

The Chaotic English Language Policy and Planning in Bangladesh: Areas of Apprehension

Mohammad Mosiur Rahman* and Ambigapathy Pandian

School of Languages, Literacies and Translation, Universiti Sains Malaysia, 11800 USM, Penang, Malaysia

ABSTRACT

This article describes and explains the policies related to the use and teaching of English in Education Policy and Planning (LPP) in Bangladesh. From Independence, the nation faced a problem in selecting a consistent English language policy; the selections that were made resulted in poor English language teaching in the country. A historical timeline of the English-in-Education policy is presented and discussed in this article to identify the inconsistencies in the language policy. Although a number of challenges since achieving Independence have been addressed, in the past two decades the problem of selecting a suitable education policy for English as a subject has become more critical with the introduction of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) as a method of English language teaching. Therefore, the present article critically examines Bangladesh's current language in education policy through the framework of Kaplan and Baldauf (2003). This paper is entirely based on secondary sources and entails analysis of the extant literature. From data obtained from articles and manuscripts, this article sketches the problem from historical accounts, empirical studies and experts' points of view.

Keywords: Language Policy and Planning (LPP), English Language Teaching (ELT), Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), Bangladesh

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 27 March 2017

Accepted: 13 December 2017

E-mail addresses:

mosiurbhai@gmail.com (Mohammad Mosiur Rahman)

ambiga@usm.my (Ambigapathy Pandian)

*Corresponding author

INTRODUCTION

Due to the absence of local expertise and a lack of funding for research, Bangladesh has not received much attention in language-in-education policy research (Hamid & Erling, 2016). English language education policy and planning in Bangladesh has

been influenced by numerous forces at the national, supra-national and sub-national levels. There has been little research into language in education in connection with historical factors, national priorities, educational NGOs and international development agencies (Chowdhury & Kabir, 2014). This complex set of factors makes it difficult to find simple explanations for the use of English as a language for economic development, the prominence of the language in the national curriculum and, conversely, the modest outcomes of English language teaching in Bangladesh (Rahman, Pandian & Kaur, 2018).

This article discusses two aspects of English use in the language policy and planning in Bangladesh. Firstly, the article critically examines English language policy and planning in Bangladesh to provide an in-depth understanding of how, over time, the English in Education policy has changed. Secondly, this article critically analyses policy outcomes and the complex set of factors that have hindered the successful implementation of quality English language teaching in Bangladesh. The theoretical framework of language in education policy by Kaplan and Baldauf (2003) was used in the analysis.

English Language Policy in Bangladesh

The legacy of English language teaching and learning began with the Macaulay Minutes of 1835. Thomas Babington Macaulay, in the late 1800s, was sent to Calcutta as the advisor to the governor of British India. One of his tasks was to ease the challenges

faced by the British rulers of India as a result of the complex mix of languages that was a fact of life in the vast sub-continent. Macaulay provided a unified blueprint for introducing the English language and its associated culture to the education system of British India. Witnessing its success in India, the British used the same blueprint in other parts of Asia and Africa that were part of their empire. Macaulay had no knowledge of the complex and diverse languages of South Asian countries, where more than 250 languages coexist. Bangladesh, then called Bengal, received that same blueprint for the use of English in education and still bears the legacy of colonial Britain's language education policies. In the period of Pakistan's rule in Bangladesh, English was used between Dhaka and Islamabad as the medium of communication. So, education in English has a deep-rooted history in Bangladesh, mostly to serve the needs of oppression and communication (Chowdhury & Kabir, 2014; Hamid & Erling; 2016).

English has become the present-day global *lingua franca*, and the growing importance of learning English is a fact. Therefore, a national language policy that includes the use of English can bring value in internationalising a country's economy and promoting economic solvency. Bangladesh's English in language policy and planning (LPP) is an exemplary case study of this. English in language policy and planning has not been static in Bangladesh's history (Chowdhury & Kabir, 2014). It has been adapted for political reasons and has been directly and indirectly influenced by

international donors and NGOs that have had their own interests in mind (Hamid & Erling, 2016).

Hamid (2010) pointed out that poor-quality English language teaching (ELT) was inherited through inconsistent language policy and planning (see Table 1). According to Hamid, Bangladesh does not have a clear and planned language policy. Currently, the country suffers from a policy-practice gap resulting from the use of the communicative English method that was introduced in the late 1990s (Hamid & Honan, 2012). For a long time questions have arisen regarding English in language policy and planning (LPP) in Bangladesh, a term defined by many scholars, such as Rubin and Jernudd (1971) and Kaplan and Baldauf (2003), as a structured activity to study language issues for solving language problems in a given context.

