

## **DO TEACHERS AND STUDENTS WANT CLT? A STUDY OF BANGLADESHI COLLEGE TEACHERS' AND STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF CLT**

**Md Shidur Rahman**

A Doctoral Student at School of Education, Queen's University Belfast, UK

---

**ABSTRACT:** *English is embedded, as a core and compulsory subject from years 1-12, in Bangladeshi education system. Keeping English in this position indicates that an increased emphasis is placed on learning English. In order to strengthen students' communicative competence in English, moreover, the Government substituted CLT for GTM in 2001. However, many argued that, despite this change, most of the students are still unable to communicate in English effectively. This communicative inability of students generates a question that is whether or not students and teachers actually want CLT. Therefore, this study aimed to investigate teachers' and students' perceptions of whether they desire CLT or not, and of how they perceive CLT. To achieve this aim, nine participants (three teachers and six students) were selected to obtain data through conducting semi-structured in-depth interviews. Qualitative technique was followed to analyse the data. The results of this study indicated that the students and teachers desire CLT, and they also expect the problems with CLT to be resolved. Even, they also have drawn some recommendations for improving CLT in Bangladesh.*

**KEYWORDS:** Communicative language teaching, communicative competence, students' and teachers' perception, context, college level

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

Communicative language teaching (CLT) has become a current language teaching orthodoxy in many countries around the world (Kumaravadivelu, 2014). The CLT approach, as opposed to Grammar Translation Method (GTM), has been prevailing in Bangladesh for more than a decade. But many claimed that the CLT has failed to satisfy students' need — which is principally to be proficient in communication, and that it is not working in the context of Bangladesh. Kirkwood and Rae (2011), for example, pointed out that CLT in new curriculum seems not to be successful when the students are seen to fail to perform communication efficiently in English despite the approach (CLT) refers to developing student's communicative competence. Furthermore, Abedin, Mojlis & Akter (2009) argued that the use of CLT in Bangladesh is only written in the curriculum—no practical employment of it is obvious either inside or outside the classroom. Above all, teachers have not embraced CLT approach because they still employ the traditional GTM (Abedin, 2012) for teaching. Nevertheless, the Bangladeshi Government has already introduced a ground breaking 9 year-project (2008-17) named English in Action (EIA). The aim of this project is to supply CLT resources such as audio record player, and to train the teachers (Shaheen, Walsh, Power & Burton, 2013). The pragmatic step of this kind may resolve the current problems associated with CLT in Bangladesh.

So far, however, little attention has been paid to examine how the teachers and students feel about CLT. This means there is a research gap, and a study needs to be carried out to address this gap. Therefore, this study seeks to unearth the students' and teachers' perception of CLT.

This study is significant as it will help the educators, teacher educators, policy makers, parents, and students. The results of this study can help particularly teacher educators and policymakers rethink of teacher training policies, of reforming the curriculum, of developing the infrastructure and study-place environment, and probably of devising the new mechanisms of teaching English. The study begins by the research context. It will then go on to literature review, research questions, research methods, results, and discussion.

## **RESEARCH CONTEXT**

The research context is Bangladesh where majority people speak Bengali, the medium of education. The context incorporates two perspectives in Bangladesh: education system (ES) and English language education (ELE).

### **Education System in Bangladesh**

Two sectors of education exist in Bangladesh — public and private. The public sector education consists of three main stages — primary, secondary and tertiary. It is interesting that three kinds of education systems are active within these three stages. These systems are: the general government system, includes all the three stages; the Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) system, covers secondary and tertiary level; and the Madrasah system, stresses on Islamic education from primary to tertiary stage (Khan, Rana and Haque, 2014). The private sector education including NGOs, however, is also delivering education to all three stages (Thornton and Thornton, 2012).

Both positive and negative factors lie in the education system. Some positive factors are apparent, for example — the Bangladeshi government, with the help of UNESCO, emphasised on the inclusive education — “education for all” (Malak, Md, Habib, Banu, & Roshid, 2014; Ahmmed & Mullick, 2014), as well as on education for sustainable development (Haque, 2014). Moreover, currently the rate of student-enrolment is an upward trend in all three stages of education (BANBEIS, 2012). Lastly, the government has initiated projects to train the teachers and to supply the teaching resources. English in Action (EIA), as mentioned earlier, is a project of this kind (Shaheen, Walsh, Power & Burton, 2013). So all these evidence indicate that the education system in Bangladesh is moving forward.

