

University of Rajshahi

Rajshahi-6205

Bangladesh.

**RUCL Institutional Repository**

**<http://rulrepository.ru.ac.bd>**

---

Institute of Bangladesh Studies (IBS)

PhD thesis

---

2020

# Postmethod Pedagogy and English Language Teaching in Bangladesh: Challenges and Potentials

Ahsan, Mohsina

University of Rajshahi

---

<http://rulrepository.ru.ac.bd/handle/123456789/1090>

*Copyright to the University of Rajshahi. All rights reserved. Downloaded from RUCL Institutional Repository.*

# **Postmethod Pedagogy and English Language Teaching in Bangladesh: Challenges and Potentials**

*A dissertation submitted to the Institute of Bangladesh Studies in partial  
fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of  
Philosophy in English*

## **Researcher**



**Mohsina Ahsan**

PhD Fellow, Session: 2011-12  
Institute of Bangladesh Studies  
University of Rajshahi

## **Supervisor**

**Dr. M. Shahidullah**

Professor  
Department of English  
University of Rajshahi

**Revised Copy**



**Institute of Bangladesh Studies  
University of Rajshahi, Bangladesh**

**September 2020**

## **Declaration**

I declare that the dissertation entitled "Postmethod Pedagogy and English Language Teaching in Bangladesh: Challenges and Potentials" submitted to the Institute of Bangladesh Studies, University of Rajshahi to fulfil the partial requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy is my original endeavour completed under supervision and guidance of Dr. M. Shahidullah, Professor, Department of English, University of Rajshahi, Bangladesh.

I further declare that this work was not previously submitted for any degree and is not presented at the same time for any other degree to any other institute.

**(Mohsina Ahsan)**  
PhD Researcher  
Institute of Bangladesh Studies  
University of Rajshahi

## Certificate

With great pleasure I hereby certify that the dissertation titled "Postmethod Pedagogy for English Language Teaching in Bangladesh: Challenges and Potentials" submitted by Mohsina Ahasan to the Institute of Bangladesh Studies (IBS), University of Rajshahi, Bangladesh for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy is an original research work done under my supervision and guidance. To the best of my knowledge, this dissertation was not previously submitted for any diploma/degree/fellowship to any other university or institute. Materials taken from other sources have been duly acknowledged in the thesis.

This dissertation is recommended and forwarded to the University of Rajshahi, through the Institute of Bangladesh Studies (IBS), for necessary formalities leading to its acceptance in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

**(Dr. M. Shahidullah)**  
Professor  
Department of English  
University of Rajshahi  
&  
Supervisor

## Acknowledgments

I am grateful to the Almighty, who enabled me to undertake and complete this research work. I would like to acknowledge my gratitude to certain people who helped me in different ways at different stages of my research work.

I must acknowledge the indebtedness to my supervisor, Dr. Md Shahidullah, Professor, Department of English, Rajshahi University for his guidance. Without his constant help, support and patience it would not have been possible to complete the work.

I would like to thank, Dr. Zakir Hossian, Professor and Director of the Institute of Bangladesh Studies, whose constant advice and support greatly helped me to successfully complete this work. I must mention the names of two former Directors of IBS, Dr. Mahbubur Rahman, Professor, Department of History, University of Rajshahi and Dr. Swarochis Sarkar, Professor, IBS, University of Rajshahi from whom I got primary inspiration and all out support to carry on my work. Thanks are also due to all the reverend teachers of The Institute of Bangladesh Studies (IBS), Professor Dr Jaynul Abedin, Professor Dr. Nazimul Haque, Professor Dr. Mostafa Kamal and Professor Dr. Kamruzzaman, for their all-out cooperation except which it would have not been possible for me to finish my work successfully. I express my gratitude to Dr. Maswood Akter, Professor and ex-Chairman, Department of English, Rajshahi University who inspired me at the initial phase of my study. Thanks also due for all of my teachers of the Department of English, Rajshahi University for their encouragement to carry on my work.

I acknowledge my heartfelt thanks to Md. Ashrafur Islam, Assistant Professor, Nawgaon BWC College and a formal fellow of IBS for his encouragement and useful suggestions to continue my research. I also thank Dr. Towfiq Osman Khan, Assistant Professor, Department of English, Daffodil University for providing me with useful resources to carry on my library research for the study. I am indebted to Dr. Nasim, IT Analyst, Department of Statistics, Rajshahi University for his assistance with part of the statistical data entry. I thank profusely Md. Maniruzaman, Lecturer, Department of Statistics, Khulna University for his support to carry on my statistical data analysis.

I would like to thank Ajmeri Ashrafi, Town Planner, RDA, Masuma Pervin, Assistant Professor, Department of Law, Northern University Bangladesh and Sayla Sarmin Snigdha, Associate Professor, Department of English, Khulna University who also helped me with essential suggestions at different phases of my research. I remember with gratitude Md. Hashibul Hoshen Rana and Biswanath Roy, M.A students of the Department of Statistics, University of Rajshahi, Md. Ariful Islam, M.A student of the Department of English, Begum Rokeya University, Rangpur and Rizwana Hasin Shotovee, ex-student of Department of English, University of Rajshahi for their generous support at different phases of my work.

I am grateful to Begum Rokey University, Rangpur, my working institution, for granting me study leave for the research. I express my sincere gratitude to all my colleagues and all the principals, teachers, students and administrators of the colleges where I conducted the empirical study, without whose kind co-operation this study would not have been possible. I cannot help extending my special thanks to Md. Obaidur Rahman, Professor and Head of the Department, Nawabganj Govt. College, Professor, for his cordial help with field work in all the colleges of Nawabganj. I would

also like to thank Md. Mustafizur Rahman, Assistant Professor, Department of English, New Govt. Degree College, Rajshahi, Md Atikur Rahman and Samson Hasdak, Lecturers, Department of English, Rajshahi College and Md. Mozammel Hossain, Lecturer, Dattapara College, Natore for their sincere help which made the empirical study feasible.

I want to thank Mr. Ziaul Haque, Secretary and Mr. Monirul Haque Lenin, Assistant Secretary of IBS who helped me from time to time with necessary support and help whenever I needed. Thanks also go to other officials and staffs for their sincere cooperation during my work were in progress. I would also like to thank the staff at Active Computer Centre as they helped me in many ways in word processing and formatting the thesis. My gratitude also goes to Md. Hasin Ahmed Khan, Deputy Director, Rajshahi University for his moral support to carry on my work.

I am profoundly grateful to my husband, Dr. Md. Mamunur Rahman Siddique and my parents, Md. Ahsan-Ul-Haque and Mahmuda Haque. No language can describe the depth of love, devotion, support and faith that I received from them throughout my work. I must recall with gratitude the inspiration I got from my paternal uncles, Dr. M. Shamsur Ali, Honorary Professor, Department of History, Rajshahi University and Md. Monirul Haque, Deputy Director, Department of Physical Science and Sports for pursuing this goal. I am deeply indebted to my only brother Md. Meshbah-Ul-Haque and his wife Dr. Sharmin Bashir for their continuous inspiration and support throughout the entire period of my work. I must thank my cousin Md. Iftekharul Haque who constantly helped me conducting the empirical study. In the end I would like to thank all my relations whose name I cannot enlist here for shortage for their support.

**Mohsina Ahsan**

## **Abstract**

Postmethod pedagogy is a recent development in language teaching and learning that emerged after the failure of different methods tried from the classical times till the mid-90s. The idea was developed first by Kumaravadivelu in 1994. Different methods came in and went out of fashion without the desired learning outcome. In 1989 the very concept of method began to face serious criticisms for their “one-size-fits-all” type “Cookie-cutter” approach of language teaching which presents a preselected package of language teaching for all situations which fail to take into account the local knowledge and understanding of local culture and context (particularities). Postmethod pedagogy works through its three pedagogical Parameters: (i) The Parameter of Particularity, (ii) The Parameter of Practicality and the (iii) Parameter of Possibility. In other words, it advocates for devising a context-sensitive bottom up pedagogy that is solely based on the local understanding of a particular context and connects language with the socio-political reality of teachers and learners.

The research questions of the study have been: (i) What are the limitations of the concept of method and the methods Era and what factors lead to the emergence of the idea of Postmethod pedagogy? (ii) What are the key features and parameters of Postmethod pedagogy? (iii) What are the realities (“Particularities”) of English teaching-learning culture and context of Bangladesh? And (iv) What would be the pedagogic potentials of and challenges for implementing the parameter of “Practicality” and “Possibility” in Bangladesh? The study examines the idea of



Postmethod condition and the theoretical underpinning of Postmethod condition and the key features of Postmethod pedagogy, with special emphasis on its three pedagogic parameters and the pedagogic tools (macrostrategies) through library research. The empirical research in this study focuses on the particularities of teachers and learners with reference to their experience, beliefs, expectations, learning style preferences, learning strategies, teaching-learning situation, testing and evaluation and so on. A brief theoretical discussion regarding the teaching learning situation, material evaluation and also testing and evaluation and their impact on learners have been done in the study.

The empirical survey of the study has been conducted by using- (i) Questionnaire Survey, (ii) Interview and (iii) Classroom Observation. The data were collected from students and teachers of 33 colleges of Rajshahi Division of Bangladesh. The collected data have been used as the primary data in this research and the results present a picture of the “Particularities” of Bangladeshi teaching-learning culture as a whole.

In the study, the “Particularities” of the teaching-learning culture of Bangladesh have been studied with reference to the (i) Actual teaching-learning practice (experience of teachers and learners) in Bangladesh, (ii) Psychological disposition that includes Teachers’ and Learners’ beliefs, expectations, learning style preferences and learning strategies, (iii) Teaching-learning situation, (iv) Textbook and material evaluation and (v) Testing and evaluation system. Both actualities and psychological disposition have been examined in terms of teachers’ role, learners’ role, classroom interaction and mode of interaction and feedback. Particularities of teaching-learning situation has been examined in terms of class size, sitting arrangements and the availability of teaching-learning aids in the class.

The results of the empirical study show that the prevailing teaching-learning culture in the country is traditional to a certain extent but there is also a situation of combination of both traditional and progressive modes of teaching and learning. Teachers and learners are habituated to using techniques or strategies of method-centred pedagogies. The study examines the major features of the parameters of “Practicality” and “Possibility” which are marked by the search for: (1) not “an alternative method but an alternative to method”, (2) “Principled Pragmatism”, (3) Teachers’ Autonomy, (4) Learners’ Autonomy, and (5) Practice driven theory generating not theory driven. The study then examines the potentials of and challenges for implementing the ideas of “Practicality” and “Possibility” in the present “Particularities” of Bangladesh. The study also examines whether the teachers are capable enough for “Reflective Practice of Teaching” and “Principled Pragmatism” in the present realities of Bangladesh. It also makes an attempt to look into whether the learners are capable for exercising autonomy and shaping their individual identities in the context of the country. If there are challenges, the study discusses how these can be addressed and what do they imply for “Teacher Education Programmes” and teachers’ training, for learners, for classroom practices, for testing and evaluation and for designing courses and curriculum. The study makes some recommendations and implications for further areas of research for English Language Teaching in Bangladesh which draws it to a logical conclusion.

## Contents

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Declaration .....  | i         |
| Certificate .....  | ii        |
| Acknowledgments .....  | iii       |
| Abstract .....   | vi        |
| Contents .....   | ix        |
| List of Tables .....   | xx        |
| List of Figures .....  | xxii      |
| <b>Chapter One : Introduction .....</b>                            | <b>1</b>  |
| 1.1 Prelude .....  | 1         |
| 1.2 Background .....   | 2         |
| 1.3 The Notion of Pedagogy .....                                   | 3         |
| 1.4 The Concept of Method .....                                    | 4         |
| 1.5 The Myth of Method .....                                       | 6         |
| 1.6 Limitations of the Methods .....                               | 9         |
| 1.7 Paradigm Shift in Pedagogy .....                               | 15        |
| 1.8 The Emergence of Postmethod .....                              | 16        |
| 1.9 The Statement of the Problem .....                             | 19        |
| 1.10 Research Questions .....                                      | 22        |
| 1.11 Research Objectives .....                                     | 23        |
| 1.12 Justification of the Research .....                           | 23        |
| 1.13 Semantic Map of the Study .....                               | 24        |
| 1.14 Feasibility of the Study .....                                | 26        |
| 1.15 Limitations of the Study .....                                | 26        |
| 1.16 Definition of Key Terms Used in the Study .....               | 27        |
| 1.17 Conclusion .....  | 28        |
| <b>Chapter Two : The Key Features of Postmethod Pedagogy .....</b> | <b>29</b> |
| 2.1 Introduction .....   | 29        |

|   |  |           |
|---|--|-----------|
| 2.2   | Postmethod Condition .....                                   | 29        |
| 2.3   | Local Knowledge and Postmethod Pedagogy .....                | 31        |
| 2.4   | Parameters of Postmethod pedagogy.....                       | 34        |
| 2.4.1   | The Parameter of Particularity .....                         | 34        |
| 2.4.1.1   | Particularity of Teaching-Learning context or Situation..... | 36        |
| 2.4.1.2   | Class Size and Teaching and Learning Language.....           | 38        |
| 2.4.1.3   | Teachers' Position in the Classroom .....                    | 38        |
| 2.4.1.4   | Seating Arrangements for Students in the Classroom.....      | 39        |
| 2.4.1.5   | Teaching Learning Aids .....                                 | 39        |
| 2.4.1.6   | Particularity of Teachers.....                               | 40        |
| 2.4.1.6.1   | Beliefs of Teachers .....                                    | 40        |
| 2.4.1.6.2   | Experience of Teachers .....                                 | 42        |
| 2.4.1.6.3   | Expectations of Teachers.....                                | 43        |
| 2.4.1.7   | Particularity of Learners .....                              | 43        |
| 2.4.1.7.1   | Beliefs of Learners.....                                     | 43        |
| 2.4.1.7.2   | Learning Strategies of Learners.....                         | 45        |
| 2.4.1.7.3   | Learning Style Preferences of Learners.....                  | 49        |
| 2.4.1.7.4   | Experience of Learners .....                                 | 52        |
| 2.4.1.7.5   | Expectations of Learners .....                               | 52        |
| 2.4.2   | Particularities of Material Evaluation .....                 | 53        |
| 2.4.3   | Particularities of Testing and Assessment of Learners .....  | 54        |
| 2.4.4   | Parameter of "Practicality" .....                            | 57        |
| 2.4.5   | Parameter of "Possibility".....                              | 59        |
| 2.5   | Producing Critical and Creative Individuals.....             | 60        |
| 2.6   | Conclusion .....   | 63        |
| <b>Chapter Three : Pedagogical Procedures and Indicators of Postmethod.....</b> |  | <b>64</b> |
| 3.1   | Introduction.....  | 64        |
| 3.2   | The Pedagogical Procedures of Postmethod.....                | 64        |
| 3.3   | Macrostrategies.....   | 65        |
| 3.3.1   | Macrostrategy 1: Maximizing learning opportunities.....      | 66        |
| 3.3.2   | Macrostrategy 2: Minimizing perceptual mismatches .....      | 68        |
| 3.3.3   | Macrostrategy 3: Facilitating negotiated interaction.....    | 69        |
| 3.3.4   | Macrostrategy 4: Promoting learner autonomy.....             | 71        |
| 3.3.5   | Macrostrategy 5: Fostering language awareness.....           | 73        |
| 3.3.6   | Macrostrategy 6: Activating intuitive heuristics .....       | 74        |
| 3.3.7   | Macrostrategy 7: Contextualizing linguistic input.....       | 75        |

|   |   |           |
|---|---|-----------|
| 3.3.8   | Macrostrategy 8: Integrating language skills .....  | 76        |
| 3.3.9   | Macrostrategy 9: Ensuring social relevance .....  | 77        |
| 3.3.10  | Macrostrategy 10: Raising cultural consciousness .....  | 78        |
| 3.4   | Microstrategies .....   | 80        |
| 3.5   | The Pedagogic Indicators of Postmethods.....  | 81        |
| 3.5.1   | The Postmethod Learner .....  | 81        |
| 3.5.2   | The Postmethod Teacher.....   | 83        |
| 3.5.2.1   | Teachers' Role as "Reflective Practitioners" in<br>Postmethod Pedagogy .....                                  | 84        |
| 3.5.2.2   | The Postmethod Teacher Educator.....  | 86        |
| 3.6   | A Critical Review of the Ideas of Postmethods.....  | 90        |
| 3.7   | Conclusion .....  | 98        |
| <b>Chapter Four : Research Methodology.....</b> |   | <b>99</b> |
| 4.1   | Introduction.....   | 99        |
| 4.2   | Major Consideration for the Empirical Study .....   | 100       |
| 4.3   | Methods of Data Collection.....   | 101       |
| 4.4   | Selection of Study Areas and Sampling plan for the Empirical Study.....                                       | 102       |
| 4.4.1   | Area-wise Sampling Plan for Students' Questionnaire Survey and<br>Interview .....                             | 104       |
| 4.4.2   | Area-wise Sampling Plan for Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and<br>Interview .....                             | 105       |
| 4.4.3   | Sampling Plan for Classroom Observation.....  | 106       |
| 4.5   | Description of the Instruments Used for the Empirical Study.....  | 108       |
| 4.5.1.4   | Construction of the Questionnaires and Other Instruments Used for<br>the Empirical Study.....                 | 108       |
| 4.5.1.5   | A Detailed Section-wise Description of the Statements in the<br>Questionnaire for Teachers and Learners ..... | 111       |
| 4.5.1.1   | Teachers' and Learners' Questionnaire (See Appendix).....   | 111       |
| 4.5.1.2   | Instruments for Students' and Teachers' Interview.....  | 116       |
| 4.5.1.3   | Instruments for Classroom Observation and Follow-up<br>Discussion with Teachers .....                         | 117       |
| 4.6   | Administration of the Empirical Study.....  | 118       |
| 4.6.1   | Administration of Teachers' Questionnaire .....   | 118       |
| 4.6.1.6   | Administration of Teachers' Interview .....   | 118       |
| 4.6.1.7   | Administration of the Students' Questionnaire.....  | 119       |
| 4.6.1.8   | Administration of the Students' Interview .....   | 119       |

|   |   |     |
|---|---|-----|
| 4.1.9   | Process of Classroom Observation .....  | 120 |
| 4.7   | Processing and Analysing of Questionnaire Survey, Interview and Classroom Observation Data .....  | 120 |
| 4.8   | Concluding Remarks .....  | 121 |
| <b>Chapter Five : The Findings of the Particularities of Bangladeshi Teaching-Learning Culture.....</b> |   |     |
| 5.1   | Introduction.....   | 122 |
| 5.2   | Section-wise Results of the Students' and Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview .....  | 125 |
| 5.2.1   | Section-wise Results of the Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview .....  | 125 |
| 5.2.1.1   | Means and SDs of Section-B (Experience of Teaching and Learning English) .....  | 125 |
| 5.2.1.1.1   | Means and SDs of the Traditional variables of Section-B (Experience of Teaching and Learning English) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview .....               | 125 |
| 5.2.1.1.2   | Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-B (Experience of Teaching and Learning English) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview .....               | 126 |
| 5.2.1.1.3   | A Comparison of Cluster Means of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-B (Experience of Teaching and Learning English).....                             | 128 |
| 5.2.1.2   | Means and SDs of Section-C (Teachers' Beliefs Regarding Teaching and Learning English).....   | 129 |
| 5.2.1.2.1   | Means and SDs of the Traditional Variables of Section-C (Teachers' Beliefs Regarding Teaching and Learning English) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview. .... | 129 |
| 5.2.1.2.2   | Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-C (Teachers' Beliefs Regarding Teaching and Learning English) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview. .... | 130 |
| 5.2.1.2.3   | A Comparison of Cluster Means of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-C (Teachers' Beliefs Regarding Teaching and Learning English). ....              | 131 |
| 5.2.1.3   | Means and SDs of the Variables of Section-D (Expectations Regarding Teaching-learning English).....   | 132 |
| 5.2.1.3.1   | Means and SDs of the Traditional Variables of Section-D (Teachers' Expectations Regarding   |     |

|           |   |     |
|-----------|---|-----|
|           | Teaching and Learning English) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview .....  | 132 |
| 5.2.1.3.2 | Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-D (Teachers' Expectations Regarding Teaching and Learning English) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview .....      | 133 |
| 5.2.1.3.3 | A Comparison of Cluster Means of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-D (Teachers' Expectations Regarding Teaching and Learning English). .....                  | 134 |
| 5.2.1.4   | Means and SDs of Section-E (Students' Learning Style Preferences and Language Teaching).....  | 135 |
| 5.2.1.4.1 | Means and SDs and of the Traditional variables of Section-E (Students' Learning Style Preferences) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview. ....                            | 135 |
| 5.2.1.4.2 | Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-E (Students' Learning Style Preferences) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-5.12..... | 136 |
| 5.2.1.4.3 | A Comparison of Cluster Means of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-D (Students' Learning Style Preferences). .....  | 137 |
| 5.2.1.5   | Means and SDs of Section-F (Students' Learning Strategies and Language Teaching).....   | 138 |
| 5.2.1.5.1 | Means and SDs of the Traditional variables of Section-F (Students' Learning Strategies) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview.....  | 138 |
| 5.2.1.5.2 | Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-F (Students' Learning Strategies) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview.....  | 139 |
| 5.2.1.5.3 | A Comparison of Cluster Means of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-F (Students' Learning Strategies and Language Teaching).....                               | 140 |
| 5.2.1.6   | Means and SDs of Section-G (Teaching-Learning Opportunities).....   | 141 |
| 5.2.1.6.1 | Means and SDs of the Traditional variables of Section-G (Teaching-Learning Opportunities) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview.....                                      | 141 |
| 5.2.1.6.2 | Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-G (Teaching-Learning Opportunities) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview.....                                      | 142 |

|           |   |     |
|-----------|---|-----|
| 5.2.1.6.3 | A Comparison of Cluster Means of Teachers Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-G (Teaching-Learning Opportunities).....  | 143 |
| 5.2.2     | Section-wise Results of the Means and SDs of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview.....  | 144 |
| 5.2.2.1   | The Means and SD of Section-B (Experience about Teaching-Learning).....   | 144 |
| 5.2.2.1.1 | The Means and SD of the Traditional variables of Section-B (Experience about Teaching-Learning) of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview.....                            | 144 |
| 5.2.2.1.2 | The Means and SD of the Traditional variables of Section-B (Experience Regarding Teaching-Learning) of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview.....                        | 145 |
| 5.2.2.1.3 | A Comparison of Cluster Means of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-B (Experience Regarding Teaching-Learning).....  | 146 |
| 5.2.2.2   | Means and SDs of Section-C (Beliefs of Students' about Learning and Teaching English).....  | 147 |
| 5.2.2.2.1 | Means and SDs of the Traditional variables of Section-C (Beliefs of Students' Regarding Learning and Teaching English) of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview.....     | 147 |
| 5.2.2.2.2 | Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-C (Beliefs of Students' Regarding Learning and Teaching English) of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview.....     | 148 |
| 5.2.2.2.3 | A Comparison of Cluster Means of Students Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-C (Beliefs of Students' Regarding Learning and Teaching English).....                   | 149 |
| 5.2.2.3   | Means and SDs of Section-D (Expectations of Students Regarding Learning and Teaching English).....  | 150 |
| 5.2.2.3.1 | Means and SDs of the Traditional variables of Section-D (Expectations of Students Regarding Learning and Teaching English) of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview..... | 150 |
| 5.2.2.3.2 | Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-D (Expectations of Students Regarding Learning and Teaching English) of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview..... | 151 |
| 5.2.2.3.3 | A Comparison of Cluster Means of Students Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-  |     |



|           |  |     |
|-----------|--|-----|
|           | D (Expectations of Students Regarding Learning and Teaching English).....  | 152 |
| 5.2.2.4   | Means, and SDs of Section-E (Students' Learning Style Preferences) .....   | 153 |
| 5.2.2.4.1 | Means and SDS of the Traditional variables of Section-E (Students' Learning Style Preferences) of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview . | 153 |
| 5.2.2.4.2 | Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-E (Students' Learning Style Preferences) of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview . | 154 |
| 5.2.2.4.3 | A Comparison of Cluster Means of Students Questionnaire Survey and Interview (Students' Learning Style Preferences).....                         | 155 |
| 5.2.2.5   | Means and SDs of the variables of Section-F (Students' Learning Strategies and Language teaching) .....  | 156 |
| 5.2.2.5.1 | Means and SDs of the Traditional variables of Section-F of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview .....                                    | 156 |
| 5.2.2.5.2 | Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-F of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview .....                                    | 157 |
| 5.2.2.5.3 | A Comparison of Cluster Means of Students Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-F  | 158 |
| 5.2.2.6   | Means and SDs of the variables of Section-G (Students' Learning Opportunities and Language learning).....  | 159 |
| 5.2.2.6.1 | Means and SDs of the Traditional variables of Section-G of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview .....                                    | 159 |
| 5.2.2.6.2 | Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-G of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview .....                                    | 159 |
| 5.2.2.6.3 | A Comparison of Cluster Means of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-G   | 161 |
| 5.3       | Particularities of Teaching-Learning Situation.....  | 162 |
| 5.3.1     | Means and SDs of Section-G (Teaching-Learning Situation) .....   | 162 |
| 5.3.2     | Means and SDs of Section-H (Teaching-Learning Situation) .....   | 163 |
| 5.4       | Particularities about Materials: A Glimpse of the English Textbooks of H.S.C Level in Bangladesh.....  | 164 |
| 5.4.1     | H.S.C English Textbook .....   | 165 |
| 5.5       | Particularities about Testing and Evaluation of English Teaching-Learning System at H.S C Level .....  | 170 |

|  |   |     |
|--|---|-----|
| 5.5.1  | The Frequency Count and Percentage of the Variables of Section-I for Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview (Testing and Evaluation of English Teaching-Learning System at H.S C Level) ...               | 170 |
| 5.5.2  | The Frequency Count and Percentage of the Variables of Section-I of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-I (Testing and Evaluation of English Teaching-Learning System at H.S C Level) ..... | 173 |
| 5.6  | Classroom Observation and Follow-up Discussion Report with Teachers ..  | 175 |
| 5.7  | Conclusion .....  | 179 |
| <b>Chapter Six : The Potentials of and Challenges for the Parameters of "Practicality", "Possibility" and Macrostrategies of PMP in Bangladesh .....</b> |   |     |
| <b>181</b>   |   |     |
| 6.1  | Introduction.....   | 181 |
| 6.2  | The Key Features of the Parameter of "Practicality": Potentials and Challenges in Bangladesh.....   | 181 |
| 6.2.1  | The Key Features of "Reflective Teaching" in Bangladesh: Potentials and Challenges .....  | 182 |
| 6.2.1.1  | Potentials of and Challenges for Bangladesh: .....  | 182 |
| 6.2.1.1.1  | The Potentials of "Reflective Teaching" in the Particularities of Bangladesh.....   | 186 |
| 6.2.1.1.2  | The Challenges for "Reflective Teaching" in the Particularities of Bangladesh.....  | 186 |
| 6.2.2  | Teachers' Autonomy: Potentials of and Challenges for Bangladesh..   | 187 |
| 6.2.2.1  | The Potentials and Challenges of Postmethod pedagogy for Bangladesh.....  | 187 |
| 6.2.2.1.1  | Potentials of Practicing "Teachers' Autonomy" in the Particularities of Bangladesh.....   | 189 |
| 6.2.2.1.2  | Challenges for Practicing "Teachers' Autonomy" in the Particularities of Bangladesh ...   | 190 |
| 6.3  | The Parameter of "Possibility": Potentials and Challenges .....   | 190 |
| 6.3.1  | The Teachers' as "Transformative Intellectuals": Potentials and Challenges .....  | 191 |
| 6.3.1.1  | Potentials of Teachers as "Transformative Intellectuals" in the Particularities of Bangladesh.....  | 192 |
| 6.3.1.2  | Challenges for Teachers as "Transformative Intellectuals" in the Particularities of Bangladesh.....   | 192 |
| 6.3.2  | Learners' "Identity Formation": Potentials and Challenges .....   | 192 |
| 6.4  | The "Practicality" and "Possibility" of the Macrostrategies of PMP in the Particularities in Bangladesh: Potentials and Challenges .....  | 194 |
| 6.4.1  | Maximizing learning opportunities .....   | 195 |

|         |   |     |
|---------|---|-----|
| 6.4.1.1 | Potentials of Maximizing Teaching-learning Opportunities in Classes of Bangladesh:.....             | 197 |
| 6.4.1.2 | The Challenges for Maximizing Teaching-learning Opportunities in Classes of Bangladesh:.....        | 197 |
| 6.4.2   | 6.4.2 Minimizing Perceptual Mismatches:.....  | 197 |
| 6.4.2.1 | The Potentials of Minimizing Perceptual Mismatches in the Particularities of Bangladesh.....        | 208 |
| 6.4.2.2 | The Challenges for Minimizing Perceptual Mismatches in the Particularities of Bangladesh.....       | 209 |
| 6.4.3   | Facilitating Negotiated Interaction: Potentials and Challenges .....                                | 209 |
| 6.4.3.1 | The Potentials of Facilitating Negotiated Interaction in the Particularities of Bangladesh.....     | 210 |
| 6.4.3.2 | The Challenges for Facilitating Negotiated Interaction in the Particularities of Bangladesh.....    | 210 |
| 6.4.4   | Promoting Learner Autonomy: Potentials and Challenges.....  | 211 |
| 6.4.4.1 | The Potentials of Promoting Learner Autonomy in the Particularities of Bangladesh.....              | 213 |
| 6.4.4.2 | The Challenges for Promoting Learner Autonomy in the Particularities of Bangladesh.....             | 214 |
| 6.4.5   | Fostering Language Awareness .....  | 214 |
| 6.4.5.1 | The Potentials of Fostering Critical Language Awareness in the Particularities of Bangladesh.....   | 215 |
| 6.4.5.2 | The Challenges for Fostering Critical Language Awareness in the Particularities of Bangladesh ..... | 216 |
| 6.4.6   | Activating Intuitive Heuristics .....   | 216 |
| 6.4.6.1 | The Potentials of Activating Intuitive Heuristics in the Particularities of Bangladesh.....         | 218 |
| 6.4.6.2 | The Challenges for Activating Intuitive Heuristics in the Particularities of Bangladesh.....        | 218 |
| 6.4.7   | Contextualizing Linguistic Input.....   | 219 |
| 6.4.7.1 | The Potentials of Contextualizing Linguistic Input in the Particularities of Bangladesh.....        | 221 |
| 6.4.7.2 | The Challenges for Contextualizing Linguistic Input in the Particularities of Bangladesh.....       | 221 |
| 6.4.8   | Integrating Language Skills .....   | 222 |
| 6.4.8.1 | The Potentials of Integrating the Four Language Skills in the Particularities of Bangladesh.....    | 223 |
| 6.4.8.2 | The Challenges for Integrating the Four Language Skills in the Particularities of Bangladesh.....   | 223 |

|   |   |            |
|---|---|------------|
| 6.4.9   | Ensuring Social Relevance.....  | 224        |
| 6.4.9.1   | The Potentials of Ensuring Social Relevance in the Particularities of Bangladesh.....   | 225        |
| 6.4.9.2   | The Challenges for Ensuring Social Relevance in the Particularities of Bangladesh.....  | 225        |
| 6.4.10  | Raising Cultural Consciousness.....   | 226        |
| 6.4.10.1  | The Potentials of Raising Cultural Consciousness in the Particularities of Bangladesh.....                                      | 227        |
| 6.4.10.2  | The Challenges for Raising Cultural Consciousness in the Particularities of Bangladesh.....                                     | 227        |
| 6.5   | The Parameters of “Practicality” and “Possibility” and Testing and Evaluation in Bangladesh.....                                | 228        |
| 6.6   | Conclusion.....   | 228        |
| <b>Chapter Seven : Summary of the Findings, Recommendations and Conclusion.....</b> |   | <b>229</b> |
| 7.1   | Introduction.....   | 229        |
| 7.2   | Chapter-wise Summary of the Study.....  | 229        |
| 7.3   | Objective-wise Summary of the Findings of the Study.....  | 231        |
| 7.3.1   | Potentials of and Challenges for the “Particularities” in Bangladesh.....   | 231        |
| 7.3.2   | Potentials of and Challenges for the Parameters of “Practicality” and “Possibility”.....  | 236        |
| 7.3.2.1   | Potentials of and Challenges for the Parameter of “Practicality”.....   | 236        |
| 7.3.2.2   | Potentials of and Challenges for the Parameter of “Possibility”.....  | 237        |
| 7.3.2.3   | Potentials of and Challenges for the Macrostrategies of Postmethod pedagogy.....  | 238        |
| 7.4   | Implications.....   | 243        |
| 7.4.1   | Implications for Redefining Teachers’ Role as “Reflective Practitioners” and “Transformative Intellectuals” for Bangladesh..... | 243        |
| 7.4.2   | Implications for Learners’ Role as “Autonomous Individuals” and “Critically Conscious Individuals” for Bangladesh.....          | 243        |
| 7.4.3   | Implications for Teacher Education Programmes.....  | 244        |
| 7.4.4   | Implications for Implementing Context-sensitive Macrostrategies of PMP in for Bangladesh.....                                   | 246        |
| 7.4.5   | Implications for Producing Culture-sensitive Materials and Syllabus for Bangladesh.....   | 246        |
| 7.4.6   | Implications for Testing and Evaluation for Bangladesh.....   | 247        |

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| 7.4.7 Implications for Further Research..... | 247        |
| 7.5 Conclusions.....                         | 250        |
| 7.6 Recommendations.....                     | 253        |
| 7.7 Conclusion .....                         | 255        |
| <b>Bibliography .....</b>                    | <b>257</b> |
| <b>Appendices .....</b>                      | <b>268</b> |

## List of Tables

|             |   |     |
|-------------|---|-----|
| Table 4.1:  | Sampling Distribution.....  | 105 |
| Table 4.2:  | Sampling Distribution.....  | 106 |
| Table 4.3:  | Sampling Distribution.....  | 107 |
| Table 5.1   | The outline of the differences between the Traditional Model of Language Pedagogy and the Progressive Model of Language Pedagogy..... | 123 |
| Table 5.2:  | Section B (Traditional) .....   | 126 |
| Table 5.3:  | Section B (Progressive) .....   | 127 |
| Table 5.4:  | Section B.....  | 128 |
| Table 5.5:  | Section C (Traditional) .....   | 129 |
| Table 5.6:  | Section C (Progressive) .....   | 130 |
| Table 5.7:  | Section C.....  | 131 |
| Table 5.8:  | Section D (Traditional) .....   | 132 |
| Table 5.9:  | Section D (Progressive) .....   | 133 |
| Table 5.10: | Section D .....   | 134 |
| Table 5.11: | Section E (Traditional) .....   | 135 |
| Table 5.12: | Section E (Progressive).....  | 136 |
| Table 5.13: | Section E.....  | 137 |
| Table 5.14: | Section F (Traditional).....  | 138 |
| Table 5.15: | (Progressive).....  | 139 |
| Table 5.16: | Section F .....   | 140 |
| Table 5.17: | (Traditional).....  | 141 |
| Table 5.18: | Section-G (Progressive).....  | 142 |
| Table 5.19: | Section G .....   | 143 |
| Table 5.20: | Section B (Traditional) .....   | 144 |
| Table 5.21: | Section B (Progressive) .....   | 145 |
| Table 5.22: | Section B.....  | 146 |
| Table 5.23: | Section C (Traditional) .....   | 147 |

|             |   |     |
|-------------|---|-----|
| Table 5.24: | Section (Progressive) .....   | 148 |
| Table 5.25: | Section C.....  | 149 |
| Table 5.26: | Section D (Traditional).....  | 150 |
| Table 5.27: | Section D (Progressive).....  | 151 |
| Table 5.28: | Section-D .....   | 152 |
| Table 5.29: | Section E (Traditional) .....   | 153 |
| Table 5.30: | Section E (Progressive).....  | 154 |
| Table 5.31: | Section-E.....  | 155 |
| Table 5.32: | Section F (Traditional).....  | 156 |
| Table 5.33: | Section F (Progressive).....  | 157 |
| Table 5.34: | Section-F.....  | 158 |
| Table 5.35: | Section G (Progressive) .....   | 160 |
| Table 5.36: | Section G .....   | 161 |
| Table 5.37: | Section G .....   | 162 |
| Table 5.38: | Section I.....  | 171 |
| Table 5.39: | Section-I.....  | 173 |
| Table 6.1:  | Teachers' Role .....  | 183 |
| Table 6.2:  | Learners' Role .....  | 184 |
| Table 6.3:  | Classroom Interaction.....  | 185 |
| Table 6.4:  | Mode of Error Correction and Feed back.....   | 186 |
| Table 6.5:  | Maximizing Learning Opportunities .....   | 195 |
| Table 6.6:  | Teachers' and Student's Beliefs about Teachers' Role .....                                | 199 |
| Table 6.7:  | Teachers' and Students' Beliefs about Learners' Role.....                                 | 200 |
| Table 6.8:  | Teachers' and Students' Beliefs about Classroom Interaction .....                         | 200 |
| Table 6.9:  | Teachers' and Students' Beliefs about Mode of Error Correction and<br>Feed back .....     | 201 |
| Table 6.10: | Teachers' and Learners' Expectations about Teachers' Role.....                            | 202 |
| Table 6.11: | Teachers' and Learners' Expectations about Learners' Role .....                           | 203 |
| Table 6.12: | Teachers' and Learners' Expectations about Classroom Interaction....                      | 203 |
| Table 6.13: | Teachers' and Learners' Expectations about Mode of Error<br>Correction and Feedback ..... | 204 |
| Table 6.14: | Teachers' and Learners' Learning Style Preferences and Teaching<br>English .....          | 205 |
| Table 6.15: | Teachers' and Students' Perceptions Regarding Learning Strategies ..                      | 207 |
| Table 6.16: | Facilitating Negotiated Interaction: Potentials and Challenges .....                      | 209 |

|             |   |     |
|-------------|---|-----|
| Table 6.17: | Promoting Learner Autonomy: Potentials and Challenges ..... | 211 |
| Table 6.18: | Fostering Language Awareness .....                          | 215 |
| Table 6.19: | Activating Intuitive Heuristics.....                        | 217 |
| Table 6.20: | Contextualizing Linguistic Input .....                      | 220 |
| Table 6.21: | Integrating Language Skills .....                           | 222 |
| Table 6.22: | Ensuring Social Relevance .....                             | 224 |
| Table 6.23: | Raising Cultural Consciousness .....                        | 226 |

## **List of Figures**

|             |   |     |
|-------------|---|-----|
| Figure 1.1: | The Semantic Map of the Study .....   | 25  |
| Figure 2.1: | Teacher's conceptualizations and classroom practices (Breen et.al.<br>2001) ..... | 41  |
| Figure 3.1: | The Pedagogic Wheel of Postmethod.....  | 79  |
| Figure 6.1: | Educational Background of College Teachers.....                                   | 188 |
| Figure 6.2: | ELT training Background of College Teachers .....                                 | 189 |



# Chapter One

## Introduction

### 1.1 Prelude

In Bangladesh, like other EFL and ESL situations, ELT has been confronting many problems for the last two decades at almost all levels of education. Different methods have been tried but students' learning outcome is still very poor. Teachers in Bangladesh like their counterparts across the globe have adopted and adapted techniques from various teaching methods and have tried to implement them in the classrooms but there has not been any visible change of the situation. Unfortunately, all their efforts proved futile. Those methods have covertly compelled them to impose top-down language pedagogy, but it did not work in Bangladesh like other ESL/EFL contexts for various reasons. Widdowson sums up the situation saying:

... what has developed quite impressively over the last 15 years or so has been...expertise, and an awareness of various aspects of language teaching...but where...things have not been really effective has been in mediation, the way these ideas have been integrated into local, political and educational conditions of the countries where they were applied, so that the overriding failure...has been that we have tended to get ideas which have hardened too readily into a paradigm and people have shot off to various parts of the world and implemented various programmes...were tended always to make the same basic error, which is to assume that somehow it is the local conditions that have to be adjusted to the packaged set of concepts we bring with us rather than look into the real issue, practical as well as ideological, of implementation and innovation within those local contexts...I don't think we have brought into operation an awareness of local conditions nor an effective involvement of local people, so that one can see these as in some sense, even though enlightened and benevolent, well meaning, but nevertheless to some degree impositional.<sup>1</sup>

From the mid-90s there has been a major shift in ELT pedagogy. Many applied linguists declare the 'end' or death of "Methods era" and argue for a paradigm shift, which they term as the "Postmethods era". "Methods era" was prominently based upon

---

<sup>1</sup> Interview as cited in Robert Philipson, *Linguistic Imperialism* (Oxford University Press, 1992), 259-260

a major hypothesis that “one-size-fits-all” (i.e. the same idea and practice will work out with all teachers and learners in all contexts). But from 1990s, theorists in language education developed an argument that the same method does not work with all, in all contexts, and language education and teaching-learning should be culture and context specific. This is a new development in ELT or education, as a whole, and is new focus of research in recent times. This study makes an attempt to examine the different aspects of this new development and explores the potentials of and challenges for implementing them in the context of Bangladesh.

## **1.2 Background**

Over the centuries many methods and approaches have been developed and practiced for teaching and learning English as a second and foreign language in different countries across the world. The field of ELT has always been in flux and this is due to the fact that in order to meet the learners’ growing needs in different period’s adoption of new methods was a must. Effective English Teaching meant applying prescribed principles and techniques based on a particular theory of language and of language learning. Since the early days of teaching and learning English in ESL/EFL context, many methods have been tried and given up. Starting with Grammar Translation Method and after it they innovated and tried Audio-lingual, Direct Method, Natural Approach, The Silent Way, Suggestopedia, Total Physical Response, Community Language Teaching, Communicative Language Teaching, and Task-based Language Teaching and learning, one after another but none of these methods and approaches could satisfy the needs and purposes of English language teaching in ESL/EFL contexts. Hence a reaction against method started and certain language researchers Allwright (1991), Kumaravadivelu (1994); Pennycook, (1989) and Prabhu (1990)

started to question the very concept of method, and promoted the idea of “anti-methods” or Postmethod Pedagogy.

### 1.3 The Notion of Pedagogy

In order to know Postmethod, one needs to have a clear perception about the concept of pedagogy and method. Pedagogy is a word which has had a relatively short history in the ELT literature. As for Shahidullah,

The term pedagogy means the science and also the art of teaching. This may be used synonymously with teaching techniques or classroom procedures...the basic function of pedagogy is providing input in ways that can facilitate or maximize learners’ intake and provide opportunities for output, and also try to help learners think, analyse, interpret and evaluate by critically engaging them in the learning process and thereby cultivate learners’ critical intellect. It is concerned with the modes or styles of inputting that can best facilitate maximum intake for the learners and their output skills.<sup>2</sup>

Pedagogy “specifies relations between its elements: the teacher, the classroom or other context, content, the view of learning and learning about learning.”<sup>3</sup> They also explain how in this model pedagogy appears to be relatively a technical concept that reflects a fixed inter-relationship between various components of an academic setting. As such, it can be viewed as an academic model and may be in contrast with a practitioner’s model of pedagogy where intricacies and particularities of a specific context may define the meaning of pedagogy. In the latter model, there is likely to be less definition of particular aspects and more acknowledgement of the dynamic inter-relationships between all the players in the learning context and the various influences on their learning. In spite of having multifaceted meanings, pedagogy may be described as “a deliberate attempt to influence how and what knowledge and identities [sic] are

---

<sup>2</sup> M. Shahidullah, “English Studies in Bangladesh: Quest for a Native Pedagogy” in Abdullah Al Mamun and Maswood Akhter, eds, *Literature, History and Culture: Writings in Honour of Professor Aali Areefur Rehman*. Rajshahi: Department of English, University of Rajshahi, 2014):721

<sup>3</sup> Watkins and Mortimore (1999: 8), cited in Keesing-Styles, Linda. “Radical Pedagogy.” (ISSN: 1524-6345, 2003) [www.radicalpedagogy.org](http://www.radicalpedagogy.org).

produced within and among particular sets of social relations.”<sup>4</sup> As ELT pedagogy can shape the identity of learners and give them voice of agency, it has the potentials to liberate them if it is implemented effectively.

#### 1.4 The Concept of Method

The concept of method is inextricably bound up with pedagogy and its meaning in ELT literature is “shrouded in a veil of vagueness”. According to *Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning*<sup>5</sup>, the term “method” is derived from the Greek word *Methodos* which “includes the idea of a series of steps leading towards a conceived goal.” The encyclopaedia defines method simply as “a planned way of doing something”. In ELT, “a method implies an orderly way of going about something, ascertaining a degree of advanced planning and of control, then; also, a process rather than a product.”<sup>6</sup> The term “methods”, as presently used in the literature on second and foreign language (L2) teaching, does not refer to what teachers actually do in the classroom: rather, it refers to established methods conceptualized and constructed by the experts in the field. Nobody can be sure of the exact number of existing methods of ELT to date. A book published in the mid-sixties, for example, gives a list of fifteen “most common” types of methods which are still in use in one form or other in different parts of the world.<sup>7</sup>

As for Richards and Rodgers (2001), a “method” is an umbrella term which is “theoretically related to an approach, organizationally determined by a design and

---

<sup>4</sup> Ibid

<sup>5</sup> B. Kumaravivelu, *Understanding Language Teaching: From Method to Post-method* (Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, Mahwah, New Jersey, London, 2008), 162

<sup>6</sup> Shahidullah, “English Studies in Bangladesh: Quest for a Native Pedagogy”

<sup>7</sup> B. Kumaravivelu, *Beyond Methods: Macrostrategies for Language Teaching* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2003), 24

practically realized in procedure.”<sup>8</sup> According to Bell (2001), “Method is a way of arriving to one’s teaching goal, method is a manner in which a system is implemented to complete a specific task-a method applies to a structured idea that a teacher follows-combining theory and practice that best suits their learners’ need.”<sup>9</sup>

In general sense method entails: (i) Teachers’ role, (ii) Learners’ roles, (iii) Interactional patterns in the classroom, (iv) Mode of error correction and (v) Mode of feedback.<sup>10</sup> The chief concerns of methods are as follows:

1. Providing input, facilitating the conversion of input into intake and intake into output,
2. Providing input by teachers in such a way that helps maximum intake and plan tasks or activities that help output,
3. Making sure that input should be of  $i+1$  type,, also called ‘roughly tuned’ rather than at the level of  $i$  (called finely tuned input), or ‘ $i+....5$ ’,
4. Lowering affective filter (learning is not only a cognitive process but also largely affective),
5. Involving the psychological factors like attitudes and motivation of learners’<sup>11</sup>

As already mentioned, ELT has witnessed different methods in different periods with their apparently radical claims yet it would be wrong to assume that all those methods come up with different paths. Rather they have got remarkable common underpinnings both in theory and practice of ELT. So Wilga Rivers (1991) aptly says that what seems to be strikingly a new method is more often than not a variant of existing methods presented with “the fresh paint of a new terminology that camouflages their fundamental similarity”.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Jack C. Richards and Theodore Rodgers, *Approaches to and Methods in Language Teaching* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001),20

<sup>9</sup> Ibid ,72

<sup>10</sup> M. Shahidullah English Studies in Bangladesh: Quest for a Native Pedagogy” in *Literature, History and Culture: Writings in Honour of Professor Aali Areefur Rehman*. Abdullah Al Mamun and Maswood Akhter, eds., (Department of English, University of Rajshahi, Rajshai, 2014), 723

<sup>11</sup> Ibid

<sup>12</sup> Wilga Rivers (1991) cited in Kumaravadelu, *Understanding Language Teaching*,163

## 1.5 The Myth of Method

The recognized methods of ELT are inspired and maintained by "multiple myths"<sup>13</sup> that have long been taken for as "professional articles of faith".<sup>14</sup> Kumaravadivelu holds that these myths are, up to a larger extent, responsible for creating the "inflated image" of the concept of method. Some of them are as follows:

Myth 1: "There is a best method out there ready and waiting to be discovered".<sup>15</sup>

Stern (1985) says that ELT professionals have been preoccupied with a "search for the best method" and therefore "...language teaching methods have followed the pendulum of fashion from one extreme to the other (p.138)."<sup>16</sup> So the history of methods suggests "a problematic progressivism, whereby whatever is happening now is presumed to be superior to what happened before (*Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning*, 2000, p.278)"<sup>17</sup>. Hence, Kuamravadivelu says regretfully:

We thought we should be able to find that one magical method through objective analysis. Instead, we found to our dismay that the formation and implementation of a method have to take into account many variables (such as language policy and planning, learning wants and needs, wants and situations, teacher profile, etc.) most of which cannot be controlled by a systematic study. We found that we cannot even compare known methods to see which one works best.<sup>18</sup>

Myth 2: "Methods constitutes the organizing principles of language teaching".<sup>19</sup>

The concept of methods organizing principles of teaching and learning language in various contexts and situations fulfilling learner needs and wants is another myth about the concept of method. This second myth is unfortunate due to the fact that it is

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibid

<sup>14</sup> Ibid

<sup>15</sup> Kumaravadivelu, *Understanding Language Teaching*,163

<sup>16</sup> Ibid,164

<sup>17</sup> *Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning*, 2000, p.278 (cited)Ibid

<sup>18</sup> Ibid

<sup>19</sup> Ibid, 164

too inadequate and too limited to properly explain the complexity of language pedagogy.<sup>20</sup> Kumaravadivelu aptly adds to this point:

By concentrating excessively on methods, we have ignored other factors that govern classroom processes and practices-factors such as teacher cognition, learner perception, societal needs, cultural contexts, political exigencies, economic imperatives, and institutional constraints, all of which are inextricably linked together. Each of these factors shapes and reshapes the content and character of language teaching; each having a huge impact on the success or failure of any language teaching enterprise.<sup>21</sup>

Myth 3: “Method has a universal and ahistorical value<sup>22</sup>.”

The misled faith in a “universally applicable method” and “its top-down orientation” has been responsible for creating the second myth about the concept of method. In fact no idealized concept of method is capable to envisage all the variables (i.e. learning and teaching needs, wants, situations and so on) and therefore to provide context specific solutions that ELT practitioners need mostly to meet up the challenges that they face every day in language classrooms also varies from one context to another. Another part of the problem of this third myth is that the search for a universally applicable method has been predominantly top-down exercise as it is guided by “one-size-fit-all-cookie-cutter approach that assumes a common custom with typical goals.<sup>23</sup> But learners across the world do not learn English in ESL/EFL situations with the same objectives. They have different goals and ways for learning English. The so called methods have failed to fathom this “essential local touch”.<sup>24</sup>

Myth 4: “Theorists conceive knowledge, and teachers consume knowledge.”<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibid, 165

<sup>21</sup> Ibid

<sup>22</sup> Ibid

<sup>23</sup> Ibid

<sup>24</sup> Ibid

<sup>25</sup> Ibid, 166

In the field of ELT, there is a clear dichotomy between theory and practice which has created a division of labour between the theorist and the teacher. This has given way to the fourth myth about method which holds that teachers would globally follow the principles and practices of established methods. But teachers in real life rarely do so. Rather they use their own intuitive ability and experiential knowledge to decide what works and what does not work in classrooms. There is thus a significant variance between what theorist advocates and what teachers do in classrooms.<sup>26</sup>

Myth 5: “Method is neutral, and has no ideological motivation.”<sup>27</sup>

The fifth myth is that method is neutral and immune from ideological constraints. The ideological nature of ELT has also been well examined (e.g. Canagarajah: Pennycook, 1998; Phillipson, 1992; Ricento, 2000).<sup>28</sup> In a penetrating analysis of the concept of method in particular, Pennycook<sup>29</sup> in his paper explains how “the concept of method exhibits a particular view of the world and is articulated in the interests of unequal power relationships.” Pennycook also shows “how the dominance of this notion in the conceptualization of teaching has diminished rather than enhancing our understanding of language teaching.”<sup>30</sup> There are three important reasons, as to him, why the concept of method is so weak. Firstly, there is little argument as to which methods existed when, and in what order, secondly, there is little agreement and conceptual coherence to the term used; and thirdly, there is little evidence that methods ever reflected classroom reality.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Ibid

<sup>27</sup> Ibid, 167

<sup>28</sup> Ibid

<sup>29</sup> Pennycook (1989), cited in Kumaravadivelu, *Understanding Language Teaching*, 163

<sup>30</sup> Alastair Pennycook, “The Concept of Method, interested Knowledge, and the Politics of Language Teaching.” (*TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 23. No. 4, 1989), 597

<sup>31</sup> Ibid, 602



## 1.6 Limitations of the Methods

In 1989, the very concept of method began to face severe criticisms for its “positivist, progressiveist and patriarchal” outlook of the linear developments of TESOL practices (Pennycook, 1989). Critics around the world like Phillipson (1996), Holliday (1994), Pennycook (1989), Long (1989, 2003), Prabhu (1990), Stern (1991), Nunan (1987), Swafer, Arans and Morgan (1982), Richards and Rodgers (1990, 2003) began to criticize “the conceptual coherence”<sup>32</sup> and validity of method. A good many data-based, classroom-oriented investigations conducted in various contexts by these researchers reveal dissatisfaction with methods. They have pointed out four interrelated facts about language pedagogy in the traditional classrooms:

- Teachers who claim to follow a particular method do not conform to its theoretical principles and classroom principles at all,
- Teachers who claim to follow different methods often use the same classroom procedures,
- Teachers who claim to follow the same method often use different procedures, and
- Teachers develop and follow in their classroom a carefully crafted sequence of activities not necessarily associated with any particular method.

Being dissatisfied with the ambiguous concept and nature of method, Clark (1983) says that “the term ‘method’ is a label without substance”.<sup>33</sup> Stern (1983) also remarks that there is a “fundamental weakness”<sup>34</sup> in the concept of Method. He holds that the “conviction has gradually spread that language teaching cannot be satisfactorily conceptualized in terms of teaching method alone” (p. 474) has not been reinforced in line with the continuing emphasis on methods.<sup>35</sup> Pennycook (1989) holds that the concept of method is ultimately prescriptive rather than descriptive. Rather than analysing what is

---

<sup>32</sup> Ibid, 602

<sup>33</sup> Kumaravadivelu, *Understanding Language Teaching*, 168

<sup>34</sup> Ibid

<sup>35</sup> Pennycook, “The Concept of Method, interested Knowledge, and the Politics of Language Teaching”, 597

happening in language classrooms, methods come up with prescriptions for classroom behaviour.<sup>36</sup> He also says to this end,

While it is clear that language teaching has undergone many transformations over the centuries, a thorough examination of the past suggests that these changes have represented different configurations of the same basic options rather than some linear, additive progress toward the present day, and that these changes are due principally to shifts in the social, cultural, political, and philosophical climate. The Method construct that has been the predominant paradigm used to conceptualize teaching not only fails to account adequately for these historical conditions, but also is conceptually inconsistent, conflating categories and types at all levels and failing to demonstrate intellectual rigor. It is also highly questionable whether so-called methods ever reflected what was actually going on in classrooms.<sup>37</sup>

Canagarajah (1999) holds that classroom realities rarely correspond to any recognized method since the implementations of methods may differ from teacher to teacher and class to class depending on contextual factors (i.e. “logistical, cultural, institutional forces at play”). Therefore, when teachers start with a specific method in mind, they get impacted by classroom incidents to make changes as they teach. This is why scholars doubt whether there is anything called a ‘method’.” Clarke and Silberstein (1988) says that the prescriptions (of “methods”) are implied in virtually all discussions of the relationship between theory and practice.<sup>38</sup> The “relative unhelpfulness” of the existence of methods was first emphasized by the British applied linguist, Dick Allwright in 1991 while giving a talk in a conference in Ottawa, Canada and the talk was titled deliberately, “The Death of the Method”.<sup>39</sup> Following his lead, the American scholar, Brown (2002) too has used imagery of the death of methods.<sup>40</sup> Allwright elucidates six reasons to show the futility of the concept of methods:

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibid, 609

<sup>37</sup> Ibid, 608

<sup>38</sup> Ibid

<sup>39</sup> Allwright, Dick, 1991 cited in Kumaravadivelu, *Understanding Language Teaching*, 168-169

<sup>40</sup> Brown (2002) (cited) Ibid

- a) It is built on seeing differences where similarities may be more important, since methods that are different in abstract principles seem to be far less so in the classroom.
- b) it simplifies unhelpfully a highly complex set of issues, for example seeing similarities among learners when differences may be more important...
- c) it diverts energies from potentially more productive concerns, since time spent learning how to implement a particular method is time not available for such alternative activities as classroom task design;
- d) it breeds a brand loyalty which is unlikely to be helpful to the profession, since it fosters pointless rivalries on essentially irrelevant issues;
- e) it breeds complacency, if, as it surely must, it conveys the impression that answers have indeed been found to all the major methodological question in our profession;
- f) it offers a 'cheap' externally derived sense of coherence for language teachers which may itself inhibit the development of a personally "expensive", but ultimately far more valuable, internally derived sense of coherence...<sup>41</sup>

So “method-based teacher education” puts teachers in awfully miserable conditions as those ready-made packages of methods fail to meet the challenges of the practice of everyday teaching. These are the reasons the discontentment grew over time about the concept of method and they finally necessitated the demise of methods era. As Kumaravadivelu holds that “...the ambiguous use of the term, method, and the multiple myths that are associated with it, have contributed to a gradual erosion of its inability as a construct in language learning and teaching, prompting some to say that the concept of method is dead.”<sup>42</sup>

Kumaravadivelu rightly says that the concept of method not only has little theoretical validity but also it has got less practical utility. He also says that its meaning is not only ambiguous but also its claim is dubious.<sup>43</sup> Some concrete examples may be drawn in this regard to explain the futility of these ELT methods. As a matter of fact, the curriculum of CLT, however well designed, cannot by itself guarantee meaningful communication in the classroom through classroom activities. It has been observed that

---

<sup>41</sup> Ibid,168-169

<sup>42</sup> Allwright (cited)Ibid,167

<sup>43</sup> Ibid,170

CLT works better in the comfortable surroundings of private language schools and universities based intensive English programmes where classes are small and students are limited, self-motivated and belong to literate cultures.<sup>44</sup> Therefore, the implementation of CLT in the state run educational institutions in the non-western contexts, where classroom size and number of students are large is not practical. In his paper Shahidullah points out:

Teaching-learning situation is an important variable and largely determines classroom practices including teachers' roles, learners' roles, interactional patterns and feedback to be given. Aspects of teaching-learning culture such as class-size, seating arrangements for teachers and learners and other physical facilities like cleanliness of the classroom, its surrounding or of the entire institution, lighting condition, ventilation, noise level of the classroom and teaching-learning aids are some of the important variables that have a direct bearing on formal teaching and learning in institutional situations.<sup>45</sup>

He made an empirical survey on 453 students of 11 institutes of the selected region in order to have a proper understanding of the prevailing teaching-learning situation of the country. As a whole, the study shows that the seating arrangements, class size and teaching-learning aids are hardly favourable for providing English education in the country. So undoubtedly it is difficult to carry on interactive activities of CLT in the present classroom settings.

Mamun, Shafiul and Bhowmik<sup>46</sup> show that there will be students with multiple preference respective of subject matter. So, on the basis of the findings of their study, they recommend ELT practitioners to change their teaching styles to accommodate different learning preferences of learners. But this might seem not so easy in the context

---

<sup>44</sup> Mohamamd Emdadul Huda, "Culture Sensitive Material Design for English Language Teaching in Bangladesh"(Unpublished Dissertation, Institute of Bangladesh Studies, Rajshahi University, 2003), 13

<sup>45</sup> M. Shahidullah, "Significance of teaching-learning situation in language learning and an empirical survey of the teaching-learning situation in Bangladesh." (*Jahangirnagar University Studies in Language and Literature: Harvest* Vol.19., pp.112-128, 2004), 111.

<sup>46</sup> Sadat, M. Mamun, Islam, Md. Shafiul and Bhowmik, Subrata Kumar, "Say 'yes' to learners: identifying learner's preferences for EFL in Bangladesh"(*Jahangirnagar University Studies in Language and Literature: Harvest*, Vol. 19. 2004), 112-128.

and culture of Bangladesh where the language teaching pedagogy gets impacted by several teaching-learning situational parameters or variables of the country such as class-size, duration of class, teaching materials and other infrastructural realities.

Pennycook (1994) asserts that ELT practices must be harmonious with the larger cultural, discursive or ideological orders of a country.<sup>47</sup> The prerequisite of an appropriate English language teaching methodology, as Holliday (1997) encapsulates, is as follows:

- i) It should have a built-in-facility for the teacher to reflect upon and learn about the social dimension of the classroom, and to continue learning,
- ii) It should therefore incorporate ongoing ethnographic action research,
- iii) It should be able to put into practice what has been learnt and should therefore be continually adaptable to whatever social situation emerges.<sup>48</sup>

This list indicates “what a potentially appropriate methodology must be able to do, to make it appropriate and therefore culture-sensitive”.<sup>49</sup> Classroom-oriented studies carried out in the last two decades show that these points are not reflected in the traditional method-oriented language classroom. The study conducted by Swaffar, Arens, and Morgan (1982) revealed, even syllabus designers and textbook producers do not strictly follow the underlying philosophy of a given method, and more importantly, even teachers who are trained in and claim to follow a particular method do not fully conform to its theoretical principles and classroom procedures (see also Kumaravadivelu, 1993a).<sup>50</sup> Hence considering the point of views of the ELT practitioners, Kumaravadivelu says to this end, “... none of these methods can be realized in their purest form in the actual classroom primarily because they are not derived from classroom\experience and experimentation but are artificially transplanted into the classroom and, as such, far

---

<sup>47</sup> Pennycook (1994) cited in Huda, “Culture Sensitive Material Design”,13

<sup>48</sup> Holliday, Adrian, *Appropriate Methodology* (Cambridge University Press,1994),164

<sup>49</sup> Ibid,165

<sup>50</sup> Swaffar, Arens, and Morgan (1982) & Kumaravadivelu, (1993a) cited in B. Kumaravadivelu, “The Postmethod Condition: (E)merging Strategies for Second Foreign Language Teaching” (*TESOL QUARTERLY*, Vol. 28, No. 1, Spring 1994SunJose' Slate University),30

removed from classroom reality (Nunan, 1991; Pennycook, 1989; Richards, 1989).<sup>51</sup> In such circumstances, it is not surprising that all attempts to devise alternative methods have proved to be an exercise in futility.

Phillipson (1992) holds the view that western ELT practices are culturally biased and inappropriate in the non-western setting. He cites examples from many ELT experts and shows that western communicative methodology fails to produce much communication and its materials do not work in the third world countries. So he puts emphasis on devising a culture-responsive pedagogy that can benefit ELT in non-western context. In fact, classroom is the microcosm of the wider society outside it. The aspects of classroom interaction are always impacted by the broader society of which the participants of these interactions are members. So for an appropriate methodology, all the factors affecting the classroom activities should be taken into account (Holliday, 1994).<sup>52</sup> Just as the personal background of the learner influences how something is learned, what is learned shapes the person's consciousness, identity, and relationships which are embedded in the educational experience.<sup>53</sup>

Classroom reality is socially situated and historically determined. Pennycook (1989) writes:

A clearer understanding of the situation ... suggests that teachers make a whole series of decisions about teaching based on their own educational experiences, their personalities, their particular institutional, social, cultural, and political circumstances, their understanding of their particular students' collective and individual needs, and so on. Any relationship between these decisions and theories about pedagogy and language learning are highly complex and need to be studied without the use of a priori categories, especially when those categories are as clumsy and unspecific as are methods. As any teacher who has taught through any of the alleged upheavals over methods can testify, there is a

---

<sup>51</sup> Nunan, (1991), Pennycook, (1989), Richards, (1989) (cited) Ibid, 29

<sup>52</sup> Holliday (1994) cited in Huda, "Culture Sensitive Material Design for English Language Teaching in Bangladesh." (Unpublished PhD dissertation. Institute of Bangladesh Studies. Rajshahi University, 2003),14

<sup>53</sup> Huda, "Culture Sensitive Material Design", 33

remarkable disparity between, on the one hand, the dictates of "experts" and textbooks and on the other, actual classroom practice.<sup>54</sup>

What is therefore fundamental to challenge the social and historical forces is a pedagogy that empowers teachers and learners. Postmethod pedagogy is such a development that takes into consideration the lived experience of teachers and learners bring to the educational setting.

