



Learners' Roles in the Use of Communicative Language Teaching in English Language Writing Skills Training in Marakwet Sub-counties, Kenya

Philip Kwambai Cheruiyot
Kisii University, Kenya

Email: pkwambai@gmail.com or pkwambai@kisiiuniversity.ac.ke

Received June 1, 2020; Revised June 12, 2020; Accepted June 14, 2020

Abstract: *English is both compulsory and examinable subject in secondary schools and second language to most Kenyans. Many learners have problems in the four language skills. Although learners will have been taught English through primary school, there is much they need to do to enhance their mastery of English. This study was prompted by dismal performance in English in Marakwet Sub-counties at KCSE examinations taking into consideration that examinations are mainly expressed through the written mode. This paper, therefore, examines learners' roles in Communicative Language Teaching approach in writing skills in schools. The study adopted Krashen's: The Input Hypothesis and it employed the descriptive survey design. The study population comprised 33 schools. Simple random sampling was used to select 11 schools and 121 Form Three students. Purposive sampling was used to select 11 teachers. Questionnaire, interview and observation schedules were used to collect data. The data was analysed descriptively using Statistical Package for Social Sciences version 21. Findings revealed that teachers considered students to be at the centre of teaching writing skills. Majority of the respondents felt that the teacher should be designing writing activities. Students felt that teachers should encourage learners to learn by themselves through own efforts to communicate in writing. The study recommends that more time should be allocated to writing skills, learners given adequate opportunities and activities to engage in and regular use of captivating essays among others. These findings are invaluable to teachers, learners, language educators and English curriculum developers in efforts to improve writing skills.*

Keywords: *Learners, Roles, Use, Communicative Language Teaching, English Language, Writing Skills*

1. Introduction

Language remains a primary source of communication which is the basic attribute of human life (Thomson, 2003) and language remains the main medium of human communication (Clark & Bly, 1995). Communication initially served to connect individuals within societies and communities. However, over time it has taken a new dimension as people from various societies, communities and nations have found reasons to interact with one another. There has been an increase in the need for communication amongst the people of the world in various spheres of international contact like politics, academics, economics, technology and culture among others. The world has thus become what is now commonly understood as a global village. This has created the need for a lingua franca for this global village to enhance communication and therefore make it more realistic for various linguistic

backgrounds (Crystal, 1997). This scenario led to emergence of a global language and English was bestowed upon this privilege thus becoming the language of international communication. According to the *Ethnologue.com* English language is ranked the third largest spoken language world over after Chinese and Spanish. The unique aspect is that English is spoken across the world and is not only restricted to one area like the other languages (Kristina, 2010). Proficiency in English can provide one with the opportunities for employment, travelling, higher education, and even modest life. One's competence in English is also crucial in as far as accessing printed and electronic information and higher education is concerned. McKay (2002) goes further to affirm "knowledge of English is necessary for accessing many discourses at a global level from international relations to popular culture and academia" (p. 18).

The Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach is much advocated as a method that could enhance development of the various language skills among learners. It is also expected that through CLT, learners will acquire the appropriate communicative competence to help them meet their day to day communication needs. Many course books, syllabus books and even teachers' handbooks in Kenya espouse the use of this approach through the teaching/learning activities stipulated. Writing skills play a critical part in language performance and even so to the performance of other subjects. This is because all examinations are presented in writing and therefore mastery of this skill, through appropriate teaching method, is of utmost importance. Writing is a higher language skill that requires learners to communicate ideas effectively. It is through writing skills that learners are not only trained to be organised but also think critically and creatively as they respond to various situations. Adequate command of writing skills is essential for success in any academic discipline. Moreover, writing forms part of personal development skills that are useful beyond the classroom; it is a life-long skill. English language functional skills are quite useful after school since learners' knowledge of the various writing skills shall become very handy in their various undertakings.

