

The Dissension Between the Teaching of English Language & Literature in Bangladesh: A Reality Check

**Tasneem Siraj Mahboob¹
Mirza Md. Adwit Rahman²**

Abstract: From Greek and Roman epoch, the reading and appreciation of literary works have been included in school, college and university curriculum. However, the continuous evolution in pedagogical methodology necessitate the development language skills among literature students is a crying need. On the other hand, the idea of developing language skills is a very recent pedagogical item practiced in educational institutions. The problem arises when both the literature and language pedagogues reacted instead of collaborating over the necessity of incorporating literature in language classroom or teaching language skills in literature classroom. The literature teachers put emphasis mainly on the translation, interpretation, comprehension and appreciation of literary works neglecting the effective use of communicative language skills in their classrooms; whereas, the language practitioners have made the language and communication skills to be the end product. This paper focuses on the importance of developing language skills in literature classrooms at tertiary level and how the students fall short of expected learning outcomes due to the reaction to the teaching and learning of communicative skills among the students and teachers of literature. The authors have also tried to identify whether there are possible ways for collaboration of literature and language in the English classroom.

Introduction

Recent indicators show that the tertiary level students cannot meet the expected standard of English for communicative purposes even after getting approximately 1900 hours of English classes from class 1 to 12 (A. Rahman, 2015). Even the English graduates find it hard to compete

¹ Associate Professor, Department of English, University of Dhaka.

² Assistant Professor, Department of English, Stamford University Bangladesh.

in the job market due to their poor knowledge of the language. Since this is the scenario, the literature teachers question the effectiveness of language teaching and argues that literature teaching alone can develop the language proficiency among the students and thus ELT should be restricted up to college level. Due to this negative attitude towards the language practitioners, they have been going through extensive criticism over the years and have been trying to justify the appropriation of teaching English language in tertiary level education for quite a long time. This paper discusses the reaction of the literature pedagogues against language teaching along with the arguments ELT practitioners present in their favour. Finally, this paper looks into the possibilities of the collaboration between the teachers of literature and language and will explore the possibilities of peaceful coexistence.

Before elaborating the arguments, we would like to present a brief background of ELT in both worldwide and Bangladeshi context. In the later part of the article, the reaction of literature teachers towards language teachers and the responses of the language practitioners will be presented along with the findings of the survey conducted by the authors. Some suggestions will also be presented in relation to the findings.

Brief Background of ELT Worldwide

The trend of ELT dates back to 15th century and till date it has been subject to rigorous changes. At that time King Henry V established English as the official language though English text books became available, that too only in England, from 17th century when the need to teach English to non-native English speakers (European immigrants) was in vogue. The first two English text books prepared and published were Jacques Bellot's 'The English School master' and 'Familiar Dialogues' in 1580 to 1590 (Anonymous, n. d., p. 2). At that time the English language teachers focused on teaching grammatical rules, sentence structures, memorization of vocabulary and translation of literary texts. This method was called Classical Method which is popularly called Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) from late 19th century (Thanasoulas, 2002).

In British colonies the English-knowing citizens were employed in government offices and eventually, English was made the official

language in some colonies like Canada, Australia, USA, and New Zealand (Anonymous, n. d., p. 3). Even in India English was made the official language in 1833.

Since the teaching methodology for languages like Sanskrit and Persian was closely identical to GTM, the English rulers, mainly Charles Grant (1835) suggested to introduce the teaching of English language to Indian people with the help of English literature. From then, GTM became a very popular language teaching method in Indian Sub-continent. Even once English was considered to be the common language to promote unity and nationalism among Indian people (Anonymous, n. d., p. 7).

Moreover English and European literature and culture were taught along with ELT through English medium education as suggested by Charles Grant which has still been in practice in countries of Indian sub-continent who were former colonies of Britain. Along with that in 1800-01 'Fort William College' was founded in Calcutta to impart western education. In addition to that Thomas Babington Macaulay's English Education Act in 1835 accelerated the importance of English in India (Anonymous, n. d., p. 6). From 1844 English-knowing Indians were given preference in professional sectors as declared by Lord Hardinge. Thus, the teaching of English was infiltrated in surrounding countries of India like Burma, Sri Lanka etc.

