

Challenges to Implementing Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in Bangladesh

Sukanto Roy, Ph.D. Candidate in English (Composition & TESOL), Indiana University of Pennsylvania, USA

Abstract

This paper analyzes the challenges to implementing Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in Bangladesh where the introduction of CLT to teach English is a relatively recent phenomenon. The paper starts with a brief history of CLT, followed by its characteristic features and objectives. Next, it explores the role of teachers and learners as well as teaching activities in CLT. Then it discusses the challenges to implementing CLT in some countries of the world and introducing CLT in Bangladesh. Based on the previous research, it shows that large class sizes, mismatches between curriculum and assessment, cultural inappropriateness, lack of training, and poor socio-economic conditions are the major challenges to implementing CLT in Bangladesh. It also sheds light on the recommendations for overcoming those challenges provided by the researchers. Finally, the paper concludes with the implication for further research to explore the ways to adapt CLT in the large classrooms in Bangladesh.

Keywords: Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), implementation, challenges

Introduction

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) can be interpreted as a set of principles about the objectives of language teaching, the types of classroom activities that effectively promote learning, and the responsibility of teachers and learners in the classroom (Richards, 2006). Savignon (2007) argued, “It would be inappropriate to speak of CLT as a teaching ‘method’ in any sense of that term as it was used in the 20th century. Rather, CLT is an approach that understands language to be inseparable from individual identity and social behavior” (p. 217). Though the ideas of CLT are not new in the context of the world, they are still relatively new for the context of Bangladesh where the

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 16:3 March 2016

Sukanto Roy, Ph.D. Candidate in English (Composition & TESOL), Indiana University of Pennsylvania, USA

government introduced CLT in 2001 from grade six to grade twelve for teaching English with the goal of improving learners' communicative competence (Rahman and Karim, 2015; Shurovi, 2014).

In Bangladesh, English is taught from grade one to grade twelve as a compulsory subject. However, many students in Bangladesh cannot develop the ability to use English appropriately in real life communication even after completing twelve years of education. Fifteen years have passed since CLT was introduced in Bangladesh, and still many students in Bangladesh do not have the expected level of communicative competence in English. Therefore, it is important to look into the factors that hinder the successful implementation of CLT in Bangladesh. So, in this paper, I will analyze the challenges to implementing CLT in the context of Bangladesh.

To accomplish the task, I will first discuss the history of CLT, followed by its characteristic features and objectives. Next, I will explore the role of teachers and learners as well as teaching activities in CLT. Then, I will discuss the challenges to implementing CLT in some countries of the world and introducing CLT in Bangladesh. Next, I will analyze the challenges to implementing CLT in Bangladesh based on previous research. After that, I will discuss the recommendations for overcoming those challenges provided by the researchers. Finally, I will talk about the implications of further research.

History of CLT

The outset of CLT is to be found in the modification of the British language teaching convention dating from the late 1960s (Richards and Rodgers, 1986). According to Richards and Rodgers (1986), "Until then, Situational Language Teaching represented the major British approach to teaching English as a foreign language" (p. 64). It emphasized the basic structures in meaningful situation-based activities. However, British applied linguists challenged the "theoretical assumptions" underlying Situational Language Teaching being influenced by American linguist Noam Chomsky (Richards and Rodgers, 1986, p. 64). D. A. Wilkins (as cited in Richards and Rodgers, 1986) put forward a functional or communicative definition of language that could serve as "a basis for developing communicative syllabuses for language teaching" (p. 65). The writings of

Wilkins and other British applied linguists on the theoretical foundation for communicative or functional approach to language teaching came to be referred to as the “Communicative Approach or simply Communicative Language Teaching” (Richards and Rodgers, 1986, p. 65). So, CLT emerged as a reaction to Situational Language Teaching and later on was developed by many linguists and researchers like Dell Hymes.

Hymes (1972) challenged the theory of Chomsky and coined the term “communicative competence” in order to contrast a communicative view of language and Chomsky’s theory of competence (Richards and Rodgers, 1986, p. 69). Richards and Rodgers (1986) stated, “Hymes’s theory of communicative competence was a definition of what a speaker needs to know in order to be communicatively competent in a speech community” (p. 70). Hymes (1972) emphasized not only the knowledge of language but also the ability how to use the language in communication. Therefore, the theory of CLT is enriched by many linguists and researchers after its origination.