On the contrary, there were no efforts made to engage students in meaningful tasks because of such variables as time constraints and overloaded syllabus which is driven by examination-oriented curriculum. This contravenes the rationale espoused by CLT which was to make second language learners competent in communication for the purpose of using language in authentic contexts; hence, becoming linguistically competent world over. A number of people including language teachers and educators are interrogating the significance of learner roles in CLT approach in teaching and learning of English language (Rouf, & Sultana, 2018). The learners' role in a language class was mainly confined to teacher-centred activities where upon learners are supposed to follow what the teachers do or tell them without any interrogation, that is, they are merely passive. This virtually goes against the 'functional aspect' espoused by Halliday (1970) and Hymes (1972) of communicative competence.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Berns (1990) explains that in CLT, "language teaching is based on a view of language as a communication, that is, language is seen as a social tool which speakers and writers use to make meaning; speakers communicate about something to someone for some purposes either orally or in writing" (p. 104). From this assertion, CLT is a strategy to the teaching of second language (L2) and foreign language (FL) that espouses interaction as both the means and the ultimate goal of language learning. It is also known as communicative approach to teaching of foreign languages or simply the communicative approach. This approach is a reaction to the traditional and teacher-

centred methods such as audio-lingual method, direct method and grammar translation among others.

There are several language course books used in secondary school which have placed a lot of emphasis on CLT approach. This is seen in the way they treat the language items. All the exercises are learner-centred in covering all the four language skills even though there are findings which indicate that teachers rely more on the reference books than the well-designed communicative text books provided (Harun-Or-Rashid, 2015). Teachers are therefore encouraged to use their ingenuity and creativity in organizing teaching and learning process (KIE, 2006). The current revised syllabus has brought on board contemporary issues that are pertinent in society which are incorporated in the English syllabus. These include civic education, good governance, HIV/AIDS pandemic, environmental education, information technology, poverty eradication, drug and substance abuse and gender responsiveness which learners can write about notwithstanding the fact that they are real-world issues. The use of authentic materials provide the students with the opportunity to understand language in the perspective of practical life where they are expected to use language appropriately and meaningfully (Tomlinson & Masuhara, 2013). These issues have been integrated in the teaching of the four language skills of which among them is the writing skills.

All these call for a teaching approach which enhances language competence through various learning strategies. Kenya Institute of Education (2002, 2006) defines the appropriate methods for teaching the four language skills, grammar, and even vocabulary. These methods are not prescriptive. Virtually, all these methods are well captured under CLT approach because they are learner-centred and the teacher is a facilitator and a guider. In spite of all these, learners have not displayed adequate communicative competence in English language as evidenced in poor performance at Kenya Certificate of Secondary examinations (KCSE). Related to this statement, Rouf & Sultana (2018) maintains that a lot of second language learners have not been able to achieve the expected academic performance owing to poor command of English Language. This is why this study was undertaken to establish learners' roles in teaching and learning writing skills in CLT classrooms as initiated and implemented by English language teachers. The study sought to find out whether learners are comfortable with corrections, whether learners decide and engage in the communicative roles and whether they participate in activities associated with CLT approach.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Elements Underlying the CLT Practices

The first element is *communication* principle (Richards & Rodgers, 1986). According to Morrow (as cited in Larsen-Freeman, 1986, p. 132), there are three features that are characteristic of communicative activities. First feature is information-gap in which during the communication, some knowledge exchange should take place. For instance, asking someone who knows what today is “what is today?” and getting his/her response is not a true communication. Besides this, Scrivener (2005) states that people normally communicate when one has information, such as facts, opinions, ideas and etcetera that the other person does not have. The second feature is that of choice whereby the speaker should have choice of what to say and how to say in the course of his/her communication. The third one is feedback in which true communication is done with a purpose. The speaker can evaluate whether or not their purpose has been attained vis-a-vis the information he/she receives from their listener. If the listener does not have any opportunity to provide the speaker with the feedback, then the exchange is not indeed communicative.