During World War II, the army soldiers were needed to be proficient in different foreign languages. This need for communication with both the allies and the enemies initiated Army Method which was later renamed to Audiolingual Method. This method was based on linguistic and psychological theories. Since the purpose was solely communicative, the learners acquired the language through habit formation and conditioning.

Again economic prosperity of Britain as a colonizer attracted immigrants which paved the way to different techniques and methods of ELT based on language learning psychology. The term ELT came into being in 1946 when British Council published the first issue of the *English Language Teaching Journal*. During 1960s ELT was called 'English for Immigrants' which was renamed as Teaching English as Second Language (TESL) in 1970. In relation to that, Association of Recognized English Language School (ARELS) was established in 1960

which was the first attempt to promote ELT as a profession and set a platform for both EFL and ESL teachers to share their views, knowledge and experiences through conferences (Anonymous, n. d., p. 4).

Along with these improvements in teaching English, the need for communication of immigrants among themselves and with the employers swayed the ELT practitioners which resulted into the birth of the most renowned approach to language teaching namely Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) during 1970s. It brought a huge leap in the field of ELT. Adoption of communication need-based learning materials and real-life communicative activities, designing of new curriculum and text books, establishing assessment and evaluation standards established CLT on a strong ground (Anonymous, n. d.). Later, need-based curriculum divided CLT into different branches like English for Specific Purposes (ESP), English for Academic Purposes (EAP), English of Occupation Purposes (EOP), English for Science and Technology (EST) etc. which has spread CLT approach even more (Ibid, p. 4-5).

Status of ELT in Bangladesh

After the partition of India and Pakistan in 1947, English was an official language of Pakistan and the only cultural link between East and West Pakistan. Hoque (2008) cited from Curriculum Committee in 1962 that English was used in "...government, legislative, debates, courts and higher education" (p. 26). He also stated that English was the medium of instruction in higher studies. Unlike India and Pakistan, guided by patriotic fervor, Bangladesh declared Bangla as official language and neglected English for the first few years after independence.

The Education Commission in 1974 recommended using Bangla as the medium of instruction at all levels of education and the commission (1974, p. 15) felt that "It is unnecessary to make the study of any foreign language compulsory at the university level" (Hoque, 2008, p. 28). The commission also suggested to write textbooks at higher stages of education in Bangla and made English compulsory from class VI to class XII (Ibid). Later in 1976 English Language Teaching Taskforce was set up by the Ministry of Education and the taskforce recommended to make English compulsory from class III or IV instead of class V and emphasized on teacher training programs at primary and secondary

level of education. It also endorsed the introduction of ‘appropriately graded syllabus’ together with new textbooks for testing comprehension and writing skills which took effect from 1992 (Ibid).

Recently from late 1990s and early 2000 (A. Rahman, 2015), the importance of English is acknowledged and the necessity of expert English teachers was realized. In 1990 Bangladesh government decided to make English as a compulsory subject from class I on the basis of an investigative report conducted by NCTB in collaboration with British Government Overseas Development Administration (ODA) which was implemented in 1992 (Hoque 2008, p. 29). In NCTB’s Secondary English Curriculum of 1996, English was considered as a work-oriented skill-based subject aiming at learners needs for employment, development and higher education (A. Rahman, 2015). Finally, realizing the importance of learning English language, “English education was reintroduced in the B. A., B. S. S., B. Com., and B. Sc. courses as a compulsory subject of 100 marks after 1993” (Hoque 2008, p. 30). Along with that, English Language Teaching Improvement Project (ELTIP) was launched by the government of Bangladesh in collaboration with Department of International Development (DFID) with a view to train the English language teachers. (Ibid) As a continuation of this decision, the Education Policy of 2010 stressed on interesting and attractive teaching-learning environment monitored by professionally trained teachers (A. Rahman, 2015).

