

# A Methodology for Teaching English Literature at University Level

Dildora Kuvandikova

English Teacher, Jizzakh Branch of National University of Uzbekistan  
Named After Mirzo Ulugbek, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

## ABSTRACT

This article outlines a reflection on the best way to programme a very broad subject, such as English literature, within the framework of Uzbek universities. It focuses on four fundamental points, among others, in order to better plan the contents, namely, the criteria for organising the programmes, their methodological approach, the implementation, typology and evaluation of the knowledge and, finally, the actual and possible bibliographical contribution. More tangentially, other important issues are pointed out, such as the methods of participation in class, the language used in class, the canonical questioning of primary and secondary contents, the criteria for the choice of compulsory and optional readings and, finally, the possibility of individualising the programme for each student.

**KEYWORDS:** *methodological programming, English literature, canon questioning, evaluation*

**How to cite this paper:** Dildora Kuvandikova "A Methodology for Teaching English Literature at University Level" Published in International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development (ijtsrd), ISSN: 2456-6470, Volume-4 | Issue-4, June 2020, pp.858-863, URL: [www.ijtsrd.com/papers/ijtsrd31241.pdf](http://www.ijtsrd.com/papers/ijtsrd31241.pdf)



IJTSRD31241

Copyright © 2020 by author(s) and International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development Journal. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)



## INTRODUCTION

It is always a complicated task to plan a subject as broad as English literature, which spans from the medieval origins to the late 20th century, and includes not only the most important post-colonial literatures, but also topics devoted to literary theory and criticism, as well as the study of the main Anglo-American critical texts. It is also difficult to achieve a historical and thematic continuity that is not found in the monographic programmes of each of the subjects. It is therefore necessary to try to ensure that each of these subjects, divided in a traditional diachronic way, achieves a balance between its objectives and the teaching that can be given. However, this general programme is not a real programme, since it does not exist as such within the new curriculum of English Philology at the Jizzakh state pedagogical institute, whose descriptors seem to lean more towards the thematic monograph and specialisation. In this detailed programme, as we have pointed out, each of the topics of each subject must be related to its selected bibliography, as well as to the objectives and the list of compulsory and recommended readings for each case. Finally, it must take into account much more clearly the actual class time available, as well as its theoretical and practical "implementation". In advance, as we pointed out above, it seems methodologically more useful to carry out a general and diachronic, more traditional programme, in which the history of English literature is found, from its beginnings to the division of the literatures of the countries emancipated from Great Britain in the post-colonial era, in

which each subject is detailed as it would be taught in a specific academic year. In our opinion, this is intended above all to do two very important things: on the one hand, that literary history should be framed within a temporal globality and a unity of facts that should be known as they occur - with the coherence of a general programme to be followed at all times - and, on the other, that the concrete implementation, and partial force, that occurs during the physical reality of a four-month period should not be forgotten - which forces the always difficult exercise of delimiting and deciding which specific texts to omit and which to teach during that period. In this type of programming we also think it is appropriate to carry out (in the manner of the new methodological pedagogy) an analysis of the objectives, means, chosen texts, and a selected bibliography effectively used in the classroom.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

The programmes will also be divided into lessons that are chosen according to a predominantly thematic rather than symmetrical character, and that are likely to be taught during a specific period of time, for each case. An average of between twenty and thirty lessons per period seems to be visibly adjusted to the teaching possibilities that our Uzbek University offers, even though we always know that the logic of everyday life and its ups and downs causes its ravages in the theoretical progress of the course and that it is practically impossible to carry out the planned activities in their entirety. We understand that in this period, in

accordance with the bases of the study plans that follow the credit systems, the formula of one hour of class per week is equivalent to one and a half credits per four-month period. In this way, and given that English literature subjects are mostly 7.5 credits (for compulsory subjects) and 6 credits (for optional subjects), we calculate that for each term, an average of 15 weeks of actual class time after discounting holiday periods corresponds to ten/ fifteen lessons (for 6-credit subjects) and fifteen/ twenty (for 7.5-credit subjects).