The second element is *task* principle. This is where the language activities are used for carrying out meaningful tasks which promote learning. Harmer (1991) states that there has been an agreement that rather than pure rote-learning or de-contextualized practice, language has to be acquired as a result of some deeper experience than the concentration on a grammar point. The author supports his view with the results of Allwrights’ experiment and Prabhus’ Bangalore project (Harmer, 1991). Richards and Rodgers (1986) point out that CLT approach includes efforts to make tasks and language meaningful to the target learners through an analysis of genuine, realistic situations and its emphasis is on the use of authentic situations from real-life materials and its attempt to create a secure, non-threatening atmosphere. All these attempts are in tandem with the major principle of communicative view of language and language learning which aims at helping learners learn a language through real-life and meaningful communication which involves a process of creative construction to achieve language competence.

Language that is essential to the learner supports the learning process. Here, meaning is paramount (Finocchario & Brumfit, as cited in Richards & Rodgers, 2001). In socio-cognitive perspectives, language is viewed as a medium of conveying meaning and knowledge is transmitted through communication which involves two parts, for instance, speakers and listeners, and writers and readers, but is generated through negotiation. Consequently, communication is not only about following universally laid down rules but also of

negotiation through and about the conventions themselves (Breen & Candlin, 2001, p. 10).

The other dimension of CLT that is closely related to task principle is learner-centred and experience-based. As Warschauer (2000) says: “With interactive communicative language use as the call of the day, communicative processes became as important as linguistic product and instruction became more learner-centred and less structurally driven” (p. 5). In CLT environment, learners are seen as active players in the construction of knowledge rather than passive recipients of information given by the teacher or the textbook. On the contrary, language teachers are no longer viewed as knowledge bearers, playing a key role. Rather they share different roles such as communication facilitator; independent participant, needs analyst, counsellor and group process manager (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 167) to create more fascinating experiences for the learners.

2.2 The Goals of CLT

The chief goal of CLT is the teaching of communicative competence (Hymes, 1972) in which learners have a critical role to play in second language teaching. This term can be clarified by first comparing it with the concept of grammatical competence which refers to the knowledge people have that enables them produce sentences in a language. It also refers to knowledge of the creation units of sentences, for instance parts of speech, phrases, clauses, sentence patterns and how sentences are formed. Grammatical competence is the focus of many grammar practice books that mainly present grammar rules after which they provide exercises for practice by way of using the rules earlier on provided. The unit of analysis and practice is basically the sentence. Traditional language learning focused primarily on the mastery of grammatical competence. This is where language learning was viewed as a process of mechanical habit formation. Good habits are formed by having students produce correct sentences and not through making mistakes. Errors were to be avoided through controlled opportunities for production (either written or spoken). By memorizing dialogs and performing drills, the chances of making mistakes were minimized. Learning was very much seen as under the control of the teacher. With communicative competence, language learning process involves interaction between the learner and users of the language, collaborative creation of meaning, locating meaningful and purposeful interaction through language, negotiation of meaning as the feedback learners get when they use the language, paying attention to the language one hears and trying to incorporate new forms into one's language. While grammatical competence is an important dimension of language learning, it is clearly not all that is involved in learning a language since one can master the rules of sentence formation in a language and still not be

very successful at being able to use the language for meaningful communication (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

One of the main goals of CLT, therefore, is to develop fluency in language use. Fluency is natural language use occurring when a speaker engages in meaningful interaction which sustains comprehensible and on-going communication notwithstanding limitations in their communicative competence (Hymes, 1972). Communicative competence includes a number of aspects of language knowledge some of which include the ability to use language for a number of different purposes and functions, being able to vary our use of language according to the situation and the participants for instance being able to use formal and informal speech. Or when to use language appropriately for written as opposed to spoken communication, knowing how to produce and understand different types of texts, for example narratives reports, interviews, conversations etc. and knowing how to maintain communication despite having limitations in one's language knowledge for instance through using different kinds of communication strategies.

