



English Literature and Composition Studies in Bangladesh: Conflict, Co-existence, and Globalization

Mohammad Shamsuzzaman
North South University, Bangladesh
mohammad.shamsuzzaman@northsouth.edu

Abstract

English literature and Composition studies never mesh given their origins and foci. English literature is essentially British in most places outside of the United States. Composition is essentially North American. Literature explores written texts while Composition creates new texts. Composition studies has been a relatively new intellectual formation compared to the long history of English literature, which has been the parent discipline of English studies all over the world, including in Bangladesh. However, while Composition studies is acknowledged as a legitimate sub-field of English studies around the globe, it is not integral to English studies in Bangladesh until recently. English literature continues to define and dominate English studies in Bangladesh. In the context of Bangladesh, Composition is the ultimate Other. At the same time, English studies independent of composition is ineffective, incomplete. This article explores the ontological conflict between English literature and Composition studies in the context of Bangladesh. It, then, establishes the connection between English literature and Composition studies. Finally, it discusses the ramifications of globalization affecting English literature and Composition studies in the landscape of English studies in Bangladesh.

Keywords: English Literature, Composition Studies, Globalization

Conflicting Relationship: English Literature and Composition

Historically, in countries where English literature and Composition have most developed, particularly the United States, these two disciplines have never been bed fellows. While sharing institutional homes, these are two paradigms apart in terms of their sovereign philosophies, pedagogies, and epistemologies. Literature is poetics. Composition—which is also called “Writing Studies” or “Rhetoric and Composition” and focusing on the teaching of academic writing—is pragmatics. Literature is art. Composition is craft. Literature explores existing texts.

Composition creates new texts. Literature comes from artists; Composition comes from anyone who can work hard, can concentrate, and has a tolerance for frustration and failure (Smith, 1982). Hirvela (2005) claims that the lit-comp debate that explores the differences between these two intellectual formations first arose in the 1980s, though a prescient Aydelotte (1914) apprehended the potential conflict between English literature and composition about a century back. The conflict has been more political than intellectual, and for a long time, some would say until now, politics has favored English literature more than Composition in that the former treated the latter as “the weak spouse, the new kid, the cash cow, the oppressed majority” (Elbow, 2002, p.533). English literature colonized composition, but composition cleft away from it to emerge as an independent intellectual formation.

In Bangladesh, though, literature reigns supreme, with an interesting twist. Like all former British colonies, the English language has been a colonial imposition on the Indian subcontinent including Bangladesh. As such, the language carries a curse of history along. Inadvertently, English literature shares that burden of historical accident given that the primary portal that the language gained approval and appreciation was English literature. Macaulay’s *Minute on Indian Education* in 1835 was instrumental in coercing English literature upon the natives who were ignorant until they were enlightened through a heavy dose of English literature. Macaulay claims that because English literature is superior to literature written in local vernaculars, it is innocuous and evitable. Thus a colonial imposition became a cultural artifact to somewhat cauterize English literature of its colonial legacy. As times passed by, the language emerged critical for economics, education, and communication for the post-colonial nations in the Indian subcontinent. English literature becomes synonymous with the English language. As a result, English literature continues to define English studies in the Indian subcontinent uncontested. Bangladesh is no exception.

For example, one of the oldest universities in the Indian subcontinent was the University of Dhaka, Bangladesh, which was launched in 1921 with 12 departments (Rahman, 1981). The Department of English was one of 12 departments. Until 1985, however, the intellectual activities of the department essentially revolved around English literature (Alam, 2011). The department continued to offer an M.A. in ELT since 1985. While ELT expanded the scope of English studies, the focus of English studies remained English literature, for “we cannot study English without literature” (Chowdhury, 2001, p.21). As literature professionals default to such an assumption, disciplinary hubris stalks to disadvantage other branches of English studies in Bangladesh. It renders composition insignificant upfront, because such an assumption warrants a pedagogical approach that belies some of the basic principles of composition pedagogy.

