Academicus Magazine

Revista Multidisciplinar
Versão Online - ISSN: 3005-3633
Vol. 4, N°2, pp.132-147, 2026
http://www.revista.academicuspro.ao

From Rote Learning to Critical Literacy: Reframing English Literature Pedagogy in Nepal and Bangladesh [1]

Ramesh Prasad Adhikary [2]
Sheikh Saifullah Ahmed[3]

Recebido: 05.08.2026
Aceito: 10.05.2026
Publicado: 16.11.2026

Abstract: In Nepal and Bangladesh, English is institutionalized and taught, but its use in the classroom tends to focus on the reproduction of a certain canon of texts, teacher explanation and examination rather than dialogue and interpretation, critical inquiry and questioning. This integrative review critically synthesizes existing and contemporary studies on reader response, stylistics, critical literacy, multimodality, translanguaging, this review is not meant to provide an exhaustive list, but rather to analyze and synthesize a carefully selected group of peer-reviewed research studies and foundational scholarship that directly relates to literature learning, multilingual education, EMI, assessment washback, and English education in South Asia. A disjunction is identified, but occurs repeatedly. International scholarship has come to think of literary reading as transactional, where reading is seen as having a linguistic basis, situational, and multimodally reconstructed, while the institutional contexts reported in Nepal and Bangladesh often produce memorized answers and monologic transmission. In this regard, this study suggests a framework called Response-Text-Power-Design. It integrates affective and dialogic response, close attention to text form, and analysis of ideology and representation, creative redesign across modes, and multilingual scaffolding, teacher assessment alignment, and teacher learning as enabling conditions. The article posits that reform is about removing individual techniques and mandating that interaction be in English. It should instead redesign the relationship among curriculum, classroom discourse, assessment, and teacher development.

***Keywords*:** English literature pedagogy, critical literacy, Nepal, Bangladesh, reader response, stylistics, multimodality, English-medium instruction, translanguaging, assessment.

Da Aprendizagem Mecânica ao Letramento Crítico: Reconfigurando a Pedagogia da Literatura Inglesa no Nepal e em Bangladesh

Resumo: *No Nepal e em Bangladesh, a língua inglesa está institucionalizada e é ensinada; contudo, seu uso em sala de aula tende a focar na reprodução de um determinado cânone de textos, em explicações dadas pelo professor e em exames, em vez de privilegiar o diálogo, a interpretação, a investigação crítica e o questionamento. Esta revisão integrativa sintetiza, de forma crítica, estudos contemporâneos sobre a resposta do leitor, estilística, letramento crítico, multimodalidade e *translanguaging* (translinguagem). O objetivo não é apresentar uma lista exaustiva, mas sim analisar e sintetizar um conjunto criteriosamente selecionado de pesquisas revisadas por pares e obras de referência que tratam diretamente da aprendizagem de literatura, educação multilíngue, ensino de conteúdos em inglês (EMI), os efeitos da avaliação no ensino (*washback*) e o ensino de inglês no Sul da Ásia. Identifica-se uma discrepância recorrente: enquanto a literatura acadêmica internacional compreende a leitura literária como um processo transacional — fundamentado na linguagem, situado e reconstruído de forma multimodal —, os contextos institucionais relatados no Nepal e em Bangladesh frequentemente resultam em respostas memorizadas e em uma transmissão monológica. Diante disso, este estudo propõe uma estrutura denominada "Resposta-Texto-Poder-Design" (*Response-Text-Power-Design*). Essa abordagem integra a resposta afetiva e dialógica, a atenção minuciosa à forma textual, a análise de ideologias e representações, a reconfiguração criativa por meio de diferentes modos de linguagem, além de oferecer suporte multilíngue (*scaffolding*), alinhamento entre avaliação e ensino, e o desenvolvimento profissional docente como condições facilitadoras. O artigo argumenta que uma reforma educacional não deve se limitar à adoção de técnicas isoladas ou à imposição do uso exclusivo do inglês nas interações; ao contrário, ela deve reconfigurar a relação entre currículo, discurso em sala de aula, avaliação e formação de professores.*

Palavras-chave: *pedagogia da literatura inglesa, letramento crítico, Nepal, Bangladesh, resposta do leitor, estilística, multimodalidade, ensino de conteúdos em inglês (EMI), *translanguaging* (translinguagem), avaliação*

Del aprendizaje memorístico a la alfabetización crítica: replanteando la pedagogía de la literatura inglesa en Nepal y Bangladés

Resumen: *En Nepal y Bangladés, el inglés está institucionalizado y se enseña en el sistema educativo; sin embargo, su uso en el aula tiende a centrarse en la reproducción de un canon específico de textos, en las explicaciones del docente y en los exámenes, en lugar de fomentar el diálogo, la interpretación, la indagación crítica y el cuestionamiento. Esta revisión integradora sintetiza de manera crítica estudios existentes y contemporáneos sobre la respuesta del lector, la estilística, la alfabetización crítica, la multimodalidad y el *translanguaging* (uso flexible de lenguas). El objetivo no es ofrecer una lista exhaustiva, sino analizar y sintetizar un conjunto cuidadosamente seleccionado de investigaciones revisadas por pares y trabajos académicos fundamentales que guardan relación directa con el aprendizaje de la literatura, la educación multilingüe, la enseñanza en inglés (*English-medium instruction* o EMI), el impacto de la evaluación en la enseñanza (*washback*) y la educación en inglés en el sur de Asia. Se identifica una disyunción recurrente: mientras que la literatura académica internacional concibe la lectura literaria como un proceso transaccional —basado en el lenguaje, situado y reconstruido de forma multimodal—, los contextos institucionales descritos en Nepal y Bangladés a menudo derivan en respuestas memorizadas y en una transmisión monológica. Ante este panorama, el presente estudio propone un marco denominado «Respuesta-Texto-Poder-Diseño» (*Response-Text-Power-Design*). Este enfoque integra la respuesta afectiva y dialógica, una atención minuciosa a la forma textual, el análisis de la ideología y la representación, el rediseño creativo a través de diversos modos, el andamiaje multilingüe, la alineación de la evaluación docente y el aprendizaje del profesorado como condiciones facilitadoras. El artículo sostiene que la reforma educativa no debe limitarse a eliminar técnicas aisladas o a imponer el uso exclusivo del inglés en la interacción; por el contrario, propone rediseñar la relación entre el currículo, el discurso en el aula, la evaluación y el desarrollo profesional docente.*