However, A. Rahman (2015) also stated that the reality of the standard of English language ability of the students is still not up to the mark. Students cannot achieve required standard of communicative competence in English despite spending about 1900 hours of English classes from class 1 to 12.

When this is the prevailing condition, the authors think the conflict between literature and language teaching will only worsen the problem and suggest that collaboration between these two streams will help our learners to be competent user of English.

Literature pedagogues’ reaction to language teaching in Bangladesh

The graduates of English departments from different universities of the country are expected to be groomed up as good English teachers for all levels – from primary to tertiary. But the literature pedagogues think

that even after the implementation of English language courses both in school and college level, there has not been any visible improvement in the learners' communicative competence. Alam (2012 as cited in A. M. M. H. Rahman, 2015) claims that "ELT is not working in Bangladesh. ELT courses have not produced any great teachers compared to those produced by literary studies." He also claimed earlier (2007, p. 373 as cited in A. M. M. H. Rahman, 2015) that "...Students coming out of the so called CLT method do not have the competence needed or expected from them."

Thus vehemently opposing the implementation of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach in Bangladesh replacing Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) Alam (2007) thinks "GTM products were much better than CLT products. We went 'backwards' by introducing CLT. Time has come to trash CLT" (p. 373, as cited in A. M. M. H. Rahman, 2015). Literature pedagogues emphasized the reestablishment of GTM method claiming, "GTM was a time-tested method for language teaching, had reached a stage of perfection after centuries of trial and need to be reintroduced" (Ibid).

Literature teachers continuously blamed the outcome of English language teaching and proposed the teaching of English literature alone as a solution to make good English teachers. Alam (2007, p. 373) gave a 'suitable example of the reality':

Language cannot be learnt from poor quality texts created by Bangladeshi writers. Texts about society and economic problems cannot be good models of language. In HSC textbook, there are no literary texts except three poems. Without literature students cannot learn a language well. If you want to learn a language you cannot do so by 'creating texts'. (as cited in A. M. M. H. Rahman, 2015)

This should also be mentioned that the Government of Bangladesh (GoB) in collaboration with British Council launched ELTIP project to provide training to teachers so that they can teach effectively. This project was also aimed at training the teachers to prepare suitable learning materials. Those trained teachers of English language designed a series of text books named *English for Today* and put it into effect from 2001 for class 11 and 12. Since then this has been made compulsory English text book for school and college level and has gone through continuous evaluation and changes. It is the reality that using

literary texts is not in practice in secondary and higher secondary level in Bangladesh since National Curriculum and Textbook Board (NCTB) designs the textbooks with selected reading materials and teachers are instructed to follow that book. But, several people following previous curriculum where literary texts were used to teach language preferred that curriculum to the present one for better development of language skills (personal communication).

From the above discussion of Alam (2007), as cited in A. M. M. H. Rahman (2015), it is evident that many teachers of literature feel strongly against the introduction of ELT as a discipline in universities since they believe English literature study alone can develop good English teachers with better communicative competence. They also opposed the implementation of CLT in secondary and higher secondary level as they believe GTM to be a better method for language teaching and learning. Thus the professional identity formation of ELT teachers is often affected by everyday discourses dominated by literature experts that trivialize ELT practitioners.

ELT practitioners proving their worth

On the other hand, ELT professional also have their logical grounds. Since language practitioners undergo continuous criticism for not producing proficient language users and good English teachers, language teachers put forward several arguments favouring their position.

Language teachers argue that the study of literature alone cannot serve the purpose of learning a language and being competent enough to communicate effectively. Hutchinson and Waters (2006) have shown the change in the purpose of language learning after the end of Second World War in 1945 with the expansion of technology and commerce stating that, "The effect was to create a whole new mass of people wanting to learn English, not for the pleasure or prestige of knowing the language, but because English was the key to international currencies of technology and commerce" (p. 6). In 1945, Reeve (1945) clearly described the need for communication skills, "In civilian life employers plead for employees who can read and follow instructions, who can speak intelligibly and write legibly" (p. 376). It implies that the appreciation of literature of English was not the purpose of English

language learning but the necessity of using English communicatively motivated people to learn English. Therefore, the study of only literature is not enough to meet the needs of the language learners.