Essentializing literature is tantamount to essentializing reading, not writing. As Elbow (1993) claims that professors of literature are “professors of reading” (p.13), who believe that reading inevitably leads to writing. “Reading is not enough for writing”, as Toni Morrison claims in her *Paris Review* interview. Reading is much like eating. If a reader is on a diet of junk prose, that can destroy his writing minds and muscles. Writing that is vapid, insipid, and unappetizing can kill the writer in a reader. Toor (2007) as such claims that teaching writing by bad writing is not an option. Bad writing is endemic across genres. Because reading privileges a writer and denigrates a reader, bad writing is hardly noticed. An author becomes an authority, who is immune to criticism. But there is such an entity as a bad writing. Some of scholars who write badly enjoy highest academic endorsement. Homi Bhabha’s writing, for example, is unduly ponderous, complex, and incomprehensible. As Pinker (2014) claims that ideally in a sentence a writer tells his readers who is doing what to whom in way which is easy to follow and difficult to

misunderstand. Bhabha's writing would miserably fail to meet demands like Pinker's that many readers deservedly demand. From the perspective of writing effectively, as writing instructors try to teach students across the disciplines, Bhabha could be seen as a scholar who has not learned how to write. But calling him a bad writer would sound arrogantly naïve. He has been critical for post-colonial and cultural studies. No literature major can avoid studying Bhabha, but literature students would not do well to emulate his writing style as well as his theories and perspectives. Of course, the justification for excessively complex writing is that the content demands it; but writing scholars, as well as readers and writers across academe, would disagree.

If reading at all has to contribute to writing, a reader must read like a writer (Morgan, 1990). A reader must notice the mechanical, semantic, and syntactic options and restrictions a writer avoids and adopts to transcribe his thoughts. In an academic context that is hardly the case. Academics mine for content. They hardly care about the styles and strategies of writing. Academics pass that habit down to their students. Such reading hardly hones writing. Pinker (2014) claims that good writers have absorbed a vast inventory of words, idioms, tropes, constructions, and rhetorical tricks. Important as well to remember that the symbiotic relationship between reading and writing is not inevitable and automatic. Reading is translation. Writing, on the other hand, is transcription. Reading and writing might not cross-pollinate unless there is a conscious and systematic effort. Purposes of reading in literature are the exploration of themes, examination of characteristics, and the appreciation of canons and histories of texts. Reading with such a disposition is disconnected with and non-responsive to writing.

Reading in literature can inspire awe. Writers in literature are often considered gifted or possessed. They write in at once in refined and rhapsodic language that only genius and artists can do (Elbow, 2002). Writers in literature reflect distinctive passion and panache as well as represent ultimate linguistic and semantic sophistication, which is too idiosyncratic for a beginner to imitate. But writing is learned by imitation (Zinsser, 1998). In the EFL context of Bangladesh, most of the literature students are always, already the victims of what Kietlinska (2006) calls "two hats" problem. They must write as they learn the language. For these students, literature offers no authentic models to learn the language but an irresistible temptation to emulate the masters. When beginners with inadequate linguistic and conceptual wherewithal begin to emulate those literature sophisticates, their writing creates a lexical and syntactic quagmire, where the meaning is partially or completely lost. Their writing shows confusion, because it springs from confusion. This perspective considered, the potential of literature to foster writing is seriously limited.

The perception about writing and writers that marginalizes effective writing in favor of "literary" writing for all contexts and purposes perpetuates a myth that writing is art and that writers are geniuses. Writing, in most genres and disciplines, is more a craft than an art. There is nothing magical and mysterious about writing in most, if not, all contexts in our lives and professions today. Writing never flows from any secret, sacred source. Humans do not have facility for writing because writing is artificial (Ong, 1983) and is an act of pretense (Pinker, 2014). For no writer, writing is a natural endowment. Writing is an intellectual achievement. Writing is strategic, and the conception and construction of writing presuppose some predictable steps and stages. As Marquez claims in his *Paris Review* interview, "writing, after all, is carpentry." He likens writing to the making of a chair that is at once daunting and strategic. And writers are not geniuses. They are just brain-rackers. As Smith (1984) claims that no writer is by default more sensitive, sensible, and hard-working than an average human being, and that no writer comes from any privileged background. All writers become writers by being writers.