At the same time, these lessons may well be subdivided, when necessary, into clearly differentiated parts, thus forming concrete and balanced thematic units, with which their contents would be taught in a much more relaxed and accessible way to the teacher and his or her students. In our opinion, this is a more logical division and one that should be taken into account when restructuring the teaching project of the English Philology degree course. Each of these lessons would take up approximately four or five hours of theoretical and practical lessons per week, as appropriate - we insist that this is an approximate division, since, as has been pointed out above, the syllabus is not absolutely symmetrical and there are lessons that should be taught in more time than others. In view of the above, a list of readings must be presented which may seem excessive in some cases, but which attempts to be mitigated through procedures such as, for example, the choice of each student, group work and other systems, which we will discuss later. Often, the programming can be slightly modified, since it should not be in any case an "instrument of torture", both for the teacher, frustrated by not being able to cover it, and for the student, burdened by the weight of the unreachable; thus, texts can be suppressed for the sake of deepening contents, but, at the same time, it is considered possible and enriching if the subject works effectively for each specific group. The further divisions of this general theoretical scheme that we are outlining have to follow a structural criterion for two main reasons: the better global understanding of the student of the subject to be developed and the easier possibility of omitting sub-headings, theoretically less important, if reasons of various kinds make it necessary. In the same way, the structural design allows the opportune annual revision of each subject and the possibility of not radical changes in authors and concrete works, of the badly called minor ones, since the great authors of literature seem obvious that they should always be studied, as well as works that constitute a landmark for the future of a genre, like *The Waste Land* or the work of James Joyce as an example for the 20th century. In this connection, one must note the difficult omission of names that a program like this entails for the teacher, especially with regard to the twentieth century, where the canon has not yet been adjusted and the immediacy produces a greater subjective critical affection towards one type of literature to the detriment of others, often for reasons that are not strictly literary; authors such as Basil Bunting or Tom Raworth in contemporary poetry seem to be neglected in favour of "official" poets or laureates, or novelists considered "realists" such as Anthony Powell, C.P. Snow or L.P. Hartley are relegated to the background due to the emergence of an experimental literature in the 1960s that is fashionable in today's critical studies because of its innovation in the genre. For this reason, in the organisation of the programmes, an attempt should be made to offer not only a general and canonical vision of literature, which is very viable with regard to very distant times, such as the

medieval or renaissance periods, but which is continually being re-evaluated, above all from the point of view of *gender studies*, mainly from the Restoration and certainly in the 18th and 19th centuries - the Victorian era is a clear example of this, Let's not forget works such as Gilbert and Gubar's *The Madwoman in the Attic*, which reinterprets the myth of the *madwoman* in Charlotte Brontë's novel in the light of the reevaluation of the female figure in literature - and which in our century, due to the above, becomes an extremely complex issue. In this sense, and to the extent of our possibilities, it is necessary to provide the student with an overview of the complexity and the vital force of literature, which sometimes seems to be lost when everything is rationally classified into periods, dates, and limits. This idea implies a desire to include in the programme authors who are inevitably relegated, unjustly many times, from the classical *syllabuses* because of time constraints, and who can contribute worthy works to literature; or also to include the revision that the new critical currents offer to the global panorama. Such is the case, to follow the example cited above, of Charlotte Brontë's novel, *Jane Eyre*, about which the new feminist critics have brought to the fore authors such as Jean Rhys and her very interesting *Wide Sargasso Sea*, whose recreation of Bertha Mason (Antoinette Cosway), and her parodic and aesthetic contribution to the novel, make it seem advisable to devote some attention to it. For this reason, we must also try to offer a global vision of the latest trends in twentieth-century literature, of authors and works whose imperishable quality cannot yet be discerned, but which are the palpable sign of our times and the proof for the student that literature is not something dead and buried in the written memory of men. The future will take care of including some and rejecting others from the literary canon, but it is always relevant to show the strength of its vitality. Leaving aside for the moment the content of the programme, we would like to focus now on its form. Since the time of formalist criticism at the beginning of the century, the viability of making history of literature has been questioned. Studies devoted to the subject, such as those by René Wellek and Austin Warren (1948), do not seem to reach a definitive solution. What does seem obvious is that the diachronic procedures of literary history should not be understood as an accumulation of generally unconnected data, as an encyclopaedic succession of materials that do not lead to the unity of contents, but generally to fragmentation. It is necessary, therefore, to provide a unitary vision, to relate the sources and to study the close relationship between a literature and the society that produces it. If we do a little bit of history, we can go back to the beginning of Romanticism, when the dogmatic and often erratic view of the books of literary history was overcome, and special emphasis was put on the studies of the author; that is, it went from a mimetic and encyclopaedic period to one that exalted the nationalistic originality of the writer, his sublime interpretation of the "motherland. During the Victorian era there was a kind of regression towards the compilation of data and the neoclassical idea of wisdom. This era produced historicism and became the literary stories of the end of the century, in which the literary text did not appear, but the biographies, historical data and works of a variety of canonical authors had to be studied by heart. The revolution of the new criticism during the first decades of the 20th century, as well as the aesthetic role of the Russian formalists and the rise of structuralism, leads us to understand literature through the carefully analysed texts as