Along with other countries, ELT has become a well-established discipline also in Bangladesh in past few decades. Considering the necessity of skillful use of English as second language (ESL) in Bangladesh, almost all the public and private universities already have introduced or going to introduce undergraduate and postgraduate courses in English as Foreign Language (EFL)/ ESOL/ELT (A. M. M. H. Rahman, 2015). Teacher training programs, workshops, seminars and conferences are arranged more frequently by Bangladesh English Language Teachers' Association (BELTA), government and even by a few non-government organizations to make the objective of ELT fruitful (Ibid).

A. M. M. H. Rahman (2015) also stated that CLT is well-accepted worldwide. He finds this approach the most effective one as CLT allows the teaching of a language creating context and situations where learners participate in communicative tasks and learning activities using the target language, and not by memorizing grammatical rules only (Ibid). To counter the criticism of literature pedagogues, he mentioned that, "Setbacks in the implementation of CLT lies not in CLT itself, but the failure of education authorities in the management of the change process from GTM to CLT" (Ibid).

What is taught in literature classroom is also one of the prime concerns of language teachers when the primary purpose of language learning is effective communication. According to Widdowson (1975, p. 75):

What is usually taught in many parts of the world in the name of literature at school, college or university levels is 'critical orthodoxy', a set of readymade judgments for rote-learning rather than strategies of understanding great literature, which can be transferred to other unknown literary works. (as stated in A. M. M. H. Rahman, 2015)

Ihejirika (2014) also identified the teaching contents of literature classrooms as -

...the Literature teachers, to a large extent, pre-occupy their teaching period with the teaching of stories, the contents and the socio-cultural, economic and religious implications of the prescribed literary texts without placing much emphasis on the language components of the texts. (p. 85)

Here lies the importance of ELT as a separate discipline. English language teachers use literary works as teaching materials adapting to learning situations as "...literature is often found to be linguistically deviant and unsuitable as a model for non-literary purposes, also unlikely to be used in everyday life" (Widdowson 1975, p. 80 as cited in A. M. M. H. Rahman, 2015). Adaptation of literary texts for language classroom is mandatory. If ELT practitioners do not do so, it will be difficult for the language learners to learn the language from the study of literature. A. M. M. H. Rahman, (2015) justly stated that, "We must realize that English writers have not been writing for school children, or even students of their mother tongue." He also described that "...High quality literary texts are not a good style for non-literary purposes. The pure literary syllabus is justified in its own right, but should not be confused with a syllabus for teaching a language."

Even, the comprehension of class lectures in literature classroom, appreciating literary works in both spoken and written form require linguistic ability of listening, speaking and writing. Scott (2001) asked a very justifiable question when she, being an Applied Linguist went into a literature classroom to teach literature – "Do students have the necessary proficiency in the target language to read and discuss literary texts?" (p. 539). If a literature student is not linguistically proficient, s/he will not be able to communicate in literature classroom. Therefore, ELT is needed in all levels of education starting from school to universities. Herron (1985) rightly concluded the conflict between literature and language teaching commenting that, "...instead of criticizing the pedagogues' emphasis on communicative competence at the basic skills level, the literature specialists should really thank pedagogues for motivating the students to want to continue their study of another language into the upper level courses" (p. 11).

Research Methodology

We conducted a survey among teachers of English literature, linguistics, applied linguistics and language. A questionnaire (see appendix) consisting of 33 questions was distributed among teachers from both public and private university. Among all, 24 teachers responded to the questionnaire.

First 15 questions were aimed at extracting the demographic information of the respondents. Most of the questions were multiple choice question along with few open-ended questions. In the second part of the questionnaire, from question 16 to 33, most of those were open-ended questions with few were multiple choice questions.

Research Findings

The findings along with the demographic information of the respondents are analyzed below.