Because literature explores writing, not the process of production of writing, it shrouds writing in an aura of maze. Writers are elevated to position of prodigies. Because writing is struggle for everyone (Briedenbach, 2006), and students struggle to write, they are tempted to consider that they not gifted to writer. They give up writing. Exposure to literature is psychologically demotivating for novice writer as such.

Psychology aside, there is a mismatch between application and reading in literature. Lindemann (1993) claims that examining literary language has limited usefulness for writing, because students do not write literature; they write about it or respond to it. This disjuncture between reading and writing compounds further when student discover that they read discourse in aesthetic genre, but they are required to write in critical genre. While Pinker (2014) claims that various genres cannot be strictly demarcated, writing in an academic context is stubbornly genre-specific. Academic writing is meant to be consumed by a specific discourse community. Every discourse community has its own principles and prejudices to regulate the production and consumption of written discourse. Meshing genre in academic discourse requires uncommon courage and creativity. Very few writers (Steven Pinker and Suresh Canagarajah, for example) can shuttle between genres with ultimate clarity, coherence, and flair. Novice literature students in the EFL context of Bangladesh do not have the stylistic, strategic, and linguistic capital to mesh genre. They must model their writing on what they read. Literature does not allow that opportunity.

Equally problematic is that fact that literature is non-responsive to the kind of writing students need to accomplish these days in that literature collapses the discourse of the academy into one genre (Lindemann, 1993), narrative genre. Personal narrative is replaced by an emphasis on argument and research (Lunsford & Lunsford, 2008). Writing these days is more intellectual and objective than intuitive and subjective. Writing these days is more concise and precise than ornate and allegorical. Critical intelligence and factual diligence characterize writing these days. Literature apparently does not tread that terrain. Literature turns emotion into a source of illumination (Aydelotte, 1914), which hardly convinces students these days who are infused with the spirit of scientific skepticism (Pinker, 2014). Student writers these days are tackling the kind of issues that require inquiry and investigation as well as reflection (Lunsford & Lunsford, 2008). Writers these days are agentive, cognitive, and creative within in the confine of conventions. These conventions are not the tools of the trade of literature. Literature as such fails to cater to the writing needs of the students in Bangladesh.

Literature professionals are aware of these qualifications of literature in English studies in Bangladesh. For example, a sophisticated voice in English studies in Bangladesh has been Professor Fakrul Alam, who is a professor of English literature at the University of Dhaka, Bangladesh. His work, partially but critically, explores the ramifications of the intersection of English literature vis-à-vis other branches of English studies in Bangladesh. Alam (2011, p.258) evinces that literature professionals in Bangladesh are already riddled with disciplinary self-doubt, because “for a long time many of us in the profession had scanted our students.” He nonchalantly wonders why his teachers did not teach him how to write when he had been studying English literature at the University of Dhaka in the mid-70s. Alam (201, p. 270) recommends that composition be part of English studies in Bangladesh, for “at least a few of us understood by the 1980s that teaching literature meant not only training students in the humanities but also educating them in aspects of rhetoric and composition.” The ontological clash, then, between English literature and Composition is more pedagogical than essential.

Co-existence: English and Composition

Surprising as it might sound, more literature means more Composition in the context of Bangladesh. The landscape of English studies underwent critical re-orientation in the 1990s when many new universities –mostly private, began to emerge to comply with the government of Bangladesh’s decision to expand tertiary education manifold (Alam, 2016). As the private universities began to proliferate, the focus of English studies in Bangladesh shifted from English literature to language studies. ELT emerged as a major pedagogical force. This sudden mood swing in English studies in Bangladesh was pyrrhic. ELT emerged in Bangladesh in the mid-80s, and it was in its infancy in the early-90s. It critically lacked a cadre of well-prepared professionals. The influx of universities, however, needed professionals immediately to advance their agendas involving English studies in Bangladesh. The private universities recruited people indiscriminately. They were not hardcore professionals, per se. They were contingent crew. Alam (2016) indicated them as “hollowman.” Hamid and Baldauf (2008, p.16) claim that “ELT is bogged down” in Bangladesh. ELT, nonetheless, is the currency of English studies in Bangladesh. ELT in Bangladesh is too exclusive and overbearing even to eclipse English literature, let alone Composition.

