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### Abstract

*This study appraised Communicative Language teaching in English as a second language classroom. It X– rayed the goals, classroom activities adopted, the role of the teacher and possible challenges that hampered its effective implementation. The study adopted a descriptive survey in the collection of data. One hundred and sixty-five (165) English language teachers were sampled from a population of two thousand seven hundred and fifty, (2,750), English language teachers’ in Ankpa Local Government Area of Kogi State. Four research questions were asked to guide the study. Data were collected using questionnaire. It was equally analyzed using simple percentage. Major findings of the study were as follows; deficiency in spoken English, little time for and expertise in material development, little motivation for communicative competence, grammar based not fluency-based examinations, and lack of effective and efficient assessment instruments. Finally, the study made some useful recommendations which are as follows; spoken English should be encouraged in the CLT classrooms, students should be motivated for communicative competence and that the government should provide support and adequate funding for the implementation of CLT programmes.*
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### Introduction

Communicative Language Teaching in English as a Second Language (ESL), needs highlighting what ESL is and difference between ESL, ESOL and other acronyms closely related to it. English as a Second Language (ESL) essentially refers to the learning of English as the target language in the environment in which it is spoken as the primary language of interaction, communication, as well as business (Zekariya 2010). English as a Second Language is a situation where English language is learned in a country where English is dominantly spoken, or where English is the official language. Other terms closely related and often confused with it is English as a foreign language (EFL) and English as an official language (ESOL).

EFL (English as a foreign language) refers to teaching of English to the speakers of other languages. It refers to the learning of English in the environment of one’s native language. It indicates the learning of English in a non-English-speaking region. It should be noted that this sort of instruction can take place in any country, English-speaking or not. Typically, EFL is learned either to pass exams as a necessary part of one’s education, or for career progression while one works for an organization or business with an international focus. EFL may be part
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of the school curriculum in countries where English has no special status. An example of EFL in Nigeria is the French language until recently. There are few differences between English as a foreign language and as an official language.

First, learning in an EFL setting may or may not take place in a classroom setting. Yet, learning English in an EFL environment implies that it is much more likely to occur within the context of the classroom. The foremost point is that learners in an ESL environment have access to speakers of the target language and thus, abundance of exposure to English in its natural use outside the classroom whereas, this is not usually the case for EFL learners. Just as we speak English, both in and out of the classroom, we know that French language is limited to the classroom as we do not really have need for it daily in Nigeria.

Also, since ESL learners have the chance of continuing learning English outside the classroom through interactions in their everyday lives, learning the target language for these students is more than a curriculum discipline, it is rather part of their survival. Therefore, ESL learners need to learn the language to survive and grow (Ellis, 2015). The English language classroom in ESL settings typically functions on the principle of immersing (that is communicating in English throughout) learners in the target language.

For effective distinction, a more generic term has been introduced, i.e., a common term that accommodates all other forms of English learned by non-native speakers, that is; English for speakers of other languages (ESOL). Though this term is more commonly used in the United Kingdom, it applies to both ESL and EFL contexts. Another reason why this term was created is because some individuals argue that when students are learning English in English speaking country, these students are not necessarily learning a second language. It could, in fact, be a student’s third or even fourth language. English as a Second Language, then, is limited and not fully comprehensive in its description. English to Speakers of other Languages, “ESOL” is a more accurate description for such learners. TESOL then refers to Teaching English to Speakers of other Languages which is now in vogue as opposed to the earlier “Teaching English as a foreign language (EFL).

English language Teaching (ELT) is in a constant state of flux, with new theories, practices and methodologies coming up from time to time. One of these approaches is the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) which came as a reaction to traditional language teaching and older methods such as Audio-Lingual, Grammar Translation, and Situational Language Teaching. CLT is today a recognized theoretical model which many ELT practitioners and applied linguists regard as one of the most effective approaches to language teaching at all levels. Savingnon (2002) is of the opinion that a good understanding of CLT can be traced to concurrent developments in Europe and North America. Among other factors, the language needs to a group of immigrants and workers whose population was exploding in Europe, forced the council of Europe to develop a syllabus that was learner centered. The syllabus was fashioned in line with neo-Firthian, Hallidayan or functional linguistics wherein language carries “meaning and centrality of “context of situation” is underscored. In this regard, the communicative needs of learners in any instructional programme took pride of
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place. Language functions were rooted in assessment of learners’ needs. Consequently, it is a language programme that adopted functional-notional syllabi.