There is no denial that the ELT policy of Bangladesh lacks clear vision. According to Chowdhury and Kabir (2014), until the creation of the National Education Policy (NEP) in 2010, Bangladesh neither had any plan nor did it display consistency in the status accorded to English in the country's Education Policy. After Independence, six education commissions were founded to develop the blueprint for a National Education Policy of Bangladesh. These were: the Education Commission Report, 1974, the English Teaching Taskforce Commission, 1976, the Bangladesh National Education Commission Report, 1988, the National Curriculum Committee, 1991, the National Education Policy, 2000, the Bari Commission Report, 2002, the Miah Commission Report, 2004 and the National Education Policy, 2010. Nevertheless, the status of English was consistently inconsistent from the first task force to the National Education Policy Report of 2010.

Table 1
Chronological summary of English Language policy in Bangladesh

Education Policies and Commission Reports	The Position of English and English Education
1974 Bangladesh Education Commission	English language given priority as a foreign language, to be taught from Class 6 General emphasis on English language
1976 English Teaching Taskforce Commission	English language to be taught either in Class 3 or Class 6, subject to availability of English teachers
1988 Bangladesh National Education Commission	Grade 3 suggested as <i>recommended</i> starting point for English language education Grade 6 suggested as <i>uniform starting point</i> for English language education
1991 National Curriculum Committee	English language education introduced in Class 3 English language was introduced as a compulsory subject in Class 1 (1992)
2000 National Education Policy	English language set as medium of instruction for kindergartens Curriculum and all text material used in kindergartens translated into English Introduction of English language as an <i>extra</i> subject from Class 1 and 2 and as a <i>compulsory</i> subject from Class 3

Table 1 (continue)

Education Policies and Commission Reports	The Position of English and English Education
2003 National Education Commission	<p>Along with Bengali, English language could be medium of instruction from the secondary level (Class 7)</p> <p>Emphasis on English language as medium of instruction at the tertiary level</p> <p>Reemphasis on English language learning from the primary level</p> <p>One objective of primary education to acquaint learners with English language skills as a foreign language</p> <p>Emphasis on rebuilding the overall English language curriculum</p> <p>Emphasis on organising foreign training for trainers of Primary Teachers Institute (PTI) and National Academy for Primary Education (NAPE) and local training for all secondary school teachers to improve English education</p> <p>Emphasis on introducing a six-month English language course at the tertiary level</p>
2010 National Education Policy	<p>English language was recognised as an essential tool for building a knowledge-based society</p> <p>Emphasis on English language writing and speaking from the very beginning of primary education</p> <p>English language to be set as a compulsory subject adopted in all streams from the secondary level</p> <p>English language as medium of instruction could be introduced from the secondary level</p> <p>Emphasis on appointing adequate number of English language teachers at secondary level</p> <p>English language to be a compulsory subject in all colleges and universities</p> <p>English language (along with Bengali) to be the medium of instruction at the tertiary level</p> <p>Emphasis on the need to translate books written in English to Bengali</p>

(Chowdhury & Kabir, 2014, p.10)

Table 1 shows that over time, English was given preference in the National Education Policy. An intentional and goal-orientated language policy, as stated above, can be a blessing for a nation. However, in the case of Bangladesh, this did not happen. Unfortunately, it did not happen due to the lack of planning and clear vision behind the policy (Ali & Walker, 2014). More importantly, it resulted in poor quality of English language education in the country.

According to Hamid and Jahan (2015), the quality of overall English language education is so poor that even a Bengali-medium, Master's-degree-level student cannot speak decent English. Considering the inevitable significance of the English language in the modern era, the policy on English has shifted from a highly monolingual educational system dominated by Bengali to mandatory English language instruction from primary to tertiary level

and the use of English as the medium of instruction. However, new language policies have to be evaluated based on existing resources.

METHODS

This study drew on Kaplan and Baldur's (2003) framework that identifies six key areas of policy development for LPP implementation. These areas include access, curriculum, materials and methods, personnel, resources, evaluation and community policy. Baldauf's (2003) language-in-education policy framework is useful in interpreting findings based on the secondary data collected from internal (education policy documents) and external (scholarly articles) sources.