Present employer	Public University	48%
	Private University	40%
	Other institution	12%
Past employer	Public University	20%
	Private University	36%
	Other institution	12%
	Not mentioned	24%
Year of teaching	Less than 10 years	36%
	11 – 15 years	16%
	16 – 20 years	12%
	21 – 25 years	20%
	More than 25 years	16%
Major in Honors	Literature	60%
	Linguistics/Applied Linguistics (AL)/ELT/TESOL	0%
	Mixed	40%
	Not mentioned	0%
Major in Masters	Literature	32%
	Linguistics/AL/ELT/TESOL	48%
	Other	20%
	Not mentioned	0%
Masters from abroad	Yes	64%
	No	36%
Area of interest in Masters from abroad	Literature	0%
	Linguistics/AL/ELT/TESOL	56%
	Mixed	40%
	Not mentioned	4%

Different area of interest in 2 nd Masters from that of 1 st Masters	Yes	40%
	No	40%
	Not applicable	20%
Already availed PhD	Yes	28%
	No	72%
Area of interest for PhD	Literature	14.2%
	Linguistics/AL/ELT/TESOL	57.1%
	Other	28.5%
Intend to avail PhD	Yes	89%
	No	11%
Area of interest for future PhD	Literature	11.1%
	Linguistics/AL/ELT/TESOL	55.5%
	Others	16.6%
	Not mentioned	17%
Preferred courses for teaching	Literature	24%
	Linguistics/AL/ELT/TESOL	52%
	Both	24%
English graduates interested in teaching career should specialize in a specific field like Literature or ELT	Yes	84%
	No	12%
	Both	4%
Requirement of specialization of English graduates to teach Literature or Language	Yes	36%
	No	52%
	May be	4%
	Not answered	8%
GTM should be reintroduced	Completely agree	4%
	Agree	8%
	Partially agree	40%
	Disagree	40%
	Not answered	8%
CLT approach is working effectively in Bangladesh	Completely agree	0%
	Agree	4%
	Partially agree	44%
	Disagree	52%
Learning objectives of Literature classes in tertiary level should contain the development of linguistic/communicative competence	Yes	76%
	No	20%
	Not mentioned	4%

The teaching of Literature alone can help develop the communicative competence of English graduates	Yes	28%
	No	56%
	Not mentioned	16%
The teaching of ELT alone can help develop the communicative competence of English graduates	Yes	36%
	No	64%
	May be	4%
Importance of setting separate departments for English Literature and Language	Yes	44%
	No	28%
	May be	8%
	Not mentioned	20%

The respondents were asked an open ended question about their reasons for choosing Linguistics/AL/ELT/TESOL for their post-graduation. They put forward that the scholarships are more available in Linguistics/AL/ELT/TESOL area than in literature. They also said that they chose this area to improve their knowledge of English language teaching, testing etc. Some of the respondents chose this area to work on integrating literature with language teaching. Even, some of the respondents chose to study this area from abroad due to their dissatisfaction with the contemporary methods and approaches of teaching English language. Some of them also mentioned that this area of study helps to get related jobs easily.

When the respondents were asked about their reason for choosing English literature or ELT for study, they commented the following:

Literature	ELT
Love for literature	To get formal understanding of language teaching techniques
Interest in literature over language	More scope for job, research and scholarship
Creativity and imagination can be employed	Prestigious
Do not need to rely on memorization	Practical and useful
Weak proficiency in Bangla	No alternative to literature
	Easier to get good grades

The respondents also opined that they chose to teach literature and/or language for following reasons.

Literature	Linguistics/AL/ELT/TESOL
Student express more interest in learning stories, plays and poems	Related to real life context
Extensive reading required for taking classes which helps in writing research articles	Creativity and relevance of ELT
Passion for literature	Interactive
Feel comfortable	Authentic materials used
	Helps to learn English systematically

Next, when the respondents were asked about the requirement of specialization of English graduates, they emphasized on specialization and put forward the following reasons:

Specialization is needed to be more focused
To be a better teacher having knowledge, theories, methods and materials
Students can get greater motivation and better clarification

However, they suggested that if literature teachers teach language classes, they should have metacognitive and analytical skills. Teachers should also engage the students.