Notwithstanding the above positive factors, there still remain some challenges in the system across the all three education tiers. Firstly, lack of enough classrooms, materials and resources impede students and teachers for making education successful. Secondly, the larger classes become boisterous, and the teachers often cannot control those classes. Thirdly, unsatisfactory salary and benefit package is another negative factor which hardly encourages talented people to work as teachers (Rahman, Shahriar, & Anam, 2014). Lastly, the infrastructure of schools is not modernised such as traditional classroom — equipped with chalk, duster and blackboard; and insufficient ICT, toilet, and pure water supply facilities (Hoque, Zohora, Islam & Al-Ghefeili, 2013).

Regardless of these negative factors, the education system is advancing because various education improvement projects are undertaken in Bangladesh. One of these projects is — Bangladesh: ‘Secondary Education Sector Development Project’ by ADB (2011). The next section will focus on the situation of English language learning within this education system.

## **English Language Education in Bangladesh**

After independence in 1971, English language education in Bangladesh was marginalised and went through slow changes (Das, Shaheen, Shrestha, Rahman, & Khan, 2014). However, since 1986 till today, English as a second language as well as a compulsory core subject is taught from years 1-12. The purposes of learning English are to communicate, to study in abroad, to get a better job, to open a business and so on (Sultana, 2014; Hossain, 2012). But enormous obstacles are obvious for English language learning and teaching such as lack of skilled teachers, teaching materials, classroom, training facilities, and inadequate opportunity for using English outside the classroom (Bulter, 2011). Consequently, teaching and learning English in Bangladesh are inadequately progressive.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Definition of CLT**

The meaning of CLT needs to be elucidated as this term is fundamental to this study. CLT, as its name suggests, refers to teaching a language communicatively. But it is difficult to present an explicit definition of this term because this term covers a diverse methods and approaches for teaching L2 (Second Language) communicatively (Wong, 2012). Therefore, the following writers have defined CLT distinctively. Richards and Rodgers (2001, p.159) stated that, “The Communicative Approach in language teaching starts from a theory of language as communication. The goal of language teaching is to develop what Hymes (1972) referred to as ‘communicative competence’. Hymes coined this term in order to contrast a communicative view of language and Chomsky’s theory of competence.” That is to say, communicative competence is the key to CLT. However, Cook (2013, p.17) argued that, “Communicative teaching based language teaching on the functions that the second language had for the student and on the meanings they wanted to express, leading to teaching exercises that made the students communicate with each other in various ways... .” This definition stresses on meanings and functions of a language. Then, Rodgers (2014, p.38) said, “Communicative language teaching similarly was adopted as evidence of a new paradigm of understanding about language teaching and learning.” In other words, Rodgers (2014) believes that CLT is a new model of language learning and teaching. All these definitions, insofar as, seem to be separated from one another. That is, the researchers have brought multiple perspectives under the umbrella of CLT approach. Harmer (2001) and Thornbury (2006) also called CLT an umbrella term.

### **CLT: Aim and Characteristics**

Given the definitions of CLT, the delineation of its aim and objectives clarifies its meaning further. Aim — Communicative competence is the goal of CLT (Richards, 2006). In other words, “The purpose of communicative language teaching to develop the ability to cope with naturally occurring language in context...” (Widdowson, 2003: 23; Li & Song, 2007). Characteristics — CLT involves students in communication to develop their communicative competence. Littlewood (1981:1) said that, “One of the most characteristic features of CLT is that it plays systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspects of language.” Then, in CLT all classroom activities have a communicative intent (Larsen-Freeman, 1986), and CLT

uses authentic materials (Li, 1998). In CLT, teachers facilitate learners instead of controlling them, such as handing over responsibility for tasks to students (Cook, 2013). So it is clear that strengthening communicative competence is the core aim of CLT, and that varied characteristics prove that CLT is multi-aspects in focus.

### **Background of CLT**

The concept of CLT originated both in the U.S.A. and Europe (Savignon, 2008). This was in the late 1960s and early 1970s when various prominent linguists contended that the practising language structures and studying language as a system (vocabulary and grammar) were not helping learners use language in their real-life communicative situations (Stelma, 2009). In the U.S.A. an influential linguist Noam Chomsky in the 1960s had come up with the theory of linguistic competence: manipulating vocabulary and structures. Hymes (1972), a sociolinguist, responded to Chomsky's theory and introduced the term 'communicative competence': the ability to use language in a social context. Concurrently, the need for teaching the major languages of European Common Market to the adults was a significant impetus for CLT approach (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). From the late 1960s, the origins of CLT are also to be found in the changes of British language teaching tradition. Before this time, Situational Language Teaching approach, in which fundamental structures are practised when language teaching, was utilised for teaching English as a foreign language. So, it can also be said that CLT appeared in due to the dissatisfaction of structural teaching method.

