



MALL and CALL Technologies as Means to Enhance Learning English in Higher Learning Institutions: Challenges and Strategies to Developing Students' Speaking Skills

¹Anastasié Uwababyeyi ²Dr. Jean Paul Ngoboka & ³Dr. Patrick Ujwiga Anguru

¹University of Tourism, Technology and Business Studies, Rwanda

^{2,3}University of Rwanda, college of Education

*Corresponding author: anastasieuwababyeyi0@gmail.com

Abstract: Many graduates leave Higher Learning Institutions (HLIs) incompetent in communication skills in English and fail to successfully compete on the labor market. This paper aims to examine the contribution of Mobile assisted language learning (MALL) and Computer assisted language learning (CALL) as new technologies to teach English speaking skills in Rwanda HLIs. The research was conducted in seven HLIs. The HLIs located in Kigali city were chosen using simple random sampling while HLIs from provinces were purposively selected. Questionnaire and interviews were used to solicit views of informants about the issue. 140 students and 10 teachers gave their views. The results revealed that the methodology used currently in HLIs leads to the traditional approach focusing on grammar and vocabulary, because of a big number of students and a short time allocated to the English programs. Consequently, students lack opportunities to practice speaking skills. All interviewees stated that MALL and CALL may improve speaking skills. Thus, students should be given tasks that involve speaking to upgrade their accuracy and fluency even outside the classroom. In this regard, the classroom will not be the only source of learning. However, the impact of MALL and CALL on speaking skills will be felt if the strategies proposed in this paper including closely monitoring tasks given to students, training lecturers in ICT and well equipped language laboratory among other, are adopted. Stakeholders of HLI should also work together to facilitate the use of MALL and CALL to promote the English speaking skill in HLIs.

Keywords: MALL and CALL, New technologies, Speaking skills, HLI, L2 and FL

How to cite this work (APA):

Uwababyeyi, A., Ngoboka, J. P. & Angulu, P. U. (2021). MALL and CALL technologies as means to enhance learning English in higher learning institutions: Challenges and strategies to developing students' skills. *Journal of Research in Innovation and Implications in Education*, 5(4), 260 – 273.

1. Introduction

English language is an international language used in various parts of the World. This language is used by around 380 million people as the first language or mother tongue while around 380 million people use English as L2 or FL (John, 2019). Like other languages, English can be taught using either traditional or modern technologies, through four skills, namely listening, speaking, reading and writing. According to Chaney, 1998; Coulthard, & Condlin, 2014, speaking is the most important

among the four skills, it is the skill by which students will be judged upon in various circumstances. Lack of proficiency in English among students is often reported. This might be attributed to the kind of methodology used to teach the language. Students complain about the method of memorization through which they are facilitated in their respective classes (Martins Kremer & Valcke, 2014). During the 19th century, traditional methods in language teaching such as the grammar translation method and direct method were emphasized (John, 2019). Tradition methods rendered students passive recipients of knowledge in learning L2 or FL

Hazarika (2017), and the lack of motivation appeared as a serious challenge in teaching and learning a language since they did not foster communicative competence. The introduction of new technology in language teaching in the early 1960s and 1970s (Abbasova & Mammadova, 2019), assisted teachers in teaching second language learners how to speak well. The role of teachers was to monitor learners' interaction or using a central control panel as Hazarika (2017) suggested. Since those years, technology has developed worldwide and has become vital in English language teaching, and this made learners easily acquire second and/or foreign language.

Among the four official languages used in Rwanda, English performs the most functions, especially in the education sector; it has been approved by the government as the medium of instruction in Rwanda since 2008 (Pearson, 2014 & Mwaura, 2008) replacing French that was the former medium of instruction. Since the establishment of English language, the government of Rwanda has made much effort in providing various teaching and learning materials in different primary and secondary schools and training teachers. However, it is noticed that many students enrolling in HLIs of Rwanda still have a low level of English proficiency (Niyibizi, Sibomana, Parmal, 2019; Tabaro, 2015). These authors have discussed various causes, including for the fact that majority of teachers are native speakers of Kinyarwanda and are not proficient in English (Uwizeyimana, 2018; Nzitabakuze, 2012; Pearson, 2014). Consequently, Rwandan students develop writing more than speaking (Sibomana, 2010). In addition, the classroom is the only place where learning English takes place (Banegas, 2009). Furthermore, some students fear to talk thinking that their peers will laugh at them and this may negatively affect learners of FL Du (2009) and may be a greater cause of language worry. This paper aims at finding out whether or not the use of modern technologies MALL and CALL may be a good solution to observed challenges in HLIs of Rwanda.