Characteristic Features of CLT

There are some certain characteristic features of CLT. Littlewood (1981) stated, “One of the most important characteristic features of CLT is that it pays systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspects of language, combining these into a more fully communicative view” (p. 1). CLT advocates going beyond teaching grammatical rules of the target language, and recommending that by using the target language in a meaningful way, learners will develop communicative competence. Larsen-Freeman (2000) said, “The most obvious characteristic of CLT is that almost everything that is done is done with a communicative intent” (p. 129). According to her, the communicative approach in language learning and teaching considers that the primary focus of language learning is to build up communicative competence and to be able to use the language appropriately in a given social context. So, the characteristic features of CLT are different from those of previous methods.

The Objectives of CLT

The main objective of CLT is to help students to learn a language so that they can use it to communicate meaningfully in any real life situation. Larsen-Freeman (2000) asserted, “Communicative Language Teaching aims broadly to apply the theoretical

perspective of the Communicative Approach by making communicative competence the goal of language teaching and by acknowledging the interdependence of language and communication” (p. 121). The communicative approach makes teachers and students consider language in terms of the communicative functions it performs in everyday life. Richards (2006) stated, “Communicative language teaching sets as its goal the teaching of communicative competence” (p. 2). Students should be able to use the language through CLT. Therefore, the objectives of CLT are based on the practical needs of language learners.

The Role of the Teacher in CLT

The teacher plays an important role in CLT. Richards (2006) stated, “The role of the teacher in CLT is that of a facilitator, who creates a classroom climate conducive to language learning and provides opportunities for students to use and practice the language and to reflect on language use and language learning” (p. 23). Breen and Candlin (as cited in Richards and Rodgers, 1986) described teacher roles in the following terms:

The teacher has two main roles: the first role is to facilitate the communication between all participants in the classroom, and between these participants and the various activities and texts. The second role is to act as an independent participant within the learning-teaching group. (p. 77)

According to Richards and Rodgers (1986), other roles assumed for teachers in CLT are “needs analyst, counselor, and group process manager” (p. 77). The CLT teacher should know how to determine and respond to learners’ language needs. As a counselor, a CLT teacher is expected to assist learners to communicate effectively by giving advice, feedback, and motivation. Moreover, CLT teachers should know how to organize the classroom as a setting for communication and communicative activities. The teacher’s role in CLT is “less dominant” than in a teacher-centered method (Larsen-Freeman, 2000, p. 129). According to Ahmed (2014), a teacher in CLT plays the role of the guide, and not an “all-knowing knowledge provider” (p. 3). Therefore, the roles of the teacher in CLT are different from the traditional roles of a language teacher and these are one of the most crucial factors in the successful implementation of CLT in any context.

The Role of the Learners in CLT

Learners in CLT have many important roles to play as well. Richards (2006) has stated, “Learners in CLT develop their own routes to language learning, progress at different rates, and have different needs and motivation for language learning” (p. 23). According to Richards and Rodgers (1986), CLT emphasizes the process of communication which leads to “different roles for learners from those found in more traditional second language classrooms” (p. 77). Breen and Candlin (as cited in Richards and Rodgers, 1986) described the learner’s role within CLT in the following terms:

The role of learners as negotiator emerges from and interacts with the role of joint negotiator within the group and within the classroom procedures and activities which the group undertakes. The implication for the learner is that he should contribute as much as he gains, and thereby learn in an interdependent way. (p. 77)

According to Larsen-Freeman (2000), learners in CLT are “communicators” (p. 129). She has said that learners in CLT are “more responsible managers” of their own learning (p. 129). Similarly, Richards (2006) has said that learners in CLT are expected to take “greater degree of responsibility” for their own learning (p. 5). So, the learners themselves are responsible for conducting the interaction among them. Learners, in CLT, should always take the opportunity to share their ideas and opinions. According to Richards (2006), in CLT, learner first, learning second. It indicates that learners’ engagement is a priority in CLT. If learners in a language classroom are not engaged, learning does not take place. Therefore, learners are not mere passive listeners; rather, they are active participants in a CLT classroom situation.