Alam (2011) claims that the ELT professionals are intellectually and ethically suspect to teach Composition because they themselves have not written anything. Regarding composition instructors in general, Hairston (1986) shares the same perspective. With most English literature professionals in Bangladesh, however, that is not the case. Professor Alam himself is an authentic example. He has been an internationally acclaimed scholar, who has published extensively from prestigious international outlets. Being a literature professional does not necessarily disqualify him to teach writing. He is being innocent of composition theories. Pinker (2014) claims that composition is a field of plausible mastery like cooking and photography. It requires intuition, judgment, experience, and observation to compose texts across genres. As a writer himself, Professor Alam may have possessed all these attributes. He is potentially capable of teaching writing, as are most literature professionals in Bangladesh. Composition, therefore, is compatible with literature in Bangladesh. The same deduction applies to other contexts, too. Two of the leading witting scholars, Peter Elbow and Helen Sword, have English literature background.

While composition scholars do not essentialize the view that reading automatically leads to writing, they never discount reading as a critical prerequisite to writing. Act of reading is inseparable from the act of writing (Murray, 1982). Literature is a treasure trove for reading. Literature is a broad rubric that ropes in discourses from various genres to accommodate the tastes, temperament, and necessities of diverse readers. Insipid and arid prose never pass off as literature. Literary prose is vibrant and engaging. Potentially, then, Composition bleeds into literature. Teaching Composition without literature is like teaching dance without music (Miller, 1980). While composition scholars are deeply divided about the role of literature in a composition class, they are mostly occasionally vocal about stogy academic discourse. Elbow (2002), for example, claims that there is no such thing as academic discourse in that it widely varies across the disciplinary spectrum. He further claims that academic discourse lacks voice. Literature values voice. However steeped the culture of English studies in Bangladesh in literature, it is essentially Composition friendly.

By definition, Composition is a cohesive unit of discourse. Composition scholar Flower (1982) claims that academic discourse is reader-based. Academic writers do not expect their

readers to read between lines, because there is no line between the lines. It is all flatly stated. As such, academic writing is clutter and jargon free. Miller (1980) claims that literature is least cluttered and jargon-ridden. Literature uses a word in its original form. On the other hand, good academic writers nominalize (Lunsford, 1980). Nominalization leads to zombification of language. Sword (2012) claims that when a verb is re-purposed as a noun, it becomes a zombie noun. A zombie noun sucks the life juice out of a word. It is no longer as meaningful as the original word is. Sword (2012) further claims that academic discourse demands uncommon intellectual stamina of readers. Novice readers in the EFL context of Bangladesh might feel stunted by hefty and unwieldy academic discourse. Exposure to such texts is counter-productive to writing. Literature is an escape hatch to counter that problem. The potential of literature to promote Composition awaits utilization in Bangladesh.

The purpose of Composition is communication. Imaginative language is the primal and basic form of communication that touches people most deeply (Elbow, 2002). Imaginative language is literature's forte. Imagination is a not mere linguistic trapping. It indicates and enhances cognitive development. Imagination is cognitively essential. It is linguistically critical, too, as Elbow (2002) contends that students' strongest linguistic powers cannot be harnessed until imaginative language is considered as a norm. Composing is a complex cognitive endeavor. Composition that is elegant and evocative embodies linguistic prowess. As is, literature and composition form a continuum. This may have prompted Alam (2016) to reminisce the use of literary texts in the previous centuries, when English studies attracted and benefited learners. When English literature loses steam in Bangladesh, Composition gains no ground. To conspire against Composition is not an avowed agenda of English literature in Bangladesh. Literature, after all, is composition.