Then, in 1971, the British linguists investigated the ways to teach a language communicatively rather than to describe the language through presenting grammar and vocabulary. Hallidays (1973), for example, worked on semantic potential of language; Wilkins (1976) developed notional/functional syllabus; and Canale and Swain (1980) emphasised on communicative competence. Amongst these linguists, Canale and Swain's (1980) definition is deemed to be the best as they have stated that communicative competence incorporates not only grammatical competence but also sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic competence.

Indeed, having looked at the history of CLT propagation in general, there is a need to focus on how the CLT approach emerged in Bangladesh. Prior to introducing CLT in Bangladesh, the ELT practitioners had taught their students with Grammar-Translation Method (GTM). The GTM chiefly focuses on teaching grammar and practising translation as its principal learning and teaching activities. This method tends to be focusing on reading and writing activities — very little attention pays to speaking and listening (Griffiths & Parr, 2001a). However, the government replaced GTM with CLT in 2001 in order that students could be proficient in communicative English (Mondal, 2012a). That is to say, making students competent in communication in English gave further impetus for changing the teaching method. Furthermore, it was also felt that the GTM had not worked well to meet the goals of learning English (Ullah, 2013). Nevertheless, this replacement for GTM was a significant change in English curriculum at higher secondary level. In order to make this change successful, the English Language Teaching Improvement Project (ELTIP), supported by both the Bangladeshi Government (MoE) and the UK Department for International Development (UKDFID), first embedded the CLT approach in English curriculum in 2001 (Mondal, 2012b). The NCTB (National Curriculum and Textbook Board) in Bangladesh also worked in tandem with ELTIP. However, Rahman (2015a) believes that due to the mismanagement of the change, CLT resulted in failure in higher secondary level in Bangladesh. The next section will present the pros and cons of CLT.

## **Benefits and Challenges of CLT**

The CLT approach has benefits as well as challenges. One of the benefits is that CLT builds up a rapport between the teacher and the student of a context in which teacher-centred approach perpetuates (Chang & Goswami, 2011). Then, CLT is concerned with various competence, rather than only grammatical competence as in GTM, such as linguistic, communicative, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competence. Therefore, the educators globally have adopted the CLT approach to a greater extent. Another benefit of using CLT approach is that learners learn language by using it (Strong version). In other words, CLT emphasises the learners' involvement in language learning. Consequently, learners can learn to communicate quickly and effectively in CLT approach comparing to other methods of teaching. Benjamin Franklin's famous quote also highlighted involvement, "Tell me, I'll forget. Show me, I'll remember. Involve me, I'll understand"

Notwithstanding these benefits, CLT encounters some challenges. This approach, for example, may not be compatible with every context (Bax, 2003). Then, Yang (2014) found some misunderstandings of CLT as threats, for example — CLT focuses only on meaning rather than form, ignores learners' errors, and stresses on fluency more than accuracy. Moreover, CLT may be inappropriate in contexts where a cultural stereotyping perception is powerful. The Asian students, for instance, don't like working in groups or Polish students are very interested in grammar (Thornbury, 2006). Some other challenges are also apparent for implementing CLT worldwide such as insufficient facilities of teaching materials; of authentic language environment; of textbooks; and of computer, internet, overhead projector, video and audio.

However, using CLT approach has had many more advantages than shortcomings as the challenges are plausible to overcome. The positive CLT outcomes can be achieved through implementing new CLT-user-friendly techniques and changes such as using ICT in communicative English programme yields rather effective learning for students (Bañados, 2013).

## **The Role of Teachers and Learners in CLT**

Teachers and students are the live actors in a CLT classroom. Both these characters have some roles to play (Abate, 2014). As has already been mentioned, CLT engages students in communication for developing their communicative competence (Chung & Huang, 2010). So, students have a vital role to play for CLT to be implemented. Firstly, students are negotiators who negotiate meaning between themselves (Mondal, 2012) within the pair-work or group-work form of interaction. Secondly, students are the active participants in classroom activities. Lastly, students take their own responsibility for learning (Ullah, 2013).