Classroom Activities in CLT

In CLT, classroom activities should be conducive to developing learners’ communicative competence. Littlewood (1981) has divided the activities into “pre-communicative activities” and “communicative activities” (p. 86). He has asserted that classroom activities in CLT start with pre-communicative activities and finish with communicative activities. According to him, pre-communicative activities include different types of drill or question and answer practice. With the help of pre-

communicative knowledge and skills, the learner has to communicate for meaning in

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 16:3 March 2016

Sukanto Roy, Ph.D. Candidate in English (Composition & TESOL), Indiana University of Pennsylvania, USA

222

Challenges to Implementing Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in Bangladesh

communicative activities, such as “cued dialogues, role play, discussion, debate,” etc. (Littlewood, 1981, p. 86). According to Richards (2006), a significant feature of communication in CLT is the concept of “information gap” (p. 18). This indicates the phenomena as in real communication; people usually interact with each other in order to receive information they do not have. In CLT, “pair and group work” are emphasized because most of the activities are designed to be carried out in “pairs or small groups” (Richards, 2006, p. 20). Through pair and group work, learners can learn hearing the language used by other participants of the group and get the chance to generate higher amount of language. Moreover, pair and group work have the potential to increase learners’ motivational level.

Challenges to Implementing CLT in Various Countries of the World: CLT in India

Daisy (2012) has pointed out that there are many states in India, “particularly the north Indian states,” where CLT is still facing challenges (p. 258). She has asserted that overall scenario of teaching English in these states is frustrating and students in general do not have communicative competence in English. Daisy (2012) has found that the existing syllabi do not reflect the objectives of CLT. Therefore, she has recommended modifying the existing syllabi and restructuring the new ones by following CLT approach.

CLT in China

Researchers (Ahmed and Rao, 2012; Ju, 2013) have identified several factors that hinder the successful implementation of CLT in China. Ahmed and Rao (2012) presented that it was not feasible to adopt CLT because China has its special characteristics. These characteristics included the teachers’ inability to teach communicatively and the pressure of grammar focused examination system. Again, Ju (2013) stated, “The application of CLT encounters difficulties because of large population; English teaching in China always takes a form of big classes with more students” (p. 1581). According to him it is not possible for English teachers to analyze each learner’s need and help accordingly. Therefore, in China, English teachers are facing difficulties in implementing CLT in their classes.

CLT in Iran

Mowlaie and Rahimi (2010) attempted to discover the disparity between the attitudes of English language teachers in one language school in Iran towards the tenets of CLT and their classroom practice. They conducted the study with 100 EFL teachers who were teaching English in different branches of one of the well-known language schools in Tehran, Iran. The results have showed that their classroom practice is not in harmony with their attitude. The researchers have found that the main reason lies in the lack of enough training opportunities on CLT for the teachers. Vaezi and Abbaspour (2014) also have examined teachers' perceptions of CLT in Iran by administering an attitude questionnaire. They have found that the teachers favor group work activities; however they cannot organize group work activities in their classes. The researchers have pointed that the discrepancy among the teachers' perception and practice is due to their cultural background in the context of Iran.

CLT in Vietnam

Hiep (2007) has conducted a research on the effectiveness of CLT in Vietnam. The three teachers of his study were teaching English at a university in Vietnam and all of them highlighted the potential usefulness of CLT. The results have showed that the teachers wanted to implement CLT in their classes. However, they experienced some challenges in implementing the “common CLT techniques such as pair work and group work” (p. 198). Therefore, they have talked about the need to “adapt rather than imply adopt CLT” in Vietnam (p.198). Hiep (2007) has found that one of the main problems in using CLT in Vietnam was that teachers were dependent on the inherent traditional practices.

