

Original scientific paper

LITERATURE STUDENTS' MANUAL FOR EAP WRITING: A SURVEY OF INTERPRETATIVE PRACTICES AND MOVEMENTS IN LITERARY CRITICISM

Milena Kaličanin, Marija Budimski

Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Philosophy Niš, Serbia

Abstract. *The practice of teaching Methodology of scientific research, the obligatory course for PhD literature students of Foreign Philology at the Faculty of Philosophy in Niš, has showed that one of the frequent shortcomings in the process of creating a well-equipped literary scholar represents the lack of adequate knowledge regarding the mere purpose of literary criticism, its interpretative practices, methods and movements. Thus, the most important task of a literary instructor is to offer basic scientific insights into the previously mentioned matter, establish firm initial grounds and prepare students for further acquisition of diverse literary specificities. Accordingly, the aim of this article is to offer a brief survey of methods and movements in literary criticism that may serve as a starting point in the critical analysis of a literary work. Before focusing on the survey itself, diverse definitions of literary criticism are presented in the first part of the article. In the next segment, four most common interpretative practices in literary criticism (close reading, contextual analysis, the application of a critical approach, and social critique) are discussed. The last part of the article depicts and shortly explains some major contemporary schools of critical analysis, most frequently used in literature courses at the university level. The theoretical framework of the study relies on the valuable insights mainly of Rapaport, and then Richards, Brooks, Warren, Selden, Widdowson and Brooker. We finally argue that the obtained theoretical knowledge of literary criticism particularities represents a solid ground for developing an analytic apparatus for EAP writing.*

Key words: *EAP writing, critical reading, critical thinking, literary criticism, literary theory, comprehension, interpretation, movement*

1. INTRODUCTION: FROM CRITICAL READING AND CRITICAL THINKING TO EAP WRITING

One of the major issues in teaching Methodology of literary scientific research is related to the placement of students' academic interests within a vast field of interpretative practices and movements in literary criticism. Namely, since this is the course usually taught at the university level (MA and PhD level, to be precise), it is logically presupposed that a great amount of research should be done by students themselves, excluding an educator's major involvement in the research process, apart from giving broad guiding instructions. However, the teaching practice proves that MA and PhD literature students

Submitted August 26th, 2023, accepted for publication October 10th, 2023

Corresponding author: Milena Kaličanin, Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Philosophy Niš, Serbia

E-mail: milena.kalicanin@filfak.ni.ac.rs

are generally not versed in the particularities of both interpretative practices and critical schools of thought they usually refer to in their essays and term papers. They automatically and without profound contemplation rely on the popular labels ascribed to the most common literary practices and movements, frequently unaware of their chronology and definitions, possible applications and academic contexts.

There are probably many plausible reasons that can explain this phenomenon, one of them definitely being that “over the past thirty years, the nature and amount of reading done by amateur as well as professional readers (including translators, interpreters, book reviewers, educators and students) has changed dramatically” (Javorčíkova & Badinská 2021, 655). Javorčíkova & Badinská validly claim that since the inception of the Internet in the 1990s, “the intensified focus on reading has placed new demands on the quality of reading and the level of reflection on the information gathered” (2021, 655). The phenomena of critical reading and critical thinking are of utmost importance both in one’s private and professional (academic) life. In order to develop efficient reading comprehension skills, both students and instructors need to be equipped with certain abilities that can enable them to “find quality sources of information and arrange them in a hierarchy, identify plagiarism and corroborate authors’ authority” (2021, 656). The profusion of literary texts thus requires a new set of skills to be developed on the part of both literature students and their instructors. The new set of skills should rely on the “direct correlation of effective reading and critical thinking” (Browne and Keeley 1981, 8). This correlation is particularly significant bearing in mind the fact that “higher education programs and universities worldwide include critical thinking and critical reading as one of the primary aims and course objectives” (Spirovska 2022, 439). However, although these skills seem to be included as main objectives in quite a few academic courses, their implementation in teaching practices is “far from straightforward (Spirovska 2022, 440).