On the other hand, teachers' roles vary depending upon the type of syllabus, course, setting (which part of the world it takes place), teaching methods and so on. For example, a student-centred course needs teachers' managerial roles for helping students to learn, but a teacher-directed course requires a direct input of teaching (Jordan, 1997). As CLT is a learner-centred approach (Lewis, 1997), managerial roles work best with it. These managerial roles are teacher as classroom manager, instructor, facilitator, co-communicator, group organiser, and so on.

Both of the characters above — students and teachers — are to understand their respective roles to play. In other words, a balance of explicit understanding of these roles between students and teachers needs to be maintained. So an induction classes and/or a training programme on their roles can be arranged prior to starting their CLT classes.



## Acceptability of CLT

Having familiarised with the roles played by the students and teachers at CLT class, the acceptability of CLT needs to consider. In this respect, Swan (1985) claimed that the communicative theory of meaning and use is inappropriate to foreign language teaching. By contrast, Widdowson (1985) refuted Swan's claim by arguing that communicative approach has made a considerable improvement in the methodology. However, Swan's claim is partially true as CLT is seemingly not entirely successful in some Southeast Asian countries such as Vietnam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Thailand, Myanmar and Laos (Kustai, 2013). Moreover, many claimed that CLT has become a popular teaching approach across the world. Pan (2013), for instance, stated that CLT is one of the mainstream teaching approaches. Others expressed that CLT is not being acceptable owing to its apparent failure in some places in the world. Olagboyega (2012), for example, observed that teachers use grammar translation method although CLT is already installed in the education system of Japan. This means CLT is not properly set up in Japanese education system. So it is evident that CLT outcomes are often unsatisfactory in most of the educational settings. The mainspring of this situation is probably that the CLT implementing agents (Educators) have failed to define CLT and its functions accurately, and to show the clear distinctions between CLT and GTM.

## CLT vs GTM

As is evident from the previous discussion, the teachers employ GTM though CLT prevails in the education system in Bangladesh as well as in other educational settings in the world. So, the distinctions between CLT and GTM should be crystallised. Firstly, many argued that CLT is an approach to teaching, not a method. For example, CLT is an approach (Swathi, 2014); while GTM is a method (Shastri, 2010). Secondly, all four skills: speaking, writing, reading and listening are practised in CLT, whereas only writing and reading skills are chiefly practised in GTM (Alam, 2015; Griffith & Parr, 2001). Thirdly, in CLT, learners learn target language through interaction by engaging in pair work/Group work/dialogue/role play activities; on the other hand, in GTM, learners learn target language through practising translation and grammar (Abbas & Ali, 2014). Fourthly, CLT is a learner-centred approach; by contrast, GTM is a teacher-centred method (Natsir & Sanjaya, 2014). In other words, learners talk more, and are active in CLT; but in GTM teachers talk more and learners remain passive. Lastly, as has already been noted, CLT refers to linguistic, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competence; conversely, GTM entails only linguistic competence. All these points indicate that CLT and GTM are opposites in character. But CLT makes learners proficient in communication as this approach involves them in real-life communication activities such as role play activity — practising the interaction takes place between a doctor and a patient. So, a number of notable differences between CLT and GTM are obvious. The discussion, however, so far reflects on various expert perceptions related to CLT.

## Research Questions

As the central focus of this study is to uncover the teachers' and students' perception about CLT, the study addresses the following research questions:

- a) How do students and teachers find CLT?
- b) Do students and teachers prefer CLT or GTM?
- c) What are strengths and weaknesses of CLT?

## Research Methods

The qualitative research method was applied for this study. Some reasons stayed behind using this method. Firstly, the teachers' and students' perceptions were interpreted in words, not in numbers. As is also stated by Bryman (2012, p.380) that, "Qualitative research is a research strategy that usually emphasises words rather than in the collection and analysis of data." Then, the study aim was to uncover the participants' feelings, opinions, and experience about CLT. Similarly, the qualitative research also refers to how people make sense of their world and the experiences they have in the world— to understand the meaning the people have shaped (Holloway and Wheeler, 2013). This research provided detailed description of participants' opinions, experience, perceptions, and meanings of their actions (Denzin, 1989). Finally, qualitative research is rather capable to explore a research topic in depth (Carlsen and Glenton, 2011). However, quantitative research method was not chosen for this study because the data in quantitative research are numeric and analysed using statistics (LoBiondo-Wood and Haber, 2013). Moreover, quantitative research focuses on single reality (Sale, Lohfeld, & Brazil, 2002); whereas qualitative research is concerned with multiple perspectives (Rahman, 2015b). As is mentioned, this study, too, purported to unearth the teachers' diverse perceptions about CLT. Therefore, qualitative research method was appropriate for this study.