2.3 Learner Roles in CLT Classroom

Breen and Candlin (as cited in Richards & Rodgers, 2001) describe the learner's role in CLT as "Negotiator between the self, the learning process, and the object of learning, emerges from and interacts with the role of joint negotiator within the group and within the classroom procedure and activities which the group undertakes" (p. 166). In CLT, students are expected to participate through the use of such activities as pair work, role plays, group work, project work, task work and information-gap activities among others. Learners have to participate in classroom activities that are based on a cooperative rather than individualistic approach to learning. Students ought to listen to their peers in group work or pair work tasks and not rely on the teacher for model. They are expected to take charge of their own language and the teachers take the role of facilitator and monitor. In a nutshell, classroom activities should be entirely learner-centred (Walia, 2012). To develop into good writers, students should develop an *editorial eye* by continuously re-engaging each piece of text they indulge in. The crucial aspect in writing exercises is that students should be personally involved so as to make the language experience of lasting value.

There are two extensions of language use training that take two different parts to achieve CLT. These are: process-based and product-based methodologies. Under process-based methodologies there is content-based instruction (CBI) and task-based instruction (TBI). They are referred to as process-based methodologies because they share as a common start point form of creating classroom processes that are believed to best facilitating learning. Under product-based CLT approaches, there is text-based instruction and competency-based instruction.

These two approaches focus a lot on the products of teaming as starting on course design than on classroom process. They identify the kinds of uses of language the learner is expected to be able to master at the end of a given period of instruction. Teaching strategies are then selected to help achieve these goals.

The functional aspects of language is realized when learners engage themselves in meaningful classroom communicative tasks. Learners have the role of creating language by way of 'trial and error' (Finochiaro & Brumfit, 1983). Teachers are discouraged from assuming dominance in their classrooms (McLean, 2012). Moreover, CLT advances 'teacher-directed student-centred' classroom strategies of second language teaching and learning (Rance-Roney, 2010). Larsen-Freeman (1986) asserts that teachers should ensure at all times that learners interact quite often in the classroom amongst themselves and with their teachers in spite of the fact that the teachers should play low key role by remaining mere facilitators of learners' learning.

3. Methodology

The study was conducted in the larger Marakwet Sub-counties in Elgeyo-Marakwet County, Kenya. The research adopted descriptive survey design. The study targeted 41 secondary school teachers of English and 404 Form Three learners. The sample population was drawn from 33 public secondary schools in the Sub-county. Form Three learners were presumed to have acquired sufficient levels of knowledge in English language. It is also at this level that the learners can take risks and participate more actively in tasks with less anxiety. This is because this group of learners are freer amongst themselves and more so they are used to each other.

Stratified sampling was adopted to select schools based on the nine divisions in the Sub-county. At the time of the study, the Sub-county had a total of 33 public secondary schools with no private secondary schools. Simple random sampling was used to select two schools from the division that had more than five schools and one school in divisions that had less than five schools. Purposive sampling was not only used to get 11 teachers of English teaching Form Three class in the 11 selected schools but also the form three students in the same schools. Furthermore, simple random sampling was used to select a total of 121 students for the study from the 11 selected schools. While in each school, the research sampled 30% of the total population of the Form Three students.