general patterns that lead to a history of the literature of each era. The subsequent decline of structuralist postulates and of the text as the only intrinsic force that can be analysed has led to deconstructive approaches, as well as to the return of sociological, political, philosophical and cultural analyses of texts, without forgetting the texts themselves. This last great revolution in literary studies is producing a great critical apparatus that is unapproachable in its entirety, but which has greatly questioned the study of traditional literary history and *close reading*, as is frequently seen in recent times. However, before outlining the best theoretical approach to be followed, in our opinion, we would like to highlight the pros and cons of several of the postulates that have been put forward previously: The traditional historicist approach serves to provide a general frame of reference. It is, in fact, the one that offers a global perspective and a coherent and complete vision of the literature of a certain country or period. When it does not fall into anecdote or unconnected list of data, it serves as the only coherent support for the texts. It is therefore necessary for general introductory topics, for the deep structure of each subject, as a connecting thread. But it must never fall into the study of each author's biography, into excessive memorization, to the detriment of textual analysis itself. Finally, it avoids the teacher simply giving lectures on those authors he or she likes best, and gives the student the possibility of continuing to study in depth on his or her own, as well as not walking in ignorance of the historical context of the authors he or she is reading. This historicist approach is the only one possible, in our opinion, as far as the *survey course* subjects of the new curriculum of 1994 are concerned, that is, the subjects called *English Literature I and II*. In this sense, given that during the first academic year the student will be given a global and systematic vision of English literary history, it is possible to move away from it partially in the other subjects of this subject, all the more so as these are more monographic in their definition that appears in the curriculum. However, even in these cases there must always be a minimum basic use of data, since the student must know where he or she is at any given moment, which can only be achieved through historical contextualisation. Furthermore, the historical approach allows for a clear understanding of the styles and generic evolution of specific periods and provides the student with a global humanistic formation -which, if well used, can be useful for the study of comparative literature, for the evaluation of the propagation of one culture over another and for the globalization of the understanding of European and universal literary movements in their time and aesthetics.

The textual approach, as noted above, is the most appropriate for the analysis of certain specific texts, such as poetics. It should be remembered that most of the masterful analyses of the *new critics* were based on short poems. It is not possible, therefore, to analyse major texts such as novels, plays or books of poems in their entirety with the same depth over such a limited and diverse academic period. Their function -very important, in our opinion, but not absolute- must then be to decipher the aesthetics and style of the works studied, through the commentary of significant fragments and paragraphs, stanzas or specific acts, which can be extended and applied to the whole work itself, giving rise to the student's intervention through his or her personal or group work. Finally, *close reading* should alternate with (and never replace) the overall picture of the time, style, and