Ideally, as Javorčíkova and Badinská assert, a critical reader and thinker is not a mere “consumer” of the text; rather, he or she is a “co-creator” of its connotative and denotative meaning(s), as well as ethical, cultural, social, political and many other implications. He or she is also a “decision-maker” and “authority”, determining its significance for the life of the reader and their community. (Javorčíkova & Badinská 2021, 658)

In accordance with the insights about a critical reader and thinker as an authority on the ethical, cultural, social, political and other issues in community, Perkins and Jiang (2020) suggest that literature (and literature teaching) have remained a valid source for gaining necessary critical reading and thinking skills. They propose a literature-based composition course for advanced Non-native English Speaking (NNES) students in an English for Academic Purpose (EAP) program. Their justification of such a significant course is based on the following points:

(1) extended writing about a text, or texts, should lead to reading comprehension improvement; (2) culturally responsive literature should enhance engagement; (3) reading literature, as writerly reading, will assist NNES students with developing strategies applied to reading-to-write tasks and to integrated writing skills; (4) reading for writing (RFW) will expose NNES students to a wide range of genres, syntactic constructions, discourse structures, and words and word families; (5) RFW should lead to the development of multiple-documents literacy; and (6) contemporary writing models incorporate reading as a component of the composing process, which emphasizes the inter-dependency of reading and writing. (Perkins & Jiang 2020, 48)

These points also represent the crux of teaching Methodology of literary scientific research, the obligatory course for PhD literature students of Foreign Philology at the Faculty of Philosophy in Niš. The prerequisites these students have to fulfil before writing their doctoral theses refer not only to voracious, but also engaged reading of literature resulting in the development and gradual enhancement of their reading comprehension. Engaged, critical reading of suggested literary texts further involves an improvement of writing strategies which is relevant for taking PhD exams, usually given in the form of term papers, eventually to be published in scientific literary journals. Ultimately, critical reading is of utmost importance for literature students in the complex process of writing their PhD theses. Thus, the interdependency of reading and writing that Perkins and Jiang (2020) emphasize, is directly obtained through the individual research of each PhD literature student, resulting in writing a term paper which would eventually serve as a basis of the doctoral thesis: after a thorough process of critical reading and critical thinking and according to personal literary preferences regarding concrete authors, specific genres and diverse literary approaches.

However, one of the frequent shortcomings in the process of creating a well-equipped literary scholar concerns, as already suggested, the lack of adequate knowledge regarding the mere purpose of literary criticism, its interpretative practices, methods and movements. Therefore, the most significant task of a literary instructor is to offer basic scientific insights into the previously mentioned matter, establish firm initial grounds and prepare students for further acquisition of diverse literary specificities. In order to familiarize literature students with basic interpretative practices and movements in literary criticism, this article offers a broad survey of most common methods and critical schools of thought used in literature analysis. It provides both literature students and their instructors with some general notions about literary criticism that may, hopefully, serve as a starting point in teaching, as well as the acquisition of initial literature interpretative practices. Herman Rapaport's study (2011) represents one of the major sources for literary courses of EAP programs, most particularly the course in Methodology of literary scientific research at the Faculty of Philosophy in Niš. Hence the largest part of the article relies on it. Though being completely aware of other, outstanding studies in this field (for example Terry Eagleton's *Literary Theory: An Introduction* (1983), *After Theory* (2003), *How to Read Literature* (2013), or Umberto Eco's *Interpretation and Overinterpretation* (1992), to name just a few), Rapaport's study has proved quite efficient in the teaching practice so far probably due to its concise explanations, clear language style and gradual introduction of literary terminology. In a nutshell, Rapaport's study that this article is largely based on represents a basic introduction to the vast field of literary criticism, offering initial critical insights that would, hopefully, enable and inspire literature students to conduct further academic research without a thorough instructor's assistance and eventually produce competent literary academics.