In this study, an attempt has been made to examine the different facets of Postmethod with special focus on the potentials of and challenges for implementing it in the Bangladeshi context.

### **1.7 Paradigm Shift in Pedagogy**

There are two basic paradigms of pedagogy and they are: (i) Traditional/ Transfer/ Pouring in Paradigm or teacher fronted, memory based, Lecture model (lockstep approach) and (ii) Innovative/ Interactive/ Transactional/ Interactional/ Liberating/ Problem-posing or Student-centred, Creative Construction model through critical engagement (Shahidullah, 1999)<sup>55</sup>. At present, in the field of ELT a paradigm shift is palpable and the shift is from "the pedagogy of the oppressed" to the innovative pedagogy. The shifts are marked by the following characteristics:

1. A shift from the product to process oriented pedagogy, or a shift in focus on process which involves creative construction of knowledge by critical engagements of the learners in the learning process.
2. A shift from transmission to transactional model of pedagogy.
3. A shift from rote learning to discovery-oriented learning, learning through problem solving, and learning by doing.
4. A shift from teacher dependence on learner autonomy, and liberation of learners from teachers,

---

<sup>54</sup> Alastair Pennycook, "The Concept of Method, interested Knowledge, and the Politics of Language Teaching." (*TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 23. No. 4, 1989), 589-618.

<sup>55</sup> M. Shahidullah, "English Studies in Bangladesh: Quest for a Native Pedagogy" in Abdullah Al Mamun and Maswood Akhter, eds. *Literature, History and Culture: Writings in Honour of Professor Aali Areefur Rehman*. (Rajshahi: Department of English, University of Rajshahi, 2014), 728-729

5. A shift from a focus on the cognitive side only to focus on both cognitive, affective and socio-cultural aspects,
6. A shift from teachers' choice to learners' preferences.<sup>56</sup>

Kumaravadivelu (2003, 2006)<sup>57</sup> uses the term pedagogy in a broad sense, intending to cover not only issues about classroom strategies, instructional materials, curricular objectives, and evaluation measures, but also many historical, political and socio-cultural experiences that more or less influence ELT.

### 1.8 The Emergence of Postmethod

The term "Postmethod" was first coined by Pennycook (1989) and then was taken up by others, including Prabhu (1990), Allright (1991), Stern (1992) and Kumaravadivelu (1994, 1999, 2001, 2003, 2006).<sup>58</sup> Kumaravadivelu defines Postmethod condition in the following way:

Having witnessed how methods go through endless cycles of life, death, and rebirth, the language teaching profession seems to have reached a state of heightened awareness-an awareness that as long as we are caught up in the web of 'method', we will continue to get entangled in an unending search for an unavailable solution, an awareness that drives us to continually recycle and repackage the same old ideas and an awareness that nothing sort of breaking the cycle can salvage the situation.<sup>59</sup>

Though the main thrust in the post-method concept is to develop a new set of strategies and procedures for language teaching, it does not advocate for complete abandonment of the existing methods. Instead, it endorses any attempt on the part of the teachers to modify and adjust an established method to the realities of their local contexts, thus recreating them as their own (Richards and Rodgers 2001:251).<sup>60</sup> By

---

<sup>56</sup> Ibid

<sup>57</sup> Kumaravadivelu, *Beyond Methods* (2003) and *Understanding Language Teaching* (2006)

<sup>58</sup> Pennycook (1989), Prabhu (1990), Allright (1991), Stern (1992), Kumaravadivelu (1994, 1999, 2001, 2003, and 2006) cited in Mohammad Emdadul Huda, "Post-method Pedagogy and ELT in Bangladesh." (*Global Journal of Human Social Science and Linguistics and Education*, Vol. 13, Issue: 7, Version: 1.0, 2013)

<sup>59</sup> Kumaravadivelu, *Understanding Language Teaching*, 162.

<sup>60</sup> Richards and Rodgers (2001:251), cited in Mohammad Emdadul Huda, "Post-method Pedagogy and ELT in Bangladesh." (*Global Journal of Human Social Science and Linguistics and Education*, Vol. 13, Issue: 7, Version: 1.0, 2013)



drawing on a number of methods, teachers can develop an “eclectic method” harmonious with the local contextual variables. In this regard Cattell (2009, p. 59) says, “One way to overcome the limitations of the methods paradigm would be to simply allow teachers to choose from a variety of methods”.<sup>61</sup>

Kumaravadivelu (2003) also holds that the very concept of method is nothing but “a construct of marginality” and that “It valorises everything associated with the colonial Self and marginalizes everything associated with the subaltern other. In the neo-colonial present, as in colonial past, methods are used to establish native Self as superior and the non-native Other as inferior.”<sup>62</sup> So it is obvious why methods are commodified and marketed as practicable in all learning or teaching context cannot be suitable for any learning or teaching context. Hence, what is felt to be imperative is, as Kumaravadivelu holds, *the decolonization*<sup>63</sup> of the methodological concepts of ELT and to make the shift from the concept of method to the notion of Postmethod condition possible.<sup>64</sup>

In line with the same thought, Canagarajah (1999) says:

ELT scholars realize that methods are ‘constructs’ put together by specific social groups for particular ends on the basis of their social practice and interests (Pennycook. 1989, Philipson, 1992). Methods are not value free instruments of solely pragmatic support. They are ideological in embodying partisan assumptions about social relations and cultural values. Methods can reproduce these values and practices whatever they are being used. The empirical claims and emergency criteria serve only to blind teachers to the hegemonic implications of methods.<sup>65</sup>

Canagarajah also explains how the methods industry parallels commerce in the international market place. He criticizes the centre’s unfair monopoly over trade

---

<sup>61</sup> Cattell (2009, p. 59), (cited) Ibid

<sup>62</sup> For more details see B. Kumaravadivelu, “Critical Language Pedagogy: A Postmethod Perspective on Language Teaching” (*Forum, World Englishes*, Vol. 22, No. 4, 2003, pp. 539-550) [http://bkumaravadivelu.com/articles in pdfs/,541](http://bkumaravadivelu.com/articles%20in%20pdfs/541)

<sup>63</sup> Ibid,549

<sup>64</sup> Ibid,544

<sup>65</sup> A. Suresh, Canagarajah, *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999),104

products with periphery nation which is extended through the trade in language-teaching methods. He regrets:

It is not surprising that many teachers in periphery communities succumb to center claims that the methods propagate through their glossy textbooks, research journals, teacher training programs, and professional organizations are the most efficient. This dependency on imported products has tended to undermine the alternative styles of thinking, learning, and interacting preferred by local communities. Beyond this, of course, every new method sold to periphery institutions is a drain of limited educational budgets, which may further deplete by the cost of paying centre experts to retrain the teaching cadres. In these ways, the extensive promotions help to draw periphery communities even deeper into a vortex of cultural, financial and professional dependency.<sup>66</sup>

However, Canagarajah<sup>67</sup> also says that adopting a periphery standpoint does not mean that the educators or teachers in ESL/EFL contexts should ignore centre traditions of thinking and discourses altogether. They can even engage with them from their locations as periphery subjects with critical awareness to resist linguistic and cultural imperialism and the local merges with the global but with critical insight as to teaching and learning English.<sup>68</sup> In this connection he also remarks:

Periphery subjects must then acquire English in their own terms while maintaining proficiency in their native languages and discourses. They have to negotiate with English to gain positive identities, critical expression, and ideological clarity. Rather than slavishly patronizing the language and accepting the typical values it embodies with the unfavourable representations it provides, periphery students will become insiders and use the language in their own terms according to their own aspirations, needs and values. They will reposition themselves in English language and discourse to use these not as slaves, but as agents: to use English not mechanically and differently, but creatively and critically.<sup>69</sup>

Postmethod pedagogy entails an understanding of the limitations of methods and a desire to go beyond those limitations with a view to recognizing the complexities

---

<sup>66</sup> Ibid

<sup>67</sup> Ibid

<sup>68</sup> Ibid

<sup>69</sup> Ibid, 176

of language teaching and its contexts and take initiatives to develop context-sensitive and culture-specific language teaching. In doing so ELT practitioners need to become “transformative intellectuals”, as coined by Henry Giroux (1988), who are capable of developing “counterhegemonic pedagogies” that will educate students not only to function in the larger society as critical agents by acquiring essential knowledge and skills, but also make them ready for transformative action.<sup>70</sup> At this point, language pedagogy assumes the features of “Humanistic pedagogy” which sheds light on the fact that teachers need to consider the learners’ whole person, their cognitive, and affective beings which impact the learning process significantly. Maximum learning outcome will never be achieved unless learners are emotionally as well as cognitively involved in the language learning process.<sup>71</sup> Thus being context-bound rather than merely relying on the underpinnings of imposed theories, Postmethod pedagogy empowers teachers to devise personal theories of practice that suits learners’ needs and objectives while learning English as a second or foreign language.

### **1.9 The Statement of the Problem**

Although Bangladesh has a long history of English teaching and learning, and the learning outcomes of the learners reportedly was quite good in the past. In recent years the learning outcome is quiet frustrating. There has been a shift from Grammar Translation Method to Communicative Language Teaching with a great expectation in the late 1970s’. New Language Syllabuses have been designed and new textbooks have been written, teachers have been trained, some attempts have been made to change testing and evaluation system; but learning outcome does not seem to improve. Many students still fail in English in S.S.C and H.S.C examinations. Students’ proficiency

---

<sup>70</sup> Henry Giroux (1988) cited in Kumaravadivelu, *Beyond Methods*,13-14

<sup>71</sup> Shahidullah, “English Studies in Bangladesh: Quest for a Native Pedagogy”,729

level in all the four skills of English are miserably poor. These being the situation, people are criticized of present teaching-learning practices also. There have been serious problems at the implementations of the ideas. It has been seen that though the ideas underpinning CLT have been scientific, the implementation of them were found difficult. Even the trained teachers faced problems and complexities in implementing them in classrooms. A study shows that the trained teachers used only 56 out of 652 minutes of their teaching implementation what they learnt from their learning. A report of a baseline study done by English in Action (BIA) project in 2008-09 reveals that a remarkable number of students have not progressed beyond initial level of competence in spoken English. The report also says that the overall competence in spoken English of the teachers, learners and community adults is very frustrating.<sup>72</sup>

For implementation of CLT what have been thought crucial for teachers and learners are to change their roles in language pedagogy. As they could not do away with the influence of GTM or take on the roles that CLT requires, the latter failed here. A large number of our teachers are found unable to implement the culture non-responsive CLT here as the students could not be psychologically prepared to participate in communicative activities changing their passive roles as listeners in the classrooms which were one of the pivotal objectives of CLT. They have been often found as knowledge “depositories”<sup>73</sup> of what their teachers, educational institutions, learning materials, educational settings and testing systems provide them or allow them. But English is not like any other content based subject and so its four skills need special focus in language pedagogy and hence teachers’ role in teaching it effectively is enormously significant.

---

<sup>72</sup> Muhammad Emdadul Huda, “Postmethod Pedagogy and ELT in Bangladesh.” *Global Journal of Human Social Science Linguistics & Education* 1 Vol. 13. no. issue, 2013

<sup>73</sup> Freire, Paulo, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Continuum International Publishing Group Inc), 72

Experts in the University English Departments of the country are also genuinely concerned about the situation. The results of the Dhaka University Admission Test, 2014-15 session English show a very dismal picture of English teaching and learning. Of the total 40,565 examinees, 22000 failed in English and only two students qualified to be enrolled in the Department of English according to university sources.<sup>74</sup> There is no denying of the fact that it is a serious problem in the country and the situation demands serious attention and research.

Literature now suggests that the methods Era is over as it has failed to produce the desired results globally also. As put by Phillipson (1992),

A survey of theories of educational and dependency and the empirical evidence by a World Bank consultant ends with the bald statement that ‘there is a good deal of the evidence that much western curricula, technology and institutions have failed in the ‘Third World because of their inappropriateness (Hurst, 1984).<sup>75</sup>

The present argument in this study is for Postmethod pedagogy. We now belong to the Postmethod era. The paradigm shift from methods to Postmethod began taking place in mid 1990s. Since then many leading applied linguists have argued for context-appropriate methodology (Holliday, 1994)<sup>76</sup> and Postmethods (Kumaravadivelu, 1994, 2003, 2006). The latter is a new pedagogic approach which involves many new ideas in language education. However, scientific and theoretically promising, its implementation requires changed role of teachers and learners, new materials and textbooks, new classroom practices and new types of testing and evaluation. As the ideas are quite new for Bangladesh, and the country could not successfully implement CLT in the last two decades, how far Postmethod can be implemented in our context requires an

---

<sup>74</sup> DU Correspondent, “Poor English Raises Concern”, *The Daily Star*, 2014

<sup>75</sup> Phillipson, Robert, *Linguistic Imperialism*, 4th ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 260

<sup>76</sup> Holliday, *Appropriate Methodology* (1994), Kumaravadivelu, *Beyond Methods* (2003) and *Understanding Language Teaching* (2008)

investigation. It is important to examine the potentials and challenges for implementing Postmethods prior to taking any decision to adopt it in the teaching-learning context of our country. This study is an attempt to do so.

As only theoretical solidity of pedagogy is not enough to prove that a method can be applied in all cultures and contexts, because teaching-learning is a situated cultural contextual factor, and as the wider socio-politico-cultural realities were not properly taken into consideration earlier, the different methods in the methods era did not work in different ESL/EFL situations, it is therefore important to examine the implementational challenges and potentials of the new pedagogical insights and it is with this end in view that the present study tries to examine the “Particularities” of English teaching-learning culture of Bangladesh and see how far the ideas of “Practicality” and “Possibility” of Postmethod pedagogy (PMP) can be implemented in the prevailing particularities of Bangladesh. This new development is considered a better option for language education and the core research question in the study is:

What are the potentials of and challenges for implementing Postmethod Pedagogy (PMP) in Bangladesh?

### **1.10 Research Questions**

This study addresses the following research questions:

- (i) What are the limitations of the concept of method and the methods Era and what factors lead to the emergence of the idea of Postmethod pedagogy?
- (ii) What are the key features and parameters of Postmethod pedagogy?
- (iii) What are the realities (“Particularities”) of English teaching-learning culture and context of Bangladesh?
- (iv) What would be the pedagogic potentials of and challenges for implementing the parameters of “Practicality” and “Possibility” of Postmethods in Bangladesh?

### 1.11 Research Objectives

This research will make an attempt to:

- (i) examine the limitations of the concept of method and the methods era and the factors that lead to the emergence of the idea of Postmethod pedagogy,
- (ii) develop a conceptual framework of Postmethod pedagogy,
- (iii) examine the realities (“Particularities”) of English teaching-learning culture and context of Bangladesh,
- (iv) examine the potentials of and challenges for implementing the parameters of “Practicality” and “Possibility” of Postmethod pedagogy in Bangladesh,
- (v) recommend measures for ELT in Bangladesh.


### 1.12 Justification of the Research

This study explores new pedagogical insights in English education of Bangladesh. It pinpoints the limitations of the methods and methods Era and puts forward arguments for implementing Postmethod pedagogy with a view to altering the prevailing teaching-learning scenario here. In doing so it takes into account the "*Particularities*" (the actualities) of the English teaching–learning context of Bangladesh. Most importantly it makes an attempt to examine teachers’ and learners’ beliefs, experience, expectations, learning style preferences and learning strategies in relation to English teaching-learning here. Both the literature and empirical survey bring out many important facts regarding the aforementioned issues. The literature survey complemented by the empirical investigation of the study will pave the way for providing useful suggestions as to the potentials of and challenges for implementing a culture-sensitive Postmethod pedagogy for English Language Teaching in the country.

### **1.13 Semantic Map of the Study**

In the wake of Postmethod Era English Language Teaching Pedagogy is assuming new looks in different parts of the world according to respective contexts. However, to understand the importance of Postmethod pedagogy for ELT in the context and culture of Bangladesh requires the conceptualization of a semantic map of the study by which the innovative pedagogy is supposed to work.





**Figure 1.1: The Semantic Map of the Study**

#### **1.14 Feasibility of the Study**

This study is feasible as the researcher has good academic preparation as she has a background in ELT and has got experience of teaching at both private and public universities. Again though all the respondents of the study are H.S.C level students, the researcher was able to collect valid and reliable data and information regarding the research issues. Respective college teachers were also co-operative. The library research for collecting secondary data was also feasible because of the availability of enough books and research articles on the related topic. Moreover, advice from the experts in the relevant field, logistic supports from IBS and most importantly the guidance of the respected supervisor helped the researcher complete the study in time.

#### **1.15 Limitations of the Study**

One of the limitations of the study is that it studies only the teaching-learning situations of the H.S.C level students and their teachers. As far as the empirical study is concerned, this study was conducted only in three areas of Rajshahi Division that were chosen purposively and they are: Rajshahi, Natore and Chapainawabganj. So owing to time constraints and communication hurdles, 18 colleges of the mentioned area have been taken into consideration for conducting students' survey and interview. Again, as the number of teachers in 18 colleges were insufficient, 13 more colleges were selected from the chosen areas to conduct questionnaire survey and interview on teachers.

Another limitation of the study is that the respondents in many cases did not cooperate actively because of their limited knowledge in the field of study. While administering the questionnaire survey and interview with the students, it was felt that the instruments too had certain limitations. While answering the questions, the students confused the English language classroom situation with the classroom situations of other subjects. Again, as the language of the Questionnaire Survey and Interview was English,

the researcher had to spend a good amount of time explaining item by item to elicit the right information as much as possible. It was hard for the researcher in some cases to get consent and scheduled time to conduct questionnaire survey and interview on teachers.

Another limitation of the research was that owing to bad weather, sometimes the researcher had to cancel her scheduled plan of doing survey or classroom observation in the institutions of certain areas of Natore and Chapainawabganj which was also very much time consuming.

### **1.16 Definition of Key Terms Used in the Study**

|            |  |
|------------|--|
| ELT        | = English Language Teaching  |
| ESL        | = English as a Second Language   |
| EFL        | = English as a Foreign Language  |
| CLT        | = Communicative Language Teaching  |
| PMP        | = Post method Pedagogy   |
| TL         | = Target Language  |
| L1         | = First Language   |
| L2         | = Second Language  |
| CP         | = Critical Pedagogy  |
| NCTB       | = National Curriculum and Textbook Board   |
| Pedagogy   | = The method and practice of teaching, especially as an academic subject or theoretical concept. |
| Method     | = A method is an application of an approach in the context of language teaching.                 |
| Postmethod | = A search for an alternative to method.   |
| Q. Survey  | = Questionnaire Survey   |
| SQM        | = Student's Questionnaire Survey   |
| SIM        | = Students' Interview  |
| TQM        | = Teachers' Questionnaire Survey   |
| TIM        | = Teachers' Interview  |
| SD         | = Standard Deviation   |

### **1.17 Conclusion**

Postmethod Pedagogy which is a much talked about topic in ELT in recent times, needs closer examination for its proper implementation in any context. So it is very important to examine the important cultural and contextual variables like the present experiences of teachers and learners, their beliefs and expectations, students' learning style preferences and strategies, and the overall teaching+-learning situation of Bangladesh to examine the applicability of the new ideas in Bangladesh. The study will first examine the theoretical strengths or arguments of Postmethod and then have a look at the above-mentioned variables through an empirical investigation. The empirical study is expected to give a detailed picture of the actualities of Bangladeshi English teaching-learning situation at Higher Secondary Level. The findings will play a vital role in drawing our attention to the potentials of and challenges for implementation of Postmethod pedagogy in the country. This innovative pedagogy being context-sensitive and culture specific seems theoretically impressive, yet how far it could be pragmatic in our setting needs a close and critical examination. This present study is an attempt to do so.

## **Chapter Two**

# **The Key Features of Postmethod Pedagogy**

### **2.1 Introduction**

English language teaching in ESL/EFL is a dynamic field, which is still growing up and changing very fast. Postmethod pedagogy is one of the latest developments in English Language Teaching which emerged in response to the demand for the most optimal way of teaching English. It is also a rising area of research which is drawing attention of ELT experts, researchers and practitioners around the world. So the literature of this field is also getting enriched day by day. This chapter is a detailed literature survey on the key features of Postmethod pedagogy.

The present chapter discusses the “Postmethod condition” and the key features of Postmethod in detail. Some ideas about local knowledge and its importance in Postmethod pedagogy have been also focused in this chapter. It stresses on the details of pedagogic parameters and the pedagogic indicators. The chapter also tries to provide details about the different aspects of “Particularities” of context or a teaching-learning culture. Moreover, it elucidates the different socio-psychological variables (“Particularities”) of teaching-learning culture such as beliefs, experience, expectations, learning style preferences and strategies of teachers and learners with respect to language teaching-learning in a given context.

### **2.2 Postmethod Condition**

The “Postmethod condition” is a sustainable state of affairs that fundamentally restructure and reshape the language teaching as well as teacher education. It emphasizes the need to review the character and content of classroom teaching in the

light of all its pedagogical and ideological perspectives. It compels language pedagogues to refigure the reified relationship between theory and practice.

Kumaravadivelu describes the Postmethod condition in the following terms:

As conceptualizers of philosophical underpinnings governing language pedagogy, theorists have traditionally occupied the power centre of language pedagogy while the practitioners of classroom teaching have been relegated to the disempowered periphery. If the conventional concept of method entitles theorists to construct knowledge-oriented theories of pedagogy, the postmethod condition empowers practitioners to construct classroom-oriented theories of practice. If the concept of method authorizes theorists to centralize pedagogic decision making, the postmethod condition enables practitioners to generate location-specific, classroom-oriented innovative practices.<sup>1</sup>

The three essential interrelated attributes of the “Postmethod condition” are as follows:

- i) It indicates a search for an “alternative to method rather than an alternative method.”<sup>2</sup> Methods are mainly the constructs of top-down processes while alternatives to methods are the products of bottom-up processes. So in practical terms the Postmethod condition implies the numerous possibilities for redefining the connection between the Center and the periphery. It empowers teachers to the extent that they produce innovative teaching strategies based on local knowledge and classroom-oriented activities.<sup>3</sup>
- ii) The Postmethod condition implies teacher autonomy which is highly ignored in traditional pedagogy. The typical concept of method ignores the fund of experience and tacit knowledge about teaching which the teachers bring with them in classroom (Freeman,1991,30).<sup>4</sup> But postmethod condition acknowledges “the teachers’ potential to know not only how to teach but how to act autonomously within the academic and administrative constraints

---

<sup>1</sup> B. Kumaravadivelu, "Postmethod Condition: (E) Merging Macrostrategies for Second/Foreign Language Teaching" (*TESOL QUARTERLY*, Vol. 28, No. 1, Spring 1994), 30. The goal of the proponents of eclecticism was to promote "the careful, principled combination of sound ideas from sound sources into a harmonious whole that yields the best results" (Hammerly, 1991, p. 18)

<sup>2</sup> B. Kumaravadivelu (2003)*Beyond Methods: Macrostrategies for Language Teaching*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 32-33

<sup>3</sup> Ibid,33

<sup>4</sup> (Freeman,1991,30) (cited)Ibid

imposed by institution, curricula, and textbooks.”<sup>5</sup> It aids teachers to develop critical thinking and also enable them to theorize from their own experience, knowledge and practice.

- iii) The third feature of Postmethod condition is “principled pragmatism.” It is different from “eclecticism” which advocates for putting together practices from different recognized methods.<sup>6</sup> The third condition implies that the relationship between theory and practice, ideas and their actualization, can only be comprehended within the domain of application, that is, through the immediate activity of teaching (Widdowson, 1990)<sup>7</sup>. In this case the teachers’ “subjective understanding of the teaching they do” can be of immense help which is supposed to arise from their own experience as learners and teachers and through specialized education and expertise in pedagogy and peer discussion.<sup>8</sup>

The aforementioned three major attributes of Postmethod condition play a vital role in forming the base on which the three pedagogic parameters of a Postmethod pedagogy is built.

### 2.3 Local Knowledge and Postmethod Pedagogy

Kumaravadivelu holds that one of the major goals of Postmethod pedagogy is to empower the practicing teachers to build a pedagogy taking into account “local knowledge”<sup>9</sup> and local understanding. The term *local knowledge* has acquired its critical attention in the last decade or so with the scholarship of movements like post-colonialism and cultural studies. It does not refer to something that indicates “a philosophical paradigm or a body of ideas.” There are certain overlapping assumptions that characterize the term local knowledge as “context-bound, community-specific, and non-systematic because it is generated ground-up through social practice in everyday

---

<sup>5</sup> Ibid

<sup>6</sup> Ibid, 33

<sup>7</sup> Widdowson (1990), cited in Kumaravadivelu, *Beyond Methods*, 34

<sup>8</sup> Ibid

<sup>9</sup> A. Suresh, Canagarajah, ed., *Reclaiming the Local in Language Policy and Practice*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc, Publishers, 2005, 3-4

life.”<sup>10</sup> The idea of “local knowledge” took the “Central Stage” as a global critical trend developed against a one-way-flow of western knowledge to the rest of the knowledge.

As Canagarajah (2005) says:

Celebrating local knowledge refers to adopting a practice. We treat our location (in all its relevant senses: geographical, social, geopolitical) as the ground on which to begin our thinking. Local knowledge is not a *product*, constituted by the beliefs and practices of the past. Local knowledge is a *process*—a process of negotiating dominant discourses and engaging in an ongoing construction of relevant knowledge in the context of our history and social practice. What is important is the *angle* from which we conduct this practice that is, from the locality that shapes our social and intellectual practice.<sup>11</sup>

Canagarajah (2005) warn ELT practitioners about the need to “move beyond the myopic entrapment of the local.”<sup>12</sup> To do that a clear grounding in their own location is vital as it gives them the confidence to engage with knowledge from other locations as they deconstruct and reconstruct them for their purposes. The construction of local knowledge as two parallel processes are defined as: (i) deconstructing established knowledge to understand its local shaping and (ii) reconstructing local knowledge for contemporary needs. The first implies the reflective interpretation of established knowledge for local needs and interests. While the second process entails the accommodation of local knowledge to current conditions so that it can be relevant for other settings beyond local needs.<sup>13</sup>

Local knowledge constitutes a significant resource for studying fields of human experiences forgotten, censored, or excluded from expert discourse. As a “non-centralized kind of theoretical production whose validity is not dependent on the approval of the established regimes of thought” (Foucault, 1980), local knowledge (or “subjugated knowledge”) preserves memories of struggles and conflicts. It helps one enormously to discover “the ruptural effects of conflict and struggle that the order imposed by

---

<sup>10</sup> Canagarajah, ed., *Reclaiming the Local*, 3-4

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid*, 13

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid*, 15

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid*



functionalist or systematizing thought is designed to mask” (Foucault, 1980).<sup>14</sup> Kumaravadivelu regrets that part of the (neo) colonial agenda is precisely to reduce local knowledge into an *invisible* and *inaccessible* entity and thereby making the periphery communities to continue to depend on the Centre<sup>15</sup> for documented knowledge base. To talk otherwise, periphery cannot “escape from history”. Periphery communities have not paid proper attention documenting “local knowledge” pertinent to second and foreign language learning does not mean that they don’t have any knowledge base at all. To clarify this point, he further cites Canagarajah (2002) who made comments on the macrostrategic framework of Postmethod pedagogy:

Such strategies have been used by those in periphery always. They simply haven’t documented in the professional literature. What is available in published form are pedagogical approaches from the communities that enjoy literature or publishing resources. Periphery teachers have shared their teaching strategies orally in their local contexts.<sup>16</sup>

The importance of local knowledge is profound on devising the bottom-up Postmethod language pedagogy that helps to challenge the practice of *self-marginalization*<sup>17</sup> perpetuated by the “hegemonic power”<sup>18</sup> of the Centre.

Methods that are constructed and commodified as usable in *all* learning or teaching contexts aim at spreading and expanding the “colonial agenda of economic and cultural domination”.<sup>19</sup> It continues to uphold the colonial image of the native ‘Self’ and the non-native ‘Other’ by ignoring the local knowledge and local interests altogether. The British scholars who came to teach English in colonial India brought

---

<sup>14</sup> Foucault, (1980) (cited)Ibid, 63

<sup>15</sup> Kumaravadivelu, “Critical Language Pedagogy”, 541

<sup>16</sup> Ibid, 547

<sup>17</sup> Ibid,540-544

<sup>18</sup> Canagarajah,ed.. *Reclaiming the Local*, 26. “Hegemony is the process by which dominant groups win universal acceptance for their version of things. Ideally, rather than eradicating oppositional views, hegemony works by accommodating them in a way that the dominant group’s view still enjoys superiority and legitimacy.”

<sup>19</sup> Kumaravadivelu, “Critical Language Pedagogy”, 541

with them a subjugating and dominating attitude towards the local knowledge (Krishnaswamy and Burde, 1998, Pennycook, 1998.).<sup>20</sup> For instance, although India has long been a multilingual country with a rich tradition of learning and teaching second languages, the colonial scholars have shown very little interest in paying attention to local knowledge. It is obvious that being cut off from the local context and ignoring the local knowledge, those so call called colonial *one-size-fits-all* ELT methods cannot be appropriated to any learning or teaching context. So an imperative need is felt to decolonize the methodological aspects of ELT and to do so a fundamental move from the concept of method to the concept of method (Kumaravadivelu, 1994) is a must.<sup>21</sup>

## **2.4 Parameters of Postmethod pedagogy**

According to Kumravadivelu, any attempt to explore a new or alternative or best method within the framework of existing methodologies is bound to be conditioned by “the construct of marginality”. So, any attempt to devise a Postmethod pedagogy in the postcolonial context need to be geared up by the desire to go beyond the detrimental effect of method as “a construct of marginality.”<sup>22</sup> It is essentially a bottom-up approach which is based on the parameters of (i) Particularity, (ii) Practicality and (iii) Possibility.

### **2.4.1 The Parameter of Particularity**

The first parameter requires that language pedagogy should be “sensitive to a particular group of teachers teaching a particular group of learners pursuing a particular set of teaching goals within a particular institutional context embedded in a particular socio-cultural milieu (Kumaravadivelu,2001)<sup>23</sup>.” So, the parameter of “Particularity” clearly

---

<sup>20</sup> Krishnaswamy and Burde, (1998), Pennycook, (1998,) cited in Kumaravadivelu, “Critical Language Pedagogy: A Postmethod Perspective on Language Teaching” 541

<sup>21</sup> Ibid, 544

<sup>22</sup> Kumaravadivelu, (1994) (cited) Ibid

<sup>23</sup> Kumaravadivelu (2003) cited in Kumaravadivelu, *Undertsnading Language Teaching*, 85

rejects the very idea of method based pedagogies which are built on a single set of teaching aims and objectives attainable through a single set of teaching principles and procedures. To simply put, the parameter of particularity, in the paradigm of PMP, refers to the key aspect of local context of teaching or what Kumaravadivelu (2003) calls "situational understanding"<sup>24</sup> of language teaching. Such an idea of pedagogic particularity holds that a meaningful pedagogy cannot be comprised without a holistic interpretation of particular situations and so it cannot be improved without a general improvement of those particular situations (Elliott, 1993).<sup>25</sup> From a pedagogic point of view, Kumaravadivelu explains that the particularity is at once a goal and a process. That means one works *for* and *through* particularity at the same time and to do that one needs to work through a continual cycle of observation, reflection and action (i.e. praxis). So it is a progressive advancement of means and ends.<sup>26</sup>

However, the local context, which has been pivotal in Postmethod pedagogy, entails local knowledge (i.e. local people, physical setting, the nature and course of the institutions, time and teaching resources and so on). In other words, local knowledge is deeply rooted in the social and intellectual practices of a culture and society. Kumaravadivelu (2006, p.43-44) says that social context as well as educational context have got heavy bearing on L2 development. Studies conducted by Wond-Fillmore (1989)<sup>27</sup> revealed that social setting creates and shapes opportunities for both learners and competent speakers of L2 to communicate with each other, thereby it refers to maximizing learning potential. A study by Donato and Adair-Hauck (1992), concluded that the social and discourse in which instructional intervention is delivered plays a

---

<sup>24</sup> Ibid, 171

<sup>25</sup> Ibid, 171

<sup>26</sup> Kumaravadivelu, *Beyond Methods*, 35

<sup>27</sup> Wond-Fillmore (1989) cited in Kumaravadivelu, *Undersnading Language Teaching*, 43-44

vital role in facilitating second/foreign language development in the classrooms. Apart from this, L2 learners' educational context too has a close connection with social context of L2 learning which is grounded in educational psychology which puts emphasis on the inseparability and reciprocal influence of educational institutions and settings where teaching and learning operations are embedded (Bloome and Green, 1992)<sup>28</sup>. Learners' educational context shapes language policy, language planning and most importantly the learning opportunities available to the L2 learner. Therefore, it is impracticable to insulate classroom life from the dynamics of political, educational and societal institutions where learners are born and brought up. The beliefs, experience or expectations that they bring with them in the classroom have got huge potentials to affect classroom practices up to a certain extent which is beyond thought of policy planners or curriculum designers or textbook writers.<sup>29</sup> So a context-sensitive language education as Kumaravadivelu (2006) remarks, can emerge:

... only from the practice of particularity. It involves a critical awareness of local conditions of learning and teaching that policy makers and program administrators have to seriously consider in putting together an effective teaching agenda. More importantly, it involves practicing teacher, either individually or collectively, observing their teaching acts, evaluating their outcomes and identifying problems, finding solutions, and trying them out to see once again what works and what doesn't.<sup>30</sup>

#### **2.4.1.1 Particularity of Teaching-Learning context or Situation**

The L2 teaching-learning context or situation is an important variable in language pedagogy and they do vary from culture to culture. The classroom situations (both inside and outside) are directly related to the implementations of teaching programmes effectively. The natural setting or the socio-cultural conditions outside the classroom build the informal context which often provides learners the exposure to pick up and use the target language. While the classroom setting with its infrastructural and

---

<sup>28</sup> Bloome and Green (1992) as cited in Donato and Adair-Hauck (1992) (cited) Ibid, 44

<sup>29</sup> Ibid, 44

<sup>30</sup> Kumaravadivelu, *Undersnading Language Teaching*, 172

emotional environment provide the formal context of language learning.<sup>31</sup> According to Tudor (1996), contextual factors are crucial for the successful realization of any language course. Any event of teaching or learning occurs in a context, and so it is important to recognize this influential factor in teaching and learning.<sup>32</sup>

The learning situations may be viewed as learning opportunities (Allwright, 1991 and Spolsky, 1989).<sup>33</sup> According to Allwright (1991)<sup>34</sup>, learning situations may provide two types of encounters: (1) encounter opportunities or the opportunities to meet whatever is to be learned (i.e. exposure to the target language data or “input” and (2) practice opportunities or opportunities to do something with target materials. The framework for formal teaching- learning situation in the classroom is provided by the physical environment of the classroom. It has been regarded as very beneficial for formal institutional learning. Spolsky (1989) and Cohen and Mannion (1977) say that the physical situation in the classroom can both assist and hinder learning.<sup>35</sup> A teaching methodology appropriate for one kind of classroom situation may not be suitable for another kind of classroom situations. As Shahidullah (2004), points out:

Teaching-learning situation is an important variable and largely determines classroom practices including teachers’ roles, learners’ roles, interactional patterns and feedback to be given. Aspects of teaching-learning culture such as class-size, seating arrangements for teachers and learners and other physical facilities like cleanliness of the classroom, its surrounding or of the entire institution, lighting condition, ventilation, noise level of the classroom and teaching-learning aids are some of the important variables that have a direct bearing on formal teaching and learning in institutional situations.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> M. Shahidullah, “Teaching-learning Culture in Bangladesh, And Recent ELT Theories: Conformity and Contradiction” (Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Department of English, University of Pune, India, 1997), 24

<sup>32</sup> Tudor (1996) cited in Huda. “Culture Sensitive Materials Design for English Language Teaching in Bangladesh”. (Unpublished PhD dissertation, IBS, University of Rajshahi, Bangladesh, 2003),36

<sup>33</sup> Allwright (1991) and Spolsky (1989) cited in Shahidullah, “Teaching-learning Culture in Bangladesh, 24

<sup>34</sup> Allwright (1991) (cited) Ibid

<sup>35</sup> Spolsky (1989) and Cohen and Mannion (1977) (cited) Ibid

<sup>36</sup> M. Shahidullah, “Significance of teaching-learning situation in language learning and an empirical survey of the teaching-learning situation in Bangladesh.” (*Jahangirnagar University Studies in Language and Literature: Harvest* Vol.19. 2004), 110.

Hence an analysis of a learning situation involves an analysis of all these variables.

#### **2.4.1.2 Class Size and Teaching and Learning Language**

Class size is an important variable which seems to vary from context to context. There are many contexts where the size of class is small consisting only of 20-30 students while there are contexts where class size is large consisting of more than 50 students, sometimes 100 and 150 students. The teaching procedures which are feasible in small classes may be difficult to implement in large classes. The pedagogical procedures by which the educational goals may realistically be achieved in these two cases will inevitably be different (Tudor, 1996).<sup>37</sup> It is found that in small classes, it is easy for teachers to establish a close relationship with the students and address their interests and attend to their problems which are quite impossible in big classes. It has been observed that CLT works better in the comfortable surroundings of private language schools and university based intensive English programmes where classes are small and students are limited, self-motivated and belong to literate cultures. Therefore, the implementation of CLT in the state run educational institutions in the non-western contexts, where classroom size and number of students are large is not practical (Pennycook, 1994).<sup>38</sup>

#### **2.4.1.3 Teachers' Position in the Classroom**

It is generally thought that careful attention to seating arrangements contributes more than any other aspects of classroom environment. The location of the teachers' desk or dais or teachers' position in the classroom impacts teaching language in ESL/EFL context. Teachers may take a frontal position; sometimes they can sit or stand on a raised platform and sometimes at the same level with their students. They may also

---

<sup>37</sup> Tudor,(1996) cited in Huda, "Culture Sensitive Materials Design", 37

<sup>38</sup> Pennycook(1994), (cited)Ibid,13

room around the class. Teachers' position has an important bearing on language teaching-learning methodology and material design. The frontal position said to give a teacher an authority but it distance students from him or her. Whereas other positions of teacher in a classroom show his/her cooperative gesture that make learners easy to learn language in a friendly atmosphere.<sup>39</sup>

#### **2.4.1.4 Seating Arrangements for Students in the Classroom**

Seating arrangements is an important situational factor in language classrooms and it is not the same in all contexts. In many contexts, students' benches, desks or chairs are movable and can be arranged in different ways when it is needed, yet this cannot be done where benches or chairs are fixed to the ground and arranged in long rows. Teachers or students cannot move freely in such classrooms and so the mode of interaction in such classrooms will be different from that of the former type of classrooms.<sup>40</sup>

#### **2.4.1.5 Teaching Learning Aids**

The teaching-learning aids are other important situational factors for language pedagogy. The availability of teaching- learning aids can facilitate language teaching and learning up to a great extent. But all teaching-learning contexts of the world cannot provide similar teaching-learning aids. While the western setting have most of the modern teaching-learning aids such as projectors, access to library, internet and computers, maps, replicas and so on among many other aids, most Asian contexts lag far behind in this regard (Shahidullah, 2004, p.116).<sup>41</sup> About such contrastive contexts, Tudor (1996) mentions:

The pedagogical options open to a teacher whose only aid is the blackboard, and whose students can rely on the notes they make during class time and

---

<sup>39</sup> Shahidullah, "Significance of teaching-learning situation in language learning",28

<sup>40</sup> Ibid

<sup>41</sup> Shahidullah, 2004, p.116 cited in Shahidullah, "Significance of teaching-learning situation", 112-128.

possibly a course book, as clearly different from those enjoyed by a teacher and students who have access to video and audio equipment in every classroom, good recording facilities, computer laboratory.<sup>42</sup>

#### **2.4.1.6 Particularity of Teachers**

The parameter of particularity takes into account particularity of teachers in a context which entails certain socio-psychological variables. As for Kumaravadivelu (2003), any language pedagogy must be sensitive to a particular group of teachers teaching a particular group of students pursuing a particular goal. Teachers being the member of a community develop their individual beliefs, experience, and expectations about language teaching-learning in ESL/EFL situations and these have got direct relevance to the values, norms, and traditions of their culture and society. Along with the social setting, the educational setting where they carry on the pedagogical activities is very vital in teaching English.

##### **2.4.1.6.1 Beliefs of Teachers**

Beliefs of teachers is another socio-cultural factor that impact language pedagogy up to a great extent (Cotteral, 1995).<sup>43</sup> Through their prior experience as students and later when they become professional teachers or practitioners, they develop certain ideas and conceptions about language pedagogy such as how teaching acts could be facilitated, how their performances could be excelled, what should be their attitudes to motivate learners to learn quickly and so on. So any mismatch between the beliefs of teachers and the language teaching methodology can yield negative outcome which will impede learners' learning process. So when a country switches to any new methods of teaching, it requires a change in the role of teachers as well as learners since it is not easy to change their beliefs overnight.


---

<sup>42</sup> Tudor (1996) cited in Huda, "Culture Sensitive Materials Design"

<sup>43</sup> Cotteral (1995) cited in Shahidullah, "Significance of teaching-learning situation",22



In a study done on the Chinese students by Burnaby and Sun (1989, 223)<sup>44</sup> have seen that the Chinese teachers believe that the analytical, grammar-based teaching methods which they follow in their country are the best methods for their students' learning English. They rather despise communicative approach of language teaching. Breen and his 18 Australian colleagues (Breen, Hired, Milton, Oliver, Thwaite, 2001)<sup>45</sup> conducted a study and show the possible relationship between teachers' beliefs, guiding principles, and classroom actions, and their consistent influence on instant ongoing thinking and decision making. The figure below demonstrates it:



**Figure 2.1: Teacher's conceptualizations and classroom practices (Breen et.al. 2001)<sup>46</sup>**

<sup>44</sup> Burnaby and Sun (1989, 223) cited in Huda, "Culture Sensitive Materials Design",31

<sup>45</sup> Breen, Hired, Milton, Oliver, Thwaite, (2001) cited in Kumaravadivelu, *Undertsnading Language Teaching*,179

<sup>46</sup> Breen (et.al. 2001) as cited in Kumaravadivelu, *Undertsnading Language Teaching*, 180

According to them, the pedagogic principles meditate between the experientially informed teachers' beliefs and the teachers' on-going decision making and actions with a particular class of learners in a particular situation. They also say that these principles are "reflexive in both shaping what teacher does whilst being responsive to what teacher observes about learners' behaviour and their achievements in the class."<sup>47</sup> As time goes on, teachers develop a coherent pedagogic framework that can be implemented in different teaching situations based on learners' needs and goals and only such kind of personal knowledge of teachers can support teacher to make their own theory of practice which has been one of the chief claims of Postmethod pedagogy.

#### **2.4.1.6.2 Experience of Teachers**

Experiences of teachers are very crucial in a language teaching pedagogy. Teachers have got experiences about language and language teaching-learning situations through their engagement in the language teaching-learning system. Their experience help them to form their beliefs, perceptions and expectations about language pedagogy. Teachers are prone to following the kind of teaching methodology that they became familiar with in their student life. So they are often found to follow teaching methodologies on the basis of their earlier experiences. In a survey, Johnson (1984) has noticed that in the Southeast Asian countries, teachers put emphasis on grammatical accuracy. They regard grammatical correctness as social appropriateness and meaningful communication. Even so they do not allow their students to speak grammatically incorrect sentences in their presence. Johnson explains that this attitude of teachers in that zone is the outcome of their learning English through Grammar Translation Method.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> Ibid

<sup>48</sup> Johnson (1984) cited in Huda, "Culture Sensitive Materials Design",36

### **2.4.1.6.3 Expectations of Teachers**

The teachers also form their expectations about the language and language teaching – learning context in ESL/EFL situations and these have roots in the cultural background and pedagogical experiences. Just like the learners, teachers to achieve these expectations through their socialization as members of a particular society and culture. While in Asian societies teachers expect to play a rigid and dominating role in the class, the Western settings of language learning highly encourage learner-centred classrooms where learners are given ample scopes to participate in classroom activities and have their voice in a friendly and comfortable environment. Cortazzi (1994,57) says that when the expectations of teachers and learners are congruent, or at least, with the nature of materials and methods, language learning takes place easily or smoothly.<sup>49</sup>

### **2.4.1.7 Particularity of Learners**

The parameter of particularity takes into account particularity of learners in a context as well. According to this parameter, the learners are supposed to pursue a specific set of goals within a specific institutional context in the background of a specific socio-cultural milieu. Being the members of the society, learners develop their individual beliefs, expectations, attitudes of experiences about learning and these have got direct relevance to the values, norms, and traditions of their culture and society. Along with the social setting, the educational setting of learners is also very vital as it has got a direct link with the former.

#### **2.4.1.7.1 Beliefs of Learners**

Language learners of a particular ESL/EFL context come to the classroom with some beliefs about language learning which are usually shaped by their previous experience

---

<sup>49</sup> Cortazzi (1994,57) cited in Huda, “Culture Sensitive Materials Design”,31

as language learners or by their backgrounds. For example, many good learners around the world seem to believe that language learning is other kind of learning or language learning is a special ‘gift’ or ‘aptitude’ and so on. So, beliefs of language learning vary from learner to learner across cultures and they give way to developing different language learning strategies in the end.

Horwitz (1987)<sup>50</sup> holds that beliefs about language teaching and learning lead to deployment of strategies. All behaviours are governed by beliefs and experiences. Therefore, learners’ beliefs functions as substantial tools either to facilitate or hinder the very language learning process. She also holds that in the typical classroom where there is a native teacher and students of diverse cultural backgrounds, differing beliefs about language learning may well be a major source of cultural conflict. After surveying a wide-range of learners’ beliefs, she invented Beliefs about Language Learning Inventory (BALLI) and by using it she short-listed five major areas of beliefs:

- Foreign language aptitude,
- The difficulty in language learning,
- The nature of language learning,
- Learning and communication strategies,
- And motivations.<sup>51</sup>

Research shows that students’ beliefs have a very close relation with their language acquisition and their use of language learning strategies. Wenden (1986)<sup>52</sup> shows that that students’ beliefs form their reaction to teaching activities and that a teaching method which does not conform to belief about language learning is likely to meet discontent of students. She also says that students’ beliefs can influence their

---

<sup>50</sup> Horwitz (1987) (cited)Ibid

<sup>51</sup> Elaine K Horwitz., “Surveying Student Beliefs About Language Learning (1987), in Wenden, Anita & Joan Rubin ,eds. *Learner Strategies in Language Learning* (Prentice Hall (UK) Limited, 1987), 121

<sup>52</sup> Wenden(1986) cited in Huda, “Culture Sensitive Materials Design”,30

learning strategies.<sup>53</sup> In a study on some students from diverse cultural backgrounds attending an intensive English programme at the University of Texas, she (1987) found that students' beliefs about language impact their language learning strategies. She holds that learners' beliefs about language learning create a sort of inner logic which directs, consciously or unconsciously, what they do to promote their own learning. She has seen that in language learning activities, learners are affected by their beliefs in four respects.<sup>54</sup> They are:

- The kind of strategies they use,
- What they attend to do,
- The criteria they use to evaluate the effectiveness of learning activities and of social contexts that give them opportunities to use of practice the language,
- Where they concentrate their use of language.<sup>55</sup>

It has been found that beliefs as to learning in Asian societies are different from those in European societies in many ways. Serpell (1976) remarks that the Indonesian students believe in giving greater emphasis on social responsibility than on individualism. While the students of Papua New Guinea believe that social recognition is more important than self-respect.<sup>56</sup> Thus beliefs of students vary from culture to culture. So addressing the beliefs of a particular group of students in a particular context pursuing a particular goal is important in ESL/EFL research since inaccurate beliefs about language learning may lead learners to use less effective language learning strategies.

#### **2.4.1.7.2 Learning Strategies of Learners**

It has been acknowledged that language processing strategies exist and they impact language acquisition (cf for example the papers of McLaughlin, Kingbourne, Cole,

---

<sup>53</sup> Horwitz, "Surveying Student Beliefs", 120

<sup>54</sup> Wenden (1987)(cited) Ibid, 30

<sup>55</sup> Anita L Wenden, "Conceptual Background and Utility" in Wenden, Anita & Joan Rubin (ed.), *Learner Strategies in Language Learning* (Prentice Hall (UK) Limited, 1987), 3

<sup>56</sup> Serpell (1976) (cited) Ibid.

Bates, and Macwhinney, Wode, Wintiz in Wintiz (ed), 1981).<sup>57</sup> According to Rubin, learner strategies entails any set of operations, steps, plans, routines used by the learner to facilitate the obtaining, storage, retrieval and use of information, that is what learners do to learn and do to regulate their learning. Along with this, it is important to take into consideration learners' knowledge about language and his/her beliefs about the language learning process (that is what he/she knows) to better understand how learner strategies are used.<sup>58</sup>

Rubin holds that there are two major kinds of language learning strategies which contribute directly to learning: (1) Cognitive Strategies and (2) Metacognitive Strategies. Apart from this, there are (3) Communication Strategies and (4) Social Strategies which contribute indirectly to learning.<sup>59</sup>

Cognitive Strategies refer to the steps or operation used in learning or problem-solving that require direct analysis, transformation, or synthesis of learning materials. Cognition consists of those process or strategies through which an individual obtains knowledge or conceptual understanding (direct learning). On the other hand, metacognitive strategies refer to (i) knowledge about cognitive processes and (ii) regulation of cognition or executive through such processes as planning, monitoring and evaluating (indirect learning).<sup>60</sup>

Rubin (1981) identified six general cognitive strategies which may directly contribute to language learning<sup>61</sup>:

---

<sup>57</sup> McLaughlin, Kingbourne, Cole, Bates, and Macwhinney, Wode, Wintiz in Wintiz (ed), (1981), cited in Wenden, "Conceptual Background and Utility", in Anita Wenden & Joan Rubin (eds.), *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*, 3

<sup>58</sup> Joan Rubin, "Learner Strategies: Theoretical Assumptions, Research History and Typology" in *Ibid*, 19

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid*, 23

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid*, 23-25

- i. *Clarification or Verification*: It refers to those strategies which learners use to verify or clarify their understanding and formulating the rules and structures of the new language. Verification enables students to store information for further use.
- ii. *Guessing or Inductive Inferencing*: It denotes strategies which learners used previously through gaining linguistic or conceptual knowledge which helped them derive explicit hypotheses about the linguistic form, semantic meaning or speaker's intention. It involves using hunches from a wide range of possible sources to determine the speaker's intention. Thus learners can use what they know about their own or a second language to infer meaning.
- iii. *Deductive Reasoning*: It implies a problem-solving strategy in which the learner looks for and uses general rules in approaching the foreign or second language. Here the learner uses his/her prior linguistic or conceptual knowledge to conceive specific hypotheses about the linguistic form, semantic meaning or speaker's intention. The difference between inductive and deductive reasoning is that by the former strategy learner looks for a specific meaning/rule whereas by the latter the learner looks for using more general rules. The process is used to find out organization and patterns that make sense to the learner in order to obtain and store more information about a language in more organized and retrieval fashion. The logical procedure of deductive reasoning include: analogy, analysis and synthesis.
- iv. *Practice*: It refers to strategies which contribute to the storage and retrieval of language by focusing on accuracy of the usage of the target language. Practice involves strategies such as repetition, rehearsal, and experimentation, application of rules, limitation, and attention to detail.
- v. *Memorization*: It refers to strategies which focus on the storage and retrieval of language. It seems that some of the strategies, such as drill and repetitions used for practice are likened to memorization strategies. In case of memorization the attention is paid to the storage and retrieval process and the goal of these strategies is organization.
- vi. *Monitoring*: It refers to strategies in which learner notices errors (linguistic as well as communicative), observes how a message is received and interpreted by

the addresses, and then decides what to do about it. This process seems to be a blending of cognitive and metacognitive strategies. For example, identifying a problem, determining a solution or making a correction (steps 1, 2 and 4) are cognitive since they involve direct analysis, transformation or synthesis of learning materials. However, deciding on the action to be taken or evaluating the action (steps 3 and 5) are metacognitive since they involve self-management, that is, deciding in what action is to be taken or the effect of an action taken.

Rubin holds that metacognitive strategies are used “to oversee, regulate or self-direct language learning.”<sup>62</sup> Wenden (1982, 1986) examined how learners regulate their learning by planning, monitoring and evaluating their learning activities.<sup>63</sup> Wenden (1982)<sup>64</sup> identified several planning strategies which students use. According to her, by choosing and prioritizing which aspects to learn, students set their own learning goals.

While communication strategies are less directly related to language learning since their main focus is on the process of participating in a conversation (i.e. functional practicing) and getting meaning across clarifying what the speaker is intended. However, the importance of communication strategies in the learning process cannot be denied since they allow the learners to remain in the conversation. By continual exposure to natural conversation, learners may also learn (1) through opportunities to hear more of the target language, and (2) through opportunities to produce more utterances and test their knowledge. Additionally, with successful communication, motivation for more learning can be enhanced. It is seen that learners use communicative strategies when there is a gap between the learners’ knowledge and the learners’ communicative drive.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> Ibid,25

<sup>63</sup> Wenden (1982) (cited) Ibid

<sup>64</sup> Wenden (1982) (cited) Ibid

<sup>65</sup> Ibid,26



Social strategies are those activities learners engage in which afford them opportunities to be exposed and practice their knowledge of the target language. Wong-Fillmore (1976) identified two social strategies: join a group and act as if you understand what is going on, even if you don't, and seek help from your peers. These strategies only indirectly impact language teaching since they don't lead directly to obtaining, storing, retrieving and using of language.<sup>66</sup>

#### **2.4.1.7.3 Learning Style Preferences of Learners**

Learning style has been defined in a variety of ways. According to Keeds (1979, cited in Melton,1990,)<sup>67</sup> “learning style is the cognitive, effective and psychological behaviours that serve as relatively stable indicators of how learners perceive, interact with, and respond to, the learning environment.” Hyland (1993), refers to it as a person's natural, habitual and preferred way of learning. It can be said that learning style is a broad concept which includes learners' psychological as well as cognitive variables. Apart from these, many researchers have talked about another kind of variables in relation to learning, which have been termed as sensory variables.<sup>68</sup> Dunn (1983, 1984) has observed in a research that learners have four basic categories of sensory variables—visual, auditory, kinaesthetic and tactile. The blending of these three sets of variables as a whole produce learners' a set of preferred modes of behaviour which may be described as an individual's learning style.<sup>69</sup>

Researchers (e.g. Cafferty, 1980, Copenhaver, 1979, Domino. 1979, Krimisky, 1982, Lynch, 1981 and Pizzo, 1981 among others)<sup>70</sup> believe that learning style

---

<sup>66</sup> Wong-Fillmore (1976)(cited)Ibid,27

<sup>67</sup> Keeds (1979,cited in Melton,1990,) cited in Huda, “Culture Sensitive Materials Design”,33

<sup>68</sup> Hyland (1993) (cited)Ibid

<sup>69</sup> Dunn (1983, 1984) (cited) Ibid

<sup>70</sup> Cafferty (1980), Copenhaver, (1979), Domino (1979), Krimisky (1982), Lynch (1981) and Pizzo (1981) in Shahidullah, “Teaching-learning Culture in Bangladesh, And Recent ELT Theories: Conformity and Contradiction”

preferences should be in consistent with language teaching methodology. Hyland (1993)<sup>71</sup> states that if teaching methodology is in tune with the preferred learning styles of students, teaching can take place in the satisfaction of the students and better results can be achieved. Spolsky (1989) says,

Learners vary (both individually and according to such characteristics as age, level, and cultural origin) in their preferences for learning style (visual, auditory, kinesthetic, and tactile) and mode (group or individuals); as a result, learning outcome is best when the teaching style matches the learner's learning style preferences.<sup>72</sup>

So it is important to match the teaching methodology with the learning style preferences of learners for ensuring the success of language teaching and learning in ESL/EFL context.

Mamun, Islam and Bhowmik (2004) conducted a study on 256 students studying at the undergraduate level in Bangladesh.<sup>73</sup> The subjects included in the study were selected from four institutions: two public and two private universities of Bangladesh. The responses were first year students and sophomores. All of these students were studying EFL as a partial requirement of their Bachelor's degree. The study also incorporated sixteen English teachers from the selected institutions. The study provides some major implications regarding the learning preferences of the EFL learners of Bangladesh and they can be summarized as follows:

- Regarding studying style, students did not prefer working individually, but teachers were not aware of this fact.
- Students did not prefer the types of learning activities which emphasize receptive skills and so the students remain passive in the class. But they would prefer to actively participate in the activities of the class.

---

<sup>71</sup> Hyland (1993) cited in Huda, "Culture Sensitive Materials Design",34

<sup>72</sup> Spolsky (1989) (cited) Ibid

<sup>73</sup> Sadat, M. Mamun, Islam, Md. Shafiul and Bhowmik, Subrata Kumar, "Say 'yes' to learners: identifying learner's preferences for EFL in Bangladesh". *Jahangirnagar University Studies in Language and Literature: Harvest*, Vol. 19. 2004, pp. 112-128.

- The students seemed to prefer vocabulary learning strategies that would include verbatim translation as well as using words in a sentence and guessing the meaning of unknown words. Teachers were wrong to assume that their students like to learn the new words through translation only.
- Students would not prefer immediate error correction in the classroom. Rather they thought that it would be better to be corrected later in private and individually.
- As to the use of media, students would like to watch more television programme like movies which facilitates language learning by exciting and meaningful process. Teachers also seemed to hold the same idea. The former group can be labeled as ‘visual learners’ and the latter as auditory learners as classified by Reid (1995).
- Learners did not at all like ‘language games’ However, most of the students enjoyed talking with and listening to other students and having interaction with each other (global learners).
- The students were highly interested in learning about culture. This fact shows that they were aware of the importance of developing cultural competence in language pedagogy.
- Students would feel satisfied with their achievements in English not only for facts like getting good grades but also for being successful to use language in meaningful situation.

Learning styles of the learners get hugely affected by respective teaching-learning cultures. For example, the cultures of Asian societies will be remarkably different than that of the Western cultures in many respects and so would be the learning style preferences of learners of those cultures. It has been seen that whereas the Asian cultures are marked by homogenous, hierarchical, group harmonious and group dependent attributes, the Western cultures are featured by heterogeneity, egalitarianity, individuality and independence. It is because of the varied cultural and contextual realities that most of the Asian students group up as *File Dependent* learners and like to process data in a more media dependent manner. On the other hand, the Western students prefer to learn by adopting self-directed and discovery-oriented approach and processing data autonomously.<sup>74</sup> So ELT practitioners or teachers need to recognize students’ learning style preferences seriously with a view to devising an appropriate methodology for teaching L2 in ESL/EFL situations.

---

<sup>74</sup> Huda, “Culture Sensitive Materials Design for English Language Teaching in Bangladesh”,35

#### **2.4.1.7.4 Experience of Learners**

Experience of learners is also an important factor in language pedagogy. Learners in ESL/EFL context come to classrooms with their experience about language and language learning strategies through their involvement in language teaching-learning programmes. These experiences have a great influence in shaping learners' beliefs, expectations, learning style preferences, learning strategies and learning opportunities to learn the target language.

#### **2.4.1.7.5 Expectations of Learners**

Learners in ESL/EFL context come to classrooms with some expectations and these expectations are formed through their socialization as members of a society and educational institution. As for Cortazzi (1990), if the expectations of teachers and students are consistent with the nature of materials and methods up to a certain extent, language learning can take place effortlessly.<sup>75</sup> Spolsky (1989) states that a second language learner come to a language class with a set of notions about what is involved in the task; these expectations intermingle with personality factors and the actual learning situation to determine the strategies that the learner will adopt.<sup>76</sup> So teachers should take into account the expectations of a particular group of learners pursuing a particular goal to make the outcome of learning a success.

Maley (1989) states that in societies where learning is anticipated to be difficult, systematic, text-based, exam-oriented, context-focused, disciplined and silent, accordingly there learners are expected to be respectful, obedient hardworking, silent,

---

<sup>75</sup> Cortazzi (1990) cited in Huda, "Culture Sensitive Materials Design",31

<sup>76</sup> Shahidullah, "Teaching-learning Culture in Bangladesh, And Recent ELT Theories:Conformity and Contradiction",22

group-oriented and impassive.<sup>77</sup> McHugh (1989) mentions that Japanese students are very much respectful to their teachers and they expect that teachers will teach in classrooms seriously. They do not approve the informal dress up or light gestures of their teachers.<sup>78</sup> According to Horwitz (1987), the students might withdraw from the learning process if language classrooms fail to meet their expectations.<sup>79</sup> She adds to this point that in such cases, the students can resist or non-cooperate with the instructional activities. Even so they can hide the discontent which can ultimately have a strong impact on their ultimate success in picking up the target language.<sup>80</sup>

#### **2.4.2 Particularities of Material Evaluation**

Textbook evaluation is basically a straightforward, analytical ‘matching process: matching needs to available solutions’ (Hutchinson and Waters 1987:97).<sup>81</sup> So material evaluation criteria should be based on local knowledge and local needs and conditions. According to Sheldon, a course book assessment is basically subjective and it is rule-of-thumb activity and that there is no neat formula, grid, or system that can ever provide a definitive yardstick for material assessment.<sup>82</sup> He also says that textbook appraisal is not a once-only activity.<sup>83</sup> So when a course book is selected for evaluation, “its success or failure can only be meaningfully determined during and after its period of classroom use. Learners are not taught in a vacuum but come from somewhere and they follow particular educational goals and that is why the course book ultimately needs to

---

<sup>77</sup> Maley (1989) cited in Huda, “Culture Sensitive Materials Design”, 32

<sup>78</sup> McHugh (1989), (cited) Ibid

<sup>79</sup> Horwitz (1987) (cited) Ibid, 31-32

<sup>80</sup> Ibid

<sup>81</sup> Hutchinson and Waters (1987:97) cited in Leslie E. Sheldon, “Evaluating ELT textbooks and Materials”, *ELT Journal*, Volume 42/4 October 1988, Oxford University Press 1988, 237

<sup>82</sup> Ibid

<sup>83</sup> Ibid, 245

be assessed considering those goals their way of accomplishments.<sup>84</sup> McDonough and Shaw hold that textbook assessment criteria are local to a great extent since it is difficult to be assured as to what criteria are appropriate and acceptable globally.<sup>85</sup> As Sheldon says,

ELT course books evoke a range of responses, but are frequently seen by teachers as necessary evils. Feelings fluctuate between the perception that they are valid, labour-saving tools, and the doleful belief that ‘masses of rubbish is skillfully marketed’ (Brumfit 1980:30). In basic terms, there seems to be a ‘course book credibility gap’ (Greenall 1984:14) because of emphatic contradictions and potential conflicts of interest in their creation, commercial exploitation, public assessment, selection, and ultimate classroom use. ELT books are frequently seen as poor compromises between what is educationally desirable on the one hand and financially viable on the other.<sup>86</sup>

The literature on the subject of textbook evaluation is not very extensive. Various writers have suggested ways of helping teachers in particular to be more sophisticated in their evaluative approach, by positing ‘checklists’ based on supposedly generalizable criteria. Cuunigsworth holds that there can be many criteria for evaluating course books and that it is best to recognize the priorities of a context and make a check-list accordingly.<sup>87</sup> Hence, textbook evaluation largely depends on one’s own local priorities, preferences and contexts.