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What are the current methods and approaches used at HLIs in the teaching of speaking skills in Rwanda?
2. Which speaking skills components can be improved with the use of MALL and CALL in HLIs in Rwanda?
3. What are the challenges and strategies for teaching and learning English speaking skills using MALL and CALL in HLIs in Rwanda?

2. Literature Review

Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL) and Mobile-Assisted Language Learning (MALL) are the predominant areas that reveal the

implementation of technology to support English language learning. Moreover, both CALL and MALL have influenced language acquisition and have differentiated modern language classroom from traditional language classroom in the way that the learning of English language is smooth and attractive to students. The discovery of new technologies in teaching and learning English led many countries to adopt the new methodology of teaching in classrooms. In Europe, the majority of teachers (90%) use ICT to prepare lessons Chhabra (2012) and this seems to be the same in many other countries where using ICT is the preferred methodology in teaching and learning English language. In the United states of America the institution in charge of technology has developed a plan to transform education through the power of technology (Motteram, 2013). In the same country, the classes of EFL are shifting from the usual methods to use of ICT (Abbasova & Mammadova 2019). Teachers then have a responsibility to prepare students to speak English in real world outside the classroom, and know effective components to focus on while teaching English speaking. To this extent, Kuning (2019) highlights where to focus while teaching English speaking. Indeed, Kuning's emphasis is teaching how to correctly produce the English speech sounds and stress words and produce sentences with proper intonation patterns and rhythm in the second language. Furthermore, teaching oral skills requires the selection of the appropriate content in line with the topic, the event, the time and the place, people to talk to, and there is a need to teach how to speak quickly and confidently with limited uncertainties (Nunan, 2003 in Kuning, 2019). Smith and Craig (2013) add that CALL as a new technology in teaching English is used for any visual, audio, text or graphic format linked with the spread of information through technology where learning support occurs simultaneously or separately.

Unlike developed countries, African countries, including Rwanda, the teaching of English as L2 or FL faces challenges. From the Belgian colonial period, i.e. from 1890 to 1994 the years during which Rwanda faced genocide perpetrated against Tutsis, French was used as medium of instruction in teaching subjects (LeClerc, 2008 & Munyankesha, 2004). From 1996 to 2008, primary and secondary students learned either English or French as their first language of instruction, and took Kinyarwanda as a subject. On the other hand, university students were taught either in French or in English Nkubito & Uwababyeyi (2017), depending on the language they felt comfortable with. Since 2008, the Government of Rwanda announced that French would no longer be the medium of instruction (Mwaura, 2008) and it was replaced by English, the current medium of instruction for all schools. The change of French language in the favor of English was motivated by the benefits that Rwanda would derive from being part of East African Community (EAC) and its wish to contribute as a sub-regional leader in trade, tourism and science and technology

(MINEDUC, 2008). Rwanda strived to train all teachers how to teach in English to cope with the new reform Gove and Cvelich (2011). These trainings were facilitated by Rwandan teachers and a few from Uganda and Kenya with good proficiency in English. Despite the efforts of many Rwandans educated in French to learn English, their proficiency in English language is still wanted due to late and limited exposure to English. This is the case of many graduates and undergraduates that are unable to express themselves in different settings (Niyibizi, Sibomana, Parmal 2019 & Tabaro, 2015).