2. SOME DEFINITIONS OF LITERARY CRITICISM

Literary criticism, as perceived by Ivor Armstrong Richards (1950), is a reader's endeavour to discriminate between experiences and evaluate them, both in terms of their real-life experience and the experiences depicted in the literary work (2). In order to accomplish this discrimination and evaluation, a reader must, to a degree, understand "the nature of experience, . . . or theories of valuation and communication" (Richards 1950, 2). As all other principles of criticism may be said to be arbitrary, which principles are applied

to literary criticism must be drawn from the aforementioned understanding of the nature of experience and the theories of valuation and communication (Richards 1950, 2). As a matter of fact, as Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren (1979) suggest, branches of speculation and study such as history, physics, theology, psychology and literature function not at the level of the abstract, as is the case with typical textbooks written in these fields, but at the level of “images of life in the process of being lived as in fiction or drama” (1). These authors regard the process of reading in much the same way as Richards does – according to them, fiction broadens an individual’s experience and increases an individual’s knowledge of the possibilities of the self. Thus, as fiction is “an imaginative enactment of life” (Brooks & Warren 1979, 1) and, therefore, an extension of our own lives (Brooks & Warren 1979, 1), literary criticism may indeed be understood as a process which relies on the understanding of the nature of experience (Richards 1950, 2).

More specifically, and in a perhaps the more traditional understanding of the term, literary criticism is the study of literary texts by “readers with special competencies in the study of writings by major authors” (Rapaport 2011, ix), wherein the special competencies required of the reader, or critic, are, among others, the detailed knowledge of a given author’s life and times, excellent competence in the language of the author and their writing, and knowledge of disciplines which may be relevant to the author’s work, only some of which are psychology, religion and philosophy (Rapaport 2011, ix). Moreover, the literary critic is typically not bound to a single author, but is a reader with expertise in reading a wider range of authors who had lived and written in different periods of history and is, consequently, acquainted with literary conventions, allusions and genres, or standard practices, cultural references and literary types, respectively. In addition, literary critics are similarly well-acquainted with a range of literary devices which may be characterised as significant for the patterning, or structuring, of literary works in general. Above all, as Herman Rapaport (2011) notes, literary critics are “intuitive readers who perceive semantic and syntactic implications that escape notice by most others and use these implications to develop suggestive and coherent interpretations” (ix).

The aforementioned forms of expertise required of literary critics, of themselves constitute more a collection of practices useful for literary analysis than they do a complete, coherent theory. What is meant by *literary theory* is “a critical analytic that is aware of itself as a *methodology* and that is capable of self-reflexively calling its own assumptions into question” (Rapaport 2011, ix). Theory, then, is rooted in the methodological study of interpretation. Accordingly, the Theory of Interpretation may pose questions such as:

how we can know the difference between a true and a false interpretation, a reading that is good from one that is bad. How do we know we are construing meanings accurately? What are the limits of inferring meanings or developing textual implications? How do we know that a sentence is to be taken ironically and not straightforwardly? What if our interpretation is not authorized by the writer who has maintained a very different interpretation? And what if our interpretation uses analytical tools not known to the authors or their contemporaries? (Rapaport 2011, ix-x)

Indeed, Richards agrees that art criticism, and by extension literary criticism, might pose such fundamental questions as: “What gives the experience of reading a certain poem its value? How is this experience better than another? Why prefer this picture to that? In which ways should we listen to music so as to receive the most valuable moments? Why is one opinion about works of art not as good as another?” (1950, 5-6). In order for literary

scholars to even start contemplating on these questions, they have to be thoroughly aware of most common interpretative practices in literary criticism.

2. INTERPRETATIVE PRACTICES IN LITERARY CRITICISM

Before enumerating interpretative practices in literary criticism, it is necessary to distinguish between *comprehension* and *interpretation*. Comprehension refers to a precise and literally accurate conceptual construction of information gathered from a specific text which, in essence, exceeds mere competence in that it leads a critic to notice those details in a text that others ordinarily would not. Namely, so as to be able to discuss a given literary work, a critic should know what actions take place and in what order, how individuals within the text are described and characterised, how settings, or places, are depicted and which details are included in or excluded from that depiction, and what figurative details and narrative devices were included in the text. Additionally, the comprehension of a text relies on the ability to identify major themes within the text, points of view, and key allusions, or “references to historical occurrences, myths, or passages in other influential texts, for example, the Bible” (Rapaport 2011, 2). In essence, comprehension encompasses the gathering and assembling of any and all textual information which can be used as evidence to support or justify specific interpretations (Rapaport 2011, 2).