specific work of a given author. The study of the great universal myths and their literary archetypes implies, anyway, a very wide knowledge of the universal literature that is not so easily possessed, so, as we have pointed out, this method should not be the base of the study of the subject, but a very positive way of capturing the symbolic, metaphorical and allegorical dimensions of many texts, especially, in this case, the theatrical and poetic ones -from Shakespeare to T.S. Eliot- but also the great structures of some novels, such as those of Joyce, Durrell, or Golding in this century. There are periods of literature, such as the medieval one, which due to their remoteness are much better understood from the great mythological cycles (the Arthurian ones, the alliterative romances, the great ballads are perhaps the most relevant examples). Within the new critical tendencies we find the analysis of the reception of works, that is, the *reader-response criticisms*. The aesthetics of the reception has its interest in specific periods of English literature, as for example in the ideological history of the public in the medieval cars and in the *morality plays*, in the false verisimilitude of the novel of the eighteenth century and in the costumbrist theater of the end of the same century, or in the Victorian moralist literature. The new interpretations of intertextuality in the works entails a permanent author-reader dialogue on which most of the metafictional novel of the 20th century has been based. Therefore, without being too dazzled by the absolute value of the method, we must not forget it as useful for the socio-political analysis of texts. Another approach, which today seems more outdated, but whose ramifications still retain a great hermeneutic power, is that which comes from the derivatives of historical materialism, from *new historicism* to English cultural materialism, which transcend the Marxist literary theories that construct the social histories of literature. Against these theses, post-structuralism has defended, based on the historical manipulation of the victors, the non-existence of history as a single reality, but as the succession of many stories, diverse and complex, fragmented, which produce the globality of the historical or literary discourse to be studied. In this sense, the neo-historicist approach emphasizes the presence of secondary, subversive or marginal elements of traditional stories, which must be revalued in the literary canon. Finally, the critical approach, i.e. the reading of specialized criticism of specific topics, is very useful to delimit the diverse and sometimes conflicting tendencies of the analysis of a given text or period, on the one hand, and to promote the critical plurality of points of view, on the other. In short, given that the possibilities of approaching a work are multiple, we must opt for the one that is most appropriate to each one, the one that best fits in with teaching practice, and that can best define it in itself and within the ensemble of English-language literature. Without forgetting, as we have repeatedly insisted, the unifying historical basis, we believe that based on the textual analysis of significant fragments and emphasising the ultimate content of them, that is, that which eternalizes them and gives them value - something for which approaches such as mythology are very valuable - and through a plural critical analysis, which does not forget the value of the text in its time and context, the appropriate ethical and aesthetic understanding can be achieved. All this ends up achieving the greatest interest for the teacher and his or her students, which must be to achieve their critical capacity through the knowledge that there is no single interpretation and that, since his or her own as a competent

and well-informed reader counts as that of any other, he or she must read the works for himself or herself. Indissolubly linked to the preparation of the programme is the actual execution of it, which constitutes the basis of the interaction of the elements necessary for didactic communication: the channel through which the teacher transmits the message to his students. It is extremely important, therefore, that there is a logical and explainable teaching organization, so that the teacher is not the only one who understands the objectives to be taught and the student feels that he is not part of the teaching process. This type of communication therefore implies an understanding of the material to be used, the way in which the classes will be given, the roles of the students and the teacher, and the criteria for teaching and evaluating the knowledge taught. It seems, then, that a good moment for such information is the beginning of the academic year when the corresponding commentary on the programme is carried out, which should be detailed and concrete.

