannot check what students are doing as part of the lesson outside the class is higher when compared to Literature graduates; that is why ELT graduates do not use literary works. But, both groups agree on the fact that not being able to check what students are doing is not one of the reasons why they do not use literary works for reading comprehension activities, though the number is higher in Literature graduates. Both ELT and Literature graduates see curriculum restriction as a hindrance against the use of literary works, but the number of Literature graduates who think curriculum restriction as a hindrance against the use of literary works is higher.

According to the participants of the study, literature or literary works are mostly seen within the scope of the language itself both by ELT teachers with an ELT and Literature background. In examining the role of literature in reading comprehension, there is not a remarkable difference between the views of ELT teachers with a literature and ELT background; they both favor the use of literary texts in their reading classes. As to the reasons why they do not use literature or literary works, ELT graduates are hesitant to define the reasons precisely, but Literature graduates are clear in their beliefs and practices, know why they do or why they do not.

In general terms, ELT teachers with an ELT background do not see themselves as confident and competent as ELT teachers with a Literature background. ELT teachers

with a background in literature may possess the knowledge required to distinguish whether the emphasis should be placed on practical application, whether the information is verifiable or when its purpose is purely literary. It may be seen that Literature graduates are strict in their choices when compared to ELT graduates. Literature graduates prefer “Not Sure” as a choice in the questionnaire quite less than ELT graduates.

Regardless of their educational background, the majority of the participants of the study encourage students to read literature or literary works outside the class. Additionally, they use literature or literary works because it improves vocabulary; it is a valuable complement to classroom material, it offers a good deal of cultural information and expands students’ language awareness.

Comparing the differences in literature and ELT curricula, language teachers with a literature background are more advantageous in using extra reading comprehension materials such as literature. As mentioned in the previous chapters, the percentage of literature and literature related lessons in ELT curricula is only around 5-10 %. On the other hand, in literature departments the percentage of literature and related lessons is 95 %, naturally. This means ELT teachers with a literature background have read more literary works, have more comprehensive vocabulary and collocations than ELT graduates, which all lead to confidence and competence in reading lessons. In those ways, teachers with a literature background are more familiar with authentic materials, and are more likely to take their students go beyond the text. Literature graduates see literature as an extracurricular activity.

Apart from all these, the study also reveals the need for further research on the subject since literature is an important and inseparable part of the language itself. This study may be an inspiration for those who would like to study on the need for the inclusion of further literature courses into the curricula of ELT Departments. Also, with a wider range, including all regions of Turkey, a more comprehensive study can be carried out.

If to summarize, since reading is one of the most essential parts of the language; for some, the most essential part, and since literature is fundamental for reading, in this respect the role of literature or literary works should not be underestimated. Since reading is not the emphasis of most curricula, it seems that this absence is particularly apparent in programs targeting the needs of more advanced learners, such as university preparation programs. It is possible that teachers in such situations are not convinced of the merits of reading comprehension activities for their students.

According to the findings of the study, if literature is seen as a vital part of reading comprehension, knowing more about literature and teaching through literature should be given more emphasis.

REFERENCES

- Alvermann, D., & Earle, J. (2003). Comprehension instruction. In A. P. Sweet, & C. Snow (Eds.), *Rethinking reading comprehension*. New York: Guilford.
- Alyousef, H. S. (2006). Teaching reading comprehension to EFL learners. *Journal of Language and Learning*, 5 (1), 63-73.
- Anderson, R. C. (1996). *Promoting reading in developing countries*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Anshakov, O., & Gergely, T. (2010). *Cognitive reasoning: A formal approach*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Antunez, B. (2002). English language learners and the five essential components of reading instruction. Retrieved on February 22, 2012 from <http://www.readingrockets.org/article/341/>
- Arib, S. (2010). An exploration of the teacher's personal constructs: The effects of the English language instructors' majors on their orientations toward teaching reading comprehension. *Journal of Language and Translation* (1) 1, 29-38.
- Armitage U., Wilson, S. & Sharp, H. (2004). Navigation and ownership for learning in electronic texts: An experimental study. *Electronic Journal of E-Learning*, 2 (2). Retrieved from <http://www.ejel.org/volume-2/vol2-issue1/issue1-art17.htm>.