### **2.4.3 Particularities of Testing and Assessment of Learners**

According to ELT experts, a test is a tool for measuring a student’s knowledge or ability. It is a yard stick which is regarded as an indicator of a learner’s success or failure.<sup>88</sup> Davies and Allen (1977) and Hughes (1989)<sup>89</sup> talk about four major types of

---

<sup>84</sup> Ibid, 246

<sup>85</sup> McDonough and Shaw (1993), *Materials and Methods in ELT*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 66

<sup>86</sup> Ibid, 237

<sup>87</sup> Cuunigsworth (1995, 2) cited in Huda (2003), “ Culture Sensitive Material Design”

<sup>88</sup> Rubina Khan, “English Language Assessment in Bangladesh: Developments and Challenges,” In Moon, Y-in and Spolsky, B. *Language Assessment in Asia: From Policy to Pedagogy*. Hyderabad, India, Cambridge University Press, 125

<sup>89</sup> Davies and Allen (1977) and Hughes (1989) (cited)Ibid

tests – proficiency, achievement, diagnostic and placement tests. Proficiency tests do not hinge on any syllabus; they purport to test the ability of the students – what they have learnt overtime. Proficiency tests are used to gauge how suitable candidates will be for performing a certain task or following a specific course (Heaton, 1990).<sup>90</sup> Achievement tests are essential to measure the learning which is taking place. They help to indicate progress and attainment of objectives specified earlier. An achievement test is usually a formal examination given at the end of a school year. It measures a student's mastery of what should have been taught and is concerned with covering the contents of a syllabus (Heaton, 1990).<sup>91</sup> A diagnostic test helps to diagnose the strengths and weaknesses of the students and accordingly highlights area for remedial attention. A placement test enables teachers to place students in groups according to their language ability before embarking upon a course.<sup>92</sup>

Testing implies making inferences and one of the key functions of test is to measure (Bachman & Palmer, 1996; McNamara, 2000).<sup>93</sup> The three essential qualities of test that are integral to proper measurement are (i) reliability, (ii) validity and (iii) practicality (i) Reliability means the consistency of test scores and it imperative to have relatively consistent test scores because irregular scores cannot provide us accurate information about the ability teachers want to measure. It may not be possible to remove inconsistencies completely- however through test design efforts may be made to minimize the sources of inconsistencies that are under the control of teachers (Bachman & Palmer, 1996).<sup>94</sup> A test is considered valid if it measures what it is supposed to

---

<sup>90</sup> (Heaton, 1990) (cited) Ibid

<sup>91</sup> (Heaton, 1990) (cited) ibid

<sup>92</sup> Heaton (1990) (cited) Ibid,125

<sup>93</sup> Bachman & Palmer (1996); McNamara(2000) (cited) Ibid,127

<sup>94</sup> Bachman & Palmer, 1996, (cited)Ibid

measure. Four main types of validity which test designers and teachers should be aware of are content, construct, and criterion and face validity. And Practicality refers to issues such as test administration, feasibility concerns and costs.<sup>95</sup>

An integral part of the test construction process is drawing test specifications. They are the recipe or blue print which is vital for any kind of test design (Bachman, 1990; McNamara, 2000)<sup>96</sup>. In particular, test specifications need to be given a major consideration in large scale assessments, since the tests need to be reliable, valid and practical. All those involved with the testing process should be guided by test specifications as they serve as a blue print for test developers and item writers. Important factors such as the defining of the test construct and its scoring procedures form part and parcel of test specifications (Rashid & Galea, 2005). Drawing a well-constructed test specification will ensure that a test is not only well constructed but also make it transparent valid and reliable. Teachers and test designers need to learn to design test specifications for a test because it will help them to spell out the test tasks based on test objectives and learning outcomes.<sup>97</sup>

Teachers need directions for test construction and they should also have a clear conception about the content, structure, format, scoring procedures among other things of the test. Bachman (1990) gives a comprehensive check list of points for drawing test specifications and it is given below<sup>98</sup>:

- 1) Purpose of the test
- 2) Type of learners

---

<sup>95</sup> Ibid

<sup>96</sup> Bachman (1990), McNamara (2000) (cited) Ibid

<sup>97</sup> (Rashid & Galea, 2005) (cited) Ibid

<sup>98</sup> Bachman (1990) (cited) Ibid



- 3) Target Language Situation
- 4) Section/papers & length of test
- 5) Language Skills
- 6) Language Elements
- 7) Tasks (discrete point or integrative)
- 8) Items for each section
- 9) Rubrics
- 10) Criteria for assessment.

These test specifications can guide teachers in a particular context to conduct test-construction effectively.

#### **2.4.4 Parameter of “Practicality”**

The second parameter refers to the relationship between theory and practice. More specifically, it implies the union of action and thought or, to put otherwise, when there is action in thought and thought in action. It is the result of what *Van Manen* has called *pedagogical thoughtfulness* (Van Manen, 1991).<sup>99</sup> In the context of deriving a theory of practice, pedagogical thoughtfulness plays a vital role. It simultaneously “feeds and is fed by reflective capabilities of teachers” that empower them to do certain tasks effectively. Therefore practicing teachers will have to understand and identify problems, analyze and assess information, consider and evaluate alternatives, and then choose the best available alternative, which is then subjected to further critical review. In this sense, a theory of practice is “an on-going, living, working theory” (Chambers, 1992, 13) that entails continual reflection and action and this is what the “Reflective Teaching” stands for.<sup>100</sup>

---

<sup>99</sup> Van Manen, (1991), (cited) Ibid, 540

<sup>100</sup> Chambers, (1992, 13), cited B. Kumaravadivelu, (2001), 'Toward a Postmethod Pedagogy', *San José State University, San José, California, United States*, 541

Kumaravadivelu stresses on developing *Personal theories* by teachers which should be geared by the *pedagogic thoughtfulness*. Traditionally teachers seem to be dependent on utilizing *Professional theories* in classrooms developed by experts which he criticizes highly. O'Hanlon (1993) defines *Professional theories* are those that are produced by experts, and are generally transmitted from centres of higher learning while *Personal theories* refer to those that are developed by teachers by interpreting and applying professional theories in practical situations while they are on the job.<sup>101</sup> Teachers are advised to do action research in the classroom by testing, interpreting, and judging the usefulness of *Professional theories* proposed by experts. Such an interpretation of teacher research is very limited since it gives teachers little scopes for self-conceptualization and self-construction of pedagogic knowledge. The parameter of "Practicality" goes beyond such deficiencies inherent in the theory versus practice and theorists' theory versus teachers' theory dichotomies.<sup>102</sup>

Kumaravadivelu said that if teachers' reflection and action are seen as constituting one side of the practicality coin, their insights and intuition can be seen as constituting the other. What constitute the good teaching is teacher's unexplained awareness that gets deposited and crystalized through prior and ongoing encounters with learning and teaching through prior experience and ongoing encounters with learning and teaching.<sup>103</sup> Such an awareness has been variously referred to as the teacher's *conception of practice* (Freeman, 1996), *sense of plausibility* (Prabhu, 1990), or *beliefs and assumptions* (Woods, 1996).<sup>104</sup> Hargreaves (1994) has called it *the ethic of practicality* a phrase by which he implies<sup>105</sup>:

---

<sup>101</sup> O'Hanlon (1993) (cited) Ibid, 540

<sup>102</sup> Kumaravadivelu (2006), *Understanding Language Teaching*,173

<sup>103</sup> Kumaravadivelu, (2001), 'Toward a Postmethod Pedagogy', *San José State University, San José, California, United States*,541

<sup>104</sup> Prabhu,(1990), Woods(1996)(cited) Ibid,542

<sup>105</sup> Hargreaves (1994), (cited) Ibid

Teacher's powerful sense of what works and what doesn't; of which changes will go and which will not—not in the abstract, or even as a general rule, but for *this* teacher in *this* context. In this simple yet deeply influential sense of practicality among teachers is the distillation of complex and potent combinations of purpose, person, politics and workplace constraints.<sup>106</sup>

Van Manen (1977) called this awareness simply *sense making* approximately a decade ago. In fact, teachers' *sense making* does not get matured fortnight. It takes time as they gain knowledge over time as they learn to cope with “competing pulls and pressures representing the content and character of professional preparation, personal beliefs, institutional constraints, learner expectations, assessment instruments, and other factors.”<sup>107</sup>

Although the nature of teachers' sense making apparently seems to be instinctive and eccentric, it masks the fact that it is shaped and reshaped by the pedagogic factors governing the microcosm of the classroom as well as by the sociopolitical forces stemming from the outside. As a result *sense making* demands that teachers should view pedagogy not merely as a device for maximizing learning opportunities in the classroom, but also as a means for understanding and transforming possibilities in and outside the classroom. At this point, the pedagogy of “Practicality” transmutes into the pedagogy of “Possibility.”<sup>108</sup>

#### **2.4.5 Parameter of “Possibility”**

The parameter of possibility emphasizes learners' shaping of individual identity rather than any *hegemonic identity* by relating language teaching to the process of social transformation. It helps the learners to develop a critical mind-set towards their learning L2. This parameter of Postmethod pedagogy link itself to the tradition of Critical pedagogy (CP) since they are alike in their mission to bring a revolutionary change in the society through change in education.

---

<sup>106</sup> Ibid

<sup>107</sup> Ibid

<sup>108</sup> Ibid

The philosophy of education of the Brazilian educationist, Paulo Freire lies at the core of Critical pedagogy. Freire (1970) and his followers (e.g. Giroux, 1988; Simon, 1988) assert that any pedagogy is closely linked to power and dominance and it aims to create and sustain social inequalities. Language pedagogy is no exception to this and therefore the critical pedagogues put emphasis on the importance of admitting and highlighting students' and teachers' individual identity. It also encourages them to question the *status quo* that keeps them dominated in society.<sup>109</sup>

The key concerns of the third parameter of PMP are language ideology and learner identity. In the process of connecting itself to the wider socio-politico-cultural reality, the parameter of "Possibility" focuses mostly on raising learners' "critical consciousness" which helps them to shape themselves as Agents of Change who are capable to raising their voice against linguistic imperialism. Exercising critical thinking capacity, the Posmethod learners can explore the hidden motives of the top-down methods and Methodists and form resistance against it. As Kumaravadivelu says, "more than any other educational enterprise, language education provides its participants with challenges and opportunities for a continual quest for subjectivity and self-identity".<sup>110</sup> The beliefs, experience, expectations or the learning style preferences that learners bring to the class influence their identity formation up to great extent which has been the core objective of the parameter of "Possibility."

## **2.5 Producing Critical and Creative Individuals**

As English language teaching seems to be aiding to maintain unequal core-peripheral relations in the capitalist world-economy, and of suppressing diversity of language and thought in the world, many writers under the wide Critical Tradition Pedagogy has

---

<sup>109</sup> Freire (1970), (cited) Ibid, 174

<sup>110</sup> Ibid, 175.

criticized these views. Critical Pedagogy<sup>111</sup>, as inaugurated by the revolutionary Brazilian Educator and Philosopher Paulo Freire, is such an innovative pedagogy which tries to develop learners' ability to think critically about their situation and recognize connections between their individual problems and experiences in the background of society and culture which shape their norms and values of and about life. The imposed pedagogy from above compel them to get alienated from the very learning and teaching process of which they are part and parcel and thereby fail to develop any critical insight about anything in life. Critical pedagogy calls for the recognition of learners' and teachers' subject-positions, i.e. their class, race, gender and ethnicity, and for sensitivity toward their impact on education. Such an awareness can also impact policy planners, curriculum designers, or textbook compilers to change the pedagogic practices in spectacular and innovative ways.

In his famous book *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire challenges the Banking Model of Education that views the total education system as act of 'depositing', learners as the 'depositories' and the teacher is the 'depositor'. Freire rejects such an inhuman and mechanical model of education in favour of a real humanistic model of Problem-posing Pedagogy that views education to be consist of acts of cognition that take place through dialogue. According to Freire, in Problem-posing education "no one teaches *another*, nor is anyone self-taught". He also explains how "Through dialogue the teacher-of-the-students and the students-of-the-teacher cease to exist and a new term emerges: *teacher-student with students-teachers*. While

---

<sup>111</sup> For details see Paulo Freire, *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York. London: Continuum Publishing, 2005)

banking education anesthetizes creative power, Problem-posing education involves a constant unveiling of reality. The former attempts to maintain the submersion of consciousness; the latter strives for the emergence of consciousness and critical intervention in reality'. Thus to be aware of raising one's own consciousness is the first step in "Praxis" which is the outcome of the continuous relation between action, reflection and dialogue.<sup>112</sup>

The experiences participants bring to the pedagogical setting are shaped not just by the teaching-learning episodes they have encountered in the past but also by the broader social, economic, and political environment in which they are born and brought up. The policy planners, curriculum designers, or textbook producers can make the best use of these experiences which have a massive potential to alter the pedagogic practices in a given context in surprising ways. In the process of sensitizing itself to the prevailing sociopolitical reality, the pedagogy of "Possibility" is also concerned with constructing individual identity. Since the language education is always in a state of flux, it keeps on providing its participants with challenges and opportunities for a continual quest for subjectivity and self-identity. As Weedon (1987) points out, "language is the place where actual and possible forms of social organization and their likely social and political consequences are defined and contested. Yet it is also the place where our sense of our subjectivity, is constructed" (p. 21).<sup>113</sup> So the pedagogy of "Possibility" can play a vital role in language learners' classroom with their learning-teaching community to open up to social transformation.

---

<sup>112</sup> Ibid

<sup>113</sup> Weedon (1987) (cited) Ibid, 544

## 2.6 Conclusion

This chapter discusses the theoretical underpinnings of Postmethod pedagogy. PMP being context-sensitive aims to counteract the hegemonic power of centre-based pedagogy and in order to do that it takes the local *knowledge* into serious consideration. The chapter also sheds light on the “Particularities” of teachers, learners and teaching-learning context. In the next chapter the pedagogic procedures of Postmethod pedagogy (i.e. the macrostrtegic framework) will be discussed which are crucial for teachers to theorizing from practice and practicing from theorize in class.

## **Chapter Three**

# **Pedagogical Procedures and Indicators of Postmethod**

### **3.1 Introduction**

In chapter-II the three key attributes of Postmethod pedagogy have been discussed which lay the underpinning on which the pedagogic framework of Postmethods can be constructed. This framework enable teachers to adopt and adapt context-sensitive pedagogical procedures for classroom practice based on their personal knowledge, experience and insights, discarding the preset and presequenced methodologies of language teaching prescribed by the top-down models. The aim of such a framework is innovative since it encourages teachers to function as active and autonomous individuals to the extent that they become efficient pedagogical decision makers. Thus PMP empowers teachers by entrusting them with the responsibility to devise pedagogical procedures which are propelled by the “Principled Pragmatism”. In other words, “it allows the possibility for activating and developing teachers' sense of plausibility and creates in them a sense of interested involvement.”<sup>1</sup> This chapter discusses the pedagogical procedures (i.e. the macrostrategies) in detail. Additionally it focuses on the pedagogical indicators of Postmethod pedagogy.

### **3.2 The Pedagogical Procedures of Postmethod**

According to Littlewood (2002), how far learners in ESL/EFL context can achieve language proficiency is dependent on some factors such as:

- the opportunities that exist for using second language,
- the emotional climate of the learning situations,

---

<sup>1</sup> B. Kumaravadivelu, *TESOL QUARTERLY* ,Vol. 28, No. 1, Spring 1994, “The Postmethod Condition:(E)merging Strategies for Second/Foreign Language Teaching”, San Jose' Slate University,31



- the type of language the learner will be exposed to,
- and the effects of formal instruction that is the mode of instruction in the classroom.<sup>2</sup>

Much of these aspects of Littlewood can be related to Kumaravadivelu's (2003, 2006)<sup>3</sup> some of the macrostrategies which he advocates for the implementation of Postmethod pedagogy in the classroom. The recommended macrostrategies of Kumaravadivelu are supposed to drive the language pedagogy beyond the limited and limiting concept of method reflecting the salient principles of Postmethod pedagogy namely the parameters of "Particularity", "Practicality" and "Possibility". The following section provides a brief account of the macrostrategies of Postmethods.

### 3.3 Macrostrategies

A Macrostrategy refers to a general plan derived from currently available theoretical, empirical, and pedagogical knowledge related to L2 learning and teaching. To put in other way, A macrostrategy is a broad guideline based on which teachers can generate their own location-specific, need-based microstrategies (classroom procedures or techniques). Macrostrategies are considered theory-neutral, because they are not confined to underlying assumptions of any one specific theory of language, learning, and teaching. They are also supposed to be method-neutral because they are not conditioned by a single set of principles or procedures associated with language teaching methods. The macrostrategies are supposed to vary from context to context and the selection of content and features of them will depend on local expertise and local expectations.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> William T. Littlewood, *Foreign and Second Language Learning : Language Acquisition Research and Its Implications for the Classroom Research* (Cambridge University Press,2002),53-68

<sup>3</sup> Kumaravadivelu, *Beyond Methods* (2003) and *Understanding Language Teaching*(2006)

<sup>4</sup> Kumaravadivelu, "Towards a Postmethod Pedagogy",545

The macrostrategies are supposed to be based on local knowledge and local need. They will be implemented in the classroom through different microstrategies (techniques or mechanisms) which will be devised by the practicing teachers. In this regard, in-service and pre-service teacher education programme can train them up to execute the entire process. One of the primary tasks of such education programmes should be to create conditions for practicing and prospective teachers to acquire necessary knowledge, expertise and autonomy that comprise their contextual pedagogical knowledge base.<sup>5</sup> Kumaravadivelu holds that the macrostrategic framework intends to change the classroom practitioners into strategic thinkers, teachers, and explorers who will invest their time and effort to:

- reflect on the specific needs, wants, situations, and processes of learning and teaching;
- stretch their knowledge, skill, and attitude to stay informed and involved;
- design and use appropriate microstrategies to maximize learning potentials in the classroom; and
- monitor and evaluate their ability to react to myriad situations in meaningful ways.<sup>6</sup>

In a nut shell, this framework of PMP provides teachers with possible tools for theorizing from their practice and practicing what they theorize in a given context. The strategic framework constitute 10 macrostrategies that are embedded in operational terms. The macrostrategies, as proposed by Kumaravadivelu, are as follows<sup>7</sup>:

### **3.3.1 Macrostrategy 1: Maximizing learning opportunities**

The first macrostrategy regards teaching as a process of creating and utilizing learning opportunities. As such teachers are seen both as creators of learning opportunities for their learners as well as the utilizers of learning opportunities created by learners. As

---

<sup>5</sup> Kumaravadivelu, *Beyond Methods*, 42

<sup>6</sup> Ibid, 42-43

<sup>7</sup> Kumaravadivelu, *Understanding Language Teaching*, 201

creators of learning opportunities teachers need to maintain a balance between their role as planners of teaching acts and their role as mediators of learning acts. The former involves an a priori judgment based on learners' current level of knowledge or ability and their learning goals, whereas the latter involves an ongoing assessment of how well learners are capable to handle classroom input and interaction. Teachers need to recognize, as Kumaravadivelu says, that classroom opportunities should not be bound by:

- i. teachers' agenda
- ii. teaching materials and
- iii. syllabus specifications.<sup>8</sup>

These three factors are all usually pre-set even before the actual classroom interaction takes place with learners. But these have got inherent limitations and therefore teachers should be cautious about not to become captives of their own agenda which includes lesson plans. To maximize learning opportunities, teachers should be keen to develop and modify their lesson plans continuously on the basis of ongoing feedback in classroom. They should take the predetermined syllabus as a pre-syllabus and recreate it to meet specific learner needs, wants, and situations, and treat the prescribed textbook as a pretext that should be only as a springboard for launching appropriate classroom activities.<sup>9</sup>

Learners create learning opportunities for themselves and for their peers as well by looking for clarification, raising doubts, questions, making suggestions, and so forth. If teachers want to make benefits out of the learning opportunities created by learners, they can no longer see "teachers simply as teachers, and learners simply as learners, because both are, for good or ill, managers of learning" (Allwright, 1984)<sup>10</sup>. Teachers cannot afford to ignore any contribution from other partners jointly engaged in the

---

<sup>8</sup> Kumaravadivelu, *Beyond Methods*, 45

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid*, 45-77

<sup>10</sup> Allwright, (1984) cited in Kumaravadivelu, *Understanding Language Teaching*, 203

process of creating and utilizing learning opportunities as the production of classroom interaction goes on in a cooperative venture. Language learning opportunities can be created inside as well as outside classrooms.

### **3.3.2 Macrostrategy 2: Minimizing perceptual mismatches**

Language Communication in ESL/EFL classroom has the potential to contain ambiguities and complexities and so even a well-planned and well-executed might yield to some kind of mismatch between the intention of teachers and the interpretation of learners. Kumaravadivelu says that “An important first step in knowing more about the learners’ personal perspectives on classroom aims and events is to understand the possible sources that could contribute to potential mismatches between teacher intention and learner interpretation.”<sup>11</sup> So to be conscious about the probable sources of mismatch between teachers’ intention and learners’ interpretation is crucial for teachers. There are at least ten potential sources of perceptual mismatch that teachers should be aware of:

1. Cognitive: a source that refers to the knowledge of the world and mental processes through which learners obtain conceptual understanding of physical and natural phenomena;
2. Communicative: a source that refers to skills through which learners exchange messages, including the use of communication strategies;
3. Linguistic: a source that refers to linguistic repertoire—syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic knowledge of the target language—that is minimally required to participate in classroom activities;
4. Pedagogic: a source that refers to teacher/learner recognition of stated or unstated, short- and/or long-term objective(s) of classroom activities;
5. Strategic: a source that refers to learning strategies, that is, operations, steps, plans, and routines used by the learner to facilitate the obtaining, storage, retrieval, and use of information;
6. Cultural: a source that refers to prior knowledge of the target cultural norms minimally required for the learner to understand classroom activities;
7. Evaluative: a source that refers to articulated or unarticulated types and modes of ongoing self-evaluation measures used by learners to monitor their classroom performance;

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid

8. Procedural: a source that refers to stated or unstated paths chosen by the learner to achieve an immediate goal. Procedural source pertains to locally specified, currently identified bottom–up tactics, which seek a quick resolution to a specific problem on hand, whereas strategic source, mentioned earlier, pertains to broad-based, higher-level, top–down strategy, which seeks an overall solution to a general language-learning situation;<sup>12</sup>

Kumaravadivelu states that having knowledge about these mismatches can help ELT practitioners to intervene whenever they notice or whenever learners indicate problems in carrying out a specific classroom activity. There are at least three insights that can be derived from the above discussed points:

1. Mismatches are avoidable: They are part and parcel of everyday teaching and even highly structured and carefully planned lessons will result in producing one kind of mismatch or another.
2. Mismatches are identifiable: Mismatches are not exhaustive or mutually exclusive. They are distinct enough to be related to one another and so they are identifiable.
3. Mismatches are manageable: Perceptual mismatches may be unavoidable but they are not unmanageable. If recognized in time and addressed with care, a mismatch can be converted into a learning opportunity.<sup>13</sup>

It is logical to assume that the narrower the gap between teachers' intentions and learners' interpretations, the greater the chances of achieving learning and teaching goals in ESL/EFL contexts.

### **3.3.3 Macrostrategy 3: Facilitating negotiated interaction**

This macrostrategy, as to Kumaravadivelu, refers to meaningful learner–learner, learner–teacher interaction in class where the learners have the freedom and flexibility

---

<sup>12</sup> Kumaravadivelu, *Understanding Language Teaching*, 203

<sup>13</sup> Kumaravadivelu, *Beyond Methods*, 90

to initiate and navigate talk.<sup>14</sup> So it does not simply mean to react or respond to a specific teaching-learning situation in class. Negotiated interaction means that the learner should be actively involved in meaningful interaction. As to interaction, it should be treated as a:

- (a) textual,
  - (b) interpersonal
- and (c) ideational activity respectively<sup>15</sup>

(a) Interaction as a textual activity refers basically the use of linguistic features of language necessary for understanding linguistic input. The linguistic dimension includes phonological, syntactic and semantic signals that enable learners and their interlocutors to understand input and transmit messages as intended. The metalinguistic dimension is concerned with promoting language awareness to talk about structures and techniques of language.<sup>16</sup>

(b) Interaction as an interpersonal activity refers to the use of language to promote communication between participants. So it entails different sociolinguistics features of language required to establish roles, relationships and responsibilities.<sup>17</sup>

And (c) interaction as an ideational activity implies an expression of the participants' own experience of the real or imaginary world in, around and outside the situated learning and teaching context. It specifically relates to ideas or emotions participants bring with them based on their lived experiences of past and present.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid,102

<sup>15</sup> Ibid

<sup>16</sup> Ibid

<sup>17</sup> Ibid

<sup>18</sup> Ibid

During these interactional activities, teachers should facilitate the learner's understanding and use of language as system, language as discourse, and language as ideology. ESL/EFL learners need to be provided with opportunities for negotiated interaction in order to speed up their comprehension and production. Studies on interactional modifications demonstrate that what enables learners to move beyond their current receptive and expressive capacities are opportunities to modify and restructure their interaction with their interlocutors until mutual comprehension is reached.

### **3.3.4 Macrostrategy 4: Promoting learner autonomy**

Language learning is largely an autonomous activity and so promoting learner autonomy is vital in Postmethod pedagogy. The postmethod learner is an autonomous learner. Kumaravadivelu talks about two major types of autonomy:

- (i) Narrow view of learner autonomy: learning to learn
- (ii) Broad view of learner autonomy: learning to liberate<sup>19</sup>

(i) The narrow view of learner autonomy aids learners learn how to learn, equipping them with the metacognitive, cognitive, social, and affective strategies. These are necessary to self-direct learners their own learning and raise their consciousness about the learning strategies they seem to possess intuitively, making the strategies explicit and systematic so that they are available to improve their language-learning abilities as well. While the broad view of liberatory autonomy involves helping learners learn how to liberate. This can provide the learner with the tools necessary to realize the potential for social transformation.

(ii) As adult L2 learners possess past experience, they tend to bring with them in classrooms preconceived notions about what constitutes learning, what constitutes

---

<sup>19</sup> Kumaravadivelu, *Beyond Methods*, 133-145

teaching, and prior expectations about what impedes the learner- and teacher-role relationships in the classroom. Kumaravadivelu says that teachers should have adequate psychological preparation combined with strategic training that will help learners understand "what the learning strategies are, how to use them for accomplishing various problem-posing and problem-solving tasks, how to monitor their performance, and how to assess the outcome of their learning."<sup>20</sup>

Kumaravadivelu talks about another kind of autonomy which is called social autonomy which is connected to learners' ability and keenness to function effectively as cooperative members of classroom community. It denotes the fact that the strategies or activities that help to increase meta-cognitive activities and learning management skills involve social interaction (Broady and Kenning, 1996).<sup>21</sup> Kumaravadivelu remarks that social autonomy help learners to "...gain a sense of responsibility for aiding their own learning and that of their peers, and they develop a degree of sensitivity and understanding toward other learners who may be more or less competent than they themselves are."<sup>22</sup>

The three aspects of autonomy promise the development of an overall academic ability, intellectual competence, social consciousness, and mental attitude essential for learners to avail opportunities and overcome challenges both in and outside classroom. It should be noted that teachers and learners can follow different stages of autonomy (degree of autonomy) depending on the linguistic and communicative needs and demands of a particular task in a particular class. Autonomy cannot be successfully promoted in the absence of a supportive and conducive classroom culture.

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibid

<sup>21</sup> Broady and Kenning, (1996) cited in Kumaravadivelu (2001), "Towards a Postmethod Pedagogy", 546-547

<sup>22</sup> Ibid



### 3.3.5 Macrostrategy 5: Fostering language awareness

Language awareness is essential for the realization of an individual's full potential which ultimately gives way to the realization of a nation's ideal. The relevant literature in the field of language and education provides various strands of thought about how language awareness can be fostered. These thoughts may be classified as:

- (i) General language awareness
- (ii) Critical language awareness<sup>23</sup>

Kumaravadivelu defines (i) general language awareness in the background of Postmethod pedagogy as the deliberate attempt to draw learners' attention to the formal properties of their L2 in order to increase the degree of explicitness required to promote L2 learning. Such awareness of L2 is based on strategies that highlight understanding, general principles, and operational experience. Strategies based on language awareness have intellectual appeal and instructional applicability needed to speed up the rate of learning. They also help learners to make themselves conscious about the aspects of L2 that would otherwise go unnoticed, and as a result they would not learn the initial incorrect analyses by supplying negative evidence. Again, learners need to develop (iii) critical language awareness in order to dig deep into the ideological practices that deceptively use language with a view to maintaining a social and political power structure. If ELT practitioners want to encourage L2 learners to do the kind of critical analysis of language used by CLA advocates<sup>24</sup>, then they should take into account the ideological markers of a text in addition to its propositional message. If they fail to do

---

<sup>23</sup> Kumaravadivelu, *Beyond Methods*, 156-166

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid*, 165, 175

so, they will knowingly or unknowingly contribute not only to the marginalization of their learners but also to their own marginalization.

### **3.3.6 Macrostrategy 6: Activating intuitive heuristics**

In educational context, heuristics refer to the process of self-discovery on the part of the learner. It also refers to a particular method of teaching which allows students to learn discovering things by themselves and learning from their own experiences rather than by telling them things (*Cambridge International Dictionary of English*, 1995, p. 610).<sup>25</sup> In ESL/EFL situation, an important task of teachers is to create a rich linguistic environment in the classroom where learners can activate their intuitive heuristic and one way of doing this is to provide enough textual data so that the learner can infer certain underlying rules of form and function through self-discovery.

A good deal of linguistic and discoursal information can be conveyed, not directly through rules (deductive approach to teach grammar), but indirectly through examples (inductive approach to teach grammar). Learners may be encouraged to find the rule-governing pattern in the examples provided. They should encounter the linguistic structure several times so that “the design of the language may be observed, and its meaning (structural, lexical, and socio-cultural) inductively absorbed from its use in such varying situations” (Rivers, 1964)<sup>26</sup>.

There are two important factors that play vital roles in activating intuitive heuristics of learners. They are: (i) Consciousness Raising and (ii) Gap Filling. While the former means to a deliberate attempt to draw learners’ explicit attention to the features of the target language, particularly the grammatical features, the latter means

---

<sup>25</sup> *Cambridge International Dictionary of English*, 1995, p. 610, cited in Kumaravadivelu. *Beyond Methods*, 176

<sup>26</sup> Rivers (1964) cited in Kumaravadivelu (2008), *Understanding Language Teaching*, 204

learners' ability to notice the gap between what they already know and what they need to know. Empirical studies show that self-discovery plays a crucial role in learner comprehension and retention regardless of the learners' language ability.

### **3.3.7 Macrostrategy 7: Contextualizing linguistic input**

Language communication is intractably bound up with its communicative context. Latin "contexus" means joining together. Michael Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan define context as the joining together of realities.<sup>27</sup> The features of language as discourse demands contextualization of linguistic input so that learners can benefit from the interactive effects of systemic as well as discursal components of language. In this regard the responsibility for contextualizing linguistic input lies more with the classroom teacher than with the syllabus designer or the textbook writer. It is the teacher who can succeed or fail in creating contexts that encourage meaning-making in the classroom irrespective of what textbooks profess. Kumaravadivelu talks about the four realities (contexts):

- (i) Linguistic
  - (ii) Extralinguistic
  - (iii) Situational
  - (iv) Extrasituational<sup>28</sup>
- (i) Linguistic reality refers to the immediate linguistic environment that contains formal aspects of language (i.e. noun, pronoun, ellipses, substitutions and so on) for the process of meaning making,
  - (ii) Extralinguistic reality refers to immediate linguistic environment that contains prosodic signals such as stress and intonation. They carry subtle information beyond the syntactic and semantic features of language.

---

<sup>27</sup> Michael Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan, cited in Kumaravadivelu (2003), *Beyond Methods*, 204

<sup>28</sup> Kumaravadivelu. *Beyond Methods*, 205-216

- (iii) Situational reality refers to the context of situation. Bronilaw Malinowski (1923) argues that language is embedded within a context and that the situation in which utterances are made cannot be overlooked.<sup>29</sup>
- (iv) The last one refers to the context of culture. The problem of what is and what is not appropriate is more acute in an extrasituational context. Communicative appropriateness depends on the socio-cultural-political or ideological contexts that shape meaning in a specific speech event. Thus this macrostrategy of PMP involves the integration of syntactic, semantic, pragmatic and discourse aspects of language as a whole.

### **3.3.8 Macrostrategy 8: Integrating language skills**

L2 learning involves not merely an integration of linguistic components of language, but also an integration of language skills. The four language skills, as for the traditional language-centred methods, are: Listening, Speaking reading and writing. Since language skills are essentially interrelated and mutually reinforcing, fragmenting them into manageable, atomistic items runs counter to the parallel and interactive nature of language and language behaviour. So Kumaravadivelu argues that though some traditionally it seen to combine reading and writing as one unit and listening and speaking as another, this seems to be impossible as learners actually integrate various language skills not restrictively the ones indicated. They, for instance, listen to the teacher attentively and take notes, thereby, combining listening and writing. Therefore, it is necessary that teachers conduct lessons in such a way that learners get the chance to use language for all the language skills. All available empirical, theoretical, and pedagogical information emphasizes the need to integrate language skills for effective language teaching.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> Bronilaw Malinowski (1923) (cited) Ibid

<sup>30</sup> Kumaravadivelu (2008), *Understanding Language Teaching*, 206

### 3.3.9 Macrostrategy 9: Ensuring social relevance

Language pedagogy in ESL/EFL context is not a discrete activity. Rather it is deeply rooted in the larger social and political context and so it gets hugely impacted by them. Social relevance refers to the need for teachers to be sensitive to the societal, political, economic, and educational environment in which L2 education takes place. In fact, The social context shapes various learning and teaching issues such as (a) the motivation for L2 learning, (b) the goal of L2 learning, (c) the functions L2 is expected to perform at home and in the community, (d) the availability of input to the learner, (e) the variation in the input, (f) and the norms of proficiency acceptable to that particular speech community.<sup>31</sup>

Learners' learning purpose and language use are probably the most crucial factors in determining the social relevance of an L2 programme. The L2 speech community produce different types of functions of language and they impact the learning and use of L2 in various ways. While learning to use the L2, the learners are seldom exposed to the full range of their L2 in all its complexity that one would expect in a context where it is used as a primary vehicle of communication. While picking up the target language the learner does not become an imitation native speaker but a person who can stand between the two languages, using both when appropriate (Cook, 1992).<sup>32</sup> Teachers should take into account this observation while decision making in terms of appropriate instructional materials (text or course books and so on), evaluation measures and target knowledge or ability.

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid.

<sup>32</sup> Cook, (1992) (cited) Ibid, 207

### 3.3.10 Macrostrategy 10: Raising cultural consciousness

Culture teaching has always been an integral part of second or foreign language teaching pedagogy. Traditionally, it is aimed at creating in the L2 learner an awareness of and empathy toward the culture of the L2 community. According to a review by Stern (1992), culture teaching has emphasized a cognitive component in terms of geographical knowledge, knowledge about the contributions of the target culture to world civilization, knowledge about differences in the way of life as well as an understanding of values and attitudes in the L2 community; an affective component in terms of interest, curiosity and empathy; and a behavioural component in terms of learners' ability to interpret culturally relevant behaviour, and to conduct themselves in culturally appropriate ways.<sup>33</sup> Thus, as Stern reiterates, one of the goals of culture teaching has been to help the learner gain an understanding of native speakers and their perspectives.


In view of the stated circumstances above, cultural diversity is often overlooked which needs to be explored and explained with proper importance. Such a traditional view of culture teaching may be adequate for helping learners develop socio-cultural knowledge/ability yet it may not serve the cause of language teaching in these days of cultural globalization. Therefore what is required now is global cultural consciousness. To gain that end, instead of privileging the teacher as the sole cultural informant, the learner should be regarded as a cultural informant. Teachers will encourage learners to identify the cultural knowledge they bring to the classroom and by using it to help them share their own individual perspectives with the teacher as well as other learners. By doing so they will be able to detect the differences between cultures. Such a multicultural approach can also help to dispel stereotypes that create and sustain cross-cultural misunderstandings and miscommunications (Kumaravadivelu, 2003).<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> Stern (1992) (cited) Kumaravadivelu (2003). *Beyond Methods*, 268

<sup>34</sup> (Kumaravadivelu, 2003) cited in Kumaravadivelu (2003), *Understanding Language Teaching*, 273

In sum, macrostrategies are guiding principles derived from current theoretical, empirical and experiential knowledge of L2 learning and teaching and they are likely to change over time as knowledge base grows or changes. This pedagogic parameters of particularity, practicality, and possibility have the potential to form the operating principles for constructing a situation-specific Postmethod pedagogy. The parameters and the macrostrategies are interrelated and are mutually reinforcing as shown in Fig. 2.1. The parameters of particularity, practicality and possibility function as the axle that connects and holds the centre of the pedagogic wheel. The macrostrategies function as spokes that join the pedagogic wheel to its centre thereby giving the wheel its stability and strength. The outer rim stands for language learning and language teaching.<sup>35</sup>



**Figure 3.1: The Pedagogic Wheel of Postmethod<sup>36</sup>**

<sup>35</sup> Ibid,209.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid

Kumaravadivelu remarks that research based macrostrategic framework should not be taken just "as a dogma for uncritical acceptance but as an option for critical appraisal in light of new and expanding experience and experimentation in L2 learning and teaching."<sup>37</sup> Accordingly, the current study aims to conduct a survey on the higher secondary level students of Bangladesh and dig deep into the realities of their beliefs, expectations, learning style preferences, learning strategies and classroom practice of language teaching and learning and so on and thereby bring to the fore what are the problems of the traditional language pedagogy and what are the ways and techniques to implement a culture-sensitive pedagogy for ELT in Bangladesh. The macrostrategies provide only the general guiding principles for classroom teaching but to implement them in the classroom one has to adopt and adapt different types of microstrategies and in order to do that one has to take into account the prevailing teaching-learning scenario of a particular context.

### **3.4 Microstrategies**

*Microstrategies* are classroom procedures that are designed to realize the objectives of a particular macrostrategy. Each macrostrategy can have any number of, and any type of, microstrategies, depending on the local learning and teaching situation; the possibilities are endless. However, microstrategies are conditioned and constrained by the national, regional, or local language policy and planning, curricular objectives, institutional resources, and a host of other factors that shape the learning and teaching enterprise in a given context. Most of all, they have to be designed keeping in mind the learners' needs, wants, and lacks, as well as their current level of language knowledge/ ability.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> B.Kumaravadivelu, Kumaravadivelu, "The Postmethod Condition: (E) merging Strategies for Second/Foreign Language Teaching", *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 28, No. 1. (Spring, 1994), pp. 27-48. Stable URL: <http://links.jstor.org/>, 32

<sup>38</sup> Kumaravadivelu, *Understanding Language Teaching*, 208-214



### 3.5 The Pedagogic Indicators of Postmethods

The *pedagogic indicators* of Postmethods refer to those features that are considered to reflect the roles played by the key participants in language pedagogy which are congruent with the parameters of “Particularity”, “Practicality” and “Possibility”. Postmethod learners, teachers and teacher educators play vital roles in shared decision making in classrooms. So the pedagogic indicators imply the extent to which shared decision making is integrated into the planning and implementation of classroom aims and activities.

#### 3.5.1 The Postmethod Learner

The Postmethod learners are supposed to be active and autonomous. Kumaravadivelu explains how Postmethod pedagogy aims to make the most use of the learner investment and learner interest by practically giving them a meaningful role in pedagogic decision making.<sup>39</sup> As Breen and Littlejohn (2000) observed, “a pedagogy that does not directly call upon students’ capacities to make decisions conveys to them that either they are not allowed to or that they are incapable of doing so; or it may convey that the more overt struggle to interpret and plan is not part of ‘proper’ learning”<sup>40</sup>. Postmethod pedagogy provides learners ample scopes to play active role in pedagogic decision making. There are two types of views of learner autonomy as encapsulated by Kumaravadivelu: (i) a narrow view and (ii) a broad view.<sup>41</sup> The former seeks to develop in the learner a capacity to learn to learn whereas the latter goes beyond that to include a capacity to learn to liberate as well. In fact, to help learners learn to learn involves developing in them the ability to “take charge of one’s own

---

<sup>39</sup> Ibid,176

<sup>40</sup> Breen and Littlejohn (2000) (cited) Ibid, 176-177

<sup>41</sup> Ibid,177

learning,” (Holec, 1981, p. 3)<sup>42</sup>. According to Holec, taking charge means to:

- (a) have and to hold the responsibility for determining learning objectives,
- (b) for defining contents and progressions,
- (c) for selecting methods and techniques to be used,
- (d) for monitoring the procedure of acquisition, and finally,
- (e) for evaluating what has been acquired.<sup>43</sup>

Generally, *learning to learn* means learning to use appropriate strategies to realize desired learning objectives. The taxonomies of learning strategies (e.g., O’Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990)<sup>44</sup> as well as user-friendly manuals (e.g., Chamot, et. al., 1999; Scharle & Szabo, 2000)<sup>45</sup> have already been discussed earlier in this chapter. These learning strategies offer learners’ insights into what they need to know and how they can plan and regulate their learning. These sources tell us that learners use several metacognitive, cognitive, social, and affective strategies to achieve their learning objectives. They also tell us that there are many individual ways of learning a language successfully, and that different learners will approach language learning differently. By using appropriate learning strategies, learners can monitor their learning process and maximize their learning potential. Kumaravadivelu (2003a, 139-140) says that learners can exploit some of these opportunities by:

- Identifying their learning strategies and styles in order to know their strengths and weaknesses as language learners;
- stretching their strategies and styles by incorporating some of those employed by successful language learners;
- reaching out for opportunities for additional language reception or production beyond what they get in the classroom, for example through library resources,

---

<sup>42</sup> Holec (1981, p. 3) (cited) Ibid, 176

<sup>43</sup> Ibid

<sup>44</sup> O’Malley & Chamot (199); Oxford(19900) (cited) Ibid

<sup>45</sup> Chamot, et. al.(1999),Scharle & Szabo (2000) (cited)Ibid,177

- learning centers and electronic media such as the Internet;
- collaborating with other learners to pool information on a specific project they are working on;
- and taking advantage of opportunities to communicate with competent speakers of the language.<sup>46</sup>

As a whole, these activities help learners gain a sense of responsibility for aiding their own learning.

Kumaravadivelu regards the narrow view of autonomy as *academic autonomy* that enables learners to be effective learners. While the broad view of autonomy is referred by him as *liberatory autonomy that empowers* learners to become critical thinkers. Thus, latter goes much further by actively seeking to help learners recognize socio-political hurdles that impede them to be conscious of their full human potential as well as by providing them with the intellectual and cognitive tools that are significant to overcome those impediments.<sup>47</sup> Apart from these two, Kumaravadivelu speaks of *Social autonomy* which relates to learner's ability and willingness to function effectively as cooperative members of a classroom community.<sup>48</sup>

### 3.5.2 The Postmethod Teacher

According to Kumaravadivelu, the Postmethod teachers are supposed to be autonomous. Teacher autonomy is the pivot of Postmethod pedagogy.<sup>49</sup> Traditionally, method-based pedagogy is very much prone to overlooking the deposit of experience and knowledge which teachers possess by virtue of their lives as students (Freeman, 1991, 135)<sup>50</sup>. Postmethod pedagogy, on the other hand, recognizes the teachers' prior knowledge along with their potential to know not only how to teach but also know how

---

<sup>46</sup> Kumaravadivelu (2003a, 139-140) (cited) Ibid, 177

<sup>47</sup> Ibid

<sup>48</sup> Kumravadivelu. "Towards a Postmethod Pedagogy", 546

<sup>49</sup> Kumaravadivelu, *Understanding Language Teaching*, 178

<sup>50</sup> Freeman (1991,135) (cited) Ibid,178

to act autonomously within the academic and administrative constraints imposed by institutions, curricula, and textbooks. It also promotes the ability of teachers to know how to develop a reflective approach to their own teaching, how to analyze and evaluate their own teaching acts, how to initiate change in their classroom, and how to monitor the effects of such changes (Wallace, 1991)<sup>51</sup>. Such an ability can evolve only if teachers have a desire and a determination to acquire and assert a fair degree of autonomy in pedagogic decision making.

Kumaravadivelu<sup>52</sup> also holds that teachers in ESL/EFL context enter into the realm of professional knowledge through a readymade package of “methods”. While teaching they come to know about the limitations of these top-down products and try to break away from such a constraining concept of method. Thus they develop their own *eclectic method* and in order to do that, they have to mostly depend on their prior and evolving personal knowledge of learning and teaching in the given contexts. However, personal knowledge of teachers does not simply imply behavioral knowledge of how to do particular things in the classroom. It involves a cognitive dimension that connects thought with activity and the entire process happens based on the context-embedded, explanatory process of knowing what to do (Freeman, 1996)<sup>53</sup>. It evolves over time, through determined effort. Teachers in a particular context can become autonomous only when they are ready to embark on a continual process of self-development.

### **3.5.2.1 Teachers’ Role as “Reflective Practitioners” in Postmethod Pedagogy**

Postmethod pedagogy views teachers as “Reflective Practitioners” in contrast to the traditional view of teachers as “Passive Technicians”. According to Dew (1933),

...teaching is seen not just as a series of predetermined and presequenced procedures

---

<sup>51</sup> Wallace(1991) (cited) Ibid

<sup>52</sup> Ibid, 179.

<sup>53</sup> (Freeman, 1996) (cited) Ibid

but as a context-sensitive action grounded in intellectual thought.<sup>54</sup> Teachers are seen not as passive transmitters of received knowledge but as problem-solvers possessing “the ability to look back critically and imaginatively, to do cause-effect thinking, to derive explanatory principles, to do task analysis, also to look forward, and to do anticipatory planning”<sup>55</sup>

This is why Kumaravadivelu remarks reflective teaching as a *holistic approach* that underlines “creativity, artistry, and context sensitivity.”<sup>56</sup>

Again Don Schon (1983) in his book *The Reflective Practitioner* elaborates the Deweyan concept of reflection and shows in what way teachers’ conscious involvement in classroom instruction can yield to new and prolific perspectives to the complexities of teaching that cannot be matched by experts’ views who stand apart from classroom realities.<sup>57</sup> The two intertwined frames of reflection namely “reflection-on-action” and “reflection-in-action” is differentiated in the following way:

Reflection-on-action can occur before and after a lesson, as teachers plan for a lesson and then evaluate the effectiveness of their teaching acts afterward. Reflection-in-action, on the other hand, occurs during the teaching act when teachers monitor their ongoing performance, attempting to locate unexpected problems on the spot and then adjusting their teaching instantaneously. Schon rightly argues that it is the teachers’ own reflection-in/on-action, and not an undue reliance on professional experts, that will help them identify and meet the challenges they face in their everyday practice of teaching.<sup>58</sup>

Therefore, what reflective teachers constantly attempt to do is to maximize their learning potential and that of their learners through classroom-oriented action research and problem-solving activities.

The idea of teachers as “Transformative Intellectuals” traces back to the works

---

<sup>54</sup> Dew (1933), cited in Kumaravadivelu, *Beyond Methods*, 10

<sup>55</sup> Ibid

<sup>56</sup> Ibid

<sup>57</sup> Don Schon (1983) (cited) Ibid

<sup>58</sup> Ibid, 10.

of a group of critical pedagogues as Henry Giroux (1988), Peter McLaren (1995), and Roger Simon (1987), and language teaching professionals such as Elsa Auerbach (1995), Sarah Benesch (2001), and Alastair Pennycook (2001).<sup>59</sup> The Freirean philosophy (1972, 1993)<sup>60</sup> on education influenced all of them up to a great extent. As for them, teachers as “Transformative Intellectuals” play the roles of professionals who are capable of reflecting on the ideological principles that gives way to innovative practice in classroom. Assuming the new roles enable teachers to connect pedagogical theory and practice to wider social issues. They also feel encouraged to work together to share their ideas, exercise power over domination and represent a vision of a better and more humane life through teaching (Giroux & McLaren, 1989, cited in op.cit.)<sup>61</sup>. Such roles of teachers as “Transformative Intellectuals” outshines the traditional roles of teachers as “Passive Technicians”. Postmethod pedagogy puts emphasis on this aspect of teachers most in order to make them socio-politico-culturally conscious and eventually empowered.

### **3.5.2.2 The Postmethod Teacher Educator**

The top-down traditional models of language teaching pedagogy are designed to transmit a set of pre-selected principles of classroom methodology from the teacher educator to the prospective teacher. As Pennycook (2004) points out, “Mainstream approaches to teacher education in TESOL have frequently lacked a social or political dimension that helps locate English and English language teaching within the complex social, cultural, economic, and political environments in which it occurs”.<sup>62</sup> This is essentially an imposed approach in which teacher educators perceive their roles in line

---

<sup>59</sup> Henry Giroux (1988), Peter McLaren (1995), Roger Simon (1987), Elsa Auerbach (1995), Sarah Benesch (2001), Alastair Pennycook (2001) (cited) Ibid,13

<sup>60</sup> Freirean philosophy (1972, 1993) (cited) Ibid

<sup>61</sup> Giroux & McLaren (1989), cited in op.cit. (cited) Ibid

<sup>62</sup> Pennycook (2004), cited in Kumaravadivelu, *Understanding Language Teaching*,182

with the tradition of method-based pedagogy. As Kumaravadivelu explains, “one of engineering the classroom teaching of student teachers, offering them suggestions as to the best way to teach, modelling appropriate teaching behaviours for them, and evaluating their mastery of discrete pedagogic behaviours through a capstone course called *practicum* or *practice teaching*.”<sup>63</sup> Such a transmission model of teacher education fails to produce “Reflective” and “Transformative” practitioners who constitute the pillars of Postmethod pedagogy.

Kumaravadivelu holds that the mission of a Postmethod teacher educator is to create conditions for prospective teachers to acquire necessary authority and autonomy. Such attributes will enable them to reflect on and shape their own pedagogic experiences. In other words, the interaction between the teacher educator and the prospective teacher should become dialogic in the Bakhtinian sense<sup>64</sup>. According to Bakhtin (1981), interaction is “dialogic” when all the participants to an interactional exchange have the authority and the autonomy to express their voice and exhibit their identity. A dialogue is “monologic” as it is controlled by one individual, even if two or more individuals take part in it. So dialogic is very helpful as it facilitates an interaction between meanings, between belief systems; an interaction that produces what Bakhtin calls, “a responsive understanding.”<sup>65</sup> In such a dialogic enterprise, the primary concern of the teacher educator is to provide opportunities for the dialogic construction of meaning out of which an identity or voice may emerge. In such a pedagogy which is dialogically constructed participants get plentiful scopes to think and act critically on their own.<sup>66</sup>

Postmethod perspective, as for Kumaravadivelu, views teacher education as a

---

<sup>63</sup> Ibid, 182

<sup>64</sup> Ibid.

<sup>65</sup> Bakhtin (1981) (cited) Ibid

<sup>66</sup> Ibid

perennial and dialogically built entity involving critically reflective participants and it discourages any predetermined, prescribed pedagogic practice. When teacher education is dialogic, a series of actions follows through purposeful interactions and as a result the channels of communication between student-teachers and teacher-educators open-up. Now the student teachers actively and freely use the linguistic, cultural and pedagogic capital they bring with them. Apart from this, the teacher educators also use the student teacher's values, beliefs, and knowledge as an integral part of the learning process. On the whole, the entire process of teacher education becomes reflective and rewarding.<sup>67</sup> To explain in practical terms, as Kumaravadivelu says, the Postmethod teacher educator becomes one of<sup>68</sup>:

- recognizing and helping student teachers identify the inequalities and imbalances built into the current teacher education programmes which treat teacher educators as producers of knowledge and practicing teachers as merely consumers of knowledge;
- enabling prospective teachers to express their thoughts and experience eloquently and share with other student teachers in class their progressing personal beliefs, experience, assumptions, and knowledge regarding language teaching-learning at the outset and also during and at the end of their teacher education programmes.
- encouraging prospective teachers to think critically so that they may relate their personal knowledge with the professional knowledge that they are being exposed to and also motivating them to monitor how each shapes and is shaped by the other, assess how the basic professional knowledge could be used to

---

<sup>67</sup> Ibid

<sup>68</sup> Ibid, 183



derive their own personal theory of practice;

- creating conditions for student teachers to obtain basic classroom discourse analytical skills which will aid them understand the nature input and interaction in classroom;
- rechannelizing part of their own research agenda to do what Cameron, Frazer, Harvey, Rampton, and Richardson (1992) called “empowering research,” i.e. research *with* student-teachers;
- Exposing student teachers to a pedagogy of “Possibility” by helping them critically engage and eventually raise their consciousness about their surroundings i.e. awareness about power and politics, ideas and ideologies that inform ESL/EFL education.

Undoubtedly these tasks are challenging and it is a matter of regret that most of the current Teacher Education Programmes are unable to meet these challenges. Therefore, these programmes require a fundamental restructuring that changes an information-oriented Teacher Education into an inquiry-oriented one and this is why Kumaravadivelu proposes the coherent macrostrategic framework for language teaching in classrooms which is supposed to push the language pedagogy beyond the limited and limiting concept of method.<sup>69</sup>

In the paradigm of Postmethod pedagogy, the teachers are primarily concerned with exploring what works and what does not work using what Brown (2007) calls an *enlightened* or *eclectic method* of language teaching to deal with language learners pitfalls

---

<sup>69</sup> Ibid

in ESL/EFL context.<sup>70</sup> However, Postmethod advocates for devising an alternative to method of language teaching and it works by its macrostrategic framework which is also considered as theory-neutral since it is not conditioned by any specific set of theoretical principles.<sup>71</sup> The implementation of the macrostrategies in the context of Bangladesh requires a close inspection and examination and in order to do that the researcher needs to pay heed to the present English teaching-learning culture of the country.

### 3.6 A Critical Review of the Ideas of Postmethods

Although Post-method has taken the ELT World by storm, it is not free from criticism. The mainstay of this new idea is that it is not knowledge or theory driven, it is practice and context driven. But a close examination can show that it is still largely theory driven. Although it grows out of the limitations of the method and upon the death of the methods, many critics of ELT around the world feel the presence of methods in the Postmethod Era and so they simply cannot accept the demise of the methods. As Bell (2003) says: “Indeed, postmethodologists have done such a wonderful job in killing off methods that one wonders if the methods bogeyman really existed.”<sup>72</sup> When Kumaravadivelu (2003)<sup>73</sup> claims that Postmethod is theory neutral, this also suggests that it is not guided by any principles but one of the important conditions of Postmethods is “Principled Pragmatism”. The word “Pragmatism” here refers to practical actions according to realities of classroom, but the word “Principled” reminds one of theory; the principles are theory driven. So Kumaravadivelu’s claim is self-

---

<sup>70</sup> Brown (2007) cited in Hlaviso A., Motlhaka, “Exploring Postmethod Pedagogy in Teaching English as Second Language in South African Higher Education,” *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, MCSER Publishing, Rome-Italy, Vol-6 No-1, January 2015, ISSN 2039-2117 (online)/ISSN 2039-9340

<sup>71</sup> Ibid.

<sup>72</sup> David M. Bell. “Method and Postmethod: Are they really so incompatible?”, *TESOL QUARTERLY* Vol. 37, No. 2, Summer, 2003, p.328

<sup>73</sup> Kumaravadivelu, 2003, p.38

contradictory. Although the Postmethod proponents claim that methods are dead, in reality methods were never applied properly, and without exact application they are blamed as ineffective.

Another claim made by Kumaravadivelu (2003) is that his macrostrategic framework is “theory neutral”. But the question that instantly emerges here is whether any framework can ever be theory neutral (e.g. Pennycook, 1989)<sup>74</sup>. It is worthwhile to mention that the very edifice of Postmethods is built on the references to the literature of language teaching research which by no means can be theory free. In fact, Kumaravadivelu’s position about the role of theory in method and Postmethods is not clear. Many prominent applied linguists do not find differences between CLT and Postmethods. For example, Bygate, Skehan, and Swain,<sup>75</sup> argue that “communicative language teaching was explicitly a post-method approach to language teaching (see notably Brumfit and Johnson,1979; and Brumfit,1988) in which the principles underlying the use of different classroom procedures were of paramount importance, rather than a package of teaching materials” (Bygate et al.,2001, p.2)<sup>76</sup>. In line with the same arguments, Bell (2003)<sup>77</sup> points out that many of Kumaravadivelu’s strategies-negotiated interaction, integrated language skills, learner autonomy, and so on look unusually like CLT and so he remarks that the constraints of methods that Postmethod condition mentions are threatening for teachers’ “sense of plausibility” by “deconstructing methods” (Kumaravadivelu,2006).<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> Bygate, Skehan, and Swain,2001, cited in Seyyed Mohammad Reza Hashemi, “(Post)-Methodism: Possibility of the Impossible?”, p.141, *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 137-145, January 2011 © 2011 ACADEMY PUBLISHER Manufactured in Finland.

<sup>75</sup> Ibid

<sup>76</sup> Ibid, 142

<sup>77</sup> Ibid

<sup>78</sup> David M. Bell. “Method and Postmethod: Are they really so incompatible?”, *TESOL QUARTERLY* Vol. 37, No. 2, Summer, 2003, p.328

Liu (1995) reacts to the notion of “futility/demise of the search for better method’ and emphasis on finding “an alternative to method”. He explains that Postmethod cannot be considered as an alternative to methods since at the level of practice they both require realizable procedures or “Principled Pragmatism”. So, for Liu Postmethod without method is like theory without practice or an alternative thinking but not an alternative form of doing, and this will challenge the parameter of “Practicality”. Liu also believes that the term “principle” is more fitting than “macro-strategy’ and contends that “macro-strategies should not and cannot replace methods.”<sup>79</sup> Moreover, they seem to have some pre-packaged generalized theories or ideas prescribed for practitioners; so, they are also top-down imposition, not “bottom up” or context-sensitive or practice driven.

Bell (2003) attacks Postmethodologists when they argue that methods can never be realized in their purest form in the classroom according to the principles of their originator because methods are not derived from classroom practice.<sup>80</sup> He says:

“...L2 teaching professionals know that what is realized as method in the classroom emerges over time as a result of the interaction among the teacher, the students, and the materials and activities (Richards, 1990). This notion of the social construction of method in millions of different classrooms suggests that what is called method is often an a posteriori rationalization of many similar teaching practices rather than an a priori set of prescriptions emanating from one source. Even seemingly monolithic methods like grammar translation and the audiolingual method owe much of their apparent prescriptive coherence to the rationalizations of methods historians (Howatt, 1984; Pennycook, 1989).”<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> Liu (1995)cited in Ibid

<sup>80</sup> David M. Bell. “Method and Postmethod: Are they really so incompatible?”, *TESOL QUARTERLY* Vol. 37, No. 2, Summer, 2003, p.328

<sup>81</sup> Ibid,329

In view of the immense difficulty of realizing a set of a priori methodological outcomes in the classroom, Bell (2003) questions the need to get preoccupied with such prescriptive nature of methods.<sup>82</sup> Hence, he says:

Postmethod pedagogy can therefore be seen as both an attempt to understand the paradigm shift that L2 education has gone through in the past 40 years and an attempt to unify practices in a more holistic way. The 1970s designer methods can be seen as piecemeal attempts to usher in the new paradigm shift. Postmethodology, therefore, rather than going beyond method, may be understood as a synthesis of various methods under the umbrella of CLT, or what Liu (1995) calls a “method redefining condition” (p. 176).

He counters this argument which disregards the huge impact that the main philosophies of community language learning, silent way, and suggestopedia have had on language teaching.<sup>83</sup> He cites the example of the development of CLT which has partially been driven by “the co-option of the humanistic, student-centered principles of designer methods.” Therefore, the principles and strategies of Postmethod theorists seem to have commonalities to the very core elements of the 1970s designer methods. Larsen-Freeman (2005 a)<sup>84</sup> startles the Postmethodologists by asserting: “I certainly do not want to throw out the concept of method” (p.22). She states that “methods are not immutable in practice. As teachers gain experience, they come to understand a particular method differently (Larsen-Freeman, 2005 b, p.11)”<sup>85</sup>. While examining teachers’ beliefs about the claim that methods are dead, Bell (2005) reports that in the minds of teachers’ methods are not dead. Bell’s (2005) survey shows that teachers still consider methods useful. He concludes that “postmethod need not imply the end of the methods but rather an understanding of the limitations of the notion of method as it is

---

<sup>82</sup> Ibid

<sup>83</sup> Ibid

<sup>84</sup> Larsen-Freeman (2005 a) cited in Seyyed Mohammad Reza Hashemi, “(Post)-Methodism: Possibility of the Impossible?”, p.142, *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 137-145, January 2011 © 2011 ACADEMY PUBLISHER Manufactured in Finland.

<sup>85</sup> cited in Ibid

narrowly defined and a desire to transcend those limitations.”<sup>86</sup> Thus, critics of Postmethods come up with their claims of the tangible presence of method even in the Postmethod era. The problem is aptly put by Bell (2003)<sup>87</sup>:

Just as proponents of designer methods often doubted that teachers left to their own devices would teach systematically, postmethodologists fear teachers will slavishly follow whatever method they have been trained in. The obsessions of both sets of theorists underestimate the intellectual autonomy and discernment of the practitioner.

Along with this, the argument of Postmethod for teachers’ “Sense of Plausibility” and *subjective understanding of the situation* propelled by “Principled Pragmatism” is expected to make teachers capable to observe, analyse and interpret what works and what does not work in their classrooms and thereby assume the role of theorizers on their own, but Hashemi (2011)<sup>88</sup> says that in doing so Postmethod “... may corner the less experienced practitioner by forcing him or her into an isolated frame of mind and create an unbridgeable gap between the teacher’s fantasy and the reality of the moment.” This is how, the practitioners will have to shoulder responsibilities beyond their grip. Bell says (2003): “By deconstructing methods, postmethod pedagogy has tended to cut teachers off from their sense of plausibility, their passion and involvement, what Grundy (1999) has described as going from “model to muddle” (p. 54).”<sup>89</sup> Hence, for the critics of Postmethods, the idea of putting too much emphasis on teachers’ “Sense of Plausibility” or “Principled Pragmatism” and thereby empowering them seem idealistic. Kumaravadivelu (2003) claims that

---

<sup>86</sup> David M. Bell, “Do Teachers Really Think That Methods Are Dead?” Downloaded from <https://academic.oup.com/eltj/article/61/2/135/366387> by Korea national university of transportation user on 27 September 2020

<sup>87</sup> David M. Bell. “Method and Postmethod: Are they really so incompatible?”, *TESOL QUARTERLY* Vol. 37, No. 2, Summer, 2003, p.329

<sup>88</sup> Seyyed Mohammad Reza Hashemi, “(Post)-Methodism: Possibility of the Impossible?”, p.142, *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 137-145, January 2011 © 2011 ACADEMY PUBLISHER Manufactured in Finland

<sup>89</sup> David M. Bell. “Method and Postmethod: Are they really so incompatible?”, *TESOL QUARTERLY* Vol. 37, No. 2, Summer, 2003, p.333

methods do not help teachers in this decision-making process because methods, by nature, are constructed in a general way to make them (vaguely though) applicable to a wider range of contexts.

In fact, the Postmethod discourse has tried to include these concerns in its construction, and the view of teaching it proposes apparently encompasses both matters of practice and politics.<sup>90</sup> It is the third parameter of Postmethod, the parameter of “Possibility”, as Kumaravadivelu (2003) says, relates language teaching to the process of social transformation by tapping the socio-politico-cultural consciousness that students bring with them to classroom.<sup>91</sup> Akbari(2008) remarks that this is the point where language teaching acknowledges the critical dimension of the profession which has been already discussed in Chapter-One (Section: 2.4.5)language teaching critical practice is “about extending the educational space to the social, cultural, and political dynamics of language use (Kumaravadivelu,2006, p.70)”.<sup>92</sup> Postmethods’ wider recognition of context and its critical dimension is also ideal which is likely to face challenges for implementation in EFL/ESL contexts by teachers who are not sufficiently aware of this dimension of language teaching . It is not an easy task.