The reform of the teaching that is advocated today at the Uzbek University and at the University of oriental studies in particular allows the realization of theoretical classes of about fifty students and practical classes of about half, so this represents real possibilities of teaching more varied and enjoyable classes. This does not mean that we should avoid the traditional master class that contributes so much, in our opinion, to the first exposition of the specific topic to be developed. On the contrary, we believe that this type of lesson has great benefits for the clarity of the assimilation of concepts, styles and periods, which can be deepened later in the books. The teacher must also be able to dissert with rigor, seriousness, and always updating his knowledge, on the subject that he has in charge. The function of the master class is, therefore, indispensable to awaken the student's interest towards the contents that he must later find in the bibliographic sources at his disposal, and the teacher must, therefore, behave like a professional in continuous renovation, who demonstrates to his students his advanced position by means of the example to be followed. The teacher's function -besides the moral value that has just been assigned to him- is to filter and select the contents, to act as a theoretical channel between the works and their readers, to discern the ways and means for their study. But there are other kinds of classes, as important or even more important than the master class, which serve to complement it. Specific seminars on the texts, tutorials and presentations by the students of aspects prepared bibliographically, always guided by the first information from the teacher, are very useful in getting the students involved in the subject matter and also in achieving from them, in a progressive way, the intellectual maturation that is the indirect goal of *Universities* since its medieval origins. For this type of class we need a small group of students -approximately ten per seminar-, although we have already pointed out that the number we really have is twenty-five, but we should try to achieve even less if this were possible. In the seminar-type classes it is possible to use different methods and concrete texts illustrating the presentations and the bibliography given at the beginning of each topic. It does not seem logical to forget the stylistic, linguistic or structural approach, but there are other more novel approaches, as we have already pointed out - the comparative, intertextual, deconstructive, feminist, *culture studies...* - that should not be forgotten. All of them would not be useful without an attentive first *reading* of the text (*close to the close reading of the new critics*, but sifted by

the new critical theories that also make us observe the arbitrariness and the different registers, the significant absences in the "construct", the possible re-readings and the ironic or parodic use of the text) and its subsequent detailed analysis.

Another very valuable tool for these objectives is the elaboration of written works that must be the initiation of the student in scientific research, something that must be achieved progressively at the end of the philological career and that constitutes the ideal to be reached: the formation of the student body until he or she achieves intellectual independence. These serve, moreover, as a means of access to an increasingly structured and competitive Third Cycle, in the absence of specific methodological subjects, which exist in other countries, that teach writing and research to be correct. In relation to the above, it seems necessary to point out the difficulties of access to an updated bibliography that we have encountered with certain frequency in Uzbek universities. It is necessary, therefore, to provide the libraries with general and specific collections and to ask for aid -which the ministry, being aware of this, has been granting lately- to nourish them adequately. This is a very important task that must be achieved in order to compete with Asian universities on an equal footing. Thus, the area of English Literature and Culture of our Department, to which the subject matter belongs, has been concerned with updating the bibliographical material, which has been achieved mainly through the participation of researchers in projects of the Uzbek universities, which provide specific funding for very specific topics, as well as providing an annual budget item of the area specifically dedicated to the acquisition of more general bibliographies. Thus, we will structure the teaching by means of the following models: The *lesson* (or *lecture*), in which the teacher exposes a topic of the subject with hardly any participation of the student, who is limited to the attentive reception of the contents, except to raise doubts or questions about it. (Establishing a percentage of this type of lessons, we consider that they should occupy between 10% and 25% of the total of each thematic unit; that is to say, the first hour of each four/five of the teaching week). The *class* itself, where a greater dialogue is established between teacher and students, led by the former, but with the active participation of the students, towards the teacher or among themselves, and expressing their impressions on the subject. It can be made up of readings, of aspects of debate, of in-depth study of the characteristics discussed in the master class (following our scheme, this should occupy another 25% of the total indicated, that is, another hour - or an hour and a half - of the total of four/five indicated above). The *seminar*, in which the teacher goes to a second level more receptive and of supervision, while the students comment and deepen in primary texts, previously studied, and counting already with the theoretical support to establish the *close reading*, or the hermeneutic deciphering of the text. (It should occupy between 25% and 50% of the total of hours of which each topic consists). The *workshop*, used in an active and more spontaneous way when it is necessary, allows the students to present *papers* that they have elaborated individually or in groups, or to discuss about specific aspects, in the form of a final round table about the analyzed subject. (This system should not be used for all the subjects, if it is not necessary, but it is very useful in some of them that are more suitable for the detailed elaboration of the texts. It will be used for 10% of the total, especially on