## Participants

Two categories of participants were selected for this study: three teachers (males) and six students (Four males and two females). All three teachers had teaching experience, qualifications, and formal training. One of them achieved Masters in TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages), CELTA (Certificate in English Language Teaching to Adults), and PTTLS (Preparing to Teach in the Lifelong Learning Sector) qualifications. They also practised teaching utilising both GTM and CLT.

The second category of participant was of six students. Two of the participants, who shared their experience of communicative language learning, are currently studying at Queen's University Belfast, UK. Almost all of these student-participants started learning English at their early age (From primary school). Their purpose of learning English was to get a better job and good salary, to study in abroad, and to do business. They also had experience of learning communicative language in high school level. However, both students and teachers were chosen as participants for this study because they are directly associated with CLT.

## Instrument

The qualitative research data collection tools are observation, interviews, document or artefact review (Wheeldon & Faubert, 2009). Among these tools, the semi-structured interview was opted for this research in order to elicit the participants' feelings about CLT. Moreover, the researcher of this study was a primary instrument for data collection as well (Merriam, 2014) though human instrument could be biased.

## Procedure

All the participants were interviewed over the phone. Having taken permission of the participants, a recording device (Dictaphone) was used to record the interviews. After finishing all the interviews, audio recordings were transcribed. Important notes were taken down during the interviews. The obtained data were analysed in words.

## RESULTS

As is previously mentioned, the teachers and students were interviewed in order to investigate students' and teachers' feelings and understandings about whether they prefer CLT or not. Hence, after completing the interviews, three major themes pertaining to the teachers' and students' perceptions emerged from this study. These themes are: 1) how teachers and students find CLT, 2) teachers' and students' preference between CLT and GTM, and 3) strengths and weaknesses of CLT.

*First theme:* All the teacher participants expressed their satisfactions with CLT approach in Bangladesh as this approach is the best and a modern approach — students can learn very promptly, and become competent in communication.

For example — one of the teachers stated that, “yea, I am completely comfortable. CLT is the best method to teach.”

Nevertheless, despite these positive feelings; they also encountered difficulties when teaching English communicatively such as students' demotivation for learning English, their inattentive behaviour towards the teaching topics, insufficient teaching materials, and so on.

For instance, another teacher described that, “ Actually, you know that we are very much under developed country. Most of the students of under developed countries are not eager to learn English. I should say they are not very much zealous for learning English. They just learn Bengali language from their parents where they are born. That is why they show very much indifference for learning language.”

Like teachers, students also had mixed feelings about communicative English learning and teaching. Every student-participant became zealous to communicate with others in English, and also showed their preferences for CLT. Nonetheless, they indicated some CLT phenomena in Bangladesh: unfavourable environment for English learning, students' tendency of using L1 in lieu of English, teachers' uncommunicative behaviour, and little scope for being involved in communication.

One of the students narrated that, “yes, it is so much difficult to speak English because we are not able to understand because the situations are not available to learn English.”

*Second theme:* The teachers mentioned that they prefer CLT to GTM — because GTM develops writing and reading skills rather than four skills (Reading, Writing, Listening, and Speaking).

For example, a teacher believes that, “Actually, the GTM is only for the writing, not for speaking. If any students practising GTM for 10 yrs they might not know how to speak. They know how to write. They don't be competent in speaking, but in CLT they become competent in both of them. They can be able to speak and write as well. It is the best way to teach. I don't think it is suitable for the modern world.”

Likewise, as is already found that students opt for CLT. They only learn grammar for communicating accurately.

A student participant remarked, “Naturally we learn many grammar here, when we communicate we try to speak fluently, then grammar actually we try to use it...”



*Third theme:* Every teacher participant pointed out some strengths and weaknesses of CLT approach in Bangladesh. They observed that CLT in Bangladesh is progressing gradually and students can learn English easily and quickly with this approach. Young teachers, particularly, are interested in CLT. But varied weaknesses they also noticed such as students from rural areas attempt to by-pass communicative language learning, less opportunity for teacher to be trained, students feel shy and fear to communicate, large classes, and inadequate teaching materials and congenial environment. Some teachers, not all, are still employing GTM.