On the other hand, interpretation, a skill typically emphasised in university level literary courses, goes beyond comprehension in that it requires the ability to identify problems, conceptualise them, examine textual evidence, and offer hypotheses and solutions. Literary interpretation, essentially, occurs when critics pose questions about what they have observed in the text. A critic’s insight and originality are directly tied to the manner in which they pose questions in relation to the texts they are analysing. What distinguishes a seminal work from a common study, Rapaport points out, is “the originality of the way in which a problematic is conceptualized and the surprising results to which it leads” (2011, 3). In other words, a seminal work will not merely adhere to the imitation of institutionally sanctioned practices (Rapaport 2011, 2-3).

As regards interpretative practices, four types of critical practice are commonly employed either separately or combined: *close reading*, *contextual analysis*, *the application of a critical approach*, and *social critique*. *Close reading* is a practice which implies paying close attention to even the most minute details and elements of a text, such as characterisation, setting, point of view, diction, figuration, tone, rhythm, rhetorical style, plot and allusion, in order to develop and support explanations on why certain elements in the text are presented as they are. Typically, *close reading* is related to the dichotomy of what textual elements indicate in the literal sense, and what can be inferred from them (Rapaport 2011, 4-5). *Contextual analysis* is a practice which presupposes that a text cannot have meaning in isolation, and thus attempts to establish a context within which a literary work may be situated so as to determine its meaning. Essentially, *contextual analysis* aims to draw parallels, or direct connections, between elements within the work and elements within the provided context. This practice, or approach, is most often used by literary historians, who tend to establish four main contexts for the analysis of literary works: (1) the philological history of the language in which the author wrote the text; (2) the literary tradition informing the work and to which the text can be said to belong; (3) the biography of the author; and (4) the social, political and cultural contexts of the time in which the text was written,

which likely influenced the elements present in the text.¹ However, though the approach is illuminating, it is limited in a number of ways, only some of which are the facts that:

- (i) A contextual approach presupposes the meaning of a work lies outside the work per se, which suggests a certain extrinsic determinism at work, (ii) it presupposes that the meanings are fixed or frozen in a period of historical time, which suggests our experience of how a work speaks to us is subordinated to or cancelled out by its artefactual significance, (iii) it is based on the construction of contexts that may be highly selective and conveniently managed to yield the results for which the researcher is looking, and (iv) contextual analysis reduces works of literature to ordinary norms that were widely held in society; (Rapaport 2011, 6)

Application of a critical approach, although “blatantly allegorical” (Rapaport 2011, 7) in its crudest form, is a more systematic and advantageous approach in that the critic, or researcher, applies a coherent body of analytical thought, or a valid theory tested by others, to a text in order to explain its meaning without resorting to making extemporaneous or improvised determinations about the text. An application of any critical theory requires the critic to find “considerable symmetry between the literary work and the theory” (Rapaport 2011, 8), because the theory applied is meant to illuminate the literary work in a manner that explains those elements within a text which would otherwise seem disconnected or arbitrary. Those who are critical of applied theories in general point out that to read cultural works or events in this manner means reducing those works or events to neat and reductive, or simplistic, models, and therein lies the perceived disadvantage of this practice – approaches may seem conceptually predictable in relation to their itineraries and the results, or insights, they yield may be inferred without consulting a critic’s analysis. Ultimately, an application should work to illuminate the literary work, and the literary work should work to illuminate the theory applied (Rapaport 2011, 7-9).

Social critique, or *social criticism*, is a politically motivated practice emphasising questions of inequality, victimhood and relations of power. Often, critics who engage in *social criticism* generally do so in order to model a sociological theory or to respond to current affairs in the world. As Rapaport indicates on the example of the recent interest in self-fashioning, empire and ‘Otherness’ within Renaissance scholarship, social criticism is largely a reflection of contemporary interests in specific issues rather than a reflection of issues inherently important to the period in which a literary work was written. In other words, “interests of the present drive interests in the past” (Rapaport 2011, 10). One of the goals of engaging in *social criticism*, in line with the notion that political protest and advocacy are among the main motives for writing literature, is the development of the consciousness raising elements within a literary work because a literary work, being concrete and particular, tends to observe social relations better than an abstract and conceptual sociological theory, and thus offers clearer insight into one’s social surroundings. However, one of the objections to *social criticism* is the practice’s tendency to reduce a text to content analysis, or a discussion of the storyline in terms of who, when, what, why and where, which essentially marks the content of the text equal to the social content of