Postmethod discourse overlooks the reality of teaching and teacher’s lives and has made the implementation of pedagogy of “Practicality” (which is, to put otherwise, the practical culmination of the two other pedagogies) quite problematic. Hence, for Akbari (2008), the implementation of PMP (i.e. the macrostrategies) requires the existence of an

---

<sup>90</sup> Ramin Akbari, “Postmethod Discourse and Practice”, *TESOL QUARTERLY* Vol. 42, No. 4, December 2008, p. 643

<sup>91</sup> B.Kumaravadivelu, (2003) *Beyond Methods*,37

<sup>92</sup> Ramin Akbari, “Postmethod Discourse and Practice”, *TESOL QUARTERLY* Vol. 42, No. 4, December 2008, p. 644

appropriate Teacher Education Infrastructure as well as an acknowledgement of the limitations that teachers face in their day to day life classroom practice.

Kumaravadivelu (2006)<sup>93</sup> himself mentions two major sources of problems that must be addressed to implement PMP effectively in such contexts: (i) Pedagogical Barriers and (ii) ideological barriers (p-215-223). While the former deals with entrenched modes of teacher education that rely on a transmission view of knowledge and treat L2 Teacher Education as the process of transferring a set if predetermined, preselected and presequenced body of knowledge from teacher educator to the prospective teacher (Kumaravadivelu, 2006, p.216), the latter refers to the politics of representation and what counts as valid knowledge. Through a process of marginalization and self-marginalization, teachers' practical knowledge does not find the space and scope to be regarded as perceptible, and as a result it fails to get access to the accepted knowledge community. In this connection, Akbari (2008) critically comments that Kumaravadivelu does not offer any feasible and systematic solution as to how these barriers could be overcome and what tools could be used to create the desirable context for teacher autonomy and growth based on PMP. Akbari also says regrettably what is missing, in fact, is a proper understanding of the limits within which the teachers have to perform. So, "by assigning extra roles of social reformers and cultural critic of teachers, the Postmethod is taking teaching beyond the realms of possibility and practice".<sup>94</sup>

According to Akbari (2008), the profession is totally aware of the fact that teachers have to work within tight administrative frameworks; they must consider textbooks and evaluations in the form of tests. The constrictive role of textbooks has

---

<sup>93</sup> cited in Ibid, p.645

<sup>94</sup> cited in Ibid



received just a superficial acknowledgement in Kumaravadivelu's (2003,2006) writings and primarily in the context of imperialist or global forces and not in the actual context of teacher's practical lives. So, when Kumaravadivelu talks about textbooks, it is mostly in relation to socio-economic-political environment in which language pedagogy operate and no reference is made to the rigid framework that even locally produced books can impose on practicing teachers. Akbari (2008) also remarks that nowhere Kumaravadivelu tells teachers how they can negotiate the administrative system that fix their standards of performance or income since these are controlled by the authority of the state where teachers usually do not have access.<sup>95</sup>

The macrostrategies are also criticized. Akbari (2008) says that the macrostrategic framework of PMP by saying that it is only good for in-service teachers and although Kumaravadicelu presents observational-reflective techniques for prospective practitioners, he provides no systematic framework about how prospective teachers can be initiated into the discourse and practice of Postmethod.<sup>96</sup> "The ideal classroom where teacher can exercise their freewill, unfortunately rarely exists in the reality of language classrooms."<sup>97</sup> So the dilemma of Postmethod teachers is aptly summarized by Akbari (2008): "The problems that political ideologies and the academic world could not solve-problems of injustice, marginalization and representation, voice and inclusion, effective design and delivery of the instructional materials-are now assigned to the lone postmethod practitioner."<sup>98</sup> He sounds really serious when he says:

---

<sup>95</sup> Ibid,646

<sup>96</sup> Ibid

<sup>97</sup> Ibid

<sup>98</sup> Ibid,649

If postmethod is really a bottom-up movement, then it must stop abstract speculations and base its claims on empirical data gathered from teachers themselves and their world of practice. Teacher's professional development also can compromise teachers' ability to be reflective practitioners in the sense promoted by postmethod discourse.<sup>99</sup>

Therefore, to implement a context-sensitive bottom up Postmethod pedagogy, as Akbari(2008) explains further, the pedagogues must get its inspiration from the reflections of teachers and their pedagogical knowledge and experience not from any postmodern philosophy or academic discussion per se. Otherwise the claim of Bell (2003) as he says critically about PMP, "Yet in the rush to bury methods, postmethod pedagogy has obscured the positive aspects of method"<sup>100</sup> will prove to be true.

### 3.7 Conclusion

Postmethod condition puts emphasis on devising a pedagogy that would take the *local knowledge* into consideration. This chapter discusses the pedagogical procedures and indicators of Postmethod which are context-sensitive, theory-neutral and so based *on local knowledge*. The pedagogical insight, needs and necessity in particular contexts determine the construction of these macrostrategies on the basis of which teachers can select microstrategies or methodologies for classroom practice.

---

<sup>99</sup> Ibid

<sup>100</sup> David M. Bell. "Method and Postmethod: Are they really so incompatible?", *TESOL QUARTERLY* Vol. 37, No. 2, Summer, 2003, p.332

## Chapter Four

# Research Methodology

### 4.1 Introduction

The proposed research combines both qualitative<sup>1</sup> and quantitative<sup>2</sup> procedures of data collection and analysis for the credibility and validity of the research. As the research is about a shift from the traditional method based pedagogy to Postmethod pedagogy in Bangladesh, the empirical investigation of this study, therefore, basically tries to explore the prevailing teaching learning actualities and so it takes into consideration teachers' and learners' *Particularities* like experience, beliefs, expectation and so on with respect to the teaching-learning culture of English in Bangladesh which has been one of the chief objectives of the study. It seems that the proposed research is more to do with the subjective aspects of the individuals and therefore qualitative techniques would be best suited to meet the mentioned research objective.

Another objective of the study has been to look into the pedagogic “Practicalities” and “Possibilities” of implementing Postmethod for English language pedagogy in Bangladesh. Accordingly, the empirical survey makes an attempt to examine the challenges of and potentials for implementing Postmethod pedagogy in the local context through survey method<sup>3</sup> which has been one of recognized quantitative methods.

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. M. Zainul Abedin. Handbook of Research, Dhaka & Chittagong: Book Syndicate, 2010,23, Qualitative research is designed to tell researchers why and how things happen as they do. Judith Langer indicates that qualitative research is ideal for those who want to extract feelings, emotions, motivations, perceptions, consumer's language or self-directed behaviour.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, 24, Quantitative research answers questions of researchers relating how much, how often, how many, when and how; it is often used for testing a theory, requiring that the researchers maintain a distance from the research so as not to influence research findings.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid, Survey method is a technique by which quantitative facts are collected about the socio-economic and other social aspects of a population to fulfil certain objectives. It is reliable, enables direct contact with respondents, excellent vehicles for measuring attitudes, orientations prevalent in a large population. But it is costly, time consuming and mostly deal with current and immediate issues and problems.

This chapter sheds light on the overall plan for the empirical survey along with design of the study area and sampling plan, selection of respondents, data collection approach, methods and instruments (i.e. the Questionnaire Survey, Interview and Classroom observation). It also gives idea about conducting the survey, and processing, analysing and interpreting the collected data.

#### **4.2 Major Consideration for the Empirical Study**

As language education is always in flux, one of the major considerations of the empirical study is to examine the “Particularities” (the realities) of English teaching-learning culture and context of Bangladesh. In doing so, the study also makes an attempt to examine the challenges to and potentials of implementing the “Practicality” and “Possibility” of Postmethod pedagogy in Bangladesh. The theoretical perspectives and the pedagogical procedures of PMP have already been discussed in chapter two and three. The details of the empirical investigation of the study will help to look into the potentials of and challenges for implementing the ideas of Postmethods for Bangladesh.

While selecting the research methodologies and preparing the instruments for conducting the empirical study, the following “Particularities” of learners and teachers in Bangladesh have been taken into consideration:

- ◆ Experience about teaching and learning English
- ◆ Beliefs about teaching and learning English
- ◆ Expectations about teaching and learning English
- ◆ Learners’ learning style preferences
- ◆ Learners’ learning strategies
- ◆ Learning opportunities of students

- ◆ Teaching learning Situation
- ◆ Textbook and material evaluation for English teaching-learning
- ◆ Testing and evaluation system of the English Courses

### **4.3 Methods of Data Collection**

The required data were collected from both primary and secondary sources. The primary data were collected from the relevant field and the secondary were collected through extensive library research and for this published materials, books, articles, textbooks, relevant research monographs, web sources and so on have been used. Besides, unpublished dissertations, various reports of government and private institutions investigation in the relevant field were consulted. The supervisor and other experts who guided research earlier and some researchers who conducted empirical investigations in the respective field in the country were consulted as well and as per their advice, the instruments to conduct the empirical study were chosen. The study being descriptive in nature, as for Cohen and Mannion, the best method to conduct its empirical investigation is the survey method.<sup>4</sup> Survey method uses several research methodologies such as questionnaire survey, interviews, and classroom observation and so on. The method employed for the empirical survey of the study entails:

1. Questionnaire Survey for Students and Teachers
2. Interview with Students and Teachers
3. Classroom Observation Schedule

The analysis of this questionnaire was also done in two parts to make the empirical study feasible. The first was on the basis of secondary data and the second was on the basis of primary data collected. Identifying factors through secondary data

---

<sup>4</sup> Cohen and Mannion(1980) cited in Shahidullah, “Teaching-learning Culture in Bangladesh”,1997

was the beginning of the research study. In order to validate the results and assess them in light of the primary data, the second part was carried out.

#### 4.4 Selection of Study Areas and Sampling plan for the Empirical Study

The survey was conducted at the Higher Secondary level (H.S.C). The cluster sampling method was used for the selection of the universe of the empirical investigation. According to Kothari, “Cluster sampling involves grouping the population and then selecting the groups or the clusters rather than individual elements for inclusion in the sample”.<sup>5</sup>

Although the study is about the entire Bangladesh, it was not possible to cover the huge area for the researcher and only three districts of Rajshahi Division were chosen purposively for the empirical investigation. The three areas where the empirical study were conducted are: Rajshahi, Chapainawabganj and Natore. These areas were selected randomly as it is assumed that the teaching-learning scenario is homogenous all through the country as teachers follow the same syllabus and classroom activities. Therefore, any part of the country represents the whole country. Apart from this, financial constraints and other hazard like transportation, accommodation and so on were the primary factors that made the researcher to choose the cluster sampling method.

Within the cluster, a stratified<sup>6</sup> random sampling method was followed while

---

<sup>5</sup> C.R. Kothari (2004), *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*, New Delhi: Age International, 26

<sup>6</sup> M. Nurul Islam (2007), *An Introduction to Sampling Methods: Theory and Applications*, Revised Ed. Dhaka: Al-Akaba Printers, Bookworld. Stratified sampling refers to a type sampling method by which the researcher divides the population into separate groups, called strata. Then, a probability sample (often a simple random sample) is drawn from each group. Stratified sampling has several advantages over simple random sampling. For example, using stratified sampling, it may be possible to reduce the sample size required to achieve a given precision. Or it may be possible to increase the precision with the same sample size. The precision and cost of a stratified design is influenced by the way that sample elements are allocated to strata. One approach is proportionate stratification. With proportionate stratification, the sample size of each stratum is proportionate to the population size of the stratum. Strata sample sizes for Students are determined by the following equation :

$$n_h = (N_h / N) * n$$

selecting students from government and non-government colleges under both urban and rural category. The reason behind doing so was the considerations of the differences in the levels of performances and reputations of different institutions of the universe of the empirical study. The four categories are:

- i) Urban government colleges
- ii) Urban non-government colleges,
- iii) Rural government colleges,
- iv) Rural non-government colleges.

In each district of Bangladesh, there is at least one government college and more non-government colleges. In most of the cases, the governments colleges are located in the district head-quarters while only with a few exceptions, mostly non-government colleges are located in rural areas. Keeping in view all these facts, only the aforementioned districts were considered as the representative of the system and standard of education of the Intermediate Second year students in the whole country. A total number of 18 colleges were selected for conducting questionnaire survey and interview on students following proportionate stratified random sampling method. For the selection of subjects under each college within selected districts again random sampling method has been used. Again as the number of English teachers are quite limited in government colleges and non-government colleges, the researchers had to select 15 more colleges randomly within those areas to conduct questionnaire survey and interview and the As a whole 60 teachers of 33 colleges were selected to conduct the survey and interview on them following simple random sampling method.<sup>7</sup>

---

where  $n_h$  is the sample size for stratum  $h$ ,  $N_h$  is the population size for stratum  $h$ ,  $N$  is total population size, and  $n$  is total sample size.

<sup>7</sup> W.G. Cochran (1963), *Sampling Techniques*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.), 75, A simple random sample is a subset of a statistical population in which each member of the subset has an

#### 4.1.1 Area-wise Sampling Plan for Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview

For the students' questionnaire survey, institutions were selected from the aforementioned categories. From the four categories, a total number of 18 colleges were selected randomly for the questionnaire survey and interview within the study areas. The survey and interview were conducted on the 287 and 89 students of H.S.C from the selected colleges respectively. A detailed list of the colleges and number of students selected for students' questionnaire survey and interview respectively are given below in a table:

---

equal probability of being chosen. A simple random sample is meant to be an unbiased representation of a group.

In this case, the populations that are large, Cochran developed a formula to yield a representative sample for proportion

$$n_0 = \frac{z^2 \times p \times q}{e^2}$$

Where,  $z^2$  is the abscissa of the normal curve that cuts off an area  $\alpha$  at the tails ( $1 - \alpha$  equals the desired confidence level, e.g., 95%);  $p$ =the estimated proportion of an attribute that is present in the population and  $q=1-p$ ;  $e$ =Margin of error.

If it is assumed the proportion of population is  $p=0.50$  and margin of error is  $e=0.05$  and 95% confidence level is  $z=1.96$ , the resulting sample size is denominated as follows:

$$n_0 = \frac{(1.96)^2 \times 0.5 \times 0.5}{(0.05)^2} = 384.16$$

If the population is small then the sample size can be reduced slightly. This is because a given sample size provides proportionately more information for a small population than for a large population. The sample size ( $n_0$ ) can be adjusted using the following formula:

$$n_0 = \frac{n_0}{1 + \frac{(n_0 - 1)}{N}}$$

If the number of population size is  $N=71$ , then we have

$$n = \frac{384.16}{1 + \frac{(384.16 - 1)}{71}} = \frac{384.16}{6.40} = 60.3 \approx 60$$



**Table 4.1: Sampling Distribution**

| Category of College              | SI NO. | Name of the Colleges                            | Total Number of Students | Number of Students selected for Questionnaire Survey | Number of Students selected for Interview |
|----------------------------------|--------|---|--------------------------|--|---|
| Category 1: Urban                | 1.     | Rajshahi College                                | 1250                     | 26   | 8   |
|                                  | 2.     | New Govt. Degree College Rajshahi               | 1800                     | 36   | 11  |
|                                  | 3.     | N.S College, Natore                             | 900                      | 18   | 5   |
|                                  | 4.     | Rani Bhabani Govt. Womens' College              | 700                      | 14   | 4   |
|                                  | 5.     | Nawabganj Govt. College                         | 1800                     | 37   | 12  |
|                                  | 6.     | Nawabganj City College                          | 1200                     | 25   | 8   |
| Category -2 Urban Non-government | 7.     | Shahmakh dum Degree College                     | 750                      | 16   | 5   |
|                                  | 8.     | Dighapatia M.K College                          | 800                      | 16   | 5   |
|                                  |        | Birshrestho Captain Jahangir Mohiduddin College | 500                      | 10   | 4   |
|                                  |        | Dattapara College                               | 450                      | 10   | 3   |
|                                  |        | Shahid Nazmul Haque College, Naldanga           | 250                      | 5  | 1   |
| Category-3: Rural Government     | 12.    | Adinah Fazlul Haque Govt.College                | 700                      | 14   | 5   |
|                                  | 13.    | Abdulpur College                                | 700                      | 14   | 5   |
| Category-4: Rural Non-government | 14.    | Naohata College                                 | 350                      | 7  | 2   |
|                                  | 15.    | Baneshwor College                               | 700                      | 14   | 4   |
|                                  | 16.    | Biraldah College                                | 400                      | 8  | 3   |
|                                  | 17.    | Namosankarwati College                          | 400                      | 8  | 3   |
|                                  | 18.    | Shibganj College                                | 350                      | 7  | 2   |
| Total                            |        |   | 14000                    | 287  | 89  |

#### 4.1.2 Area-wise Sampling Plan for Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview

As the number of English teachers is not sufficient in the selected government and non-government colleges (registered under MPO) of the chosen areas, the researchers had to select 15 more colleges randomly within those areas to conduct questionnaire survey and interview. As a whole 60 running teachers (available) of the selected 33 colleges gave their consent to conduct the survey and interview on them. The questionnaire survey was done on 45 teachers and the interview was taken with 15 teachers. A detailed list of the colleges and number of teachers selected for teachers' questionnaire survey and interview respectively are given below in a table:

## Sampling Plan for Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview

**Table 4.2: Sampling Distribution**

| Category of College                      | SI No. | Name of the Colleges                                | Total Number of teachers' | Number of Teachers' selected for Questionnaire Survey | Number of Teachers' selected for Interview |
|--|--------|---|---------------------------|---|--|
| Category 1:<br>Urban<br>Government       | 1      | Rajshahi College                                    | 10                        | 4   | 1  |
|  | 2      | New Govt. Degree College Rajshahi                   | 5                         | 2   | 1  |
|  | 3      | Rajshahi Govt. City College                         | 3                         | 1   | 0  |
|  | 4      | Rajshahi Govt. Womens' College                      | 4                         | 2   | 0  |
|  | 5      | N.S College,Natore                                  | 3                         | 2   | 1  |
|  | 6      | Rani Bhabani Govt. Womens' College                  | 2                         | 1   | 1  |
|  | 7      | Natore City Collge                                  | 2                         | 1   | 0  |
|  | 8      | Nawabganj Govt. College                             | 2                         | 1   | 1  |
|  | 9      | Nawabganj City College                              | 2                         | 1   | 0  |
|  | 10     | Nawabganj Govt. Womens' College                     | 2                         | 1   | 0  |
| Category -2:<br>Urban Non-<br>governmnet |        | Shahmakhdum College                                 | 2                         | 1   | 1  |
|  | 8      | Varendra College                                    | 2                         | 1   | 0  |
|  |        | Kamela Haque Degree College                         | 1                         | 1   | 0  |
|  |        | Dighapatia M.K College                              | 2                         | 2   | 1  |
|  |        | Dattapara College                                   | 2                         | 1   | 1  |
| Category-3:<br>Rural<br>Govrnmnet        |        | Birsherstho Sohid Captain Muhammad Jahangir College | 1                         | 1   | 0  |
|  | 17     | Adinah Fazlul Haque Govt. College                   | 3                         | 2   | 1  |
|  | 18     | Abdulpur Govt. College                              | 2                         | 1   | 1  |
| Category-4:<br>Rural Non-<br>governmnet  | 19     | Gule-Afroz Govt. College                            | 2                         | 1   | 0  |
|  | 20     | Naouhata College                                    | 2                         | 1   | 1  |
|  | 21     | Keshorhat College                                   | 2                         | 1   | 0  |
|  | 22     | Mohonpur College                                    | 1                         | 1   | 0  |
|  | 23     | Baneshwor College                                   | 2                         | 1   | 0  |
|  | 24     | Durghapur College                                   | 1                         | 1   | 1  |
|  | 25     | Balugram Adarsha College                            | 1                         | 1   | 0  |
|  | 26     | Namosankarwati College                              | 1                         | 1   | 0  |
|  | 27     | Shibganj College                                    | 1                         | 1   | 1  |
|  | 28     | Narayanpur College                                  | 1                         | 1   | 0  |
|  | 29     | Kansat Soleman College                              | 1                         | 1   | 1  |
|  | 30     | Nazirpur College                                    | 1                         | 1   | 0  |
|  | 31     | Shahid Nazmul Haque College, Naldanga               | 1                         | 1   | 0  |
|  | 32     | Gopalpur College                                    | 2                         | 1   | 1  |
|  | 33     | Lalpur College                                      | 1                         | 1   | 0  |
| Total                                    |        |   | 71                        | 45  | 15   |

**4.1.3 Sampling Plan for Classroom Observation**

A total 33 lessons were observed in the study. The classes for observation were selected from those institutions (i.e. 33 colleges) where the students' and teachers' questionnaire

survey and interview were done. The main purpose of selecting those intuitions was that the researcher became close to both teachers and students while conducting the questionnaire survey and interviews. It took almost three months to conduct the field work in the chosen colleges of the selected areas. So, the researcher did not feel discomfort to have access to the classrooms and have a look at the classroom reality of those institutions. A number of 33 teachers gave their consents to her to carry on the classroom observation.

Institution-wise sampling plan for the classroom observation is presented in the table below:

**Table 4.3: Sampling Distribution**

| SI | Name of the Colleges                                | Number of Class Observed |
|----|---|--------------------------|
| 1  | Rajshahi College                                    | 1                        |
| 2  | New Govt. Degree College Rajshahi                   | 1                        |
| 3  | Rajshahi Govt. City College                         | 1                        |
| 4  | Rajshahi Govt. Womens' College                      | 1                        |
| 5  | N.S College,Natore                                  | 1                        |
| 6  | Rani Bhabani Govt. Womens' College                  | 1                        |
| 7  | Natore City College                                 | 1                        |
| 8  | Nawabganj Govt. College                             | 1                        |
| 9  | Nawabganj City College                              | 1                        |
| 10 | Nawabganj Govt. Womens' College                     | 1                        |
| 11 | Shahmakhdum College                                 | 1                        |
| 12 | Varendra College                                    | 1                        |
| 13 | Kamela Haque Degree College                         | 1                        |
| 14 | Dighapatia M.K College                              | 1                        |
| 15 | Dattapara College                                   | 1                        |
| 16 | Birsherstho Sohid Captain Muhammad Jahangir College | 1                        |
| 17 | Adinah Fazlul Haque Govt. College                   | 1                        |
| 18 | Abdulpur Govt. College                              | 1                        |
| 19 | Gule-Afroz Govt. College                            | 1                        |
| 20 | Naouhata College                                    | 1                        |
| 21 | Keshorhat College                                   | 1                        |
| 22 | Mohonpur College                                    | 1                        |
| 23 | Baneshwor College                                   | 1                        |

| SI    | Name of the Colleges                  | Number of Class Observed |
|-------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 24    | Durghapur College                     | 1                        |
| 25    | Balugram Adarsha College              | 1                        |
| 26    | Namosankarwati College                | 1                        |
| 27    | Shibganj College                      | 1                        |
| 28    | Narayanpur College                    | 1                        |
| 29    | Kansat Soleman College                | 1                        |
| 30    | Nazirpur College                      | 1                        |
| 31    | Shahid Nazmul Haque College, Naldanga | 1                        |
| 32    | Gopalpur College                      | 1                        |
| 33    | Lalpur Degree College                 | 1                        |
| Total | 33                                    | 1                        |

#### 4.5 Description of the Instruments Used for the Empirical Study

The instruments used in the study include:

1. A students' questionnaire
2. A teachers' questionnaire
3. A classroom observation scheme

These instruments were designed keeping in view the objectives and research questions and taking into consideration the important aspects on the topic, which emerged from the literature survey of the study.

##### 4.1.4 Construction of the Questionnaires and Other Instruments Used for the Empirical Study

The instruments for the empirical study were constructed following the objectives, research questions and major focus of the study. As one of the goals of the present research is to examine the "Particularities" of English teaching-learning culture in Bangladesh, the instruments were devised focusing on the teachers' and learners' (H.S.C level students) beliefs, experience, expectations, learning style preferences, learning strategies, learning opportunities, teaching-learning situation and testing and evaluation system and so on, which emerged from the discussion in chapter-II and III on theory and practice of Postmethod pedagogy (PMP).

Provided the theoretical framework for the construction of the instruments of the empirical study and insight from literature survey on research methodology in ELT in this study, some of the authorities consulted for devising the instruments were Brown (1999), Nunan (1992) and Kothari (1999) among others.

Prior to doing this, some standardized instruments used by experts and authorities for studies of similar areas elsewhere were consulted for designing of this study. Such instruments entail Horwitz's (1983, 1985, 1987) *Learners' Belief Inventory* and Reid's (1987) *Learning Style Questionnaire* and Kolb's *Learning Style Inventory*. Some of the items in the questionnaire and other instruments have been adopted, some others are adapted from these instruments. Again, some other items of the instruments derive from the discussion in chapter-II and chapter-III.

Using the standardized questionnaires and in consultation with some teachers and experts, two sets of questionnaires-one for teachers and the other for students-, were designed first and a pilot study was conducted with 20 students of H.S.C level and 5 teachers from New Govt. Degree College, Rajshahi and Dattapara College, Natore. In the light of the problems experienced in the pilot study, the questionnaires were filtered and modified. Some items in the questionnaires of both teachers and students were found irrelevant for addressing the central problem and were dropped from the final version of the question. The pilot study highlighted some problems which were important for the research objectives and so some new items were incorporated into the questionnaires. While doing the pilot study, it was also felt that many of the items were not clear to the respondents and so rewording and rephrasing were done. The language of the questionnaire was made as simple as possible so that they were clear to the respondents.

To make the questionnaire survey easier and time effective, all the statements of the questionnaires were made closed type. So the *psychometric* Likert Scale<sup>8</sup>, mostly five point and sometimes a three point and a two point rating scales have been used in both different sections of both teachers' and students' questionnaires. In the sections, where 5 point scales have been used, the values mean:

1=No/ Never  
 2=Sometimes  
 3=Often  
 4=Very Often and  
 5= Always

Or

1= Strongly Disagree  
 2=Disagree  
 3=Undecided  
 4=Agree  
 5=Strongly Agree

In section, where a three point scale has been used, the values mean:

1=No/Never  
 2=Yes but Not Enough  
 3=Yes

Or

1=Not at all  
 2= Moderately/Medium  
 3=Very Well/Well

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid, 68. A Likert Scale, developed by Rensis Likert, is the most widely used variations of the summated scale. It consists of statements that express either a favourable or an unfavourable toward the object of interest. The respondent is asked to agree or disagree with each statement. Each statement is given a numeric score to reflect its degree of attitudinal bias and the score may be summed to measure the participant's overall attitude.

In sections, where a *dichotomous*, two point scale has been used, the values mean:

1= True

2= False

In sections B, C, D, E, F and 7.1 of G section of teachers' questionnaire and interview schedule and also in sections B, C, D, E, F and 7.1 of G of students' questionnaire and interview schedule a 5 point scale has been used. In 7.2 of G of both teachers' and students' questionnaire, a 3 point scale has been used. In section-H and I of both teachers' and students' questionnaire some check-lists have been used. In addition to that, a 2 point scale has been used for some of the variables in section- I on testing and evaluation system of both teachers' and students' questionnaire survey and interview schedule.

#### **4.1.5 A Detailed Section-wise Description of the Statements in the Questionnaire for Teachers and Learners**

In this section of the present chapter, the instruments used for the empirical study are introduced and described in detail.

##### **4.5.1.1 Teachers' and Learners' Questionnaire (See Appendix)**

Both the teachers 'and learners' questionnaire comprise 152 variables which are almost identical and divided into 9 Sections each with a separate title. The sections are:

Section-A: Personal Details (Var 1.1-1.8)

Section-B: Experience of Teaching and Learning English (Var 1.1-1.8)

Section-C: Beliefs regarding Teaching and Learning English (Var 3.1-3.22)

Section-D: Expectations regarding Teaching and Learning English (Var 4.1-4.10)

Section-E: Learning Style Preferences (Var 5.1-5.22)

Section -F: Learners' Learning Strategies (Var 6.1-6.18)

Section-G: Learners' Learning Opportunities (Var 7.1-7.11) & (Var 7.2.1-7.2.3)

Section-H: Teaching-learning Situation (Var 8.1-8.12)

Section-I: Testing and Evaluation System (Var 9.1-9.24)

### **A Detailed Description of Students' Questionnaire**

A detailed description of the questionnaire is as follows:

#### **Section A: Personal Details (Var 1.1-1.8)**

This is a small section featuring eight personal details of the respondents through variables 1.1-1.8. In case of student-respondents, the details include name, gender, name of college, location of college, type of College, class and role and in case of teacher-respondents name, gender, name of college, location of college, type of College, qualification and Training on ELT have been entailed.

#### **Section-B: Experience of Teaching and Learning English (Var 1.1-1.8)**

In this section a five point scale has been used where, 1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree,3=Undecided,4=Agree,5=Strongly Agree. The section has 18 variables. Variables 2.1,2.2,2.3,2.4,2.5,2.6,2.7,2.12 and 2.17 feature teachers' role in the classroom and variables 2.8,2.9,2.15 and 2.16 feature learners' role in the transmission model of education or traditional pedagogy. Types of classroom activities or interactional pattern are marked by variables 2.12, 2.13 and 2.14. Variables 2.10 and 2.18 feature mode of error correction and giving feedback of existing pedagogy respectively.

#### **Section-C: Beliefs regarding teachers about Teaching and Learning English (Var 3.1-3.22)**

Language learners' beliefs function as substantial tools either to facilitate or deter the very language learning process (Horwitz, 1987:126). Research shows that students'



beliefs have a very close relation with their language acquisition and their use of language learning strategies. Rubin (1981, in Wenden and Rubin (ed), 1987) identified six general cognitive strategies which may directly contribute to language learning: (1) *Clarification or Verification* (2) *Guessing or Inductive*, (3) *Inferencing* (4) *Deductive Reasoning* (5) *Practice* (6) *Memorization* (7) *Monitoring*. Again, there are metacognitive and communication strategies of language learning. These have direct or indirect bearings on language learning strategies which ultimately promote self-directing learning which is regarded as autonomous learning. In addition to learners' beliefs, teachers' beliefs also play crucial roles in L2 teaching.

In this section a five point scale has been used where, 1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree,3=Undecided,4=Agree,5=Strongly Agree. Among the 22 variables in this section, 3.2, 3.4, 3.18 and 3.19 feature teachers as well as learners' belief about foreign language learning aptitude and attitude. Again, variables 3.5-3.16 and 3.21-3.22 manifest their beliefs about language learning techniques and activities in classrooms. Variable teachers' and learners' belief about the importance of language learning in practical life and variable 3.3 and 3.20 show what view they hold about autonomous learning.

#### **Section-D: Expectations regarding Teaching and Learning English (Var 4.1-4.10)**

This section also uses a five point scale where values mean: 1=No/ Never, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 4=Very Often and 5= Always. This section has got 10 variables which are all related to teachers' and learners' expectations about teaching-learning English. Here variable 4.1 features teacher-learners' expectations as to mode of learning English, 4.2 shows expectations about error correction, 4.3 features expectations about teaching grammar and 4.4 features expectations about using culture-

sensitive course materials and 4.5 manifests expectations about participating/engaging in classroom activities. Again, variable 4.6 features teachers' and learners' expectations regarding skill training, var. 4.7-4.9 are about teachers' and learners' expectations regarding classroom activities in our context. Teacher's and learners' expectations about promoting learners' critical language awareness has been marked by variable 4.10.

### **Section-E: Learning Style Preferences (Var 5.1-5.22)**

Learners develop different learning style preferences in the course of learning their second/foreign language due to their different types of socialization factors. These learning preferences may play vital role in minimizing the mismatches between teachers' targets and learners' goals. Again, these may help to promoting learner autonomy. In this section there are 9 variables which are closely related to promoting learner autonomy. This section is divided into three subsections.

In this section a five point scale has been used where, 1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Undecided, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree. The 9 variables (var. 5.1-5.9) in the first subsection and the 10 variables (var.5.13-5.22) in the third subsection feature different learning style preferences of learners. The 3 variables in the second subsection (5.10-5.12) feature the tasks which teachers prefer their students to do in classrooms. As a whole, the entire section gives an idea of teachers' and learners' perception about learning style preferences.

### **Section -F: Learners' Learning Strategies (Var 6.1-6.18)**

It is both the teachers' as well as learners' responsibility to identify the gap between teachers' intentions and learners' perceptions or interpretations in learning a language in ESL/EFL context. According to Kumaravadivelu (2003 mismatches are hidden and so

they are not easily identifiable. In line with the discussions in Chapter-III (Section-3.3.2), the ten sources that have the potential to contribute to the mismatch between teachers' intentions and learners' interpretations are : (1) Cognitive, (2) Communicative, (3) Linguistic, (4) Pedagogic, (5) Strategic, (6) Cultural, (7) Evaluative, (8) Procedural, (9) Instructional, and (10) Attitudinal.

This section also uses a five point scale where the values mean: 1=No/ Never, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 4=Very Often and 5= Always. This section has 18 variables which feature teachers' perception about learners' use of learning strategies and also learners' own knowledge about using those strategies. Variables 6.2 feature learners' use of *deductive reasoning*, variables 6.1,6.7 and 6.12 feature *guessing or inferencing*, 6.4 and 6.5 manifest *clarification or verification* and 6.17 features *memorization*. Again variables 6.10, 6.11, 6.13 feature learners' use of *monitoring* strategy and variables 6.8-6.9, 6.14 and 6.15 feature their use of *practice* strategy.

### **Section-G: Learning Opportunities (Var 7.1-7.11) & (Var 7.2.1-7.2.3)**

In this section a five-point scale and three-point scales have been used. In the five-point scale the numbers mean: 1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Undecided, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree and in the 3-point scale the numbers mean:1=No/Never, 2=Yes but Not Enough, 3=Yes respectively. Language teaching-learning opportunities include the opportunities available both inside as well as the outside the classroom. In this section variables 7.1.1 to 7.1.8 feature teachers' as well as learners' awareness of having teaching-learning opportunities inside classroom in relation to different classroom activities and variables 7.2.1 to 7.2.3 feature English teaching-learning opportunities in relation to extracurricular activities outside class.

### **Section-H: Teaching-learning Situation (Var 8.1-8.12)**

A three-point scale has been used in this section where the values mean: 1=Not at all, 2= Moderately/Medium and 3=Very Well/Well. The section has 12 variables which feature four major aspects of English teaching-learning situation in Bangladesh: (1) teaching aids available in a institution (8.1-8.8), (2) seating arrangements (8.12) and (3) teachers' position in the classroom (8.10-8.11) and (4) class size (8.9)

### **Section-I: Testing and Evaluation System (Var 9.1-9.27)**

This section uses a two-point scale where the values mean: 1=No and 2=Yes. The section has 22 variables which feature teachers' and learners' opinion about eight major aspects of teaching and evaluation system.(1) Variables 9.1,9.2,9.3,9.9 and 9.25 feature content of tests, (2)variables 9.4,9.5,9.6,9.7,9.14,9.16 and 9.17 feature skill tests, (3) variables 9.10 and 9.11 reflect opinions about techniques of tests, (4)variable 9.12 shows what kind of language is used in tests, (5)9.18 and 9.19 feature test Instruction, (6)9.20 and 9.21 feature observations about test score, (7) 9.22 shows views about test syllabus and (8) 9.7,9.13 and 9.25 feature judgments about satisfaction with the prevalent test system.

#### **4.5.1.2 Instruments for Students' and Teachers' Interview**

The researcher used students' and teachers' questionnaires for taking face to face interviews with students and teachers respectively. The written instructions on the survey questionnaire for each section were given to the respondents orally. If anyone had any difficulty in grasping any item regarding any statement, she would make it clear as far as possible to elicit the right information. Then their responses were recorded by ticking the appropriate box against each statement following the rating

scales in each of the sections of the questionnaire. The interview helped to triangulate the written responses of the questionnaire survey and thereby added more validity and credibility to this research.

#### **4.5.1.3 Instruments for Classroom Observation and Follow-up Discussion with Teachers**

A classroom observation scheme was prepared and used for the classroom observation and following this study. The observation scheme constituted twelve major points and they are as follows:

- i. Teachers' role
- ii. Learners' role
- iii. Promoting *Critical Language Awareness*
- iv. Raising *Cultural Consciousness*
- v. Using Culture Sensitive Materials and Textbooks
- vi. Using Bangla in class while the lesson goes on
- vii. Integrating and Practicing Skills of English
- viii. Teaching Grammar
- ix. Teaching-Learning Situation
- x. Modes of Error-Correction and Feedback
- xi. Learning Environment
- xii. Teachers' Expertise

The teaching-learning situation of the colleges of the country has been examined under a few other headings such as (a) Class Size, (b) Seating Arrangements (c) Physical Condition of the Class and (d) teaching-learning aids.

## **4.6 Administration of the Empirical Study**

### **4.6.1 Administration of Teachers' Questionnaire**

45 teachers of 33 colleges were selected for administering the questionnaire survey. The researcher herself distributed them at the colleges where she herself conducted questionnaire survey and interview with students. Apart from this, the head of the Departments of English at those colleges were provided letters seeking their consent and cooperation to conduct the survey and interview (See Appendix). Some questionnaires were sent to some colleges where the researchers could not go physically and so she distributed them through personal contacts. The questionnaires that were sent through personal contacts were also collected through personal contacts.

#### **4.1.6 Administration of Teachers' Interview**

The researcher got consent of 15 running teachers from the selected colleges to take interview with them. She tried her best to build a personal acquaintance with the teachers before taking their interviews. The colleges where she conducted the questionnaire survey earlier on teachers became so familiar to her that taking interview at those institutions became quite easier for her. Even many of the teachers of those colleges were students at the Department of English, University of Rajshahi where the researcher also had been a student. The researcher started with a brief introduction to his study, and an explanation of the kind of things she wanted to explore through the interview. She explained the sections of the questionnaire and their scoring patterns. After that the researcher read out the questionnaire and explained them where necessary. Then the responses were recorded on separate sheets for each interviewee.

#### **4.1.7 Administration of the Students' Questionnaire**

The researcher herself administered the students' questionnaire survey with students in the selected areas on. She briefly introduced the purpose of the study and explained the importance of the students' responses for the study. The students were explained what they were meant to do and how. The likert scale and its scoring pattern (i.e values 1,2,3,4 and 5) and what they meant in each of the sections were explained section-wise. The purpose of these sections was also explained to them in detail. Then the individual items of the questionnaire were read out, paraphrased in English, translated in Bengali and explained in the easiest possible words one by one. After that, the students were asked to score their responses in by ticking the right number in the boxes against each statement. The students in each of the colleges took at least two days to fill up their responses and finishing the questionnaire. The students were asked to double check if any item was left or unanswered because of their vague understanding of the specific point. In those cases, the items were explained again to them and they recorded their responses then. The questionnaire survey was done on students in different colleges at scheduled time arranged by prior discussions with and consents of respective college authorities.

#### **4.1.8 Administration of the Students' Interview**

90 students' interviews were done by the researcher herself in different colleges of the selected area. Each of the groups was interviewed at scheduled time according to the sampling plan mentioned in the 4.1 sample distribution table. Prior to the interview, the researcher tried to make the students feel free and comfortable. After that, the researcher introduced the topic and then began talking about the purpose of the study. The format of the discussion, the scoring pattern of the scale and their respective values in each section were explained to the students in detail. The researcher tried to make

her use of language clear as much as possible for the students. The items on the interview scheme were paraphrased in Bangla one by one and also were explained where necessary. The interviewees responded in terms of values, and the researcher herself recorded the responses on the sheets meant for each interviewees. This is how all the interviews were done in the selected colleges of the chosen areas. The students were found to be quite curious about the entire procedure and if any of the items were not clear to them, they would stop the researcher and asked for clarification. They scored their responses when they clearly understood the items on the interview scheme.

#### **4.1.9 Process of Classroom Observation**

As per the agreed schedule, the researcher met the teachers in each of the colleges, who took her into the classrooms. They explained to the students the purpose of the researcher's presence in the classroom. A tape recorder was used to record the proceedings in a classroom. The researcher also carried a note book and classroom observation checklist to note down the salient features observed in the classes. She took into consideration certain factors of a class like its teaching-learning opportunities, physical condition, seating arrangements, use of culture-sensitive materials, mode of error correction and giving feedback, number of total students and overall teaching-learning environment. After each lesson the observer's notes were checked with the teacher concerned and a follow up discussion with him/her ensued and finally they also cooperated by endorsing their observation notes.

#### **4.7 Processing and Analysing of Questionnaire Survey, Interview and Classroom Observation Data**

The collected data of the questionnaire survey and the interviews were compiled, cleaned, edited and tabulated using computer. The questions and responses were coded and entered in the computer using Microsoft Excel software first. Then data Statistical



Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23.0 was used for the statistical analysis. Coding of variables in quantitative research is very critical for better interpretation of results. Name, area, location, experience, belief, expectation, learning preferences and strategies, learning opportunities in relation to learners and teachers were all coded and entered in to the computer. Certain statistical tools used for the analysis of the collected data of the questionnaire survey and interview of teachers and learners.

To analyse the data, both descriptive and inferential statistics have been used. Measures of central tendency such as Mean, Standard Deviation and Frequency Counts are mostly used to see the central tendency of the teaching-learning “Particularities” of Bangladeshi context with reference to the major considerations described in section 4.2 of this chapter.

#### **4.8 Concluding Remarks**

In this chapter the research design and administration of the study have been presented in detail. The use of methodology (i.e. questionnaire survey, interview and classroom observation) has been extensively used for this exploratory research. The details of research methodology, questionnaire design and its validation and administration are discussed here, considering the research questions and objectives of the study. The next chapter presents the findings and interpretations of the results of the empirical investigations complemented by theoretical insights discussed in chapter-II and chapter-III.

## **Chapter Five**

# **The Findings of the Particularities of Bangladeshi Teaching-Learning Culture**

### **5.1 Introduction**

This chapter brings to the fore the results of the empirical study in the light of its one of the main objectives which was to examine the realities or “Particularities” of ELT culture in Bangladesh. These are crucial to consider since they give way to finding out important insights regarding the challenges of and potentials for implementing Postmethod pedagogy for Bangladesh. It line with the discussion in Chapter-II, the following “Particularities” of the teachers and learners in Bangladesh have been taken into consideration:

- Experience of teaching and learning English
- Beliefs regarding teaching and learning English
- Expectations regarding teaching and Learning English
- Learning style preferences and language teaching
- Learning strategies
- Learning opportunities and language teaching
- Teaching learning situation
- Textbook and material evaluation for English teaching-learning
- Testing and Evaluation System of the English Courses.

Literature review manifests that the aforementioned aspects of language pedagogy falls into either (1) the Traditional or Transmissional model, (2) the Progressive or Innovative model of Language Pedagogy, or (3) they may be in a state of amalgam of both. Since, the two modes of pedagogy are not mutually exclusive; they

have significant differences between them in approaches and techniques.<sup>1</sup> As Shahidullah (1997) shows the different nature of two models of language pedagogy in the following way<sup>2</sup>:

**Table 5.1**  
**The outline of the differences between the Traditional Model of Language Pedagogy and the Progressive Model of Language Pedagogy**

| <b>Traditional</b>                                       | <b>Progressive</b>  |
|--|---|
| Teacher teaches.   | Teacher does not teach: he/she initiates, organizes, guides and monitors learning activities of the learners. |
| Teacher controls and manipulates the class.              | No teacher control and manipulation in the class.   |
| Teacher corrects most of the student errors.             | Teacher overlooks learners' errors but gives feedback at the end of the session.                              |
| Students are passive listeners.                          | Students are active listeners.  |
| Students are thought about.                              | Students are active thinkers.   |
| Students have no roles in decision making.               | Students have a role in decision making.  |
| Students are teacher dependent.                          | Students work independently of the teacher.   |
| Learning is not the learners' responsibility.            | Learning is the learners' responsibility.   |
| Lecture is the major source of learning.                 | Learners are encouraged to learn thorough student-centred activities.   |
| Little or no student interaction; no group or pair work. | Maximum student interaction; maximum group or pair work.  |
| No real life task.                                       | Use real life type activities such as role play and simulation.   |

In line with these points of the two paradigms, Sections-B, C, D, E, F and G of the study have been divided into traditional and progressive clusters to examine the present English teaching-learning actualities and psychological disposition of the teachers and learners of Bangladesh. As a whole they represent the "Particularities" of English teaching-learning culture of Bangladesh. As ELT has gone through significant changes over the years and there has been globalization and cultural exchanges in education, these are likely to have impacted teachers' and students' psychological disposition. One of the prime objectives of Postmethod Pedagogy in this study has been to examine the *status*

<sup>1</sup> Shahidullah, Teaching Learning Culture in Bangladesh, 1997:139-140

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

*quo*, the present actualities of classroom teaching-learning in Bangladesh, the psychological disposition of the teachers and students regarding classroom teaching-learning, teaching-learning situation, syllabus and materials, and testing and evaluation currently used in the country. The findings of each section are presented in two tables—one for the traditional, and the other for the progressive clusters.

A comprehensive picture of the “Particularities” of Bangladeshi English Teaching-learning culture is presented through a descriptive analysis of the data collected by different methods of investigation in this study. The results of the teachers’ and students’ questionnaires and interviews are presented in terms of Means and Standard Deviations (SDs) and the *p-values* for the current actual teaching-learning “Particularities” of Bangladesh. The results have been presented in the following order:

- Results of teachers’ questionnaire survey and interview
- Results of students’ questionnaire survey and interview, and
- Results of classroom observation

Results of the Questionnaire Survey and Interviews are presented side by side in the same tables. It has been quite easy to do so as the same questionnaire has been used for both methods of investigation. While presenting the result of the data in the tables, care was taken to present them section-wise as featured in the students’ and teachers’ questionnaires.

The results are presented in terms of Means and Standard Deviations of the variables in each section of specific questionnaire. The mean scores of the traditional and progressive variables in each section of teachers’ and students’ Q. Survey and Interview have been interpreted as follows:

- a) High= Means 4.00 and above
- b) Considerably High= Means between 3.00 and 4.00
- c) Considerably low= Means between 2.00 and 3.00
- d) Low= Means below 2.00

The data of the classroom observation is qualitative in character and therefore, they have been presented in the form of reports. For the traditional variables, the higher the mean score of the variables, the more traditional the actualities of that particular aspect is. Similarly, for the progressive variables in the progressive clusters, the higher the mean score, the more progressive the reality is with regard to that particular aspect

## **5.2 Section-wise Results of the Students' and Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview**

### **5.2.1 Section-wise Results of the Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview**

The results of the Questionnaire Survey and Interviews have been analysed statistically and Mean and Standard Deviation (SDs) of each variable have been presented in tabular forms.

#### **5.2.1.1 Means and SDs of Section-B (Experience of Teaching and Learning English)**

##### **5.2.1.1.1 Means and SDs of the Traditional variables of Section-B (Experience of Teaching and Learning English) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview**

Means and SDs of the Traditional variables of Section-B (Experience of Teaching and Learning English) Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-4.2:

**Table 5.2: Section B (Traditional)**

| SN   | Statements   | Teachers' Questionnaire Survey |      | Teachers' Interview |      |
|------|--|--------------------------------|------|---------------------|------|
|      |  | Mean                           | SD   | Mean                | SD   |
| 2.1  | You Lecture most of the time in the classroom.   | 3.95                           | 0.77 | 3.95                | 0.52 |
| 2.2  | Your students remain silent in the class mostly and speak only when you ask them questions.          | 3.88                           | 0.78 | 4.05                | 0.62 |
| 2.3  | You are very formal and always maintain a distance from your students and so they are afraid of you. | 1.78                           | 1.04 | 1.74                | 1.24 |
| 2.8  | Your students entirely depend on you for their learning.   | 2.78                           | 0.96 | 2.63                | 0.83 |
| 2.10 | You rebuke your students if they commit errors.  | 1.88                           | 0.90 | 1.84                | 1.26 |
| 2.12 | You use whiteboards in the class.  | 3.27                           | 1.12 | 3.00                | 1.29 |
| 2.19 | You teach reading skill to your students.  | 4.24                           | 0.74 | 4.27                | 0.73 |
| 2.20 | You teach writing skill to your students.  | 4.32                           | 0.91 | 4.39                | 0.74 |

(a) **Questionnaire and Interview:** In the Questionnaire Survey, 2 Variables (2.19 and 2.20) have high mean scores (4.24 and 4.32 respectively). Var. 2.8 has considerably low mean score (2.78) and 2 var. (2.3, 2.10) have low mean scores (1.78, 1.88). For the variables in this section, the lower the score, less traditional is the reality and higher the score, more traditional is the situation. In the Interview, 3 var.(2.2, 2.19 and 2.20) have high mean scores (4.05, 4.27 and 4.39), 1 var. (2.1) has considerably high mean score (3.95), 1 (2.8) var. has considerably low mean score (2.63) and like Survey, 2 var. (2.3, 2.10) have low mean scores (1.74, 1.84). These suggest that the teaching-learning experience of Bangladeshi teachers is more traditional.

#### **5.2.1.1.2 Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-B (Experience of Teaching and Learning English) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview**

Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-B of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-5.3:

**Table 5.3: Section B (Progressive)**

| SN   | Statements   | Teachers' Questionnaire |      | Teachers' Interview |      |
|------|--|-------------------------|------|---------------------|------|
|      |  | Mean                    | SD   | Mean                | SD   |
| 2.4  | You create language learning opportunities in the class for practicing different skills and sub-skills of English.   | 4.05                    | 0.50 | 4.11                | 0.66 |
| 2.5  | You help your students in doing tasks or activities.   | 4.37                    | 0.49 | 4.37                | 0.50 |
| 2.6  | You are very friendly and helpful and therefore students can have access to you whenever they need.                  | 4.34                    | 0.48 | 4.21                | 0.42 |
| 2.7  | You encourage learners' independent thinking/creativity.   | 4.27                    | 0.55 | 4.21                | 0.42 |
| 2.9  | You take part in selecting materials and other classroom activities (methodology).                                   | 3.68                    | 0.88 | 3.89                | 0.74 |
| 2.11 | You use seminar presentations and participations in class by students.   | 2.12                    | 0.60 | 2.00                | 0.47 |
| 2.13 | You assign different types of tasks to your students in class.   | 4.10                    | 0.63 | 3.95                | 0.78 |
| 2.14 | You encourage students to talk in the class.   | 4.22                    | 0.96 | 4.37                | 0.76 |
| 2.15 | You use pair work in the class.  | 4.02                    | 0.94 | 3.74                | 1.20 |
| 2.16 | You use group work in the class.   | 3.85                    | 0.91 | 3.79                | 0.98 |
| 2.17 | You explain everything for your students.  | 3.41                    | 1.20 | 2.95                | 1.18 |
| 2.18 | You involve your students in finding out things by themselves first and afterwards you provide feedback and explain. | 4.00                    | 0.95 | 4.00                | 1.00 |
| 2.21 | You teach listening skill to your students.  | 1.15                    | 0.42 | 1.18                | 0.53 |
| 2.22 | You teach speaking skill to your students.   | 1.00                    | 0.00 | 1.00                | 0.00 |

(a) **Questionnaire and Interview:** The results of the variables in the Q. Survey presented in column -3 of table-5.3 in this section show 8 var. (2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.13, 2.14, 2.15 and 2.18) out of 16 have high mean scores (4.05, 4.37, 4.34, 4.27, 4.10, 4.22, 4.02, 4.00 respectively). 3 var. (2.9, 2.16 and 2.17) have considerably high mean scores (3.68, 3.85 and 3.41 respectively), only 1 var. (2.11) has considerably low mean score (2.12) and 2 var. (2.21, 2.22) have low mean scores (1.15, 1.00). In the Interview, 6 var. (2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.14 and 2.18) show high mean scores (4.11, 4.37, 4.21, 4.21, 4.37 and 4.00 respectively), 4 var. (2.9, 2.12, 2.13, 2.15 and 2.16) have considerably high mean scores (3.89, 3.00, 3.95, 3.74 and 3.79), 1 var. (2.11) has considerably low

mean score (2.00) and 2 variables (2.21, 2.22) have low mean scores (1.18, 1.00). These results suggest that the teaching-learning experience of Bangladesh is quite progressive.

### 5.2.1.1.3 A Comparison of Cluster Means of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-B (Experience of Teaching and Learning English)

A Comparison of Cluster Means of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-B is presented in table-5.4:

**Table 5.4: Section B**

| Questionnaire |      |       |         |         | Interview |       |       |         |         |
|---------------|------|-------|---------|---------|-----------|-------|-------|---------|---------|
| Trad          | Prog | Diff. | t-value | p-value | Trad      | Prog  | Diff. | t-value | p-value |
| 3.263         | 3.47 | 0.208 | -0.436  | 0.669   | 3.234     | 3.801 | 0.607 | -0.892  | 0.383   |

p-value\* < 0.05

Note: In the Questionnaire  $df=16$ ; In the Interview  $df=20$

The cluster-wise result of teachers' experience of teaching English presented in the table-5.4 shows that the actuality of teaching-learning practice in the country is in a state of amalgam. In the Survey, Mean Scores of both clusters are high, though the Progressive Mean is 0.208 higher (Diff.=0.208,  $t = -0.436$ ,  $p\text{-value} > 0.05$ ;  $df=20$ ) than the Mean of the Traditional Cluster. So the difference is not significant.

In the Interview, Mean Scores of both Clusters are high, though the Progressive Mean is 0.607 higher (Diff.= 0.607,  $t = -0.929$ ,  $p\text{-value} > 0.05$ ;  $df=20$ ) than the Mean of the Traditional Cluster. Therefore, the difference is not significant.

The results of the Q. Survey, Interview and the comparison of the traditional and progressive means as a whole suggest that the teaching-learning experience of Bangladesh is in a state of amalgam of both traditional and progressive modes of teaching-learning.



### 5.2.1.2 Means and SDs of Section-C (Teachers' Beliefs Regarding Teaching and Learning English)

#### 5.2.1.2.1 Means and SDs of the Traditional Variables of Section-C (Teachers' Beliefs Regarding Teaching and Learning English) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview.

Means and SDs of the Traditional variables of Section-C (Teachers' Beliefs Regarding Teaching and Learning English) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-5.5:

**Table 5.5: Section C (Traditional)**

|      | Statements   | Teachers' Questionnaire |      | Teachers' Interview |      |
|------|--|-------------------------|------|---------------------|------|
|      |  | Mean                    | SD   | Mean                | SD   |
|      | <b>You believe:</b>  |                         |      |                     |      |
| 3.1  | Lectures are very useful for learning.   | 4.07                    | 1.03 | 4.37                | 0.76 |
| 3.3  | It is mostly teachers' responsibility to ensure students' learning.  | 2.78                    | 1.26 | 2.63                | 1.38 |
| 3.5  | English is best learned through memorization.  | 1.63                    | 0.77 | 2.00                | 1.16 |
| 3.9  | Use of mother tongue is necessary for learning English   | 4.07                    | 1.03 | 3.89                | 0.66 |
| 3.10 | Knowledge about target language culture is important to learn English  | 4.12                    | 0.68 | 3.95                | 0.78 |
| 3.11 | Errors should be corrected in time.  | 4.17                    | 0.59 | 4.37                | 0.76 |
| 3.12 | Teachers are experts; they know how to organize things better to help learners learn English.  | 4.17                    | 0.59 | 4.16                | 0.83 |
| 3.13 | It is easier to read and write English than to speak and understand it. So reading and writing should be taught before listening and speaking. | 3.56                    | 0.95 | 4.16                | 0.83 |
| 3.14 | Learning how to translate from your native language (Bangla) to English and vice-versa helps language-learning.                                | 3.85                    | 0.96 | 4.11                | 0.46 |
| 3.15 | Grammar is very important for learning English.  | 3.80                    | 0.90 | 4.16                | 0.83 |
| 3.16 | Skills of English help learners to get a good job.   | 4.27                    | 0.45 | 4.32                | 0.48 |
| 3.18 | English is difficult to learn.   | 2.51                    | 0.98 | 3.21                | 0.86 |

(a) **Questionnaire and Interview:** The results of the variables in the Q. Survey presented in column -3 of table-5.5 in this section show that 6 of the 12 variables have high mean scores. Variables (3.1, 3.9, 3.10, 3.11, 3.12 and 3.16) have high mean scores (4.07, 4.07, 4.12, 4.17, 4.17 and 4.27 respectively), 3 var. (3.13, 3.14, 3.15) have considerably high mean scores, 1 var. (3.3) has

considerably low mean score (2.78) and 1 var. (3.5) has low mean score (1.63). Interview results also show that 6 var. (3.1, 3.11, 3.12, 3.13, 3.14, 3.15 and 3.16) have high mean scores (4.37, 4.37, 4.16, 4.16, 4.11, 4.16 and 4.32 respectively), 4 var. (3.9, 3.10, 3.13 and 3.18) have considerably high mean scores (3.89, 3.95, 3.84 and 3.21 respectively), 1 var. (3.3) has considerably low mean score (2.63) and 1 (3.5) variable has low mean score (2.00). These suggest that teacher' beliefs regarding teaching-learning English is quite traditional.

#### **5.2.1.2.2 Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-C (Teachers' Beliefs Regarding Teaching and Learning English) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview.**

Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-C (Teachers' Beliefs Regarding Teaching and Learning English) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-5.6:

**Table 5.6: Section C (Progressive)**

|      | Statements   | Teachers' Questionnaire |      | Teachers' Interview |      |
|------|--|-------------------------|------|---------------------|------|
|      |  | Mean                    | SD   | Mean                | SD   |
|      | You believe:   |                         |      |                     |      |
| 3.2  | Students' active participation is necessary for language learning.                             | 4.76                    | 0.44 | 4.74                | 0.45 |
| 3.4  | The natural ability (aptitude) to learn a foreign language is important for language learning. | 3.98                    | 0.76 | 4.11                | 0.94 |
| 3.6  | Language skills develop through practice and so opportunities for practice are important.      | 4.51                    | 0.75 | 4.53                | 0.51 |
| 3.7  | Students should be allowed to ask questions in class whenever they need.                       | 4.39                    | 0.74 | 4.42                | 0.51 |
| 3.8  | Students learn better when there is enough interaction (communicative activities) in class.    | 4.24                    | 0.44 | 4.42                | 0.51 |
| 3.17 | Learning English is different from learning other subjects.                                    | 4.12                    | 0.33 | 4.42                | 0.51 |
| 3.19 | Learners should take responsibility for their learning.  | 3.37                    | 0.77 | 3.05                | 0.91 |
| 3.20 | Pair works are helpful for learning.   | 4.41                    | 0.50 | 4.42                | 0.51 |
| 3.21 | Group works are helpful for learning.  | 4.32                    | 0.72 | 4.42                | 0.51 |

(b) The results of the variables in the Q. Survey presented in column -3 of table-5.6 in this section show that 7 var. (3.2, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.17, 3.20 and 3.21) have high

mean scores (4.76, 4.51, 4.39, 4.24, 4.12, 4.41 and 4.32 respectively) and 2 var.(3.4, 3.19) considerably high mean scores (3.98, 3.37). In Interview, results of the variables presented in column- 5 of the table also show that 8 var. (3.2, 3.4, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.17, 3.20 and 3.21) have high mean scores (4.74, 4.11, 4.53, 4.42, 4.42, 4.42, 4.42 and 4.42 respectively) and only 1 var. (3.19) has considerably low mean score (3.05). These indicate that teacher' beliefs regarding teaching-learning English is more progressive than the traditional.

### 5.2.1.2.3 A Comparison of Cluster Means of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-C (Teachers' Beliefs Regarding Teaching and Learning English).

A Comparison of Cluster Means of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-C is presented in the table-5.7:

**Table 5.7: Section C**

| Questionnaire |       |       |         |         | Interview |       |       |         |         |
|---------------|-------|-------|---------|---------|-----------|-------|-------|---------|---------|
| Trad          | Prog  | Diff. | t-value | p-value | Trad      | Prog  | Diff. | t-value | p-value |
| 3.654         | 4.198 | 0.544 | -1.990  | 0.061   | 3.810     | 4.256 | 0.445 | -1.607  | 0.124   |

p-value\* $<0.05$

*Note: In the Questionnaire df=18; In the Interview df=19*

The table-5.7 shows that the cluster-wise result of teachers' beliefs about teaching English. It reflects the psychological disposition of teachers' regarding teaching-learning practices in Bangladesh. In the Survey, Mean Scores of both clusters are high, though the Progressive Mean is 0.544 higher (Diff.= 0.544,  $t = -1.990$ , p-value $>0.05$  ; df=19) than the Mean of the Traditional cluster. So the difference is insignificant.

In the Interview, Mean Scores of both clusters are high, though the Progressive Mean is 0.445 higher (Diff.= 0.445,  $t = -1.607$ , p-value $>0.05$ ; df=19) than the Mean of the Traditional cluster. So the difference is insignificant.

The results of the Questionnaire Survey, Interview and the comparison of the traditional and progressive cluster means indicate that teachers' and learners' beliefs regarding teaching-learning in Bangladesh English is an amalgam of traditional and progressive modes of teaching.

### 5.2.1.3 Means and SDs of the Variables of Section-D (Expectations Regarding Teaching-learning English)

#### 5.2.1.3.1 Means and SDs of the Traditional Variables of Section-D (Teachers' Expectations Regarding Teaching and Learning English) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview

Means and SDs of the Traditional variables of Section-D (Teachers' Expectations Regarding Teaching and Learning English) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-5.8:

**Table 5.8: Section D (Traditional)**

|     | Statements  | Mean | SD   | Mean | SD   |
|-----|---|------|------|------|------|
|     | You expect:   |      |      |      |      |
| 4.1 | Students should learn by listening to your lectures in the class. | 4.22 | 0.79 | 4.21 | 0.78 |
| 4.2 | Errors should not be overlooked.                                  | 3.83 | 1.41 | 2.89 | 1.15 |
| 4.3 | Grammar should be taught and learned seriously.                   | 3.73 | 1.19 | 4.38 | 0.86 |

(a) **Questionnaire and Interview:** The results of the variables in the Q. Survey presented in column -3 of table-5.8 in this section have 1 high mean score (4.22) and 2 considerably high mean scores (3.83 and 3.73). In Interview the results of the variables presented in column-5 of the table show 2 high mean scores (4.21, 4.38) and 1 considerably low mean score (2.89). These results suggest that the expectations of teachers' expectations regarding teaching-learning are traditional.

### 5.2.1.3.2 Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-D (Teachers' Expectations Regarding Teaching and Learning English) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview

Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-D (Teachers' Expectations Regarding Teaching and Learning English) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-5.9:

**Table 5.9: Section D (Progressive)**

|      | Statements   | Teachers' Questionnaire |      | Teachers' Interview |      |
|------|--|-------------------------|------|---------------------|------|
|      |  | Mean                    | SD   | Mean                | SD   |
|      | You expect:  |                         |      |                     |      |
| 4.4  | Students should learn by listening to your lectures in the class.  | 4.22                    | 0.79 | 4.21                | 0.86 |
| 4.5  | Errors should not be overlooked.   | 3.83                    | 1.41 | 2.89                | 0.89 |
| 4.6  | Grammar should be taught and learned seriously.  | 3.73                    | 1.19 | 4.38                | 0.76 |
| 4.7  | Your students will like of your using course materials and textbooks that relates to your home-culture and context.  | 3.93                    | 0.76 | 3.26                | 0.77 |
| 4.8  | Students should participate in interactive activities in the class as much as possible.                              | 4.07                    | 0.82 | 3.95                | 0.96 |
| 4.9  | Teachers should create opportunities for skills training.  | 3.98                    | 0.76 | 3.89                | 0.60 |
| 4.10 | Students should be engaged in pair works.  | 3.37                    | 0.99 | 4.00                | 0.79 |
| 4.11 | Students should be involved in group works.  | 3.61                    | 0.92 | 3.95                | 0.86 |
| 4.12 | Students should be allowed to work individually.   | 2.56                    | 1.05 | 2.95                | 0.66 |
| 4.13 | Students' <i>critical language awareness</i> (i.e. how English shapes your life and personality) should be promoted. | 3.29                    | 0.98 | 3.26                | 0.73 |
| 4.14 | Students should be taught about <i>cultural awareness</i> .  | 2.35                    | .79  | 2.23                | 0.69 |

(b) **Questionnaire and Interview:** The results of the variables in the Q. survey presented in column -3 of Table-5.9 in this section 2 var. have (4.4, 4.8) high mean scores (4.22, 4.07) , 7 var. have(4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.9, 4.10, 4.11 and 4.12) considerably high mean scores (3.83, 3.73, 3.93, 3.98, 3.37, 3.61 and 3.29 respectively) and 2 have (4.12, 4.14) considerably low mean scores(2.56,2.35). In Interview the results of the variables presented in colum-5 of the table show 3 var. (4.4, 4.6 and 4.10)

high mean scores (4.21, 4.38 and 4.00 respectively), 5 (4.7, 4.8, 4.9, 4.11 and 4.13) considerably high mean scores (3.26, 3.93, 3.98, 3.37, 3.61 and 3.29 respectively) and 3 have (4.5, 4.12 and 4.13) considerably low mean scores (2.89, 2.95, 2.23). These results suggest that the expectations of teachers and learners regarding teaching-learning are progressive to a great extent.