Howatt (2018) identified a ‘strong’ version of the communicative approach and a ‘weak’ version. The weak version which has become more or less the standard practice in the last few years, stresses the importance of providing learners with opportunities to use their English for communicative purposes and, characteristically, attempts to integrate such activities into a wider programme of language teaching while the ‘strong’ version of communicative teaching, on the other hand, advances the claim that language is acquired through communication, so that it is not merely a question of activating an existing but inert knowledge of the language, but of stimulating the development of the language system itself. If the former could be described as ‘learning to use’ English, the latter entails ‘using English to learn it’.

Therefore, CLT is seen as an approach that aims to:

a.) make communicative competence the goal of language teaching and

b.) Develop procedures for the teaching of the four language skills that acknowledge the inter- dependence of language and communication (Richard, 2006).

Since its emergence in the early 1970s, CLT has opened a multiplicity of windows to illuminate ELT; it is now widely utilized as a prominent language teaching approach around the world. Nevertheless, many ESL teachers at all levels of education remain somewhat confused, unenthusiastic, and unaware of the lesson opportunities which CLT offers. It is pertinent, therefore, to lay out some important principles of CLT and its relevance in any classroom where English is taught or used as a second language.

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is generally regarded as an approach to language teaching (Richards & Rodgers 2001). As such, CLT reflects a certain model or research paradigm, or a theory (Celce-Murcia 2001). It is based on the theory that the primary function of language use is communication. Its primary goal is for learners to develop communicative competence (Hymes 2016), or simply put, communicative ability. In other words, its goal is to make use to real-life situations that necessitate communication.

Communicative competence is, therefore, defined as the ability to interpret and enact appropriate social behaviours, which requires the active involvement of the learner in the production of the target language (Hymes 2016; Canale & Swain 1980; Celce-Murcia et al, 1995).

### Goals of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

According to Richards (2013), communicative language teaching can be understood as a set of principles about the goals of language, the kinds of classroom activities that best facilitate learning, and the roles of teachers and learners in the classroom”. Implicit in the definition are four overlapping issues namely: (1) goals of language teaching (2) how learners learn a language (3) kinds of classroom activities, and (4) roles of teachers and learners in their negotiation of meaning.

Indeed, the goals of language teaching is the pivot on which the other three issues revolve. According to Richard (2013) the major goal of CLT is communicative competence, which is
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concerned with a learner’s ability to use language for meaningful communication. He suggests strongly that the goal involves a whole range of issues namely.

* 1. Knowing how to use language for a range of different purposes and functions (grammatical competence).
	2. Knowing how to vary our language according to the setting and the participants (for example, knowing when to use formal and informal speech or when to use language appropriately for written as opposed to spoken communication (Sociolinguistic competence).
	3. Knowing how to produce and understand different types of texts (for example, narratives, reports, interviews, conversations) (discourse competence).
	4. Knowing how to maintain communication despite having limitations in one’s language knowledge or grammatical competence (for example, through using different kinds of communicative strategies (strategic competence).

This study is anchored in Cognitive Constructivism developed by Jean Piaget (1896-1980), Constructivism is a new theory in education that claims that humans are better able to understand the information they have constructed by themselves. According to constructivist theories, learning is a social advancement that involves language, real world situations and interaction and collaboration among learners. The learners are central in the learning process. Learning is affected by our prejudices, experiences, the time in which we live and both physical and mental maturity. When motivated, the learner exercises his will, determination, and action to gather selective information, convert it, formulate hypothesis, test these suppositions via applications, interactions, or experiences and to draw verifiable conclusions. Constructivism transforms today’s classrooms into a knowledge-construction site where information is absorbed, and knowledge is built by the learner.

In constructivist, unlike the conventional teacher, the teacher is a facilitator and a guide, who plans, organizes, guides, and provides directions to the learner, who is accountable for his own learning. The teacher supports the learner by means of suggestions that arise out of ordinary activities, by challenges that inspire creativity and with projects that allow for independent thinking and new ways of learning information. Students work in groups to solve problems and challenges in real world situations, this in turn leads to the creation of practical solutions and a diverse variety of students’ products. Constructivist theories have found more popularity with the advent of personal computers (PCs) in classrooms and homes. PCs provide individual students with tools to experiment and build their own learning at their own pace. With the use of the web, the learner can now conduct research, interact with diverse populations, share ideas and work on group projects. The assessment tool in a constructivist classroom is not a test or a quiz, rather it is the learner’s product; most of the time this is a port-folio format that has been designed by the learner.