Of course, literature varies from Composition given genre. Genre, however, is a French word, which stands for gender, not sex, in English. It is not universal and exceptionless as such. Genre is a convenient construct, which is open to further intervention and interpretation. Good writing does not fit in a single formula (Pinker, 2014). Genre teases apart various forms of writing, but it does not tell which is which. Good writing is too original to be genre-specific. Of particular note here is the fact that the principles of composing across the so called genres are the same. Writing is thinking for a novelist as well as for a critic. Writing is recursive both in so called creative and academic genre. Writing is habitual, not natural, for a poet and for an academic. Writing emerges after multiple revisions for anyone who writes. The logical deduction of this argument is that, regardless of genres, writing emerges from the same stream of human's consciousness. Shuttling between genres requires some stylistic adjustment, not cognitive conversion. The perception of the homogeneity of writing is so deeply embedded in Bangladesh that writing denies to be classified. The biggest persuasion toward that direction is being Kaiser Haq, a professor of English literature at the University of Dhaka. He has been country's only poet writing in English that is widely internationally appreciated. Poetry apart, his scholarly work enjoys global recognition. In such an academic culture, Composition exists naturally despite and beside literature.

No way, then, does the history of English studies in Bangladesh revolve around or reduce to a "deep legacy of anger, hurt, and guilt" (Elbow, 2002) between English literature and Composition studies. English literature, however, has been the default discipline of English studies in the Indian subcontinent for about 200 years. It has been so central to the culture of English studies in Bangladesh that it has assumed the aura of a cult. Mere literary texts have become gospels. Writers have become prophets. Classrooms have become pulpits. Teachers have

become pontiffs. These assumptions are held uncontested for so long that these may have made literature professionals mildly zealous. Alam's (2001) observation is pertinent in this context. He was in the committee assigned to revamp the curriculum of English B.A. (Hons) at the University of Dhaka. He wanted to dilute the curriculum-which is purely literature-based- with some language-based courses. He was surprised to discover that he had to change the mind-set of some the senior faculty members of the department. Some literature professionals in Bangladesh still resist change so as to ensconce in the hallowed tradition of literature. That made English literature inadvertently exclusionary to shy away from other branches of English studies in Bangladesh. English literature did not intentionally distance itself from Composition studies, but composition fell in a paradigm of begin negligence.

Despite that, if composition has to gain any ground in Bangladesh, it needs its ultimate Other functioning smoothly. Because ELT is insular and exclusive in Bangladesh, and there exists a strong but uncultivated symbiotic relationship between English literature and Composition in Bangladesh, literature potentially promotes Composition. Composition in Bangladesh cannot emerge independent of English literature. Research by Shamsuzzaman, Everatt, and McNeill (2012), however, shows that English literature in Bangladesh seems to have been relinquishing its influence because of the emergence of ELT. That portends a bleak prospect for Composition studies in Bangladesh. But for the all hullabaloo involving ELT in Bangladesh recently, the intellectual and pedagogical infrastructure of English studies still revolve around English literature. English literature by no means is less real and useful than any other branches of English studies. Snubbing it aside is impulsive than intellectual. Kuhn (1970) claims that no paradigm will be replaced or will vanish unless there is another paradigm to replace it. ELT in Bangladesh is emergent and porous. As a paradigm, ELT is not sturdy enough to replace English literature. As English literature continues in Bangladesh, the sooner the literature professionals discover that without Composition, English literature is problematic and partial, the better.

English Literature, Composition, and Globalization

Globalization-and its cognate, internationalization-does not necessarily pit English literature against Composition; neither does it merge them. Globalization questions the status quo of both the branches of English studies and urges them to be more inclusive and egalitarian. Both Composition and English literature critically fall short on this front. Composition, for example, is a North American framing and is geographically, historically, and ideologically loaded and located (Donahue, 2009). Composition à la North American dispensation obligates a specific way of thinking and languaging. It assumes homogeneity of language, thought, and culture. It is parochial and crushes plurality. Composition is only global if the globe reduces to North America. Beyond North America, there are perhaps as many versions of compositions as many languages and cultures are there. The perceptions and practices of other versions of compositions across cultures doubtless vary from those of North American ones', which have elevated non-fiction prose to a sacred height (Tate, 1993). A case in point is Bangladesh.