### 5.2.1.3.3 A Comparison of Cluster Means of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-D (Teachers' Expectations Regarding Teaching and Learning English).

A Comparison of Cluster Means of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-D (Teachers' Expectations Regarding Teaching and Learning English) is presented in table-5.10:

**Table 5.10: Section D**

| Questionnaire |      |       |         |         | Interview |       |       |         |         |
|---------------|------|-------|---------|---------|-----------|-------|-------|---------|---------|
| Trad          | Prog | Diff. | t-value | p-value | Trad      | Prog  | Diff. | t-value | p-value |
| 3.926         | 3.54 | 0.387 | 1.637   | 0.136   | 3.826     | 3.543 | 0.284 | 0.554   | 0.618   |

p-value\* $<0.05$

*Note: In the Questionnaire df=9; In the Interview df=3*

The table-5.10 shows the cluster-wise results of teachers' experience of teaching English and manifest the psychological disposition of teachers regarding teaching-learning practices in Bangladesh. In the survey, Mean Scores of both clusters are high, though the Traditional Mean is 0.387 higher (Diff. = 0.387,  $t = 1.637$ ,  $p\text{-value} > 0.05$ ;  $df=3$ ) than the Mean of the Progressive cluster. So the difference is not significant.

In the Interview, Mean Scores of both clusters are high, though the Traditional Mean is 0.284 higher (Diff. = 0.284,  $t = -0.554$ ,  $p\text{-value} > 0.05$ ;  $df=3$ ) than the Mean of the Progressive cluster. So the difference is not significant.

The results of the Questionnaire Survey, Interview and the comparison of the traditional and progressive cluster means suggest that teachers' and learners' expectations regarding teaching-learning English is in a situation of mixture of both traditional and progressive modes of language teaching.

#### 5.2.1.4 Means and SDs of Section-E (Students' Learning Style Preferences and Language Teaching)

##### 5.2.1.4.1 Means and SDs and of the Traditional variables of Section-E (Students' Learning Style Preferences) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview.

Means and SDs and of the Traditional variables of Section-E (Students' Learning Style Preferences) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-5.11:

**Table 5.11: Section E (Traditional)**

|      | Statements  | Teachers' Questionnaire |      | Teachers' Interview |      |
|------|---|-------------------------|------|---------------------|------|
|      |   | Mean                    | SD   | Mean                | SD   |
|      | Your students prefer to learn:  |                         |      |                     |      |
| 5.1  | from your lectures.   | 4.41                    | 0.50 | 4.37                | 0.50 |
| 5.3  | by following your teachers' points on board.                                    | 4.24                    | 0.62 | 4.32                | 0.75 |
| 5.5  | things by heart (i.e. by memorizing things).                                    | 3.46                    | 1.19 | 3.05                | 1.22 |
|      | You prefer your students to:  |                         |      |                     |      |
| 5.12 | learn by using examples from day today life events rather than using textbooks. | 4.17                    | 0.50 | 4.26                | 0.45 |
|      | Your students learn better:   |                         |      |                     |      |
| 5.13 | if you tell them what to do and you guide them.                                 | 4.15                    | 0.57 | 4.32                | 0.58 |
| 5.15 | when students listen to someone explaining something in the class.              | 4.02                    | 0.57 | 3.89                | 0.66 |
| 5.16 | when you use white-board in the class.  | 4.00                    | 0.74 | 3.89                | 0.66 |
| 5.18 | if they take notes while you lecture.   | 3.77                    | 0.92 | 4.00                | 0.88 |

- (a) **Questionnaire and Interview:** The results of the variables in the Q. Survey presented in column -3 of table-5.11 in this section show that 6 var. (5.1, 5.3, 5.12, 5.13, 5.15 and 5.16) have high mean scores (4.41, 4.24, 4.17, 4.15, 4.02

and 4.00 respectively) and 2 var.(5.5, 5.18) have considerably high mean scores (3.46, 3.77). In Interview, results of the variables presented in column- 5 of the table also show 5 var. (4.1, 4.3, 4.12, 4.13 and 4.18) high mean scores (4.37, 4.32, 4.26, 4.32 and 4.00 respectively) and 3 var. (5.5, 5.15, 5.16) considerably high mean scores (3.05, 3.89 and 3.89 respectively). These show that teachers' learning style preferences are very much traditional.

**5.2.1.4.2 Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-E (Students' Learning Style Preferences) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-5.12.**

Means and SDs and of the Traditional variables of Section-E (Students' Learning Style Preferences) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-5.12:

**Table 5.12: Section E (Progressive)**

|      | Statements  | Teachers' Questionnaire |      | Teachers' Interview |        |
|------|---|-------------------------|------|---------------------|--------|
|      |   | Mean                    | SD   | Mean                | SD     |
|      | Your students prefer to learn:                                |                         |      |                     |        |
| 5.2  | Through discussions with their class-mates.                   | 3.76                    | 0.86 | 3.95                | 0.91   |
| 5.4  | By practicing different types of activities in the class.     | 4.20                    | 0.68 | 4.42                | 0.77   |
| 5.6  | How to express your ideas or opinion about a topic.           | 3.80                    | 0.90 | 3.84                | 0.83   |
| 5.7  | By asking you questions.                                      | 4.27                    | 0.72 | 4.16                | 0.69   |
| 5.8  | By choosing for themselves what they want to learn.           | 2.90                    | 1.00 | 2.58                | 0.84   |
| 5.9  | By following their own plan for achieving their goals.        | 3.05                    | 0.95 | 2.54                | 0.83   |
|      | You prefer your students to:                                  |                         |      |                     |        |
| 5.10 | do everything on their own in the class.                      | 2.61                    | 1.16 | 2.47                | 1.12   |
| 5.11 | Select content, material and method for their learning.       | 2.68                    | 1.15 | 2.95                | 1.13   |
|      | Your students learn better:                                   |                         |      |                     |        |
| 5.14 | if they learn independently.                                  | 2.98                    | 1.17 | 2.58                | 1.12   |
| 5.17 | if they make drawings as they study.                          | 3.17                    | 0.86 | 3.16                | 0.83   |
| 5.19 | when their peers tells them how to do something in the class. | 3.95                    | 4.11 | 0.46                | 104.55 |
| 5.20 | when they learn individually.                                 | 3.05                    | 2.74 | 0.81                | 100.00 |
| 5.21 | when they learn in pairs.                                     | 4.39                    | 4.32 | 0.48                | 97.96  |
| 5.22 | when they learn in groups.                                    | 4.37                    | 4.26 | 0.45                | 91.84  |



(b) **Questionnaire and Interview:** The results of the variables in the Q. Survey presented in column -3 of table-5.12 in this section show that 4 var.(5.4, 5.7, 5.21, 5.22) have high mean scores (4.20, 4.27, 4.39 and 4.37 respectively), 6 var.(5.2, 5.6, 5.9, 5.17, 5.19 and 5.20) have considerably high mean scores ( 3.76, 3.80, 3.05,3.17. 3.95 And 3.05 respectively) and 4 var. ( 5.8, 5.10, 5.11 and 5.14) have considerably low mean scores (2.90, 2.61, 2.68 and 2.98 respectively. In Interview, results of the variables presented in column- 5 of the table also show 2 var. (5.4, 5.7) high mean scores (4.42, 4.16), 3 (5.2, 5.6 and 5.17) considerably high mean scores 5 var. considerably low mean scores (2.58, 2.54, 2.47, 2.95 and 2.58 respectively) and 4 var. (5.19, 5.20, 5.21 and 5.22) low mean scores (0.46, 0.81, 0.48 and 0.45 respectively). These suggest that teachers' perceptions regarding learning style preferences are to some extent progressive.

#### 5.2.1.4.3 A Comparison of Cluster Means of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-D (Students' Learning Style Preferences).

A Comparison of Cluster Means of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-D (Students' Learning Style Preferences) is presented in table-5.13:

**Table 5.13: Section E**

| Questionnaire |       |       |         |         | Interview |       |       |         |         |
|---------------|-------|-------|---------|---------|-----------|-------|-------|---------|---------|
| Trad          | Prog  | Diff. | t-value | p-value | Trad      | Prog  | Diff. | t-value | p-value |
| 4.027         | 3.512 | 0.514 | 2.518*  | 0.020   | 4.012     | 3.434 | 0.578 | 2.235*  | 0.036   |

p-value\* < 0.05

Note: In the Questionnaire  $df=19$ ; In the Interview  $df=20$

The table-5.13 shows the cluster-wise results of teachers' opinion about the learning style preferences of learners. In the Survey, Mean Scores of both clusters are high, though the Traditional Mean is 0.514 significantly higher (Diff.= 0.514,  $t=2.518^*$ ,  $p\text{-value}<0.05$ ;  $df=20$ ) than the Mean of the Progressive cluster. So the difference is significant.

While in the Interview, Mean Scores of both clusters are high, though the Traditional Cluster Mean is 0.578 significantly higher (Diff.= 0.578,  $t = 2.235^*$ ,  $p\text{-value} < 0.05$  ;  $df=20$ ) than the Mean of the Progressive cluster. Hence the difference is significant.

The results of the Questionnaire Survey, Interview and the comparison of the traditional and progressive cluster means suggest that teachers' perceptions regarding learning style preferences are more traditional than the progressive.

### 5.2.1.5 Means and SDs of Section-F (Students' Learning Strategies and Language Teaching)

#### 5.2.1.5.1 Means and SDs of the Traditional variables of Section-F (Students' Learning Strategies) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview.

Means and SDs of the Traditional variables of Section-F (Students' Learning Strategies) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-5.14:

**Table 5.14: Section F (Traditional)**

|      | Statements   | Teachers' Questionnaire Survey |      | Teachers' Interview |      |
|------|--|--------------------------------|------|---------------------|------|
|      |  | Mean                           | SD   | Mean                | SD   |
|      | Your students:   |                                |      |                     |      |
| 6.1  | use their first language knowledge to learn English.                     | 3.82                           | 1.06 | 3.95                | 0.97 |
| 6.2  | compare the grammar rules of their mother language with that of English. | 3.63                           | 1.22 | 3.53                | 1.39 |
| 6.3  | use what they already know to learn something new.                       | 3.22                           | 0.88 | 2.95                | 0.91 |
| 6.7  | think about grammar rules when they write.                               | 3.49                           | 1.21 | 3.63                | 1.07 |
| 6.10 | use library to learn English.  | 2.68                           | 0.76 | 2.89                | 0.81 |
| 6.13 | use a dictionary to understand new words while reading.                  | 3.10                           | 0.89 | 3.21                | 0.79 |
| 6.16 | do not like to make mistakes when they speak/write.                      | 2.68                           | 0.76 | 2.53                | 0.84 |

(a) **Questionnaire and Interview:** The results of the variables in the Q. Survey presented in column -3 of table-5.14 in this section show that 5 var. (6.1, 6.2,

6.3, 6.7 and 6.13 have considerably high mean scores and 2 var. (6.10 and 6.16) have considerably low mean scores (2.68, 2.68). In Interview, results of the variables presented in column- 5 of the table also show 4 var. (6.1, 6.2, 6.7 and 6.13) have considerably high mean scores (3.95, 3.53, 3.63 and 3.21 respectively) and 3 var. (6.3, 6.10, 6.16) have considerably low mean scores (2.95, 2.89 and 2.53 respectively). These indicate that teachers' perceptions about students' learning strategies are quite traditional.

#### 5.2.1.5.2 Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-F (Students' Learning Strategies) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview.

Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-F (Students' Learning Strategies) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-5.15:

**Table 5.15: (Progressive)**

|      | Statements   | Teachers' Questionnaire |      | Teachers' Interview |      |
|------|--|-------------------------|------|---------------------|------|
|      |  | Mean                    | SD   | Mean                | SD   |
|      | Your students:   |                         |      |                     |      |
| 6.4  | focus on pictures, subtitles and keywords when they read.      | 3.10                    | 1.06 | 2.79                | 1.03 |
| 6.5  | think about techniques that help them to learn English better. | 2.46                    | 1.14 | 2.68                | 1.11 |
| 6.6  | use grammar rules consciously for developing their skills.     | 3.44                    | 1.00 | 3.68                | 0.95 |
| 6.8  | monitor and judge their own progress in language learning      | 2.22                    | 0.99 | 2.32                | 1.00 |
| 6.9  | identify problems that delay their learning.                   | 2.61                    | 0.92 | 2.42                | 0.90 |
| 6.11 | use internet to learn English.                                 | 2.32                    | 0.88 | 2.74                | 0.87 |
| 6.12 | use other sources to learn English.                            | 2.37                    | 0.77 | 2.53                | 0.70 |
| 6.14 | try to guess the meaning of new words when they read.          | 3.17                    | 0.83 | 3.50                | 1.04 |
| 6.15 | look for conversation partners to improve speaking skills.     | 2.54                    | 1.03 | 2.63                | 0.96 |
| 6.17 | can not evaluate their own performances.                       | 2.78                    | 0.88 | 2.53                | 0.70 |
| 6.18 | look for opportunities for practice.                           | 2.41                    | 0.50 | 2.63                | 1.04 |

(c) **Questionnaire and Interview:** The results of the variables in the Q. Survey presented in column -3 of table-5.15 in this section show that 3 (6.4, 6.6, 6.14)

of the 11 variables have considerably high mean scores (3.10, 3.14 and 3.17 respectively) and 8 (6.5, 6.8, 6.9, 6.11, 6.12, 6.15, 6.16 and 6.17) have considerably low mean scores (2.46, 2.22, 2.61, 2.32, 2.37, 2.54, 2.78, and 2.41 respectively). In Interview, results of the variables presented in column- 5 of the table also show 2 (6.6, 6.14) considerably high mean scores (3.68 and 3.50) and 8 (6.5, 6.8, 6.9, 6.11, 6.12, 6.15, 6.16 and 6.17) considerably low mean scores (2.68, 2.32, 2.42, 2.74, 2.53, 2.63, 2.53, and 2.63 respectively). These indicate that teachers' perceptions about students' learning strategies are progressive to some extent.

### 5.2.1.5.3 A Comparison of Cluster Means of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-F (Students' Learning Strategies and Language Teaching)

A Comparison of Cluster Means of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-F (Students' Learning Strategies and Language Teaching) is presented in the table-5.16:

**Table 5.16: Section F**

| Questionnaire |       |       |         |         | Interview |       |       |         |         |
|---------------|-------|-------|---------|---------|-----------|-------|-------|---------|---------|
| Trad          | Prog  | Diff. | t-value | p-value | Trad      | Prog  | Diff. | t-value | p-value |
| 3.231         | 2.674 | 0.556 | 2.687*  | 0.019   | 3.241     | 2.768 | 0.473 | 2.087   | 0.058   |

p-value\* < 0.05

*Note: In the Questionnaire df=12; In the Interview df=12*

The table-5.16 shows the cluster-wise results of teachers' opinion about learners' role in picking up learning strategies. In the Survey, the Mean scores of Traditional Variable is considerably high and the Traditional cluster Mean is significantly higher 0.556 (Diff.= 0.556, t =2.687\*, p-value<0.05 ; df=12) than the Mean of the Progressive cluster. So the difference is significant.

Again both in the interview, the Mean scores of the Traditional variables are considerably high. But the Mean of Traditional cluster is higher 0.473 (Diff. = 0.473,  $t = -2.087$ ,  $p\text{-value} > 0.05$ ;  $df = 12$ ) than the Mean of the Progressive Cluster. Hence the difference is not significant.

The results of the Questionnaire Survey, Interview and the comparison of the traditional and progressive cluster means indicate that teachers' perceptions with respect to learners' learning strategies are more traditional than the progressive.

### 5.2.1.6 Means and SDs of Section-G (Teaching-Learning Opportunities)

#### 5.2.1.6.1 Means and SDs of the Traditional variables of Section-G (Teaching-Learning Opportunities) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview

Means and SDs of the Traditional variables of Section-G (Teaching-Learning Opportunities) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-5.17:

**Table 5.17: (Traditional)**

|       | Statements                                    | Teachers' Questionnaire |      | Teachers' Interview |      |
|-------|---|-------------------------|------|---------------------|------|
|       |   | Mean                    | SD   | Mean                | SD   |
| 7.1   | Your students:                                |                         |      |                     |      |
| 7.1.5 | learn grammar in the class.                   | 3.83                    | 0.74 | 3.68                | 0.75 |
| 7.1.7 | are asked questions while the lesson goes on. | 3.34                    | 1.04 | 3.21                | 1.08 |

- (a) **Questionnaire and Interview:** The results of the variables in the Q. Survey presented in column -3 of table-5.17 in this section show that all the variables (7.1.5 and 7.1.7) have high mean scores (3.83, 3.34) and in Interview, results of the variables (7.1.5 and 7.1.7) presented in column- 5 of the table also show quite similar results (3.68, 3.21). These suggest that teachers' perceptions regarding teaching-learning opportunities are traditional.

### 5.2.1.6.2 Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-G (Teaching-Learning Opportunities) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview

Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-G (Teaching-Learning Opportunities) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-5.18:

**Table 5.18: Section-G (Progressive)**

|        | Statements  | Teachers' Questionnaire |      | Teachers' Interview |      |
|--------|---|-------------------------|------|---------------------|------|
|        |   | Mean                    | SD   | Mean                | SD   |
| 7.1    | Your students:  |                         |      |                     |      |
| 7.1.1  | get enough opportunities to express their ideas or opinions in the class. | 3.20                    | 1.23 | 2.53                | 0.84 |
| 7.1.2  | can share their ideas or opinions with their peers in the class.          | 3.45                    | 0.90 | 3.68                | 0.75 |
| 7.1.3  | can ask questions while the lesson goes on.                               | 3.59                    | 0.95 | 3.79                | 0.92 |
| 7.1.4  | are engaged in problem-solving activities                                 | 3.63                    | 0.86 | 4.05                | 0.52 |
| 7.1.6  | are given the responsibility for their own learning.                      | 3.10                    | 0.83 | 2.89                | 0.88 |
| 7.1.8  | are made to watch TV programmers in English in the class.                 | 1.00                    | 0.00 | 1.00                | 0.00 |
| 7.1.9  | are taught words with meanings in different contexts.                     | 4.22                    | 0.42 | 4.16                | 0.38 |
| 7.1.10 | take part in different role-playing activities in the class.              | 2.34                    | 0.94 | 2.53                | 1.02 |
| 7.1.11 | are provided a friendly and relaxed environment in your English class.    | 4.29                    | 0.84 | 4.42                | 0.51 |
| 7.2    | Your college arranges regular:  |                         |      |                     |      |
| 7.2.1  | English poetry recitation session.  | 1.10                    | 0.30 | 1.00                | 0.00 |
| 7.2.2  | English extempore speech competition.                                     | 1.00                    | 0.00 | 1.00                | 0.00 |
| 7.2.3  | English essay competition.  | 1.15                    | 0.42 | 1.18                | 0.53 |

(d) **Questionnaire and Interview:** The results of the variables in the Q. Survey presented in column -3 of table-5.18 in this section show that 2 var.(7.1., 7.1.11) have high mean scores (4.22, 4.29), 5var. (7.1.1, 7.1.2, 7.1.3, 7.1.4 and 7.1.6) have considerably high mean scores (3.20, 3.45, 3.59. 3.63 and 3.10 respectively), 1 var.(7.1.10) has considerably low mean score (2.10) and 4 var. (7.1.8, 7.2.1, 7.2.2 and 7.2.3) have low mean scores (1.00, 1.10, 1.00 and 1.15).

In Interview, results of the variables presented in column- 5 of the table also show that 3 var. (7.1.4, 7.1.9 and 7.1.11) have high mean scores (4.05, 4.16 and 4.42 respectively), 2 var.(7.1.2, 7.1.3) have considerably high mean scores (3.68, 3.79) and 4 var. (7.1.8, 7.2.1, 7.2.2 and 7.2.3) have low mean scores (1.00, 1.00, 1.00 and 1.18). These show that teachers' perceptions about teaching-learning opportunities are progressive to some extent.

### 5.2.1.6.3 A Comparison of Cluster Means of Teachers Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-G (Teaching-Learning Opportunities).

A Comparison of Cluster Means of Teachers Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-G (Teaching-Learning Opportunities) is presented in table-5.19:

**Table 5.19: Section G**

| Questionnaire |       |       |         |         | Interview |       |       |         |         |
|---------------|-------|-------|---------|---------|-----------|-------|-------|---------|---------|
| Trad          | Prog  | Diff. | t-value | p-value | Trad      | Prog  | Diff. | t-value | p-value |
| 3.585         | 2.672 | 0.912 | 2.046   | 0.079   | 3.445     | 2.685 | 0.759 | 1.665   | 0.134   |

p-value\* $<0.05$

*Note: In the Questionnaire df=7; In the Interview df=8*

The table-5.19 in the survey shows that the Mean scores of Traditional clusters is considerably higher 0.912 (Diff.= 0.912,  $t = -2.046$ ,  $p\text{-value} > 0.05$  ;  $df=7$ ) than the Mean scores of Progressive cluster. But the difference is not significant for the Questionnaire Survey.

While in the Interview, the Mean Scores of Traditional cluster is higher 0.759 (Diff.0.759,  $t = 1.665$ ,  $p\text{-value} > 0.05$ ,  $df=8$ ) than the Mean Scores of Progressive cluster. But the difference is not significant.

The results of the Questionnaire Survey, Interview and the comparison of the traditional and progressive cluster means indicate that teachers' perceptions regarding

English teaching-learning opportunities are in a state of an amalgam of both the traditional and progressive modes of teaching.

## 5.2.2 Section-wise Results of the Means and SDs of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview

### 5.2.2.1 The Means and SD of Section-B (Experience about Teaching-Learning)

#### 5.2.2.1.1 The Means and SD of the Traditional variables of Section-B (Experience about Teaching-Learning) of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview

Means and SDs of the Traditional variables of Section-B (Experience about Teaching-Learning) of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-5.20:

**Table 5.20: Section B (Traditional)**

| SN   | Statements   | Mean | SD   | Mean | SD   |
|------|--|------|------|------|------|
| 2.1  | Your teacher lectures most of the time in the classroom.   | 4.15 | 0.97 | 4.01 | 0.96 |
| 2.2  | You remain silent in the class mostly and speak only when your teacher asks you questions.           | 3.95 | 1.23 | 3.82 | 1.39 |
| 2.3  | Your teachers are very formal and always maintain a distance from you and so you are afraid of them. | 1.26 | 2.23 | 2.49 | 1.33 |
| 2.8  | You entirely depend on your teacher for your learning.   | 2.80 | 1.37 | 2.73 | 1.40 |
| 2.10 | You are criticized by your teacher if you make mistakes/errors.                                      | 2.67 | 1.35 | 2.47 | 1.33 |
| 2.12 | Your teacher uses boards to make lessons clear to you in the class.                                  | 4.25 | 0.97 | 4.08 | 1.21 |
| 2.18 | Your teacher teaches you reading skills.   | 4.41 | 0.50 | 4.42 | 0.51 |
| 2.19 | Your teacher teaches you writing skills.   | 4.76 | 0.44 | 4.37 | 0.76 |

(a) **Questionnaire and Interview:** The results of the variables in the Q. Survey presented in column -3 of table-5.20 in this section show that 3 var. (2.1, 2.12 and 2.13) have high mean scores (4.15, 4.25 and 4.02 respectively), 1 var. (2.2) have considerably high mean score (3.95) and 2 var.(2.8, 2.10) have considerably low mean scores (2.80, 2.67). In Interview, results of the variables presented in column- 5 of the table also manifest that 2 var. (2.12, 2.13) have high mean scores (4.08, 4.00), 1 var. (2.2) has considerably high mean score



(3.82) and 3 var. (2.3, 2.8, 2.10) have considerably low mean scores (2.49, 2.73, 2.47). These imply that students' experience regarding learning and teaching in Bangladesh is quite traditional.

#### 5.2.2.1.2 The Means and SD of the Traditional variables of Section-B (Experience Regarding Teaching-Learning) of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview

Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-B (Experience Regarding Teaching-Learning) of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-5.21:

**Table 5.21: Section B (Progressive)**

| SN   | Statements  | Mean | SD   | Mean | SD   |
|------|---|------|------|------|------|
| 2.4  | Your teacher creates language learning opportunities in the class for practicing different skills and sub-skills.         | 3.69 | 1.22 | 3.85 | 1.19 |
| 2.5  | Your teachers are very friendly and therefore you can have access to them whenever you need.                              | 4.41 | 0.96 | 4.30 | 1.20 |
| 2.6  | Your teacher helps you in doing tasks or activities.  | 4.21 | 0.95 | 4.08 | 1.22 |
| 2.7  | Your teacher encourages you to think independently or creatively.   | 3.98 | 1.16 | 3.96 | 1.09 |
| 2.9  | You take part in selecting materials and other classroom activities (methodology).  | 3.40 | 1.17 | 3.36 | 1.14 |
| 2.11 | Your learning process includes seminar presentations and participations.  | 2.90 | 1.40 | 2.83 | 1.39 |
| 2.13 | You participate in different classroom tasks assigned by your teachers.   | 4.02 | 1.03 | 4.00 | 1.06 |
| 2.14 | You are encouraged to talk in the class.  | 3.88 | 1.17 | 3.61 | 1.15 |
| 2.15 | You work in pairs in the class.   | 3.43 | 1.25 | 3.35 | 1.37 |
| 2.16 | You work in group in the class.   | 3.51 | 1.30 | 3.37 | 1.33 |
| 2.17 | Your teacher explains everything for you in the class.  | 3.90 | 1.19 | 3.82 | 1.16 |
| 2.18 | Your teacher involves you in finding out things by yourselves first and afterwards he/she provides feedback and explains. | 3.78 | 1.21 | 3.71 | 1.13 |
| 2.21 | Your teacher teach you listening skills.  | 1.22 | 0.57 | 1.16 | 0.50 |
| 2.22 | Your teacher teach you speaking skills.   | 1.32 | 0.63 | 1.22 | 0.57 |

(a) **Questionnaire and Interview:** The results of the variables in the Q. Survey presented in column -3 of table-5.21 in this section show that 2 var. (2.5, 2.6) have high mean scores (4.41, 4.21), 8 var.(2.4, 2.7, 2.9, 2.14, 2.15, 2.16, 2.17

and 2.18) have considerably high mean scores (3.69, 3.98, 3.40, 3.88, 3.43, 3.51, 3.90 and 3.78 respectively) and 1 var.(2.11) has considerably low mean score (2.90). In Interview, results of the variables presented in column- 5 of the table show 2 var.(2.5, 2.6) have high mean scores (4.30, 4.08), 8 var.(2.4, 2.7, 2.9, 2.14, 2.15, 2.16, 2.17 and 2.18) have considerably high mean scores (3.85, 3.96, 3.36, 3.61, 3.35, 3.37, 3.82 and 3.71 respectively) and 1 var.(2.11) has considerably low mean score (2.83). These suggest that students' experience regarding the teaching-learning culture of Bangladesh is quite progressive.

### 5.2.2.1.3 A Comparison of Cluster Means of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-B (Experience Regarding Teaching-Learning).

A Comparison of Cluster Means of Students Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-B (Experience Regarding Teaching-Learning) is given in the table-5.22:

**Table 5.22: Section B**

| Questionnaire |       |       |         |         | Interview |      |       |         |         |
|---------------|-------|-------|---------|---------|-----------|------|-------|---------|---------|
| Trad          | Prog  | Diff. | t-value | p-value | Trad      | Prog | Diff. | t-value | p-value |
| 3.531         | 3.404 | 0.128 | 0.259   | 0.799   | 3.549     | 3.33 | 0.219 | 0.552   | 0.588   |

p-value\* $<0.05$ ;

*Note: In the Questionnaire df=13; In the Interview df=17*

The table-5.22 the cluster-wise result of learners' perception about the actuality of the teaching-learning practice in the country. In the Survey, Mean Scores of both clusters are high, though the Traditional Mean is higher 3.531(Diff.= 3.531,  $t = -0.726$ , p-value $>0.05$  ; df=17) than the Mean of the Progressive cluster. But the difference is not significant.

In the Interview, Mean Scores of both clusters are high, though the Traditional Mean is higher 3.549(Diff. = 3.549,  $t = -0.219$ , p-value $>0.05$ ; df=17) than the Mean of the Progressive cluster. Hence, here also the difference is not significant.

The results of the Questionnaire Survey, Interview and the comparison of the traditional and progressive cluster means indicate that students' experience regarding English teaching-learning culture in Bangladesh is in a state of amalgam of traditional and progressive modes of teaching.

### 5.2.2.2 Means and SDs of Section-C (Beliefs of Students' about Learning and Teaching English)

#### 5.2.2.2.1 Means and SDs of the Traditional variables of Section-C (Beliefs of Students' Regarding Learning and Teaching English) of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview

Means and SDs of the Traditional variables of Section-C (Beliefs of Students' Regarding Learning and Teaching English) of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-5.23:

**Table 5.23: Section C (Traditional)**

| SN   | Statements   | Students' Questionnaire Survey |      | Students' Interview |      |
|------|--|--------------------------------|------|---------------------|------|
|      |  | Mean                           | SD   | Mean                | SD   |
|      | You believe :  |                                |      |                     |      |
| 3.1  | Lectures are very useful for learning.   | 4.45                           | 0.84 | 4.34                | 1.09 |
| 3.3  | It is mostly teachers' responsibility to ensure students' learning.  | 2.87                           | 1.43 | 2.75                | 1.42 |
| 3.5  | English is best learned through memorization.  | 2.16                           | 1.38 | 2.33                | 1.35 |
| 3.9  | Use of mother tongue is necessary for making classroom interaction effective.  | 4.00                           | 1.11 | 3.72                | 1.23 |
| 3.10 | Knowledge about target language culture is important to learn English  | 4.16                           | 0.88 | 4.09                | 0.96 |
| 3.11 | Errors should be corrected in time.  | 4.50                           | 0.67 | 4.51                | 0.64 |
| 3.13 | It is easier to read and write English than to speak and understand it. So reading and writing should be taught before listening and speaking. | 3.75                           | 1.22 | 3.70                | 1.20 |
| 3.14 | Learning how to translate from your native language (Bangla) to English and vice-versa helps language-learning.                                | 4.40                           | 0.72 | 4.39                | 0.78 |
| 3.15 | Grammar is very important for learning English.  | 4.54                           | 0.78 | 4.42                | 0.85 |
| 3.16 | Skills of English help learners to get a good job.   | 4.59                           | 0.68 | 4.54                | 0.74 |
| 3.18 | English is difficult to learn.   | 3.44                           | 1.35 | 3.40                | 1.29 |

(a) **Questionnaire Survey and Interview:** The results of the variables in the Q. Survey presented in column -3 of Table-5.23 in this section show that 7 var. (3.1.

3.9, 3.11, 3.14, 3.15, 3.16 and 3.18) have high mean scores (4.45, 4.00, 4.16, 4.50, 4.40, 4.54, and 4.59 respectively), 2 var.(3.13, 3.18) have considerably high mean scores (3.75, 3.44) and 2 var.(3.3, 3.5) have considerably low mean scores. In Interview, results of the variables presented in column- 5 of the table show that 6 var. (3.1, 3.10, 3.11, 3.14, 3.15 and 3.16) have high mean scores (4.34, 4.09, 4.51, 4.39, 4.42 and 4.54 respectively), 3 var. (3.9, 3.13 and 3.18) have considerably high mean scores (3.72, 3.70 and 3.44 respectively), and 2 var.(3.3, 3.5) considerably low mean scores (1.43, 1.38). These indicate that students' beliefs regarding teaching-learning is very much traditional.

#### 5.2.2.2.2 Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-C (Beliefs of Students' Regarding Learning and Teaching English) of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview

Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-C (Beliefs of Students' Regarding Learning and Teaching English) of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-5.24:

**Table 5.24: Section (Progressive)**

| SN   | Statements   | Questionnaire Survey |      | Interview |      |
|------|--|----------------------|------|-----------|------|
|      |  | Mean                 | SD   | Mean      | SD   |
|      | You believe :  |                      |      |           |      |
| 3.2  | Students' active participation is necessary for language learning.                             | 4.50                 | 0.75 | 4.37      | 1.00 |
| 3.4  | The natural ability (aptitude) to learn a foreign language is important for language learning. | 4.04                 | 1.02 | 3.97      | 1.07 |
| 3.6  | Language skills develop through practice and so opportunities for practice are important.      | 4.55                 | 0.76 | 4.51      | 0.91 |
| 3.7  | Students should be allowed to ask questions in class whenever they need.                       | 4.29                 | 0.90 | 4.36      | 0.91 |
| 3.8  | Students learn better when there is enough interaction (communicative activities) in class.    | 4.23                 | 0.89 | 4.18      | 0.92 |
| 3.18 | Learning English is different from learning other subjects.                                    | 4.10                 | 0.99 | 4.18      | 0.87 |
| 3.19 | English is difficult to learn.   | 3.44                 | 1.35 | 3.40      | 1.29 |
| 3.20 | Learners should take responsibility for their learning.  | 4.07                 | 0.92 | 3.98      | 0.84 |
| 3.21 | Pair works are helpful for learning.   | 4.24                 | 0.78 | 4.24      | 0.77 |
| 3.22 | Group works are helpful for learning.  | 4.52                 | 0.65 | 4.40      | 0.84 |

- (a) **Questionnaire Survey and Interview:** The results of the variables in the Q. Survey presented in column -3 of Table-5.24 in this section show that 9 var.(3.2, 3.4, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.18, 3.20, 3.21 and 3.22) have high mean scores (4.50, 4.04, 4.55, 4.29, 4.23, 4.10, 4.07, 4.24 and 4.52 respectively), and 1 var.(3.19) has considerably high mean scores (3.44). In Interview, results of the variables presented in column- 5 of the table show that 8 var. (3.2, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.18, 3.21 and 3.22) have high mean scores (4.37, 4.51, 4.36, 4.18, 4.18, 4.24 and 4.40 respectively), 3 var. (3.4, 3.19 and 3.20)) have considerably high mean scores (3.97, 3.40 and 3.98 respectively), and 2 var. (3.3, 3.5) have considerably low mean scores (1.43, 1.38). These indicate that students' beliefs regarding teaching-learning is quite traditional.

#### 5.2.2.2.3 A Comparison of Cluster Means of Students Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-C (Beliefs of Students' Regarding Learning and Teaching English).

A Comparison of Cluster Means of Students Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-C (Beliefs of Students' regarding Learning and Teaching English) is presented in the table-5.25:

**Table 5.25: Section C**

| Questionnaire |       |       |         |         | Interview |       |       |         |         |
|---------------|-------|-------|---------|---------|-----------|-------|-------|---------|---------|
| Trad          | Prog  | Diff. | t-value | p-value | Trad      | Prog  | Diff. | t-value | p-value |
| 3.896         | 4.198 | 0.301 | -1.165  | 0.263   | 3.835     | 4.159 | 0.323 | -1.3102 | 0.211   |

p-value\* < 0.05

*Note: In the Questionnaire df=14; In the Interview df=14*

The Table-5.25 shows that the cluster-wise result of students' beliefs about learning and teaching English. It reflects the psychological disposition of teachers regarding teaching-learning practices in Bangladesh. In the Survey, Mean Scores of both clusters are high, though the Progressive Mean is higher 0.301 (Diff.= 0.301, t =-

1.165,  $p\text{-value} > 0.05$  ;  $df=14$ ) than the Mean of the Traditional cluster. But the difference is not significant.

In the Interview, Mean Scores of both clusters are high, though the Progressive Mean is 0.323 higher (Diff.= 0.323,  $t = -1.3102$ ,  $p\text{-value} > 0.05$  ;  $df=19$ ) than the Mean of the Traditional cluster. So the difference is not significant.

The results of the Questionnaire Survey, Interview and the comparison of the traditional and progressive cluster means indicate that students' beliefs regarding English teaching-learning culture in Bangladesh is in a state of amalgam of both traditional and progressive modes of teaching.

### **5.2.2.3 Means and SDs of Section-D (Expectations of Students Regarding Learning and Teaching English)**

#### **5.2.2.3.1 Means and SDs of the Traditional variables of Section-D (Expectations of Students Regarding Learning and Teaching English) of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview**

Means and SDs of the Traditional variables of Section-D (Expectations of Students Regarding Learning and Teaching English) of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-5.26:

**Table 5.26: Section D (Traditional)**

|     | Statements  | Students' Questionnaire |      | Students' Interview |      |
|-----|---|-------------------------|------|---------------------|------|
|     |   | Mean                    | SD   | Mean                | SD   |
|     | You expect:   |                         |      |                     |      |
| 4.1 | You should learn from listening to teachers' lectures in the class. | 3.41                    | 1.39 | 3.39                | 1.45 |
| 4.2 | Your teacher should not overlook your errors.                       | 3.42                    | 1.52 | 3.19                | 1.60 |
| 4.3 | Grammar should be taught seriously in the class.                    | 3.49                    | 1.01 | 4.28                | 1.00 |

The results of the variables in the Q. Survey presented in column -3 of Table-5.26 in this section have 3 (4.1, 4.2 and 4.3) high mean scores (3.41, 3.42 and 3.49) In Interview,

results of the variables presented in column- 5 of the table show 1 (4.3) high mean score (4.28) and 2(4.1 and 4.2) considerably high mean scores (3.39 and 3.19). These show that students' expectations regarding teaching-learning is very much traditional.

#### 5.2.2.3.2 Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-D (Expectations of Students Regarding Learning and Teaching English) of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview

Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-D (Expectations of Students Regarding Learning and Teaching English) of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-5.27:

**Table 5.27: Section D (Progressive)**

|      | Statements   | Students' Questionnaire |      | Students' Interview |      |
|------|--|-------------------------|------|---------------------|------|
|      |  | Mean                    | SD   | Mean                | SD   |
|      | You expect:  |                         |      |                     |      |
| 4.4  | Your teacher would use interesting course materials and textbooks that relates to your home-culture and context, teacher would use | 4.31                    | 1.11 | 4.24                | 1.00 |
| 4.5  | You should be engaged in interactive activities in the class as much as possible.  | 4.09                    | 1.17 | 3.82                | 1.23 |
| 4.6  | Your teacher should create opportunities for skills training.  | 3.97                    | 1.21 | 3.91                | 1.15 |
| 4.7  | You should be engaged in group works.  | 3.91                    | 1.15 | 3.54                | 1.24 |
| 4.8  | You should be engaged in pair works.   | 3.79                    | 1.24 | 3.43                | 1.31 |
| 4.9  | You should be allowed to work independently.   | 3.60                    | 1.44 | 3.34                | 1.45 |
| 4.10 | Your teacher should help you to promote your critical language awareness (i.e. how English shapes your life and personality).      | 3.47                    | 1.31 | 4.03                | 1.23 |
| 4.11 | Your teacher should teach you about <i>cultural awareness</i> .  | 2.77                    | 1.04 | 2.65                | 1.11 |

**Questionnaire and Interview:** The results of the variables in the Q. Survey presented in column -3 of Table-4.27 in this section have 2 (4.4, 4.5) high mean scores (4.31 and 4.09), and 5(4.6, 4.7, 4.8, 4.9 and 4.10) considerably high mean scores (3.97, 3.91, 3.79, 3.60 and 3.47) and 1 var. (4.11) has considerably low mean score (2.77). In

Interview, results of the variables presented in column- 5 of the table show 2(4.4, 4.10) high mean scores (4.24, 4.03) and 5(4.5, 4.7, 4.8, 4.9 and 4.10) considerably high mean scores (3.97, 3.40) and 1 var.(4.11) has considerably low mean score (2.65). These suggest that students' beliefs regarding teaching-learning is very much progressive.

### 5.2.2.3.3 A Comparison of Cluster Means of Students Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-D (Expectations of Students Regarding Learning and Teaching English).

A Comparison of Cluster Means of Students Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-D (Expectations of Students Regarding Learning and Teaching English) is presented in the table-5.28:

**Table 5.28: Section-D**

| Questionnaire |       |       |         |         | Interview |      |       |            |         |
|---------------|-------|-------|---------|---------|-----------|------|-------|------------|---------|
| Trad          | Prog  | Diff. | t-value | p-value | Trad      | Prog | Diff. | t-value    | p-value |
| 3.44          | 3.739 | 0.299 | -1.767  | 0.121   | 3.62      | 3.62 | 0.00  | -0.1.2E-15 | 1.00    |

p-value\* $<0.05$

*Note: In the Questionnaire df=7; In the Interview df=3*

The Table 5.28 shows the cluster-wise result of students' expectations of learning English and manifests their psychological disposition of them regarding teaching-learning practices in Bangladesh. In the Survey, Mean Scores of both Clusters are high, though the Progressive Mean score is significantly higher 0.299 (Diff.= 0.299,  $t = -1.767, p\text{-value} > 0.05$  ;  $df=7$ ) than the Mean score of the Traditional Cluster. So the difference is not significant.

In the Interview, Mean Scores of both Clusters are equal and so the mean difference is zero (Diff.= 0.00,  $t = -0.387, p\text{-value} > 0.05$  ;  $df=3$ ).So, Here, the difference is not significant.



The results of the Questionnaire Survey, Interview and the comparison of the traditional and progressive cluster means indicate that students' expectations regarding English teaching-learning culture in Bangladesh is in a state of a combination of both the traditional and progressive modes of teaching.

#### 5.2.2.4 Means, and SDs of Section-E (Students' Learning Style Preferences)

##### 5.2.2.4.1 Means and SDS of the Traditional variables of Section-E (Students' Learning Style Preferences) of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview

Means and SDs of the Traditional variables of Section-E (Students' Learning Style Preferences) of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-5.29:

**Table 5.29: Section E (Traditional)**

|      | Statements   | Students' Questionnaire |      | Students' Interview |      |
|------|--|-------------------------|------|---------------------|------|
|      |  | Mean                    | SD   | Mean                | SD   |
|      | You prefer to learn:   |                         |      |                     |      |
| 5.1  | from lectures of your teachers.  | 4.10                    | 0.80 | 4.13                | 0.91 |
| 5.3  | by following teachers' points written on board.                                  | 4.25                    | 0.85 | 4.34                | 0.74 |
| 5.5  | things by heart (i.e. by memorizing things).                                     | 2.94                    | 1.37 | 2.96                | 1.35 |
|      | You prefer your teacher to:  |                         |      |                     |      |
| 5.12 | teach by using examples from day to day life events rather than using textbooks. | 4.06                    | 0.83 | 4.10                | 0.83 |
|      | You learn better:  |                         |      |                     |      |
| 5.13 | if the teacher tells you what to do and guide you in the class.                  | 4.47                    | 0.70 | 4.42                | 0.75 |
| 5.15 | when teacher uses white-board in the class.                                      | 4.05                    | 0.83 | 4.07                | 0.94 |
| 5.16 | if you make drawings as they study.  | 4.16                    | 0.79 | 4.20                | 0.64 |
| 5.18 | when your peers tells you how to do something in the class.                      | 4.19                    | 0.93 | 4.02                | 1.01 |

The results of the variables in the Q. Survey presented in column -3 of Table-5.29 in this section show that 7 var. (5.1, 5.3, 5.12, 5.13, 5.15, 5.16 and 5.18) have high mean scores (4.10, 4.25, 4.06, 4.47, 4.05, 4.16 and 4.19 respectively), and 1 var.(5.5) has considerably low mean score (2.94). In Interview, results of the variables presented in column- 5 of the table show that 7 var. (5.1, 5.3, 5.12, 5.13, 5.15, 5.15, 5.16 and

5.18) have high mean scores (4.13, 4.34, 4.10, 4.42, 4.07, 4.20 and 4.02 respectively) and 1 var. (5.5) has considerably low mean score (2.96). These suggest that students' learning style preferences are very much traditional.

#### 5.2.2.4.2 Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-E (Students' Learning Style Preferences) of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview

Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-E (Students' Learning Style Preferences) of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-5.30:

**Table 5.30: Section E (Progressive)**

|      | Statements  | Students' Questionnaire |      | Students' Interview |      |
|------|---|-------------------------|------|---------------------|------|
|      |   | Mean                    | SD   | Mean                | SD   |
|      | You prefer to learn:  |                         |      |                     |      |
| 5.2  | through discussions with your class-mates.                    | 4.24                    | 0.74 | 4.15                | 0.82 |
| 5.4  | by practicing different types of activities in the class.     | 4.26                    | 0.89 | 4.20                | 0.89 |
| 5.6  | by expressing your ideas or opinion about a topic.            | 4.27                    | 0.73 | 4.20                | 0.74 |
| 5.7  | by asking your teachers questions.                            | 4.28                    | 0.82 | 4.26                | 0.85 |
| 5.8  | choosing for yourself what you want to learn.                 | 3.87                    | 1.09 | 3.60                | 1.18 |
| 5.9  | by following your own plan for achieving your goal.           | 4.32                    | 0.91 | 4.26                | 0.97 |
|      | You prefer your teacher to:                                   |                         |      |                     |      |
| 5.10 | do everything for you in the class.                           | 2.68                    | 1.30 | 2.97                | 1.37 |
| 5.11 | select content, material and method for their learning.       | 3.13                    | 1.29 | 3.34                | 1.27 |
|      | You learn better  |                         |      |                     |      |
| 5.14 | when you listen to someone explaining something in the class. | 3.49                    | 1.24 | 3.45                | 1.29 |
| 5.17 | if you take notes while your teacher lectures.                | 4.20                    | 0.86 | 4.02                | 1.12 |
| 5.18 | when your peer tells you how to do something in the class.    | 4.19                    | 0.93 | 4.02                | 1.01 |
| 5.19 | when you learn individually.                                  | 3.96                    | 1.03 | 3.90                | 0.92 |
| 5.20 | When you learn in pairs.                                      | 4.06                    | 0.86 | 4.11                | 0.79 |
| 5.21 | When you learn in groups.                                     | 4.37                    | 0.73 | 4.20                | 0.91 |

The results of the variables in the Q. Survey presented in column -3 of Table-5.30 in this section show that 9 var.(5.2, 5.4, 5.6, 5.7, 5.9, 5.17, 5.18, 5.20 and 5.21) have high mean scores (4.24, 4.26, 4.27, 4.28, 4.32, 4.20, 4.19, 4.06 and 4.37

respectively), 4 var.(5.8, 5.11, 5.14 and 5.19) have considerably low mean scores (3.87, 3.13, 3.49 and 3.96 respectively) and 1 has (5.10) considerably low mean score (2.68). In Interview, results of the variables presented in column- 5 of the table show 9 var. (5.2, 5.4, 5.6, 5.7, 5.9, 5.17, 5.18, 5.20 and 5.21) high mean scores (4.13, 4.34, 4.10, 4.42, 4.07, 4.20 and 4.02 respectively), 4 have (5.8, 5.11, 5.14 and 5.19) considerably high mean scores (3.87, 3.13, 3.49 and 3.96 respectively) and 1 has (5.10) considerably low mean score (2.97). These show that students' learning style preferences are quite progressive.

#### 5.2.2.4.3 A Comparison of Cluster Means of Students Questionnaire Survey and Interview (Students' Learning Style Preferences)

A Comparison of Cluster Means of Students Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-E (Students' Learning Style Preferences) in the table-5.31:

**Table 5.31: Section-E**

| Questionnaire |       |       |         |         | Interview |       |       |         |         |
|---------------|-------|-------|---------|---------|-----------|-------|-------|---------|---------|
| Trad          | Prog  | Diff. | t-value | p-value | Trad      | Prog  | Diff. | t-value | p-value |
| 4.027         | 3.951 | 0.076 | 0.359   | 0.724   | 4.03      | 3.906 | 0.124 | 0.642   | 0.532   |

p-value\* $<0.05$

*Note: In the Questionnaire df=16; In the Interview df=13*

The Table 5.36 shows that the cluster-wise result of students' opinion about their learning style preferences. In the Survey, Mean Scores of both Clusters are high, though the Traditional Mean is higher 0.076 (Diff.= 0.076, t =0.359, p-value $>0.05$  ; df=13) than the Mean score of the Progressive Cluster. But the difference is not significant.

While in the Interview, Mean Scores of both Clusters are high, though the Traditional Mean score is higher 0.124 (Diff.= 0.124, t =-0.124, p-value $>0.05$  ; df=13) than the Mean score of the Progressive Cluster. Hence the difference is also not significant.

The results of the Questionnaire Survey, Interview and the comparison of the traditional and progressive cluster means indicate that students' learning style preferences in Bangladesh is in a state of an amalgam of both traditional and progressive modes of teaching.

### 5.2.2.5 Means and SDs of the variables of Section-F (Students' Learning Strategies and Language teaching)

#### 5.2.2.5.1 Means and SDs of the Traditional variables of Section-F of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview

Means and SDs of the Traditional variables of Section-F of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-5.32:

**Table 5.32: Section F (Traditional)**

|      | Statements   | Students' Questionnaire |      | Students' Interview |      |
|------|--|-------------------------|------|---------------------|------|
|      |  | Mean                    | SD   | Mean                | SD   |
|      | You:   |                         |      |                     |      |
| 6.1  | use your first language knowledge to learn English.                      | 3.85                    | 1.28 | 3.84                | 1.25 |
| 6.2  | compare the grammar rules of their mother language with that of English. | 3.66                    | 1.35 | 3.69                | 1.32 |
| 6.3  | use what you already know to learn something new.                        | 4.19                    | 1.02 | 3.99                | 1.07 |
| 6.7  | think about grammar rules when you write.                                | 4.03                    | 1.18 | 3.97                | 1.20 |
| 6.10 | use library to learn English.  | 3.52                    | 1.39 | 3.35                | 1.41 |
| 6.13 | use a dictionary to understand new words while reading.                  | 3.52                    | 1.28 | 3.51                | 1.17 |
| 6.16 | do not like to make mistakes when you speak/write.                       | 4.07                    | 1.19 | 4.11                | 1.03 |

(a) **Questionnaire and Interview:** The results of the variables in the Q. Survey presented in column -3 of Table-5.32 in this section show that 3 var.(6.3, 6.13 and 6.16) have high mean scores (4.19, 4.03 and 4.07 respectively), 4 var.(6.2, 6.3, 6.10 and 6.13) have considerably high mean scores (3.85, 3.66, 3.52, and 3.52 respectively). In Interview, results of the variables presented in column- 5 of the table show that 1 var. (6.16) has high mean score (4.11) and 6 var. (6.1,

6.2, 6.3, 6.7, 6.10 and 6.13) have considerably high mean scores (3.84, 3.69, 3.99, 3.97, 3.35 and 3.51 respectively). These indicate that students' learning strategies are very much traditional.

#### 5.2.2.5.2 Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-F of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview

Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-F of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-5.33:

**Table 5.33: Section F (Progressive)**

|      | Statements  | Students' Questionnaire |      | Students' Interview |      |
|------|---|-------------------------|------|---------------------|------|
|      |   | Mean                    | SD   | Mean                | SD   |
|      | You:  |                         |      |                     |      |
| 6.4  | focus on pictures, subtitles and keywords when you read.      | 3.99                    | 1.14 | 3.80                | 1.14 |
| 6.5  | think about techniques that help you to learn English better. | 3.83                    | 1.23 | 3.87                | 1.21 |
| 6.6  | use grammar rules consciously for developing your skills.     | 3.19                    | 1.36 | 3.13                | 1.46 |
| 6.8  | monitor and judge your own progress in language learning      | 3.83                    | 1.19 | 3.78                | 1.19 |
| 6.9  | can identify problems that delay your learning.               | 3.54                    | 1.24 | 3.55                | 1.26 |
| 6.11 | use internet to learn English.                                | 3.97                    | 1.25 | 4.00                | 1.14 |
| 6.12 | use other sources to learn English.                           | 3.94                    | 1.15 | 3.79                | 1.25 |
| 6.14 | try to guess the meaning of new words when they read.         | 3.61                    | 1.43 | 3.36                | 1.49 |
| 6.15 | look for conversation partners to improve speaking skills.    | 3.10                    | 1.37 | 2.87                | 1.38 |
| 6.17 | can not evaluate your own performances.                       | 3.85                    | 1.28 | 3.84                | 1.25 |
| 6.18 | look for opportunities for practice.                          | 3.66                    | 1.35 | 3.69                | 1.32 |

(b) **Questionnaire and Interview:** The results of the variables in the Q. Survey presented in column -3 of Table-5.33 in this section show that all the variables (var.6.4-6.18) show considerably high mean scores (3.99, 3.83, 3.19, 3.83, 3.54, 3.97, 3.94, 3.61, 3.10, 3.85 and 3.66 respectively). In Interview, results of the variables presented in column- 5 of the table show that 1 var. (6.11) has high mean score (4.00) and 9 var. (6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.8, 6.9, 6.12, 6.14, 6.17 and 6.18) have considerably high mean scores (3.80, 3.87, 3.13, 3.78, 3.55, 3.79, 3.36,

3.84 and 3.69 respectively) and only 1 var.(6.15) considerably low mean score (2.87). These suggest that students' learning strategies are also progressive to a certain degree.

### 5.2.2.5.3 A Comparison of Cluster Means of Students Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-F

A Comparison of Cluster Means of Students Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-F is presented in the table-4.34:

**Table 5.34: Section-F**

| Questionnaire |       |       |         |         | Interview |       |       |         |         |
|---------------|-------|-------|---------|---------|-----------|-------|-------|---------|---------|
| Trad          | Prog  | Diff. | t-value | p-value | Trad      | Prog  | Diff. | t-value | p-value |
| 3.834         | 3.683 | 0.151 | 1.097   | 0.290   | 3.78      | 3.607 | 0.172 | 1.164   | 0.263   |

p-value\* $<0.05$

*Note: In the Questionnaire df=14; In the Interview df=15*

The table 4.34 shows the cluster-wise result of students' opinion about the learning strategies they use to learn English. In the Survey, Mean Scores of both Clusters are high, though the Traditional Mean score is higher 0.151 (Diff.= 0.151,  $t=0.151, p\text{-value}>0.05$  ;  $df=14$ ) than the Mean score of the Progressive cluster. So the difference is not significant.

While in the Interview, Mean Scores of both clusters are high, though the Traditional Mean is higher 0.172 (Diff.= 0.172,  $t=-1.164, p\text{-value}>0.05$  ;  $df=1$ ) than the Mean of the Progressive cluster. Hence the difference is not significant too.

The results of the Questionnaire Survey, Interview and the comparison of the traditional and progressive cluster means indicate that students' learning strategies in Bangladesh are in a situation of an amalgam of both traditional and progressive modes of teaching.

### 5.2.2.6 Means and SDs of the variables of Section-G (Students' Learning Opportunities and Language learning)

#### 5.2.2.6.1 Means and SDs of the Traditional variables of Section-G of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview

Means and SDs of the Traditional variables of Section-G of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-4.35:

**Table 4.35: Section G (Traditional)**

|       | Statements                                    | Students' Questionnaire |      | Students' Interview |      |
|-------|---|-------------------------|------|---------------------|------|
|       |   | Mean                    | SD   | Mean                | SD   |
|       | You:  |                         |      |                     |      |
| 7.1.5 | are taught grammar in the class.              | 4.22                    | 0.89 | 4.19                | 0.74 |
| 7.1.7 | are asked questions while the lesson goes on. | 3.99                    | 0.98 | 3.99                | 1.11 |

- (a) **Questionnaire and Interview:** The results of the variables in the Q. Survey presented in column -3 of Table-5.35 in this section show that 1 var. (7.1.5) high mean score (4.22) and 1 var. (7.1.7) has considerably high mean score. In Interview, results of the variables presented in column- 5 of the table show 1 var.(7.1.5) has high mean score (4.19) and 1 var.(7.1.7) has considerably high mean score (3.99). These indicate that students' learning opportunities in Bangladesh are quite traditional.

#### 5.2.2.6.2 Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-G of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview

Means and SDs of the Progressive variables of Section-G of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-4.36:

**Table 5.35: Section G (Progressive)**

|        | Statements   | Students' Questionnaire |      | Students' Interview |      |
|--------|--|-------------------------|------|---------------------|------|
|        |  | Mean                    | SD   | Mean                | SD   |
| 7.1    | You:   |                         |      |                     |      |
| 7.1.1  | get enough opportunities to express your own ideas or opinions in the class. | 3.83                    | 1.01 | 3.87                | 0.84 |
| 7.1.2  | can share your ideas or opinions with your peers in the class.               | 4.00                    | 0.88 | 4.02                | 0.87 |
| 7.1.3  | can ask questions while the lesson goes on.                                  | 3.98                    | 0.91 | 4.07                | 0.81 |
| 7.1.4  | are engaged in problem-solving activities.                                   | 4.01                    | 0.94 | 4.01                | 0.90 |
| 7.1.6  | are given the responsibility of your own learning.                           | 3.78                    | 1.11 | 3.94                | 1.13 |
| 7.1.8  | you are made to watch TV programmes in English in the class.                 | 2.94                    | 1.52 | 3.13                | 1.53 |
| 7.1.9  | are taught words with meanings in different contexts.                        | 3.59                    | 1.21 | 3.48                | 1.22 |
| 7.1.10 | take part in different role-playing activities in the class.                 | 2.94                    | 1.31 | 2.88                | 1.37 |
| 7.1.11 | are provided a friendly and relaxed environment in your English class.       | 3.93                    | 1.08 | 3.74                | 1.38 |
| 7.2    | Your college arranges regular:   |                         |      |                     |      |
| 7.2.1  | English poetry recitation session.   | 1.64                    | 0.88 | 1.71                | 1.28 |
| 7.2.2  | English extempore speech competition.  | 1.68                    | 0.85 | 1.66                | 0.88 |
| 7.2.3  | English essay writing session.   | 1.61                    | 0.83 | 1.70                | 0.93 |

(b) **Questionnaire and Interview:** The results of the variables in the Q. Survey presented in column -3 of Table-5.36 in this section show that 2 var. (7.1.2, 7.1.4) have considerably high mean scores (4.00 and 4.01), 5 var. (7.1.1, 7.1.3, 7.1.6, 7.1.9 and 7.1.11) have considerably high mean scores (3.83, 3.98, 3.78, 3.59 and 3.93 respectively) and 2 var.(7.1.8 and 7.1.10) have considerably low mean scores. In Interview, results of the variables presented in column- 5 of the table show 3 var.(7.1.2, 7.1.3 and 7.1.4) have high mean scores (4.02, 4.07 and 4.01 respectively), 5 var. (6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.8, 6.9, 6.12, 6.14, 6.17 and 6.18) have considerably high mean scores (3.80, 3.87, 3.13, 3.78, 3.55, 3.79, 3.36, 3.84 and 3.69 respectively) and 1 var. (6.15) has considerably low mean score (2.87). These suggest that students' learning opportunities are progressive to a certain extent.



### 5.2.2.6.3 A Comparison of Cluster Means of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-G

A Comparison of Cluster Means of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-G is presented in the table-4.37

**Table 5.36: Section G**

| Questionnaire |       |       |         |         | Interview |       |       |         |         |
|---------------|-------|-------|---------|---------|-----------|-------|-------|---------|---------|
| Trad          | Prog  | Diff. | t-value | p-value | Trad      | Prog  | Diff. | t-value | p-value |
| 4.105         | 3.161 | 0.944 | 3.073*  | 0.0096  | 4.09      | 3.184 | 0.905 | 3.040   | 0.0102* |

p-value\* < 0.05

*Note: In the Questionnaire df=12; In the Interview df=12*

The table 4.42 shows that the cluster-wise result of students' opinion about their learning opportunities. In the Survey, Mean Scores of both clusters are high/considerably high. Here the Traditional Mean score is significantly higher 0.944 (Diff.= 0.944,  $t = 3.073^*$ ,  $p\text{-value} < 0.05$  ;  $df=12$ ) than the Mean score of the Progressive cluster. Here the difference is significant.

While in the Interview, Mean Scores of both Clusters are high/considerably high, though the Traditional Mean is higher 0.172 (Diff.= 0.172,  $t = -1.164$ ,  $p\text{-value} < 0.05$  ;  $df=12$ ) than the Mean score of the Progressive cluster. Hence the difference is significant too.

The results of the Questionnaire Survey, Interview and the comparison of the traditional and progressive cluster means suggest that students' English learning opportunities in Bangladesh are more traditional than the progressive.

### 5.3 Particularities of Teaching-Learning Situation

#### 5.3.1 Means and SDs of Section-G (Teaching-Learning Situation)

Means and SDs of the variables of Section-G (Teaching-Learning Situation) of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-4.38:

**Table 5.37: Section G**

|      | Statements   | Questionnaire Survey | Interview | Questionnaire Survey | Interview |
|------|--|----------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|
|      |  | Mean                 | SD        | Mean                 | SD        |
|      | You have:  |                      |           |                      |           |
| 8.1  | a good stock of text books or course books in your college library.  | 1.73                 | 0.63      | 1.79                 | 0.54      |
| 8.2  | a language laboratory in your college.                               | 1.22                 | 0.57      | 1.16                 | 0.50      |
| 8.3  | a language club in your college.                                     | 2.41                 | 0.87      | 2.74                 | 0.56      |
| 8.4  | A debating club in your college.                                     | 2.12                 | 0.90      | 2.42                 | 0.84      |
| 8.5  | audio facilities in your institution.                                | 1.80                 | 0.87      | 2.16                 | 0.96      |
| 8.6  | video facilities in your college.                                    | 1.85                 | 0.73      | 2.11                 | 0.88      |
| 8.7  | computer facility in your college.                                   | 1.93                 | 0.73      | 1.95                 | 0.71      |
| 8.8  | well furnished, spacious and clean classrooms.                       | 1.32                 | 0.63      | 1.75                 | 0.86      |
| 8.9  | Regular students in class 11/12 below 40.                            | 1.73                 | 0.63      | 1.79                 | 0.54      |
| 8.10 | benches/chairs or desks in your college fixed to the ground or floor | 1.22                 | 0.57      | 1.16                 | 0.50      |

- (a) **Questionnaire Survey and Interview:** The results of the variables in the Q. Survey presented in column -3 of table-4.38 in this section show that none of them have any high mean score (above 4.00) or considerable high mean score (between 3.00 and 4.00). The mean scores of var. (8.3, 8.4) are (2.41 and 2.12) respectively which suggest that according to teachers, there is almost no language club and debating club in most of the colleges of Bangladesh. Again the rest of the variables of this section have mean scores below 2.00 which present teachers' view regarding the overall English classroom teaching-learning situation of Bangladesh. To sum them up, the English language

classrooms of Bangladesh have almost no video, audio or computer facilities. Additionally, the classroom size is usually quite big here. In most of the cases the classrooms are not well furnished, well spacious or clean. So, English language teaching-learning situation of Bangladesh is not up to the mark. Almost all the variables of this section show very close mean scores in the Questionnaire Survey and Interview. Therefore the results of Survey and Interview bear similar results with respect to teachers' view about English teaching-learning situation in Bangladesh.