Data for the study was collected through interview schedule, observation schedule and questionnaire. The collected data was then analysed by use of descriptive statistical techniques which include: percentages and frequency means and presented in tables. Data from interview and observation schedules was coded and

analysed descriptively in identified themes based on study objectives.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Students' Questionnaire Results

Learning Writing Skills

The student respondents were asked if they could learn English writing skills better if taught by teachers of English

Table 1: Learning of Writing Skills

Learning writing skills	Frequency	Percent
Being taught by a teacher because he/she is more experienced	90	78.3
Through discussion by fellow students because we understand each other well	23	20.0
Both are very important	2	1.7
Total	115	100.0

Administering Corrections

The respondents were required to state whether or not they were often stopped by their teachers in order to correct them while giving answers. From the research findings,

or through class discussion. From the results in the table below, it is clear that majority, 90(78.3%), of the respondents said that they would learn writing skills in English better if they were taught by a teacher while 23(20.0%) reported that they could learn it through discussion with fellow students. The remaining 2(1.7%) students reported that they could learn writing skills better through both the teacher and class discussion. Table 1 below gives summary of the findings.

89(77.4%) of the respondents said that they were not stopped by the teachers while giving answers. The rest of the 26(22.6%) student respondents stated that they were stopped to be corrected by a teacher while giving answers. Table 2 below summarizes these findings.

Table 2: Administering Correction

Administering correction	Frequency	Percent
Yes	26	22.6
No	89	77.4
Total	115	100.0

Influence of Correcting while Giving an Answer

The respondents were asked to identify the influence of teachers' actions of correcting them while giving an answer on their learning process. As shown in the table below, 58(50.4%) of the respondents stated that correcting

them improved their mastery of writing skills while 37(32.2%) believe they are motivated. The remaining 20(17.4%) of the student respondents said that they felt discouraged when corrected while giving an answer. Table 3 below summarizes the findings.

Table 3: Influence of Correcting while Giving an Answer

Statement	Frequency	Percent
Motivates me to write more	37	32.2
Improves writing skills because mistakes are corrected immediately	58	50.4
It brings discouragements to the students	20	17.4
Total	115	100.0

Learner Participation during Teaching and Learning Process

The respondents were required to state the frequency with which they were allowed to participate in the teaching/learning activities. It was established that 85(73.9%) of the respondents maintained that they were

always involved in pair work while 26(22.7%) of them said that they were not involved. The remaining 4(3.5%) were not sure. It was also revealed that 66(57.4%) of the respondents reported that they were always involved in learning games while 49(42.6%) stated that they were not involved in the games. From the findings, 40(34.8%) of the respondents stated that they are involved in

puzzles/crossword during teaching/learning process while 59(41.3%) stated that they are not involved in the puzzles. Concerning group work, the findings revealed that majority, 102(88.7%), of the respondents participated in group work while 9(7.8%) reported they are not involved in group while 4(3.5%) were unsure. In addition, a few (38.3%) respondents were involved in map reading while about half (58.2%) are not involved in the activity. The remaining 4(3.5%) of the respondents were not certain. The results also revealed that 37(32.2%) of the respondents were always involved in surveys to collect information while 71(57.8%) were not. The remaining 6.1% of the respondents were uncertain.

The research findings also showed that 38(33.3%) of the respondents were always involved in interviews to collect information while 77(76.9%) of them were not involved. It further emerged that 96(83.4%) of the respondents revealed that they always participated in role plays while 18(15.7%) of them were not. The remaining 1(0.9%) of the respondents were not sure.

It was also found out that 62(43.9%) of the respondents were always involved in improvisation of roles based on given information while 30(26.1%) of them were not involved. The remaining 30(26.0%) of the respondents were not involved and 23(20.0%) were uncertain. It was also reported by 108(93.9%) of the respondents that they were always involved in completion of sentences and filling of blank spaces while 7(6.1%) of them said they were rarely involved in completion of sentences. The findings further indicated that 79(68.7%) of the respondents were always involved in debates in class on

topics to write about while 36(31.4%) were not involved in the debates.

Furthermore, 95(72.6%) of the respondents said they always participated in discussions while 18(17.7%) were not. The remaining 2(1.7%) of the respondents was not sure. It was further found that only 43(37.4%) of the respondents participated in hot-seating while 54(46.9%) did not. The remaining 18(15.7%) of the respondents were not sure. Concerning information-gap activities, it was revealed that 75(65.2%) of the respondents were always involved in information-gap activities while 38(33.0%) were not involved in these activities. The remaining 2(1.7%) of the respondents were not sure. It was also found that 76(66.0%) of the respondents were always involved in sharing personal experiences while 33(28.7%) were not. The remaining 6(5.2%) of the respondents were not sure.