This challenge is common to African countries. The existing literature shows that L2 learners from Africa lack skills in English as the language of instruction (Alidou and Brock-Utne, 2011; Brock-Utne, et al, 2005). In Rwanda, having a common spoken language, which is Kinyarwanda, may hamper the learning of other languages because of lack of practice outside the classroom. As it is argued by a number of authors (Webb, 2003; Kagwesage, 2013), the failure to use a language which is the medium of instruction in the proper way leads to lack of progress in education. Thus, as a way of addressing the issue, the Ministry of Education (MINEDUC) launched the one laptop per child (OLPC) programme in 2009 from primary four to facilitate the use of English. . Moreover, in 2015, laptops, computers, tablets, to mention but a few, were provided by a computer manufacturing company after an agreement with Rwanda. All these ICT tools came following an arrangement between Rwanda and the company to support the education sector; the devices were inexpensive and trusted Kozma & Isaacs (2011). In 2016, MINEDUC initiated ICT in Education Master Plan which included the SMART Classroom Initiative to hasten the use of ICT from low level to HLI. The SMART Classroom initiative, indeed, aimed to change from a simple to a powerful ICT network focusing on curriculum and content growth Kozma & Isaacs (2011). During that period a number of learners and teachers had access to ICT and the target was to expand ICT in all levels of education. Thus, students from secondary schools needed to increase their knowledge after laptops distribution in primary school. According to Taylor & Robinson (2019), there are currently more schools equipped with ICT tools in Rwanda than those lacking ICT tools, and many instructors are using at ease the ICT devices in the teaching and learning process.

Studies have clarified the teaching of English as L2 or FL highlighting how ICT has addressed challenges related to teaching and learning English across countries (Abbasova & Mammadova, 2019). These challenges are direct consequences of the traditional methods of teaching and learning English. In Rwandan context, MINEDUC (2008) emphasizes the country's effort to develop the education system to cope with English as a medium of instruction. Despite the Government's effort, challenges of speaking English in HLIs still persist

(Niyibizi, Sibomana, Parmal, 2019; Tabaro, 2015). It is in this context that, MALL and CALL are the subject of the current study whose purpose is to investigate, whether or not, these new technologies may bridge the existing gap.

Theoretical Framework

Two major theories comprising cognitive psycholinguistic tradition and sociocultural theory of teaching speaking skill are discussed referring to (Pakula, 2019). The cognitive psycholinguistic tradition emphasizes individual learning processes. This style of learning is explained as implicit learning that leads to automated process and explicit learning with conscious inspection (Long & Doughty, 2003; Kiernan, & Aizawa, 2004). During the learning process, proceduralization makes learners master the rules of the language given its frequent use. Learners progressively acquire practical knowledge and develop a habit after some repetitions of the same rule. With time, learners automatize this habit and they unconsciously fix the rules. Proceduralization is good to initiate before encouraging fluency in speaking a language (Pakula, 2019).

The view of sociocultural theory in teaching speaking skills is that society plays a vital role in learning a language (Block, 2003; Lantolf, 2000). For this reason, to acquire a language, learners must start communication with other people, they slowly improve that language and finally master it. Pioneers of this theory believe that learning of a language obliges interactions, and thanks to problem-solving activities, individual capacities are attained (Pakula, 2019). It means that the achievement of learners depends on tasks performed inside or outside the classroom. Tasks assigned by the teachers should include listening to individual native speakers, pairs and group presentations; by regularly speaking and receiving feedback from the teachers, students can become fluent speakers.

3. Methodology

In this study simple random sampling technique was used, to give an equal chance to all HLIs found in Kigali city. In provinces, purposive sampling was used, focusing on the HLIs location and accessibility. Hence, three urban HLIs, one public and two privates and four rural HLIs were selected as a case study. This made it possible to generalize the results for all HLIs of Rwanda. Only one college among the three Colleges of the University of Rwanda that deliver bachelor's degree in Kigali city was selected. As private HLIs are seven in Kigali city, two of them were identified. Moreover, one HLI from each of the four provinces of Rwanda were purposively chosen taking into consideration their location and accessibility. In fact, the selection of targeted group consisted of non-probability

sampling technique, to give a chance to private HLIs located in the four provinces. In this type of sampling, some elements of the population have no chance of selection.

Within the sampling, two targeted groups were students and lecturers. Lecturers from 7 HLIs were equal to 10 lecturers all together. Further, 20 students, 10 from first years (5 males and 5 females) and 10 from second years (5 males and 5 females) in each HLI were identified. Students from third year were not targeted as many of them had completed their studies or were busy with their final exams. The total number of respondents from seven HLIs was 150 respondents. The distribution of respondents was as follows: 10 male students and 10 female students, 1 or 2 English lecturers identified purposively in each HLI. The lecturers from each case study were equal to 10 respondents. These were interviewed and all student respondents were 140. This kind of non-probability sampling resulting in the total number of 150 people was used to generalize the whole population of staff and students in HLIs. Only lecturers of English language were preferred among other lecturers due to their background knowledge in teaching and learning languages and students facilitated by English lecturers were judged suitable informants in the identified case studies.