Secondary data analysis is described by Boslaugh (2007) as: "In the broadest sense, analysis of data collected by someone else" (p. 9). In order to search peer-reviewed articles, a systematic search was conducted in SCOPUS and Google Scholar, filtered by different years with relevant keywords (e.g. Language Policy in Bangladesh, ELT in Bangladesh, CLT in Bangladesh). The findings and discussion are presented under the six policies that Kaplan and Baldauf's (2003) framework theorised. The implication of the findings in the context of English Language Teaching in Bangladesh is discussed with a view to improving these policies.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Kaplan and Baldauf's (2003) language-in-education framework is a strong analytical

tool that covers every aspect of language policy and associates all the stockholders within an educational system. The components of the framework are:

- Access policy: Access policy means when to and who will learn what language.
- Personnel policy: Personnel policy refers to the in-service and pre-service training of teachers.
- Curriculum, methods and materials policy: These three policies are related to one another and are often called micro-teaching policy, with specific teaching goals. The curriculum sets the goal and objectives of the micro-teaching. Methodology and materials policy involves the teaching methods and teaching materials adopted during a particular period. In other words, through method and materials the goals of the curriculum are implemented.
- Resourcing policy: Resourcing policy is financing for language education.
- Community policy: Community policy contains guidelines on parental attitudes, funding sources and recruiting teachers and students.
- Evaluation policy: Evaluation policy involves evaluation of curriculum, assessment of student success and evaluation of teaching.

English Language Access Policy in Bangladesh

According to the English language access policy of Bangladesh, English is to be

introduced as a mandatory subject in Grade 1 among six-year-olds. Providing English for all from a very early stage of language development appears to be a particularly ambitious policy when taking into account the requirements for policy implementation discussed by Kaplan and Baldauf (2003). The allocated class time for English in schools is 35 minutes each day, five days a week. Early introduction of English in schools was justified by setting communicative competence as the goal of instruction for national participation in the global economy and for improving the standard of English in the country.

Early access to English language teaching can be analysed from different dimensions due to the nature of the language's introduction and the practical constraints in providing access to English to every learner. Although some other policies in Asia have also introduced English from Grade 1 (Kirkpatrick, 2012), the case of Bangladesh is different due to the socio-economical differences among its population. If access to English brings positive benefits to individuals, then English should be made accessible to all citizens, equally. However, the quality of English language teaching was not carefully planned in that quality of teaching has not been equal across the country (Hamid & Erling, 2016).

In addition, the access policy in Bangladesh is not in line with the recent development in the field of language education. The notion that early language learning is better is strongly challenged by Second Language Acquisition (SLA)

researchers. Studies have found that other than picking up pronunciation, early language learners do not benefit more than late language learners (Muñoz, 2008; Rahman, Pandian; Karim & Shahed, 2017). It is ideal to give a second-language learner the necessary environment for learning a second language and the input so he/she can recognise the target language faster (Muñoz, 2008). The policies of early access to English and medium of instruction are not free from external forces (e.g. international donors and NGOs). Rather, these policies are highly forced on the country and policymakers by external stakeholders to import English language teaching as a product (Hamid, 2010; Hamid, Nguyen, & Baldauf, 2013). Moreover, according to Hamid and Baldauf (2011), the English access policy in Bangladesh did not help the cause much and created social inequity within the citizenry because access to English is not equal in rural and urban areas. This inequality has several dimensions, such as infrastructure, teacher skill and expertise and logistics. As Huq (2004) explained, "Physical conditions of most of the schools were miserable: poor classroom environment, poor furniture (inappropriate, broken and inadequate), insufficient (or non-existent) library and laboratory facility and finally poor and uncared surroundings" (p. 52)

Since an access policy cannot be devised without an understanding of ground realities, what unfortunately has happened in Bangladesh is that efforts to improve teaching and learning of the English

language have been impeded. Therefore, Bangladesh's access policy is worthy of re-evaluation by policy makers regarding when and who will learn the language.

Personnel Policy

The core of a national education policy is developing its teachers in accordance with the nation's goals (Hargraves & Fullan, 1992). In the language Policy and Planning of Bangladesh, the personnel policy is the real concern. Language teachers require specialised training that cannot be interspersed with other requirements. The overall poor quality of the teachers and insufficient training restrain implementing the macro-level policy (curriculum) at the micro level (pedagogy). Teachers of English in Bangladesh severely lack ELT qualifications, which affects the quality of language teaching (Hamid & Baldauf, 2008). According to Kirkwood and Rae (2011), teachers' qualifications, education and their competency are not at the appropriate level to practise CLT in the classroom.

The qualification needs to match the primary or secondary schools in Bangladesh, but this is still below the quality needed to teach CLT effectively (Kirkwood, 2013). A Bachelor's or first degree from any background is needed to apply for a job in schools. After recruitment, primary-school teachers need to attend a Certificate-in-Education and secondary-school teachers need to attend a Bachelor-in-Education programme within the first year through the National University of Bangladesh. However, the syllabus of these courses is too

general to be effective for language teachers in Bangladesh (Hamid, 2010).