Concerning decision-making, 79(68.7%) of the respondents were involved in decision-making while 33(27.0%) were not involved. The remaining 5(4.3%) of them were not sure. The study also found out that 88(76.5%) of the respondents were always involved in dialogue. The remaining 3(2.6%) were not sure. It was further shown that 93(80.8%) of the respondents and another 22(11.2%) of them participated during writing lessons and not participated, respectively. The results revealed that 67(58.2%) of the respondents participated during dramatization while 42(36.5%) were not. The remaining 6(5.2%) were not sure. Table 4 gives a summary of these findings.

Table 4: Learner Participation during Teaching and Learning Process

Statement	Always		Not Sure		Rarely		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Pair work	85	73.9	4	3.5	26	22.7	115	100.0
Learning games	66	57.4	0	0	49	42.6	115	100.0
Puzzles/cross-word	40	34.8	16	13.9	59	47.3	115	100.0
Group work	102	88.7	4	3.5	9	7.8	115	100.0
Map reading	44	38.3	4	3.5	67	58.2	115	100.0
Surveys to collect information	37	32.2	7	6.1	71	51.8	115	100.0
Interviews to collect information	38	33.0	0	0	77	76.9	115	100.0
Role plays (students assigned roles)	96	83.4	1	9.0	18	15.7	115	100.0
Improvisation of roles based on given information	62	43.9	23	20.0	30	26.1	115	100.0
Completion of sentences and filling of blank spaces	108	93.9	0	0	7	6.1	115	100.0
Debates in class topics to write about	79	68.7	0	0	36	31.4	115	100.0
Discussions	95	72.6	2	1.7	18	17.7	115	100.0
Information-gap activities	43	37.4	18	15.7	54	46.9	115	100.0
Sharing personal experience	75	65.2	2	1.7	38	33.0	115	100.0
Decision-making exercises	76	66.0	6	5.2	33	28.7	115	100.0
Dialogue	79	68.7	5	4.3	33	27.0	115	100.0
Participation during writing	88	76.5	3	2.6	24	20.9	115	100.0
Participating during dramatization	93	80.8	0	0	22	19.2	115	100.0
	67	58.2	6	5.2	42	36.5	115	100.0

Shying away from Participation

The respondents were asked to state whether or not students in their classes shy away from participating in the activities named. It is instructive to note from the findings

that 45.2% (54) of the respondents reported that their students in their class shy away from participating in the teaching/learning activities while 54.5% (61) reported lack of participation by the students. Table 5 has the summary of the findings.

Table 5: Shying away from Participation

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	54	45.2
No	51	54.8
Total	115	100.0

4.2 Observation Results

The researcher observed the levels of student autonomy in answering and asking questions, clarifying issues during discussions and writing based on what they had learned. It was observed that teachers dominated most of the discussions and never gave students the opportunity to fully participate in class activities. In two different classes, some students asked the teacher questions about the formats for writing diaries and minutes. A few others corrected their colleagues' work during class presentations. It was also noted that most students answered questions freely and the teacher clarified issues raised; for example, in writing official letters some students wanted clarification on where to put the sender's address vis-à-vis the recipient address.

It was further observed that students interjected through asking questions in areas they did not understand. A case in point was minute-writing where some students wanted to know if the closing prayer in meetings was included in the adjournment and also whether or not it was allowed to shorten the names of months, for instance *Aug.* instead of *August*. It was also observed that most learners were passive in class; they only actively participated when the teacher asked them a question. It was equally observed that most learners participated mostly by way of answering questions asked. There was minimal use of pair work, group work, debates and presentation of information. It was also observed that most teachers used teacher-centred approaches such as the lecture method.