One of the teacher participants revealed that, “They feel shy. There is another problem; our surrounding environment is congenial for learning English. Not very much favourable for us. We with some of my friends speak English in an open place, and other persons watch us and they comment us that we speak English. Our environment is not suitable for learning English. We have no enough platforms to practice English.”

Students, as weaknesses, focused on teachers’ inefficiency of exploiting CLT, lack of suitable learning environment, and their introverted behaviour. On the contrary, they mentioned that communicative English helps them seek for a better job, and study abroad.

A student, for example, opined that, “This is very important language because everyone speaks this language all over the world, important for getting a job, studying abroad; everything depends on English now-a-days.”

Both the participants draw some recommendations to better the CLT in Bangladesh. Teachers emphasised the exam system, curriculum, classroom environment, teacher training to be modernised.

A teacher said, “OK. I think the first thing the govt. should do is that teacher should be given training, because they are autocrat, their mentality should be changed. Major issue is that Bangladeshi curriculum does not support CLT. Exam system should be changed, and then I think it is possible to implement CLT in Bangladesh.”

But students suggested that they should practise communicative English excessively. They also should have language lab, debating club, and good rapport with teachers.

The one more student advocated that, “sir CLT in Bangladesh my suggestion is that more and more language practice should be started, English magazine, English debating club should be ensured in school, college level...and we need to change our outlook etc...etc...”

The findings around these three themes in this study represent what the teachers and students understand, feel, and find about CLT. The indications of these findings will be discussed in the following section.

## **DISCUSSIONS**

The results of this study indicate that both students and teachers have blended views about CLT — positive and negative. At the one extreme, they desire CLT. At the other extreme, there is little scope for involving in communication in a classroom context, since there is a lack of communicative atmosphere in the classroom. Above all there is a little scope for practising English either inside or outside the classroom (Butler, 2011). Another point can also be taken into account that the teachers and students should be incentivised for learning communicative

English (Rahman, 2015a) in order to get rid of the problems. Moreover, the government should take the CLT matters as concerns to make it work.

The results also reveal that the students and the teachers are in favour of CLT rather than GTM as the GTM does not integrate all four skills of language learning and it is a teacher-directed method. This finding is in line with the idea of Natsir & Sanjaya (2014) and Alam (2015) in the literature. However, Abedin (2012) argued that the English teachers in Bangladesh, though not all, still teach students with GTM. So it suggests that the teachers believe that CLT is beneficial, but they are aligned with their beliefs in their teaching practice. Another reality has appeared from this study that the young-aged teachers are interested in CLT rather than the old-aged ones. Alongside the teachers, students are responsive to CLT too.

Then the results suggest that students are introverted; they are sometimes reluctant to talk to each other in the classroom. This seems like a cultural problem that Thornbury (2006) mentioned as the cultural stereotyping, but in this study students have appeared as intrapersonal characters due to their introversion. Another important and unexpected phenomenon has derived from this study that people have a tendency to tease at those who speak English to each other in public places. This tendency embarrasses the learners. This is a new understanding which has not been found in the literature. Moreover, teachers' incompetence in CLT is a major shortfall of CLT in Bangladesh. But the literature pointed out that teachers, as managers, are to play a major part in a learner-centred class.

Finally, students and teachers have some recommendations for improving the present situations of CLT at college level in Bangladesh which are consistent with other researchers. Students, for example, put emphasis on to be engaged in communication to a greater extent. This perception is in line with Benjamin Franklin's well-known quote in the literature which has mainly emphasised on engagement in terms of learning. Having looked at the research results, it can be summed up that the Bangladeshi college students and teachers desired CLT and expressed some concerns simultaneously. It seems that they present CLT problems in order to support CLT as they left some suggestions for improving the CLT matters.

## CONCLUSION

This study set out to uncover the college students' and teachers' perception of CLT in Bangladesh. The results of this study have demonstrated quite a few perceptions of students and teachers towards CLT. One of the most significant perceptions is that all the participants exposed their positive feelings about CLT — they are interested in CLT. Another perception this study has explicated that both the teachers and students expressed their preferences for CLT rather than for GTM. Lastly, some strengths of CLT have been specified by the participants. One of the strengths is that the young teachers and students, in particular, have interests for communicative English teaching and learning. Together with these positive feelings, the research results have elicited some problems with CLT. The major problem, out of many, is that the people laugh at those who speak English especially outside the classroom.