The participants think GTM should be reintroduced because -

For	Against
Fosters reading habits	CLT should include the teaching of grammar
Needed to produce grammatically correct sentences	Blended approach should be considered
CLT cannot produce good user of English grammar	GTM is not based on any sound principle of language learning
GTM was successful in Bangladesh	Memorization of grammar rules does not help
	Translation is not needed by general learners
	GTM does not promote communication skills

Since the participants believe that CLT has not been implemented effectively, they projected the following concerns regarding conducting of literature classes in CLT approach:

CLT did not work in secondary or higher secondary level
Every teacher should invent his/her own method/style
Students need to be engaged in constructive discussion and debates
Small classroom with technical support, teachers' creativity is required
Role playing, poster presentation, storytelling can be incorporated

But, the also opined that a blend of GTM and CLT will be more effective in literature classroom.

The respondents also think that ELT or literature classes alone cannot help developing the language skills of the learners. Therefore, they suggested a blended approach. To validate their opinion, the respondents commented that-

ELT aims at developing the teaching abilities only
Literature should be used for developing communicative competence
Teaching of English need a proper mix of literature and ELT

Peaceful Coexistence

From the above discussion it is proved that the teaching of literature and language are closely related. Therefore, as Ihejirika (2014) suggested, this relation-

...should be explored and exploited in order to enhance effective teaching and learning of Literature and English Language so that the learners would possess high level of proficiency in the use of English Language, which would ultimately contribute immensely in addressing the seeming poor academic performance at the secondary and tertiary levels of education... (p. 85)

The study of both language and literature is interrelated. This relationship is duly described as –

...language theories, concepts and styles are put into function in the creation of literary texts. Therefore, if one must interpret and analysis a literary text, one must be competent in the language of the text and conversely if one must be competent in language, one should be sufficiently exposed to the literature of the language in question. (Ibid, p. 86)

Since literature is believed to be the language in action, in one hand literature students should be equipped with enough linguistic competence to appreciate literary works; and on the other hand, language learners should be acquainted with literary texts as authentic learning material after they reach the expected level of competency in using English language. Thus the collaborative action from both literature and language pedagogues can help learners develop all-round communicative competence.

Though using literary texts in language classrooms is widely in use, the language teachers have made the analysis of language the end product leaving the usage of language in context. Willmott (1979, p. 57) supports this practice as "...literature...helps the pupil to use language; it offers good models and stimulates linguistic responses of various kinds. English teachers not only present literature; they also exploit it, because it can generate language as well as exemplify it" (cited in Ihejirika 2014, p. 87). Therefore, it is obvious that "If we want literature to retain its place in the curriculum, or more importantly, find a position of favor among students, applied linguists and teachers of literature must work cooperatively." commented Scott (2001, p. 547).

Yimwilai (2015, p. 15) suggested another "language-based approach" advocated by Carter and Long (1991). According to them this approach to teaching literature "...helps EFL students enhance their knowledge of the target language by working on familiar grammar, lexical, and discourse categories, indirectly paving the way for a better understanding of a text and the formulation of meaningful interpretations" (Ibid). Which will eventually help literature students to "...access text in a systematic and methodical way to study examples of specific linguistic features, literal and figurative language, and direct and indirect speech" (Ibid). Even Grittner (1977, p. 284-98) mentioned Knop's similar approach to teaching literature. She pointed out that "...the reading of literature need not be done in total isolation from language learning per se" (Herron 1985, p. 13). She also claimed that "...the structural analysis and vocabulary work are legitimate activities which can even add to the understanding and appreciation of a literary work" (Ibid). She also argued that "The use of the word families, context clues, and inferencing can serve the goals of literary appreciation while, at the same time, being used to review and expand students' guessing ability and knowledge of the language" (Ibid).