### 5.3.2 Means and SDs of Section-H (Teaching-Learning Situation)

Means and SDs of the variables of Section-H (Teaching-Learning Situation) of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview are presented in the table-4.39:

**Table-4.39: Section H**

|      | Statements  | Questionnaire Survey |      | Interview |      |
|------|---|----------------------|------|-----------|------|
|      |   | Mean                 | SD   | Mean      | SD   |
|      | You have::  |                      |      |           |      |
| 8.1  | a good stock of text books or course books in your college library.           | 2.43                 | 0.81 | 2.52      | 0.74 |
| 8.2  | a language laboratory in your college.  | 1.60                 | 0.86 | 1.51      | 0.80 |
| 8.3  | a language club in your college.  | 1.57                 | 0.87 | 1.43      | 0.77 |
| 8.4  | a debating club in your college.  | 1.86                 | 0.96 | 1.72      | 0.94 |
| 8.5  | audio facilities in your institution.   | 1.84                 | 0.89 | 1.98      | 0.92 |
| 8.6  | video facilities in your college.   | 1.96                 | 0.93 | 2.09      | 0.95 |
| 8.7  | have computer facility in your college.                                       | 2.30                 | 0.87 | 2.29      | 0.86 |
| 8.8  | well furnished, spacious and clean classrooms.                                | 2.54                 | 0.73 | 2.57      | 0.71 |
| 8.9  | The number of regular students in class 11/12                                 | 2.75                 | 0.56 | 2.85      | 0.47 |
| 8.10 | The benches/chairs or desks in your college are fixed to the ground or floor. | 1.80                 | 0.40 | 1.91      | 0.29 |

- (a) **Questionnaire Survey and Interview:** The results of the variables in the Q. Survey presented in column -3 of table-4.39 in this section show that none of them in this section have any high mean score (above 4.00) or considerable high mean score (between 3.00 and 4.00). The considerable low mean scores of var.

(8.2 and 8.3) are (1.60 and 1.57) respectively which suggest that according to the students, there is almost no language laboratory and language club in most of the colleges of Bangladesh. Var. 8.1, 8.7 and 8.8 have considerable low mean scores (below 2.00-3.00) which suggest that colleges of Bangladesh mostly lack in a good stock of text-books in library, good computer facilities and well furnished, well spacious or clean classrooms. To sum them up, the English language classrooms of Bangladesh have almost no video, audio or computer facilities and also, the classroom size is mostly big here. In most of the cases the classrooms are not well furnished, well spacious or clean. Almost all the variables of this section show very close mean scores in the Q. Survey and Interview. Therefore the results of both show similar views OF students regarding English teaching-learning situation in Bangladesh.

#### **5.4 Particularities about Materials: A Glimpse of the English Textbooks of H.S.C Level in Bangladesh**

Course books and other teaching-learning materials play an important role in English teaching and learning. Textbooks can be centrally produced, that means they can be and mostly are produced by the centre or BANA countries (i.e. Britain, Australia and North America) and exported to the rest of the world as a global commodity for global consumption. They can also be developed locally by local experts accommodating local history and tradition, culture and values. Text or Course books like *Headway* and *Cambridge Course Books* are produced for global consumption. Many countries of the world now produce materials locally in a culture and context sensitive way. It is argued that:<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Huda, "Culture Sensitive Materials Design for English Language Teaching in Bangladesh". Unpublished PhD dissertation, Institute of Bangladesh Studies, University of Rajshahi, Bangladesh, 2003,134 and Leslie E., Sheldon, "Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials". <https://academic.oup.com/>. Accessed May, 2019

1. Materials should integrate the four language skills of English-listening, speaking, reading and writing- in each lesson of the text.
2. Selection of the content should be based on a multi-strand syllabus with major emphasis on the structural, functional, cultural and communicative aspects of language.
3. The language items should be sequenced systematically following some principles, sequences, complexity and frequencies of use.
4. A number of reasonable words, notions, functions, structures and sub-skills should be included and contextualized for facilitating meaningful negotiated interaction in class.
5. Context and culture sensitive materials should be selected or developed to ensure social relevance.
6. The materials should help promote learners' "Critical Language Awareness."
7. The material should be helpful for raising learners' "Cultural consciousness" and shaping individual identities.
8. The material should provide enough opportunities for practice through different types of tasks and activities.

#### **5.4.1 H.S.C English Textbook**

The H.S.C English Textbook, *The English for Today* is a locally produced book for class 11 and 12. It is written by Quazi Mustain Billah, Faqrul Alam, M. Shahidullah, Shamsad Mortaza, Zulfqar Haider and Goutam Roy and edited by Syed Munzoorul Islam and Shaheen M. Kabir. It is coordinated by Md. Abdur Rahim and Muhammad Humayun Kabir. It was published from Dhaka in 2015 by NCTB (National Curriculum and Textbook Board) of Bangladesh and prescribed by the Govt. as the textbook for class 11 and 12 in the country.

In the preface to the book it has been claimed that the book is based on the principle of learning a language by practicing the four skills of English- listening, speaking, reading and writing-which is central to the communicative approach to language teaching.

The book is comprised of 15 units and 493 lessons. Each lesson contains a range of tasks and activities that enable students to practice the four skills of English, sometimes individually and sometimes in pairs or groups. It is observed that the four skills have been integrated almost in all the units of the book. For example, Unit-4 has 5 lessons which has a total of 41 tasks and activities. Out of 41 tasks and activities, 9 are on speaking and listening skills, 25 are on writing and 7 are on reading. This clearly demonstrates that there is an integration of skills with more weight on writing as students are very weak in writing in the country.

The contents' page provides a glimpse into the book. It shows that the book is based on a multistrand syllabus since it includes both forms and functions of language. Various items of language functions like describing, matching, comparing, guessing, asking, talking, discussing, expressing views and so on and the items of grammar (i.e. parts of speech, Direct or Indirect Speech etc.) have been used in different lessons of the book. The second point of the check-list (point-2) regarding the selection of items has been closely followed.

The book has partially included new language items one by one in a planned way. In organizing the 493 items in 57 lessons of 15 units, the book has not followed any principle of sequencing, grading, progression and frequency of language use. Although each of the lessons of the Units starts with some warm up activity and

reading texts, the rest of the activities and tasks for practicing other skills of English were put randomly. So it can be said that the book is not fully congruent with the check-list (point-3) regarding the organization of items.

Most of the topics and themes of the book are educative and didactic. A good many of them are culture-sensitive. So those content of the book makes sure the social relevance. For example, “The Unforgettable History” of Lesson-2 of Unit-1 is on the legendary speech 7<sup>th</sup> March, 1971 of Bangabondhu’s historic speech to the Bangalee Nation. The speech greatly incited the subjugated people of Bangladesh to raise their voice against the oppression of the Pakistan Government which ultimately paved the way for the Liberation War of Bangladesh in 1971. The topic “Traffic Capital of the World” in Lesson-2 of unit-2 is relevant to Bangladeshi culture since it presents the serious traffic problems in Dhaka. The topic of Lesson-1 of Unit-3 is titled “Food Adulteration Reaches New Height” talks about how people of Bangladesh are suffering from fatal diseases for consuming food and vegetables contaminated with formalin. “The Story of Shipi” in L-4 of U-5 of the book presents a very culture-sensitive issue of our country presents another serious issue of our country, child marriage and early pregnancy. L-1 of U-6 presents Tagore’s thinking about education of the reputed poet Rabindranath Tagore. The title of the lesson is “An Eastern University” which relates to our country and it has social relevance. L-1 of U-8 entitled as “Water, Water Everywhere...” which presents the current dismal picture of the river Buriganga in Bangladesh which once had a glorious past. L-2 of U-8 upholds the details of a famous inland of Bangladesh called Hakaluki Haor which is located in the districts of Maulivibazar and Sylhet of Bangaldesh. Again, the topics of L-4 and L-5 of this unit are also very much related to our context. L-4 has the title “Threats to Tigers of

Mangrove Forest” and L-5 “Kuakata: Daughter of the Sea”. While the former presents the details of the habitat of Royal Bengal Tigers, *Sundarbans* which is under threat due to manmade disasters and climate change, the latter presents a description of the unique sea beach which located in southmost tip of the country. These themes are relevant to Bangladesh. The themes are related to local problems and issues of Bangladesh that will create an awareness of indigenous life and culture.

Lesson-1 of U-9 is titled “Bengali Face” which presents the translation of Jibananondo Das’s “Banglar Mukh ami dekhiachchi” by Fakrul Alam. The poem portrays the spectacular and perennial beauty of the rural Bangladesh. L-3 of U-9 presents “The Legend of Gazi” which is about a Muslim saint who worked for the spread Islam in the parts of Bengal near *Sundarbans*. The story of Gazi Pir has been part of the local folk literature of Bangladesh. Unit-11 has four lessons and all of them present issues related to *diaspora* in connection with the immigrant people of Bangladesh. L-2 has the title “Bangla Town in East London” which talks about the struggle and success of the people of this country living abroad to achieve the official designation for the area as “Banglatown”. L-3 of U-11 presents the stories of struggle of Bangladeshi immigrants who live in Italy in relation to diaspora. The last lesson (1-4) of this unit shows the picture of Bangladeshi immigrants living in the UK in connection to diaspora.

L-2 of U-14 is on “Folk Music” which shows the salient features and various kinds of folk-songs in Bangladesh. These are rich as they manifest the culture, the festivals, views on life, nature, river and rural life and mysticism. L-3 has the title “Crafts in Our Time” which shows the age-old history and heritage of handicrafts in Bangladesh which is now on the verge of extinction. *Nakshikatha* and *Craft dolls* are some of the examples of those crafts. U-15 has four lessons. Among them the one titled



“Travelling to a Village of Bangladesh” has social relevance. It presents the personal experience of a foreigner lady who visits a remote village of Bangladesh. It portrays the place and people of rural Bangladesh through her anecdote and so bears social relevance to the country. These topics and titles show that they relate to local issues and problems, they relate life, culture, history and heritage of this country. They are not about English life and culture as English teaching materials used to be in the past.

Almost all the units and lessons of the book contain elements that might be helpful for raising learners’ “Cultural Consciousness”. For example, L-5 of U-5 presents how children of different cultures across the globe have tried to change the world with their visions, courage and hard work. It can help students of Bangladesh to be aware of the cultures of other people and learning English in relation to them. Again L-4 of U-15 portrays “The Wonders of Vilayet” which is about the amazing picture of the parks, gardens and houses in London including the Queens Palace. The author also makes references to houses and housings materials used in Bengal at that time. To it provides a parallel picture of cross-cultural and inter-cultural elements of two countries.

The book contains some elements that there are some elements that can promote learners’ “Critical Language Awareness”. For instance, in L-3 of U-6, the topic of the lesson is “21<sup>ST</sup> Century Higher Education” which motivate learners to think critically in its warm up activity. Again thinking critically has been encouraged in the book by using some literary contents randomly all though the text. For example, L-4 of U-12 is about the short story “The Old Man at the Bridge” written by Ernest Hemingway. The item.6 of this lesson asks students to critically examine the theme of the text.

The organization of the tasks and activities in the 493 lessons of 15 Units of the book show that it gives learners ample scopes to practice the different skills of English. A close analysis of the lessons reveals that though reading, writing and speaking have been given much emphasis to practice, listening is neglected. There are only a few tasks that are set in the book to practice listening skills. However, the material shows a paradigm shift from a focus on Anglo-American culture of the former acculturation model to a culture-specific and context-sensitive model of local texts and topic to shape individual values and identities.

## **5.5 Particularities about Testing and Evaluation of English Teaching-Learning System at H.S C Level**

### **5.5.1 The Frequency Count and Percentage of the Variables of Section-I for Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview (Testing and Evaluation of English Teaching-Learning System at H.S C Level)**

The particularities of testing and evaluation is discussed with reference to H.S.C English tests in Bangladesh. The Frequency Count and Percentage of the Variables of Section-I for Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview (The Testing and Evaluation) is presented in table-4.45 were aimed at presenting a picture of the present Testing and Evaluation System in Bangladesh:

Table 5.38: Section I

| Q.N  | Statements  | Questionnaire Survey |          | Interview |          |
|------|---|----------------------|----------|-----------|----------|
|      |   | Yes (%)              | No (%)   | Yes (%)   | No (%)   |
| 9.1  | The test paper contains varieties of questions in their tests.                                  | 40(97.6)             | 1(2.4)   | 19(100)   | 0(0.0)   |
| 9.2  | The contents questions are selected from textbooks.   | 8(19.5)              | 33(80.5) | 6(31.6)   | 13(68.4) |
| 9.3  | The component of tests covers all the sub-skills of reading.                                    | 10(24.4)             | 31(75.6) | 5(26.3)   | 14(73.7) |
| 9.4  | Students' writing skills are tested.  | 40(97.6)             | 1(2.4)   | 18(94.7)  | 1(5.3)   |
| 9.5  | Listening skills of the students are tested.  | 0(0.0)               | 41(100)  | 0(0.0)    | 19(100)  |
| 9.6  | Speaking skills of the students are tested.   | 0(0.0)               | 41(100)  | 0(0.0)    | 19(100)  |
| 9.7  | Separate questions are set for different skills (i.e listening, speaking, reading and writing). | 0(0.0)               | 41(100)  | 0(0.0)    | 19(100)  |
| 9.8  | Is there a gap between items you teach in the class and items that are set in the examinations? | 24(58.5)             | 17(41.5) | 12(63.2)  | 7(36.8)  |
| 9.9  | Tests cover the different areas of language.  | 16(39.0)             | 25(61.0) | 9(47.4)   | 10(52.6) |
| 9.10 | The questions are subjective.   | 41(100)              | 0(0.0)   | 19(100)   | 0(0.0)   |
| 9.11 | The questions are objective.  | 6(14.6)              | 35(85.4) | 3(15.8)   | 16(84.2) |
| 9.12 | The questions are unambiguous and easy to understand.   | 37(90.2)             | 4(9.8)   | 16(84.2)  | 3(15.8)  |
| 9.13 | Testing and evaluation system is reliable and satisfactory.                                     | 3(7.3)               | 38(92.7) | 4(21.1)   | 15(78.9) |
| 9.14 | You take face to face interview of students for speaking test.                                  | 2(4.9)               | 39(95.1) | 1(5.3)    | 18(94.7) |
| 9.15 | There is a clear instruction for the questions to be answered.                                  | 37(90.2)             | 4(9.8)   | 16(84.2)  | 3(15.8)  |
| 9.16 | You make your students listen to native speakers speech in their listening test.                | 3(7.3)               | 38(92.7) | 2(10.5)   | 17(89.5) |
| 9.17 | Your students listen to audio/CD player records in the listening test.                          | 15(36.6)             | 26(63.4) | 7(36.8)   | 12(63.2) |
| 9.18 | You provide your students test instructions properly.   | 33(80.5)             | 8(19.5)  | 17(89.5)  | 2(10.5)  |
| 9.19 | You get proper test format instruction from NCTB.   | 25(61.0)             | 16(39.0) | 9(47.4)   | 10(52.6) |
| 9.20 | Score of the same examinee will be different if marked by different examiners.                  | 38(92.7)             | 3(7.3)   | 17(89.5)  | 2(10.5)  |
| 9.21 | Score of the same examinee will be the same whoever is the examiner.                            | 5(12.2)              | 36(87.8) | 1(5.3)    | 18(94.7) |
| 9.22 | Questions are not set from outside the syllabus.  | 19(46.3)             | 22(53.7) | 7(36.8)   | 12(63.2) |
| 9.23 | Students are familiar with the test format and techniques.                                      | 40(97.6)             | 1(2.4)   | 17(89.5)  | 2(10.5)  |
| 9.24 | Tests contain knowledge of English language.  | 19(46.3)             | 22(53.7) | 9(47.4)   | 10(52.6) |
| 9.25 | Students are tested what they are supposed to be tested.  | 3(7.3)               | 38(92.7) | 2(10.5)   | 17(89.5) |

Table 4.45 above shows that as for the var.9.1 in the Questionnaire Survey, 97.6 % of the teachers told that the test paper contains varieties of questions in their tests. For var. 9.2 in Survey, 19.5 % of the teachers told that the content questions are selected from textbooks. 24.4 % of them expressed that the component of tests covers all the sub-skills of reading (var.9.3). Responses to var.9.4 in the Q. Survey show that 97.6% students said that students writing skills are tested. 0% of the teachers expressed their view that students' listening skills are tested (var.9.5). Again, var.9.6 in the

Survey shows that 0% of the teachers told that students speaking skills are tested. Var. 9.7 in the Q. Survey shows that 0% of them said that separate questions are set for testing different skills of English. For 9.8 in the Q. Survey. 58.5 % of them said that there is a gap between items they teach in the class and items that are set in the examination. Var.9.9 in the Q. Survey manifests that 39 % of the teachers said that tests covers all the areas of language. For var.9.10 of Q. Survey, 100% of them said that the tests are subjective and for var. of 9.11 Q. Survey, 14.6 % of them told that the test is objective. 90.2 % teachers expressed the view that the questions in the test are unambiguous and easy to understand (var.9.12 in the Q. Survey). Only 7.3 % teachers hold the view that the testing and evaluation system is reliable and satisfactory. Var.9.14 in the Q. Survey shows that only 4.9 % teachers take face to face interview of students for speaking test. Var.9.15 in the Survey shows that 90.2% of them get clear instruction for the questions to be answered. Only 7.3 % teachers hold the view that they make students listen to native speaker's speech in their listening test (var.9.16 in the Survey) and 36.6 % told that their students listen to audio/CD player records in the listening test (var.9.17 in the Survey). Var.9.19 in the Survey shows that 61 % teachers said that they get proper test instruction from NCTB. 92.7 % of them told that the scores of the same examinee will be different whoever is the examiner (var.9.20 in the Survey) while only 12.2 % of them hold that scores of the same examine will be the same whoever is the examiner (var.9.21 in the Survey).Var.9.22 in the survey shows that 46.3% teachers said that questions are not set from outside syllabus. 97.6 % of them said that students are familiar with the test format and test techniques (var.9.23 in the Q. Survey). 46.3 % of them said that tests contains knowledge of English Language (var.9.24 in the Survey). Only 7.3 % teachers hold that students are tested what they are supposed to be tested (var.9.25 in the Q. Survey).

### 5.5.2 The Frequency Count and Percentage of the Variables of Section-I of Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview of Section-I (Testing and Evaluation of English Teaching-Learning System at H.S C Level)

The Frequency Count and Percentage of the Variables of Section-I for Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview (The Testing and Evaluation) is presented in table-4.46 were aimed at presenting a picture of the present Testing and Evaluation System in Bangladesh:

**Table 5.39: Section-I**

| Q.N   | Statements  | Questionnaire Survey |             | Interview |           |
|-------|---|----------------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|
|       |   | Yes (%)              | No (%)      | Yes (%)   | No (%)    |
| Q9.1  | The test paper contains varieties of questions in their tests.                                  | 253(89.89)           | 34(10.11)   | 80(89.89) | 9(10.11)  |
| Q9.2  | The contents questions are selected from textbooks.   | 134(46.69)           | 153(53.31)  | 52(58.43) | 37(41.57) |
| Q9.3  | The component of tests covers all the sub-skills of reading.                                    | 171(59.58)           | 116(40.42)  | 50(56.18) | 39(43.82) |
| Q9.4  | Students' writing skills are tested.  | 245(85.37)           | 42(14.63)   | 70(78.65) | 19(21.35) |
| Q9.5  | Listening skills of the students are tested.  | 60(20.91)            | 227(79.09)  | 17(19.1)  | 72(80.9)  |
| Q9.6  | Speaking skills of the students are tested.   | 57(19.51)            | 230(80.49)  | 17 (19.1) | 72(80.9)  |
| Q9.7  | Separate questions are set for different skills (i.e listening, speaking, reading and writing). | 56(57.84)            | 231(42.16)  | 19(21.35) | 70(78.65) |
| Q9.8  | Is there a gap between items you teach in the class and items that are set in the examinations? | 89(68.99)            | 198(31.01)  | 61(68.54) | 28(31.46) |
| Q9.9  | Tests cover the different areas of language.  | 166(57.84)           | 121(42.16)  | 41(46.07) | 48(53.93) |
| Q9.10 | The questions are subjective.   | 242(84.32)           | 45(15.68)   | 74(83.15) | 15(16.85) |
| Q9.11 | The questions are objective.  | 194(67.56)           | 93(32.4)    | 54(60.67) | 35(39.33) |
| Q9.12 | The questions are definite and easy to understand.  | 185(64.46)           | 102(35.54)  | 55(61.8)  | 34(38.2)  |
| Q9.13 | Testing and evaluation system is reliable and satisfactory.                                     | 132(45.99)           | 155(54.01)  | 46(51.69) | 43(48.31) |
| Q9.14 | You take face to face interview of students for speaking test.                                  | 53(18.47)            | 234 (81.53) | 21(23.6)  | 68(76.4)  |
| Q9.15 | There is a clear instruction for the questions to be answered.                                  | 224(78.05)           | 63(21.95)   | 70(78.65) | 19(21.35) |
| Q9.16 | You make your students listen to native speakers speech in their listening test.                | 43(14.98)            | 244(80.49)  | 11(12.36) | 78(87.64) |
| Q9.17 | Your students listen to audio/CD player records in the listening test.                          | 53(18.57)            | 234(81.53)  | 15(16.85) | 74(83.15) |
| Q9.18 | You provide your students test instructions properly.   | 231(80.49)           | 56(19.51)   | 76(85.39) | 13(14.61) |
| Q9.19 | You get proper test format instruction from NCTB.   | 228(79.44)           | 59(20.56)   | 64(71.91) | 25(28.09) |
| Q9.20 | Score of the same examinee will be different if marked by different examiners.                  | 192(66.9)            | 95(33.1)    | 42(47.19) | 47(52.81) |
| Q9.21 | Score of the same examinee will be the same whoever is the examiner.                            | 103(35.89)           | 185(64.11)  | 31(34.83) | 58(65.17) |
| Q9.22 | Questions are not set from outside the syllabus.  | 205(71.43)           | 82(28.57)   | 59(66.29) | 30(33.71) |
| Q9.23 | Students are familiar with the test format and techniques.                                      | 222(77.35)           | 65(22.65)   | 66(74.16) | 23(25.84) |
| Q9.24 | Tests contain knowledge of English language.  | 234(84.53)           | 53(18.47)   | 71(79.78) | 18(20.22) |
| Q9.25 | Students are tested what they are supposed to be tested.  | 72(25.09)            | 215(74.91)  | 15(16.85) | 74(83.15) |

Table 4.46 above shows that for var.9.1 in the Questionnaire Survey, 89.9 % students told that the test paper contains varieties of questions in their tests. For var. 9.2 in Survey, 46.7 % students told that the content questions are selected from textbooks. 59.6 % of them expressed that the component of tests covers all the sub-skills of reading (var.9.3). According to var.9.4 in the Q. Survey, 85.4% of them hold that that their writing skills are tested. 20.91 % students expressed that their listening skills are tested (var.9.5). Again, var.9.6 in the Survey shows that 19.51 % respondents told that their speaking skills are tested. Var. 9.7 in the Q. Survey shows that 57.84 % of them said that separate questions are set for testing different skills of English. For 9.8 in the Q. Survey. 68.99 % of them said that there is a gap between items they test and teach in the class. Var.9.9 in the Q. Survey manifests that 57.84 % of the students said that tests covers all the areas of language. For var.9.10 Q. Survey, 84.32% respondents said that the tests are subjective and for var.9.11 Q. Survey, 67.56 % of them told that the test is objective. 64.5% of them expressed the view that the questions in the test are definite and easy to understand (var.9.12 in the Q. Survey). Only 7.3 % students hold the view that the testing and evaluation system is reliable and satisfactory (var.9.13 in the Survey). Var.9.14 in the Survey shows that only 18.47 % students told that their teachers take face to face interview of them for speaking test. Var.9.15 in the Survey shows that 78.05% of the students told that there is a clear instruction for the questions to be answered. 14.98 % of the students told that they are made to listen to native speaker's speech in their listening test (var.9.16 in the Survey) and 18.6 % told that they listen to audio/CD player records in the listening test (var.9.17 in the Survey). Var.9.18 in the Survey shows that 80.49 % of the students are provided test instructions properly by their teachers. Var.9.19 in the Survey displays that 79.44 % of them told

that their teachers get proper test instruction from NCTB. 66.9% of them told that the scores of the same examinee will be different whoever is the examiner (var.9.20 in the Survey) while only 35.89 % of them hold that scores of the same examinee will be the same whoever is the examiner (var.9.21 in the Survey).Var.9.22 in the survey shows that 71.43 % respondents said that questions are not set from outside syllabus and 77.35% of them are familiar with the test format and test techniques (var.9.23 in the Q. Survey). 84.53% students told that tests contain knowledge of English Language (var.9.24 in the Survey). Only 25.09 % of them hold that they are tested what they are supposed to be tested (var.9.25 in the Q. Survey).

## **5.6 Classroom Observation and Follow-up Discussion Report with Teachers**

The data of the classroom observation was collected qualitatively and while observing the lessons, emphasis was given on what happens in the classroom. The researcher also focused on the strength and weaknesses of the teaching-learning practices of Bangladesh. The classroom observation reports has been organized and presented under the following category:

- xiii. Teachers' role
- xiv. Learners' role
- xv. Promoting *Critical Language Awareness*
- xvi. Raising *Cultural Consciousness*
- xvii. Using Culture Sensitive Materials and Textbooks
- xviii. Using Bangla in class while the lesson goes on
- xix. Integrating and Practicing Skills of English
- xx. Teaching Grammar
- xxi. Teaching-Learning Situation

- xxii. Modes of Error-Correction and Feedback
- xxiii. Teaching-Learning Environment
- xxiv. Teachers' Expertise

The teaching-learning situation of the colleges of the country has been examined under a few other headings such as (a) Class Size, (b) Seating Arrangements (c) Physical Condition of the Class and (d) teaching-learning aids.

#### **(i) Teachers' Role**

Most of the teachers were found lecturing most of the time in the class. They read out from the texts, paraphrased and explained the highlights of the texts. In some cases they were found to be formal and in some cases very friendly and cooperative. They were found to create learning opportunities by engaging them in different problem solving tasks. They used boards sometime and a few of them used projector in the class. In some of the cases they were found to ask their students questions related to their texts. In most of cases they were found to monitor the classroom activities. The classroom atmosphere was quite friendly in most of the classes. The follow up discussion with teachers reflected that they do not have any idea about teachers' role as "Reflective Practitioners" and "Transformative Intellectuals". They do not possess any knowledge about "Critical Language Awareness" and "Cultural Consciousness".

#### **(ii) Learners Role**

In most of the cases learners were found to be passive while lessons went on in classes. A great many of them kept quiet and talked only when the teachers asked them questions. In some of the classes, students were seen to share or discuss ideas with their peers. Students were also keen to participate in meaningful interaction with their peers as they were found



to work in pairs or groups. They were not found to work individually in most of the cases. They were found reluctant to ask their teachers questions whenever they need. They do not have any knowledge about “The Critical Language Awareness” and “Cultural Consciousness”. The follow up discussion with teachers also reflected this.

### **(iii) Promoting Critical Language Awareness**

Teachers and Students expressed that they have little knowledge about Critical Language Awareness since it is a new dimension in language pedagogy.

### **(iv) Raising Cultural Consciousness**

Although students are taught some culture sensitive stuff in class, they are not aware about raising *Cultural Consciousness*. It is also a new idea in language education and teachers are not conscious of teaching it in class.

### **(v) Use of Culture Sensitive Materials and Textbooks**

Teachers and students hold that the textbook that has been prescribed by NCTB for H.S.C level students is culture-sensitive up to a certain extent. Teachers were found to follow this book in the class. Teachers were only found occasionally to compare the local culture with that of the English people. They were sometimes seen to connect students’ real life experiences to classroom activities. The follow up discussion with teachers revealed that they do not use any other culture-sensitive materials beside the textbook to teach English in Class.

### **(vi) Using Bangla in classroom Interaction**

It was seen that in most of the classes teachers used Bangla in class which facilitated the

classroom activities. Teachers hold that students feel uncomfortable and anxious if they are discouraged to use their mother tongue in class.

#### **(vii) Integrating and Practicing Skills of English**

Teachers were found to practice reading and writing mostly in class. The other two skills were neglected. Different types of activities were assigned to students for practice them in class. The follow up discussion with teachers manifested that teachers give more priority to teaching reading and writing than listening and speaking.

#### **(viii) Grammar Teaching**

In most of the cases grammar was taught following the deductive method of language teaching though in some cases both inductive and deductive methods were used. The discussion with teachers showed that they teach students grammar in class quite seriously.

#### **(ix) Teaching-learning Situation**

The class size of the most of the cases were found quite big (more than 50 students in a class). The teacher usually sat in the front of the classroom and the students sat in rows. The lighting, noise level and the like were not much satisfactory in most of the cases. Most of the classes had white boards, though they did not have audio, video and computer facilities and they varied from one another according to their location of area (urban and rural). In most of the cases the classrooms are not spacious and clean. They also do not have sufficient light and air-passing provisions. Hence, the overall teaching-learning situation of the country is not up to the mark.

#### **(x) Interactional Pattern:**

In some of the classes there was much interaction while in some classes there were not much interaction. The students preferred to use mother tongue mostly for interaction in the class.

**(x) Mode of Error Correction and Feedback:**

There was a little feedback on students in most of the classes. They were not rebuked in most of the cases if they were found to make mistakes in most of the cases. In the follow up discussion with teachers, it was found that teachers try to give positive feedback on their performance in class.

**(xi) Teaching-learning Environment**

In some of the cases, the learning environment was found friendly while in some cases teachers were found rude. The classes were found to be active mostly.

**(xii) Teachers' Expertise**

In most of the cases teachers were found to be average in class management. In some classes, it was found that teachers are neither good at talk management or topic management. Even they are not eligible enough for *activating intuitive heuristics*. The follow up discussion with teachers reveal that they do not have any knowledge about it since it is a new concept in language pedagogy.

The classroom observation report as a whole presents the actual practice of classrooms in the context of Bangladesh, in some aspects the practice seems to be largely traditional yet they also show aspects of progressive modes of teaching. So there seems to be prevailing an amalgam of the traditional and progressive modes based teaching and learning system in the country.

**5.7 Conclusion**

The results of the Empirical study in this chapter present the “Particularities” or the *actualities* and *psychological disposition* of Bangladeshi English teaching-learning culture. There prevails an amalgam of the traditional and progressive modes of teaching

and learning here. It was found that in some cases the traditional modes of teaching is predominating and in other cases the progressive mode of teaching. Even in some cases the impact of the traditional and progressive modes of teaching seem to have equal weights. In the next chapter data from the empirical study have been analysed with reference to the five aspects of classroom teaching-learning culture to examine the match and mismatch of these existing realities with the key features of Postmethod pedagogy and thereby examine the potentials of and challenges for implementing those in Bangladesh.

## **Chapter Six**

# **The Potentials of and Challenges for the Parameters of "Practicality", "Possibility" and Macrostrategies of PMP in Bangladesh**

### **6.1 Introduction**

Chapter-II and Chapter-III thoroughly present the key features of the parameters of Postmethod pedagogy and its macrostrategic framework. The detailed results of the “Particularities” have been presented in Chapter-V. This chapter outlines the key features of the parameters of “Practicality” and “Possibility” and examines the potentials of and challenges for the implementation of these ideas in the “Particularities” of Bangladesh. In other words, the potentials and challenges for these parameters of PMP are examined here by relating each of the key features of them with reference to the actualities of English teaching-learning culture of Bangladesh.

### **6.2 The Key Features of the Parameter of "Practicality": Potentials and Challenges in Bangladesh**

As discussed in Chapter-II, the key features of the Parameter of “Practicality”, as Kuamravadivelu said, are as follows:

1. It broadly involves the relationship between theory and practice and narrowly to the teachers’ skill in monitoring his or her own teaching effectiveness.
2. It clarifies the relationship between theory and practice, between the theorist’s role and the teacher’s role in education. The former generates theory and the latter implements theory. The parameter of “Practicality” emphasizes on practice generated theory, and opposed to theory driven practice.

3. It argues for “Reflective Teaching” that requires teachers to understand and identify problems, analyze and judge information and also consider and evaluate alternatives, and finally pick the best available alternative that is subjected to further critical appraisal. So teachers assume the role of “Reflective Practitioners”.

### **6.2.1 The Key Features of “Reflective Teaching” in Bangladesh: Potentials and Challenges**

As discussed in Chapter-II and mentioned once gain in the key features of the parameter of “Practicality” above, one of the major concerns of it is “Reflective Teaching”. The key attributes of “Reflective Teaching” are as follows:

1. It is guided by the “Principled Pragmatism” that advocates for a teacher-generated theory of practice in any given context which focuses mostly on how classroom teaching-learning can be shaped and reshaped by teachers as a result of self-observation, self-analysis and self-evaluation and so to practice it in any given context.
2. Teachers’ development of context-sensitive knowledge is vital for practicing “Reflective Teaching” and “Principled Pragmatism”. It enables them to generate theory reflecting on their practice and vice-versa.

#### **6.2.1.1 Potentials of and Challenges for Bangladesh:**

In the empirical study, the following picture of the Actualities of Bangladeshi Teaching-learning Culture has been found.

### a) Teachers' role

The present picture of teachers' roles is presented in the following table:

**Table 6.1: Teachers' role**

| SL   | Statements  | Questionnaire Survey |                | Interview Mean |                |
|------|---|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|      |   | Teachers Mean        | Students' Mean | Teachers' Mean | Students' Mean |
| 2.1  | Teachers lecture most of the time in the class.   | 3.95                 | 4.15           | 3.95           | 4.01           |
| 2.3  | Teachers are very formal and always maintain a distance from students and so they are afraid of them.                   | 1.78                 | 1.26           | 1.74           | 2.49           |
| 2.4  | Teachers create language learning opportunities in the class for practicing different skills and sub-skills of English. | 4.05                 | 3.69           | 4.11           | 3.85           |
| 2.6  | Teachers help students in doing tasks or activities.  | 4.34                 | 4.21           | 4.21           | 4.08           |
| 2.7  | Teachers encourage learners' independent thinking/creativity.   | 4.27                 | 3.98           | 4.21           | 3.96           |
| 2.11 | Teachers use seminar presentations and participations in class by students.   | 2.12                 | 2.90           | 2.00           | 2.83           |
| 2.12 | Teachers use boards in the class.   | 3.27                 | 4.25           | 3.00           | 4.08           |
| 2.17 | Teachers explain everything for students.   | 3.41                 | 3.90           | 2.95           | 3.82           |
| 2.18 | Teachers involve students in finding out things by themselves first and afterwards they provide feedback and explain.   | 4.00                 | 3.78           | 4.00           | 3.71           |

This section examines how well the teachers are prepared for implementing “Reflective Teaching” in Bangladesh. First, the present actualities of Bangladesh are presented and then it is discussed whether it is possible to implement “Reflective Teaching” in Bangladesh. The actual teaching-learning “Particularities” presented above from Chapter-V show that Bangladeshi teachers are mostly not used to practicing reflective teaching (i.e. teaching based on the unification of reflection and action) in class which

is grounded on the “Principled Pragmatism”. The Mean scores of the variables of Teachers’ Questionnaire Survey (TQM) and Students’ Questionnaire Survey(SQM) about Teaches’ Role presented in table-1 seem to be mostly high and considerably high which indicate that teachers are in the habit of lecturing most of the time in the class, create enough opportunities to practice various skills and sub-skills and engage learners in different activities and tasks in class and encourages them to increase their creativity (See var.2.1, var.2.4 and var.2.7 in table-5.3.1 and 5.3.2). Var.2.1 and 2.11 show considerably low and low mean scores respectively which indicate that teachers are not formal and they do not use seminar presentations in classroom.

#### b) Learners’ Role

The present picture of learners’ roles is presented in the following table:

**Table 6.2: Learners’ Role**

| SL    | Statements   | Questionnaire Mean(TQM) |                | Interview Mean (TIM) |                |
|-------|--|-------------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|
|       |  | Teachers’ Mean          | Students’ Mean | Teachers’ Mean       | Students’ Mean |
|       | Students:  |                         |                |                      |                |
| 2.2   | remain silent in the class mostly and speak only when teachers ask them questions. | 3.88                    | 3.95           | 4.05                 | 3.82           |
| 2.8   | entirely depend on teachers for their learning.                                    | 2.78                    | 2.80           | 2.63                 | 2.73           |
| 2.15  | work in pairs in the class.  | 4.02                    | 3.43           | 3.74                 | 3.35           |
| 2.16  | work in group in the class.  | 3.85                    | 3.51           | 3.79                 | 3.37           |
| 7.1.1 | get enough opportunities to express their ideas or opinions in the class.          | 3.20                    | 3.83           | 2.53                 | 3.87           |
| 7.1.2 | can share their ideas or opinions with their peers in the class.                   | 3.45                    | 4.00           | 3.68                 | 4.02           |
| 7.1.3 | can ask questions while the lesson goes on.  | 3.59                    | 3.98           | 3.79                 | 4.07           |

The high and considerably high mean scores of most of the variables of Teachers’ Questionnaire Survey and Interview and Students’ Questionnaire Survey and Interview



as to learners' role in table-2 also show that learners are also used to learn English following the pre-set principles of top-down models of language teaching.

### c) Classroom Interaction

The present picture of classroom interaction practices in Bangladesh:

**Table 6.3: Classroom Interaction**

| SL     | Statements  | Questionnaire Mean(TQM) |                | Interview Mean (TIM) |                |
|--------|---|-------------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|
|        |   | Teachers' Mean          | Students' Mean | Teachers' Mean       | Students' Mean |
| 7.1.4  | Students are engaged in problem-solving activities                | 3.63                    | 4.01           | 4.05                 | 4.01           |
| 7.1.7  | Students are asked questions while the lesson goes on.            | 3.34                    | 3.99           | 3.21                 | 3.99           |
| 7.1.10 | Students take part in different role-playing activities in class. | 2.34                    | 3.94           | 2.53                 | 2.88           |

The considerably high mean scores of variables 7.1.4 and 7.1.7 of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview and Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview in table-3 show that the classroom interaction is based on the pre-set principles or theories of top-down models of language teaching. Var. 7.1.10 has considerably low mean scores for teachers in Q. Survey and Interview (2.34 and 2.88) which suggests that they do not like learners taking part in role-playing activities in class which is typical of traditional mode of teaching.

#### d) Mode of Error Correction and Feed back

The present picture of Mode of Error Correction and Feedback in Bangladesh:

**Table 6.4: Mode of Error Correction and Feed back**

| SL   | Statements                                      | Questionnaire Mean(TQM) |                | Interview Mean (TIM) |                |
|------|---|-------------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|
|      |   | Teachers' Mean          | Students' Mean | Teachers' Mean       | Students' Mean |
| 2.10 | Teachers rebuke students if they commit errors. | 1.88                    | 2.67           | 1.84                 | 2.47           |

The low and considerably low mean scores of variable 2.10 of Teachers' Questionnaire Survey and Interview and Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview regarding mode of error correction and feedback in table-4 also show that teachers do not rebuke students if they make errors which is typical of the progressive mode of teaching.

##### **6.2.1.1.1 The Potentials of “Reflective Teaching” in the Particularities of Bangladesh**

The results of the empirical data show that the teaching-learning practices in Bangladesh are not guided by the “Principled pragmatism” which puts emphasis on the reconciliation of theory and practice by teachers. At present, there is almost no use of “Reflective Practice” in teaching English in the country. Here teachers mostly follow the pre-set and pre-selected activities prescribed by the method-based pedagogies. So there is little or no potential at the moment.

##### **6.2.1.1.2 The Challenges for “Reflective Teaching” in the Particularities of Bangladesh**

Since “Reflective Teaching” requires the teachers to generate theory on the basis of their practice and reflection and also practicing what they theorize in class which they are not used to, implementing it in Bangladesh is a big challenge for Bangladesh at the moment. The empirical data show that prevalent teaching-learning system in the

country is based on methods or theory-driven theory. So, it will prove difficult for teachers to generate theory from practice, and also practice the “Principled pragmatism.” Teachers here are used to teach English in class following the preselected and presequenced principles of imposed method-based pedagogies for quite a long time and to select classroom methodologies and take pedagogical decisions on the basis of practice in class might not be feasible for them. Hence to go beyond the limitations of method and to implement “Reflective Teaching” will be a challenge.

## **6.2.2 Teachers’ Autonomy: Potentials of and Challenges for Bangladesh**

As discussed in Chapter-II, Teacher Autonomy lies at the heart of Postmethod Pedagogy and this is also very important for the parameter of “Practicality”. The key features of Teacher Autonomy are given below:


1. Teacher autonomy in Postmethod pedagogy refers to teachers having a reasonable degree of competence, confidence and authority to generate their own theories based on practical classroom experience and contextual pedagogical knowledge.
2. Teachers have to observe, evaluate and monitor their own teaching acts to act autonomously.
3. They will also require to develop a critical mind-set to act autonomously within the academic and administrative constraints imposed by institutions, curricula and textbooks.

### **6.2.2.1 The Potentials and Challenges of Postmethod pedagogy for Bangladesh**

The results of the empirical study regarding the actualities and psychological disposition of teachers and learners in terms of teachers’ role, learners’ role, classroom interaction and mode of error-correction and feedback (see in appendices) and the reports of classroom observation and the follow up discussion with teachers presented

in Chapter-IV show that the classroom culture of Bangladesh for teaching English is entirely method-based. There is hardly any autonomy of teachers and learners to select content and materials and decide about methodologies. In most of the cases, teachers were found to take the pedagogical decisions (i.e. See teachers' role, classroom interaction, mode of error-correction and feedback in Figure-1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 in appendices) following the prescribed principles of the top-down models. The data on teachers' background, their qualification and expertise show that they are not prepared to practice "Reflective Teaching in Classroom. The results of the empirical data (the Questionnaire Survey and Interview) regarding teachers' educational background and special training ELT indicates how far the teachers of the country are capable of devising a context-sensitive pedagogy based on their *situational understanding of teaching* in Bangladesh. It was found that 63.3 % of the teachers' have Master's degree, 33 % have Honours Degree and only 3.3 % have Others (PhD/MPhil) in English.


The figure-1 shows the percentage of the educational background of the college teachers of Bangladesh:



**Figure 6.1: Educational Background of College Teachers**

It was found from the results of the empirical study that only 21.7% teachers of our country have special training in English Language Teaching while 78.3% have no training at all.

The following figure-2 shows the percentage of college teachers of Bangladesh of having training in ELT:



**Figure 6.2: ELT training Background of College Teachers**

Again, the classroom observation report followed by the discussion with teachers showed that most of our teachers do not get any special training on English Language Teaching. It was also learned that teachers are not aware of the limitations of method-based pedagogies in most of the cases. They even possess less idea about teachers' autonomy which gives teachers authority for theory-generating practice in class.

#### **6.2.2.1.1 Potentials of Practicing “Teachers’ Autonomy” in the Particularities of Bangladesh**

The teachers seem to have little knowledge about this new concept of teachers' autonomy and developing “Context-sensitive knowledge” or “Personal theories.” They are used to teach English following the prescribed methodologies of language teaching

and so exercising teachers' autonomy has almost no scope here at present. So, teachers' autonomy is not feasible for the classrooms of Bangladesh.

#### **6.2.2.1.2 Challenges for Practicing “Teachers’ Autonomy” in the Particularities of Bangladesh**

The results of the empirical study and the classroom observation report show that teachers of Bangladesh are not aware of and prepared for the theory-generating practice and exercising autonomy in class. They are habituated to using the professional theories developed by experts in teaching English. But to act autonomously in class, the acting teachers need to become "Reflective Practitioners". Having power to exercise autonomy in class is an enormous task which is hardly practiced in Bangladesh and so this is a challenge.

Again, the reports of classroom observation and follow-up discussion with teachers show that teachers in Bangladesh are not conscious of the limitations of the method-based classroom practices and the necessity to go beyond these. This is only possible when they are ready to train themselves to assume the role of reflective practitioners by pondering on the particularities of their local classroom practice and culture which is absent right at this moment. Teachers in the country have to work within academic and administrative constraints imposed by the top-down models. The current teacher education programmes in the country do not emphasize it. Hence, this might be another big challenge for PMP in Bangladesh.

### **6.3 The Parameter of "Possibility": Potentials and Challenges**

The third parameter of Postmethod pedagogy is the parameter of “Possibility” which has already been discussed in detail in Chapter-II. In line with that, the key features of the third parameter are as follows:

- The parameter of "Possibility" highlights learners' shaping of individual identities rather than any hegemonic<sup>301</sup> identity by relating language teaching to the process of social transformation. It helps the learners to develop a critical mind-set towards learning a second or foreign language and in this regard teachers are supposed to play vital roles too.
- As the parameter of "Possibility" is derived mainly from the works of critical pedagogists of Freirain influence, they call for the recognition of both teachers' and learners' subject-positions in terms of their class, gender, ethnicity. It helps them to unveil the hidden motives of the top-down models of language pedagogies that impose academic, administrative and ideological constraints on them in different forms to work autonomously in the context they belong to.

### **6.3.1 The Teachers' as "Transformative Intellectuals": Potentials and Challenges**

The cluster-wise mean scores of Bangladeshi teachers' and learners' Questionnaire Survey and Interview regarding actual practices and their beliefs, expectations, learning style preferences and learning strategies (See appendix-5) in terms of teachers' role, learners' role, classroom Interaction and evaluation of materials show that the present teaching-learning culture is greatly influenced by the prevailing method-based education. There is almost little or no focus on shaping learners' identity. It is mainly concerned with teaching them linguistic knowledge and training in skills. But teachers' role as "Transformative Intellectuals" and the focus on culture-sensitive identity formation is not the focus of English teaching-learning in Bangladesh. The data in table-1 show that teachers in the country act as merely *Passive Technicians* who are in

---

<sup>301</sup> Jr, Valeriano Ramos, in *The Concepts of Ideology, Hegemony, and Organic Intellectuals in Gramsci's Marxism*, 76. According to Gramsci, Hegemony ("predominance by consent") is a condition in which a fundamental class exercises a political, intellectual, and moral role of leadership within a hegemonic system cemented by a common world-view or "organic ideology".

the habit of following the prescribed principles of top-down models of language pedagogy. Hence our teachers lacks in capacity to act as “Transformative Intellectuals”. The classroom observation report followed by the discussion with teachers also reveal that our teachers are not familiar with this new idea of PMP.

### **6.3.1.1 Potentials of Teachers as "Transformative Intellectuals" in the Particularities of Bangladesh**

Teachers in Bangladesh are not familiar with the concept of Teachers’ Role as “Transformative Intellectuals” since it is a new dimension added by “Critical Pedagogy”. The reports of the classroom observation and the follow up discussions with teaches show that our teachers have almost no knowledge about it. So the present reality is not conducive for the idea of the parameter of “Possibility” of PMP.

### **6.3.1.2 Challenges for Teachers as "Transformative Intellectuals" in the Particularities of Bangladesh**

As Teachers’ role as “Transformative Intellectuals” is a new concept in language education, to implement it Bangladesh will be very challenging.

### **6.3.2 Learners’ “Identity Formation”: Potentials and Challenges**

The Posmethod learners are also supposed to explore the hidden motives of the top-down methods and Methodists and raise their voice against it exercising critical thinking capacity only if they are capable to develop their thinking capacity critically. The beliefs, experience, expectations or the learning style preferences that learners bring in the class influence learners’ identity formation or transformation up to great extent and the Pedagogy of "Possibility" intends to make it possible (See table-6, table-7, table-8, table-9, table-10, table-11, table-12, table-13, table-14, table-15 and table-16 of this Chapter). As far as the implementation of the parameter of “Possibility” in



Bangladeshi context is concerned, how far our learners are ready to cope up with these innovative ideas raises a big issue. The study shows that the students hold that their role in class is passive while the teacher lectures [var.2.2 in table 1(a) : Section-B in Chapter-IV]. Though they hold that they don't believe in learning English well through memorization [var. 3.5 and var.3.18 in table 11(a): Section-C in Chapter-IV] or English is difficult to learn [var.3.18, Table 11(a): Section-C in Chapter-IV], still they seemed to have no idea about developing critical mindset which is a new idea in language pedagogy. Again, the classroom observation reports along with the follow-up discussion reports with teachers show that our learners' are not at all familiar with the idea of thinking critically which is crucial for identity formation and unveiling the hidden motives of the imposed pedagogy.

#### **a) Potentials of the Learners' Aptness for "Identity Formation" in the Particularities of Bangladesh**

The learners of Bangladesh are not capable to developing a critical mindset that is crucial for building up their individual identities. They are not even aware of this new idea of the parameter of "Possibility" of PMP and therefore, the classrooms in the country might not be conducive to implement it.

#### **b) Challenges for the Learners' Aptness for "Identity Formation" in the Particularities of Bangladesh**

The learners in the country at the moment are used to follow the pre-set principles of method-based pedagogies for a long time and so are not ready to adopt or adapt to the idea of developing critical awareness and shaping individual identities. In that case, the teachers can play a vital role to make students critically aware about the particularities of their

English teaching-learning culture of the country. But how far they will be able to do that in the given teaching-learning situation in the country raises a big concern since the teachers in the country mostly don't get adequate training on ELT. So arranging Teacher Education programmes to train up teachers for producing apt critical thinkers might be quite challenging in the present actualities of Bangladesh.

#### **6.4 The “Practicality” and “Possibility” of the Macrostrategies of PMP in the Particularities in Bangladesh: Potentials and Challenges**

As has been discussed earlier in Chapter-III, these macrostrategies are based on *local knowledge* and local need and therefore they can be put into practice in classroom through different microstrategies need to be devised by the practicing teachers of Bangladesh. But prior to doing that, it is a must to examine the potentials of and challenges for the macrostrategies in the present particularities of Bangladesh. The macrostrategies have been discussed in detail in Chapter-III. They are mentioned once again:

1. Maximizing learning opportunities
2. Minimizing perceptual mismatches
3. Facilitating negotiated interaction
4. Promoting learner autonomy
5. Fostering language awareness
6. Activating intuitive heuristics
7. Contextualizing linguistic input
8. Integrating language skill
9. Ensuring Social Relevance
10. Raising Cultural Awareness

### 6.4.1 Maximizing learning opportunities

As has been discussed in Chapter-III, the key features of maximizing learning opportunities are:

- Teachers and learners have to create and use maximum learning opportunities in the classroom.
- Though the maximizing of learning opportunities is supposed to be a joint venture, it is more the teachers' responsibility than the students.

To consider the challenges and potentials, each of the features are compared to the present actualities of Bangladesh which is presented in the following table:

**Table 6.5: Maximizing learning opportunities**

|       | Statements   | Questionnaire Survey |                | Interview      |                |
|-------|--|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|       |  | Teachers' Mean       | Students' Mean | Teachers' Mean | Students' Mean |
|       | Teachers:  |                      |                |                |                |
| 2.4   | create language learning opportunities in the class for practicing different skills and sub-skills of English. | 4.05                 | 3.69           | 4.11           | 3.85           |
| 2.15  | use pair work in class.  | 4.02                 | 3.43           | 3.74           | 3.35           |
| 2.16  | use group work in class.   | 3.85                 | 3.51           | 3.79           | 3.37           |
| 2.18. | involve students in finding out things by themselves first and afterwards they provide feedback and explain.   | 4.00                 | 3.78           | 4.00           | 3.71           |
|       | Students:  |                      |                |                |                |
| 7.1.1 | get enough opportunities to express their own ideas or opinions in the class.                                  | 3.20                 | 3.83           | 2.53           | 3.87           |
| 7.1.2 | can share their ideas or opinions with their peers in the class.   | 3.45                 | 4.00           | 3.68           | 4.02           |
| 7.1.3 | can ask questions while the lesson goes on.  | 3.59                 | 3.98           | 3.79           | 4.07           |
| 7.1.4 | are engaged in problem-solving activities  | 3.63                 | 4.01           | 4.05           | 4.01           |
| 7.1.5 | are taught grammar in the class.   | 3.83                 | 4.22           | 3.68           | 4.19           |
| 7.1.7 | are asked questions while the lesson goes on.  | 3.34                 | 3.99           | 3.21           | 3.99           |
| 7.1.8 | you are made to watch TV programmes in English in the class.   | 1.00                 | 2.94           | 1.00           | 3.13           |

|        |  |      |      |      |      |
|--------|--|------|------|------|------|
| 7.1.9  | are taught words with meanings in different contexts.                  | 4.22 | 3.59 | 4.16 | 3.48 |
| 7.1.10 | take part in different role-playing activities in the class.           | 2.34 | 2.94 | 2.53 | 2.88 |
| 7.1.11 | are provided a friendly and relaxed environment in your English class. | 4.29 | 3.93 | 4.42 | 3.74 |
| 7.2    | Your college arranges regular:   |      |      |      |      |
| 7.2.1  | English poetry recitation session.                                     | 1.10 | 1.64 | 1.00 | 1.71 |
| 7.2.2  | English extempore speech competition.                                  | 1.00 | 1.68 | 1.00 | 1.66 |
| 7.2.3  | English essay writing session.   | 1.15 | 1.61 | 1.18 | 1.70 |

The mean scores for teachers' and students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview in the table-5 shows the current state of teaching-learning opportunities in the classrooms of Bangladesh. The high mean scores and the considerable high mean scores of variables 2.4, 2.15, 2.16 and 2.18 show that teachers in Bangladesh create opportunities for learners to learn English. As for students, variables 7.1.2, 7.1.3, 7.1.4, 7.1.5, 7.1.7, 7.1.8, 7.1.9 and 7.1.11 have either high or considerably high mean scores which suggest that inside classrooms students in the country get opportunities to learn English. Although variables 7.2.1, 7.2.2 and 7.2.3 show low mean scores which reflect that here students get little or almost no opportunities outside classroom for learning English. Again from the classroom observation it was found that teachers try to create learning opportunities in class but often students were found passive and as the considerably low mean score of var.7.1.10 shows that they often seem reluctant to take part in role-playing activities. The classroom observation data on it shows that students get opportunities to learn English in classrooms of Bangladesh but many of the teachers do not utilize them properly. The classroom size being big, it was impossible for the teachers to make sure that all the students can avail of the opportunities created by them in class.

#### **6.4.1.1 Potentials of Maximizing Teaching-learning Opportunities in Classes of Bangladesh:**

The situation in Bangladesh in this particular regard is very favourable for implementing PMP. The learners get enough scopes to share their ideas with peers, ask questions to their teachers, do different classroom tasks, and participate in different role playing activities. The results of the empirical study show that there are potentials to maximize the teaching-learning opportunities inside the classroom of Bangladesh.

#### **6.4.1.2 The Challenges for Maximizing Teaching-learning Opportunities in Classes of Bangladesh:**

Although learning opportunities are available inside the classroom, outside the classroom they are almost absent in the classes of Bangladesh. This is a big challenge for both teachers and learners, since the colleges in the country do not arrange any co-curricular activities that can help them practice English outside classroom. Students do not get opportunities to participate in any English essay writing or extempore competition or poetry recitation beside classroom activities. Moreover, as it is a monolingual country, people use Bangla for everyday communication and so this is quite a big challenge for teachers to provide learners exposure outside the classrooms to learn English.

#### **6.4.2 6.4.2 Minimizing Perceptual Mismatches:**

The discussion in Chapter-III point out that:

There are at least 10 potential sources of perceptual mismatch and they are (i) Cognitive, (ii) Communicative, (iii) Linguistic, (iv) Pedagogic, (v) Strategic, (vi) Cultural, (vii) Evaluative, (viii) Procedural, (ix) Instructional, (x) Attitudinal.

The Chapter also shows that:

- Mismatches are unavoidable,
- Mismatches are identifiable,
- Mismatches are also manageable if they are detected with caution and addressed properly.

The recognition of the potential mismatches between teachers' and learners' beliefs, expectations, learning-style preferences and learning strategies (i.e Psychological Disposition) give insights into the aforementioned possible sources of perceptual gaps. These perceptual gaps shed light on the potentials of and challenges for the implementations of pedagogical procedures in Bangladesh.

#### **A. Teachers' and Students' Beliefs about Teaching-Learning English:**

This section of the chapter examines the match and mismatch between teachers' and students' perceptions regarding their beliefs with reference to teachers' role, learners' role, interaction pattern in class and mode of feedback and error correction. A comparison between the mean scores of the variables of Teachers' and Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview presented in the table below shows the mismatch between the two.

### i) Teachers' and Student's Beliefs about Teachers' Role

**Table 6.6: Teachers' and Student's Beliefs about Teachers' Role**

|      | Statements  | Questionnaire Survey |                | Interview      |                |
|------|---|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|      |   | Teachers' Mean       | Students' Mean | Teachers' Mean | Students' Mean |
|      | Teachers/Students believe:  |                      |                |                |                |
| 3.1  | Lectures are very useful for learning.  | 4.07                 | 4.45           | 4.37           | 4.34           |
| 3.3  | It is mostly teachers' responsibility to ensure students' learning.                           | 2.78                 | 2.87           | 2.63           | 2.75           |
| 3.6  | Language skills develop through practice and so opportunities for practice are important.     | 4.51                 | 4.55           | 4.53           | 4.51           |
| 3.7  | Students should be allowed to ask questions in class whenever they need.                      | 4.39                 | 4.29           | 4.42           | 4.36           |
| 3.12 | Teachers are experts; they know how to organize things better to help learners learn English. | 4.17                 | 4.13           | 4.16           | 4.24           |

The distribution of mean scores for teachers' and students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview in the table shows that Bangladeshi teachers' and students' beliefs regarding teachers' role are almost the same. All the variables here except 3.3 have high mean scores both for teachers and students and so they express strong beliefs of both sides. The low mean scores (less than 3.00) of the var.3.3 reflect that teachers and learners do not think it is the students' responsibility to ensure learning. This contradicts with the recent idea of student-centred teaching-learning concept. But whatever is the belief in this regard, there is a mismatch between teachers' beliefs and students' perceptions.

## ii) Teachers' and Students' Beliefs about Learners' role

**Table 6.7: Teachers' and Students' Beliefs about Learners' Role**

|      | Statements   | Questionnaire Survey |                | Interview      |                |
|------|--|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|      |  | Teachers' Mean       | Students' Mean | Teachers' Mean | Students' Mean |
| 3.2  | Students' active participation is necessary for language learning.   | 4.76                 | 4.50           | 4.74           | 4.34           |
| 3.4  | The natural ability (aptitude) of learners to learn a foreign language is important for language learning. | 3.98                 | 4.04           | 4.11           | 3.97           |
| 3.19 | Learners should take responsibility for their learning.  | 3.37                 | 4.07           | 3.05           | 3.98           |
| 3.20 | Pair works are helpful for learning.   | 4.41                 | 4.24           | 4.42           | 4.24           |
| 3.21 | Group works are helpful for learning.  | 4.32                 | 4.52           | 4.42           | 4.40           |

The mean scores for teachers' and students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview in the table-7 show that Bangladeshi teachers' and students' beliefs regarding learners' role are almost the same. All the variables have high or considerably high mean scores. There is a mismatch between teachers' and learners' beliefs regarding learners' role.

## iii) Teachers' and Students' Beliefs about Classroom Interaction

**Table 6.8: Teachers' and Students' Beliefs about Classroom Interaction**

| SN  | Statements  | Questionnaire Survey |                | Interview      |                |
|-----|---|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|     |   | Teachers' Mean       | Students' Mean | Teachers' Mean | Students' Mean |
|     | Teachers/Students believe:  |                      |                |                |                |
| 3.8 | Students learn better when there is enough interaction (communicative activities) in class. | 4.24                 | 4.23           | 4.42           | 4.18           |
| 3.9 | Use of mother tongue is necessary for making classroom interaction effective.               | 4.07                 | 4.00           | 3.89           | 3.72           |



The mean scores of the variables of teachers' and students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview in the table show there is no mismatch between teachers' and students' beliefs regarding classroom interaction. Both teachers and learners in the country believe that students learn better when communicative activities are practiced in class and that mother tongue can facilitate the classroom teaching-learning.

#### iv) Teachers' and Students' Beliefs about Mode of Error Correction and Feed back

**Table 6.9: Teachers' and Students' Beliefs about Mode of Error Correction and Feed back**

| SN   | Statements                          | Questionnaire Survey |                | Interview      |                |
|------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|      |                                     | Teachers' Mean       | Students' Mean | Teachers' Mean | Students' Mean |
|      | You believe:                        |                      |                |                |                |
| 3.11 | Errors should be corrected in time. | 4.17                 | 4.50           | 4.37           | 4.51           |

The mean scores of the only variable (3.11) in both teachers' and students' Questionnaire survey and Interview are high here. So there is no mismatch in this regard.

#### B. Teachers' and Students' Expectations about Teaching-Learning English

This section of the chapter examines the match and mismatch between teachers' and students' perceptions regarding their expectations with reference to teachers' role, learners' role, interaction pattern in class and mode of feedback and error correction. A comparison between the mean scores of the variables of Teachers' and Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview presented in the table below shows the perceptual mismatches between teachers' and learners' expectations.

### i) Teachers' and Learners' Expectations about Teachers' Role

**Table 6.10: Teachers' and Learners' Expectations about Teachers' Role**

|      | Statements  | Questionnaire Survey |                | Interview      |                |
|------|---|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|      |   | Teachers' Mean       | Students' Mean | Teachers' Mean | Students' Mean |
|      | Teachers/ Students expect that:   |                      |                |                |                |
| 4.6  | grammar should be taught and learned seriously.   | 3.73                 | 3.49           | 4.38           | 4.28           |
| 4.9  | teachers should create opportunities for skills training.   | 3.98                 | 3.97           | 3.89           | 3.91           |
| 4.10 | students should be engaged in pair works.   | 3.37                 | 3.91           | 4.00           | 3.54           |
| 4.11 | students should be involved in group works.   | 3.61                 | 3.79           | 3.95           | 3.43           |
| 4.12 | students should be allowed to work individually.  | 2.56                 | 3.60           | 2.95           | 3.34           |
| 4.13 | students' critical language awareness (i.e. how English shapes your life and personality) should be promoted. | 3.29                 | 3.47           | 3.26           | 4.03           |

The mean scores for teachers' and students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview in the table shows that Bangladeshi teachers' and students' expectations regarding teachers' role is almost the same. Almost all the variables here have high or considerably high mean scores except var. 4.12. Teachers and learners expect or highly expect that grammar should be taught seriously in class (var.4.6). Both sides expect that learners' critical language awareness should be promoted (var.4.13). In both Questionnaire Survey and Interview, the mean scores for var.4.12 is considerably low for teachers while it is considerably high for learners. It indicates that though teachers expect that students should be allowed to work individually, students do not expect it. The classroom observation and the follow up discussion with teachers reflect that both teachers and learners were not aware of "critical language awareness" before the researcher explained it to them while conducting the questionnaire survey and

interview. So there was no mismatch in this regard also. The only mismatch was with regard to Students' individual work.

## ii) Teachers' and Learners' Expectations about Learners' Role

**Table 6.11: Teachers' and Learners' Expectations about Learners' Role**

| SN  | Statements  | Questionnaire Survey |                | Interview      |                |
|-----|---|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|     |   | Teachers' Mean       | Students' Mean | Teachers' Mean | Students' Mean |
|     | Teachers/Students expect that:  |                      |                |                |                |
| 3.8 | Students should learn from listening to teachers' lectures in class.  | 4.22                 | 3.41           | 4.21           | 3.39           |
| 3.9 | Students will like teachers' using course materials and textbooks that relates to their home-culture and context. | 3.93                 | 4.31           | 3.26           | 4.24           |

Here for both the variables, there is a good deal of mismatch between teachers' and students' perceptions. For var.3.8 Teachers' mean scores are 4.22 and 4.21, respectively in the Questionnaire Survey and Interview, whereas students mean scores are 3.41 and 3.39 in the Questionnaire Survey and Interview respectively. For var.3.9 teachers' mean scores are 3.93 and 3.26 whereas students' average mean scores are 4.31 and 4.24 in the Questionnaire Survey and Interview, respectively. Students means score is .38 higher in the Survey and .84 in the Interview. So there is a mismatch in both regarding this.

## iii) Teachers' and Learners' Expectations about Classroom Interaction:

**Table 6.12: Teachers' and Learners' Expectations about Classroom Interaction**

| SN  | Statements  | Questionnaire Survey |                | Interview      |                |
|-----|---|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|     |   | Teachers' Mean       | Students' Mean | Teachers' Mean | Students' Mean |
|     | Teachers/ Students expect:  |                      |                |                |                |
| 4.5 | Students should participate in interactive activities in the class as much as possible. | 4.07                 | 4.09           | 3.95           | 3.82           |

The mean scores for teachers' and students' Questionnaire survey and Interview in the table above show that Bangladeshi teachers' and students' expectations regarding classroom interaction are similar. Both sides expect or highly expect that students should participate in interactive activities in class as much as possible.