Palabras clave: *pedagogía de la literatura inglesa, alfabetización crítica, Nepal, Bangladés, respuesta del lector, estilística, multimodalidad, enseñanza en inglés (*English-medium instruction*), *translanguaging*, evaluación.*

[1] **DOI:** https://doi.org/10.4314/academicus.v4i2.14
[2] Tribhuvan University, Nepal. ramesh.adhikari@mahemc.tu.edu.np
[3] International University of Business Agriculture and Technology, Dhaka, Bangladesh ahmed.saifullah@iubat.edu

Academia de Investigação Científica
CC BY NC ND

Versão Online - ISSN: 3005-3633
Vol. 4, N°2, pp.132-147, 2026
http://www.revista.academicuspro.ao

Introduction

English literature is in an ambivalent situation in the education system of Nepal and Bangladesh. Generally viewed as a valued part of English education and a pathway to capital in language, culture, and academic success. Concurrently, the methods of instruction used in the teaching of literature often restrict the very skills one is expected to acquire in a literary course. Students may be asked to provide biographical information, plot summaries, conventional readings, and notes provided by the teacher, but fewer opportunities are provided to make claims, test claims and interpretations against evidence, consider cultural assumptions, or relate literary language to their own multilingual experiences. The outcome is a paradox: literature is institutionally valued for its humanistic and linguistic benefits, while the prevailing routines in teaching and assessment could diminish it to a recall of information. Research on instructed second-language literature (ISL) shows that gains are most likely to be observed when literary reading has been linked to meaningful language use and interpretation, rather than merely being viewed as a means of exposure (Paran, 2008).

The need for such integration is especially pressing in Nepal and Bangladesh. Both are multilingual, stratified societies and have been influenced by unequal access to the English language throughout history. English is linked to mobility, to higher education, to private schools, to transnational opportunity and is unevenly distributed. Research on English-in-education policies in Bangladesh has identified that English curricular goals are not reflected in the classroom, partly due to inadequate teacher preparation, large class sizes and examination pressures (Chowdhury & Kabir, 2014; Hamid, 2010; Hamid & Honan, 2012; Rahman & Pandian, 2018). The same can be seen in Nepal, where expansion of EMI is associated with the desire for quality and status and pedagogical and equity issues arise when support from institutions, teachers, and multilingualism are not adequately addressed (Phyak, 2013; Sah & Li, 2018). While many of these studies are not specific to literature classrooms, they help to characterize the policy and instructional context for literature instruction.

Assessment compounds the problem. Research on washback shows that tests have an impact on what is taught, how it is taught, and how effort is distributed while being taken (Alderson & Wall, 1993). Assessment research in Bangladesh has identified conflicts between policy statements, assessment practices, and classroom learning; one of which is a persistent focus on reproducing discrete knowledge (Sultana, 2019). Dialogic and creative work is difficult to sustain in environments where exams are only about standardised summaries or decontextualised information, as it seems to be of little relevance for success. The problem is not, however, one of lack of interest in critical reading on the part of teachers or students. They make sense of the logic of their practices, given institutional incentives, the available resources, and the language risk.

Along with important pedagogical resources, existing scholarship reveals three limits that are relevant to the present context. First, theories like reader response, stylistics, critical literacy, multimodality, translanguaging, and others are being spoken of in isolation. Teachers are thus given techniques, not a unified process for sequencing response, analysis, critique and production. Second, international recommendations may minimize the demands of large classes, varying levels of English proficiency, and high-stakes testing, and may not account for limited access to digital technologies. Thirdly, the evidence base directly relevant to English literature teaching in the context of Nepal and Bangladesh is rather limited. The statements on local classroom practice need to be made with prudence and differentiate from those based on broader EMI, English language teaching, and assessment research.

This article is a critical integrative review to better address these limitations. It poses three questions: (a) What principles emerge from major approaches to contemporary literature pedagogy? (b) What are the implications of these pedagogical principles for teachers and students? (c) What are the implications of these pedagogical principles for teachers and students? (b) What context-

sensitive framework can accommodate literary response and textual analysis, critical literacy, multilingual practice and assessment? and (c) How do the documented educational contexts of Nepal and Bangladesh support or hinder those principles? To this, the article suggests a Response-Text-Power-Design (RTPD) framework. The framework is not an empirically tested intervention, but rather a conceptual synthesis. It aims to make pedagogical decisions and to identify institutional supports needed for the implementation.

The key idea is that transitioning from rote-learned to critical literacy is not possible through the introduction of additional group work, digital projects, or personal-response questions into an unchanged system. There are three enabling conditions and four dimensions of classroom practice that must align in order to reform. There must be organised opportunities for pupils to respond to texts, provision to support them to draw meaning from the language, ways for them to investigate power and representation and activities that redesign meaning through speech, writing, performance and digital forms. The practices need to be scaffolded in multiple languages, assessed for interpretation and evidence, and supported by ongoing teacher learning. If there is no alignment, it is probable that innovative activities will continue to be peripheral; if there is alignment, literature can be a viable location for academic language development, cultural negotiation, and critical participation.

Conceptual Foundations: From Literary Knowledge to Critical Literacy

The first step in any pedagogy of literature is to define what constitutes the learning of literature. In a transmission model, knowledge is presented as a fixed collection of information on authors, periods, genres, themes and accepted interpretations. Such knowledge is not irrelevant. History, genre and specialist terminology can aid interpretation. The trouble is when they are the end of instruction and when students are assessed primarily on how well they can repeat them. In a critical-literacy orientation, literacy is no longer considered as a body of knowledge to be acquired, but as a resource for inquiry. Contextual facts transform into resources to explain why a text is in a specific form; who is the focus of the text; how readers are positioned in the text through language; and how interpretations vary across social locations.