- August, D. L. & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (2001). *Developing literacy in a second language: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Baumann, J. F., & Ivey, G. (1997). Delicate balances: Striving for curricular and instructional equilibrium in a second grade, literature/strategy-based classroom. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 32, 244-275.
- Biancarosa, G., & Snow, C. (2006). *Reading next: A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy – A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York* (2nd ed.). Washington, D.C.: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36 (2), 81 - 109.
- Bowling, A. (2009). *Research methods in health: Investigative health and health services* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill. Retrieved on April 10 from http://www.mcser.org/images/stories/JESRJOURNAL/Jesr_May_2012/oluwatayo_james_ayodele.pdf
- Block, C., Gambrell, L., & Pressley, M. (2002). *Improving comprehension instruction*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brown, D. (1994). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language Pedagogy*. Upper Saddle River, Prentice Hall Regents.
- Brumfit, C. J., & Carter R. A. (eds.). (1986). *Literature and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Bunt, N. A. (2009). *Elementary teachers' perceptions regarding four research-based components of reading instruction* (Thesis, University of South Dakota). Retrieved from Ann Arbor, MI: ProQuest LLC.
- Burke, A. & Rowsell, J. (2008). Screen pedagogy: Challenging perceptions of digital reading practice, *Changing English: Studies in Culture & Education*, 15 (4), 445-456. Retrieved on December 04 , 2012 from <http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~content=a906476851~db=all>
- Burns, N. & Grove, S. K. (2005). The Practice of nursing research conduct, critique, and utilization. USA: Elsevier 215-237. Retrieved on April 10, 2013 from <http://upetd.up.ac.za/thesis/available/etd-06222011-13326/unrestricted/dissertation.pdf>
- Carrell, P. L. (1984). Schema theory and ESL reading: Classroom implications and applications. *The Modern Language Journal*, 68 (4), 332-343.
- Carrell , P. L., Pharis, B. G., & Liberto, J. C. (1989). Metacognitive strategy training for ESL reading. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23 (4), 647-678.
- Carell, P. L, Devine, J. & Eskey, D. E. (1998). *Interactive approaches to second language reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carter, R. A. & Long, M. N. (1991). *Teaching literature*. London: Longman.
- Chandler, S. (1992). *Learning for what purpose? Questions when viewing learning from a sociocultural perspective*. New York: Elsevier.
- Chun, M., & Plass, J. (1997). Research on Text Comprehension in Multimedia Environments. *Language Learning & Technology*. 1 (1), 60-81. Retrieved on December 03, 2012 from http://ilt.msu.edu/vol1num1/chun_plass/default.html

- Clay, M. (2002). *An observation survey: Of early literacy achievement* (2nd ed).
Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Collie, J. & S. Slater. (1987). *Literature in the language classroom*. Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press.
- Colorado, C. (2007). Reading comprehension strategies for English
language learners. Retrieved on February 22, 2012 from [http://www.
colorincolorado.org/article/14342/](http://www.colorincolorado.org/article/14342/)
- Creswell, J.W. (2008). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods
approaches* (3rd Edition), SAGE publications Inc. Retrieved on April, 10 from
<http://essaybank.degree-essays.com/nursing/quantitative-research.php>
- Cross, D. (1995). Language teacher preparation in developing countries: Structuring
pre-service teacher training programs. *English Teaching Forum*, 33 (4), 35.
Retrieved on September 17, 2012 from <http://iteslj.org/c/webidea>
- Cruz, J. (2010). The role of literature and culture in English language teaching.
Retrieved on November 10, 2012 from <http://relinguistica.azc.uam.mx/no007>
- Cummins, C., Cheek, E. H., & Lindsey, J. D. (2004). The relationship between
teachers' literacy beliefs and their instructional practices: A brief review of
the literature for teacher education. *E-Journal of Teaching & Learning in
Diverse Settings*, 1 (2), 175-188.
- Day, R. R. (1991). Models and the knowledge base of second language teacher
education. *University of Hawaii Working Papers in ESL*, 11 (2), 1-13.
Retrieved on August, 13, 2012 from <http://www.hawaii.edu/sls/sls/wp>