CLT in Taiwan

Chang and Goswami (2011) have attempted to find out the factors that hinder the implementation of CLT “in Taiwanese college English classes” (p. 3). The researchers conducted interviews with “eight teachers from two universities in southern Taiwan that integrate CLT into English curriculum” (p. 5). The interviewees viewed “inadequate teacher training” as a factor that failed to assist them in implementing CLT (p. 8). They also reported that students' resistance to class participation was one of the main barriers

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 16:3 March 2016

Sukanto Roy, Ph.D. Candidate in English (Composition & TESOL), Indiana University of Pennsylvania, USA

224

Challenges to Implementing Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in Bangladesh

they faced in implementing CLT in their classrooms. Besides, the participants stated that “test-oriented teaching” had been one of the constraints in practicing CLT (p. 9). Moreover, they referred to large classes as another obstacle to practicing CLT. In addition, the interviewees identified limited teaching hours as a challenge to apply CLT in the English class in the context of Taiwan.

Introduction of CLT in Bangladesh

Since Bangladesh achieved its independence in 1971, English has been a compulsory subject for students at every level of schooling from primary to tertiary. After independence, the government of Bangladesh implemented the Grammar-translation method (GTM) for teaching and learning English. This was a teacher-centered method and the role of student was passive. The primary focus was on grammar which was taught in isolation. English classes were not interactive during those days. In describing that context, Sarwar (as cited in Hassan, 2013) asserted, “the previously used Grammar-translation method was deductive and students were taught only to perform well in examinations” (p. 2). In the examinations, questions were designed mainly to test students’ grammatical knowledge. Hence, GTM failed to help the learners develop their communicative competence. Therefore, with a view to achieving communicative purposes, CLT was introduced in 2001 from grade six to grade twelve in Bangladesh (Rahman and Karim, 2015; Shurovi, 2014). The goal of introducing CLT in Bangladesh was to develop learners’ ability to speak English. However, still today the goal of introducing CLT in Bangladesh is not achieved as many students cannot speak English fluently even after completing twelve years of education.

Challenges to Implementing CLT in Bangladesh

In spite of the government’s introduction of CLT in Bangladesh, the successful implementation of CLT is hampered due to various factors. In recent years, several researchers (Ahmed, 2014; Ansarey, 2012; Biswas, Uddin, and Sarker, 2013; Hamid and Baldauf, 2008; Hasan and Akhand, 2009; Iftakhar, 2014; Rahman and Karim, 2015; Shurovi, 2014; Sultana, 2014; Tarannum, 2010 etc.) have made attempts to investigate the challenges of implementing CLT in Bangladesh. I have synthesized the current literature on this topic and offered five overarching challenges to successful

implementation of CLT in Bangladesh. Some of the challenges in Bangladesh are similar as in other countries.

Large Class

In Bangladesh, one of the biggest challenges to implementing CLT is the unusual large size of the classrooms and huge number of students in one classroom (Ahmed, 2014; Ansaery, 2012; Iftakhar, 2014; Tarannum, 2010). Larsen-Freeman (2000) placed special emphasis on the small size of the class for implementing CLT. It is convenient for small number of learners in a group to interact for dealing with negotiation and meaning. In small group they can concentrate on meaningful communication and thereby can achieve authenticity and better quality in learning. Moreover, in small group of learners, it is easier for the teacher to focus on the learners in a deeper way. However, in Bangladesh almost all the class size is too large for the teachers to organize pair work or group work. Moreover, the sitting arrangement in Bangladeshi institutions is not at all conducive for pair work or group work (Barman et al., 2006). Ansarey (2012) has stated that the high number of students in classes act as a barrier in implementing CLT in English classes. Tarannum (2010) asserted:

An ideal CLT classroom should consist of 25-30 students. The number of students exceeding 30 will create problems to conduct a CLT classroom successfully.

However, in Bangladesh our usual classroom consists of 80-100 students as there is acute shortage of classrooms and teachers. Teachers cannot make pairs and groups as these make the classroom noisy and also hampers the neighboring classes. (p. 145)

Iftakhar (2014) stated, “Large class size is a big challenge for CLT in Bangladesh” (p. 201). She has mentioned that this issue is a significant institutional constraint that hinders the effective implementation of CLT in EFL classrooms. My personal teaching experience can be relevant to mention here. While teaching at Notre Dame College, Bangladesh, I had 180 students in my class. It is easily understandable that it was difficult for me to organize pair work or group work in my class. Thus, I was compelled to follow lecture method.