The case study included the following seven HLIs targeted: From Kigali city College of Sciences and

Technology (CST), Adventist University of Central Africa (AUCA), and University of Kigali (UoK) were selected. From the four provinces of Rwanda, University of Technology and Arts of Byumba (UTAB) was chosen from Northern Province, Catholic University of Rwanda (CUR) was targeted from Southern Province, Université Libre de Kigali (ULK) Gisenyi from Western Province and Université des Laiques Adventistes (UNILAK) found in Rwamagana from Eastern Province.

Semi-structured interviews from English lecturers were used to collect data in order to analyze and interpret results. As for students, a structured questionnaire was used to collect the data. Data collection took one day. Each leader of language center in HLI or HOD was first contacted by telephone to identify respondents. The following day was used to approach and ask them to fill in the questionnaire or respond to semi-structured interview. Respondents' availability for the activities was guaranteed. After data collection, the next step was to analyze each set of data and organize them by grouping the responses together and arrange them. As responses from students consisted of quantifiable data, they were analyzed and presented into tables and then, interpreted.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Results from students' questionnaire

Table 1: Respondents age range

Age range	Frequency	Percent
18-22	56	41.5
23-27	29	21.5
28-32	24	17.8
32 and above	26	19.3
Total	135	100.0

The highest number of respondents (56) was between 18 and 22 years old (41.5%) of all respondents, followed by 29 respondents found between the age range of 23 and 27 (21.5%). Further, the age range of students between 32 and

above comes to the third place (19.3%). Twenty four students (17.8%) makes the lowest respondents, ranged between 28 and 32 age. It is clear from these results that all categories of age were considered during data collection.

Table 2: Gender of respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Male	64	47.4
Female	71	52.6
Total	135	100.0

The number of female students is the highest with 71 respondents (52.6 %). Male respondents are 64 (47%) of all respondents. From the respondents' number and percentage analyzed, it is seen that both

gender responded to questionnaire, but female respondents were more available than male during data collection.

Table 3: Respondents' year of study

Year of study	Frequency	Percent
Year 1	75	55.6
Year 2	60	44.4
Total	135	100.0

Respondents from year one are 75 (55.6%) and respondents from year two are 60 (44.4%) of respondents. The difference of numbers according to levels in which respondents study and percentage, results from one HLI in which only the respondents from year one were present at the moment of data

collection. The target respondents from each HLI were 20 making 140 in all of HLIs. However, questionnaire from two HLIs were returned incomplete. This means that some of the selected respondents did not fill the given questionnaire.

Table 4: Methodology used while teaching and learning English module in HLIs

The learning process of English module	Frequency	Percentage
Following lecturer's explanation from the beginning to the end	2	1%
Following the lecturer and sometimes do exercises	11	8%
Prepare the given task and present.	24	18%
Following lecturer's explanation and following the lecturer and do exercises	4	3%
Following lecturer's explanation and prepare and do presentations	23	17%
Following the lecturer from the beginning to the end and sometimes do exercises, prepare and present	39	29%
Following lecturer's explanation, following the lecturer and sometimes do exercises, prepare and do presentations	32	24%
Total	135	100%

135 respondents answered the questions concerning how they study English module. The highest number of respondents was 39 (29%), which stated that three methodologies are used in their classroom as follows: Students sometimes follow lecturers' explanation from the beginning to the end or they follow lecturers' explanation and occasionally do exercises relating to the lesson of the day or they prepare the given topic and do presentations. The second category of 32 respondents (24%) stated that they are most of the time facilitated through two activities. They follow the lecturer's explanation and sometimes do exercises and prepare and do presentations during the lesson. In addition, the third

category of 24 respondents (18%) chose the preparation and presentation as the activity that is mostly done while studying English. Twenty-three respondents (17%) said that the methodology used is to follow lecturer's explanation and make presentations. Eleven respondents (8%) agree that they follow lecturer's explanations and sometimes do exercise. Further, four respondents (3%) confirmed that they follow lecturer's explanation and follow lecturer with doing exercises sometimes. Finally, 2 respondents (1%) declared that the methodology used while teaching English is following lecturer's explanation from the beginning to the end.