The beginning is important because of Rosenblatt's (1995) transactional account. Reading is not simply the drawing out of meaning from a standalone text, nor is it the free expression of a reader's emotions. It is an event that occurs during an interaction between a specific reader and a specific text in a certain context. There are two pedagogical implications arising from this position. First, students' prior knowledge, language, feelings and social experiences are valid sources of learning. Second, responses continue to be text- and context-dependent. Reader response is thus more likely to be effective when teachers guide students from noticing and feeling, to comparing, explaining, and revising interpretations.

Stylistics contributes the analytical discipline required for that movement. Stylistic inquiry questions: How does the patterning of language help create literary effects? The analysis is not an act of memorising features, but an act of interpretation based on the features that are presented (Jeffries & McIntyre, 2010; Simpson, 2004; Stockwell, 2002). In a multilingual classroom, this can make literary discussion more democratic since the student does not have to have a lot of background knowledge of the canon before making a defendable comment. They can start by what they can see in the language. However, stylistics becomes reductive when it is taught as device spotting. An analysis of a metaphor or alliteration must include an explanation of what it does and what it does not do in the way it is used, and how other language choices would alter its impact.

A critical literacy includes an overt focus on power. Freire (2000) commentary on banking education is still applicable when students are placed in a receiving and interpreting role. Not everything is political, nor does critical literacy ask students to take the stance of the teacher. It involves looking at the way texts create social worlds, sustain social notions, distribute social

agency, and prompt social identification. Janks (2010) sees critical literacy as a connected set of issues of domination, access, diversity and design. This will be especially helpful in postcolonial and multilingual contexts, especially with regard to English literature. Students should have access to dominant academic and literary norms, but not at the expense of ignoring or eradicating linguistic diversity or uncritically accepting the authority of the canon. They also require opportunities to revisit texts and discourses and to create alternate versions that reveal other voices and possibilities.

Similarly, Luke (2012) notes that critical literacy requires an examination of the ways texts operate with institutions and social interests. In Nepal and Bangladesh, it includes challenging the historical legitimacy of the British and American canon, the differential weight of English, and the portrayal of class, caste, ethnicity, religion, gender, region, and nation. Questions should be based on a careful reading and not an overall ideological assessment. The critical question, "Whose voice is missing?" is more academically productive when combined with these questions in the text: Who speaks? Who is described but not heard? Which verbs assign agency? What are the interiorities of which perspectives? What information does the text rely on as background knowledge? These pairings are a connection of critique and evidence.

Multiliteracies and multimodality broaden the concept of evidence and production. The New London Group (1996) maintained that the teaching of literacy needs to include the reality of linguistic and cultural multiplicity, as well as an increasing emphasis on visual, spatial, aural, and digital ways of knowing. Later research in multimodality highlighted that meaning is distributed amongst modes, and that learners are not merely consumers of texts, but producers of representations for specific audiences and purposes (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009; Jewitt, 2008; Kress, 2010). Multimodality in literature learning may involve performing literary work, visualizing maps, audioreading and interpretation, digital marking, adaptation and comparison between print and screen. These practices are educational if they involve making decisions in design that the students must clarify. A video or poster can be critical or analytical, it is not a given. Its worth is about the ability of the students to explain how changes in image, sound, sequencing, voice or language lead to an interpretation.

Multilingualism should not be regarded as a problem to be hidden and should be seen instead as a tool for learning. The multilingual learners' ability to understand, discuss, and construct meaning across their integrated repertoires is demonstrated by translanguaging scholarship (García & Li Wei, 2014). Pedagogical translanguaging is a conscious approach to using L2 and L1 to support learning with a clear focus on L2 development (Cenoz & Gorter, 2022). In the classroom, students could be asked to annotate a challenging passage in Nepali or Bangla, share cultural similarities with a known text in a familiar language, and then draw conclusions about the passage using evidence from the text in English. Unlike a translation that does not involve engagement with the literary text and is only a first language summary. The important question is not whether local languages exist or don't exist, but what type of cognitive and communicative function do they serve?

Together, these traditions suggest that critical literature pedagogy is not a single method. An intentional journey from engagement through evidence, the social analysis, and redesign. Reader response, if it isn't used in the discipline of text, can turn anecdotal. A mechanical stylistics is possible without response. Close reading can turn into assertion if it's critical literacy. Explanatory interpretation is essential to make multimodality use not a decoration. Scaffolding is needed for students' understanding and to support their learning of English; otherwise, English-only instruction may make students silent; while unrestricted L1 may limit students' chances to acquire academic English. These strengths and risks need to be coordinated through an integrated framework.

Methodology

The critical integrative review design is employed in this article. Integrative reviews are

useful when a research problem is studied from various theoretical traditions, methods, and levels of analysis and when the objective is to synthesize concepts not aimed at calculating a pooled effect (Grant & Booth, 2009; Snyder, 2019). The article is not a systematic review and meta-analysis because the available literature is heterogeneous and due to limited direct empirical base of English literature classrooms in Nepal and Bangladesh.

The review is based on three overlapping literatures. The first relates to literature pedagogy such as reader response, stylistics, second-language literary reading, critical literacy, and multimodality. The second one is about EMI, multilingualism, Global Englishes, and translanguaging. The third concerns English education, policy and assessment in Nepal and Bangladesh. The material published prior to 2000 was preserved if it introduces concepts that remain at the core of ongoing discussion, such as transactional reading, critical pedagogy, washback and multiliteracies. In the case of EMI, multimodality, Global Englishes, and South Asian policy conditions, more recent studies were given priority.

Sources were included when they were directly related to at least one of four analytical questions: How students interact with literary texts; How interpretations are based on language; How texts relate to identity and power; and How learners reformulate meaning across modes. Studies of context were added when they reported conditions related to the implementation of the study that were not part of the treatment, such as language policy, teacher capacity, classroom interaction, inequality, or assessment. Claims not related to the pedagogical context or claims without a research foundation, which were of a literary nature, were not included in the sources.