From observation, it was quiet evident that the teachers and learners did not discuss on the topics to write about. They instead arrived at various viewpoints; the teacher went straight to class and introduced the topic and the learners were not given the opportunity to express themselves about the topic under discussion. Moreover, it was evident that the learners never wrote information about a subject and neither did they represent the same in a diagram. It was further evident from the observation that in all cases students were not assigned roles; consequently,

they did not improvise scenes on given information or clues.

The research established that many of the students preferred to be taught writing skills by teachers to learning on their own. The students argued that teachers are more experienced. They also preferred to hold discussions with fellow students because peers understood one another better. It was also established that learners engaged in the following roles through the learning activities: pair work, language learning games, group work, role plays, completion of sentences and filling of blank spaces, debates, discussion, information-gap activities, sharing personal experiences, decision-making, dialogue and dramatization. Among the activities in which learners participated minimally were: puzzles/crossword, interviews to collect information, improvisation of roles, map-reading, debates, surveys to collect information and hot-seating. These activities are advanced in CLT approach. Arising from this, it was concluded that other activities under CLT have not been fully utilized, especially those that are student-centred.

The findings revealed that learners were told what to do or discuss before they started writing. It also emerged that learners exchanged their written works with other students in class. These results underscored the fact that learners prepared outlines on what they were going to write about but they also participated in activities that are based on group rather than individual. This finding supports the view by Breen and Candlin (2001) who maintain that, in a CLT classroom, students are encouraged to participate through the use of role play, pair activities etc. Learners also have to participate in classroom activities that are based on a cooperative rather than individual approach of learning.

The results of the research also indicated that learners, though to a less degree, engaged in improvisational games, filling of crosswords, storytelling and completion of tasks and impromptu acting. It was also established that learners wrote several drafts of their work before the final draft and

they also proofread their work several times. All these findings reiterate the assertions by Breen and Candlin (2001) who describe learners' role within CLT as negotiator between the self, the learning process and the object of learning. This is so because while teaching writing skills, students need to be individually involved so as to make learning experience long lasting. Kaping'ei (2006) also supports the fact that learners should participate in class for them to properly master content. From the analysed data, however, there are still gaps between learner roles as espoused in CLT approach and as was practiced in the English language classroom.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1 Conclusions

In CLT classrooms, students engage in roles such as pair work and in learning games while others get engaged in puzzles/cross-word during teaching/learning process. A big number of the students participate in group work while a small number of others were involved in map reading. Furthermore, majority of the students participate in role plays while a few other learners engaged in improvisation of roles based on given information. Many of the students participate by completing sentences and filling of blank spaces in the classroom, and a small number of others in class debates on topics to write about. Some students engage in sharing of personal experiences and decision-making during writing lessons and dramatization. Learners should be helped to develop creativity and feel free to engage in activities that develop writing skills. The language learning outcomes which have been dismal can be reverted when learners engage in more of the active roles that are characteristic of CLT approach.

References

- Belchamber, R. (2007). *The Advantages of Communicative Language Teaching*. The Internet TESL Journal, XIII (2). Retrieved from <https://iteslj.org/Articles/Belchamber-CLT.html>
- Berns, M. S. (1990). *Contexts of Competence: Social and Cultural Consideration in Communicative Language Teaching*. New York: Plenum.
- Breen, M. P. & Candlin, C. N. (2001). *The Essentials of a Communicative Curriculum in Language Teaching*. In D. R. Hall, & A. Hewings (Eds.), *Innovation in English Language Teaching. A Reader* (pp. 9-26). London and New York in association with Macquarie University and The Open University.
- Clark, H. H. & Bly, B. (1995). *Pragmatics and Discourse*. In J. L. Miller, & P. D. Eimas, (Eds.), *Handbook*