The strong, tacit assumption in Bangladesh is that writing is not structure languaged. Writing, instead, is perceptions personified. Because perception is idiosyncratic, writing always is personal and peculiar. Conventions do not dictate the production of writing. Creativity does. As is, so called non-fiction writing is not compatible to the composing culture of Bangladesh. It is inherently a Dionysian or creative writing culture (Shamsuzzaman, 2014). Emotion replaces

logic. Intuition replaces information. Philosophy replaces argument. Writing is indirect, layered, and subtle. The meaning and message in writing are as much in writing as in reading. Process of writing is not artificially segmented. Writing transpires in a non-linear, non-sequential way. It has its own grammar. The grammar of North American composition does not capture that writing culture of Bangladesh. But the culture is not too unique and esoteric. It has its ontological partner beyond North America.

Two of the assumptions that underpin the production of writing in Bangladesh are that a writer is not created. He or she is born. Writing, therefore, is a natural endowment. Writing, as well, is not an outcome of hard-work. It is an outcome of illumination. Writers are, therefore, seers. They know beforehand what they are going to write. None of these two principles of writing aligns with North American composition theories. But these principles of writing underpin French classic style of writing (Thomas & Turner, 1994). In French classic style, Thomas and Turner (1994) claims, writing is not egalitarian. This is aristocratic. Everyone cannot write. Writing is not habitual. Writing, instead, is natural. As well, writing is an act of transcription, because writers know beforehand what they will write. Writing is no discovery. Writing is epiphany. French has been a vibrant intellectual culture for centuries despite and because of these principles of writing. So is Bangladesh. Composition in Bangladesh is not an academic or institutional entity. It is a cultural commonplace. Reified as North American Composition studies is, it is culturally and intellectually impugned in Bangladesh.

North American Composition studies is exactly opposite to what globalization is and does. Globalization blurs boundaries and binaries. North American composition studies reinforces those, because it is an “Us-them” paradigm and “the internationalization of our world” (Donahue, 2009). Composition studies is essentially colonialist. Anything that is colonially insidious is contested in Bangladesh, for Bangladesh still reels under the trauma and turpitude of its dual (e.g., British and Pakistan) colonial past. Composition, as such, is politically contested in Bangladesh. Composition is hegemonic, because it presupposes that North America-based methods and materials are the correct ones, and that Bangladesh must adapt to it. Alam (2011; 2016) observes that English studies in Bangladesh has developed a trajectory of its own, because it questions, even resists, corporatization and colonization of English education by foreign agencies (e.g., The British Council) that do not take into account culture-specific ways of teaching and learning English. This considered, Composition studies automatically falls out of favor in Bangladesh.

While Composition studies remains, its offshoot, the field of L2 writing, is avowedly global. Since the 1990s, some scholars (Tony Silva and Paul Kei Matsuda, in particular) merged scholarship from applied linguistics and composition studies in particular to generate a compelling body of scholarship to cater to the peculiar writing needs of non-native speakers of English. The field does not generalize the writing needs of L2 writers; neither does it essentialize pedagogy. It intends to appreciate learners’ culture specific style of learning, the influences of mother tongue and prior schooling on learning so as to adopt pedagogical approaches, which are “issue-driven” and “need-based” (Matsuda, 2013). The field proposes as well that L2 writers are as agentive, cognitive, and creative as the so called native speakers. This is being the only intellectual formation where the scholars have confessed unqualified that it does not have a cohesive theory to teach L2 writing (Tardy, 2010, for example). For all these practical and potential promises, the avowed orientation of the field is somewhat compromised because of its obsession with research and reference. The vast landscape of trans-lingual writing cannot be captured by empirical research. Research is an elitist way of knowledge generation. Narrative is

the primal way of knowledge generation that characterizes literary culture around the globe. The field of L2 writing seems averse to narrative. Narrative happens independent of reference. When a subaltern scholar from the periphery narrates his writing culture, he cannot refer to anyone in that he may have been the first one to explore his native writing culture. Unless the field of L2 writing abounds with original narratives from across the globe, it cannot address the writing issues of L2 writers in a more informed and effective way. This shortcoming of the field is within the professional consciousness of the field as Silva (2006) urges to look at writing beyond North America. Therefore, the field of L2 writing is potentially strongly global. It merits application in Bangladesh.