¹ Rapaport notes that these are contexts relevant for the interpretation of texts for several reasons: (1) given that language is fluid and changes over time, a single word or phrase may not mean the same at the time of interpretation as it did at the time the text was written; (2) the literary tradition to which a text can be said to belong is characterised by specific norms and forms, or standard practices, which authors adopt and modify to suit their needs; (3) the experiences of the author quite often feature as episodes within a text; and (4) quite often, elements of the vast social, political and cultural contexts of the time in which the text was written are woven throughout the text in the form of, for example, themes (Rapaport 2011, 5-6).

everyday life and in so doing erases the difference between the depiction of real life offered by the text and real life itself (Rapaport 2011, 10-11).

3. MOVEMENTS IN LITERARY CRITICISM

When a certain method or group of methods is adopted by a number of major figures, or critics, what emerges is a movement, or a critical school. Some major twentieth-century schools of critical analysis include: Historicism and Cultural Materialism, New Criticism, Marxism, Structuralism, Phenomenology, Reader Response Criticism, Post-Structuralism and Psychoanalytic Criticism, and several sociologically informed forms of criticism such as Feminism, Constructivism, Cultural Studies, Global Studies, Post-colonialism, and Ethnicity, Race, Gay and Lesbian Studies (Rapaport 2011, 34; Selden et al. 2005, 180-196).

Traditional Historicism claims that the meaning of a text is established by the immediate historical context within which it was written. As such, the historical context is seen as a rational totality which informs the text through revealing meanings “in terms of publicly held understandings that can be found in the historical record” (Rapaport 2011, 34). Conversely, *New Historicism*, in all its inflections, and its British counterpart, *Cultural Materialism* view history as a discontinuous site of conflicting social, political and cultural processes expressed through material practices, of which works of literature are but one example. Thus, a literary work is not at the centre of a totalising rational context but is rather one context among many other contexts, none of which are, of themselves, rationally configured as wholes or totalising. In essence, literary and non-literary texts are, in equal measure, material practices of power and resistance (Rapaport 2011, 34-36; Selden et al. 2005, 180-196). In that vein, both *New Historicism* and *Cultural Materialism* draw heavily on Michel Foucault's understanding of discursive formations as a product of social institutions which play a pivotal role in the maintenance and replication of relations of power. Later, or rather newer, inflections of *New Historicism* focus the analysis of a text on uncovering the contemporary meanings inscribed on the text by the very matrix in which the work was shaped (Selden et al. 2005, 183-184). These contemporary meanings are essentially “ideological ‘trouble-spots’ beyond the cognition of the writer” (Levinson, as cited in Selden et al. 184). Additionally influenced by Louis Althusser, Mikhail Bakhtin and different inflections of *Marxism* and *Feminism*, *Cultural Materialism*, on the other hand, represents a more politicised variety of historicism and aims to explore the more marginalised and subversive elements of texts by asserting the notion that “every history of subjection also contains a history of resistance, and that resistance is not just a symptom of and justification for subjection but is a true mark of an ineradicable ‘difference’ . . . which always prevents power from closing the door on change” (Selden et al. 2005, 184).

New Criticism regards the internal workings of a literary text as a context of its own, which in turn means that the text itself generates its meaning without help from external content based on commonplace experiences of language use. On the contrary, a literary text breaks away from ordinary, everyday language use by means of devices such as irony, paradox, ambiguity, symbolism, metaphor and symbolism. As such, New Criticism advances close reading, uses primarily textual evidence in analyses, and emphasises the study of structure and pattern, the complexity of meaning and the importance of textual rather than contextual analysis (Rapaport 2011, 36-37).