The study results represent that the teachers and students have mixed feelings. They also have given some recommendations for overcoming the problems with CLT. This also means that they have no aversion to CLT to be implemented in Bangladesh. The current study, however, has gone some way towards enhancing our understanding of teachers' and students' perception of CLT. This study also makes several noteworthy contributions to the current literature, such

as — people’s teasing attitude towards students’ use of English outside the classroom. Despite these contributions, the study has some limitations. The first limitation is that the study could not include observation tool for data collection as the interview was held over the phone. The second, the study did not conduct face to face interview. So, further research should be carried out utilizing classroom observation strategy in addition to interview.

## REFERENCES

- Abate, E. B. (2014). Prospects and Challenges of Communicative Approach in EFL Context. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(25), 128-136.
- Abbas, S., & Ali, W. (2014). Comparison between Grammar & Translation Method & Communicative Language Teaching. *International Journal*, 2(6), 124-128.
- ADB (2011). Bangladesh Secondary Education Sector Development Project. Retrieved from: <http://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/29402/brief-secondary-education-developmenst-project.pdf>.
- Ahmed, M., & Mullick, J. (2014). Implementing inclusive education in primary schools in Bangladesh: recommended strategies. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 13(2), 167-180.
- Alam, M. M. (2015). Comparative Acceptability of GTM and CLT to the Teachers of Rural Secondary High Schools in Bangladesh. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics*, 5, 1-7.
- Bañados, E. (2013). A blended-learning pedagogical model for teaching and learning EFL successfully through an online interactive multimedia environment. *Calico Journal*, 23(3), 533-550.
- BANBEIS. (2012). “Basic Education Statistics-2012”. Available on: [http://www.banbeis.gov.bd/webnew/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=662&Itemid=212](http://www.banbeis.gov.bd/webnew/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=662&Itemid=212). Accessed on 08/01/2015.
- Bax, S. (2003). The end of CLT: A context approach to language teaching. *ELT journal*, 57(3), 278-287.
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Butler, Y. G. (2011). The implementation of communicative and task-based language teaching in the Asia-Pacific region. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 36-57.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47.
- Chang, M., & Goswami, J. S. (2011). Factors affecting the implementation of communicative language teaching in Taiwanese college English classes. *English Language Teaching*, 4(2), p3.
- Chung, I., & Huang, Y. C. (2010). The implementation of communicative language teaching: An investigation of students’ viewpoints. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 18(1).
- Cook, V. (2013). *Second language learning and language teaching*. Routledge.
- Das, S., Shaheen, R., Shrestha, P., Rahman, A., & Khan, R. (2014). Policy versus ground reality: secondary English language assessment system in Bangladesh. *Curriculum Journal*, 25(3), 326-343.
- Denzin, N. K. (1989). *Interpretive interactionism*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Wheeldon, J. P., & Faubert, J. (2009). Framing experience: Concept maps, mind maps, and data collection in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 8(3), 52-67.

- Griffiths, C., & Parr, J. M. (2001). Language-learning strategies: Theory and perception. *ELT journal*, 55(3), 247-254.
- Holloway, I. and Wheeler, S. (2013). *Qualitative research in nursing and healthcare*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1973). *Explorations in the functions of language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Harmer, J. (2003). Popular culture, methods, and context. *ELT journal*, 57(3), 288-294.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Third Edition. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Haque, F. (2014). Education for Sustainable Development: An Evaluation of The New Curriculum of The Formal Primary Education in Bangladesh. *European Scientific Journal*, 9(10).
- Hoque, K. E., Zohora, M. F., Islam, R., & Al-Ghefeili, A. A. A. (2013). Inclusive Education into Mainstream Primary Education: A Comparative Study between Malaysia and Bangladesh. *International Journal of Learning and Development*, 3(3), Pages-81.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. *Sociolinguistics*, 269-293.
- Hossain, M. (2012). English Syllabus of SSC Level in Bangladesh: An Evaluation. *BANGLADESH RESEARCH FOUNDATION JOURNAL*, 15.
- Jordan, R. R. (1997). *English for Academic Purposes: A guide and resource books for teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Khan, M. N. U., Rana, E. A., & Haque, M. R. (2014). Reforming the education system in Bangladesh: reckoning a knowledge-based society. *World Journal of Education*, 4(4), p1.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2014). The Decolonial Option in English Teaching: Can the Subaltern Act? *TESOL Quarterly*.
- Kustati, M. (2013). The Shifting Paradigms in The Implementation of CLT in Southeast Asia Countries. *AL-TA'LIM*, 20(1), 267-277.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Lewis, M., (1997). *Implementing The Lexical Approach*. England: Language Teaching Publication.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Li, Z. G., & Song, M. Y. (2007). The relationship between traditional English grammar teaching and communicative language teaching. *US-China Education Review*, 4(1), 62–65.
- Li, D. (1998). It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine: Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 677–703. doi:10.2307/3588000.
- LoBiondo-Wood, G. and Haber, J. (Eds.). (2013). *Nursing research: Methods and critical appraisal for evidence-based practice*. Elsevier Health Sciences.
- Merriam, S. B. (2014). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Mondal, N. K. (2012a). Secondary Level Students' Attitudes toward Communicative Language Teaching in Bangladesh. *Report and Opinion*, 4(5), 12-19.
- Mondal, N. K. (2012b). Higher Secondary Level Students' Evaluation of Communicative Language Teaching in Bangladesh. *English Language and Literature Studies*, 2 (3), 94-101.
- Malak, M. S., Md, H. A. B., Habib, A., Banu, M. S., & Roshid, M. M. (2014). Inclusive Education in Bangladesh. In *Equality in Education* (pp. 107-124). Sens Publishers.