English literature, however, seems to get stuck in a time warp in Bangladesh (Alam, 2011). Texts and teaching are eternally traditional. Literature, for example, continues to emanate from a William Shakespeare since the 16th century. Granted that Shakespeare is linguistically awe-inspiring, but literature is not linguistic pyrotechnics. Shakespeare is philosophically fraught. Literature is not philosophy, either. Nadine Gordimer claims in her *Paris Review* interview, “Literature is about making sense of life”. An evolutionary biologist Richard Dawkins or a theoretical physicist and string theorist Brian Greene makes sense of life as much as a poet or novelist does. Their language and the treatment of the content combine poetics and philosophy in an extraordinary way. Their texts, and some other scientific discourses, are by all means literary. Their texts are composition compatible, too. Scientists are the lucid expositors of very complex ideas (Pinker, 2014). Composer of a typical literary text perhaps is not, as there is something called “Bad Writing Contest” in the U.S. and the perennial winners of this contest are the professors of English (Pinker, 2014). As the default discipline of English studies, the guilt befalls literature professionals. Clear writing no longer defines literature professionals, perhaps because of reading knotty texts. That hazard affects literature students, too. Globalization requires literature re-defined in Bangladesh, so that it is contemporary, authentic, and useful to the learners. It also requires literature professionals in Bangladesh mentally and intellectually reformed.

For example, literature teaching is lecture-based, for a teacher talks 70 to 80% of the time (Lindemann, 1993). Students are acolytes who listen, consume, and reproduce what a teacher says. Texts are pretty nothing experience for students (Elbow, 2002), because they are linguistically too complex or culturally too disconnected. Students feel daunted and distanced by texts. Literature as such might not trickle down to students’ lives to hone critical sense of engagement with the realities around. That defeats globalization of education, which presupposes informed transmission and reception of information at personal level around and beyond border. Unless English literature transforms, it is anti-globalization. While Composition’s offshoot L2 writing is global in orientation, English literature in Bangladesh does not seem to have an alternative around. That does not augur well for the future of English literature in Bangladesh.

Conclusion

Globalization has apparently skewed the equation and ethics of education in Bangladesh. Universities in Bangladesh seem to have become surrogate job recruitment agencies that no longer teach students. They, instead, cater to the employment needs of clients and consumers. While this seedy development in education in Bangladesh is deplorable, it is unavoidable. Globalization, ironically, denigrates English given that English as a discipline is within the aegis of the humanities which shares the burden of “corporate hostilities toward the humanities”

(Donohue, 2008, p.2). Globalization does not reduce the debate of English studies between English literature and Composition. It flatly portends that English as a discipline in the humanities is endangered. Alam (2011; 2016) warns against the bleak prospect of English studies in Bangladesh because of the corporatization of education. He recommends to stop glamorizing or essentializing any particular branch of English studies- that is, ELT- in Bangladesh. Globalization requires that the English professionals in Bangladesh do not pettifog about disciplinary space and prestige among themselves. They must forge a collective disciplinary identity. When that happens--and that has to happen--English literature and Composition coexist along with a streamlined ELT.