Iterative thematic synthesis (Thomas & Harden, 2008) was used for analysis. The initial concepts were grouped in reader response, stylistics, critical literacy, multimodality, EMI and multilingualism, and assessment. When comparing across these categories, four pedagogical dimensions emerged - Response, Text, Power, and Design - and three enabling conditions that span the comparison - multilingual scaffolding, assessment alignment, and teacher learning. The synthesis also separated out direct evidence from literature classrooms from contextual inference from other English education research literature. This distinction is important because while an EMI study and an assessment study may inform about potential constraints, they do not replace classroom-based evidence of the functioning of specific literary pedagogies in Nepal or Bangladesh.

Table 1 - Analytical Domains and Evidentiary Use in the Review

Domain	Central analytical question	Representative evidence	Interpretive caution
Reader response	How do learners enter, negotiate, and revise literary meaning?	Rosenblatt (1995); Miall and Kuiken (2002); Whiteley and Canning (2017)	Personal response requires textual and contextual grounding.
Stylistics	How do linguistic and formal choices produce literary effects?	Hanauer (2001); Simpson (2004); Jeffries and McIntyre (2010)	Feature identification is not analysis unless linked to interpretive function.
Critical literacy	How do texts distribute voice, authority, agency, and exclusion?	Freire (2000); Janks (2010); Luke (2012)	Critical claims require evidence and should not compel ideological agreement.
Multimodality	How can learners redesign interpretation across modes and audiences?	New London Group (1996); Jewitt (2008); Kress (2010); Li (2020)	Creative production needs an analytical rationale and equitable access.

Domain	Central analytical question	Representative evidence	Interpretive caution
EMI and multilingualism	How do language policy and multilingual repertoires shape participation?	Macaro et al. (2018); Sah and Li (2018, 2022); Cenoz and Gorter (2022)	Broader EMI research explains conditions but cannot replace literature-specific evidence.
Assessment and context	Which incentives sustain reproduction or enable interpretation?	Alderson and Wall (1993); Sultana (2019); Bangladesh and Nepal policy studies	National claims must distinguish documented evidence from contextual inference.

Note. The review integrates theoretical, empirical, and policy-oriented sources; it does not treat the corpus as an exhaustive systematic sample.

Pedagogical Evidence and Its Implications

Reader Response, Affect, and Dialogic Interpretation

The Reader-response pedagogy calls into question the notion that a teacher's interpretation must precede and control students' encounters with a text. Empirical and stylistic research on reader response focuses on the interaction between affect, attention and text features (Beach, 1993; Rosenblatt, 1995; Miall & Kuiken, 2002; Whiteley & Canning, 2017). This orientation will reduce the barriers to participation for second-language learners. Students may not have the metalanguage to discuss perspective of the narrative or figurative patterning initially, but they can spot a surprise, discomfort, sympathy, confusion, or recognition. These answers bring forth a place for questioning.

Affective engagement should not be confused with unstructured opinion. The pedagogical challenge is to convert an initial response into an interpretive problem. A teacher could have students circle a line that affected their interpretation of the character, discuss the lines that the students circled, and discuss which words or narrative choices caused the change in interpretation. The series maintains a personal connection and also includes evidence. It also allows for healthy conflict. Rather than determining which student is "right," the class reviews interpretations to determine which interpretation better fits the text pattern and context.

Dialogic structures are especially useful in environments where students are not keen to speak English in a public forum. Use of pair rehearsal, small group annotation, written response cards and rotating discussion roles can help to achieve a more equitable distribution of participation than whole class questioning. Linguistic risk can be further mitigated by using local languages in the early stages of sense making, if the task ultimately has a well-defined English-language target. For instance, students may discuss a scene in Bangla or Nepali that they don't know from a culture and then make a claim of two sentences backed up by a quotation in English. The process accommodates bilingual thinking and the development of academic English.

Stylistics and Evidence-Based Literary Argument

Stylistics is a link between language learning and literary interpretation. In an approach to second language poetry reading, Hanauer (2001) has shown how literary language can guide attention to form without compromising the engagement with meaning. Suitable analytical categories, such as perspective, characterization, ideology, and reader positioning, are provided by Simpson (2004) and Jeffries and McIntyre (2010) that allow students to make links between grammatical and lexical decisions and the positioning of readers and their attitudes. Cognitive stylistics, in turn, explores how schemata, attention and imagined worlds are "evoked" or "triggered" by textual features (Stockwell, 2002).

However, the typical way individuals identify figures of speech is not the same as stylistic analysis. The significance of the device label is brought to life when it is linked to function, pattern

Versão Online - ISSN: 3005-3633
Vol. 4, N°2, pp.132-147, 2026
http://www.revista.academicuspro.ao

and alternatives. A teacher might instead ask students to describe the agency that the personification bestows on an object, its impact on tone, and what is different if the line were written literally. Likewise, analysis of transitivity can reveal who does what, who does what to, and what events are represented as happening without an agent. These questions link grammar and interpretation and pave the way for critical analysis.

A sequence of stylistic activity can proceed from noticing, naming, patterning and interpreting. Students first circle unusual or repetitive language. Then they are introduced to a small vocabulary of metalanguage to describe it. They then explore if the feature can be identified throughout the text. They make an interpretation and then compare alternative interpretations. This series keeps the students from being overloaded with terms. It also helps with academic writing as each paragraph may contain a statement, evidence, analysis, and implications.

Critical, Postcolonial, and Intercultural Reading

Critical literacy encourages students to analyse the process whereby legitimacy is created in literary texts and in the institutions in which they are embedded. It is especially relevant in Nepal and Bangladesh where English literature was introduced in formal education through colonial and postcolonial past and is linked to cultural authority. In a critical pedagogy there is no need to abandon British literature or American literature. It demands that the canon be made accessible for enquiry, that it be translated into that enquiry, and circulated within it, and that it be interpreted within that circulation. Pupils may question why some texts are being taught again, the value of local texts in English, and the impact of English upon access to literary study.