Hence, both the teachers of language and literature should collaborate and adopt interdisciplinary approach to their teaching of language and literature. Extensive teacher training should be devised so that language teachers can teach literature for contextualizing that language and literature teachers can teach the linguistic skills while teaching literature. Ihejirika (2015) suggested that,

...Literature teacher should possess all the basic skills necessary for teaching language while the English Language teacher should also be competent enough to teach literature. The Literature teacher should not close his eyes to the language hints that abound in the prescribed literary texts while the language teacher should not hesitate to use excerpts from the prescribed literary texts to illustrate his teaching of various language components. (p. 88)

A. M. M. H. Rahman (2015) cited Hill's (1986) proposition that support the collaboration of teachers and the use of literary texts in language classroom. Hill (1986) pointed out that, "...literature covers a wide range of texts: essays, letters, reports, short stories" (p. 11). He also suggested that,

Various language learning activities can be based on them, e.g. rewriting a story from the point of view of different characters, taking part in role-play or simulation based on the events. Other activities such as comparing, contrasting, making predictions can be done (Ibid).

But the problem lies in the language variety used in literary texts. A. M. M. H. Rahman (2015) pointed out that literary texts with "...extremely difficult on linguistic, cultural and contextual levels..." will not lead to effective language teaching. So, he suggested Vincent's (1986) proposition of simplification. According to Vincent: "A course of simplified texts could lead progressively and logically onto more difficult texts incorporating the communicative features of non-fiction writing: exposition, narration, description and argument" (p. 215).

Moreover, adapted literary texts can be introduced in elementary, secondary and intermediate level of education. This is a common practice in English medium schools. As literary texts help to motivate students' learning, suitable literary texts will be beneficial for their enthusiasm of language learning. Ihejirika (2015) suggested that,

The students at both the junior and the senior secondary school should be made to read appreciable number of literary texts as it would create room for the learners to be immersed in the target language, which would in turn boost their proficiency in English (p. 89).

He also pointed out that the selected texts should be within the linguistic capacity of the learners and relevant to the learners' educational, and socio-cultural context (Ibid).

Conclusion

From the above discussion it is apparent that there is no validity of confining language teaching up to secondary level of education and the teaching language is more necessary than ever to develop the communicative competencies in English students – from primary to tertiary level.

There is no doubt that the teaching of literature has been a well-established discipline from the beginning of English teaching. However ELT has also been proving its worth since its introduction. Therefore the teachers of literature should accept the reality that the need for communicative competence in all the students, especially English graduates is more important than the teaching of literature in this global village of science, trade and commerce.

In conclusion it is the literature pedagogues who have to decide whether they accept the reality and work in collaboration with language practitioners keeping learners' needs in mind or they go apart. Because if they continue to be critical about the worth of language teaching despite being supportive, it will not be beneficial for our students. We hope that the teachers of language and literature will work hand-in-hand to produce great teachers and graduates with better language skills to compete in the job market worldwide.

References

- Herron, C. (1985). Collaboration between Teachers of Foreign Languages and Literature. *The French Review*, 59(1), 11-15. Retrieved 15 September, 2015, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/394196>
- Hoque, M. E. (2008). English language Teaching and Learning at the Alim level in the Madrashas in Bangladesh: Problems and Possible Solutions. M. Phil. Thesis
- Hutchinson, T & Waters, A. (2006). What is ESP?. In Altman, H.B & Strevens, P (Eds), *English for Specific Purposes: A Learning-centred Approach* (pp. 6-8). United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Ihejirika, R.C. (2014). Literature and English Language Teaching and Learning: A Symbiotic Relationship. *English Language Teaching*, 7(3), 85-90. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n3p85>

- Rahman, A. (2015). English Studies in Bangladesh: Reconsidering Conceptual Paradigms. Keynote paper presented in the National Conference at Southeast University titled *English Studies in Bangladesh: Reconsidering Conceptual Paradigms*
- Rahman, A. M. M. H. (2015). Shall we go our separate ways?. Plenary paper presented in the National Conference at Daffodil International University titled
- Reeve, A.W. (1945). Why Teach English?. *The English Journal*, 34(7), 376-378. Retrieved 15 September, 2015, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/807672>
- Scott, V. M. (2001). An Applied Linguist in the Literature Classroom. *The French Review*, 74(3), 538-549. Retrieved 15 September, 2015, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/399435>
- Thanasoulas, D. (2002). *English Club*. Retrieved 25 October, 2015, from <https://www.englishclub.com/tefl-articles/history-english-language-teaching.htm>
- Yimwilai, S. (2015). An Integrated Approach to Teaching Literature in an EFL Classroom. *English Language Teaching*, 8(2), 14-21. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n2p14>
- Retrieved 25 October, 2015, from <http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/23473/3/03.%20chapter%20-%20i.pdf>