Jean Piaget and Lev Vygotsky are two eminent figures in the development of constructivist theories. They share the common belief that classrooms must be constructivist environments; however, there are differences in terms of their theories and variations as to how constructivism be carried out in classrooms.
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This study has the following objectives.

1. To find out the goals of communicative language teaching.
2. To identify various classroom activities that facilitated learning in the CLT classroom.
3. To investigate the roles of the teacher in the CLT classroom.
4. To examine possible limitations or shortcomings of the CLT.

This study is guided by the following research questions.

1. What are the goals of communicative language teaching?
2. What are the classroom activities that facilitated learning in CLT Classroom?
3. What role do teachers play in a communicative language teaching?
4. What are the possible limitations/shortcomings of the communicative language teaching?

### Method

This study used a descriptive survey research design. According to Nworgu (2002), a descriptive survey is a study which aims at collecting data on and describing in a systematic manner the characteristic features or facts about a given population. The researcher adopted this design because the study involves studying and describing certain variables in relation to the population to appraise the effectiveness of communicative language teaching.

The instrument for data collection was a self-constructed 4-point Likert Scale questionnaire tagged “An appraisal of communicative language teaching (AA CLT). It consisted of two (2) parts. The first part elicited information on the biodata of respondents. The second part contained four (4) clusters A – D. Cluster A elicited information on the goals of communicative language teaching (CLT). Cluster B focused on classroom activity. The four- point scale was rated as follows strongly agree (SA) 4 points, agree (A) 3 points, disagree (D) 3 points and strongly disagree (SD) 1 point. A criterion value of 2.5 was chosen for making decision. The instrument was face validated by experts in Language Education and Measurement and Evaluation. Cronbach’s Alpha reliability index was used to determine the internal consistency of the instrument. The reliability co-efficient of 0.84 was considered reliable.

The respondents were all the one hundred and sixty-five (165) English Language Teachers in Ankpa Local Government. Intact sample was chosen for the study because the population was deemed very small to be subjected to random sampling technique. Data was analyzed using mean and percentage. The use of percentage was informed because it is easier to be understood by majority of readers.
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### Results

 ***Table 1:****Presents the Goals of Communicative Language Teaching.*

### S/N ITEMS STATEMENT SA A D SD DEC.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. The major goal of CLT is communicative 60 | 50 | 30 | 25 Agree |
| competence. 36.3% | 30.3% | 18.1% | 15.1% |

It is concerned with the ability to use the

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 75 | 65 | 15 | 10 |
| 45.4% | 39.3% | 9% | 6% |
| 67 | 50 | 28 | 20 |
| 41% | 30.3% | 16.9% | 12.1% |

1. right vocabulary, pronunciation and sentence formation.

Sociolinguistic competence which is the

1. learner’s ability to use language correctly in a

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| specific social situation is also goal of CLT. |  |
| CLT is also concerned with strategic |
| competence which is the ability to apply |
| communication channel open and to maintain | 49 | 69 | 22 | 25 |
| the interaction between the speakers and to | 30% | 49% | 13.3% | 13.3% |
| run the conversation in accordance with their |  |  |  |  |
| intention. |  |  |  |  |
| CLT has discourse competence as one of its |  |  |  |  |
| goals. i.e., a person’s ability to combine |  |  |  |  |
| grammatical form and meanings to find | 70 | 56 | 19 | 20 |
| different ways to speak or write and the | 42.4% | 34% | 12% | 12.1% |
| student’s ability to combine the language’s |  |  |  |  |

4.

5.

Agree Agree

Agree

Agree

 element to speak or write in English.

In table I, item I which sought to find out the goal of communicative language teaching, 60 of the English language teachers’ representing 36.3% and 50 of the respondents representing 30.5% jointly agreed that the goal of CLT is communicative competence. In the same vein, 30 out of the 165 respondents representing 18.1% disagreed while 25 respondents representing 15.1% strongly disagreed.

In table 1 item 2, which is concerned with the ability to use the right vocabulary, pronunciation, and sentence formation as a goal of CLT, 75 out a total respondent of 165 representing 45.4% agreed with the statement while 65 representing 39.3% also supported the assertion that CLT aids the formation of right vocabulary, pronunciation, and sentence formation. On the contrary, 9% of the respondents representing 15 language teachers refuted the assertion. An insignificant number of respondents representing 6% strongly disagreed with the statement.