Janks's (2010) framework proves useful since it avoids the dichotomy of access to dominant forms and resistance to them. Academic English, canonical genres, and institutional conventions are important educational resources that students must access. Access should be accompanied with analysis of domination, recognition of diversity, and opportunities for design at the same time. A classroom can then explore the conventions of a Shakespearean sonnet, differentiate between the forms that became canon and those that didn't, compare the poem with what is being written in a local or contemporary context, and get students to reimagine the central conflict of the poem for a modern audience.

The text's precision should be maintained in critical reading. Students' ability to analyze the supporting elements of narration, characterization, imagery, dialogue, or genre to substantiate a text's colonial, patriarchal, elitist, or liberating qualities is analytically weak when supported by broad claims. In Luke's (2012) account of critical literacy this micro analysis is linked with the social context as readers examine how textual choices function in broader histories and institutions. In the vein of understanding how signs take on varied meanings within different contexts, Kramsch's (2006) notion of symbolic competence includes the idea of ambiguity, positioning, and attention to signs. For this purpose, literature is particularly well suited, as it is difficult to simply extract information from it, due to the fact that it is spoken in an ironic style, has polyphony and is not always narrated in a reliable manner.

Ethical classroom practice is also a component of critical literacy. Teachers need to differentiate between critical inquiry and “required” agreement. Students must be allowed time to explore meanings, come up with counterarguments, and to change their stances. If teachers talk about gender, caste, class, ethnicity, religion, or national identity without protection in place, or if teachers speak on behalf of minority students, then they can inflict harm. Text selection and facilitation is important. The curriculum should not just be made more representative by introducing additional authors to an unchanged method. It should explore relationships between voice, language, audience and power in all texts (including local and canonical).

Multimodality, Tasks, and Redesign

Multimodal pedagogy acknowledges the way the contemporary world presents stories in the form of print, film, audio, image, social media, performance, and interactive media. Jewitt (2008) and Kress (2010) demonstrate that modes differ in that they make different affordances available: sound foregrounds rhythm and emotion; image foregrounds spatial organization for attention; performance foregrounds embodied relationships that are not obvious in print. The New London Group's (1996) notion of design then, and Cope and Kalantzis's (2009) subsequent revision of multiliteracies, situate learners as active designers who renegotiate meanings made available.

This can be applied in low-tech and digital tasks in literature classrooms. Students can form a tableau of a conflict, draw a spatial map of a story, write a reading aloud that explains pace and emphasis decisions, retell a scene from a marginalised point of view or make comparisons between the printed text and the film version of a story. These tasks are difficult if they are supported with an analytical rationale. Students should cite evidence in the text that helped them to redesign, describe what the new mode makes visible and invisible, and assess the advantages and disadvantages.

The inequality of the resources should remain at the core. Multimodality is not synonymous with high-tech! Smartphone video is useful for production, if available, but paper-based storyboards, voice performance and collaborative annotation can also be used to achieve similar interpretive objectives. High bandwidth platforms could exacerbate disparities between students. The context-sensitive design is one that recognizes the learning function and then applies the least exclusionary mode that can be used for this function.

EMI, Global Englishes, and Multilingual Scaffolding

EMI has grown into a global phenomenon because institutions are seeing English as related to visibility, mobility and employability. However, there is some systematic and comparative research on the parameters that influence the outcomes achieved in EMI based instruction, such as language support, teacher preparation, interactional practice, and prior proficiency (Coleman, 2006; Macaro et al., 2018). Literary language can be lexical, unfamiliar to the reader or writer, figurative, and deliberately ambiguous, which can further intensify these demands. If the English is not consistent, teachers are forced to paraphrase and translate, and students use guidebooks and memorized summaries.

The research in Nepal, English-medium policies can be used as a linguistic capital and yet they can also be a means of perpetuating inequalities and a medium for delivering a mismatch between policy intent and classroom realities (Sah & Li, 2018). More generally, Phyak (2013) demonstrates the relationship between medium-of-instruction policy and language ideologies and local multilingual realities. Ambition for communicative competence and global participation has also influenced English policy in Bangladesh, as evidenced by studies of the persistent constraints on it, such as teacher capacity, teacher materials, class size, and assessment (Chowdhury & Kabir, 2014; Hamid, 2010; Rahman & Pandian, 2018). These circumstances make English-only literature teaching an unreliable measure of quality.

A Global Englishes perspective challenges the notion of using one native-speaker norm as the sole target for teaching. Galloway and Numajiri (2020) and Rose et al. (2021) advocate for pedagogies that equip learners to communicate in diverse Englishes and with an awareness of social meaning associated with linguistic variation. In the context of literature teaching, this helps to incorporate south Asian writing in English, translation literature, and multiple Englishes. It further allows for the study of accent, code-switching, register and linguistic identity as literary choices and not errors.

Multilingualization scaffolding can be planned at three levels. Students can "activate" and expand cultural knowledge, preview concepts or compare important terms across languages before

Versão Online - ISSN: 3005-3633
Vol. 4, N°2, pp.132-147, 2026
http://www.revista.academicuspro.ao

reading. In reading, they could perform bilingual annotation, collaborative paraphrase or select appropriate excerpts translated into the target language to overcome obstacles in the reading process without losing focus on the original text. After reading, they may plan ideas multilingually and produce an English interpretation, or create a bilingual artifact for a specified audience. The function of language choice needs to be made clear in each stage.

Nepal and Bangladesh: Contextual Constraints and Possibilities

Nepal

Parental aspiration, institutional competition and perception of quality are closely linked to the increasing use of English in education in Nepal. Sah and Li (2018) demonstrate that EMI is sometimes referred to as a form of linguistic capital, but they argue that this benefit is unequal due to the unequal resources that schools and learners have. The analysis of language policy by Phyak (2013) is also helpful in showing that decisions of the MOI are not merely pedagogical but also ideological. They're important for literature because a text that's difficult can be a challenge on the language level, not an opportunity to interpret it.

The evidence was not overwhelming that the Nepalese literature classroom is entirely dominated by rote learning, as focused classroom study is still restricted. However, there is one plausible implementation issue for which it provides support: that when teachers are required to teach prescriptively in English in a field where they have little training and uneven levels of student proficiency, explanation, translation, and note giving are efficient institutional devices. Innovation, therefore, cannot increase unmanageable workload, but must decrease it. Partially integrating short response routines, restricting stylistic metalanguage, planning bilingually and using common analytical rubrics are more manageable than complete technological change.