Teachers' professional development becomes a daunting task when there is an enormous number of low-quality teachers. However, this issue was overlooked and badly handled by policy-makers (Erling, Seargeant, & Solly, 2014; Kirkwood & Rae, 2011). The problem is related to teacher training in Bangladesh and is multifaceted. Bangladesh greatly depends on donor-funded projects from the very outset of introducing CLT in Bangladesh. According to Hamid (2010) and Ali and Walker (2014), the donor-funded teacher-training programme proved to be ineffective in increasing teacher quality (e.g. Orientation to Secondary School Teachers for Teaching of English in Bangladesh [OSSTTEB]; English Language Teaching Improvement Project [ELTIP]; English in Action [EiA]). One of the prime reasons behind the failure of efforts to promote teacher quality has been the nature of regularity among the training providers. Lack of regularity has ensured that the professional growth of teachers has not been possible (Hamid, 2010).

Another serious problem is that the training sessions are not held in a school setting. School-based training is considered very effective; its absence is what is lacking in the existing national training system (Maruf, Sohail, & Banks, 2012). The major problem that inhibits school-based training is the absence of permanent teaching-training programmes that can contribute to a long-term qualitative development

among teachers (Hamid, 2010). As a result, English-language teachers lack professional support in the form of no access to academic journals and periodicals to read, little scope for conducting action research and unavailability of school-based teacher training (Hoque, Alam, & Abdullah, 2010; Karim, Mohamed, & Rahman, 2017). Since teachers are the implementers of language policy and are often regarded as the agents of change, a policy from the macro-level often fails due to the failure of the teachers. In Bangladesh, the weak personnel policy is ultimately linked to the failure of the macro language policy of the country.

Curriculum, Methods and Materials Policy

Over the last three decades, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) has dominated curriculum, method and material policies worldwide as the preferred language teaching approach, especially in countries where English is spoken as a second or third language. However, the story of CLT is not fruitful everywhere. In Bangladesh, the introduction of CLT in the English language curriculum, method and material policies took place in the mid-1990s but its implementation in the classroom has yet to achieve its goals or to reduce the gap between policy and reality in the classroom (Kirkwood & Rae, 2011; Hamid, 2010; Ali & Walker, 2014).

Hamid (2011) stated clearly that the introduction of CLT in the curriculum made English Language Teaching problematic. The curriculum could not penetrate deeply

into ELT in Bangladesh because there is hardly any collaboration between the classroom teachers and the policy-makers in the development of curriculum (Ali, 2010). Ultimately, the needs of classroom teachers are eliminated at the very beginning (Ali & Walker, 2014) by introducing CLT without rationalising whether the teachers have the capability to implement it. This results in lack of clarity among the teachers regarding curriculum, which is exactly what happened with English language teachers in Bangladesh.

There are complexities that surround the CLT method and inhibit its ability to flourish in Bangladesh. This points to the presence of cultural differences in language programming. Chowdhury and Ha (2008) questioned the suitability of imported, Westernised CLT methods in a typical Eastern ELT context like Bangladesh. The cultural norms and values are completely different, and so are the teaching practices (Huda, 2013). In the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA), findings cannot be generalised in every context (Rahman & Pandian, 2016); this was found to be true in the context of English Language Education in Bangladesh. In a typical Bangladeshi classroom, the teacher is the ultimate source of knowledge. Hence, the practice of CLT is impossible in the classroom, as pointed out very rightly by Yasmin (2009). She has explained that the teacher-centred classroom is characterised by a minimum or lack of activities in the classroom. An unfriendly relationship between teachers and students

is the typical characteristic of English Language classrooms in Bangladesh.

CLT needs linguistics input outside the classroom to develop the language skills of the learner; in Bangladesh this is not possible because English is rarely spoken in the community (Hamid & Baldauf, 2008). However, this is also found to be true for many countries in Asia. English is not spoken widely, and mastering it is solely dependent on the classroom practice using a few topics (Baldauf, Kaplan, Kamwangamalu, & Bryant, 2011). This has not been found to be an effective language method.

The policy of excluding the traditional Grammar Translation Method (GTM) by CLT needs a deep-seated change in the curriculum, method and materials, but this did not take place in Bangladesh even after two decades. Abedin (2012) has reported that the practice of CLT in Bangladeshi classrooms is nothing but a disguised mode of old GTM. It was similarly reported by Khan (2010), who identified teachers' practice in the classroom as having a washback effect of GTM. They were not able to leave behind old practices they were used to and students were also unable to communicate in the classroom.