Item 3 on table 1 which addressed socio-linguistic competence as a goal in CLT where the learners used language correctly in specific social situation, 67 respondents representing 30.3% strongly agreed. On the contrary, only 28 respondents representing 16.9% and another 20 respondents representing 12.1% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement on sociolinguistic competence.
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Table 1 item 4 which sought to find out strategic competence which is the ability to apply communication channel open and to maintain the interaction between the speaker and to run the conversation in accordance with their intention, 49 respondents representing 30% and another significant of 50 respondents representing 30.3% and another 25 respondents representing 15.1% denied the assertion.

Finally, table 1 item 5 which addressed discourse competence as a goal of CLT which is the person’s ability to combine grammatical form and meaning to find different ways to speak or write and the students’ ability to combine language elements to speak or write in English, 70 respondents representing 42.4% affirmed to the statement while another 56 respondents representing 34% also supported the statement. On the other hand, 19 respondents representing 12% and another 20 respondents representing 12.1% disagreed totally with the statement.

***Table 2:*** *The Classroom Activities that facilitate Learning in CLT Classroom*

is also employed in the CLT Linguistically structured activities such as

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S/N ITEM STATEMENTS SA** | **A** | **D** | **SD DEC.** |
| 1. Role play and simulation go together in CLT 66 | 58 | 29 | 12 Agree |
| 40% | 35.1% | 17.5% | 7.2% |
| Information – gap activities which is 63 | 80 | 12 | 10 |
| 2. essentially based on the students’ daily lives 38.1% | 48.4% | 7.2% | 6% Agree |

1. interview where the students question each other for information is used in the CLT.

71 67

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 43.0% | 40.6% | 10.3% |  |
| 68 | 53 | 20 | 24 |
| 41.2% | 32.1% | 12.1% | 14.5% |
| 55 | 80 | 17 | 13 |
| 33.3% | 48.4% | 10.3% | 7.8% |
| 75 | 50 | 19 | 21 |

17 10 6% Agree

1. Fluency and accuracy activities are vital to the teacher in the CLT
2. Discussion and debates are of widely utilized activity in the CLT.

Prepared talks and oral presentations

Agree Agree

1. activities which are prepared by students

45.4%

30.3%

11.5%

12.7% Agree

 about a specific topic is used in the CLT.

In table 2 item 1, which discusses the classroom activities used in the CLT classroom, 66 of the respondents representing 40% and another 58 English language teachers’ responses and they agreed that role play, and simulation activities are employed by the teacher in CLT classroom. On the other hand, 29 respondents disagreed while a handful respondents of 12 representing 7.2% strongly disagreed that simulation and role play are used in CLT.

Item 2 on table 2, which sought to find out whether information gap – activities are used in the CLT, 63 respondents representing 38.1% strongly agreed while another 80 respondents representing 48.4% affirmed on the use of information gap in the CLT. Contrarily, 12 respondents representing 7.2% disagreed and another 10 representing 6% strongly disagreed on the use of information gap activities in the CLT.
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Table 2 item 3, which sought to find out whether structured linguistically activities are used in the CLT, 71 respondents representing 43% affirmed to its use while 67 respondents representing 40.6% also accepted its usage as an activity used in the CLT. Conversely a handful of 17 and 10 respondents totally disagreed with its usage as an activity used in the CLT.

In table 2 item 4, which dwelled on fluency and accuracy as activities which are vital in the CLT classroom, 68 of the respondents which represent 41.2% strongly affirmed while 53 respondents representing 32.1% attested to the decision. In the same vein, 20 respondents and 24 respondents representing 12.1% and 14.5% respectively disagreed on the use of accuracy and fluency activities in the CLT classroom.

Item 5 in the table examined discussion and debates as vital activities utilized in CLT classroom. Majority of the respondents affirmed that they are vital activities used in the CLT classroom. 68 respondents and another 80 respondents representing 33.3% and 48.4% respectively attested to it. On the contrary, 17 respondents disagreed with the assertion while another 13 respondents representing 7.8% totally disagreed with the usage of discussion and debates in the CLT. On prepared talks and oral presentation activities in table 2 item 6, 75 respondents and another 50 respondents all affirmed that they are activities used in CLT classroom. On the contrary, other respondents of 19 and 21 representing 11.5% and 12.7% disagreed with the usage of prepared talks and oral presentation in the CLT classroom.

***Table 3:****Teachers’ Role in Communicative Language Teaching in an ESL Classroom.*

### S/N ITEM STATEMENTS SA A D SD DEC.

It is the teacher responsibility to organize the

1. classroom as a setting for communication and communicative activities.