Table 5: Components emphasized and encouraged while teaching English speaking skill

Components	Emphasis			
	yes	%	No	%
Vocabulary	126	93%	9	7%
Phonology	94	70%	31	23%
Stress	42	31%	72	53%
Grammar	129	96%	2	1%
Intonation	72	53%	36	27%

Respondents were requested to choose one or more among the proposed components. Obviously, respondents' answers were yes or no. The total number of respondents is more than 135, the expected respondents and the percentage of yes and no goes beyond 100%, due to many responses allowed to one respondent. Respondents equal to 129 (96%) mentioned grammar as the highest component taught in class of English, followed by 126 respondents (93%) who revealed vocabulary among the components emphasized while teaching English. This teaching methodology relates to what Lightbown and Spada (2001) explained saying that the teaching of English in Rwanda is traditional instructional environment. Furthermore, 94 respondents (70%) said phonology among the suggested components, as for 42 respondents (31%) stated stress, but this component was selected by the lowest number of respondents. Respondents who stated that some components are not considered by

lecturers while teaching English, confirmed this as follows: Stress was stated by the highest number of respondents equal to 72 with the percentage of 53%. Intonation came the second chosen by 36 respondents, (27%) and Phonology was indicated by 31 respondents (23%). Further, 9 respondents (7%) vowed that they do not study vocabulary in English module. Finally, 2 respondents (1%), which is the lowest number of respondents, said that grammar is not considered among the components studied in English lesson. These elements of pronunciation may be taught referring to Sfar's (1998) idea. The author suggests that communicative FL teaching is not based on the idea of merely acquiring language knowledge (lexis and rules); rather, its goal is using language for meaningful communication, which is a characteristic of the participation metaphor, i.e. learning through doing activities that are on-going.

Table 6: Activities done in and outside the classroom relating to English speaking

Activities	In class				Outside the class			
	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%
Individual presentation	121	90 %	8	6%	21	16%	48	36%
Group presentation	127	94%	7	5%	23	17%	48	36%
Drama	49	36 %	37	27%	51	38%	53	39%
Debate	87	64%	9	7%	44	33%	44	33%
Group discussion	85	63%	13	10%	44	33	33	24%

The results also illuminate activities done in or outside the classroom among individual presentation, group presentation, drama, and debate as well as group discussion. Respondents were allowed to choose more than one among the proposed activities. This resulted from the number of respondents more than 135 contacted during data collection. Also, the addition of yes and no answers for activities done in or outside the classroom go beyond 100%. Asking this question, the Researcher intended to know whether the speaking skill is facilitated beyond norm classes using the new technologies MALL and CALL. Çakır (2015) states that in order to teach and learn pronunciation in a better way, it is relevant and advisable to listen to native speakers' voice through the application of new technologies like CALL and MALL, through speaking activities that may be facilitated by online platforms such as Moodle, Teams.. According to activities done in class, 127 respondents (94%) answered that they prepare and do group presentations in class and 7 respondents (5%) responded no. Individual presentation was revealed by 121 Respondents (90 %), as an activity done in class during English lesson. 8 respondents equal to (6%) said that this activity is not done in class of English. Moreover, debate comes third as an activity done while studying English lesson as revealed by 87 respondents (64%) and 9 respondents stated that debate is not

encouraged while studying English. Group discussion was responded by 85 Respondents (63%) as one of activities done in English class and 13 respondents (10%) said that this activity is not done during English lesson. The lowest number of respondents equal to 49 (36 %) stated that drama is an activity done in class and 37 respondents (27%) said that drama is not done in class while studying English.

The analysis of activities done outside the classroom put out results as follows: Drama is the first activity responded by 51 respondents as an activity done outside the classroom (38%). 53 respondents (39%) confirmed that the same activity is not done outside the classroom. Debate and group discussion occupy the second place as confirmed by 44 respondent each (33%) as an activity done outside the classroom. 44 respondents (33%) said that debate is not done outside the classroom and 33 respondents (24%) said that group discussion is not done outside the classroom. Further, 23 respondents (17%) said that group presentation is done outside the classroom and 48 respondents (36%) said that group presentation is not done outside the classroom. Finally, 21 respondents (16%) stated that individual presentation is done outside the classroom and 48 respondents (36%) said that individual presentation is not done when students are outside the classroom.