Mismatch between Curriculum and Assessment

Another great challenge to implementing CLT in Bangladesh is the mismatch between curriculum and assessment (Ansarey, 2012; Hamid and Baldauf, 2008; Hasan and Akhand, 2009; Sultana, 2014; Shurovi, 2014).

With the introduction of CLT in Bangladesh in 2001, the National Curriculum Textbook Board of Bangladesh took initiative to modify the English text books following the communicative approach to teaching and learning English in the context of Bangladesh. The books provide learners with a variety of materials such as reading texts, dialogues, pictures, diagrams, tasks and activities. These materials have been designed and developed for practicing four basic skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing. As a result, classes are expected to be interactive with students actively participating in the classroom activities through pair work and group work (Hamid and Baldauf, 2008).

However, there remains a “disparity between what the curriculum dictates and what is actually assessed on the large-scale standardized tests given at the end of each academic year” in Bangladesh (Ansarey, 2012, p. 68). Although in theory equal emphasis is given to the skills of reading, writing, listening and speaking, in reality only the skills of reading, writing and grammar are usually covered in classroom teaching. This is because listening and speaking are not assessed in the examinations at any level in Bangladesh (Shurovi, 2014, p. 1266). So, teachers and learners do not worry about these two essential skills for communicative English. Therefore, despite the CLT focus of the new textbooks, it can be argued that this focus is ignored, and texts generally are used like the old grammar-translation texts (Hamid and Baldauf, 2008).

It is not that all teachers in Bangladesh lack motivation in teaching speaking and listening skills in the English class. Sultana (2014) has found that in Bangladesh some teachers try to practice all the skills in the classroom but they lose their motivation after a certain period as listening and speaking are not directly assessed in the public examinations. Shurovi (2014) has stated that having “no compulsion to do speaking or listening class is one of inherent reasons” for lack of practice of speaking or listening in the classrooms in Bangladesh (p. 1266). Hasan and Akhand (2009) have also found that the prevailing examination system in Bangladesh is a problem for the implementation of

CLT. According to them, it is more achievement-oriented which emphasizes the grades and positions but not the issues of fluency and accuracy.

So, naturally, the teacher has become the “facilitator of examinations rather than of communicative competence” in the context of Bangladesh (Hasan and Akhand, 2009, p. 51). Moreover, the ongoing examination system in Bangladesh encourages cramming and that is why students in Bangladesh pay more attention to memorization rather than developing their communicative competence. The government has introduced CLT approach in Bangladesh but has not modified the traditional grammar-based testing system. This mismatch between curriculum and assessment can be referred to as one of the biggest challenges to implementing CLT in Bangladesh resulting in poor communicative competence in English among Bangladeshi learners.

Lack of Orientation and pre-Service and in-Service Training

Another important factor that hinders the implementation of CLT in Bangladesh is the lack of orientation and in-service and pre-service training for the teachers (Ansarey, 2012; Biswas et al., 2013; Rahman and Karim, 2015; Sultana, 2014). Biswas et al. (2-13) stated, “No initiative has so far been taken by the government of Bangladesh to familiarize CLT with the teaching community though the teachers are repeatedly urged to adapt to CLT” (p. 3). According to them, a nationwide orientation has not yet been possible to introduce CLT among the teachers in Bangladesh. The British Council in Bangladesh offers a 40 hour intensive training in CLT. However, the cost of this training program is pretty high. Only a few private colleges in and around the capital city can afford to get their teachers trained from the British Council. Moreover, teachers of Bangladesh in general have almost no access to national, regional, and international seminars, conferences, and journals on CLT.

In Bangladesh, “a pre-service training” is not required to join as English teachers in any level due to the sheer lack of graduates in English (Biswas et al., 2013, p. 3). Besides, “in-service” opportunity for training in CLT in Bangladesh is almost absent (Rahman and Karim, 2015, p. 84). The government has not yet been able to establish a Teachers’ Training College for tertiary level English teachers. There are only few such colleges in Bangladesh for secondary and primary school teachers and they are not able

to provide CLT training with all the teachers (Biswas et al., 2013). Ansarey (2012) has mentioned shortage of training in CLT as a “major challenge” to implementing CLT in Bangladesh (p. 71). Even the teachers, who are able to get training in CLT, cannot implement their CLT technique in their institutions due to students’ exam-oriented mentality and technical constraints (Sultana, 2014). Therefore, lack of training facilities in CLT is a big challenge to implementing CLT in Bangladesh.