The Teacher monitors, encourages, and

1. suppresses the inclination to supply gaps in lexis, grammar, and strategy.

The teacher as a manager controls the group

1. dynamics, decides on interaction pattern, and demonstrates task and activities.

The teacher acts like a counselor giving

1. learners advice on differences, they may have outside their language classroom

He is a diagnostician assuming a

69

41.8%

59

35.7%

65

39.3%

88

53.3%

72

43.6%

76

46%

80

48.4%

50

30.3%

14

8.4%

14

8.4%

11

6.6%

17

10.3%

10 Agree 6%

16 Agree 9.6%

1. Agree 5.4%
2. Agree 6%
3. responsibility for determining and responding to learner’s language needs, evaluating

67

40.6%

59

35.7%

19

11.5%

20

12.1%

Agree

 learners needs and difficulties.

Table 3 item 1 which is on the teachers’ responsibility to organize the classroom as a setting for communication and communicative activities, 69 respondents representing 41.8% strongly agree while another 72 representing 43.6% also affirmed to this role of the teacher in CLT
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classroom. Conversely, handful respondents of 14 and 10 respondents corresponding to 8.4% and 6% disagreed with this important role of the teacher in the CLT classroom.

Item 2 in the same table which sought to find out the role of a teacher as a monitor and encourager, 59 respondents and another 76 respondents representing 35.7% and 46% all agreed to this important role of the teacher in the CLT classroom while a handful respondents 14 and 16 representing 8.4% and 9.6% disagreed.

Table 3 item 3 which X – rayed the role of the teacher as a manager who controls group dynamic and decides on interaction pattern, majority of the respondents of 65 and 80 representing 39.3% and 48.4% all agreed while only 11 and 9 respondents representing 6.6% and 5.4% disagreed with the statement.

In the same vein item 4 on table 3 sought to find out the role of the teacher as a counselor, who offers advice in times of need, 88 respondents representing 53.3% strongly agreed with the statement and another 50 respondents which is equal to 30.3% agreed to this role of the teacher. It is only a handful number of 17 and 10 representing 10.3% and 6% that refuted the statement.

Finally in table 3 item 5 which highlights the role of the teacher as a diagnostician, assuming a responsibility for determining and responding to learners’ language needs, 64 respondents representing 40.6% strongly agreed while another 59 respondents representing 35.7% also affirmed. In the same manner, 19 and 20 respondents representing 11.5% and 12.1% disagreed with the role of a teacher as a diagnostician in CLT classroom.

 ***Table 4:****Presents the possible Limitations / Shortcomings of CLT*

### S/N ITEM STATEMENTS SA A D SD DEC.

Difficulties caused by teacher which may

* 1. include – deficiency in spoken English and lack of training in CLT.

Difficulties caused by the students’

* 1. especially low English proficiency and little motivation for communicative competence. Difficulties caused by the educational
	2. system which may be as a result a large classes and insufficient funding. Difficulties caused by CLT itself which
	3. include CLT’s inadequacy for EFL

40

24.2%

75

45.4%

72

43.6%

64

38.7%

95

51.5%

67

40.6%

69

41.8%

78

47.2%

15

9%

13

67.8%

8

84.8%

10

26%

15 Agree 9%

10 Agree 6%

16 Agree 9.6%

13 Agree

7.8%

 teaching.

Table 4 item 1 sought to find out the difficulties caused by CLT teacher which may be because of deficiency in spoken English and lack of – proper training in CLT, 40 respondents equivalent to 24.2% strongly affirmed to the statement while another 95 respondents representing 57.5% also attest to it. On the contrary, 15 respondents representing 9% disagree
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with the assertion while another 15 respondents representing the same 9% strongly disagree on the limitation caused by deficiency in spoken English and lack of proper training in CLT.

Item 2 in the same table also sought to find out the extent of difficulty caused by low English proficiency and little motivation for communicative competence, 75 respondents representing 45.4% agree with the statement while another 67 respondents representing 40.6% also supported the assertion. Similarly, handful respondents of 13 representing 7.8% disagreed with the above statement. Another respondent of 10 representing 6% also do not support the statement.

In table 4 items 3, which concerns the difficulties caused by the educational system because of large classes and insufficient funding, majority of the respondents, 72 representing 43.6% strongly agree while another 69 respondents representing 41.8% also affirmed to it. In the same vein, 8 respondents representing 4.8% disagreed while another 16 respondents were on the same page with those that disagreed.