Nepal has also valuable pedagogical resources. Students carry with them many languages, oral traditions, religious and regional stories, and experiences of social and geographical difference. These resources can be used as a support to comparative interpretation and critical discussion. English works and literature translated from Nepal can be considered to be in dialogue with the canonical works not as auxiliary cultural ornament but as equal analytical seriousness. These can turn questions of voice, translation, audience and identity key to literary investigation.

Bangladesh

The communicative objectives of English education have been a goal of Bangladesh for decades, and gaps between curriculum, classroom practice, teacher capacity, and assessment have been reported over and over again (Chowdhury & Kabir, 2014; Hamid & Honan, 2012; Rahman & Pandian, 2018). Sultana (2019) has pointed out that the systemic issues discussed in the study on English language assessment are relevant to the study of washback. In literature classes, such circumstances can lead to a reliance on summaries and model answers and predictable thematic questions especially in high-stakes tests where marking criteria for the open interpretation are vague.

Similar to Nepal, the body of evidence is not comprehensive enough to make blanket statements about the literature. However, a number of priorities emerge from the wider research. Teachers require assessment tools that show and record interpretive quality. Practice is needed with using quotations, explaining language, and counter interpreting. Multilingual discussion should be organized in a way that Bangla can help understanding and conceptualization and English can be a useful language for academic production. Digital tasks should be created with access in mind, as there is variation in devices, connection and institutional support.

Bangladesh has also a body of writings in English and in translation that students can use to explore issues of language, nation, partition, migration, gender, class, ecology, and urban-rural change. Such texts, if incorporated, can also make the assumption that English literature is the same

Versão Online - ISSN: 3005-3633
Vol. 4, N°2, pp.132-147, 2026
http://www.revista.academicuspro.ao

as British and American literature more complex. Important is not just the inclusion of a local author, but the extent to which classroom practice enables students to engage with how local experience is mediated, by means of English, and by means of transnational publishing conventions.

Comparative Synthesis

Nepal and Bangladesh have distinct political past, linguistic environment and institutional structure and curriculum. These should not be used as a "drop in" replacement for other cases. Despite this, the examined scholarship points to some common tensions: English is both opportunity and inequality; an orientation towards opportunities in communicative or critical curricula coexists with routine oriented towards examination; teacher agency is limited by training or workload; and multilingual practice is widespread but not always well planned. These likenesses warrant a comparative approach, and the differences call for local adaptations. Recent research on the implementation of EMI in the Global South also supports the need to consider English-medium expansion based on participation and equity rather than prestige (Sah & Li, 2022).

The most important comparative conclusion is that pedagogy cannot be separated from system design. These practices are likely to be fragile if assessment is based on reproduction or if marking criteria punish different interpretations or if participation is deemed risky due to English-only policy. On the other hand, if there are no classroom routines that can be used, then the systemic reform will remain abstract. Transformation needs to be aligned with the level of the task, with the level of curriculum, assessment, and professional learning.

The Response-Text-Power-Design Framework

The Response-Text-Power-Design (RTPD) framework brings together the literature into a pedagogical cycle that can be learned. It does not have a one-size-fits-all lesson structure and does not require the same share of time for each dimension each lesson. It is intended to prevent literature instruction from becoming a matter of understanding, personal response, device identification and ideology interpretation. Students in a unit should have access to four interconnected ways of working across a unit.

Response involves attention, affect, and prior knowledge, as well as dialogic meaning. Students recognize when something surprises them, connects them, is uncertain, resists, or changes. Structured talk and writing extend participation and promotes reactions into questions for the teachers. Response sets up investment and brings up the diversity of interpretation.

Text concerns evidence, language, form and genre. Students explore the effects of lexical, grammatical, narrative, poetic and structural choices. They develop a manageable analytical vocabulary and apply quotations appropriately. Initial responses are complicated and reinforced by the analysis of text.

Power entails representation, voice, ideology and institutions. Students ask who speaks, who acts, who is silenced, what is normalised, how is the text part of histories of language and culture? They make comparisons and think about how readers in different settings might read the text. Power analysis is still responsible to the text and history.

Design is about change and sharing. Students interpret and then rephrase, perform, modify, translate, visualize, or digitally display a text for a specified audience. They describe their design decisions and assess the positive and negative aspects of change and the ethical considerations. Design facilitates the visibility of learning and transfer across modes.

Table 2 - The Response-Text-Power-Design Framework

Dimension	Student activity	Teacher mediation	Assessable evidence
Response	Notice, connect, question, compare, and revise initial interpretations.	Create low-risk entry points and turn reactions into interpretive problems.	A focused response that identifies a textual trigger and a defensible question.
Text	Analyze lexical, grammatical, narrative, poetic, and structural patterns.	Teach limited metalanguage and model claim-evidence-explanation reasoning.	Accurate quotation, pattern recognition, and explanation of literary effect.
Power	Investigate voice, agency, assumptions, representation, and alternative positions.	Connect close reading with historical and institutional context; protect ethical dialogue.	A critical claim supported by textual evidence, context, and counterinterpretation.
Design	Adapt, perform, translate, visualize, or digitally redesign meaning for an audience.	Require justification of modal and linguistic choices; address access constraints.	A purposeful artifact accompanied by an analytical rationale and reflection.

Note. The four dimensions are recursive rather than strictly sequential. Multilingual scaffolding, assessment alignment, and teacher learning operate across all four.

Enabling Condition 1: Multilingual Scaffolding

To implement an RTPD cycle, there needs to be a language policy that separates access from outcome. Students can trigger their knowledge, negotiate hard meanings, compare ideas, and plan ideas in Bangla, Nepali and other languages. Then, depending on the central objective of the course (oral claim, analytical paragraph, presentation or reflective commentary), English outcomes are elaborated. As students gain control, the teacher can slowly decrease the amount of support or input.