Resourcing Policy

The resourcing policy is an enormous challenge that nations using English language teaching are facing (Hamid & Erling, 2016). Bangladesh mostly relies on foreign donor agencies when it comes

to funding language teaching (Hamid, 2010). The statement is found to be true, particularly when we see, in comparison with its counterparts in Southeast Asia, the budget for education is very low (Habib & Adhikary, 2016). However, the allocated funds are mostly used in building infrastructure, with few monies available for purchasing teaching and learning materials, resources and library facilities (Hamid, 2010). Teachers' minimum wages are very low, so much so that teachers have to rely heavily on different sources of income. This encourages teachers to practise private tutoring across the country (Anwaruddin, 2016). The matter is more prevalent in the rural areas, where resources are much less. Moreover, a hidden dissatisfaction with these ordinary resources in the rural areas is strong because the school does not provide good teaching and resources. For good English teaching instruction, students must pay a private tutor for extra teaching, which is expensive for rural parents to provide. Their income level is comparatively lower than that in urban areas (Hamid, Sussex, & Khan, 2009). Nevertheless, in terms of resourcing policy for language teaching, Bangladesh has much room to improve and the policy should allow everyone a fair opportunity to learn the language that the constitution of Bangladesh promises its citizens. However, according to Baldauf et al. (2011), presently, the language policy is quite impossible to implement because the British Council and other foreign supported language projects and private language

learning programmes for those able to afford them will only create further divisions in society.

Community Policy

The socio-economic benefits of English are well understood by the government and the community. The dream of the nation to grow its economy is impossible without developing skilled manpower that is characterised by competitive English communication skills. The linguistic market of Bangladesh, therefore, has seen enormous growth and has attracted both national and international investors (Hamid, 2016, 2010). International organisations like the British Council operate in Bangladesh more dominantly and English-medium schools are increasing in number and becoming more popular (Hamid, 2016). This highlights the parental emphasis on English language teaching for children. Parents who send their children to the mainstream Bengali-medium schools are not willing to fall behind either, and they send their children to after-school classes and tutoring in English language education, investing heavily in their children's language learning (Hamid, Sussex, & Khan, 2009). The positive outlook of the community towards English is established in Bangladesh because most of the parents perceive proficiency in the English language as beneficial to the economic future of their children (Baldauf et al., 2011).

Evaluation Policy

Many studies have highlighted the difficulties of introducing a new assessment approach, including resistance from different stakeholders (see Quader, 2001). According to Khan (2010), grammar-based tests that depend on rote memorisation is the method students employ to pass the communicative English tests. The assessment is highly dependent on a summative approach, despite the curriculum articulating the need to assess rote learning (Das, Shaheen, Shrestha, Rahman, & Khan, 2014). In consequence, in a highly exam-orientated system like Bangladesh's, the tendency for learners to memorise for examinations is left as the only choice for passing the exams (Rahman, Kabir, & Afroze, 2006).

Another major problem that besets the evaluation policy is the unmatched curriculum content and evaluation policy. Presently, in Bangladesh, the evaluation policy does not match the curriculum policy, but rather, contradicts it. According to Das et al. (2015), neither teachers nor head teachers of different schools have any clear idea about the English curriculum. The validity and reliability of national tests in Asia (e.g. primary, secondary or higher secondary) is questioned by Baldauf et al. (2011) because no specification and explanation are given for the tests and the use of one system for all is forcefully justified. Das et al. (2015), therefore, emphasised that the assessment system needs to be redesigned

because despite top priority being given to developing speaking and listening skills in the materials, they remain unassessed in exams.

IMPLICATION OF THE FINDINGS

The above discussion raises several questions regarding language policy in Bangladesh and explains different aspects of the problem. Among the policies theorised by Kaplan and Baldauf (2003), only the community policy has a positive outlook for Bangladeshi citizens regarding the importance of learning English. Otherwise, growing problems with the rest of the policies will need a multi-dimensional approach for resolving them. However, considering the nature of the problems, a few implications of the findings are discussed below.

Access Policy

In the context of Bangladesh, early introduction to English language has become critical. The notion of an early start in second language development was changed and new studies (Rahman, Pandian, Karim, & Shahed, 2017) have found early introduction to have no advantages over late introduction. Moreover, late introduction to a second language may develop other cognitive skills in children. Furthermore, in an education policy, early introduction to a second language touches on other important considerations in the Bangladeshi context (e.g. personnel policy, resourcing policy etc.). Therefore, it will be wise to start

teaching English from the secondary level, instead of the primary.

Personnel Policy

Revolutionary alteration is needed in personnel policy in implementing the language policy in Bangladesh. On the one hand, qualified teachers need to be recruited, and on the other, their professional development needs to be ensured. Relevant background at least should be mandatory for recruiting teachers in schools. A graduate in English with a major in ELT/Teaching English to the Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)/Applied Linguistics should be given preference in teaching language.