References

- Alam, F (2016, in press): Re-visioning English Studies in Bangladesh in the Age of Globalization and ELT. In R. Chowdhury (Ed.). [final title pending] New York: Springer
- Alam, F. (2011). The commodification of English. In H. Lahiri (Ed.), *Literary transactions in a globalized context: Multi-ethnicity, gender and marketplace* (pp.250-274). Delhi: Worldview.
- Alam, F. (2001). The Dhaka University English curriculum: A decade of development. In N. Zaman, F. Alam, & T. Ahmad (Eds.), *Re-visioning English studies in Bangladesh* (pp. 1-14). Dhaka. Bangladesh: UPL.
- Aydelotte, F. (1914). The Correlation of English Literature and Composition in the College Course. *The English Journal*, 3(9), 568-574. doi:10.2307/801624
- Breidenbach, K. (2006). Practical guidelines for writers and teachers. In A. Horning & A. Becker (Eds.), *Revision: History, theory, and practice*(pp.197-219). West Lafayette, Indiana: Parlor Press and The WAC Clearinghouse.
- Chowdhury, S. I. (2001). Rethinking two Englishes. In N. Zaman, F. Alam, & T. Ahmad (Eds.), *Re-visioning English in Bangladesh* (pp. 14-25). Dhaka. Bangladesh: UPL.
- Donahue, C. (2009). Internationalization and composition studies: Reorienting the discourse. *College Composition and Communication*, 61(2), 212-243.
- Donohue, F. (2008). *The last professors: The twilight of the humanities in the corporate university and the fate of the humanities*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Elbow, P. (2002). The cultures of literature and composition: What could each learn from the other? *College English*, 64(5), 533-546. doi:10.2307/3250752
- Elbow, P. (1993). The war between reading and writing— and how to end it. *Rhetoric Review*, 12(1), 5-24. doi:10.1080/07350199309389024
- Hamid, M. O., & Baldauf, R. B. (2008). Will CLT bail out the bogged down ELT in Bangladesh? *English Today* 24(03), 16-24.
- Hairston, M. (1986). When writing teachers don't write: Speculations about probable causes and possible cures. *Rhetoric Review*, 5(1), 62-70.
- Hirvela, A. (2005). ESL students and the use of literature in composition courses. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, 33(1), 70-80.
- Kietlinska, K. (2006). Revision and ESL students. In A. Horning & A. Becker (Eds.), *Revision: History, theory, and practice* (pp. 63-87). West Lafayette, Indiana: Parlor Press and The WAC Clearinghouse.
- Lindemann, E. (1993). Freshman composition: No place for literature. *College English*, 55(3), 311-316. doi:10.2307/378743

- Lunsford, A. A. (1980). The content of basic writers' essays. *College Composition and Communication*, 31(3), 278-290.
- Lunsford, A. A., & Lunsford, K. J. (2008). "Mistakes are a fact of life": A national comparative study. *College Composition and Communication*, 59(4), 781-806.
- Matsuda, P. K. (2013). Response: What is second language writing-and why does it matter? *Journal of Second Language Writing* 22(4), 448-450.
- Miller, R. K. (1980). The use of literature in English composition. *The English Journal*, 69(9), 54-55. doi:10.2307/816382
- Morgan, C. (1990). Reading like a writer. In J. L. Collins (Ed.), *Vital Signs* (pp. 60-70). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Murray, D. M. (1982). Teaching the other self: The writer's first reader. *College Composition and Communication*, 33(2), 140-147.
- Ong, W. J. (1983). Writing is a humanizing technology. *ADE Bulletin* 74, 13-16. doi: 10.1632/ade.74.13
- Pinker, S. (2014). *The sense of style: The thinking person's guide to writing in the 21st century*. New York: Viking.
- Rahman, M.A. (1981). *The history of the University of Dhaka*. Dhaka, Bangladesh: The University of Dhaka.
- Shamsuzzaman, M., Everatt, J., & McNeill, B. (2014). An investigation of the relationship between teachers' backgrounds and the teaching of second language writing in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Innovation in English Language Teaching and Research*, 3(1), 51-72
- Shamsuzzaman, M. (2014). Crossing borders: Writing in a second language. In C. McMaster & C. Murphy (Eds.), *Postgraduate study in Aotearoa New Zealand: Surviving and succeeding* (pp. 219-228). Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Silva, T. (2006). Second language writing. In K. E. Brown & A. Anderson (Eds.), *Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics* (Second ed., pp. 111-118).
- Smith, F. (1984). Myths of writing. *Language Arts*, 58 (7), 792-798.
- Sword, H. (2012). *Stylish academic writing*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press
- Tardy, C. (2010). Cleaning up the mess: Perspectives from a novice theory builder. In T. Silva and P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *Practicing theory in second language writing* (pp. 112-125). West Lafayette, Indiana: Parlor Press.
- Tate, G. (1993). A place for literature in freshman composition. *College English*, 55(3), 317-321. doi:10.2307/378744
- Toor, R. (2007). No bad authors. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved September 17, 2016, from <http://www.chronicle.com/article/No-Bad-Authors/46591>
- Thomas, F., & Turner, M. (1994). *Clear and simple as the truth: Writing classic prose*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Zinsser, W. K. (1998). *On writing well: The classic guide to writing nonfiction*. New York, NY: Harper Perennial.