Very helpful routines are bilingual glossaries developed by students, paired discussion and then reporting in English, translation comparison, and contrastive analysis of important terms. These routines must not be viewed as "transparent equivalents" of local languages. Translation alters the meaning of the literature, and a change of meaning can be a study in itself. Multilingual scaffolding therefore serves as a means to access and critical language awareness.

Enabling Condition 2: Assessment Alignment

The critical element to sustainable reform is assessment. If the exam is a success, students will rationally value recall. The assessment system must sample the same capabilities that are taught in RTPD: response informed by evidence, analysis of language, critical interpretation, and purposeful redesign. No need to give up on written examinations. It entails altering the types of questions asked in exams and the way in which they are marked.

A literature examination may give a short unseen passage and require students to make an interpretation based on two linguistic features. It can have two possible interpretations and invite students to consider them. It can require students to make comparisons between the development of a theme in a studied text and an unseen text. A multimodal adaptation with an accompanying analytical commentary may be included in the coursework, with the emphasis given to reasoning rather than production quality.

A rubric should not lump together dimensions that are relevant to the task. An analytical rubric that is defensible might evaluate interpretive claim, textual evidence, language or form explanation, context and alternative perspectives, organization, and language control. While the

Versão Online - ISSN: 3005-3633
Vol. 4, N°2, pp.132-147, 2026
http://www.revista.academicuspro.ao

accuracy of language is important, it should not be the sole measure of conceptual accomplishment. Consistently grading open interpretation is a reason why shared exemplars and moderation are crucial.

Low-stakes formative assessment is to come before high-stakes tasks. Exit tickets, quotation-explanation pairs, one-paragraph interpretations, peer review and oral rehearsals are opportunities for frequent evidence of learning, yet with minimal or no marking. Feedback should include the action to be taken in the analysis: add evidence, explain a pattern, consider counterevidence, elaborate on context, or justify a design decision. This feedback is more beneficial than a generic comment on "being critical.

Enabling Condition 3: Teacher Learning and Institutional Support

Teachers require more than occasional training in the latest fads. Professional learning should be ongoing, content-specific, and relevant to teachers' instructional materials and assessments. A practical approach would involve collaborative planning, demonstration lessons, peer observation, student work inspection and task tweaking of common tasks. It is important for the teacher to be a student before they become a teacher.

Professional development needs to focus on a few key high leverage capabilities: Facilitating dialogic discussion; Teaching a small stylistic toolkit; Designing multilingual scaffolds; Managing sensitive critical topics; Designing low-cost multimodal tasks; and Reliably using analytical rubrics. Institutions should provide shared resource banks with adaptable tasks, model responses, and bilingual support rather than expecting individual teachers to redesign entire courses independently.

Workload and class size must be acknowledged. Teachers can use group roles, peer feedback using checklists, sampling of student work, and short common tasks in large classes. Technology can support with collaborative annotation or learning-management systems, but it is not presumed. The framework can be adapted to paper, board, voice and performance. Academic administrators need to ensure that planning time is protected and that the examinations of the various departments are coordinated with the pedagogical shifts desired of teachers.

A Context-Sensitive Reform Agenda

There are three levels for reform. At the classroom level, teachers can try to shift away from some summary-first teaching to a response-first sequence, focus on one or two textual features for close reading, and ask students to support their interpretations. They can employ local language strategically and incorporate low-cost redesign tasks. These changes are very small but very important in that they make students learn to be interpreters, not recipients.

Departments map at the program level where RTPD capabilities are introduced, practiced, and assessed within courses. Some introductory classes may focus on responding to and producing evidence; more advanced classes will require more complex stylistic, theoretical, and critical analysis. Use of common rubrics can enhance coherence. Reading lists may include both classical, South Asian, translated, and contemporary texts and maintain depth of study. It is not about numbers, it is about questions that support the curriculum, that activate language, power and circulation.

On the policy side, questions and marking schemes should be reconsidered by the examination boards and curriculum authorities at universities. Language support for students and pedagogical support for teachers must go along with policies that call for EMI. English-only policies should not be a substitute for quality instruction. Quality should be judged in terms of the depth of interaction, evidence, and the growing ability of the students to express complex interpretations in English.

Research Agenda

The review reveals that the literature has identified a significant gap in empirical studies in classrooms especially in English literature pedagogy in Nepal and Bangladesh. In the future, the scope of EMI or English language teaching evidence should not be used as a replacement for literature-specific inquiry. There are four main priorities in particular.

Design-based and quasi-experimental studies are recommended first to investigate and find out the integrated pedagogies. Studies could be conducted comparing the two approaches of summary-led instruction and RTPD-informed sequences, and the analysis of the test scores could also include the quality and content of the claims, evidence, language analysis, and participation. Mixed methods would be helpful due to the fact that it is hard to capture everything about interpretive development in one measure.

Second, further studies are needed on multilingual interaction in literature classrooms. Conversation analysis, stimulated recall, and classroom ethnography might reveal the moments when Bangla, Nepali and other languages facilitate interpretation and when they are used to stand in for engagement with English. Such evidence would help to provide more accurate direction than general arguments for or against code switching.

Third, assessment research should design and pilot tasks and rubrics for critical literary interpretation. Further research is needed to explore inter-rater reliability, the impact of the accuracy of language on evaluations of conceptual quality, and the washback of unseen-text and multimodal assessments. This is necessary if a critical literacy is to become an outcome of the course rather than a desired one.

Fourth, comparative research should preserve contextual difference. A holistic analysis of mediation between shared regional pressure and outcomes due to Curriculum, Institutional Sector, Language Ecology, Teacher Education and Student Background in Nepal and Bangladesh should be analyzed. Comparative work should encompass public and private institutions, urban and non-urban locations as well as secondary and higher education. It also ought to examine how students gain access to texts and technologies, while not making an assumption about digital participation.

Lastly, the study needs to focus on teachers' agency. Teachers tend to modify policy pragmatically, taking into account the requirements of the exam, linguistic accessibility and institutional expectations. Knowing these decisions and creations can bring about reforms that are realistic and not idealistic. Teachers should not be simply implementers of externally designed interventions and assessments, but co-designers of them.