- Natsir, M., & Sanjaya, D. (2014). Grammar Translation Method (GTM) Versus Communicative Language Teaching (CLT); A Review of Literature. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 2(1), 58-62.
- Olagboyega, K. W. (2012). Some Strengths and Weaknesses. 第33号平成24年10月, 17.
- Pan, Y. C. (2013). A Closer Examination of Communicative Language Teaching. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 6(2), 40-44.
- Rahman, M. S. (2015a). Implementing CLT at Higher Secondary Level in Bangladesh: A Review of Change Management. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(2), 93-102.
- Rahman, M. S. (2015b). The Contribution Made By Qualitative Research to TESOL. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 3(2), 1-14.
- Rahman, M. I., Shahriar, S., & Anam, S. (2014). A Study on the Disparity between the Job Satisfaction of Private and Public School Teachers in Bangladesh. *Global Journal of Quantitative Science*, 1(1).
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in languageteaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sale, J. E., Lohfeld, L. H., & Brazil, K. (2002). Revisiting the quantitative-qualitative debate: Implications for mixed-methods research. *Quality and quantity*, 36(1), 43-53.
- Savignon, S. J. (Ed.). (2008). *Interpreting communicative language teaching: Contexts and concerns in teacher education*. Yale University Press.
- Shaheen, R., Walsh, C., Power, T., & Burton, S. (2013). Assessing the impact of large-scale teacher professional development (TPD) in Bangladesh: English in Action (EIA). *American Educational Research Association*. Available from: <http://oro.open.ac.uk/id/eprint/38404>. [Accessed on: 05/12/2014].
- Shastri, P. D. (2010). *Communicative Approach to the Teaching of English as a Second Language*. Delhi: Himalaya Publishing House.
- Stelma, J. (2009). What is Communicative Language Teaching? In Hunston, S., & Oakey, D. (Ed.), *Introducing Applied Linguistics: concepts and skills* (pp.53-59). Routledge.
- Sultana, F. (2014). Efficacy of Outside-Classroom English Language Learning: A Study of Intermediate Bengali Medium Students Studying English at Tertiary Level in Bangladesh. *International Journal of English Language Education*, 2(2), 28.
- Swan, M. (1985). A critical look at the communicative approach (1). *ELT journal*, 39(1), 2-12.
- Swathi, K. (2014). COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING (CLT). *Editorial Board*, 3(3), 71.
- Thornbury, S. (2006). *An A-Z of ELT: A Dictionary of Terms and Concepts*. Oxford: Macmillan Education.
- Ullah, M. M. (2013). CLT at the Higher Secondary Level in Bangladesh: Theory and Practice. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 4(4), 197-206.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1985). Against dogma: a reply to Michael Swan. *ELT Journal*, 39(3), 158-161.
- Widdowson, H. G. (2003). *Defining Issues in English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilkins, D. (1976). *Notional syllabuses: a taxonomy and its relevance to foreign language curriculum development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wong, C. Y. (2012). Case Study of College Level Second Language Teachers' Perceptions and Implementations of Communicative Language Teaching. *Professional Educator*, 36 (2).



Yang, Y. I. (2014). The Implementation of Speaking Fluency in Communicative Language Teaching: An Observation of Adopting the 4/3/2 Activity in High Schools in China. *International Journal of English Language Education*, 2(1), pp-193.