Marxism, broadly speaking, is a critique of bourgeois society and the capitalist economy upon which that society is based. This school of critical analysis has developed several forms, some of which are Diamat, or dialectical materialism, the study of class relations and class consciousness, cultural Marxism, existential Marxism, and structuralist Marxism (Rapaport 2011, 37-38).

Structuralism is informed by the work of Ferdinand de Saussure and argues that, in relation to systems of signification, the whole comes before its parts. In essence, systems are constructed through simple binary oppositions which establish patterns of identity and difference that, in turn, “encode signs and make them functional as meaningful elements within a system of differentiations and equivalences” (Rapaport 2011, 38-39). The focal point of structuralism is the rejection of the assumption that literature is a semiotic representation of an independent mental reality. As such, a literary work does not exist transcendently in the world or in the author’s imagination. Rather, the reality effect of a text is produced, not reproduced, by the sign system (Rapaport 2011, 38-39).

Phenomenology, or phenomenological literary analysis, is concerned with the subjective manifestation of a given author’s consciousness in words, or text. The process of reading is, thus, likewise a subjective act which must strive to regard the psychic life of the author, or the author’s consciousness, as a process of thought constantly in flux. Rather than a method, phenomenological literary analysis is an orientation which searches for ‘themes’ characteristic of a specific author’s consciousness (Rapaport 2011, 39-41).

Reader Response Criticism assumes that what is regarded on the page does not constitute the existence of a literary work, because literary works truly exist only in the consciousness of the reader. The process of reading is subjective because readers transfer onto a text, and thus onto the process of reading itself, their own particular psychological issues, which in turn leads to the conclusion that a ‘proper’ reading of any text is impossible (Rapaport 2011, 44-45).

Post-Structuralism, as a response to Structuralism, is associated not with a single philosophy or doctrine, but a number of theories which attempted to break away from deeply held assumptions of the past, such as bounded systematicity, the law of non-contradiction and a traditional logic of the particular in relation to the universal, so as to unmask those assumptions as being “false and fraudulent” (Rapaport 2011, 45-46).

Psychoanalytic Criticism refers to the application of various theories developed by, primarily, Freud, Jung and, later, Lacan to literature and, more broadly, culture. Freud’s major contribution may be seen in the features of dream language that correspond to the practices of imaginative written expression. Among the most notable of these features are displacement, condensation, secondary revision, symbolisation and projection. Literary criticism informed by Jung and his theory of symbolisation, different from Freud’s, largely relies on the notions of the archetype and the collective unconscious. Finally, Lacanian criticism relies on two distinct hallmarks of Lacan’s work: (1) the concept of the ‘mirror stage’, or self-perception as misrecognition or paranoid perception, and (2) the concept of retroaction, or the notion that the subject comes to be a subject retroactively, in the wake of the signification of a particular Other (Rapaport 2011, 41-43).

The many sub-fields of Sociological Criticism “presuppose left-of-center political views, advocate for liberalization of society, dwell on identitarian issues, and celebrate difference (diversity)” (Rapaport 2011, 46). The main goal of these sub-fields, such as Feminism, Constructivism, Cultural Studies, Global Studies, Post-colonialism, and Ethnicity, Race, Gay and Lesbian Studies, is to address social injustices stemming from social inequality.

Accordingly, *Feminism* is mainly concerned with the resolution of the question of whether 'difference' is an essentialist distinction, the transformation of curricula to include more female intellectuals into various canons of study, the eventual acceptance of the notion that social identities are constructed subject positions, and the critique of patriarchy (Rapaport 2011, 46).

Constructivism, informed mainly by Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann's *The Social Construction of Reality* and Michel Foucault's *The History of Sexuality*, relies, respectively, on the notion that our perceptions of social reality are relative to how reality is constructed by external parties motivated by self-interest, among which are religions, disciplinary bureaucratic agencies within society, the culture industry and class consciousness, and the notion that institutionalised disciplinary regimes are implicated in the production of knowledge which is directly exercised to discipline social order on both a collective and individual level (Rapaport 2011, 48-54).