Finally, in table 4 item 4 which sought to find out the difficulties caused by CLT itself which include inadequacy for EFL teaching, 64 and another 78 respondents representing 38.7% and 47.2% affirmed to the statement while a handful 10 and 13 respondents representing 6% and 7.8% disagreed in totality with the statement.

### Discussion

Research question 1 which sought to find out the goals of CLT Classroom, majority of the respondents agreed that communicative competence is a major goal of CLT. Communicative language teaching can be understood as a set of principles about the goals of language, the kinds of classroom activities that best facilitate learning and the roles of the teacher and learners in the classroom. Implicit in the definition are four overlapping issues namely (i) Goals of language teaching (ii) How learners learn a language (iii) Classroom activities and (iv) Roles of the teacher and learners in their negotiation of meaning. Richard (2013) also asserts that the goal of CLT is communicative competence, which is concerned with a learner’s ability to use language for meaningful communication. He suggests strongly that the goal involves a whole range of issues namely, grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence and strategic competence.

On the activities that facilitate learning in the CLT classroom, it was discovered that role play, simulation and information gap activities, linguistically structured activities and prepared talks and oral presentation are vital activities employed by teachers in the CLT classroom. Majority of the respondents attest to this. Belchamber (2007) emphasis that inCLT classroom the lessons are more student – centered, this does not mean they are unstructured. The teacher does have a very important role in the process, and that is setting up activities which make communication happens. There is a lot of preparation and accuracy practice. By implication, CLT involves equipping students with vocabulary, structures, and function, as well as strategies to enable them to interact successfully.
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In the words of Harmer (2001) who also supports role play and simulation activities he asserts that “a real-life encounter promotes communication (such as a business meeting, an encounter in an aeroplane cabin or an interview) as if they were doing so in the real world. Richard and Sandy (1998) also aligned with the views of Harmer that the concept of information gap is an important aspect of communication in a CLT classroom. This is essential because in their everyday lives, people generally communicate to get information they do not possess.

On the role of the teacher in a CLT classroom, which majority of the respondents affirmed, CLT procedures often requires teachers to acquire learner – centered classroom management skills. It is the teacher’s responsibility to organize the classroom as a setting for communication (Littlewood 1981; Fin. Occhiaro and Brumfit 1983) suggest that during an activity the teacher monitors, encourages, and suppresses the inclination to supply gaps in lexis, grammar and strategy but notes such gaps for later commentary and communicative practice. At the conclusion of group activities, the teacher leads in the briefing of the activities and pointing out alternative.

Finally, research question 4 squarely addresses the limitations / shortcomings of CLT. Most of the statements generated on the shortcomings of CLT were accepted by majority of the respondents. Scholars and researchers are of the considered opinion that taking a set of teaching method developed in one part of the world and using it in a different part would surely bring a lot of challenges (Pennycook, 1989; Halliday, 1994). Li (1998) also affirmed that the difficulties encountered in using CLT in an English as a foreign language (EFL) classroom include difficulties caused by the teachers, the students and those caused by the educational system itself.

The following were the major findings of the study.

1. There is deficiency in spoken English.
2. Lack of training in CLT.
3. There is little time for and expertise in material development.
4. There is little motivation for communicative competence.
5. Examinations are Grammar – based not fluency based.
6. Insufficient funding by the government.
7. Lack of effective and efficient assessment instruments.

### Recommendations

The following are some of the recommendations proffered in this study.

1. Training should be organized for teachers on the benefits of CLT and its “modus operandi” in the classroom.
2. Teachers should motivate the students who display communicative competence in the CLT classroom.
3. The government should support CLT by adequately funding it.
4. An effective and efficient assessment instruments should be developed for teaching in CLT classroom.
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1. Finally, spoken English should be dully encouraged in our classroom at the expense of the native language at the higher class of learning.

### Conclusion

Although implementing CLT in an ESL context is not without some shortcomings, it is erroneous to claim that CLT’s shortcomings and limitations cancel out its potential usefulness as a language teaching approach. Indeed, since its emergence in the early 1970s, CLT has helped to illuminate English Language Teaching (ELT). Today, CLT can be understood as a set of core principles concerning language learning and teaching. The principles can be applied in different ways, taking into consideration the peculiarity of a learning situation. The principles are chiefly concerned with the goals of language, the kinds of classroom activities that best facilitate learning and the roles of teachers in the ESL classroom.
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