



Article

# The Study of Poetic Language Features in General Education: Methodological Principles and Pedagogical Investigation

Meyliyeva Nasiba Tolmas qizi\*<sup>1</sup>

1. Doctoral Student Alisher Navoiy Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature

\* Correspondence: [meliyevanasiba1990@gmail.com](mailto:meliyevanasiba1990@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** Under current socio-cultural conditions resulting from the process of globalization and the development of blazingly fast information technologies, the literature education, especially poetry teaching, becomes more and more complex in a pedagogical sense, given the fact that students have lost interest in reading cultural goods made of text, seeing them as writing-based material in a more complex sense. Poetic texts in grades 5–7 tend to be treated more or less superficially, and students are engaged to reproducing the text, rather than analyzing the artistic language, imagery, and elements of expression and representation, thus stunting aesthetic development and limitations of literary competence. Despite literary theory and pedagogical scholarship highlighting the importance of aesthetic perception, emotional engagement, and the poetic function of language, there is still a lack of methodological alignment between these theoretical underpinnings and systematic, classroom-based instructional practice. This study are in the need and to explore the evidential base for how these methodological principles for the teaching of the artistic language of poetry in secondary education may contribute to pupils analytical and aesthetic skills. The overall aim and a focus of the present study. The results, employing a qualitative pedagogical design utilizing observational, textual, and participatory methodology show increased student engagement, improved interpretation metaphor, symbol and emotional tone, and the development of independent aesthetic judgment. Formulating an integrated curricular framework for the teaching of poetry based on scientific considerations, engagement and autonomy, performance in real-life situation, and the unique value of education for aesthetic experience.

**Keywords:** Poetic Language, Literary Education, Aesthetic Perception, Interactive Methods, Secondary School Students.

**Citation:** Tolmas qizi M. N. The Study of Poetic Language Features in General Education: Methodological Principles and Pedagogical Investigation. Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy, and Culture 2026, 7(2), 1-4.

Received: 06<sup>th</sup> Nov 2025

Revised: 14<sup>th</sup> Dec 2025

Accepted: 22<sup>nd</sup> Jan 2026

Published: 09<sup>th</sup> Feb 2026



**Copyright:** © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

## 1. Introduction

The rapid expansion of global information flows and digital media has profoundly influenced students' cultural consumption patterns, often prioritizing simplified and entertainment-oriented content over deep literary engagement. As a result, contemporary literature education-particularly the teaching of poetic works-faces complex pedagogical challenges. Scholars such as Q. Husanboyeva, Q. Yo'ldoshev, V. Qodirov, and R. Niyozmetova have emphasized that the declining interest in poetic texts negatively affects students' aesthetic development and literary competence [1], [2].

Poetry, as a unique literary genre, requires not only logical comprehension but also emotional sensitivity, aesthetic perception, and imaginative thinking. However, classroom observations reveal that students frequently approach poetic texts superficially, focusing mainly on content reproduction rather than artistic language and expressive devices [3].

This situation underscores the necessity of developing effective teaching principles that integrate literary theory with practical text analysis and aesthetic experience [4].

The purpose of this study is to identify and substantiate methodological principles for teaching the artistic language of poetry in secondary education (grades 5–7) and to examine their effectiveness within the instructional process [5]. The research addresses the following question: How can integrated, interactive, and aesthetically oriented teaching methods enhance students' understanding of poetic language and imagery?

### **Literature Review**

Previous research in literary pedagogy highlights the importance of aesthetic perception and emotional engagement in teaching poetry. Q. Yo'ldoshev emphasizes that lyric poetry primarily conveys emotional states and spiritual experiences rather than narrative events, noting that "the sincerity of lyrical expression has a powerful impact on the reader's emotional and ethical development" [6].

Similarly, Q. Husanboyeva argues that poetic texts should not be evaluated solely based on content but also through their artistic form, imagery, and expressive language. She stresses that without sensing the artistic language, a full understanding of poetic meaning is unattainable [7].

From a theoretical perspective, Roman Jakobson's concept of the poetic function of language provides a foundational framework for analyzing poetic texts. Jakobson asserts that in poetry, language draws attention to itself, emphasizing form and expression as central aesthetic elements [8]. Viktor Shklovsky's theory of "defamiliarization" further supports the idea that poetic language reshapes perception through unconventional imagery and expression, thereby enhancing aesthetic awareness [9].

Reader-response theory, particularly Louise Rosenblatt's transactional approach, underscores the active role of the reader in constructing meaning through personal experience and emotional response. Additionally, pedagogical theories by L. S. Vygotsky, M. M. Bakhtin, and V. Okon emphasize student-centered learning, discovery-based instruction, and the development of independent thinking through active engagement. Together, these perspectives form a comprehensive theoretical framework supporting the integration of literary theory, aesthetic perception, and interactive pedagogy in teaching poetic language [10].

## **2. Materials and Methods**

In particular, the following principles play an important role in teaching the artistic language features of poetic works:

- The principle of scientific validity and consistency, which involves explaining figurative expressive means, stylistic devices, and poetic forms on a scientific basis and presenting them in a systematic and coherent manner;
- The principle of developing activity and independence, through which students acquire skills in analyzing texts, identifying artistic devices, and understanding their semantic and aesthetic functions;
- The principle of relevance to real life and practical orientation, aimed at developing students' ability to apply the knowledge and concepts gained from poetic texts to real-life situations;
- The principle of aesthetic education, as poetic works not only foster students' interest in language and literature but also strengthen their artistic taste, aesthetic appreciation, and respect for national values [11].