Conclusion

English literature instruction in the context of Nepal and Bangladesh can only be revolutionized with more than a single trick. The reviewed scholarship reveals that personal and dialogic response, close consideration of the structure of the text, critical analysis of the construction of representation and power, and purposeful redesign across modes are all features of meaningful literary learning. These practices are consistent with language development provided that multilingual materials are planned for, English outcomes are clear and students are provided with repeated supports to shift from reaction to evidence-based interpretation. This integration can be organized using the Response-Text-Power-Design approach. It's not so much about the labels that it has, as it is about the alignment that it requires. The conception of knowledge should be shared in classroom activities, language policy, assessment, and teacher learning. If the purpose of examinations is to regurgitate summary information and EMI is viewed as an objective, then critical literacy will be peripheral. Literature can be a legitimate source of academic language development and democratic inquiry where students are required to make claims, present evidence, draw inferences, and argue for a perspective and design.

In Nepal, in Bangladesh, the objective is not to adopt a global pedagogy, and it is not to throw out the known literature. It's about the reorganization of that knowledge in the context of inquiry, evidence, plurality and participation. Such reform will enable literature classrooms to go beyond the reproduction approach while being conscious of linguistic inequality, institutional constraint and local cultural resources. It would result in a much stricter, more inclusive and more intellectually productive study of English.

References

Alderson, J. C., & Wall, D. (1993). Does washback exist? *Applied Linguistics, 14*(2), 115-129. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/14.2.115

Beach, R. (1993). *A teacher's introduction to reader-response theories*. National Council of Teachers of English.

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2022). *Pedagogical translanguaging*. Cambridge University Press.

Chowdhury, R., & Kabir, A. H. (2014). Language wars: English education policy and practice in Bangladesh. *Multilingual Education, 4*, Article 21. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13616-014-0021-2

Coleman, J. A. (2006). English-medium teaching in European higher education. *Language Teaching, 39*(1), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144480600320X

Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2009). Multiliteracies: New literacies, new learning. *Pedagogies: An International Journal, 4*(3), 164-195. https://doi.org/10.1080/15544800903076044

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th anniversary ed.; M. B. Ramos, Trans.). Continuum. (Original work published 1970)

Galloway, N., & Numajiri, T. (2020). Global Englishes language teaching: Bottom-up curriculum implementation. *TESOL Quarterly, 54*(1), 118-145. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.547

García, O., & Li Wei. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: An analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health Information and Libraries Journal, 26*(2), 91-108. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-1842.2009.00848.x

Hamid, M. O. (2010). Globalisation, English for everyone and English teacher capacity: Language policy discourses and realities in Bangladesh. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 11*(4), 289-310. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2011.532621

Hamid, M. O., & Honan, E. (2012). Communicative English in the primary classroom: Implications for English-in-education policy and practice in Bangladesh. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 25*(2), 139-156. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2012.678854

Hanauer, D. I. (2001). The task of poetry reading and second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 22*(3), 295-323. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/22.3.295

Janks, H. (2010). *Literacy and power*. Routledge.

Jeffries, L., & McIntyre, D. (2010). *Stylistics*. Cambridge University Press.

Jewitt, C. (2008). Multimodality and literacy in school classrooms. *Review of Research in Education, 32*(1), 241-267. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X07310586

Kramsch, C. (2006). From communicative competence to symbolic competence. *The Modern Language Journal, 90*(2), 249-252. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2006.00395_3.x

Kress, G. (2010). *Multimodality: A social semiotic approach to contemporary*

communication. Routledge.

Li, M. (2020). Multimodal pedagogy in TESOL teacher education: Students' perspectives. *System, 94*, Article 102337. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102337

Lo, Y. Y., & Macaro, E. (2012). The medium of instruction and classroom interaction: Evidence from Hong Kong secondary schools. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 15*(1), 29-52. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2011.588307

Luke, A. (2012). Critical literacy: Foundational notes. *Theory Into Practice, 51*(1), 4-11. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2012.636324

Macaro, E., Curle, S., Pun, J., An, J., & Dearden, J. (2018). A systematic review of English medium instruction in higher education. *Language Teaching, 51*(1), 36-76. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000350

Miall, D. S., & Kuiken, D. (2002). A feeling for fiction: Becoming what we behold. *Poetics, 30*(4), 221-241. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-422X(02)00011-6

New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*(1), 60-92. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.66.1.17370n67v22j160u

Paran, A. (2008). The role of literature in instructed foreign language learning and teaching: An evidence-based survey. *Language Teaching, 41*(4), 465-496. https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144480800520X

Phyak, P. (2013). Language ideologies and local languages as the medium-of-instruction policy: A critical ethnography of a multilingual school in Nepal. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 14*(1), 127-143. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2013.775557

Rahman, M. M., & Pandian, A. (2018). A critical investigation of English language teaching in Bangladesh: Unfulfilled expectations after two decades of communicative language teaching. *English Today, 34*(3), 43-49. https://doi.org/10.1017/S026607841700061X

Rose, H., McKinley, J., & Galloway, N. (2021). Global Englishes and language teaching: A review of pedagogical research. *Language Teaching, 54*(2), 157-189. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000518

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1995). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work*. Southern Illinois University Press. (Original work published 1978)

Sah, P. K., & Li, G. (2018). English medium instruction (EMI) as linguistic capital in Nepal: Promises and realities. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 12*(2), 109-123. https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2017.1401448

Sah, P. K., & Li, G. (2022). English medium instruction in higher education in the Global South: Practices, policies and problems. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 25*(2), 851-866. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1849011

Simpson, P. (2004). *Stylistics: A resource book for students*. Routledge.

Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research, 104*, 333-339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039

Stockwell, P. (2002). *Cognitive poetics: An introduction*. Routledge.

Sultana, N. (2019). Language Assessment Literacy: An Uncharted Area for the English Language Teachers in Bangladesh. Language Testing in Asia, 9, Article No. 1. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-019-0077-8

Thomas, J., & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC Medical Research Methodology, 8*, Article 45. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-8-45

Whiteley, S., & Canning, P. (2017). Reader response research in stylistics. *Language and Literature, 26*(2), 71-87. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963947017704724