Day, R. R. & Bamford, J. (1998). *Extensive reading in the second language classroom*.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved on April 17, 2012 from

<http://www.cape.edu/docs/TTalk0020.pdf>

Duffy, G. (Eds.). (2003). *Improving comprehension: 10 research-based principles:*

Work from the Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement.

Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Duke, N. K. & Pearson, D. (2002). Effective Practices for Developing Reading

comprehension. In A.E. Farstrup & S.J. Samuels (Eds.). *What Research Has To*

Say About Reading Instruction, (3rd ed.), 205-242. Newark, DE:

International Reading Association.

Elioglu, F. (1992). English language teaching and the place of literature in Turkish

secondary schools. *Seventh Oxford Conference on Literature Teaching*

Overseas. The British Council, pp. 19-21.

Ellis, G., & McRae, J. (1991). *The extensive reading: Handbook for secondary*

teachers. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Fitzpatrick, J.J. & Wallace, M. (2005). *Encyclopedia of Nursing Research* (2nd. ed.),

Springer Publishing Company. Retrieved on April 10, 2012 from

<http://essaybank.degree-essays.com/nursing/quantitative-research.php>.

Freeman, D. (1989). Teacher training, development and decision making: A model of

teaching and related strategies for language teacher education. *TESOL*

Quarterly, 23 (1), 27-45.

Frey, L. R., Carl, H. B., & Gary, L. K. (2000). *Investigating communication: An*

introduction to research methods. (2nd ed.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

- Flood, J., Lapp, D., & Fisher, D. (2003). Reading comprehension instruction. In J. Flood (Ed.), International Reading Association, and National Council of Teachers of English, *Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Genc, B. & Bada, E. (2005). Culture in language learning and teaching. *The Reading Matrix*, 5 (1), 73-84.
- Gibson, K. D. (2009). *Teachers' perceptions of strategy based reading instruction for reading comprehension*. (Master's Thesis for Dominican University of California). Retrieved from ERIC Database.
- Gonen, S. & Saglam, S. (2012). Teaching Culture In The FL Classroom: Teachers' Perspectives IJGE: *International Journal of Global Education*, 1 (3), 26-46. Retrieved on October 8, 2012 from <http://www.ijge.net/ojs/index.php/ijge>
- Grabe, W. (1995). Dilemmas for the development of second language reading abilities. *Prospect*, 10 (2), 38-51.
- Grabe, W. (2004). Research on teaching reading. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24. Retrieved on September 22, 2012, from <http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayfulltext?type>
- Grace, B. (2013). Advantages of Convenience Sampling. Retrieved on April 3, 2013 from <http://www.reference.com/motif/society/advantages-of-convenience-sampling>
- Gronlund, N. E. (1998). *Assessment of student achievement*. (6th Ed.) Boston:Ally and Bacon.
- Gunning, T. G. (2003). *Creating literacy instruction for all students*. Boston: Pearson.