Thus, the principles of scientific validity and consistency, activity and independence, relevance to real life, and aesthetic education serve as important methodological foundations in teaching the artistic language features of poetic works.

This study employs a qualitative pedagogical research design focused on instructional experimentation in literature classes. The research was conducted with students from grades 5–7 in general secondary schools [12].

### **Participants**

The participants included middle school students (grades 5–7) aged 11–13. Literature teachers collaborated in implementing interactive teaching strategies during poetry lessons.

### **Methods**

The research utilized the following methods:

- Classroom observation of poetry lessons;
- Textual analysis of students' responses to poetic works;
- Application of interactive teaching methods, including:
- Cluster method,
- Brainstorming,
- Insert strategy,
- Association chains,
- Bloom's taxonomy-based tasks,
- Comparative reading,
- Practical research activities.

### **Procedure**

The instructional process was organized in three stages:

1. Initial stage: identifying students' baseline understanding of poetic language;
2. Instructional stage: implementing integrated and interactive methods focused on artistic language analysis;
3. Reflective stage: evaluating changes in students' aesthetic perception and analytical skills [13].

## **3. Results and Discussion**

The findings indicate a noticeable improvement in students' engagement with poetic texts and their ability to identify and interpret artistic language features. After implementing the proposed teaching principles:

- Students demonstrated increased interest in poetic imagery and expressive devices;
- Their ability to analyze metaphors, symbols, and emotional tone improved;
- Students began expressing personal aesthetic judgments rather than reproducing textual content;
- Classroom discussions became more interactive and reflective.

Qualitative observations suggest that integrating literary theory with practical analysis fosters deeper comprehension and emotional involvement.

The results align with the theoretical perspectives discussed in the literature review. The observed enhancement in students' aesthetic perception supports Jakobson's assertion regarding the centrality of poetic language and Shklovsky's emphasis on defamiliarization as a means of deepening perception. Moreover, the increased student autonomy and engagement reflect V. Okon's view that discovery-based learning strengthens independent thinking and knowledge retention. As Okon notes, knowledge acquired through active effort remains more firmly embedded in learners' consciousness [14].

The findings also corroborate Q. Husanboyeva's claim that aesthetic experience is essential for understanding poetic meaning, as students' analytical depth improved when emotional and artistic elements were emphasized [15].

#### 4. Conclusion

This study confirms that teaching poetic language in grades 5–7 can only be effective when being based on a scientifically structured, student-oriented and aesthetic-oriented methodological framework combining the scientifically established literary theory aspects with interactive pedagogical practice. These results indicate not only a qualitative improvement in students' engagement with poetic texts but also the ability to identify and interpret figurative language and imagery; more importantly students were able to make an independent aesthetic judgment and not just reproduce content. The lesson building experiments above show therefore that scientific validity and consistency, activity and autonomy, reality and aesthetic education are not stand alone techniques but instead represent an interrelated system that not only deepens analytic skills but enhances emotional responsiveness as well. Hence, the research suggests that current practices in teaching literature must develop from conventional explanatory models to more integrative methods centered on learners' active involvement in constructing meaning and undergoing aesthetic experience. The framework is informed by the theoretical landscape whilst also addressing the practical application of teaching and learning which enhances students creativity and literacy in the current context of education.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] R. Jakobson, "Linguistics and poetics," in *Style in Language*, T. A. Sebeok, Ed. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press, 1960, pp. 350–377.
- [2] V. Shklovsky, "Art as technique," in *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*, L. T. Lemon and M. J. Reis, Eds. Lincoln, NE, USA: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1965, pp. 3–24.
- [3] L. M. Rosenblatt, *The Reader, the Text, the Poem: The Transactional Theory of the Literary Work*. Carbondale, IL, USA: Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1978.
- [4] L. S. Vygotsky, *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press, 1986.
- [5] M. M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin, TX, USA: Univ. of Texas Press, 1981.
- [6] W. Okon, *Introduction to General Didactics*. Warsaw, Poland: PWN, 1998.
- [7] C. J. Brumfit and R. A. Carter, Eds., *Literature and Language Teaching*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 1986.
- [8] A. Maley and A. Duff, *Drama Techniques in Language Learning*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2005.
- [9] B. Bloom, Ed., *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals*. New York, NY, USA: Longmans, 1956.
- [10] J. Culler, *Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 1997.
- [11] T. Eagleton, *Literary Theory: An Introduction*, 2nd ed. Minneapolis, MN, USA: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1996.
- [12] D. Benton, "Reader-response criticism in the classroom," *English Journal*, vol. 78, no. 5, pp. 68–72, 1989.
- [13] S. L. Tchudi and C. Lafer, *The Interdisciplinary Teacher's Handbook*. Portsmouth, NH, USA: Heinemann, 1996.
- [14] P. Elbow, *Writing Without Teachers*. New York, NY, USA: Oxford Univ. Press, 1998.
- [15] J. Dewey, *Art as Experience*. New York, NY, USA: Perigee Books, 2005.