5.2 Recommendations

The study makes the following recommendations:

- a) There is dire need for teachers to adopt and adapt strategies that encourage learners to assume their roles adequately in second language classroom in tandem with CLT theory,
- b) Teachers should resist the temptation to dominate English language classroom activities,
- c) Learners should be familiar with what they should do in communicative classes from their teachers who should take into consideration the learners' preferences,
- d) As facilitators, teachers should provide ample opportunities for learners to use English language in their classes,
- e) Learners ought to take part in among others role plays, group works, learning games, debates, completion exercises, opinion sharing, interviews which related to *real world* activities,
- f) The nature of second language classes should be made very interactive at all times.
- g) Learners should be involved in the preparation of class materials/resources that enhance writing skills,
- h) Collaborative classroom settings should be cultivated so as to motivate learners to learn English language,
- i) Adequate time should be allocated to development of writing skills,
- j) Teachers to introduce captivating regular essays on topical areas that learners are not only familiar with but also those that learners select by themselves and last but not least
- k) Students should participate actively in classroom activities that enhance writing skills and they should not shy away from learner roles.

of Perception and Cognition, vol. 11. Speech, language, and Communication. New York: Academic Press.

- Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Finocchiaro, M. & Brumfit, C. (1983). *The Functional-Notional Approach: From Theory to Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1970). *Language Structure and Language Function*. In J. Lyons (Ed.), *New Horizons in Linguistics* (pp. 140-465). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Harmer, J. (1991). *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (4th Ed). London: Longman.
- Harun-Or-Rashid, M. (2015). *A comparative study on teaching methods and approaches in ESL Classrooms of Bangla and English Version*

- Secondary Schools in Bangladesh*. (Doctoral Dissertation, BRAC University).
- Hymes, D. (1972). *On Communicative Competence*. In J. B. Pride and J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Kapting'ei, S. T. (2006). *The Use of Drama Techniques in Teaching of English Language in Secondary Schools in Uasin Gishu District* (Unpublished M. Phil thesis). Eldoret: Moi University.
- Kenya Institute of Education, (2002). *Secondary Education Syllabus*, vol. 1. Nairobi: Kenya Institute of Education.
- Kenya Institute of Education, (2006). *Secondary English Teacher's Handbook*. Nairobi: Kenya Institute of Education.
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and implications*. London: Longman.
- Kristina, E. (2010). *The role of English as a world language*, Munich, GRIN Verlag, <https://www.grin.com/document/188405>.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an International Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mclean, J. C. (2012). *Destroying the Teacher: The Need for Learner-centred Teaching*. *English Teaching Forum*, 50 (1), 32-35.
- Rahmatuzzaman, Mohammad. (2018). *Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): Theory Vs Reality In the Context of Secondary Schools In Bangladesh*.
- Rance-Roney, J. A. (2010). *Reconceptualizing International Groups: Grouping Schemes for Maximizing Language Learning*. *English Teaching Forum*, 48 (1), 20-26.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (1986). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (2nd Ed). UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Rouf, M., & Sultana, K. (2018). *Learner Role in CLT: Practices in the Higher Secondary Classrooms*. *Journal of NELTA*, 20(1-2), 34-40. <https://doi.org/10.3126/nelta.v20i1-2.19775>.
- Scrivener, J. (2005). *Learning Teaching*. Oxford: Macmillan Publishers Lim.
- Tomlinson, B. and Masuhara, H. (2013). *Adult Course Books*. *ELT journal*, 67(2), 233-249.
- Thompson, N. (2003). *Communication and Language. A Handbook of Theory and Practice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Walia, D. N. (2012). *Traditional teaching methods vs. CLT: A study*. *Frontiers of language and Teaching*, 3, 125-131.
- Warschauer, M. (2000). *The Changing Global Economy and the Future of English Teaching*. *TESOL Quarterly*, TESOL in the 21st Century, 34(3), 511-535.