Cultural Inappropriateness

Cultural inappropriateness is also considered to be a challenge to implementing CLT in Bangladesh. Rahman and Karim (2015) asserted, “One of the implementation problems of CLT in Bangladesh is that the approach is not always appropriate with the socio-cultural context of the country” (p. 84). In Bangladeshi cultural context, the teacher is considered to be the central figure and students must listen to the teacher passively. This cultural notion prevents interactive communication in classrooms and thus acts as an impediment in the application of CLT. Besides, the extremely formal relationship between teacher and students in Bangladesh does not create communicative learning environment in the classrooms. Generally, teachers encourage students to respond positively and speak in a flat intonation in the classrooms. This is also a barrier in implementing CLT in Bangladesh because interactive communications in the classrooms are fundamental criteria of CLT.

Students, in general, in Bangladesh lack team spirit. Biswas et al. (2013) stated, “CLT requires that students should be active participants in classroom activities; however, the students of Bangladesh have been traditionally passive and shy in the class” (p. 6). According to them, the social belief and values in Bangladesh have a lot to do with it. From the very childhood the parents teach their school going wards the classroom manners which include “neither arguing with the teacher nor asking questions” (Biswas et al., 2013, p. 6). Therefore, a sense of fear and detachment develops in Bangladeshi learners’ mind from their very childhood and they sit mute and passive in the classroom throughout their student life. Only a trifling number of Bangladeshi students occasionally share their ideas with the class teachers. Therefore, these attitudes which are deep-rooted

in socio-cultural context in Bangladesh are largely incompatible with CLT practices in the classrooms.

Teachers' Low Salary and Poor Socio-economic Condition

In Bangladesh, the poor socio-economic condition can also be attributed to the failure of successful implementation of CLT (Ansarey, 2012; Biswas, Uddin, and Sarker, 2013). According to Biswas et al. (2013), teachers' "low salary and low status" in the society of Bangladesh have a lot to do with their reluctance to invest time and energy to do some innovation in the traditional teaching (p. 4). In Bangladesh, take home salary of college teachers ranges "from \$120-\$165 per month" (Biswas et al., 2013, p. 4). In order to maintain a minimum standard of living, the teachers are often forced to take part-time jobs. So, they do not get enough time to prepare teaching materials for their classes. Apart from this, private tutoring is widely adopted in Bangladesh as a means for earning some extra cash. Ansarey (2012) has stated that poverty is also a big challenge of implementing CLT in Bangladesh. According to her, due to poverty many schools cannot employ adequate number of English teachers. She has also stated that the poor socio-economic conditions hamper the overall progress of the students in Bangladesh particularly in the rural areas where the institutions do not have the least facilities of teachers and logistic support due to fund constraints. In fact, poverty is a big barrier of implementing CLT in Bangladesh particularly in rural-based institutions in Bangladesh.

Other Challenges

There are some other challenges to implementing CLT in Bangladesh. For example, Iftakhar (2014) has pointed that teachers' deficiency in spoken English is also a challenge in applying CLT in their classroom in Bangladesh. It is a matter of great regret that many English teachers in Bangladesh do not have the ability to speak in English fluently and they do not use English while teaching English the classroom. Besides, "misconceptions about CLT" among teachers in Bangladesh also act as an obstacle to make use of communicative activities in their classes (Ansarey, 2012, p. 72). Some teachers in Bangladesh wrongly think that grammar should not at all be taught in CLT. Again, there are some teachers in Bangladesh who do not like CLT approach and prefer the traditional ways of teaching following Grammar Translation Method. This preference

of GTM by those teachers may be due to the fact that CLT requires time to develop materials and activities for the class.

Moreover, being a developing country, Bangladesh does not have adequate technological support in the field of education and this technological constraint also affects negatively the implementation of CLT in Bangladesh. The classrooms in majority of educational institutions are not equipped with modern teaching aids such as OHP, Multimedia facilities, Projectors, CD/VCD facilities, LCD monitors, etc. (Ahmed, 2014).