Appendix

Survey Questionnaire

Put tick (✓) mark in the box next to the suitable answer and mention N/A if the question is not applicable to you.

1. Name (optional):
.....
2. Present employer:
.....
3. Past employer/s (if any):
.....
4. Years of teaching:
 - Less than 10
 - 11 – 15
 - 16 – 20
 - 21 – 25
 - More than 25
5. What was your major in Undergraduation/Honours?
 - Literature
 - Linguistics/Applied Linguistics (AL)/ English Language Teaching (ELT)/ Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)
 - Mixed courses
6. What was your major in Masters?
 - Literature
 - Linguistics/Applied Linguistics (AL)/ English Language Teaching (ELT)/ Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)
 - Others (please specify)
7. Did you also receive any Post Graduation/masters degree from abroad?
 - Yes
 - No
8. If the answer is 'Yes', in which area?
 - Literature
 - Linguistics/AL/ELT/TESOL
 - Others (please mention)
9. Have you received your 2nd Post Graduation in a different area than that of 1st masters?
 - Yes
 - No
 - N/A

10. If your answer is 'Yes', why?
-
 -
 -
 -
11. Have you done your PhD?
- Yes
 - No
12. If your answer to Q # 11 is 'yes', what was the broad area of research for your Doctoral study?
- Literature
 - Linguistics/AL/ELT/TESOL
 - Other (please mention)
13. If your answer to Q # 12 is 'other', then please give your reason/s for doing so.
-
 -
 -
 -
14. If your answer to question # 11 is 'No', do you want to do your PhD in future?
- Yes
 - No
15. If 'Yes', in which area?
- Literature
 - Linguistics/ AL/ELT/ TESOL
 - Other (please mention)
- (For answering question # 16 to 27 please use extra paper, if needed.)
16. Why did you study English literature or ELT? Please give reason/s.
-
 -
 -
 -
17. Which courses do you prefer to teach?
- Literature
 - Linguistics/AL/ELT/TESOL
18. Why do you prefer to teach these courses?
-
 -
 -
 -

19. Do you think English graduates interested in a career in teaching should specialise in a specific field like literature or ELT?
- Yes
 - No
20. Why? Please give reasons in favour of your answer to Q # 19.
-
 -
 -
21. Do you think English graduates with/without specialization will be able to teach both literature and language courses?
- Yes
 - No
22. If your answer to Q # 21 is 'yes', please explain how they can do it effectively.
-
 -
 -
 -
23. To what extent do you agree that Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) should be reintroduced?
- Completely agree
 - Agree
 - Partially agree
 - Disagree
24. Why do you think so?
-
 -
 -
 -
25. "Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach is working effectively in context of Bangladesh." Do you agree with this comment?
- Completely agree
 - Agree
 - Partially agree
 - Disagree
26. Do you think literature courses can be taught following CLT approach? Please give reasons to support your opinion.
-
 -
 -
 -

27. Do you think learning objectives of literature classes in tertiary level should contain the development of linguistic/communicative competence?
- Yes
 - No
28. If your answer to question no. 27 is 'yes', do you think the teaching of literature alone can help develop the communicative competences among English graduates?
- Yes
 - No
29. Do you think English Language Teaching (ELT) alone can help develop the communicative competence of English graduates?
- Yes
 - No
30. Why do you think so?
-
 -
 -
 -
31. Do you think the time has come when different streams like English literature and ELT/AL/TESOL should be offered by two different departments?
- Yes
 - No
32. Why do you think so?
- -
 -
 -
33. Please comment on the topic of this research paper.