- Hamp, L. L. (2003). Writing teachers as assessors of writing. In Kroll, B. (ed.) *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hafiz, F. M. & Tudor, I. (1989). Extensive reading and the development of language skills. *ELT Journal*, 43 (1), 4-13.
- Hedge, T. (2003). *Teaching & learning in the language classroom*. UK: Oxford University Press.
- Heller, R., & Greenleaf, C. (2007). *Literacy instruction in the content areas: Getting to the core of middle and high school improvement*. Washington, D.C.: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Hismanoglu, M. (2005). *Teaching English through literature*. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies* 1 (1), 53-56.
- Irvin, J. L., Lunstrum, J. P., Lynch-Brown, C. & Shepard, M. F. (1996). *Enhancing social studies through literary strategies*. Washington D.C. Retrieved on April 8, 2013 from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED414209.pdf>
- Iwai, Y. (2010). Re-envisioning reading comprehension for English language learners. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 16 (4), 16-19.
- Jackson, S. L. (2009). *Research methods and statistics: A critical thinking approach* (3rd ed.) Belmont, CA: Wadsworth. Retrieved on April 8, 2013 from <http://psychcentral.com/blog/archives/2011/09/27/the-3-basic-types-of-descriptive-research-methods/>
- Jiang, W. (2000). The Relationship between culture and language. *ELT Journal*, 54 (4), 328-334.

- Johnson, K. E. (1994). Teaching and teacher education: The emerging beliefs and instructional practices of pre-service English as a second language teachers. *English Teaching Forum, 10* (4), 439-452.
- Johnson, R. K. and M. Swain (eds.) (1999). *Immersion education: International perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keene, E., & Zimmerman, S. (1997). *Mosaic of thought: Teaching comprehension in a reader's workshop*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Khonamri, F., & Salimi, M. (2010). The interplay between EFL high school teachers' beliefs and their instructional practices regarding reading strategies. *Novitas-Royal, 4* (1), 96-107.
- Klingner, J. K., Urbach, J., Golos, D., Brownell, M., & Menon, S. (2010). Teaching reading in the 21st century: A glimpse at how special education teachers promote reading comprehension. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 33*, 59-74.
- Kress, G. (2003). *Literacy in the new media age*. London: Routledge.
- Laflamme, J. G. (1997). The effect of multiple exposure vocabulary method and the target reading / writing strategy on test scores. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 40* (5), 372-381.
- Langer, J. (1997). Literacy acquisition through literature. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 40*, 602-614. Retrieved on December 3, 2012 from <http://ojs.academypublisher.com/index.php/jltr/article/view/jltr0301205210>

- Lavert, G. B. (2008). *Principal and teacher perception of the understanding and facilitation of the understanding and facilitation of cognitive instructional strategies to improving reading* (Thesis, Indiana State University). Retrieved from Ann Arbor, MI: ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
- Lazar, G. (1993). *Literature and language teaching: A guide for teachers and trainers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levine, A., Ferenz, O. & Reves, T. (2000). EFL reading and modern technology: How can we turn our students into independent readers? *TESL-EJ*, 4 (4).
- Liang, L. & Dole, J. (2006). Help with teaching reading comprehension: Comprehension instructional frameworks *International Reading Association* 59 (8), 742-753. Retrieved on December 3, 2012, from <http://www.wce.wvu.edu/Depts/SPED/Forms/Kens%20Readings/reading/Readings/comprehension/Comp%20%20models.pdf>
- Lilleberg, D. (1995). *Parents Teaching Overseas*. Retrieved on August 13, 2012 from http://www.iched.org/cms/scripts/page.php.site_id=iched&item_reading_process
- Lin, H. & Guey, C. (2004). *Reconstructing English Language Teaching in Taiwanese English Departments: An Interface between language and literature*. Retrieved on October 10, 2012 from <http://ccsun.nchu.edu.tw/~intergrams/052-061/052-061-lin.pdf>
- May, F. (2001). *Unraveling the seven myths of reading. Assessment and intervention practices for counteracting their effects*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