### iii) Teachers' and Learners' Expectations about Mode of Error Correction and Feedback

**Table 6.13: Teachers' and Learners' Expectations about Mode of Error Correction and Feedback**

| SN  | Statements                       | Questionnaire Survey |                | Interview      |                |
|-----|----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|     |                                  | Teachers' Mean       | Students' Mean | Teachers' Mean | Students' Mean |
|     | Teachers/Students expect:        |                      |                |                |                |
| 4.2 | Errors should not be overlooked. | 3.83                 | 3.42           | 2.89           | 3.19           |

The mean scores for teachers' and students' Questionnaire survey and Interview in the table show that Bangladeshi teachers' and students' expectations regarding error-correction is quite close. Both the sides expect that errors should not be ignored in class. However, in the interview, the mean scores of students are .30 higher which suggests that there is little mismatch in the perceptions of teachers and students in this respect.

### C. Teachers' and Learners' Learning Style Preferences and Teaching English

This section of the chapter looks into the match and mismatch between teachers' and students' perceptions regarding learning style preferences. A comparison between the mean scores of the variables of Teachers' and Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview presented in the table below displays the perceptual mismatches between teachers' and learners' perceptions regarding Learners' Learning Style Preferences.

**Table 6.14: Teachers' and Learners' Learning Style Preferences and Teaching English**

|      | Statements   | Questionnaire Survey |                | Interview      |                |
|------|--|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|      |  | Teachers' Mean       | Students' Mean | Teachers' Mean | Students' Mean |
|      | Students prefer to learn:  |                      |                |                |                |
| 5.1  | from teachers' lectures.   | 4.41                 | 4.10           | 4.37           | 4.13           |
| 5.2  | through discussions with their class-mates.                                      | 3.76                 | 4.24           | 3.95           | 4.15           |
| 5.3  | by following your points you make and write on board.                            | 4.24                 | 4.25           | 4.32           | 4.34           |
| 5.4  | by practicing different types of activities in the class.                        | 4.20                 | 4.26           | 4.42           | 4.20           |
| 5.5  | things by heart (i.e. by memorizing things).                                     | 3.46                 | 2.94           | 3.05           | 2.96           |
| 5.6  | how to express their ideas or opinion about a topic.                             | 3.80                 | 4.27           | 3.84           | 4.20           |
| 5.7  | by asking teachers questions.  | 4.27                 | 4.28           | 4.16           | 4.26           |
| 5.8  | by choosing for themselves what they want to learn.                              | 2.90                 | 3.87           | 2.58           | 3.60           |
| 5.9  | by following their own plan for achieving their goals.                           | 3.05                 | 4.32           | 2.54           | 4.26           |
|      | Teachers prefer students to:   |                      |                |                |                |
| 5.10 | do everything on their own in class.   | 2.61                 | 2.68           | 2.47           | 2.97           |
| 5.11 | select content, material and method for their learning.                          | 2.68                 | 3.13           | 2.95           | 3.34           |
| 5.12 | learn by using examples from day to day life events rather than using textbooks. | 4.17                 | 4.06           | 4.26           | 4.10           |
|      | Students learn better:   |                      |                |                |                |
| 5.13 | if they are told what to do and guided.  | 4.15                 | 4.47           | 4.32           | 4.42           |
| 5.15 | when they listen to someone explaining something in the class.                   | 4.02                 | 3.49           | 3.89           | 3.45           |
| 5.16 | when teachers use white-board in class.  | 4.00                 | 4.05           | 3.89           | 4.07           |
| 5.17 | if they make drawings as they study.   | 3.17                 | 4.16           | 3.16           | 4.20           |
| 5.18 | if they take notes while you lecture.  | 3.77                 | 4.20           | 4.00           | 4.02           |
| 5.19 | when their peers tell them how to do something in the class.                     | 3.95                 | 4.19           | 4.11           | 4.02           |
| 5.20 | when they learn individually.  | 3.05                 | 3.96           | 2.74           | 3.90           |
| 5.21 | when they learn in pairs.  | 4.39                 | 4.06           | 4.32           | 4.11           |
| 5.22 | when they learn in groups.   | 4.37                 | 4.37           | 4.26           | 4.20           |

The mean scores for teachers' and students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview in the table show that Bangladeshi teachers' and students' perceptions about learning style preferences. The perceptions of both regarding this are similar except in a few cases. Almost all the variables have high or considerably high mean scores except variables 5.10 which has less than 3.00 mean score for both teachers and students. Teachers' mean score is 0.50 less than students' Interview mean scores, which indicate a mismatch between teachers' and students' perceptions in this regard. There is also a mismatch with regard to var.5.11 in which students' mean score is 0.45 and 0.39 higher than the teachers' score in the Questionnaire Survey and interview, respectively. Var.5.2 shows that students mean score is 0.48 higher in the Q. Survey, in 5.4 , students' mean score is 0.22 lower in the interviews, in 5.5 teachers' mean score is 0.52 higher in the Q. Survey, in 5.6 teachers' mean score is 0.46 and 0.64 higher in the Q. Survey and Interview respectively, in 5.8, students' mean scores are 0.97 and 1.02 higher in the Q. Survey and Interview respectively, in 5.9 students' mean scores are 1.27 and 1.72 higher than teachers' mean scores in the Survey and Interview respectively. In 5.15, teachers' mean scores are 0.53 and 0.44 higher in the Survey and Interview respectively. In 5.17 teachers' mean scores are 0.99 and 1.04 higher than students' mean scores in Survey and Interview respectively. In 5.18 students' mean scores 0.43 higher in the Q. Survey and in 5.20, students' mean score is 1.16 higher in the Interview. These reflect mismatches regarding teachers' and students' perceptions about learning style preferences in Bangladesh.

#### **D. Teachers' and Students' Perceptions Regarding Learning Strategies**

This section of the chapter examines the match and mismatch between teachers' and students' perceptions regarding students' learning strategies. A comparison between the

mean scores of the variables of Teachers' and Students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview presented in the table below manifests the perceptual mismatches between teachers' and learners' perceptions regarding learning strategies.

**Table 6.15: Teachers' and Students' Perceptions Regarding Learning Strategies**

|      | Statements   | Questionnaire Survey |                | Interview      |                |
|------|--|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|      |  | Teacher' Mean        | Students' Mean | Teachers' Mean | Students' Mean |
|      | Students:  |                      |                |                |                |
| 6.1  | Use their first language knowledge to learn English.                     | 3.85                 | 3.82           | 3.84           | 3.95           |
| 6.2  | compare the grammar rules of their mother language with that of English. | 3.66                 | 3.63           | 3.69           | 3.53           |
| 6.3  | use what they already know to learn something new.                       | 4.19                 | 3.22           | 3.99           | 2.95           |
| 6.4  | focus on pictures, subtitles and keywords when they read.                | 3.99                 | 3.10           | 3.80           | 2.79           |
| 6.5  | think about techniques that help them to learn English better.           | 3.83                 | 2.46           | 3.87           | 2.68           |
| 6.6  | use grammar rules consciously for developing your skills.                | 3.19                 | 3.44           | 3.13           | 3.68           |
| 6.7  | think about grammar rules when they write.                               | 4.03                 | 3.49           | 3.97           | 3.63           |
| 6.8  | monitor and judge their own progress in language learning                | 3.83                 | 2.22           | 3.78           | 2.32           |
| 6.9  | can identify problems that delay their learning.                         | 3.54                 | 2.61           | 3.55           | 2.42           |
| 6.10 | use library to learn English.  | 3.52                 | 2.68           | 3.35           | 2.89           |
| 6.11 | use internet to learn English.   | 3.97                 | 2.32           | 4.00           | 2.74           |
| 6.12 | use other sources to learn English.                                      | 3.94                 | 2.37           | 3.79           | 3.79           |
| 6.13 | use a dictionary to understand new words while reading.                  | 3.52                 | 3.10           | 3.51           | 2.53           |
| 6.14 | try to guess the meaning of new words when they read.                    | 3.61                 | 3.17           | 3.36           | 3.50           |
| 6.15 | look for conversation partners to improve speaking skills.               | 3.10                 | 2.54           | 2.87           | 2.63           |
| 6.16 | do not like to make mistakes when they speak/write.                      | 4.07                 | 2.68           | 4.11           | 2.53           |
| 6.17 | cannot evaluate their own performances.                                  | 3.85                 | 2.78           | 3.84           | 2.53           |
| 6.18 | look for opportunities for practice.                                     | 3.66                 | 3.66           | 3.69           | 2.63           |

The mean scores for teachers' and students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview in the table above show match and mismatch between Bangladeshi teachers' and students' perceptions regarding learning strategies. In var.6.3 teachers' mean scores are 0.97 and 1.04 higher in the Questionnaire Survey and Interview respectively, in 6.4 teachers' mean scores are 0.89 and 1.01 higher in the Q. Survey and Interview respectively. In 6.5, teachers' mean scores are 1.37 and 1.19 higher in the Q. Survey and Interview respectively. In 6.6 students' mean scores are 0.25 and 0.55 higher in the Q.Survey and Interview respectively. In 6.7, teachers' mean scores are 0.54 and 0.34 higher in the Q.Survey and Interview respectively, in 6.8 teachers' scores are 1.6 and 1.46 higher in Q. Survey and Interview, respectively. In 6.9 teachers' mean scores are 0.93 and 1.13 higher in the Q.Survey and Interview respectively. In 6.10 teachers' scores are 0.84 and 1.46 higher in the Q.Survey and Interview and in 6.11 teachers' scores are 1.65 and 1.26 higher in the Q.Survey and Interview. These are areas of mismatches. In 6.12, teachers' scores is 1.57 higher in the Q. Survey and in 6.13, teachers' scores are 0.42 and 0.98 higher in the Q. Survey and Interview respectively. In 6.14. teachers' score is 0.44 higher and in 6.15 teachers' score is 0.56 higher in the Q. Survey. In 6.16 teachers' scores are 1.39 and 1.58 higher in the Q. Survey and Interview respectively.

#### **6.4.2.1 The Potentials of Minimizing Perceptual Mismatches in the Particularities of Bangladesh**

The empirical results of the data show that there are some matches between teachers' and students' beliefs and expectations regarding different aspects of language pedagogy (i.e. teachers' role, learners' role, classroom interaction and mode of interaction and feedback). These items show a favourable condition for PMP in Bangladesh.



### 6.4.2.2 The Challenges for Minimizing Perceptual Mismatches in the Particularities of Bangladesh

A good number of items in this section in table-14 and 15 show mismatches between teachers' and students' perceptions about learning style preferences and learning strategies which are areas of challenge for implementing PMP in the country.

### 6.4.3 Facilitating Negotiated Interaction: Potentials and Challenges

As has been discussed earlier in Chapter-III, the key features of facilitating negotiated interaction is as follows:

- It requires teachers and students to participate in meaningful learner-learner and teacher-teacher interaction,
- Talk and topic management are crucial for negotiated interaction.

To consider the potentials of and challenge for implementing PMP in Bangladesh, these features are compared to the present "Particularities" of the country in the following table:

**Table 6.16: Facilitating Negotiated Interaction: Potentials and Challenges**

| SN    | Statements  | Questionnaire Survey |                | Interview      |                |
|-------|---|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|       |   | Teachers' Mean       | Students' Mean | Teachers' Mean | Students' Mean |
| 2.14  | Students are encouraged to talk in class.                           | 4.22                 | 3.88           | 4.37           | 3.61           |
| 2.15  | Students work in pairs.   | 4.02                 | 3.42           | 3.74           | 3.35           |
| 2.16  | Students work un groups.  | 3.85                 | 3.51           | 3.79           | 3.37           |
| 7.1.2 | Students can share ideas or opinions with their peers in the class. | 3.45                 | 4.00           | 3.68           | 4.02           |
| 7.1.3 | Students can ask questions while the lesson goes on.                | 3.34                 | 3.99           | 3.21           | 3.99           |

The mean scores for teachers' and students' questionnaire survey and interview in the table display Bangladeshi teachers' and students' experience regarding negotiated interaction in the classroom. Almost all the variables have high or

considerably high mean scores. The results of the variables (var.3.19, 3.20, 4.7, 4.8, 5.21 and 5.22) as to pair work and group work have mostly high mean scores which shows that the classroom situation of Bangladesh is favourable for meaningful negotiated interaction. Both students and teachers strongly believe that students learn better when there is enough interaction in class (var.3.8) and so students should be engaged in communicative activities as much as possible (var.4.5 ). Students' and teachers' high mean scores of var. 5.2 and 5.20 suggest that learners have high preferences for learning by discussion with peers or listening to somebody when he or she explains something to them in class. Apart from this, the classroom observation shows that though there are opportunities of talk management both by teachers and learners in class, the topic management is poorly handled in most of the cases by the former. The researcher found that in many of the cases, students could not ask their teachers questions and kept quiet.

#### **6.4.3.1 The Potentials of Facilitating Negotiated Interaction in the Particularities of Bangladesh**

The empirical results of the study show that the classroom culture of Bangladesh is quite conducive for facilitating negotiated interaction in class since students participate in different classroom activities assigned by their teachers. Students can share their ideas or opinions with each other in class. The classroom observation report also showed that students participate in classroom interaction.

#### **6.4.3.2 The Challenges for Facilitating Negotiated Interaction in the Particularities of Bangladesh**

There are some challenges also to facilitate negotiated interaction in classrooms of Bangladesh. The follow up discussion with teachers after classroom observation reveals that they are not meticulous and efficient enough to manage topics in class that are

crucial to assisting negotiated interaction. This is a challenge for teachers. The students also often feel shy to ask their teachers questions but they are comfortable to discuss their ideas with their peers. So to participate in meaningful interactions with teachers might be somewhat challenging for learners.

#### 6.4.4 Promoting Learner Autonomy: Potentials and Challenges

In line with the discussion presented in Chapter-III, the chief concerns of promoting learner autonomy are as follows:

- Learn to take charge of one's learning,
- Learn to liberate by developing a critical mindset,
- Learn to participate in social communication.

The potentials of and challenges for these features in the “Particularities” of Bangladesh have been presented in the following table:

**Table 6.17: Promoting Learner Autonomy: Potentials and Challenges**

| SN   | Statements  | Questionnaire Survey |                | Interview      |                |
|------|---|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|      |   | Teachers' Mean       | Students' Mean | Teachers' Mean | Students' Mean |
| 2.8  | Students entirely depend on their teachers for their learning.                | 2.78                 | 2.80           | 2.63           | 2.73           |
| 2.14 | Pair work is used in class.   | 4.02                 | 3.43           | 3.74           | 3.35           |
| 2.15 | Group work is used in class.  | 3.85                 | 3.51           | 3.79           | 3.37           |
|      | Teachers/ Students believe that:  |                      |                |                |                |
| 3.2  | It is students' duty to take active part in the learning process.             | 4.76                 | 4.50           | 4.74           | 4.37           |
| 3.20 | Learners' should take responsibility of their learning.                       | 3.37                 | 4.07           | 3.05           | 3.98           |
|      | Teachers/Students expect that:  |                      |                |                |                |
| 4.9  | Learners should be allowed to work individually.                              | 2.56                 | 3.60           | 2.95           | 3.34           |
|      | Teachers/Students said that:  |                      |                |                |                |
| 5.8  | Students prefer to learn by choosing for themselves what they want to learn.  | 2.90                 | 3.87           | 2.58           | 3.60           |
| 5.9  | Students prefer to learn by following their own plan for achieving their goal | 3.05                 | 4.32           | 2.54           | 4.26           |
| 5.19 | Students learn better if they work individually.                              | 3.05                 | 3.96           | 2.74           | 3.90           |

The mean scores of teachers' and students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview in the table show Bangladeshi teachers' and students' opinion regarding learners' autonomy. For var.2.8, teachers and students mean scores are low in both Q. Survey and Interview (2.78 and 2.63 for teachers and 2.80 and 2.73 for students). For var. 4.9, students' scores are 2.56 and 2.95 in the Q. Survey and Interview respectively, though teachers' scores are 3.60 and 3.34 respectively in Q. Survey and Interview. For 5.8 students mean scores 2.90 and 2.58, though teachers' scores are 3.87 and 3.60. The considerably high mean scores of Var. 4.9 show that teachers do not expect much that students should be allowed to work individually which is quite opposite to what the students think. Var. 5.8 and 5.9 have high and considerably high mean scores respectively in Q. Survey and Interview which reflect learners' preference for exercising academic autonomy but the teachers have considerably low mean scores for those variables in Survey and Interview which show quite the opposite preferences.

The considerably low mean scores of var.2.8 shows that both teachers and learners uphold that the latter do not entirely depend on the former for learning. The high and considerably high mean scores of the variables 2.15 and 2.16 in both Q. Survey and Interview show that the learners of Bangladesh participate in activities of classroom community that is indicative of their exercising social autonomy up to a great extent. Variables 3.2 and 3.20 show that both teachers and learners strongly believe (or believe) in learners' academic autonomy. Although the low mean scores of var.4.9 show that teachers do not expect much that students should be allowed to work individually which is quite opposite what the students think of (considerably high mean scores). In 5.9 and 5.18, students' means are 2.54 and 2.74 respectively in the Interview and in the Q. Survey these scores are 3.05 for both variables.

Table-11 presents Bangladeshi teachers' and learners' views about the present state of using learning strategies by the latter. The high and considerably high mean scores of the variables 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.6, 6.7, 6.13, 6.14 and 6.18 for both learners and teachers show that the former exercise academic autonomy up to a certain extent. For 2.8 both teachers and students have considerably low mean scores in Q. Survey and Interview which indicate that teachers and students in Bangladesh do not like to be dependent on their teaches entirely Although students have high mean scores for 4.9 and 5.8, teachers have low mean scores for these in Q. Survey and Interview. The considerably low mean scores for those variables show that here learners don't use those language leaning strategies that can also help them to act autonomously.

Along with this, the classroom observation and the follow up discussion with teachers uphold that though learners use academic and social autonomy up to a certain extent, they were not found to use liberatory autonomy which is a recent development in language education.

#### **6.4.4.1 The Potentials of Promoting Learner Autonomy in the Particularities of Bangladesh**

The results of the empirical study reveal that the learners of Bangladesh exercise academic and social autonomy in class to some extent and so the classrooms can be said to be conducive for promoting learner autonomy up to a certain point. The learners were found quite willing to take the charge of their own learning though the teachers were found not to support this idea of exercising learner autonomy. Students take part in different classroom activities with their peers or pair work/group work which showed that they exercise social autonomy to some extent. Yet the classroom observation and the follow-up discussion with teachers show that students have problems using many

strategies of language learning which are helpful for promoting their autonomy. In many cases they don't use them consciously.

#### **6.4.4.2 The Challenges for Promoting Learner Autonomy in the Particularities of Bangladesh**

The results of the empirical study also reflect that right at this moment there is no scope to practice liberatory autonomy by learners in the country since it is an entirely new idea in language pedagogy. In line with the results of the empirical study it can be said that the classroom culture of Bangladesh is somewhat conducive for promoting learner autonomy up to a certain extent, still there is a big challenge as to making learners aware of the liberatory autonomy that can help them to become critical thinkers. The classroom observation report and the follow up discussion with teachers as to this matter show that our learners are not ready for this right at this moment. Besides, they need to focus on promoting their academic and social autonomy by becoming aware of the strategies that they are less habituated to use in class for learning English.

#### **6.4.5 Fostering Language Awareness**

As has been already discussed in Chapter-III, the key concerns of fostering language awareness are:

- Emphasis on students' learning both the formal and functional properties of the target language.
- The aim is to facilitate learners' consciousness raising process that is important to make learners critically aware of the hidden agenda of the imposed pedagogy and also to learn how to form individual identity.

The potentials of and challenges for these features in the realities of Bangladesh have been presented in the following table:

**Table 6.18: Fostering Language Awareness**

| SN    |  | Questionnaire Survey |                | Questionnaire Survey |                |
|-------|--|----------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|
|       |  | Teachers' Mean       | Students' Mean | Teachers' Mean       | Students' Mean |
| 7.1.5 | Students are taught grammar (i.e different aspects of linguistic properties) in class. | 3.83                 | 4.22           | 3.68                 | 4.19           |
|       | Teachers/Students expect that:   |                      |                |                      | 4.28           |
| 4.10  | Critical language awareness should be promoted.  | 4.03                 | 3.85           | 4.00                 | 4.19           |

Teachers' and students' high and considerable high means scores of var. 7.1.5 in Questionnaire Survey and Interview suggest that students are taught grammar with emphasis on different aspects of linguistic features in class. Var.4.10 also have high and considerable high mean scores both for teachers and students in Q. Survey and Interview which suggest that they expect that learners' critical language awareness should be promoted. The classroom observation report shows that teachers and learners are not aware of this recent issue of language pedagogy although they are conscious about the general features of the target language (English). They could put their opinion in the survey and interview as to the mentioned variable only when the researcher made them understood what critical language awareness stands for.

#### **6.4.5.1 The Potentials of Fostering Critical Language Awareness in the Particularities of Bangladesh**

The results of the empirical study along with the reports of the classroom observation and the follow-up discussion with teachers showed that our teachers are not capable enough to implement this innovative idea in the "Particularities" of Bangladesh. To foster language awareness among learners not only mean to make them conscious about the formal properties of English but also to make them critically aware about the hidden practices imposed by the prevailing method-based pedagogies that they have been used

to for long. The learners too are not ready for this. This does not seem to have a good potential for Bangladesh at the moment.

#### **6.4.5.2 The Challenges for Fostering Critical Language Awareness in the Particularities of Bangladesh**

Since fostering language awareness is a new concept in language pedagogy, it is a great challenge for our teachers and learners to implement it in the context of our country. Our learners need to be sensitive to these hidden practices that operates through teaching English in Bangladesh. Hence they require special training to get adapted to this idea which puts emphasis on their becoming critically aware of the social and political factors that determine language ideology in the context of Bangladesh. Though learners and teachers here expressed that they strongly expect that critical awareness (of learners) should be promoted (var.4.10), the classroom observation report following the discussion with teachers reveal that they do have little knowledge about what does “fostering language awareness mean” in the frame of PMP. So this new idea of Postmethod will pose a great challenge for the particularities of Bangladesh.

#### **6.4.6 Activating Intuitive Heuristics**

In line with the discussion of Chapter-III, the key concerns of activating intuitive heuristics are given below:

- Activating intuitive heuristics stresses teachers’ motivating learners to learn language by self-discovery ( i.e. the gap between what they already know and what they need to know).
- It puts emphasis on teacher’s effort to make the learners instinctively aware about learning the linguistic features along with the communicative use of language.



The potentials of and challenges for this macrostrategy with reference to the “Particularities” of Bangladesh have been presented in the following table:

**Table 6.19: Activating Intuitive Heuristics**

| SN    | Statements   | Questionnaire Survey |                | Interview      |                |
|-------|--|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|       |  | Teachers' Mean       | Students' Mean | Teachers' Mean | Students' Mean |
| 2.18  | Teachers involve students finding out things by themselves first and afterwards they provide feedback and explain. | 4.00                 | 3.78           | 4.00           | 3.71           |
| 5.5   | Students don't prefer to learn things by heart (i.e by memorizing things).   | 3.46                 | 2.94           | 3.05           | 2.96           |
| 6.2   | Students compare the grammar rules of their mother tongue with that of English.                                    | 3.63                 | 3.66           | 3.53           | 3.69           |
| 6.3   | Students use what they already know to learn something new.  | 3.22                 | 4.19           | 2.95           | 3.99           |
| 7.1.5 | Students are taught grammar (i.e different aspects of linguistic properties) in class.                             | 3.83                 | 4.22           | 3.68           | 4.19           |
| 7.1.7 | Students are asked questions while the lesson goes on.   | 3.34                 | 3.99           | 3.21           | 3.99           |

The mean scores of the variables in teachers' and students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview in the table manifest Bangladeshi teachers' and students' opinion regarding activating intuitive heuristics (i.e. the process of self-discovery on the part of the learner) by learners in language classes. The high and considerable high mean scores of var.2.18 show that both teachers and learners hold that teachers in the country involve students in finding out things first and later gives feedback and explain those to them. Var. 5.5 shows that according to teachers, students do not like to memorize things by heart (considerably high mean score) while the students expressed quite the opposite of it (considerably low mean score). Students' and teachers' high mean scores for var. 6.2 and 6.3 in the Questionnaire Survey show that the former like to compare the rules of their language with that of English and use what they already know to learn something new. The high and considerable high mean scores of var.7.1.5 show that

both teachers and learners agreed that grammar with focus on form is taught in class. Again the considerable high mean scores of var.7.1.7 show that students are asked questions while the lesson goes on. Still the classroom observation and the follow up discussion with teachers reveal that though learners are taught grammar with emphasis on different aspects of learners, in most of the cases the latter like to memorize things and so don't put much effort on discovering the aspects of English on their own. The classroom observation also revealed that grammar is taught following both the deductive and inductive methods in the English classes of the country.

#### **6.4.6.1 The Potentials of Activating Intuitive Heuristics in the Particularities of Bangladesh**

Activating Intuitive Heuristics is also an innovation in language pedagogy which is not practiced in the classrooms of Bangladesh. So it might not be conducive for our context. The results of the empirical study showed that the classroom interaction pattern of Bangladesh mostly follows the progressive mode of teaching, yet the classroom observation report indicates that teachers teach students grammar mostly deductively. But teaching grammar following the inductive method is more suitable to explore the different underlying rules of English on the part of the learners which is quite less in practice here.

#### **6.4.6.2 The Challenges for Activating Intuitive Heuristics in the Particularities of Bangladesh**

Activating intuitive heuristics might be quite a big challenge for the classrooms of Bangladesh since here teachers mostly teach grammar following mostly the deductive with little mixture of inductive method of teaching English. Though teachers draw learners' attention to the features of English Grammar, the students often fail to comprehend them properly. The results of the empirical study reflect that students try to

use what they already know to learn something new and they are also habituated to participate in pair work or group work. The classroom observation report showed that they cannot explore the underlying rules of grammar on their own as grammar is mostly taught following the deductive method. So though students are taught grammar with emphasis on form, they fail to understand how the linguistic system of English itself works. However, the results of var.2.18 seems to be contradictory with the classroom observation report of the researcher since students are not involved to finding out the problems first and later explain those. Hence, this is a challenge for the teachers of the country to make the students recognize the gap between what they already know and what they are supposed to know.

#### **6.4.7 Contextualizing Linguistic Input**

As has already been discussed in Chapter-III, the salient features of contextualizing linguistic input are as follows:

- Contextualizing linguistic input means that teaching can no longer depend on a decontextualized set of linguistic items preselected and pre-set by syllabus designers and textbook writers,
- Teaching should be consistent with the chief characteristics of language communication which depends on a variety of contextual factors (i.e linguistic, extralinguistic, situational, extrasituational context and so on).

The potentials of and challenges for the features mentioned above have been discussed with regard to the realities in Bangladesh in the following table:

**Table 6.20: Contextualizing Linguistic Input**

| SN    | Statements   | Questionnaire Survey |                | Interview      |                |
|-------|--|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|       |  | Teachers' Mean       | Students' Mean | Teachers' Mean | Students' Mean |
| 2.13  | Teachers assign different communicative tasks to your students.            |                      |                |                |                |
|       | Teachers/Students believe that:  |                      |                |                |                |
| 3.10  | Knowledge about target language culture is important for learning English. | 4.12                 | 4.16           | 3.95           | 4.09           |
| 3.16  | Grammar is important for learning English.                                 | 3.80                 | 4.54           | 4.16           | 4.42           |
| 6.15  | Students seek conversational partners when they speak/write.               | 2.54                 | 3.10           | 2.63           | 2.87           |
| 7.1.9 | Students are taught words with meanings in different context.              | 4.22                 | 3.59           | 4.16           | 3.48           |

The mean scores of the variables in teachers' and students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview in the table shows Bangladeshi teachers' and students' view regarding contextualizing linguistic input. The high and considerably high mean scores of var.3.10 show that teachers and students strongly believe that the knowledge of the target language culture is important for learning English though it was found from the classroom observation and the follow up discussion report of the teachers that they do not practice the contextualization of communicative activities in class. The high and considerably high mean scores for var.3.16 show that teachers and learners think that grammar is important for learning English. Teachers also assign different types of communicative tasks to their students (high and considerably high mean scores for teachers and students). But the classroom observation report revealed that the way grammatical form and function are taught here do not correspond with the communicative needs and social contexts of Bangladesh.

#### **6.4.7.1 The Potentials of Contextualizing Linguistic Input in the Particularities of Bangladesh**

The results of the empirical study and the classroom observation report showed that though the teachers of Bangladesh teach grammar seriously in class focusing on the formal aspects of English, here the communicative activities are not contextualized. It was found earlier from the results of the empirical study that students here participate in pair work or group work in class, still they are not provided with proper setting for language use in a meaningful way. Unless the grammar instruction and classroom interaction activities are practiced following the communicative and contextual needs of learners, they can't benefit them in the way the "contextualizing of linguistic input" of PMP is supposed to do. So the potentials of Contextualizing Linguistic Input in the country might be feasible only when the practicing teachers will devise microstrategies considering the contextual use of communicative activities besides grammatical features of language.

#### **6.4.7.2 The Challenges for Contextualizing Linguistic Input in the Particularities of Bangladesh**

The reports of classroom observation and the follow up discussion with teachers also revealed that the classroom activities in English classes of Bangladesh are mostly pre-set or preselected by the prevailing method-based pedagogy and it is a challenge for teachers to go beyond those prescribed principles that the traditional and progressive methods of teaching have imposed on them for long. Again, the results of the empirical data in figure-1 and figure-2 (in section 6.2.2) earlier in this Chapter show that teachers are not eligible enough to contextualize linguistic input. So the macrostrategy might not be feasible for the context of our country unless our teachers are trained to understand the communicative needs and goals of our learners besides learning the formal

properties of English grammar. Along with this, the big class size can be another hurdle to take into account learners needs and devise microstrategies accordingly to practice contextualized linguistic input here.

#### 6.4.8 Integrating Language Skills

As described in Chapter-III, the key concerns of integrating language skills refer to:

- Integrating language skills puts no extra emphasis on a specific skill designated for a special class following any predetermined curricula and textbooks,
- It also emphasizes helping learners freely use all the skills necessary for carrying out a classroom activity.

The potentials and challenges of this macrostrategy above have been discussed with reference to the realities in Bangladesh in the following table:

**Table 6.21: Integrating Language Skills**

| SN   | Statements   | Questionnaire Survey |                | Interview      |                |
|------|--|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|      |  | Teachers' Mean       | Students' Mean | Teachers' Mean | Students' Mean |
| 2.19 | The reading skill is taught in class.  | 3.95                 | 3.85           | 3.95           | 4.02           |
| 2.20 | The writing skill is taught in class.  | 3.77                 | 3.90           | 4.00           | 3.87           |
| 2.21 | The listening skill is taught in class.  | 1.78                 | 1.70           | 1.74           | 1.60           |
| 2.22 | The speaking skill is taught in class.   | 2.00                 | 1.70           | 1.84           | 1.65           |
| 2.4  | Teachers create language learning opportunities in class for practicing different skills and sub-skills of English.                            | 4.05                 | 3.69           | 4.11           | 3.85           |
| 3.13 | It is easier to read and write English than to speak and understand it. So reading and writing should be taught before listening and speaking. | 3.56                 | 3.75           | 3.84           | 3.70           |
| 3.16 | Skills of English help learners to get good jobs.  | 4.27                 | 4.59           | 4.32           | 4.54           |
| 6.16 | Students look for scopes to practice their skills.   | 2.68                 | 3.66           | 2.53           | 3.69           |

The mean scores of the variables in teachers' and students' Questionnaire Survey and Interview in the table exhibits Bangladeshi teachers' and students' view regarding integrating language skills. The high and considerably high mean scores of 2.19 and 2.20 shows that both teachers and students hold that only reading and writing are taught here in the class while the low and considerably low mean scores for var. 2.21 and 2.22 show that listening and speaking are ignored in the classrooms of Bangladesh. Variable 3.13 shows considerably high mean scores of both teachers and learners of Bangladesh show that reading and writing skills are taught with emphasis in class but the other two skills- listening and speaking is not taught seriously. Teachers say that students do not look for opportunities to use English (scores 2.68 and 2.53) but students themselves say they do so (scores 3.66 and 3.69).

#### **6.4.8.1 The Potentials of Integrating the Four Language Skills in the Particularities of Bangladesh**

The results of the empirical study (in Chapter IV) and classroom observation report showed that the teaching-learning culture of Bangladesh is a sort of amalgam of the traditional and progressive mode of language teaching. Teachers here only put emphasis on reading and writing English leaving aside the other two skills which are listening and speaking and so right at this moment the potential to integrate the four language skills in class is not good in Bangladesh.

#### **6.4.8.2 The Challenges for Integrating the Four Language Skills in the Particularities of Bangladesh**

Although students said that they look for opportunities for practicing English, the teacher didn't agreed with them on this point. The classroom observation report also reflects the same truth as to the prevailing teaching-learning situation which is a kind of blending of the top-down models (the traditional and progressive modes of teaching).

The prevailing English teaching-learning methods place extra emphasis on teaching/learning specific skills (i.e. reading and writing) following the principles of some preset curricula and prescribed books. So to go beyond the prescribed curricula and syllabus prescribed by the top down models might be quite difficult for our practicing teachers who are not even capable enough to do so. Hence designing and utilizing microstrategies that can help integrating language skills in the classrooms of Bangladesh in order to benefit learners might pose challenge for our teachers.

#### 6.4.9 Ensuring Social Relevance

As has been discussed in Chapter-III, ensuring social relevance refers to:

- Making teachers and teacher educators aware of their socio-political-cultural factors that shape their lives, ideology and individual identities.
- Producing and using culture sensitive syllabus, textbooks and curriculum.

The potentials and challenges of these features above have been discussed with reference to the realities in Bangladesh in the following table:

**Table 6.22: Ensuring Social Relevance**

| SN   | Statements  | Questionnaire Survey |                | Interview      |                |
|------|---|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|      |   | Teachers' Mean       | Students' Mean | Teachers' Mean | Students' Mean |
|      | Teachers/Learners believe that:   |                      |                |                |                |
| 3.9  | Use of mother tongue is necessary for making classroom activities effective.  | 4.07                 | 4.00           | 3.89           | 3.72           |
| 3.14 | Learning how to translate from your native language (Bangla) to English and vice-versa is important for learning English. | 3.85                 | 4.40           | 4.11           | 4.39           |
|      | Learners/Teachers expect that:  |                      |                |                |                |
| 4.4  | Teachers would use using course materials and textbooks that relates to their home culture and context.                   | 3.93                 | 4.31           | 3.26           | 4.24           |
| 6.1  | Use their first language knowledge to learn English.  | 3.82                 | 3.85           | 3.95           | 3.84           |
| 6.2  | Compare the grammar rules of their mother language with that of English.  | 3.63                 | 3.66           | 3.53           | 3.69           |



The mean scores for teachers' and students' questionnaire survey and interview in the table shows Bangladeshi teachers' and students' view about ensuring social relevance. All the variables of the table show high and considerably high mean scores. Teachers and students of Bangladesh quite strongly believe that using mother tongue in English classes of the country can facilitate L2 learning activities. They also expect that context-sensitive interesting course materials and textbooks will be used for teaching English here. The report of classroom observation and the follow up discussion with teachers also show that the use of Bangla in English classes make the learners more comfortable to learn the target language.

#### **6.4.9.1 The Potentials of Ensuring Social Relevance in the Particularities of Bangladesh**

The results of the empirical study and classroom observation report show that the use of Bangla helps learners make a connection between their mother tongue and English which is important for ensuring social relevance to the classrooms of the country. The classroom observation report show that students become frightened, nervous and hesitant when teachers do not allow the use of Bangla in class. The results of the empirical data showed that both teachers and students believe that using mother tongue facilitates the communicative activities in class. Hence, social relevance can be ensured in classrooms of Bangladesh while teaching English if teachers recognize its necessity in our context and accordingly they can design microstrategies to conduct classroom activities effectively. It will eventually enable learners to make a bridge between their own home culture and the culture of English.

#### **6.4.9.2 The Challenges for Ensuring Social Relevance in the Particularities of Bangladesh**

The results of the empirical data and the reports of the classroom observation followed by a follow-up discussion with teachers reflect that the textbooks of H.S.C level are

partially culture-sensitive. So one of the important concerns of ensuring social relevance in the Bangladeshi context is to devise context-sensitive textbooks and materials for learners. It might be a challenge for the teachers and experts in the country since they have to have the qualification to produce culture-sensitive materials for classroom teaching here. Again, to do away with the age long tradition of teaching English in the country following the prescribed the Anglo-centric books and materials imposed by the top-down models might be another challenge for teachers.

#### 6.4.10 Raising Cultural Consciousness

As has been already discussed in Chapter-III, the major concerns of raising cultural consciousness implies:

- Raising cultural consciousness emphasizes making learners capable to critically reflect on their own culture and also review it in relation to the cultures of others (i.e target language),
- It also encourages teachers to reflect on their cultural identities.

The potentials and challenges of these features above have been discussed with reference to the realities in Bangladesh in the following table:

**Table 6.23: Raising Cultural Consciousness**

| SN     | Statements   | Questionnaire Survey |                | Interview      |                |
|--------|--|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|        |  | Teachers' Mean       | Students' Mean | Teachers' Mean | Students' Mean |
| 3.10   | Teachers/ Students believe that Knowledge about target language culture is important to learn English. | 4.12                 | 4.16           | 3.95           | 4.09           |
| 7.1.12 | Students are taught about cultural consciousness in class.   | 2.16                 | 1.68           | 2.33           | 1.70           |

Teachers' and students' high score and considerably high mean scores in Questionnaire Survey and Interview show that teachers and students in Bangladesh strongly believe that knowledge about target language culture is important. The report of the classroom observation followed by the follow-up discussion with teachers also manifest that teachers and students feel the necessity of having knowledge about the culture and heritage of English. Still it was also found that teachers know very little about the "critical cultural awareness" which emphasizes learners making critically aware of the target language culture in relation to their native culture.

#### **6.4.10.1 The Potentials of Raising Cultural Consciousness in the Particularities of Bangladesh**

Raising cultural consciousness puts extra emphasis on growing consciousness of learners as to connecting the knowledge of their home culture to that of English. This is altogether a new concept in language pedagogy. The empirical study and the classroom observation reflect that this is absent in the actualities of Bangladesh and so its implementational potential seems to be less in the context of our country.

#### **6.4.10.2 The Challenges for Raising Cultural Consciousness in the Particularities of Bangladesh**

The learners in Bangladesh seem to believe that knowledge about the culture of the English language is helpful for learning it, but how to find its relevance in the local culture is a big challenge for them since culture, since local cultural focus is quite absent in the English classrooms of Bangladesh. The classroom observation report followed by discussion with teachers reveal that the local cultural focus to shape learners' identity is absent at present in the teaching-learning culture of Bangladesh.

### **6.5 The Parameters of “Practicality” and “Possibility” and Testing and Evaluation in Bangladesh**

The comparative results of the percentage of the traditional and progressive variables (for yes) Section-I in Chapter-IV showed that the Testing and Evaluation system of Bangladesh needs improvement as students are not tested what they are supposed to be tested. The Testing system is mostly traditional and needs to bring out changes to make the evaluation of students effective.

### **6.6 Conclusion**

In this chapter the potentials of and challenges for the parameters of “Practicality” and the parameter of “Possibility” of Postmethods have been examined in the “Particularities” of Bangladeshi teaching-learning culture presented in Chapter-V. Postmethod pedagogy does not advocate for any specific method based on a preselected set of principles for language teaching and learning, rather it recommends a substitute for method with the kind of tasks and activities that prove appropriate for the given “Particularities”. It puts emphasis on teachers’ to play the role of reflective practitioners who should act dynamically and autonomously while practicing the “Principled Pragmatism” and finally entrust them with the responsibility to help learners to act autonomously. Learners are highly encouraged to focus on shaping their individual identities by becoming critically aware about their surroundings and subject-positions. So this is supposed to be a joint venture for teachers and learners that they can undertake together to bring out a change in the society they live in. Such a holistic approach have the potential to change the overall teaching-learning scenario of any given context. The discussion and interpretation in this chapter show that there are both potentials and challenges for its implementation in Bangladesh.

## **Chapter Seven**

# **Summary of the Findings, Recommendations and Conclusion**

### **7.1 Introduction**

This chapter summarizes the entire study referring back to the research questions, objectives, methodology and the findings of the study. It also discusses the implications of the findings of the study and concludes with some recommendations and implications for further areas of the study.

### **7.2 Chapter-wise Summary of the Study**

The research questions that this study sought to investigate were:

- (i) What are the limitations of the concept of method and the methods Era and what factors lead to the emergence of the idea of Postmethod pedagogy?
- (ii) What are the key features and parameters of Postmethod pedagogy?
- (iii) What are the realities (“particularities”) of English teaching-learning culture and context of Bangladesh?
- (iv) What would be the pedagogic challenges of implementing the parameters of “Practicality” and “Possibility” of Postmethod pedagogy in Bangladesh?

This research objectives were to:

- (i) examine the limitations of the concept of method and the methods Era and the factors that lead to the emergence of the idea of Postmethod pedagogy,
- (ii) develop a conceptual framework of Postmethod pedagogy,
- (iii) examine the realities (“Particularities”) of English teaching-learning culture and context of Bangladesh
- (iv) examine the potentials of and challenges for implementing the parameters of “Practicality” and “Possibility” of Postmethod pedagogy in Bangladesh

- (v) recommend measures for ELT in Bangladesh.

The issue was investigated through mixed methods. The major methods of data collection were:

- (i) Questionnaire Survey
- (ii) Interview
- (iii) Classroom Observation

Chapter-I of the study discusses the limitations of the concept of method and methods era and emergence of Postmethods. It also provides a background to the current English language teaching-learning situation in the country. The chapter also includes a brief survey and literature, research questions, research objectives, limitations of the study and definitions of the key terms.

Chapter-II is a detailed literature review and provides a glimpse of the theoretical developments of Postmethod pedagogy including Postmethod condition and the three parameters: The parameter of “Particularity”, the parameter of “Practicality” and the parameter of “Possibility” and Post method indicators (i.e. Postmethod teacher, Post method learner, Postmethod Educator and so on). The chapter also discusses the different components of “Particularity” including actualities and psychological disposition which covers teachers’ and learners’ experience, beliefs, expectations, learning style preferences and learning strategies.

Chapter-III of the study discusses theories of pedagogic procedures of Postmethod which includes the Macrostrategies. These macrostrategies are general guidelines through which the three parameters of Postmethod work in any given context.

Chapter-IV discusses the methodology of the research including data collection, design of the instruments, sampling plan, administration of the study and process of data analysis.

Chapter-V presents the findings of the study. It presents the details of the parameter of the “Particularity” of Bangladeshi teaching-learning culture. The “Particularities” have been examined in terms of the actualities (the experience and opportunities of teaching-learning), and the psychological disposition (beliefs, expectations, learning style preferences and learning strategies) and the realities about teaching-learning situation, textbook evaluation and teaching and evaluation.

In Chapter-VI, the study examines the challenges to and potentials of implementing the parameters of “Practicality” and “Possibility” with reference to the “Particularities” examined and presented in Chapter-V. This chapter makes an attempt to see to what extent our teachers and learners are ready to adopt, or adapt the new ideas of Postmethod pedagogy and whether they are going to face the challenges. It shows which aspects of “Particularity” is conducive for implementation in Bangladesh, which aspects of “Practicality” and “Possibility” are going to prove challenging here.

In Chapter-VII, the overall summary of the study with a restatement of the research questions, objectives, methodology for the study. It also discusses the implications of the findings and concludes the study with a recommendation.

### **7.3 Objective-wise Summary of the Findings of the Study**

#### **7.3.1 Potentials of and Challenges for the “Particularities” in Bangladesh**

One of the objectives of the study have been to:

- (iii) examine the realities (“Particularities”) of English teaching-learning culture and context of Bangladesh.

The findings of the empirical study show that here prevails a condition that combines the traditional and progressive modes of teaching and learning. It was

found that in some cases the traditional mode of teaching is predominating and in other cases the progressive mode of teaching.

**(a) Actualities:**

(i) **Teachers' Role:** The actual teaching-learning "Particularities" of Bangladeshi teachers show that they are mostly not used to practicing "Reflective Teaching" in classrooms which is grounded on "Principled Pragmatism." Teachers are in the habit of lecturing most of the time in class, create enough opportunities to practice various skills and sub-skills and engage learners to increase their creativity. Teachers are not mostly formal in class. Though they use boards or demonstrations but they do not use seminar presentations in class.

(ii) **Learners' Role:** The actual teaching-learning "Particularities" of the learners of Bangladesh show that they remain silent mostly and speak only when teacher asks them questions. Learners entirely depend on their teachers for learning. They participate in pair work or group work in class. They get opportunities to express their ideas with their peers in class and can ask teachers questions while the lesson goes on.

(iii) **Classroom Interactional Pattern:** Teachers involve students doing different tasks and activities in class following mostly the progressive mode of teaching. Students are asked questions and they take part in role playing activities in class.

(iv) **Mode of Error Correction and Feedback:** Teachers scold students if they make errors following the traditional mode of teaching.

(v) **Teaching Learning Situation:** The overall teaching-learning situation is not satisfactory as most of the colleges do not have adequate books in the library and



also lacks in different audio-video facilities that is important for teaching and learning English. Even the classrooms are mostly not clean, spacious and well equipped. Colleges do not have any language club or debating club whereby students can carry on their co-curricular activities.

(vi) **Testing and Evaluation:** The testing and evaluation of Bangladesh have certain drawbacks. Among the four skills of English, only reading and writing are tested and listening and speaking are set aside. There is a gap between what students are taught in class and what they are tested in the examinations. Therefore, they are not tested in examinations what they are supposed to be tested.

(vii) **Textbook Evaluation:** The evaluation of the only textbook (*English for Today*) prescribed by NCTB for H.S.C level students in Bangladesh show that it is context-sensitive and culture-specific to a certain extent.

Again, the psychological disposition of teachers and learners of Bangladesh seemed to be mostly similar with some exceptions. So these reflect that their beliefs, expectations, perception about learning style preferences and strategies got greatly impacted by the principles of method-based pedagogies and hence manifested very little of the “Reflective Practice” of teaching.

#### **(a) Teachers’ and Learners’ Beliefs about Language Teaching**

(i) **Teachers’ and Learners’ Beliefs about Teachers’ role:** The beliefs of teachers’ and students’ regarding teachers’ roles in Bangladesh are almost the same. They strongly believe that lectures are helpful for learning and that language skills develop through practice and so opportunities for practice are crucial. They also believe that students should be allowed to ask questions in class whenever they need. Teachers

and students also strongly believe that teachers are experts who know how to organize things to help learners learn English better. But they do not believe that it is mostly teachers' responsibility to ensure learning. These reflect both the features of traditional and progressive modes of teaching.

**(ii) Teachers' and Learners' Beliefs about Learners' role** : The beliefs of teachers' and students' regarding learners' roles in Bangladesh are also almost similar. Both strongly believe that students' active participation is necessary for language learning. Teachers and learners also strongly believe that pair works/group works are helpful for learning. They have little mismatch regarding the fact that the natural ability to learn a language is important for language learning and that learners should take the responsibility of their learning. These reflect mostly the features of progressive mode of teaching in the country.

**(iii) Teachers' and Learners' Beliefs about Classroom Interaction**: Teachers and students strongly believe that students learn better when there is enough interaction in class and that use of mother is necessary to make the interaction more effective. So the beliefs of teachers and students about the prevailing classroom pattern is an amalgam of both the traditional and progressive modes of teaching.

**(iv) Teachers' and Learners' Beliefs about Mode of Error Correction and Feedback**: Teachers and learners both strongly believe that errors should be corrected in time which reflects the feature of traditional mode of teaching.

**(a) Teachers' and Learners' Expectations about Language Teaching**

**(i) Teachers' and Learners' Expectations about Teachers' role**: Teachers' and learners' expectations regarding Teachers' roles in Bangladesh are almost similar.

They highly expect that grammar should be taught seriously in class. They also have high expectations regarding creating opportunities by teachers for skills training, engaging students in pair work/ group work and promoting their *Critical Language Awareness*. There is a mismatch between the expectations of teachers and students regarding the fact that the latter should be allowed to work individually. So these reflect both the features of traditional and progressive modes of teaching.

(ii) **Teachers' and Learners' Expectations about Learners' role** : The expectations of teachers' and learners' as to learners' role is almost the same. Both expect that students should learn from listening to teachers' lecture in class. They have also high expectations that students will like teachers' use of context-sensitive and culture-specific course materials and textbooks in class. So, these also manifest both the features of traditional and progressive modes of teaching.

(iii) **Teachers' and Learners' Expectations about Classroom Interaction**: Teachers and students in the country highly expect that learners should participate in interactive activities as much as possible which shows the feature of progressive mode of teaching.

(iv) **Teachers' and Learners' Expectations about Mode of Error Correction and Feedback**: Teachers and students have high expectations that the errors should not be overlooked which manifests the typical feature of traditional mode of teaching.

The “Particularities” of the actual teaching-learning practices of Bangladesh (i.e. Teachers' Role, Learners' Role, Classroom Interaction and Mode of Error-correction and Feedback and so on), the teaching learning situation, the testing and evaluation and textbook evaluation of H. S.C level students show that the teaching-learning culture of the country is mostly method-based (both traditional and the

progressive) and so the practice of “Reflective Teaching” is absent in the country right at this moment.

### **7.3.2 Potentials of and Challenges for the Parameters of “Practicality” and “Possibility”**

Another objective of the study has been to:

- (i) examine the potentials of and challenges for implementing the parameters of “Practicality” and “Possibility” of Postmethod pedagogy in Bangladesh

The key features of the parameters of “Practicality” and “Possibility” and the macrostrategies of Postmethod pedagogy were examined in the “Particularities” of Bangladesh.

#### **7.3.2.1 Potentials of and Challenges for the Parameter of “Practicality”**

The major findings regarding the challenges and potentials for implementing the Parameter of “Practicality” in the context of Bangladesh are as follows:

1. The teachers of Bangladesh are not used to practicing “Reflective Teaching” in classrooms which is guided by the “Principled Pragmatism”. They seem to follow the pre-selected principles of method-based pedagogies. Both teachers’ role and learners’ role in classroom seemed to reflect both the features of traditional and progressive modes of teaching. Teachers play their roles in classrooms as merely “passive technicians”. Since the practice of “Reflective Teaching” is a new development in language education, many of them are not even familiar with the ideas of teachers’ role as “Reflective Practitioners”. Learners too here found to be passive in classes in most of the cases. So to go beyond the limitations of the method-based pedagogy and implement “Reflective Teaching” in the context of Bangladesh might be quite challenging for the practicing teachers here.

2. Most of the teachers of our country are not eligible enough to implement the new ideas of Postmethod pedagogy in the context of our country. Even they do not have enough scopes to participate in English Language Teaching. So to arrange special Teacher Education Programmes to facilitate implementing the innovations of Postmethod will be another challenge for the language experts and teachers in Bangladesh.
3. Although the prevailing English teaching-learning situation in Bangladesh is an amalgam of the traditional and progressive modes of teaching English, the classrooms are mostly teacher-centred. Teachers follow the pre-selected principles of top-down models in class. So practicing “Teachers’ autonomy” in the country might be quite difficult here. Most of the teachers are not ready to cope up with this new idea of Postmethods. They need special training to theorize from their practice and practicing what they theorize in class. Furthermore, the overall teaching-learning situation is also not up to the mark in the country which are crucial for ensuring teachers’ autonomy in any given context.

### **7.3.2.2 Potentials of and Challenges for the Parameter of “Possibility”**

The major findings regarding the potentials and challenges for implementing the Parameter of “Possibility” in the context of Bangladesh are as follows:

1. The teachers of Bangladesh do not have the capacity to act as “Transformative Intellectuals” since it is also entirely a new idea in language education. Practicing and prospective teachers need special training through Teacher Education Programmes which will enable them to produce critical individuals. This might be a challenge.
2. The learners in the country too are not aware about becoming critical individuals by raising their critical consciousness to their status quo. They do

not possess knowledge about identity formation either. To make learners critically sensible about their surroundings through consciousness raising and to make them understand the importance and ways of individual identity formation are mostly the responsibilities of their teachers. But how far our learners are ready for these new ideas and to what extent our teachers will be capable to implement these innovations of ELT might pose big challenges to our country.

### **7.3.2.3 Potentials of and Challenges for the Macrostrategies of Postmethod pedagogy**

The major findings regarding the potentials of and challenges for applying the macrostrategies of the Parameters of “Practicality” and “Possibility” in the context of Bangladesh are as follows:

- i. The Potentials of and Challenges for Maximizing the Teaching-learning Opportunities in Classes of Bangladesh:** There are some potentials of maximizing the teaching-learning opportunities inside the class. Teachers give learners scopes to learn English by sharing their ideas in class, asking questions, engaging in problem-solving activities and so on in class. The teaching-learning environment in class is also favourable for learning English to ac certain extent. Still there are challenges as to implementing this macrostrategy in classrooms of Bangladesh, as there are not as much opportunities in the classrooms as required for language learning. Moreover, there are little or no opportunities in outside the classroom.
- ii. The Potentials of and Challenges for Minimizing the Perceptual Mismatches in Classes of Bangladesh:** There are both matches and mismatches between teachers’ and learners’ beliefs, expectations, learning style

preferences and learning strategies in Bangladesh. It was found that the teachers and learners hold almost the same opinions as to beliefs and expectations about some aspects of teachers' and learners' roles and about classroom interaction pattern and mode of error correction and feedback. They have differences regarding learning style preferences and learning strategies. These are hindrances for implementing Postmethod in the country. So implementing this macrostrategy might be partially feasible and partially challenging in classrooms of the country.

**iii. The Potentials of and Challenges for Facilitating Meaningful Negotiation in**

**Classes of Bangladesh:** Though the classrooms of Bangladesh are conducive for facilitating negotiated interaction to a certain extent, yet there are challenges. Students take part in different interactive activities like pair-work or group-work or role-playing activities in class. But it was found that the teachers faces difficulties to manage topics for discussion in a big class. Furthermore they are not efficient enough for selecting topic and carrying on talk management in most of the cases which are crucial to facilitating meaningful interaction in English class. So there are challenges as well to apply this macrostrategy in classrooms of Bangladesh.

**iv. The Potentials of and Challenges for Promoting Learner Autonomy in**

**Classes of Bangladesh:** The learners of Bangladesh showed that they have scopes to exercise a little academic autonomy and social autonomy though their teachers do not like them to use it (i.e. to take charge of their own learning) in class. So the classrooms seemed somewhat conducive for promoting learner autonomy. As far as the implementation of the liberatory autonomy is concerned,

the learners are not really prepared to cope up with it as it is entirely a new idea in language pedagogy and they are not familiar with this yet. So promoting learner autonomy in language class will be challenging in the country.

- v. **The Potentials of and Challenges for Fostering Critical Language Awareness in Classes of Bangladesh:** Fostering Language Awareness is altogether a new concept in language education that make learners sensitive to the hidden practices imposed by the curriculum and textbooks of top-down models. This is absent right at this moment in our country. So it might pose a great challenge in the Bangladeshi context.
- vi. **The Potentials of and Challenges for Activating Intuitive Heuristics in Classes of Bangladesh:** Activating Intuitive Heuristics is also another innovation in language pedagogy which will prove challenging for Bangladesh. Though the teaching-learning culture of Bangladesh is an amalgam of the traditional and progressive mode of teaching-learning, still grammar is taught here following the traditional method (deductive way of teaching grammar) of language teaching. But teaching grammar following the inductive method is more appropriate to explore the underlying rules of the language which is less practiced in classrooms here. So activating intuitive heuristics in classes might be quite challenging for our context.
- vii. **The Potentials of and Challenges for Contextualizing Linguistic Input in Classes of Bangladesh:** Though teachers in Bangladesh teach students focusing on the grammatical aspects of language mostly, the interactive activities in class are not contextualized. Unfortunately, teachers are not provided with proper setting for language use in meaningful contexts. If the grammar instruction and



classroom activities are not practiced following the communicative approaches and contextual needs, they can benefit as much as they could by contextualizing linguistic input. So the classrooms of Bangladesh might be partially conducive to contextualize the linguistic input but might prove challenging for teachers.

**viii. The Potentials of and Challenges for Integrating Language Skills in Classes**

**of Bangladesh:** Teachers in Bangladesh stress on learning the two skills of English only which are reading and writing. Listening and speaking are almost ignored in class and tests. But the integration of four skills is very important to learn English successfully. Students hold that skills in English can ensure them good jobs. Teachers are used to follow the principles of some pre-set curricula and textbooks. So to go beyond this academic tradition of the top-down models and teaching four skills with equal importance might be quite difficult for practicing teachers who are not capable enough to recognize the limitations of methods, analyze their contexts and select appropriate methods and materials. Hence designing and utilizing microstrategies that can help integrating language skills which is rarely done now, might be another challenge for our teachers where most of the colleges do not have essential language teaching facilities. Moreover, the big class size might be one of the impediments in this regard.

**ix. The Potentials of and Challenges for Ensuring Social Relevance in Classes**

**of Bangladesh:** The classrooms in Bangladesh might be conducive up to some extent for ensuring social relevance as it was found that using Bangla facilitate the classroom activities in learning English. Learners feel at ease and comfortable if they are allowed to use mother tongue in class. It gives them scopes to make a bridge between their own culture and the culture of the target

language (English). Hence. Social relevance of tasks, activities has to be ensured in classrooms while teaching English if teachers recognize its necessity in our context and accordingly design microstrategies to conduct classroom activities effectively. Still English teaching-learning in Bangladesh is basically concerned with decontextualized knowledge of language rules and some skills practice. Relating language teaching-learning to socio-cultural realities is almost absent in the country. One important concern in this regard might be producing culture-sensitive materials to teach English. Most of the teachers hold that the textbooks that they use in class are only partially culture-sensitive. Again teachers were also not found to use culture-sensitive materials beside the only prescribed text-book (i.e. *English for Today*) by NCTB. Hence, producing context-sensitive materials might be another challenge in front of our experts and teachers.

- x. **The Potentials of and Challenges for Raising Cultural Consciousness in Classes of Bangladesh:** Raising cultural consciousness is another important idea in language pedagogy and teachers and learners in Bangladesh are not familiar with this aspect of Postmethod. This is absent at this moment and so the classrooms are not at all feasible for implementing this macrostrategy. Teachers in language courses are not used to teach cultural knowledge of English. It was found that they do not relate it to their indigenous culture in class and students were also found having almost no knowledge about it or how to connect it to Bangla. Therefore, this macrostrategy is likely to prove a big challenge for our context.

## **7.4 Implications**

The findings have a number of implications which are discussed below:

### **7.4.1 Implications for Redefining Teachers' Role as "Reflective Practitioners" and "Transformative Intellectuals" for Bangladesh**

Innovations in language pedagogy demand change in teachers' role. Teachers in Bangladesh need training to cope up with the new ideas of Postmethod pedagogy to function as "Reflective Practitioners" and "Transformative Intellectuals". They need to learn to devise an *enlightened eclectic method* adopting and adapting the ideas of PMP which is grounded on the "Principled pragmatism". The unification of theory and practice is at the core of "Principled Pragmatism" which encourages teachers to develop personal theories based on their contextual knowledge. This knowledge do not evolve overnight. Teachers reflect on their classroom practice, observe and analyze them and on the basis of this they become able to practice what they theorize and vice-versa. This is not an easy task and so teachers need to undergo special training to redefine their roles for practicing "Reflective Teaching". In this regard, Teacher Education Programmes can be of immense help if they can be arranged by experts and educationists in Bangladesh.

### **7.4.2 Implications for Learners' Role as "Autonomous Individuals" and "Critically Conscious Individuals" for Bangladesh**

The learners of Bangladesh exercise some degree of autonomy in classroom yet they are not fully aware of the way they can enhance it. To maximize their learning potentials, they should be made aware of the impact of learning style preferences and learning strategies to learn English. This will in the end help them promoting their autonomy. Again, our learners do not have any idea about what being critically conscious involves. So they should be taught from the very beginning of their language education about this

important aspect of PMP. Acquiring critical awareness about the surroundings is supposed to help our learners to the extent that they would be able to shaping their individual identities which is one of the key concerns of the parameter of “Possibility”.

### **7.4.3 Implications for Teacher Education Programmes**

The study implies that the practicing and prospective teachers should be trained by teacher Educators to acquire a rich repertoire to cope with the present teaching-learning actualities of Bangladesh. Teacher Education Programmes should focus on the following factors:

- Teachers in Bangladesh should have massive training to look beyond the limitations of the method-based pedagogies and develop a culture-sensitive approach of “Reflective Teaching” to teach English. They need to be trained to work as “Reflective Practitioners” and “Transformative Intellectuals”. They should also have training to generate theory from their practice in class and vice-versa. Massive Teacher Education Programmes should be inaugurated in the country to each and every English teacher from school to university.
- Teachers should also be made experts regarding recognizing the potentials of and challenges for PMP in ELT in the country as this is an innovation in language pedagogy. Even the trainees in Bangladesh are not familiar with these dimensions. The trainers also should have clear knowledge about these new ideas and skills to properly focus and practice these *aspects*. *Adequate training in these areas will equip them how to utilize the potentials and combat the challenges of PMP here.*
- Teachers should be aware about learner-autonomy which is a challenge for Bangladeshi teaching-learning culture where teacher domination, teacher

control and teacher guidance is the reality. Students are not used to select and do things on their own. This is not possible also to implement outright. So learner-orientation is crucial. There should be an emphasis on *academic autonomy* or “learning how to learn.”

- The teachers should be encouraged to think critically so that they may relate their personal knowledge to the professional knowledge they are being exposed to. They should learn how these two types of knowledge shape each other and help them to devise suitable microstrategies for their context. This generic knowledge help teacher understand particular pedagogic needs and wants and ultimately make them capable to derive their own theory of practice.
- The teachers need training to integrate the four skills of English. Teacher Education Programmes should focus on making teachers efficient to devise tasks and activities that will help students learn the four skills with importance.
- The practicing and prospective teachers should be made trained to acquire basic knowledge and expertise to raise learners’ *Critical Language Awareness* and *Cultural Consciousness* which are important aspects of PMP. They should have expertise to train learners questioning their hegemonic identities and subjective positions in the society they belong to. Apart from this, they need to become experts to make learners capable of forming their individual identities.
- Contextualizing linguistic unit and Ensuring Social Relevance are also important features of PMP. Teacher Education Programmes should stress on it.
- In order to arrange and run the Teacher Education Programmes, some specialized institutes should be established all through the country. These

institute should offer multi-purposive post-graduation teaching-learning programmes to equip teachers with essential knowledge and expertise to implement the innovations of PMP in the particularities of Bangladesh.

#### **7.4.4 Implications for Implementing Context-sensitive Macrostrategies of PMP in for Bangladesh**

The practicing teachers and language experts in the country should be trained to focus on their context-sensitive pedagogical knowledge to recognize the potentials of and challenges for the macrostrategies of Postmethod pedagogy for Bangladesh. The macrostrategies such as maximizing learning opportunities in class, minimizing perceptual mismatches, promoting learner autonomy, facilitating negotiated interaction or ensuring social relevance seemed to be conducive for the context of Bangladesh. These macrostrategies also pose some challenges to Bangladesh which have been already discussed. On the contrary, contextualizing linguistic input, fostering language awareness, integrating language skills, activating intuitive heuristics or raising cultural consciousness might not be quite feasible for the classrooms of our country. To implement these macrostrategies in our language classrooms might be quite challenging for our teachers. The overall teaching-learning situation of Bangladesh need to be improved to implement these new ideas.

#### **7.4.5 Implications for Producing Culture-sensitive Materials and Syllabus for Bangladesh**

The innovations in language pedagogy of Bangladesh calls for producing materials and textbooks which will ensure social relevance. The text book evaluation and the classroom observation report in Chapter-V show that the only prescribed textbook for H.S.C level students in Bangladesh is culture specific and context-sensitive to a certain

extent. Still teachers and learners in our country should be made conscious about the importance of using more context-sensitive materials in class. Syllabus should be designed focusing on the challenges discussed above.