Many institutions in Bangladesh are still using age-old blackboard and chalk in classrooms as they even do not have whiteboard and marker facilities. A large number of Bangladeshi students do not have any access to computer. In addition, another challenge to implementing CLT in Bangladesh is the students' low motivation (Rahman and Karim, 2015). Many students in Bangladesh are reluctant to improve their speaking and listening skills in English as those skills are not tested in the examinations. Most of the students in Bangladesh are exam-oriented and want to get good grades in the test. Even, many guardians in Bangladesh are also more inclined to getting good grades rather than improving the communicative competence in English of their wards (Hasan, 2013). So, there are several other factors that hinder the successful implementation of CLT in Bangladesh.

Recommendations

Several researchers (Ahmed, 2014; Ansarey, 2012; Biswas et al., 2013; Rahman and Karim, 2015; Sultana, 2014) have come up with their recommendations to overcome the challenges to implementing CLT in Bangladesh. Most of them have given similar types of recommendations based on the context of Bangladesh. However, different researchers have emphasized different aspects. For example, Ahmed (2014) has put emphasis on making the class size smaller and providing adequate teaching aids appropriate for CLT. Ansarey (2012) has put stress on providing massive CLT training for English teachers and lessening English teachers' work-load. Biswas et al. (2013) have given importance on improving the infrastructures to make suitable for CLT and increasing teachers' remunerations. Rahman and Karim (2015) have emphasized the modification of exam system to make it communicative and suggested that government

of Bangladesh should take long term policy for the implementation of CLT. Sultana (2014) has laid stress on motivating the learners to speak English. She also advocated that a language club should be established in every school. Each researcher has his or her logical stance in emphasizing the certain aspect for overcoming the challenges to implementing CLT in Bangladesh.

Implications for Further Research

In the light of the above discussion, it can be said that there are many challenges to implementing CLT in Bangladesh. Analyzing the previous research, this paper shows that large class sizes, mismatches between curriculum and assessment, lack of training, cultural inappropriateness, and poor socio-economic conditions are the major challenges to implementing CLT in Bangladesh. Most of the researchers have suggested either to change the exam system, to provide massive CLT training for English teachers, to increase teachers' salary, or to supply sufficient teaching aids appropriate for CLT. Another important recommendation is to make the class-size smaller and reduce the number of students in one classroom so that pair and group work can be performed in the class. However, this is not possible to execute overnight in Bangladesh, which is such a densely populated country with poor socio-economic status. Though a small country, there are more than 160 million people in Bangladesh and two-thirds of the total population lives below the poverty line (Hassan, 2013). Therefore, research is still needed to find out the ways of implementing CLT in the large classroom based on the perspective of Bangladesh. This research scope deserves due attention from educational researchers since this will have a great impact on millions of learners learning English in Bangladesh.

It is more practical to develop a new style of CLT than to expect any rapid systemic or infrastructural change in Bangladesh. It is also important to incorporate some of the ideas of Kumaravadivelu (2003) with CLT. In his book *Beyond Methods*, he has suggested that one way of conceptualizing post method pedagogy is to look at it three dimensionally as pedagogy of “particularity, practicality, and possibility” (p. 37). According to him, the parameter of particularity seeks to facilitate the promotion of a context-sensitive, location- specific pedagogy that is based on an accurate understanding

of local linguistic, sociocultural, and political particularities. The parameter of practicality enables and encourages teachers to “theorize from their practice and to practice what they theorize” (Kumaravadivelu, 2003, p. 37). The parameter of possibility refers to the sociopolitical consciousness that can also function as a catalyst for an ongoing journey for identity formation and social transformation. Therefore, the ideas of Kumaravadivelu (2003) have the potential to transcend the limitations of the concept of method since they provide teachers with the freedom to apply different methods to suit local conditions and culture.

Conclusion

Though the ideas of Kumaravadivelu (2003) are also not new in the world context, they are relevant to Bangladesh teaching-learning situation. Moreover, none of the previous researchers in Bangladesh have discussed those with significance in their studies. It will be useful to find out how some of the ideas of Kumaravadivelu (2003) can be adapted to CLT to make it successful for the large classrooms in Bangladesh. The adaptation of the ideas of Kumaravadivelu (2003) with CLT may help the English teachers of Bangladesh to overcome many of the challenges to implementing CLT in their large classrooms.