- Marshall, N. (1989). The Students: Who are they and how do I reach them?. In D. Lapp, J. Flood, & N. Farnan (Eds.). *Content area reading and learning: Instructional strategies*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- McLaughlin, M. & Allen, M. (2002). *From guided comprehension: A teaching model for grades 3-8*. International Reading Association.
- McKay, S. & Moulding, S. (1986). Literature in the ESL Classroom. In Brumfit and Carter (Eds.). *Literature and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McNamara, T. P. , Miller, D. L., & Bransford, J. D. (1991). Mental models and reading comprehension. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research, 2*, 490-511. New York: Longman.
- Meijer, P. C., Verloop, N., & Beijard, D. (1999). Exploring language teachers' practical knowledge about teaching reading comprehension. *Teaching & Teacher education, 15*, 59-84.
- Narvaez, D. (2002). *Individual differences that influence reading comprehension*. In: Block, C. C. and Pressley, M. (Eds.) *Comprehension instruction: Research based best practices*. New York, NY: Guilford Press, 166-169.
- National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implication for reading instruction: Reports of the subgroups*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Child Health and Development.

- Nation P. & Waring R. (1997). Vocabulary size, text coverage and word lists. In Schmitt, N. and McCarthy, M. (Eds.): *Vocabulary: Description, Acquisition and Pedagogy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 6-19.
- Ness, M. K. (2009). Reading comprehension strategies in secondary content area classrooms: Teacher use of and attitudes towards reading comprehension instruction. *Reading Horizons*, 49 (2), 143-166.
- Nunan, D. (1995). *Language teaching methodology: a textbook for teachers*. New York and London: Phoenix ELT.
- Oakley, G. (2011). The assessment of reading comprehension cognitive strategies: Practices and perceptions of Western Australian teachers. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 34 (3), 279-293.
- Pang, E. S., & Kamil, M. L. (2004). Second language issues in early literacy and instruction. *Publication*. Mid-Atlantic Lab for Student Success, Philadelphia, PA. Retrieved on December 3, 2012, from <http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/PolicyResearch/ELLResearchBrief.pdf>
- Paribakht, T. S. & Wesche, M. (1999). Reading and incidental L2 vocabulary acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21, 195-224.
- Pearman, C. J. (2008). Independent reading of CD-ROM storybooks: Measuring comprehension with oral retellings. *Reading Teacher*, 61 (8), 594-602.
- Poole M. E. (1975). Review of B. Bernstein, and B. Bernstein Class, codes and control *Language in Society*, 4, 73-84. doi:10.1017/S0047404500004504.

- Pressley, M. (2002). *Reading instruction that works: The case for balanced teaching* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford.
- Quirk, M., Unrau, N., Ragusa, G., Rueda, R., Lim, H., (2010). Teacher beliefs about reading motivation and their enactment in classrooms: The development of a survey questionnaire. *Reading Psychology, 31*, 93-120.
- Rayner, K., Foorman, B. R., Perfetti, C. A., Pesetsky, D., & Seidenberg, M. S. (2001). How psychological science informs the teaching of reading. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 2* (2), 31-74.
- Richards, J. C. (1998). *Beyond training*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2003). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching Today*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rivers, W. M. (1981). *Teaching foreign language skills*. Chicago: The University of Chicago.
- Robson, A. E. (1989). The use of literature in ESL and culture-learning courses in US colleges. *TESOL Newsletter, 23*, 25-27. Retrieved on April 17, 2012 from www.ccsenet.org/elt English Language Teaching
- Rosenblatt, L. (1993). The transactional theory: Against Dualism. *College English, 55* (4), 308-315.
- Routman, R. (2003). *Reading essentials: The specifics you need to teach reading well*. Portsmouth, NH: Heineman.