Race Studies, *Gay and Lesbian Studies*, and *Ethnic Studies* rely on the critical insights of Foucault in that they presuppose notions of social constructedness - they reject the presupposition that race, sexuality and ethnicity are essentialist, transcendental categories and assert that they are, in fact, constructed through bureaucratized discourse practices. Questions of personal freedom are of great importance to these areas of study, especially as concerns the extent to which a social subject is free to determine their own identity and the identification of cultural, political and social constraints and latitudes (Rapaport 2011, 54-57).

Cultural Studies refers to multiple different approaches and areas of study, among which are: (1) a specific cultural, historical formation; (2) the criticism of culture as an industry which enables the industrialisation and massification of populations; (3) the study of culture as a system of signification; (4) psychoanalytical criticism of society and culture; (5) analysis of the postmodern condition; (6) Marxist criticism of the media; (7) the study of sub-cultures; and (8) "the writing of factual social and cultural histories that rectify misconceptions or incorrect assumptions about a subject" (Rapaport 2011, 58).

Global Studies, to a great degree, converges with Cultural Studies and its approaches because globalisation refers to cultural, political and economic changes of such an extent and degree that it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the globe has become a unified space joined through satellite communication, efficient means of transportation and an industrial complex which traverses the boundaries of nations and influences the economic conditions of both economically advantaged and disadvantaged countries. Thus, Global Studies are concerned with the economic, cultural and political effects of globalisation, especially as concerns the extent of the transformation of capitalism, or lack thereof, and its effects, the notion of transculturation and the effectiveness of public spheres (Rapaport 2011, 58-61). In short, mobility and its expression as power are of central concern to Global Studies (Rapaport 2011, 61).

Finally, on account of the fact that, as an effect of globalisation, "colonial populations are being dictated to or having their circumstances determined by historical actors who exist outside their national boundaries and whose interests are largely exploitative" (Rapaport 2011, 61), *Post-Colonial Studies* are concerned with inter-cultural relations and the various modes of their expression, the chief of which is the expression of domination and subjection. To a great extent, the examination of inter-cultural relations and their expressions central to Post-Colonial Studies is informed by the critical work of Michel Foucault and the notion of the nexus of power/knowledge (Rapaport 2011, 61-64).

4. EAP WRITING SKILLS AND FOREKNOWLEDGE OF LITERARY CRITICISM PARTICULARITIES: A BRIEF DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

The aforementioned survey of literary criticism peculiarities should represent a solid ground for the further critical reading and critical thinking exploration in this field, but should also be helpful in the process of making first steps in the delicate process of writing academic essays. As Uzun (2016) claims “writing is a productive language skill which is a crucial need for students of higher education institutions since a great deal of their academic achievement is tested through this particular skill” (26). This is the reason why writing, not only as a language, but also academic skill, is more “demanding” (Uzun 2016, 26) than other skills since it logically represents the only way for students to express their opinions, attitudes and knowledge about the proposed reading and teaching material. It is also important to emphasize here that the teaching of writing, oriented towards the process and not to the product of writing allows students “to discover and employ strategies for successful writing” (Uzun 2016, 26) on their own.² In case of PhD literature students mentioned so far, combined with the presented insights from the immense field of literary criticism, the process oriented teaching of writing should lead to the generation of free-thinking, independent literary scholars.

One of the possible issues that may arise here is that the Methodology of scientific research course partly covers, or at least wavers between the categories of the courses focused solely on content and writing, respectively. The expectations from students are different in these two types of academic courses (Leki and Carson 1997). Whereas the students in content-oriented courses should be focused on the retelling of the course’s main data, the students in writing courses should be more inclined towards the diverse ways to formulate and express their personal views and, accordingly, should be equipped with the adequate writing skills. Thaiss and Zawacki (2006) rightly assert that in the previously mentioned types of courses “professors expect to see evidences of tenacity, openness and preparation along with reasonability and rationality in pieces of academic writing” (quoted in Uzun 2016, 26). This claim is of utmost importance for literature students. They find themselves on a complex path of combining initial reading views with private critical stances, deepening their academic attitudes by placing individual views in the vast pool of critical methods, interpretations and movements and then sharpening their critical apparatuses through the process of writing reviews, essays, term papers, doctoral theses, etc. A rather helpful tip for academic writing is to be obtained through the literary essays students find in their suggested reading lists. Namely, simultaneously with reading, and apart from grasping complex veins of thought and diverse ideas of a myriad of critical schools, students unconsciously acquire certain word and phrase patterns in particular, and essay organization patterns in general, that may further help them with articulating their own ideas. Thus is the quest of critical reading, critical thinking and EAP writing, alongside with given literary criticism output obtained, finally successfully accomplished.