References

- Ahmad, S., & Rao, C. (2012). Does it work? Implementing communicative language teaching approach in EFL context. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 3(12).
- Ahmed, S. (2014). The communicative language teaching (CLT) at the higher secondary levels in Bangladesh: Problems and prospect from teachers' perspective. *Language in India*, 14(7).
- Ansarey, D. (2012). Communicative language teaching in EFL contexts: Teachers attitude and perception in Bangladesh. *ASA University Review*, 6(1), 61-78.
- Barman, B., Zakia, S., & Basu, B. L. (2006). *ELT: Theory and practice*. Dhaka: Friends Book Corner.
- Biswas, D., Ahmed, N. U., & Sarker, S. R. (2013). Doomed to fail: The fate of communicative language teaching (CLT) in Bangladesh. *Language in India*, 13(9), 111-123.

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 16:3 March 2016

Sukanto Roy, Ph.D. Candidate in English (Composition & TESOL), Indiana University of Pennsylvania, USA

233

Challenges to Implementing Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in Bangladesh

- Chang, M., & Goswami, J. S. (2011). Factors affecting the implementation of communicative language teaching in Taiwanese college English classes. *English Language Teaching*, 4(2), 3-12. doi:10.5539/elt.v4n2p3
- Daisy. (2012, February). Communicative language teaching: A comprehensive approach to English language teaching. *Language in India*, 12(2), 249- 265.
- Hamid, M. O., & Baldauf, R. B. (2008, September). Will CLT bail out the bogged down ELT in Bangladesh? *English Today*, 24(3), 16-24.
- Hasan, K., & Akhand, M. (2009). Challenges & suitability of TESL at the college level in Bangladeshi context. *Journal of NELTA*, 14(1-2), 45-54.
- Hassan, M. K. (2014, January 23). Teachers' and students' perceived difficulties in Implementing communicative language teaching in Bangladesh: A critical study. *Unpublished M. Res. Thesis*. The Open University, UK.
- Hiep, P. H. (2007). Communicative language teaching: unity within diversity. *ELT Journal*, 61(3), 193-201.
- Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. (J. B. Pride, & J. Holmes, Eds.) *Sociolinguistics. Selected Readings*, 283-288 (Part 2).
- Iftakhar, S. (2014, July). Rethinking English teaching through CLT in government primary schools of Bangladesh. *DIU Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2, 193-214.
- Ju, F.-a. (2013, September). Communicative language teaching (CLT): A critical and comparative perspective. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(9), 1579-1583.
- Kumarvadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching*. Yale University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (Second ed.). (R. N. Campbell, & W. E. Rutherford, Eds.) New York: Oxford University Press.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mowlaie, B., & Rahimi, A. (2010). The effect of teachers' attitude about communicative language teaching on their practice: Do they practice what they preach? *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 1524-1528.

- Rahman, M. S., & Karim, S. S. (2015, April). Problems of CLT in Bangladesh: Ways to improve. *International Journal of Education Learning and Development*, 3(3), 75-87.
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Savignon, S. J. (2007). Beyond communicative language teaching: What's ahead. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 207-220.
- Shurovi, M. (2014). CLT and ELT in Bangladesh: Practice and prospect of speaking and listening. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(6), 1263-1268.
- Sultana, M. A. (2014). Communicative approach in ESL classroom at the secondary level. *Language in India*, 14(6), 1-17.
- Tarannum, S. (2010, December). CLT classrooms: Teachers' role & a Bangladesh perspective. *IIUC Studies*, 7, 131-146.
- Vaezi, S., & Abbaspour, E. (2014). Implementing CLT in the Iranian context: "Reality" versus theory. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 1905-1911.
-



Sukanto Roy
Ph.D. Candidate in Composition & TESOL
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
English Department
Humanities and Social Sciences Building, Office 506-U
981 Grant Street
Indiana, PA 15705-1904
USA
s.roy2@iup.edu

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 **16:3 March 2016**
Sukanto Roy, Ph.D. Candidate in English (Composition & TESOL), Indiana University
of Pennsylvania, USA 235
Challenges to Implementing Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in Bangladesh