At the end of the analysis, we can see that activities encouraging the speaking skill are more conducted inside the classroom more than outside. To this point, Sibomana (2010) explains that learners who rely on the classroom as the only place of learning English develop more their grammar than speaking skills. Observing the activities done outside the classroom, respondents who answered yes are less than those who answered no to

each activity with the exception of drama. The drama activity occupies the last activity done in class of English but occupy the first place as an activity done outside the classroom. Finally, among all activities, only debate occupies the same number of respondents who mentioned yes and no.

Table 7: Challenges faced during learning English

Challenges	Frequency	Percentage
A big number of students in class	24	18%
Lack of opportunity to talk	19	14%
Lack of native speaker voice	15	11%
A big number of students in class and lack of opportunity to talk	26	19%
A big number of students in class and lack of a native speaker voice	17	13%
Lack of opportunity to talk and lack of a native speaker voice	11	8%
A big number of students in class, lack of opportunity to talk and lack of a native speaker voice	23	17%
Total	135	100%

About the challenges faced during learning English module, the highest number is made of 26 Respondents (19%), who mentioned that a big number of students in class and lack of opportunity to talk are the two challenges faced by students, while studying English module. A big number of students in class, lack opportunity to talk and lack of a native speaker voice are the three challenges faced by students while studying English. This is revealed by 23 respondents (17%). Lack of opportunity to talk occupies the third place as confirmed by 19 respondents (14 %). Further, a big number of students in class and lack of a native speaker voice make the forth challenges revealed by 17 respondents (13%). Fifteen respondents (11%) stated

lack of native speaker voice as a challenge faced, to end with lack of opportunity to talk and lack of native speaker voice as revealed by 11 respondents (8%) among the challenges faced while learning the English module. Six of Respondents stated lack of sufficient time to practice the speaking skills. Two students mentioned the lack of laboratory and two students said that in presentations, students laugh at those who make mistakes. To this issue, Du (2009) confirmed that some students fear to talk thinking that their peers will laugh at them and this may be a greater cause of language worry.

Table 8: Strategies that can be used to overcome challenges

Strategies	Frequency	Percentage
Few students in class	12	9%
Listening to native speakers	4	3%
Having more activities allowing to speak	2	1%
Speaking English even outside the classroom	5	4%
Few students in class and listening to native speakers	2	1%
Few students in class and having more activities allowing to speak	6	5%
Few students in class and speaking English even outside the class	5	4%
Listening to native speakers and having more activities allowing to speak	3	2%
Listening to native speakers and speaking English even outside the class	7	5%
Few students in class, listening to native speakers and having more activities allowing to speak	16	12%
Few students in class, listening to native speakers, having more activities allowing to speak	0	0%
Few students in class, listening to native speakers, Speaking English even outside the class	4	3%
Few students in class, having more activities allowing to speak, speaking English even outside the class	16	12%
Listening to native speakers, having more activities allowing to speak, speaking English even outside the class	16	12%
Few students in class, listening to native speakers and speaking English even outside the class	37	27%
Total	135	100%

Respondents suggested strategies that can be used to overcome challenges observed, while studying the English module. The analyzed results revealed that little number of students in class, listening to native speakers and speaking English even outside the classroom come first as good solutions to the observed challenges. Sixteen respondents (12%) is the number of respondents that has appeared three times, suggesting that few students in class, listen to native speakers and have more activities that allow them to speak and few students in class, having more activities that make them speak, speaking English even outside the class and listening to native speakers, having more activities allowing to speak, speaking English even outside the class may be good solutions to overcome challenges faced while studying English module. In addition, 12 respondents (9%) confirmed that the little number of students in class may be a good solution to the observed challenges. Further, 7 respondents (5%) indicated that listening to native speakers and speaking English even outside the classroom is a nice solution, 6 respondents (4%) answered Little number of students in class and speaking English even outside the class, 4 respondents (3%) chose listening to native speakers as a solution to the observed challenges, 3 respondents (2 %) selected listening to native speakers and having more activities allowing to speak and 2 respondents (1%) appeared twice and asserted having more activities allowing to speak and little number of students in class as well as listening to native speakers as good solutions to overcome challenges faced by students while studying

English module. Few students and listening to the a native speaker voice were proposed 9 times by respondents as noble solutions to the observed challenges while studying the English module, having more activities allowing students to speak and speaking English even outside the class appeared 7 times. Few students in class and listening to a native speaker voice are the two variables proposed most by respondents.