particularly controversial topics, and will be a kind of final class, i.e. one hour of activity). All this practice points to an ideal: that students become confident in their mastery of the subject to the point where they feel they can continue their study independently, and even teach it (which can be verified in the workshop, or in the final round table). In addition, in order to bring the subject closer to the students in a more spontaneous and enjoyable way, the following elements can be mentioned, which can be used as teaching support methods: The reading of some texts or fragments can be replaced by recordings or videos recited by professionals in the field. This is very useful, especially in the case of theatre, if we use literal versions that can speed up the first reception of the works, as well as contextualising their content and bringing the student closer to the vitality or validity that they themselves possess. In recent times, especially due to the proliferation of technological material - computers, video cameras, digital recorders... - it is increasingly possible to record the student himself when he recites, reads, or dramatizes some fragment, or even when he exhibits his work in front of the class. All this, used with prudence and appropriately, can serve as a very valuable accessory, above all for the student himself, who sees himself and learns from his own mistakes, and with this he can try to avoid shyness complexes, or the sense of ridicule. Something much more traditional is the learning of certain theatrical passages, to be performed in class or during tutorial hours, which most of the time provokes the enthusiastic support of a great part of the students, who update the material that they found distant in the textbook. Also, in this sense, the active participation of the student in the search for material provided in the classroom should be encouraged. In this way, for example, it can be useful to turn to other arts such as music, cinema, painting, which evoke the same themes that appear in the primary texts. This can be clearly seen in the cinematographic recreation of Shakespeare's work, which is in constant growth, and whose *Romeo and Juliet* has been naively and experimentally revised by the Hollywood cinema, having the famous Leonardo di Caprio as the main actor, which can be a very clear way of "hooking" the student through the debate of parody and the chronological extrapolation in a much more serious literary theme. In the case of music, especially for medieval and 16th century literature, we should not miss the interaction of this with the lyric and dramaturgy of the time; the English madrigals are a good example of this. Painting and architecture can be used through slides and projections and are very useful also in periods as different as the medieval one, or the last parodic experiments of the British metafiction. With regard to the cinema, although this is a very different art from the literary one, comparative studies of works of literature and their more or less literal adaptations are in full swing -cf. all the production of James Ivory on the English nineteenth-century works, for example-, which can be interesting to stimulate the critical vision of the student. However, we must be aware that all these means must never become an end in themselves, and that they can be used mostly in some optional subjects (in the style of the *Monographs of English Literature*) focused on much more specific aspects, or in some doctoral course, rather than in the compulsory subjects, which are more impelled by the subject matter and massification. It follows from all the above that, when it comes to drawing up the criteria for assessing content, the emphasis should not be on the detailed encyclopaedic content of an exam - even though this still seems inevitable

due to the large number of students per class - or on the holding of specific final examinations. We believe that a continuous evaluation system that includes not only the final tests, which serve as a corollary to the programme, but also the comments, written exercises, work and presentations in class, as well as the personal performance observed by the teacher in the comments to texts, constitutes the complete evaluation -which must always be as objective as possible- and the final grade of the student. We summarize in a schematic way the main evaluation methods that have been proposed: The *final* exam (in February or June), whose purpose is for the student to demonstrate a global knowledge of the subject, that is, to be able to relate the different topics included in it, and to identify and analyze most of the texts on which it is based. It normally consists of essay and commentary questions, of a theoretical and practical nature. It lasts between two and three hours.