² Uzun (2016, 26) makes a valid distinction between the product and process oriented teaching of writing. Product oriented teaching of writing focuses on the product, as its name suggests, usually having only the instructor as the reading audience. Process oriented teaching of writing, on the other hand, is focused on the way the text is formed and formulated by the student him/herself, and thus should represent a desirable outcome of PhD literature courses.

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

This article offers a brief survey of methods and movements in literary criticism that may serve as a starting point in the critical analysis of a literary work. Diverse definitions of literary criticism are depicted before the discussion of the four most common interpretative practices in literary criticism (close reading, contextual analysis, the application of a critical approach, and social critique). By relying on the theoretical insights of mostly Rapaport, and then also Richards, Brooks, Warren, Selden, Widdowson and Brooker, major contemporary schools of critical analysis, most frequently used in literature classes at the university level, are briefly mentioned in the final segment of the research. Hopefully, the presented insights and ideas will prove valuable both to literature students making their first steps in the literary academia and their teaching instructors devising a useful starting point in the organization and implementation of various literary courses, particularly at the MA and PhD university levels.

REFERENCES

- Brooks, Cleanth & Warren, Robert Penn. 1979. *Understanding Fiction*. 3rd edition, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Browne, Neill M., and Stuart M. Keeley. 1981. *Asking the Right Questions – A Guide to Critical Thinking*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Eagleton, Terry. 1983. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. The University of Minnesota Press.
- Eagleton, Terry. 2003. *After Theory*. London: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Eagleton, Terry. 2013. *How to Read Literature*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Eco, Umberto. 1992. *Interpretation and Overinterpretation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Javorčíková, Jana, & Badinská, Maria. 2021. "Reading and Critical Thinking Skills of Undergraduate Students: A Quantitative Analysis." In *The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*. Vol. 9, No 4, Special Issue, 2021. 655–666. <https://doi.org/10.22190/JTESAP2104655J>.
- Leki, Ilona, & Carson, Joan. 1997. "Completely Different Worlds: EAP and the Writing Experiences of ESL Students in University Courses." *TESOL Quarterly*, 39-69.
- Perkins, Kyle, & Jiang, Xuan. 2020. "A proposed literature-based syllabus for EAP writing." In *Journal of Global Education and Research*, 4(1), 48-61. <https://www.doi.org/10.5038/2577-509X.4.1.1103>.
- Rapaport, Herman. 2011. "Preface." In *The Literary Theory Toolkit: A Compendium of Concepts and Methods*. ix-xii. New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Rapaport, Herman. 2011. "Introductory Tools for Literary Analysis." In *The Literary Theory Toolkit: A Compendium of Concepts and Methods*. 1-64. New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Richards, Ivor Armstrong. 1950. *Principles of Literary Criticism*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.
- Selden, Raman, Widdowson, Peter, and Brooker, Peter. 2005. "Poststructuralist Theories: New Historicism and Cultural Materialism." In *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*. 5th edition, 180-196. London: Pearson Longman.

- Spirovska, Elena. 2022. "Fostering Critical Reading and Critical Thinking Skills Through Teaching Practices in the Context of Advanced (EAP) English Courses". In *The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*. Vol. 10, No 3, 2022. 439-449. <https://doi.org/10.22190/JTESAP2203439S>.
- Thaiss, Christopher, J., Zawacki, Therese, M. 2006. *Engaged Writers Dynamic Disciplines*. Portsmouth: Boyton/ Cook.
- Uzun, Kutay. 2016. "Developing EAP Writing Skills Through Genre-Based Instruction: An Action Research." *The International Journal of Educational Researchers* 2016, 7(2): 25-38 ISSN: 1308-9501 <http://ijer.eab.org.tr>