- Sardi, C. (2002). *English language needs and course design*. Kodolanyi University.
- Sargusingh-Terrance, L. M. (2008). *Reading comprehension instruction of effective grades 5 and 6 Saint Lucian teachers* (Thesis). The University of Waikato.
- Savvidou, C. (2004). An integrated approach to teaching literature in the EFL classroom. *The Internet TESL Journal*. Retrieved on April 17, 2013 from <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Savvidou-Literature.html>
- Schultz, J. M. (2002). The Gordian knot: Language, literature, and critical thinking. In Scott, M. V. & Tucker, H. (Eds.), *SLA and the literature classroom: Fostering dialogues*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Scrivener, J. (2005). *Learning teaching: A guidebook for English language teachers*. Oxford: Macmillan.
- Sell, J. (2005). Why teach literature in the foreign language classroom?. *Encuentro*, 15, 86-93.
- Sellen, A. & Harper, R. (1997). Proceedings from CHI: *Paper as an analytic resource for the design of new technologies*, 319-326.
- Snow, C. (2002). *Reading for understanding: Towards a R&D program in reading comprehension*. Washington, D.C.: RAND Reading Study Group.
- Taylor, B. M., Pearson, P. D., Clark, K., & Walpole, S. (2000). Effective schools and accomplished teachers: Lessons about primary grade reading instruction in low-income schools. *Elementary School Journal*, 101 (2), 121-166.
- Vacca, R. T. (2002). *Making a difference in adolescents' school lives: Visible and invisible aspects of content area reading*. New York: Harper-Collins.

- Vellutino, F. R. (2003). Individual differences as sources of variability in reading comprehension in elementary school children. In C. Snow & A. Sweet (Eds.), *Rethinking, reading, comprehension*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Woolley, G. (2011). *Reading comprehension: Assisting children with learning difficulties*. New York: Springer Science.

IMPLICATIONS FOR ELT

Considering the curricula of ELT departments of several universities included in this study, it is clear that literature related lessons comprise approximately 5 % of the whole undergraduate program during the 4 year period. The first step to take should be to increase the amount and percentage of literature and literature-related lessons in ELT curricula. That is what the curricula designers should take into account since teachers are only the practitioners.

Based on the teachers' views participating in the study, the use of literature in ELT reading classes should be encouraged and supported. More emphasis should be given to the inclusion of literary works into ELT context since many ELT teachers believe that literature should be an integral part of ELT process. Since there are many ELT teachers with a literature background in the field of teaching, they will have no difficulty practicing literature or literary works during their teaching. As to other teachers with an ELT background, though they do not see themselves as competent and confident as those with a literature background, they mostly think they can practice literary works during their teaching process. They can overcome the barriers and the difficulties of using literature by practicing the literary works familiar to them, and also they can make use of various sources, such as internet, and books with teachers' book. When their answers in the questionnaire are considered, it can be seen that they do not see having access to literary works as a problem. Also, familiar texts and the books with have adapted films may be more suitable and interesting for the students, since they will be easier to activate student schemata and motivate them to read such texts.

Curriculum restriction is one of the mostly expressed reasons against the use of literature or literary works. Knowing that a teacher cannot do anything other than what is determined in the curriculum, in order to overcome curriculum restriction, literature or literary works may be supported by extracurricular activities, competitions with awards or club activities such as Literature club. Within the aims of this literature club may be to encourage students to go theatres or join related activities, which may lead to curiosity in others who are less interested in such facilities. Also the supportive aspect of literature use should be reminded to teachers on different occasions such as seminars, lectures and in-service training activities.

CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Name: Ahmet ÖZKAN
Date of Birth: 08.09.1976
Place of Birth: Çermik
Marital Status: Married
E-mail: ozkanahmet@hotmail.com

EDUCATION

- Master's Degree (M.A), University of Maltepe, Department of Foreign Languages Education, English Language Teaching (with thesis), İstanbul, Turkey, 2010 - 2013.
- Bachelor's Degree (B.A), University of Marmara, Department of Foreign Languages Education, English Language Teaching, İstanbul, Turkey, 1994 - 1999.
- Fatih Anatolian High School, İstanbul, Turkey 1987 - 1994

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

- Dilfen Language Schools, İstanbul, Turkey (September 2003 - ...) English Teacher
- English Centre, İstanbul, Turkey (March 1999 - 2002) English Teacher

OFFICIAL EXAMS TAKEN

- KPDS May, 2012 with a score of 96,25
- ALES May 2012 with a score of 79