The *test*, carried out sporadically during the course of the four-month period. It consists of short concrete questions about details of the works, which show that they have been read with attention, as well as specific aspects of the theory. It is a shorter exam, since it lasts as long as the class schedule, that is, an hour or an hour and a half at most. The *commentary* of texts. This type of exam consists of a complete text or a somewhat extensive fragment about which the student has to investigate in depth and form. Normally the name of the author is omitted, as it seems more interesting to be able to reach it through the analysis of its time and its specific style. For this type of exercise, notes and reference material can be left, such as dictionaries or encyclopaedias of philological terms. Given its characteristics, it is an exam that requires a longer time extension, with an average of about three hours. The *home test*. In some cases, this type of exam is used for the student to go deeper through the essay form on controversial or difficult to decipher issues. In these cases, this exam is given to be taken at home in a determined space of time (24 or 48 hours, or a weekend), and its extension is delimited (as many or as few lines), so that there are not very big differences in its preparation among the students. The only thing left to do is to say a few words about the language used in the classes. It seems natural that this should be primarily English, since the primary works, most of the bibliography - it should not be forgotten that bilingualism allows the use of magnificent uzbek critical works - and the critical terminology (literary figures, diction...) are in that language. On the other hand, until recently the level of our students was not always adequate to allow complex expressions, such as those required by literary science, in English; however, as in a vicious circle, if this is not learned through continuous effort it is impossible to reach levels of communicative sufficiency. Therefore, we propose, and we have practiced this in the classes, the use of English as the basic language and the reduction of Uzbek to very specific seminars and remedial classes for students who have serious difficulties in language apprehension<sup>6</sup>. Use not only by the teacher, which is obvious, but also by the student, who must take an active part in the class and who must be properly motivated, avoiding the much-feared sense of ridicule.

## CONCLUSION

As far as bibliography is concerned, the first premise is that there are a great many general and specific critical works available; it is therefore necessary to have specific

bibliographies and to refer to them for specific studies. There is also an endless list of anthologies and dictionaries, literary histories and journals (which are very useful, especially for the literature of the 20th century that is in continuous production and for understanding the critical renewals that have taken place in recent years) and, at the same time, a series of specific works that help to understand the periods to be studied. On the other hand, at the end of each theme it is advisable to include a small specific bibliography that meets two basic criteria: the inclusion of more fundamental and important critical works for the preparation of the programme, which must logically be incomplete, and the location of recent works that are not yet in the published bibliographies and that will be useful for further analysis. It will be observed that there must be subjects with a more numerous bibliography than others; this is due, on the one hand, to the idiosyncrasy of each subject and, on the other, to the arbitrariness of critical production, which follows, as in many other aspects of contemporary life, the imperatives of fashion. Finally, it seems to us indispensable that students become familiar with the bibliographical sources to be handled from the first courses of the degree, and especially during the period of specialization and in the third cycle. This information should be offered, therefore, from the programs of each subject and when it arises during the teaching period. However, not only should all these specific works be made available, but also more general information should be given about large libraries and databases, as well as the main consultation systems, urging them to know more about how to handle the most useful library matters. To this end, lists of the main English bibliographies should be provided, as well as bibliographical guides, along the lines of *Waterstone's Guide to Books*, which is usually updated every year.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Carey-Webb, A. (2001). *Literature and Lives: A Response-Based, Cultural Studies Approach to Teaching English*. National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 W. Kenyon Road, Urbana, IL 61801-1096 (Stock No. 29641: \$21.95 members, \$28.95 nonmembers).
- [2] Gygi, K., & Spyridakis, J. (2007, May). Developing a cultural model to support web site localization: a case study of Uzbek school web sites. In *Annual Conference-Society for Technical Communication* (Vol. 54, p. 1).
- [3] Hasanova, D. (2007). Teaching and learning English in Uzbekistan. *English Today*, 23(1), 3-9.
- [4] Hasanova, D., & Shadieva, T. (2008). Implementing communicative language teaching in Uzbekistan. *TESOL quarterly*, 42(1), 138-143.
- [5] Hayati, A. M. (2008). Teaching English for special purposes in Iran: Problems and suggestions. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 7(2), 149-164.
- [6] Khatib, M. (2011). A new approach to teaching English poetry to EFL students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(1), 164.
- [7] Medlin, W. K., Cave, W. M., & Carpentier, F. (1971). *Education and Development in Central Asia: A Case Study on Social Change in Uzbekistan*; 38 Tab. Brill Archive.
- [8] Pandian, A. (2002). English language teaching in Malaysia today. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 22(2), 35-52.
- [9] Vyas, M. A., & PATEL, Y. L. (2009). *Teaching English as a second language: A new pedagogy for a new century*. PHI Learning Pvt. Ltd.