In terms of teacher development, a permanent training division should be established to train language teachers. The ad hoc basis of training by donor organisations could be implemented for a short time to train teacher trainers. However, a permanent training division specialising in English Education and driven by local expertise is feasible for the sustainable professional development of language teachers. This approach would be economical, and possibly will offer school-based training to the teachers.

Curriculum, methods and materials policy. The micro-level language policy in Bangladesh is a failure altogether. None of the curriculum, method and material policies work effectively. A blend of culture and language teaching can bring success. The CLT curriculum is not implemented yet

in schools in Bangladesh due to teachers' beliefs, cultural distance and lack of facilities etc. Therefore, a possible alternative to the CLT method of ELT should be discovered.

Hence, in the policy level, it should be clear what the language teaching and learning goals are and how they can be achieved. In the post-method era, there should not be any strict methodological philosophy based on one particular method, rather mixed methods or multi-methods to English teaching should be introduced (Kumaravadivelu, 2003). In the curriculum, the strict "English only policy" in the classroom has not offered any success in ELT in Bangladesh; rather, Bengali is found to be used more frequently than English (Abedin, 2012). Bangladesh should consider the example of Singapore in this regard; there, an empathy to first language was given in order to facilitate better understanding by the learners. Language teaching and learning is highly context-biased; the methodology and materials should, therefore, accommodate the culture. In an eastern culture like Bangladesh, there is no point to enforcing CLT as it only invites failure. If the aim is to teach English properly to learners, the policy targeting the micro and macro level ought to be reshuffled.

Resource policy. Resourcing is and will always be insufficient in Bangladesh, considering the big population and limited resources that are allocated for education in the national budget. However, best use of the available resources can improve the

problem. Like other developing nations, Bangladesh had regular access to NGOs and international donors to support the implementation of its language-in-education policies. However, none of the funds was utilised effectively (Hamid & Erling, 2016). The first utilisation of the funds should be to improve teachers' lives. This will allow them to reflect on their work. Teachers' salaries need to be increased to minimise the practice of teachers in Bangladesh providing private tuition after school hours. Teachers will then be encouraged to teach more effectively in the classroom, and this will decrease the social discrimination that poor students face due to not being able to afford private tuition.

Resourcing does not only mean building infrastructure, such as schools or classrooms, but also equipping these facilities with modern technology. This is an equally important issue. Technology is an important part of language teaching today. To develop reading and listening skills, it would be meaningful to use audio-visual equipment. However, technology is rarely utilised in the English classroom in Bangladesh. In addition, teachers need to be resourced professionally as well. Teacher development programmes can be more efficient economically if directed by the locals. Presently, around the globe, Bangladeshis are working as researchers and university professionals in the world's best universities. They are more than capable of training the whole English-language teaching population of Bangladesh at minimum wages in order to serve the nation.

Evaluation policy. In the evaluation policy, a thorough revision is needed to comply with the curriculum methodology. Formative assessment is recommended through a continuous assessment framework to evaluate the learners' achievement. However, the present system of assessment, which is summative assessment, should not be ignored entirely due to its deep-rooted practice. A blend of both will work better in the context of Bangladesh. This will allow teachers to teach language more independently, without fearing exams. Communicative language teaching will prevail. Continuous assessment can be introduced and learners can be slowly weaned from memorising content and drawn instead to active learning.

CONCLUSION

Bangladesh is one of the largest English-learning populations of the world. However, there has been little research into the problems associated with English language education in the country (Chowdhury & Kabir, 2014; Hamid, 2015). An obvious consequence was the existence of ambitious policy aspirations that were far from the realities on the ground, causing instruction in English in schools to become dysfunctional. This has welcomed expected critical insight into language policy, leading especially to the establishment of social equity and the availability of resources (May, 2014). This article relates to the language policy and planning framework of Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) in the context of Bangladesh. Involvement of all

stakeholders in policy making is the key to executing language planning, as Kaplan and Baldauf believed. They combined access, resources, pedagogy, learning outcomes and community attachment in a comprehensive framework for implementing language-in-education planning; this framework was used in this article to explain the bizarre condition of English language policy and planning in Bangladesh. However, to make manpower more skilful, despite the economical constraints faced by the country, Bangladesh has to provide resources and invest in language education and, more generally, in education.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In this article, some of the most critical issues related to the English-in-Education policy and planning in Bangladesh were discussed. Bangladesh has not been able to build necessary capacity in English language teaching in order to attain self-sufficiency. Therefore, the following recommendations focus on the measures that can be taken to improve the indicators, while acknowledging the depth of the complexity and without looking for any simplistic solutions.