#### **7.4.6 Implications for Testing and Evaluation for Bangladesh**

The testing and evaluation of Bangladesh has got shortcomings since students are not tested what they are supposed to be tested. Only two skills of English are tested (i.e. writing and reading). Listening and speaking skills are totally ignored in the examinations. Although the test covers different areas of language, still there is a gap between what students are taught in class and what they are supposed to be tested in examinations. The modern teaching-learning aids like audio or video equipment are not used by our teachers in taking students' tests on listening or speaking. Hence, the testing and evaluation system needs modifications.

#### **7.4.7 Implications for Further Research**

This study suggests some areas of further research on Postmethod Pedagogy.

1. As Postmethod is a paradigm shift from the transmission to reflective mode of teaching, effective teachers' training programmes are essential for its implementation. Like all other shifts in education, implementation of PMP will involve significant changes in teachers' roles and actions for which proper training will be essential for the ELT practitioners in Bangladesh. A large number of teachers who are not well acquainted with the idea of Postmethod pedagogy are required to be trained if we want to proceed with it. Both in-service and pre-service teachers should be well prepared at home or abroad through Teachers' training programmes to acquire necessary authority and autonomy. But what would be the nature of the future research on Teachers' training programmes and how should

they look like? How will they operate in the context of our country where teachers have to work within limits to teach English? So, these can be further area of research too.

2. Though Postmethods gives teachers the sole authority to rely on their pedagogic knowledge and experience and thereby develop a “Sense of Plausibility” (i.e. their subjective understanding of the teaching), it forsakes one important concern and that is whether they are qualified enough to do that and to what extent they can do that to bring effective changes in language pedagogy. Furthermore, the teachers in Bangladesh have to carry on language teaching within socio-cultural-economic constraints. Many of the institutions infrastructural reality is really dismal here (classroom size, environment, number of students, other facilities, time constraint and so on). Unfortunately, Postmethods has put a blind eye to the actualities of teachers’ lives and experience within which language teaching takes place and this is another limitation of PMP. As such, many teachers of our country have to face a lot of hurdles to teach language in class. Therefore, an area of research will be whether our teachers are eligible or capable enough to use their “Sense of Plausibility” in class and how far they can be trained to do so for implementing PMP in our country.
3. Some ideas of Postmethods and its macrostrategies are still quite abstract (e.g. activating intuitive heuristics, raising cultural consciousness, fostering critical language awareness, ensuring social relevance and so on). Concrete realization of the ideas is needed to implement them in class and Postmethod pedagogy does not explain explicitly how teachers can operate these in a language class. Given the present actualities, how the tools of PMP can be prepared for our language



pedagogy can be areas of further research. Again, our learners are not familiar with the ideas and tools either. How they could be made ready to get used to these innovations might be another area of further research.

4. Postmethod is theoretically a bottom-up construct, though some of its ideas seem to be similar to that of top-down methods as far as their prescriptive nature is concerned. However, the critical dimension of its parameter of “Possibility” is likely to pose a big challenge for teachers in Bangladesh who are not used to focusing on issues like shaping of learners’ identities. How teachers based on their practical wisdom, observations and interpretations will define or redefine concrete tools (i.e. macrostrategies) for implementation of Postmethods here might be another area of research.
5. Postmethod pedagogy talks about two types of barrier: (i) Pedagogical and (ii) Ideological which have already been discussed in Section-2.6 of Chapter- of this study. Kumaravadivelu explains them as the “Postmethod Predicament” and regard them as the hurdles for successful implementation of Postmethods in a given context. Although he puts emphasis on challenging these barriers, he does not tell how these challenges can be confronted. This could be one of the areas of further research.
6. Postmethod pedagogy aims to unveil the hidden motives of the imposed curriculum and textbooks prescribed by the top-down models which are devoid of context-sensitivity. Textbooks or materials required for promoting learners’ “*critical awareness*” are crucial for shaping individual identities. In the given realities of Bangladesh, whether it is possible to design textbooks that would help learners to

acquire such awareness that might help them shaping their identities can be another area of further research. As for Tests, the language testing systems of Bangladesh has got many limitations. So, in view of the principles of PMP, how the language testing system could be amended to make language pedagogy more effective might be an area of further study. In the real process of classroom teaching when the teachers feel the need of some materials which can be useful for some of his/her students are not available in any book. How to handle these issues of materials require research.

## 7.5 Conclusions

In light of the summary of the findings of the study, a number of logical conclusions can be made as to the present “Particularities” of the teaching-learning culture of Bangladesh. Some of the major conclusions can be stated as follows:

- (i) The teachers of Bangladesh do not practice “Reflective Teaching” in class since they are not used to this new idea of language pedagogy. It can be concluded that the teaching-learning culture as a whole seemed to be an amalgam of the traditional and progressive modes of teaching. They seemed to be functioning in class as *passive technicians* who follow classroom methodologies which are prescribed and imposed by the method-based Pedagogies. So to redefine teachers’ role as *Reflective Practitioners* and *Transformative Intellectuals* requires that teachers in the country should have the keenness and capacity to recognize the limitations of the method-based pedagogy and to go beyond this. Teachers should feel the necessity to devise a context-sensitive and bottom-up pedagogy which will be based on local knowledge and local understanding.
- (ii) The “Principled pragmatism” is not practiced in classrooms of Bangladesh which stresses on eradicating the demarcation line between theory and practice. Teachers

are used to follow the preselected professional theories developed by experts which are devoid of *situational understanding* of our context. It was found that most of them are not even eligible to do that. Only a few of them get scopes to participate in trainings on English Language Teaching. Hence, it can be concluded that to make teachers capable for practicing what they theorize and theorizing what they practice in class require that they should be trained up through special Teachers' Education Programmes which is absent at present in the country.

- (iii) The learners in Bangladesh seemed to exercise academic and social autonomy in class up to a certain extent though they have little idea about the liberatory autonomy which focuses on raising their *critical consciousness* and shaping individual identities. So it can be concluded that here learners are not ready for coping up with the new ideas of Postmethod pedagogy and the responsibility mostly goes to teachers to prepare learners for these innovations which are crucial to learn English with a critical mindset. In this case, teachers should have adequate training to produce individuals with *critical consciousness* who are capable to unveil the hidden motives of the top-down models executed by the prescribed text-books and imposed curriculum.
- (iv) Some logical conclusions could be also drawn from these study as to the implementation of the macrostrategies of Postmethod pedagogy, taking into account their potentials to and challenges for ELT in Bangladeshi context. An appropriate ELT pedagogy in Bangladesh should include:
- Enhancing learning opportunities both inside and outside class,
  - Minimizing the perceptual mismatches between teachers' and students' learning style preferences and learning strategies,

- Providing teachers training to manage topic and talk management in large classrooms with a view to facilitate negotiated interaction among students,
- Helping learners promoting their autonomy by being conscious about their learning strategies and learning style preferences and also to developing in them a critical mindset to question the *status quo*.
- Facilitating learners' consciousness raising process as to learning English along with acquiring knowledge about the formal and functional properties of the target language.
- Making students capable to learn English through self-discovery which is emphasized by activating intuitive heuristics. Teaching grammar inductively is the best way to gain the end.
- Providing learners an appropriate set up to make sure the use of language in meaningful contexts. In other words, teaching in Bangladesh should be consistent with the chief characteristics of language communication which depends largely on a variety of contextual factors.
- Integrating the four skills of English and teaching learners all of them without prioritizing any one or two of them is very crucial to learn English.
- Making both teachers and learners conscious about the socio-political-cultural factors that form their lives, ideology and individual identities.
- Helping learners raising cultural consciousness which will enable them to critically ponder on their own culture in relation to that of others. Teachers should be trained up in this case to help learners.

## 7.6 Recommendations

1. In view of the challenges and their implications, teachers in Bangladesh need to be made aware of the importance of the “Particularities” (Actualities and Psychological Disposition) of Bangladeshi teaching-learning culture which will help them to form their contextual knowledge perpetually through reflection and action and try out classroom procedures.
2. Teachers’ role as “Reflective Practitioners” and “Transformative Intellectuals” should be emphasized in Teacher Education Programmes. They should learn to generate theory from practice. The chief concerns of Postmethod teachers is to relate personal theories to professional theories and practice autonomy. This is supposed to empower teachers which is at the heart of Postmethod pedagogy. To make teachers’ autonomous and reflective practitioners, special Teachers’ Education Programmes should be inaugurated in country that will give them proper training and guidelines as to how perform those roles. Generating practice generate theory is more difficult than theory driven practice. Therefore it is recommended that extensive and intensive teachers’ training programmes should be launched for implementing the ideas. It is easy to see Culture and Context Sensitive but as they are new for Bangladesh, it is not easy for the teachers to implement. Hence massive Teacher Education Programmes are essential.
3. Teachers’ Education Programmes should be contextualized too with a view to producing expert teachers to make the implementation of the "Practicalities" of Postmethod possible with "Principled Pragmatism."
4. Teachers of Bangladesh need to match their teaching opportunities to learners’ beliefs, expectations, learning style preferences, and learning strategies and so on which play vital role in their learning. For that also Teacher Education Programmes should be redesigned.

5. Students need to be trained to raise their *Critical Language Awareness*, preserving own language identity and retaining the norms and values of their own culture while learning English. They will be made conscious about the importance of identity formation. In this case teachers have to play vital roles. Materials should be selected and designed keeping in view these factors in mind.
6. Students should be made conscious about their roles as autonomous individuals which go beyond the features of academic and social autonomy in the background of PMP. They should make the use of the learning opportunities in and outside the classroom to maximize their learning outcomes. Besides, raising consciousness will make them capable of questioning the *status quo* which is the key concern of liberatory autonomy.
7. Curriculum designers of the country should produce curriculum and materials for teaching English that is sensitive to the local context and local knowledge should be emphasized. Teachers should no longer depend on contents that have little relevance with the Bangladeshi culture and context.
8. The present teaching-learning situation should be used as baseline data for taking pedagogic decisions which should be informed by situational realities. Tasks and activities that work in large classes and classes with minimum teaching-learning aids should be innovated.
9. The testing and evaluation system of the country needs modifications. The students are not tested what they are supposed to be tested. There should be no gap between what they are taught in class and what they are tested in examinations. Listening and speaking must also be tested. It is challenging to

administer speaking and listening test in nationwide public tests like S.S.C and H.S.C, but provision for internal assessment and viva voce might be arranged with one English teacher from the school and college itself and an external, like practical Examiners in the science subjects. It will be difficult as the number of the students will be more than double for English than an individual science subjects because English is compulsory for all branches, but it can be managed.

### **7.7 Conclusion**

In conclusion, it is obvious that Postmethod pedagogy is not a method; it is an alternative to method. It does not advocate for following pre-set principles or strategies for teaching and learning in a specific ESL/EFL context. It develops from local culture and knowledge, and takes into consideration the *situational understanding* of the given context. To address specific needs and problems, educationists and experts in Bangladesh need to closely examine and find out the strengths and weaknesses of the realities of the local context and adopt procedures required to address the local needs and problems. The kind of teachers' and learners' roles and interactional pattern that are required for "Reflective Teaching", "Principled Pragmatism" and practice generated theory building are sure to prove challenging, still they are some scientific ideas. Nevertheless, scientific implementation is very important. The study examines the prevailing teaching conditions, the "Particularities" of Bangladeshi teaching-learning culture to see whether the conditions are conducive for implementing the key features PMP. An attempt has been made in the present study to identify the potentials of and challenges for implementation of the key ideas of the parameters of "Practicality" and "Possibility". Matching the key aspects of Postmethods, the study finds out that there are some potentials, but more challenges for their implementation in the country. Therefore, a further research regarding how teachers can be motivated and trained up to

get used to these new ideas in the context of our country should be conducted. The students in the country can also be motivated through this approach to function as autonomous individuals with critical mind-sets. Yet we need to ascertain whether our students are ready to switch to an alternative to the prevailing mix-method based system of language teaching. To make them critically aware is an enormous responsibility and teachers in the country have to play the vital role and that is only possible when they are ready to go beyond the prevailing limitations of our method-centred pedagogies. So, teachers and experts here will be able to develop an appropriate pedagogy following the potentials of and challenges for Postmethods for Bangladesh only when they are ready to recognize and combat the obstacles that are outlined above in this chapter. The study also made some suggestions for overcoming the challenges, but it will not be easy to overcome them. Massive, extensive and intensive Teacher Education Programmes to train each and every teacher and developing new materials with cultural relevance and for shaping individual identity are essential. A pool of experts has to be created home and abroad for the purpose to train trainers or trainees and to design materials. Unless those can be done, there will remain a question of Postmethod Pedagogy-how pragmatic the “Principled Pragmatism” is going to prove in Bangladesh? Whether the idea of Postmethods also prove a pre-set package difficult to implement for ESL/EFL teachers, like the different methods of ELT. We have to wait and see how it works in Bangladesh and other ESL/EFL contexts, how will the high sounding but scientific ideas of PMP can be implemented, and learners have better learning outcome.



## Bibliography

- Abedin, M Zainal. *A Handbook of Research*. Dhaka & Chittagong: Book Syndicate. 2010.
- Akbari, Ramin. "Postmethod Discourse and Practice", *TESOL QUARTERLY* Vol. 42, No. 4, December 2008.
- Allen and Campbell. *Teaching English as a Second Language: A Book of Readings*. Mc Graw-Hill.
- Altan, Mustapha X. "Beliefs about Language Learning of Foreign Language- Major University Students", *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*. <http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol312/iss2/5>, 2006.
- Arikan, Arda. *Postmethod in Second Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2006.
- Banegas, Darío LuisLópez-Barrios, MarioPorto, Melina,Soto, María Alejandra. (eds). *English language teaching in the post-methods era: Selected papers from the 39<sup>th</sup> FAAPI Conference*, A.P.I.S.E (Asociación de Profesores de Inglés de Santiago del Estero), 2014.[www.faapi.org.ar](http://www.faapi.org.ar). Accessed February, 2017.
- Bassey, Michael. *Case Study Research in Educational Settings. Doing Qualitative Research in Educational Settings*. Buckingham [England]; Philadelphia: Open University Press, 1999.
- Bell, David M. "Do Teachers Really Think That Methods Are Dead?" Downloaded from <https://academic.oup.com/eltj/article/61/2/135/366387> by Korea national university of transportation user on 27 September 2020.

- Bell David M., "Method and Postmethod: Are They Really Incompatible?" *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol.37, No.2, summer, 2003. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/>. Access, August, 2017.
- Bell, Judith. *Doing Your Research Project: A Guide for First-Time Researchers in Education, Health and Social Science*. 4th ed. Maidenhead, Berkshire, England: Open University Press, 2006.
- Brown, J.D. *Understanding Research in Second Language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Brumfit, C.J. and Johnson, K., eds. *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*, Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Burns, Anne. *Doing Action Research in ELT: A Guide for Practitioners*. New York and London: Routledge, Taylor and Fransis Group, 2010.
- Can, Nilüfer. "Post-Method Pedagogy: Teacher Growth behind Walls", Proceedings of the 10th METU ELT Convention. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/>. Accessed April, 2016.
- Canagarajah, A. Suresh (ed.). *Reclaiming the Local in Language Policy and Practice*, ed. Mawah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc, Publishers, 2005.
- Canagarajah, A. Suresh. *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Canale, M. "From communicative competence to "communicative language pedagogy". In J. C. Richards and R. W. Schmidt, eds. *Language and Communication*. New York: Longman, 1983.
- Canale, M. and Swain, M. "Theoretical basis of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing". *Applied linguistics 1*, 1980.
- Candlin, Christopher N. and Mercer Neil. *English Language Teaching in its Social Context*. Newyork and London: Routledge, Taylor and Fransis Group, 2001.
- Carrel, Patricia L. "Context and formal schemata in ESL reading". *TESOL Quarterly*. Vol. 21, No.3, September, 1987, pp. 461-481.

- Carter, R. & Nunan, D., eds. *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Chalhoub-Deville, Micheline, Carol Chapelle, and Patricia Duff, eds. *Inference and Generalizability in Applied Linguistics: Multiple Perspectives. Language Learning and Language Teaching*, v. 12. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins Publishing Company, 2006.
- Chastain, K. *Developing Second-Language Skills*, the USA: HBJ Publishers, 1988.
- Chomsky, N. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1965.
- Cochran, W.G.. *Sampling Techniques*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1963.
- Cohen, L. Manion, L. & Morrison, K. *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge Falmer, 2000.
- Conlon, R. *English Works: Teaching English to Non-native Speakers in the Work place*. Colorado. US Department of Education, 1995.
- Coombe, Christine, Khan Rubina, eds. *Best Practices in ELT Voices from the Classroom*, TESOL Arabia, 2015.
- Crystal, D. *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Davies Alan, Elder Catherine, eds. *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2004.
- Davies, Alan, ed. *Dictionary of Language Testing: Studies in Language Testing*, Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Dewey John, *Experience and Education*. New York: Touchstone, 1997.
- Douglas, Lind, William Marchal, and Samuel Wathen. *Statistical Techniques in Business and Economics*. New Delhi: MacGraw-Hill, 2008.

- Ellis, R. *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Ellis, R. *Second Lagunage Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press,1998.
- Fairclough, N. (ed.) *Critical Language Awareness*. London: Longman, 1992.
- Falchikov, Nancy. *Improving Assessment through Student Involvement: Practical Solutions for Aiding Learning in Higher and Further Education*. New York: Routledge Falmer, 2005.
- Fat'hi, Jalil, Behzadpour, Fouad. "Beyond Method: The Rise of Reflective Teaching" *International Journal of English Linguistics*, Vol. 1, No. 2; September 2011.[www.ccsenet.org/ijel](http://www.ccsenet.org/ijel). Accessed May, 2019.
- Fraenkel, Jack, Norman Wallen, and Helen Hyun. *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. 8th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Humanities/Social Sciences/Languages, 2011.
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy and Civic. Courage*. (Clarke, P. Trans., 1998), Maryland: Lowman and Littlefield, 1998.
- Freire, Paulo. *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York. London: Continuum Publishing, 2005.
- Galloway, Charles M., Seltzer, Marzory Cort, Kerber, James E. & Smith, Lester S., *Theory into Practice*. Volume xxiii, No.1. Ohio State University, EDPRESS: Columbia, 1984.
- Giroux, Henry A. "Utopian Thinking under the Sign of Neo-liberalism: Towards a Critical Pedagogy of Educated Hope", *Democracy and Nature*, V01.9, No.1, 2003, pp-161-162, Doi.10.1080/1085566032000074968.
- Giroux, Henry A..*Theory and Résistance in Education: A Pedagogy for the Opposition*, Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc, Massachusetts, 1983.
- Gorard, Stephen, and Chris Taylor. *Combining Methods in Educational and Social Research*. Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2004.

- Grotjahn, R. —*On the methodological basis of introspective methods.* ‖ *Introspection in Second Language Research.* (ed). by C. Faerch and G. Kasper. Clevedon Avon, England: Multilingual Matters, 1987. Greaney, Vincent, and Thomas Kellaghan, eds. *Assessing National Achievement Levels in Education. National Assessments of Educational Achievement*, v. 1. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2008.
- Hammerly, Hector. *An Integrated Theory of Language Teaching: And its Practical Consequences*, Canada: Second Language Publications, 1985.
- Harmer Jeremy. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London: Longman, 1983.
- Harrison, Andrew. *A Language Testing Handbook*, London and Basingstoke: Macmillan Publishers LTD, 1983.
- Hashemi, Seyyed Mohammad Reza, “(Post)-Methodism: Possibility of the Impossible?”, p.141, *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 137-145, January 2011 © 2011 ACADEMY PUBLISHER Manufactured in Finland. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org>, Accessed September, 2020.
- Hasina Mahbuba, “An Evaluation of the Teaching Method of English and the Testing System at the Secondary Level in Bangladesh”. Unpublished M. A Dissertation, Department of English, University of Rajshahi, 2002.
- Holliday, Adrian. *Appropriate Methodology and Social Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Holliday, Adrian. “Innocent and ideological discourses of culture”. Posted at <http://adrianholliday.com/articles/>, February 2014. Accessed Aug, 2014.
- Hong, Yang. “On teaching strategies in second language acquisition”, Vol.5, No.1 (Serial No.38) *US-China Education Review*, ISSN1548-6613, USA, Jan. 2008. <https://researchgate.net/>. Accessed March, 2015.
- Howatt, A.P.R. *A History of English Language Teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Huda, Mohammad Emdadul, “Post-method Pedagogy and ELT in Bangladesh.” *Global Journal of Human Social Science and Linguistics and Education*, Vol. 13, Issue: 7, Version: 1.0, 2013. <https://globaljournals.org/>. Accessed July, 2013.

- Huda, Mohammad Emdadul. "Culture Sensitive Materials Design for English Language Teaching in Bangladesh". Unpublished PhD dissertation, Institute of Bangladesh Studies, University of Rajshahi, Bangladesh, 2003.
- Hui, Ming-Fai, and David L. Grossman, eds. *Improving Teacher Education through Action Research*. Routledge Research in Education 12. New York: Routledge, 2008.
- Hurd, Stella, and Tim Lewis, (eds). *Language Learning Strategies in Independent Settings*. 1st ed. Second Language Acquisition 33. Bristol, UK ; Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters, 2008.
- Hymes, D. "On communicative competence." In J. B. Pride and J. Holmes (eds) *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin." 1972.
- Islam, M. Nurul. *An Introduction to Sampling Methods: Theory and Applications*, Revised ed. Dhaka: Al-Akaba Printers, Book World, 2007.
- Karnes, Frances, Suzanne Bean. *Methods and Materials for Teaching the Gifted*. Waco, Tex.: Prufrock Press, 2009.
- Keesing-Styles, Linda, "The Relationship between Critical Pedagogy and Assessment in Teacher Education." *Radical Pedagogy*. Issn: 1524-6345., 2003, [//http.google.com/](http://http.google.com/)
- Khan, Rubina. "English Language Assessment in Bangladesh: Developments and Challenges", In Moon, Y-in and Spolsky, B. *Language Assessment in Asia: From Policy to Pedagogy*. Hyderabad, India, Cambridge University Press, pp-116-132.
- Kothari, C.R.. *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*, New Delhi: New Age International, 2004.
- Kramsch, C.(1998). *Language and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krashen,S.D. (1981). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. S. California: Pergamon Press Inc.
- Kumaravadivelu, B, "Critical Language Pedagogy: A Postmethod Perspective on

- Language Teaching”. *Forum, World Englishes*, Vol. 22, No. 4, 2003, pp. 539.[http://bkumaravadivelu.com/articles in pdfs/](http://bkumaravadivelu.com/articles%20in%20pdfs/). Accessed May 2012.
- Kumaravadivelu, B, “Toward a Postmethod Pedagogy”, [www.bkumaravadivelu.com](http://www.bkumaravadivelu.com). Accessed May, 2019.
- Kumaravadivelu, B, The “Postmethod Condition: (E)merging Strategies for Second/Foreign Language Teaching” , *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 28, No. 1. (Spring, 1994), pp. 27-48. Stable URL:<http://links.jstor.org/>. Accessed December, 2015.
- Kumaravadivelu, B, *Understanding Language Teaching: From method to Postmethod*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc, Publishers, 2008.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. *Beyond Methods: Macrostrategies for Language Teaching*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2003.
- Kuntz, Patricia S. “Beliefs about Language Learning: The Horwitz Model, 1996. EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC), USA. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/>. Accessed September, 2015.
- Lado, R, *Linguistics Across culture: Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1957.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Littlewood, William T, *Foreign and Second Language Learning: Language Acquisition Research and Its Implications for the Classroom*. Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Mair, Christian, ed. *The Politics of English as a World Language: New Horizon in Postcolonial Cultural Studies*. Amsterdam New York: Rodopi, 2003.
- Master, Peter. “Positive and Negative Aspects of the Dominance of English”, *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 32, No. 4 (winter, 1998), pp. 716. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3588002>. Accessed July 2012.

- McDonough, J., & Shaw, C. (1993). *Materials and Methods in ELT*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Mclaren. P. "Radical Pedagogy as Cultural Politics: Beyond the Discourse of Critique and Anti-utopiannism." In. P. McLaren, ed., *Pedagogy, Culture and the Body*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Mclaughlin, Barry, *Theories of Second Language Learning*, Routledge, Chapman and Hall, Inc, New York, 1989.
- McNamara, Tim, *Language Testing*. Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Monchisnski, Tony, *Critical Pedagogy and the Everyday Classroom* , Springer, Newyork, 2008.
- Mothhaka, Hlavisio A, "Exploring Postmethod pedagogy in Teaching English as Second Language in South African Higher Education". *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, vol.No.1.pp.517-524, MCSER Publishing, Rome, Italy, 2015.<https://researchgate.net/>. Accessed January 2018.
- Mouton, J., ,H. Marais. *Basic Concepts in the Methodology of the Social Sciences*. HSRC Studies in Research Methodology 4. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council, 1988.
- Muijs, Daniel. *Doing Quantitative Research in Education with SPSS*. London ; Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2004.
- Mullany, Louise, and Peter Stockwell. *Introducing English Language: A Resource Book for Students*. Routledge English Language Introductions. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon ; New York, NY: Routledge, 2010.
- Nayla, Samina Akter."Communicative Language Teaching in Bangladesh: Teacher's Beliefs and Practices." *ASA University Review*. Vol. 2, July-Dec, 2008.
- Neogi, Anirban, "Myth and Reality of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in Bangladesh: A Case Study of Teaching the Higher Secondary Textbook." Unpublished M.A dissertation, Department of English, University of Rajshahi, Bangladesh, 2005.



- Nunan, David. "The Impact of English as a Global Language on Educational Policies and Practices in the Asia-Pacific Region", *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 37, No. 4 (Winter, 2003), pp. 589-613. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3588214>. Accessed July, 2012.
- Nunan, David. *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.1989.
- Nunan, David. *Practical English Language Teaching*. Mc Graw Hill. 2003.
- Nunan, David. *First Language Learning and Language Acquisition*. National Curriculum Resource Centre. Canberra, 1985.
- O'Neil.Jr., Harold F.(eds), *Learner Strategies*, Academic Press. Inc, 1978.
- Pennycook, A., *Critical applied linguistics: a critical introduction*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc, Publishers, 2001.
- Pennycook, A., *Critical Applied Linguistics: A Critical Introduction*. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2001.
- Pennycook, Alastair, "The Concept of Method, Interested Knowledge, and the Politics of Language Teaching." *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 23. No. 4, 1989, pp. 589-618. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3588214>. Accessed July, 2012.
- Phillipson, Robert, *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Pole, Christopher John, and Marlene Morrison. *Ethnography for Education*. Maidenhead, England: Open University Press, 2003.
- Porter, Andrew C., Adam Gamoran, eds. *Methodological Advances in Cross-National Surveys of Educational Achievement*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 2002.
- Prabhu, N. S. "There Is No Best Method-Why?" *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 24, No. 2. (Summer, 1990), pp. 161-176. Stable URL: <http://links.jstor.org/>. Accessed June, 2018.
- Reagan Timothy G. & Osborn Terry, A. *The Foreign Language Educator in Society: Toward a Critical Pedagogy*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc Publishers Mahwah, NJ, 2008.

Reid, Joy M., ed. *Understanding Learning Styles*. New Jersey: PRENTICE HALL REGENTS, 1998.

Richards, Jack C. "30 Years of TESL or TEFL: A Personal Reflection", Seameo Regional Language Centre, [\\_//www.professorjackrichards.com//](http://www.professorjackrichards.com/)accessed January, 2008.

Richards, Jack C. *The Language Teaching Matrix*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Richards, Jack C., Rodgers, Theodore, *Approaches to and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Sadat, M. Mamun, Islam, Md. Shafiul and Bhowmik, Subrata Kumar. "Say 'yes' to learners: identifying learner's preferences for EFL in Bangladesh". *Jahangirnagar University Studies in Language and Literature: Harvest*, Vol. 19. 2004, pp. 112-128.

Sarwood Smith, Michael. *Second Language Learning*, Longman Group UK Limited, 1995.

Schmitt, Norbert, ed. *Formulaic Sequences: Acquisition, Processing, and Use*. *Language Learning and Language Teaching*, v. 9. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub, 2004.

Shahidullah, M, "English Studies in Bangladesh: Quest for a Native Pedagogy". 2014. In Abdullah Al Mamun and Maswood Akhter, eds, *Literature, History and Culture: Writings in Honour of Professor Aali Areefur Rehman*. Department of English, University of Rajshahi, Bangladesh, 2014.

Shahidullah, M, "Significance of teaching-learning situation in language learning and an emperical survey of the teaching-learning situation in Bangladesh." *Jahangirnagar University Studies in Language and Literature: Harvest* Vol.19. 2004, pp. 112-128.

Shahidullah, M, "Teaching-learning Culture in Bangladesh, And Recent ELT Theories: Conformity and Contradiction", Unpublished PhD dissertation, Department of English, University of Pune, India, 1997.

- Shakouri, Nima, "Methods Are Not Dead!" *Journal of Comparative Literature and Culture (JCLC)* .7 Vol. 1, No. 1, World Science Publisher, United States 2012, [www.worldsciencepublisher.org](http://www.worldsciencepublisher.org). Accessed June 2013.
- Sheldon, Leslie E., "Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials". <https://academic.oup.com/>. Accessed May, 2019.
- Somekh, Bridget. *Action Research: A Methodology for Change and Development. Doing Qualitative Research in Educational Settings*. Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2006.
- Stern, H.H. *Fundamental Concepts of ELT*. Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Sung, Kiwan, Rod Pederson, eds. *Critical ELT Practices in Asia: Key Issues Practices and Possibilities*. Rotterdam: Sense, 2012.
- Thanasoulas, D. 'The importance of teaching culture in the foreign language classroom.' *Radical pedagogy*.2001.
- Trawiński, Mariusz. *An Outline of Second Language Acquisition Theories*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Akademii Pedagogicznej, 2005.
- Turabian, Kate L. *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses and Dissertations*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2007.
- Warschauer, Mark. "The Changing Global Economy and the Future of English Teaching" *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 34, No. 3, TESOL in the 21st Century (autumn, 2000), pp. 511-535. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3587741> .Accessed July, 2012.
- Wenden, Anita, Joan Rubin (ed.), *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*. Prentice Hall (UK) Limited, 1987.

# Appendices

## Appendix 1: Questionnaire for Teachers

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am doing research on *Postmethod Pedagogy and English Language Teaching in Bangladesh: Challenges and Potentials*. The purpose of this study is to recommend a development in teaching and learning English in Bangladesh. So your response to this questionnaire is important. For this study, I would request you answer the questions with patience. Please also tick (√) the appropriate box for each item in this questionnaire. Your responses will be strictly confidential and will be used only for the purpose of the study. Thank you.

**Mohsina Ahsan**  
PhD Fellow: 2011-12, IBS, RU  
Contact: 01780000722  
mohsina.ahsan@yahoo.com

### Section- A: Personal Details

|     |                     |             |                 |         |
|-----|---------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------|
| SL  |                     |             |                 |         |
| 1.1 | Name                |             |                 |         |
| 1.2 | Gender              | Male        | Female          |         |
| 1.2 | Name of College     |             |                 |         |
| 1.4 | District Name       | 1. Rajshahi | Chapainawabganj | Pabna   |
| 1.5 | Location of College | 1.Urban     | 2. Semi-urban   | 3.Rural |
| 1.6 | Type of College     | Government  | Non-government  |         |
| 1.7 | Qualification       | Honours     | Masters         | Others  |
| 1.8 | Training on ELT     | Yes         | No              |         |

### Section- B: Experience of Teaching and Learning English

2. Read the following statements and decide to what extent each of them describe your experience of teaching-learning English. Choose and tick (✓) any of the 5 numbers in the boxes against each statement as your answer. Of the five numbers, 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Undecided, 2=Disagree, and 1=Strongly Disagree.

| SL   | Statements   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|------|--|-------------------|----------|-----------|-------|----------------|
| 2.1  | You lecture most of the time in the classroom.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.2  | Your students remain silent in the class mostly and speak only when you ask them questions.                          | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.3  | You are very formal and always maintain a distance from your students and so they are afraid of you.                 | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.4  | You create language learning opportunities in the class for practicing different skills and sub-skills of English.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.5  | You help your students in doing tasks or activities.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.6  | You are very friendly and helpful and therefore students can have access to you whenever they need.                  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.7  | You encourage learners' independent thinking/creativity.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.8  | Your students entirely depend on you for their learning.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.9  | You take part in selecting materials and other classroom activities(methodology).                                    | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.10 | You rebuke your students if they commit errors.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.11 | You use seminar presentations and participations in class by students.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.12 | You use demonstrations in the class.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.13 | You assign different types of tasks to your students in class.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.14 | You encourage students to talk in the class.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.15 | You use pair work in the class.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.16 | You use group work in the class.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.17 | You explain everything for your students.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.18 | You involve your students in finding out things by themselves first and afterwards you provide feedback and explain. | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |

### Section- C: Beliefs of Teachers about Teaching and Learning English

3. Read the following statements and decide to what extent each of them describe your beliefs about teaching- learning English. Choose and tick (√) any of the 5 numbers in the boxes against each statement as your answer. Of the five numbers, 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Undecided, 2=Disagree, and 1=Strongly Disagree.

| SL   | Statements   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|------|--|-------------------|----------|-----------|-------|----------------|
|      | You believe:   |                   |          |           |       |                |
| 3.1  | Lectures are very useful for learning.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.2  | Students' active participation is necessary for language learning.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.3  | It is mostly teachers' responsibility to ensure students' learning.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.4  | The natural ability (aptitude) to learn a foreign language is important for language learning.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.5  | English is best learned through memorization.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.6  | Language skills develop through practice and so opportunities for practice are important.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.7  | Students should be allowed to ask questions in class whenever they need.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.8  | Students learn better when there is enough interaction (communicative activities) in class.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.9  | Use of mother tongue is necessary for learning English   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.10 | Knowledge about target language culture is important to learn English  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.11 | Errors should be corrected in time.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.12 | Using mother tongue is necessary for making classroom activities effective.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.13 | Teachers are experts, they know how to organize things better to help learners learn English.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.14 | It is w easier to read and write English than to speak and understand it. So reading and writing should be taught before listening and speaking. | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.15 | Learning how to translate from your native language (Bangla) to English and vice-versa helps language-learning.                                  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.16 | Grammar is very important for learning English.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.17 | Skills of English helps learners to get a good job.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.18 | Learning English is different from learning other subjects.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.19 | English is difficult to learn.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.20 | Learners should take responsibility for their learning.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.21 | Pair works are helpful for learning.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.22 | Group works are helpful for learning.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |

### Section-D: Expectations about Teaching and Learning English

4. Read the following statements and decide to what extent each of them describe your expectations about teaching-learning English. Choose and tick (✓) any of the 5 numbers in the boxes against each statement as your answer. Of the five numbers, 1=No/Never, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 4=Very Often, and 5=Always

| SL   | Statements  | No/Never | Sometimes | Often | Very Often | Always |
|------|---|----------|-----------|-------|------------|--------|
|      | You expect :  |          |           |       |            |        |
| 4.1  | Students should learn by listening to your lectures in the class.   | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 4.2  | Errors should not be overlooked.  | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 4.3  | Grammar should be taught and learned seriously.   | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 4.4  | Your students will like of your using course materials and textbooks that relates to your home-culture and context. | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 4.5  | Students should participate in interactive activities in the class as much as possible.                             | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 4.6  | Teachers should create opportunities for skills training.   | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 4.7  | Students should be engaged in pair works.   | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 4.8  | Students should be involved in group works.   | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 4.9  | Students should be allowed to work independently.   | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 4.10 | Students' critical language awareness (i.e. how English shapes your life and personality) should be promoted.       | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 4.11 | Students should be taught about <i>cultural consciousness</i> .   | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |

### Section-E: Students' Learning Style Preferences

5. Read the following statements and describe to what extent they describe English learning style preferences of your students. Choose and tick (✓) any of the 5 numbers in the boxes against each statement as your answer. Of the five numbers, 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Undecided, 2=Disagree, and 1=Strongly Disagree.

| SL   | Statements   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|------|--|-------------------|----------|-----------|-------|----------------|
|      | Your students prefer to learn:   |                   |          |           |       |                |
| 5.1  | from your lectures.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.2  | through discussions with their class-mates.                                      | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.3  | by following your points you make and write on board.                            | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.4  | by practicing different types of activities in the class.                        | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.5  | things by heart (i.e. by memorizing things).                                     | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.6  | how to express your ideas or opinion about a topic.                              | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.7  | by asking you questions.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.8  | By choosing for themselves what they want to learn.                              | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.9  | by following their own plan for achieving their goals.                           | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
|      | You prefer your students to:   |                   |          |           |       |                |
| 5.10 | do everything on their own in the class.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.11 | select content, material and method for their learning.                          | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.12 | learn by using examples from day to day life events rather than using textbooks. | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
|      | Your students learn better:  |                   |          |           |       |                |
| 5.13 | if you tell them what to do and you guide them.                                  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.14 | if they learn independently.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.15 | when students listen to someone explaining something in the class.               | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.16 | when you use white-board in the class.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.17 | if they make drawings as they study.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.18 | If they take notes while you lecture.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.19 | when their peers tells them how to do something in the class.                    | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.20 | when they learn individually.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.21 | when they learn in pairs.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.22 | when they learn in groups.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |



### Section-F: Students' Learning Strategies

6. Read the following statements and decide to what extent each of them describe your students' English learning strategies. Choose and tick (✓) any of the 5 numbers in the boxes against each statement as your answer. Of the five numbers, 1=No/Never, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 4=Very Often, and 5=Always

| SL   | Statements   | No/Never | Sometimes | Often | Very-Often | Always |
|------|--|----------|-----------|-------|------------|--------|
|      | Your students:   |          |           |       |            |        |
| 6.1  | use their first language knowledge to learn English.                     | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.2  | compare the grammar rules of their mother language with that of English. | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.3  | use what they already know to learn something new.                       | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.4  | focus on pictures, subtitles and keywords when they read.                | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.5  | think about techniques that help them to learn English better.           | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.6  | use grammar rules consciously for developing their skills.               | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.7  | think about grammar rules when they write.                               | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.8  | monitor and judge their own progress in language learning                | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.9  | identify problems that delay their learning.                             | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.10 | use library to learn English.  | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.11 | use internet to learn English.   | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.12 | use other sources to learn English.                                      | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.13 | use a dictionary to understand new words while reading.                  | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.14 | try to guess the meaning of new words when they read.                    | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.15 | look for conversation partners to improve speaking skills.               | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.16 | do not like to make mistakes when they speak/write.                      | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.17 | can not evaluate their own performance.                                  | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.18 | look for opportunities for practice.                                     | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |

### Section-G: Learning Opportunities of Students

7. Read the following statements and decide to what extent each of them describe students' teaching-learning opportunities of English in your college.

7.1 Choose and tick (√) any of the 5 numbers in the boxes against each statement as your answer. Of the five numbers, 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Undecided, 2=Disagree, and 1=Strongly Disagree.

| SL   | Statements  | Strongly Agree<br>Strongly Disagree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|------|---|-------------------------------------|-------|-----------|----------|-------------------|
|      | Your students:  |                                     |       |           |          |                   |
| 7.1  | get enough opportunities to express their ideas or opinions in the class. | 1                                   | 2     | 3         | 4        | 5                 |
| 7.2  | can share their ideas or opinions with their peers in the class.          | 1                                   | 2     | 3         | 4        | 5                 |
| 7.3  | can ask questions while the lesson goes on.                               | 1                                   | 2     | 3         | 4        | 5                 |
| 7.4  | are engaged in problem-solving activities                                 | 1                                   | 2     | 3         | 4        | 5                 |
| 7.5  | learn grammar in the class.   | 1                                   | 2     | 3         | 4        | 5                 |
| 7.6  | are given the responsibility for their own learning.                      | 1                                   | 2     | 3         | 4        | 5                 |
| 7.7  | are asked questions while the lesson goes on.                             | 1                                   | 2     | 3         | 4        | 5                 |
| 7.8  | are made to watch TV programmes in English in the class.                  | 1                                   | 2     | 3         | 4        | 5                 |
| 7.9  | are taught words with meanings in different contexts.                     | 1                                   | 2     | 3         | 4        | 5                 |
| 7.10 | take part in different role-playing activities in the class.              | 1                                   | 2     | 3         | 4        | 5                 |
| 7.11 | are provided a friendly and relaxed environment in your English class.    | 1                                   | 2     | 3         | 4        | 5                 |

7.2 Choose and tick (√) any of the 3 numbers in the boxes against each statement as your answer. Of the three numbers, 3=Yes, 2=Yes but not enough or not always and 1=No/Never.

| SL    | Statements                            | No/<br>Never | Yes but not enough<br>/not always | Yes |
|-------|---------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|-----|
|       | Your college arranges regular:        |              |                                   |     |
| 7.2.1 | English poetry recitation session.    | 1            | 2                                 | 3   |
| 7.2.2 | English extempore speech competition. | 1            | 2                                 | 3   |
| 7.2.3 | English essay competition.            | 1            | 2                                 | 3   |

**Section-H: English Teaching-Learning Situation**

8. Read the following statements and decide to what extent each of them describe your experience of English teaching-learning situation in your college. Choose and tick ( $\checkmark$ ) any of the 3 numbers in the boxes against each statement as your answer. Of the three numbers, 1=Yes, 2=Yes but not enough or not always and 3=No.

| SL  | Statements  | No/<br>Never | Yes but not enough /<br>not always | Yes |
|-----|---|--------------|------------------------------------|-----|
|     | You have :  |              |                                    |     |
| 8.1 | a good stock of text books or course books in your college library. | 3            | 2                                  | 1   |
| 8.2 | a language laboratory in your college.                              | 3            | 2                                  | 1   |
| 8.3 | a language club in your college.                                    | 3            | 2                                  | 1   |
| 8.4 | a debating club in your college.                                    | 3            | 2                                  | 1   |
| 8.5 | audio facilities in your institution.                               | 3            | 2                                  | 1   |
| 8.6 | video facilities in your college.                                   | 3            | 2                                  | 1   |
| 8.7 | have computer facility in your college.                             | 3            | 2                                  | 1   |
| 8.8 | well furnished, spacious and clean classrooms.                      | 3            | 2                                  | 1   |

8.9. The number of regular students in class 11/12 is: (Put tick [ $\checkmark$ ] mark for the right answer)

|             |                 |
|-------------|-----------------|
| a. below 40 | b. more than 40 |
|-------------|-----------------|

8.10 The benches/chairs or desks in your college are fixed to the ground or floor. (Put tick [ $\checkmark$ ] mark for the right answer)

|        |       |
|--------|-------|
| a. Yes | b. No |
|--------|-------|

### Section- I: Testing and Evaluation System

9. Read the following statements and decide to what extent each of them describe your experience of English testing and evaluation system in Bangladesh. Choose and tick (✓) any of the 2 numbers in the boxes against each statement as your answer. Of the two numbers, 2=Yes and 1=No.

| SL   | Statements  | Yes | No |
|------|---|-----|----|
| 9.1  | The test paper contains varieties of questions in their tests.                                  | 2   | 1  |
| 9.2  | The contents questions are selected from textbooks.   | 2   | 1  |
| 9.3  | The component of tests covers all the sub-skills of reading.                                    | 2   | 1  |
| 9.4  | Students' writing skills are tested.  | 2   | 1  |
| 9.5  | Listening skills of the students are tested.  | 2   | 1  |
| 9.6  | Speaking skills of the students are tested.   | 2   | 1  |
| 9.7  | Separate questions are set for different skills (i.e listening, speaking, reading and writing). | 2   | 1  |
| 9.8  | Is there a gap between items you teach in the class and items that are set in the examinations? | 2   | 1  |
| 9.9  | Tests cover the different areas of language.  | 2   | 1  |
| 9.10 | The questions are subjective.   | 2   | 1  |
| 9.11 | The questions are objective.  | 2   | 1  |
| 9.12 | The questions are unambiguous and easy to understand.   | 2   | 1  |
| 9.13 | Testing and evaluation system is reliable and satisfactory.                                     | 2   | 1  |
| 9.14 | You take face to face interview of students for speaking test.                                  | 2   | 1  |
| 9.15 | There is a clear instruction for the questions to be answered.                                  | 2   | 1  |
| 9.16 | You make your students listen to native speakers speech in their listening test.                | 2   | 1  |
| 9.17 | Your students listen to audio/CD player records in the listening test.                          | 2   | 1  |
| 9.18 | You provide your students test instructions properly.   | 2   | 1  |
| 9.19 | You get proper test format instruction from NCTB.   | 2   | 1  |
| 9.20 | Score of the same examinee will be different if marked by different examiners.                  | 2   | 1  |
| 9.21 | Score of the same examinee will be the same whoever is the examiner.                            | 2   | 1  |
| 9.22 | Questions are not set from outside the syllabus.  | 2   | 1  |
| 9.23 | Students are familiar with the test format and techniques.                                      | 2   | 1  |
| 9.24 | Tests contain knowledge of English language.  | 2   | 1  |
| 9.25 | Students are tested what they are supposed to be tested.  | 2   | 1  |

## Appendix 2: Questionnaire for Students

Dear Student,

I am doing research on *Postmethod Pedagogy and English Language Teaching in Bangladesh: Challenges and Potentials*. The purpose of this study is to recommend a development in teaching and learning English in Bangladesh. So your response to this questionnaire is important. For this study, I would request you answer the questions with patience. Please also tick the appropriate box for each item in this questionnaire. Your responses will be strictly confidential and will be used only for the purpose of the study. Thank you.

**Mohsina Ahsan**  
PhD Fellow: 2011-12, IBS, RU  
Contact: 01780000722;  
mohsina.ahsan@yahoo.com

**Section- A: Personal Details**

|     |                     |             |                 |         |
|-----|---------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------|
| SL  |                     |             |                 |         |
| 1.1 | Name                |             |                 |         |
| 1.2 | Gender              | Male        | Female          |         |
| 1.2 | Name of College     |             |                 |         |
| 1.4 | District Name       | 1. Rajshahi | Chapainawabganj | Pabna   |
| 1.5 | Location of College | 1.Urban     | 2. Semi-urban   | 3.Rural |
| 1.6 | Type of College     | Government  | Non-government  |         |
| 1.7 | Class               |             |                 |         |
| 1.8 | Roll                |             |                 |         |

**Section- B: Experience of Students about Teaching and Learning English**

2. Read the following statements and decide to what extent each of them describe your experience of teaching-learning English. Choose and tick (√) any of the 5 numbers in the boxes against each statement as your answer. Of the five numbers, 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Undecided, 2=Disagree, and 1=Strongly Disagree.

| SL   | Statements  | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|------|---|-------------------|----------|-----------|-------|----------------|
| 2.1  | Your teacher lectures most of the time in the classroom.  |                   |          |           |       |                |
| 2.2  | You remain silent in the class mostly and speak only when your teacher asks you questions.                                | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.3  | Your teachers are very formal and always maintain a distance from you and so you are afraid of them.                      | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.4  | Your teacher creates language learning opportunities in the class for practicing different skills and sub-skills.         | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.5  | Your teachers are very friendly and therefore you can have access to them whenever you need.                              | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.6  | Your teacher helps you in doing tasks or activities.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.7  | Your teacher encourages you to think independently or creatively.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.8  | You entirely depend on your teacher for your learning.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.9  | You take part in selecting materials and other classroom activities(methodology).   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.10 | You are criticized by your teacher if you make mistakes/errors.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.11 | Your learning process includes seminar presentations and participations.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.12 | Your teacher uses boards to make lessons clear to you in the class.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.13 | You participate in different classroom tasks assigned by your teachers.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.14 | You are encouraged to talk in the class.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.15 | You work in pairs in the class.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.16 | You work in group in the class.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.17 | Your teacher explains everything for you in the class.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 2.18 | Your teacher involves you in finding out things by yourselves first and afterwards he/she provides feedback and explains. | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |

### Section- C: Beliefs about Teaching and Learning English

3. Read the following statements and decide to what extent each of them describe your beliefs about teaching- learning English. Choose and tick (✓) any of the 5 numbers in the boxes against each statement as your answer. Of the five numbers, 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Undecided, 2=Disagree, and 1=Strongly Disagree.

| SL   | Statements   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|------|--|-------------------|----------|-----------|-------|----------------|
|      | You believe:   |                   |          |           |       |                |
| 3.1  | Lectures are helpful for learning.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.2  | It is the students' duty to take active part in the learning process.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.3  | It is mostly teachers' responsibility to ensure students' learning.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.4  | The natural ability (aptitude) to learn a foreign language is important for language learning.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.5  | English is best learned through memorization.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.6  | Language skills develop through practice and so opportunities for practice are important.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.7  | Students should be allowed to ask your questions in class whenever you need.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.8  | Students learn better when there is enough interaction (communicative activities) in class.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.9  | Use of mother tongue is necessary for learning English.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.10 | Knowledge about target language culture is important to learn English  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.11 | Errors should be corrected in time.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.12 | Using mother tongue is necessary for making classroom activities effective.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.13 | Your teachers are experts who know how to organize things better to help learners learn English.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.14 | It is w easier to read and write English than to speak and understand it. So reading and writing should be taught before listening and speaking. | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.15 | Learning how to translate from your native language (Bangla) to English and vice-versa is important for learning English.                        | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.16 | Grammar is very important for learning English.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.17 | Skills of English help learners to get good jobs.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.18 | Learning English is different from learning other subjects.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.19 | English is difficult to learn.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.20 | Learners should take responsibility of their learning.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.21 | Pair works are helpful for learning English.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 3.22 | Group works are helpful for learning English.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |

### Section-D: Expectations about Teaching and Learning English

4. Read the following statements and decide to what extent each of them describe your expectations about teaching-learning English. Choose and tick (✓) any of the 5 numbers in the boxes against each statement as your answer. Of the five numbers, 1=No/Never, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 4=Very Often, and 5=Always

| SL   | Statements   | No/Never | Sometimes | Often | Very Often | Always |
|------|--|----------|-----------|-------|------------|--------|
|      | You expect that:   |          |           |       |            |        |
| 4.1  | You should learn from listening to teachers' lectures in the class.  | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 4.2  | Your teacher should not overlook your errors.  | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 4.3  | Grammar should be taught seriously in the class.   | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 4.4  | Your teacher would use interesting course materials and textbooks that relates to your home-culture and context, teacher would use | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 4.5  | You should be engaged in interactive activities in the class as much as possible.  | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 4.6  | Your teacher should create opportunities for skills training.  | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 4.7  | You should be engaged in group works.  | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 4.8  | You should be engaged in pair works.   | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 4.9  | You should be allowed to work independently.   | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 4.10 | Your teacher should help you to promote your critical language awareness (i.e. how English shapes your life and personality).      | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 4.11 | Your teacher should teach you about cultural consciousness.  | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |



### Section-E: Students' Learning Style Preferences

5. Read the following statements and decide to what extent they describe your English language learning style preferences. tick (√) any of the 5 numbers in the boxes against each statement as your answer. Of the five numbers, 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Undecided, 2=Disagree, and 1=Strongly Disagree.

| SL   | Statements  | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|------|---|-------------------|----------|-----------|-------|----------------|
|      | You prefer to learn:  |                   |          |           |       |                |
| 5.1  | from lectures of your teachers.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.2  | through discussions with your class-mates.                              | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.3  | by following teachers' points written on board.                         | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.4  | by practicing different types of activities in the class.               | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.5  | things by heart (i.e. by memorizing things).                            | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.6  | how to express your ideas or opinion about a topic.                     | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.7  | by asking your teachers questions.                                      | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.8  | choosing for yourself what you want to learn.                           | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.9  | by following your own plan for achieving your goal.                     | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
|      | You prefer you teacher to:  |                   |          |           |       |                |
| 5.10 | do everything for you in the class.                                     | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.11 | select content, material and method for your class.                     | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.12 | evaluate your class performance.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.13 | using examples from day to day life events rather than using textbooks. | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
|      | You learn better:   |                   |          |           |       |                |
| 5.14 | if the teacher tells you what to do and guide you in the class.         | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.15 | if you learn independently.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.16 | when you listen to someone explaining something in the class.           | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.17 | when teacher uses white-board in the class.                             | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.18 | if you make drawings as you study.                                      | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.19 | if you take notes while the teachers lectures.                          | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.20 | when somebody tells you how to do something in the class.               | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.21 | when you learn in pairs.  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 5.22 | when you learn in groups.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |

### Section-F: Students' Learning Strategies

6. Read the following statements and decide to what extent each of them describe your strategies of learning English. Choose and tick (✓) any of the 5 numbers in the boxes against each statement as your answer. Of the five numbers, 1=No/Never, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 4=Very Often, and 5=Always

| SL   | Statements   | No/Never | Sometimes | Often | Very-Often | Always |
|------|--|----------|-----------|-------|------------|--------|
|      | You :  |          |           |       |            |        |
| 6.1  | use your first language knowledge to learn English                 | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.2  | compare the grammar rules of your language with that of English    | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.3  | use what you already know to learn something new                   | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.4  | focus on pictures, subtitles and keywords when you read            | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.5  | think about techniques that will help you to learn English better. | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.6  | think about grammar rules when you speak.                          | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.7  | think about grammar rules when you write.                          | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.8  | monitor and judge your own progress in language learning           | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.9  | identify problems that delay your learning.                        | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.10 | use library, internet or other sources to learn English.           | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.11 | use a dictionary to understand new words while reading.            | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.12 | you try to guess the meaning of new words when you read.           | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.13 | seek conversation partners to improve your skills.                 | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.14 | do not like to make mistakes when you speak/write.                 | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.15 | can not evaluate your own performance.                             | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |
| 6.16 | look for opportunities for practice.                               | 1        | 2         | 3     | 4          | 5      |

### Section-G: Learning Opportunities of Students

7. Read the following statements and decide to what extent each of them describe your opportunities of learning English.

7.1 Choose and tick (√) any of the 5 numbers in the boxes against each statement as your answer. Of the five numbers, 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Undecided, 2=Disagree, and 1=Strongly Disagree.

| SL     | Statements   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|--------|--|-------------------|----------|-----------|-------|----------------|
|        | You:   |                   |          |           |       |                |
| 7.1.1  | get enough opportunities to express your own ideas or opinions in the class. | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 7.1.2  | can share your ideas or opinions with your peers in the class.               | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 7.1.3  | can ask questions while the lesson goes on.                                  | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 7.1.4  | are engaged in problem-solving activities                                    | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 7.1.5  | are taught grammar in the class.   | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 7.1.6  | are given the responsibility of your own learning.                           | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 7.1.7  | are asked questions while the lesson goes on.                                | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 7.1.8  | you are made to watch TV programmes in English in the class.                 | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 7.1.9  | are taught words with meanings in different contexts.                        | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 7.1.10 | take part in different role-playing activities in the class.                 | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |
| 7.1.11 | are provided a friendly and relaxed environment in your English class.       | 1                 | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5              |

7.2 Choose and tick (√) any of the 3 numbers in the boxes against each statement as your answer. Of the three numbers, 3=Yes, 2=Yes but not enough or not always and 1=No/Never.

| SL     | Statements                           | No/ Never | Yes but not enough / not always | Yes |
|--------|--------------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|-----|
|        | Your college arranges regular:       |           |                                 |     |
| 7.2.1. | English poetry recitation session    | 1         | 2                               | 3   |
| 7.2.2  | English extempore speech competition | 1         | 2                               | 3   |
| 7.2.3  | English essay competition            | 1         | 2                               | 3   |

### Section-H: English Teaching-Learning Situation

8. Read the following statements and decide to what extent each of them describe your experience of English teaching-learning situation in your college. Choose and tick (✓) any of the 3 numbers in the boxes against each statement as your answer. Of the three numbers, 3=Yes, 2=Yes but not enough or not always and 1=No.

| SL  | Statements  | No/<br>Never | Yes but not enough<br>/ not always | Yes |
|-----|---|--------------|------------------------------------|-----|
|     | You have :  |              |                                    |     |
| 8.1 | a good stock of text books or course books in your college library. | 1            | 2                                  | 3   |
| 8.2 | a language laboratory in your college.                              | 1            | 2                                  | 3   |
| 8.3 | a language club in your college.                                    | 1            | 2                                  | 3   |
| 8.4 | a debating club in your college.                                    | 1            | 2                                  | 3   |
| 8.5 | audio facilities in your institution.                               | 1            | 2                                  | 3   |
| 8.6 | video facilities in your college.                                   | 1            | 2                                  | 3   |
| 8.7 | have computer facility in your college.                             | 1            | 2                                  | 3   |
| 8.8 | well furnished, spacious and clean classrooms.                      | 1            | 2                                  | 3   |

8.9. The number of regular students in class 11/12 is: (Put tick [✓] mark for the right answer)

|             |                 |
|-------------|-----------------|
| a. below 40 | b. more than 40 |
|-------------|-----------------|

8.10 The benches/chairs or desks in your college are fixed to the ground or floor. (Put tick [✓] mark for the right answer)

|        |       |
|--------|-------|
| a. Yes | b. No |
|--------|-------|

### Section- I: Testing and Evaluation System

9. Read the following statements and decide to what extent each of them describe your experience of English testing and evaluation system in Bangladesh. Choose and tick (√) any of the 2 numbers in the boxes against each statement as your answer. Of the two numbers, 2=Yes and 1=No.

| SL   | Statements  | True | False |
|------|---|------|-------|
| 9.1  | The test paper contains varieties of questions in their tests.  | 2    | 1     |
| 9.2  | The contents questions are selected from textbooks.   | 2    | 1     |
| 9.3  | The component of tests covers all the sub-skills of reading.  | 2    | 1     |
| 9.4  | Students' writing skills are tested.  | 2    | 1     |
| 9.5  | Listening skills of the students are tested.  | 2    | 1     |
| 9.6  | Speaking skills of the students are tested.   | 2    | 1     |
| 9.7  | Separate questions are set for different skills (i.e listening, speaking, reading and writing).       | 2    | 1     |
| 9.8  | Is there a gap between items students taught in the class and items that are set in the examinations? | 2    | 1     |
| 9.9  | Tests cover the different areas of language.  | 2    | 1     |
| 9.10 | The questions are subjective.   | 2    | 1     |
| 9.11 | The questions are objective.  | 2    | 1     |
| 9.12 | The questions are unambiguous and easy to understand.   | 2    | 1     |
| 9.13 | Testing and evaluation system is satisfactory.  | 2    | 1     |
| 9.14 | You r teachers take face to face interview of you for speaking test.                                  | 2    | 1     |
| 9.15 | There is a clear instruction for the questions to be answered.  | 2    | 1     |
| 9.16 | Your teacher make your listen to native speakers speech in your listening test.                       | 2    | 1     |
| 9.17 | You listen to audio/CD player records in the listening test.  | 2    | 1     |
| 9.18 | You are provided test instructions properly.  | 2    | 1     |
| 9.19 | Your teachers get proper test format instruction from NCTB.   | 2    | 1     |
| 9.20 | Score of the same examinee will be different if marked by different examiners.                        | 2    | 1     |
| 9.21 | Score of the same examinee will be the same whoever is the examiner.                                  | 2    | 1     |
| 9.22 | Questions are not set from outside the syllabus.  | 2    | 1     |
| 9.23 | Students are familiar with the test format and techniques.  | 2    | 1     |
| 9.24 | Tests contain knowledge of English language.  | 2    | 1     |
| 9.25 | Students are tested what they are supposed to be tested.  | 2    | 1     |

### Appendix 3: Class-room Observation Scheme

| SN.   | Statements |   |
|---|------------|---|
| 1. Teachers' Role                                   | 1.1        | Teacher lectures.   |
|   | 1.2        | Teacher creates scopes to participate in communicative activities.          |
|   | 1.3        | Teacher encourages students to converse with peers.                         |
|   | 1.4        | Teacher makes students do different language skills practicing activities.  |
|   | 1.5        | Teacher is friendly and cooperative.  |
|   | 1.6        | Teacher is formal and not helpful.  |
|   | 1.7        | Teacher engages students in different problem solving activities.           |
|   | 1.8        | Teacher uses boards to demonstrate lessons.                                 |
|   | 1.9        | Teacher monitors classroom activities.                                      |
|   | 1.10       | Teachers act as "Reflective Practitioners."                                 |
|   | 1.11       | Teachers act as "Transformative Intellectuals."                             |
| 2. Learners' Role                                   | 2.1        | Students are active.  |
|   | 2.2        | Students come up with their own ideas or opinions.                          |
|   | 2.3        | Students work individually.   |
|   | 2.4        | Students work in pairs.   |
|   | 2.5        | Students work in groups.  |
|   | 2.6        | Students are passive.   |
|   | 2.7        | Students ask teachers questions whenever they need.                         |
|   | 2.8        | Students are ready for meaningful negotiation in class.                     |
| 3. <i>Critical Language Awareness</i>               | 3.1        | Learners know about <i>Critical language awareness</i> .                    |
|   | 3.2        | Teachers know about <i>Critical language awareness</i> .                    |
| 4. <i>Cultural Consciousness</i> .                  | 4.1        | Learners have knowledge about <i>Cultural consciousness</i> .               |
|   | 4.2        | Teachers have knowledge about <i>Cultural consciousness</i> .               |
| 5. Use of Culture sensitive Materials and Textbooks | 5.1        | Teacher uses culture sensitive course books and materials in the class.     |
|   | 5.2        | Teacher connects students' real life experiences to classroom activities.   |
|   | 5.3        | Teacher compares local culture with foreign culture while teaching English. |
| 6. Use of Bangla in Class                           | 6.1        | Teacher uses Bangla while the lesson goes on.                               |
|   | 6.2        | Students feel frightened if use of Bangla is discouraged in class.          |
|   | 6.3        | Use of Bangla facilitate communicative activities.                          |
| 7. Skills of English                                | 7.1        | Students get opportunities to practice the four skills of English.          |
|   | 7.2        | Four skills are integrated in lesson.                                       |
| 8. Grammar Teaching                                 | 8.1        | Grammar is taught seriously in class.                                       |
|   | 8.2        | Grammar is taught following mostly deductive method.                        |

|  |      |   |  |
|--|------|---|--|
|  | 8.3  | Grammar is taught following by both deductive and inductive method.     |  |
| 9. Teaching-learning Situation                   | 9.1  | The classroom is well-ventilated.                                       |  |
|  | 9.2  | The classroom is well furnished.  |  |
|  | 9.3  | The classroom has electric fans.  |  |
|  | 9.4  | The classroom has electric bulbs.                                       |  |
|  | 9.5  | The classroom has enough windows.                                       |  |
|  | 9.6  | Benches or Desks are fixed to floor.                                    |  |
|  | 9.7  | Benches or Desks are not fixed to floor.                                |  |
|  | 9.8  | The students sit in rows.   |  |
|  | 9.9  | Teacher sits on a chair.  |  |
|  | 9.10 | Teacher has a dais.   |  |
|  | 9.11 | Teacher moves around the class while lecturing.                         |  |
|  | 9.12 | Teacher lectures standing at a dais.                                    |  |
|  | 9.13 | Number of students is more than 40.                                     |  |
|  | 9.14 | Number of students is less than 40.                                     |  |
| 10.Modes of Error Correction and Giving Feedback | 10.1 | Teacher overlooks learners' errors.                                     |  |
|  | 10.2 | Teacher corrects error whenever they notice them.                       |  |
|  | 10.3 | Teacher gives feedback on students' performance in a friendly manner.   |  |
| 11.Learning Environment                          | 11.1 | Overall learning environment is friendly.                               |  |
|  | 11.2 | The class is lively.  |  |
|  | 11.3 | Teacher uses jokes and humour to make learning an enjoyable experience. |  |
| 12. Teachers' Expertise                          | 12.1 | Teachers are efficient in class management.                             |  |
|  | 12.2 | Teachers are skilled in talk management.                                |  |
|  | 12.3 | Teachers are eligible for topic management.                             |  |
|  | 12.4 | Teachers are deft in activating students' <i>intuitive heuristics</i> . |  |