- Policy-makers (Ministry of Education) should acknowledge the complex situation that was created due to their inconsistent policy making.
- Policy-makers should reconsider the access policy in the most realistic manner. The existing environment is not suitable for introducing learners

to English from Grade 1. The recommendation of the Education Policy 2010 should be implemented.

- ELT projects should be used for attaining sustainability and self-dependence by establishing permanent teacher-training centres, which are now missing in Bangladesh.
- Speaking and listening skills should be included in the examinations. Currently, these two skills are not being practised in the classroom and absence of these two skills in the assessment has contributed to this. This policy reformation will impact pedagogy in the classroom.
- Policy-makers should re-evaluate the suitability of the CLT method-based curriculum in the context of Bangladesh. Instead, they should adapt an education policy to embrace bilingual aims and means and choose teaching methods, curriculum and materials accordingly.

REFERENCES

- Abedin, M., Mojlis, K., & Akter, S., (2009). Listening skills in tertiary level: A reflection. *The Dhaka University Journal of Linguistics*, 2(3), 69–90.
- Abedin, M. M. (2012). The present mode of teaching in the ELT classes at the higher secondary level in Bangladesh: Is it the practice of CLT or disguised GTM? *Stamford Journal of English*, 7, 1–15.
- Ali, M., & Walker, A. L. (2014). ‘Bogged down’ ELT in Bangladesh: Problems and policy. *English Today*, 30(02), 33–38.
- Ali, M. M. (2010). Revisiting the English Language Teaching (ELT) curriculum design: How appropriate is Bangladesh higher secondary level national ELT curriculum as a learner-centred one? *IJUC Studies*, 7(1), 283–296.
- Anwaruddin, S. M. (2016). ICT and language teacher development in the global south: A new materialist discourse analysis. *Educational Studies*, 52(3), 260–278.
- Baldauf Jr, R. B., Kaplan, R. B., Kamwangamalu, N., & Bryant, P. (2011). Success or failure of primary second/foreign language programmes in Asia: What do the data tell us? *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 12(2), 309–323.
- Boslaugh, S. (2007). *Secondary data sources for public health: A practical guide*. United States of America, USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Chowdhury, R., & Ha, P. L. (2008). Reflecting on western TESOL training and communicative language teaching: Bangladeshi teachers’ voices. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 28(3), 305–316.
- Chowdhury, R., & Kabir, A. H. (2014). Language wars: English education policy and practice in Bangladesh. *Multilingual Education*, 4(1), 1–16.
- Das, S., Shaheen, R., Shrestha, P., Rahman, A., & Khan, R. (2014). Policy versus ground reality: Secondary English language assessment system in Bangladesh. *Curriculum Journal*, 25(3), 326–343.
- Erling, E. J., Seargeant, P., & Solly, M. (2014). English in rural Bangladesh. *English Today*, 30(4), 15–21.
- Habib, W., & Adhikary, T. S. (2016, May 31). Too inadequate to raise quality. *The Daily Star*. Retrieved from <https://www.thedailystar.net/frontpage/too-inadequate-raise-quality-1232116>.

- Hamid, M. O. (2010). Globalisation, English for everyone and English teacher capacity: Language policy discourse and realities in Bangladesh. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 11(4), 289–310.
- Hamid, M. O. (2011). Planning for failure: English and language policy and planning in Bangladesh. In J. A. Fishman & O. Garcia (Eds.), *Handbook of language and ethnic identity: The success–failure continuum in language and ethnic identity efforts* (Vol. 2, pp. 192–203). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Hamid, M. O. (2016). The linguistic market for English in Bangladesh. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 17(1), 36–55.
- Hamid, M. O., & Baldauf, R. B. (2008). Will CLT bail out the bogged down ELT in Bangladesh? *English Today*, 24(03), 16–24.
- Hamid, M. O., & Baldauf Jr, R. B. (2011). English and socio-economic disadvantage: Learner voices from rural Bangladesh. *Language Learning Journal*, 39(2), 201–217.
- Hamid, M. O., & Erling, E. J. (2016). English-in-education policy and planning in Bangladesh: A critical examination. In R. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *English language education policy in Asia* (pp. 25–48). Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Hamid, M. O., & Honan, E. (2012). Communicative English in the primary classroom: Implications for English-in-education policy and practice in Bangladesh. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 25(2), 139–156.
- Hamid, M. O., & Jahan, I. (2015). Language, identity, and social divides: Medium of instruction debates in Bangladeshi print media. *Comparative Education Review*, 59(1), 75–101.
- Hamid, M. O., Nguyen, H. T. M., & Baldauf Jr, R. B. (2013). Medium of instruction in Asia: Context, processes and outcomes. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 14(1), 1–15.
- Hamid, M. O., Sussex, R. D., & Khan, A. (2009). Private tutoring in English for secondary school students in Bangladesh. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(2), 281–308.
- Haq, M. N. (2004). A baseline survey of rural secondary schools: A quest for teaching-learning quality. *Bangladesh Education Journal*, 3(2), 31–54.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. G. (1992). *Understanding teacher development*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Hoque, K. E., Alam, G. M., & Abdullah, A. G. K. (2011). Impact of teachers' professional development on school improvement – An analysis at Bangladesh standpoint. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 12(3), 337–348.
- Huda, M. E. (2013). Cultural model of classroom instruction for ELT in Bangladesh. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 3(1), 67–74.
- Kabir, A. H., & Chowdhury, R. (2017). 9 'Donor logic', NGOs, the ruling elite and the decolonisation of education in Bangladesh. *Governance, Resistance and the Post-Colonial State: Management and State Building*, 13, 162.
- Kaplan, R., & Baldauf Jr, R. B. (2003). *Language and language-in-education planning in the Pacific Basin*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf Jr, R. B. (1997). *Language planning: From practice to theory*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Karim, A., Mohamed, A. R. P., & Rahman, M. M. (2017). EIA – A teacher education project in Bangladesh: An analysis from diversified perspectives. *International Journal of Instruction*, 10(4), 51–66.
- Khan, R. (2010). English language assessment in Bangladesh: Developments and challenges. In Y. Moon & B. Spolsky (Eds.), *Language assessment in Asia: Local, regional or global?* (pp. 121–157). South Korea: Asia TEFL.

- Kirkpatrick, A. (2012). English as an Asian Lingua Franca: the ‘Lingua Franca Approach’ and implications for language education policy. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 1(1), 121–139.
- Kirkwood, A. (2013). English for communication in Bangladesh: Baseline research to establish the pre-existing environment for the ‘English in Action’ project. *System*, 41(3), 866-879.
- Kirkwood, A. T., & Rae, J. (2011). A framework for evaluating qualitative changes in learners’ experience and engagement: Developing communicative English teaching and learning in Bangladesh. *Evaluation and Research in Education*, 24(3), 203–216.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). A postmethod perspective on English language teaching. *World Englishes*, 22(4), 539–550.
- Mahruf, C. Shohel, M., & Banks, F. (2012). School-based teachers’ professional development through technology-enhanced learning in Bangladesh. *Teacher Development*, 16(1), 25-42.
- May, S. (2014). Contesting public monolingualism and diglossia: Rethinking political theory and language policy for a multilingual world. *Language Policy*, 13(4), 371–393.
- Muñoz, C. (2008). Symmetries and asymmetries of age effects in naturalistic and instructed L2 learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 29(4), 578–596.
- Quader, D. A. (2001). Reaction to innovation in a language teaching project. *Journal of the Institute of Modern Languages*, 12, 5-22.
- Rahman, A., Kabir, M. M., & Afroze, R. (2006). Effect of BRAC-PACE training on English language teachers of rural non-government secondary schools. *Research and Evaluation Division, BRAC*. Retrieved from http://www.bracresearch.org/srch_dtls.php.
- Rahman, M. M., & Pandian, A. (2016). The gap between research and practice in the field of SLA: The rationale behind it and bridging the gap. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 3(3), 162–172.
- Rahman, M. M., & Pandian, A. (2018). A critical investigation of English language teaching in Bangladesh: Unfulfilled expectations after two decades of communicative language teaching. *English Today*, 1-7.
- Rahman, M. M., Pandian, A., & Kaur, M. (2018). Factors Affecting Teachers’ Implementation of Communicative Language Teaching Curriculum in Secondary Schools in Bangladesh. *The Qualitative Report*, 23(5), 1104-1126.
- Rahman, M. M., Pandian, A., Karim, A., & Shahed, F. H. (2017). Effect of age in second language acquisition: A critical review from the perspective of critical period hypothesis and ultimate attainment. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7(5), 1-7.
- Rubin, J., & Jernudd, B. H. (1971). *Can language be planned? Sociolinguistic theory and practice for developing nations*. Hawaii: The University Press of Hawaii.
- Seargeant, P., & Erling, E. J. (2011). The discourse of “English as a language for international development”: Policy assumptions and practical challenges. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Dreams and realities: Developing countries and the English Language* (pp. 248-268). London: British Council.
- Yasmin, F. (2009). Attitude of Bangladeshi students towards communicative language teaching (CLT) and their English textbook. *Teacher’s World: Journal of Education and Research*, 34, 49–59.