4.2 Results from semi-structured interview with Lecturers of English language

The first question from semi-structured interview answered by lecturers of English involved gender and age. Nine respondents among 10, (90%) were male and 1 respondent (10%) was female. The highest number of respondents was between 41 and 48 age range, occupied by five respondents (50%), followed by 2 respondents found between 33 and 40 age range (20%). Further, 1 respondent was aged between 25 and 32 age range and the age range between 49 and 56 comprised also 1 respondent. Finally, 1 respondent is found in the age range of 57 and above. As far as gender is concerned, we can conclude that a great number of English lecturers are male, i.e. 9 male respondents with only 1 female respondent.

Concerning respondents' age, a big number of respondents (5) was in the range between 41 and 48. Two respondents were found in the range between 33 and 40 and occupy the second rate. The result shows

that respondents were mature enough to answer relevantly the given questions. Nine respondents (90%) were master's holder, one respondent (10%) possessed a PhD and none of respondents had bachelor's degree as the highest qualification. Further, 6 respondents (60%) had experience of more than 10 years, between 1 and 5 years are 3 respondents (30%) and 1 respondent (10%) had between 6 and 10 years of experience. The results from lecturers' qualification showed that all lecturers are able to teach and adopt new technology since all of them were at least masters' holder. Regarding their experience, the highest number of respondents had more than 10 years of experience and none of the respondents had less than 1 year. This shows that English is taught by experienced lecturers in HLIs of Rwanda.

Listening, speaking, reading and writing were ranked in order of importance. Nine respondents (90%) ranked speaking the most important of English skills and only 1 respondents (10%), said that listening skill is the most important. Moreover, 8 respondents (80%) of respondents said that listening is the second important skill among the four skills. Writing and reading were ranked third and each of the two skills was mentioned by 5 respondents (50%) as the third important skill. Moreover, reading was ranked last by 5 respondents (50%), writing by 4 respondents (40%). Even though skills of English were ranked in order of importance, almost all respondents said that it is not easy to rank English skills in order of importance, all of the four skills are interrelated. However, even if all skills complete one another, one respondent said that productive skills i.e. speaking and listening are the most important skills followed by reading and writing considered as receptive skills. According to respondents, speaking is the most important skill because, it is a skill that engages people to interact with community and show the master of a language. According to some respondents, whatever message lecturers want to convey to learners, they do it through speaking. In speaking, people express themselves and express different ideas and different thoughts freely and confidently.

The second productive skill considered by the highest number of respondents is the listening skill. Respondents who chose listening as the second important skill declared that speaking and listening are interrelated. One respondent said that listening comes the second because; when you are speaking, you need to listen to the feedback and this fosters communication. Writing was ranked second because, what is not understood through speaking can be communicated through writing. One respondent ranked writing and reading the third important skills as these skills are gained after being learned at school. Reading came last, but according to respondents, this skill is also important, because people need to get information from reading different documents, extra reading activities or reading

for pleasure. Moreover, one respondent said that reading is also very important as it develops vocabulary and different expressions.

Most respondents stated that the learner centered or communicative approach is the method they mostly use while teaching English. One respondent explained that he encourages students to come together and hold discussion after getting a topic. Another respondent stated that he ensures that teaching and learning go hand in hand. For this reason, the respondent encourages communicative approach by inviting students to communicate with one another. Another respondent confirmed that they encourage students to be active by responding to asked questions and interacting among themselves. Lecturers use different techniques while teaching. For instance, they encourage discussions, where debate is involved and they encourage students to speak and be creative while speaking to acquire good pronunciation. Two respondents stated that when students are encouraged to discuss in English, they are given topics involving opposition like in debate. However, when the lecturer is not around, students discuss in Kinyarwanda because it is their culture to communicate among themselves in Kinyarwanda their native language. The same challenge was revealed by Kagwesage (2013) after conducting a research in HLIs of Rwanda, She found that Kinyarwanda was almost fully used in group works and sometimes in the teaching process to clarify concepts and clear up confusion.

"I keep on reminding them that they know enough Kinyarwanda and that they may try their best to speak English, because it is their target language. They do not need to improve the Kinyarwanda language". The lecturer said.

Moreover, some informants said that to encourage speaking skills is not really easy because of very big classes and limited time. One of respondents explained the issue in the following words.

"We have a very big number of students. Sometimes we have even 300 students. In the class we are teaching, students are usually required to prepare presentations and give feedback in class, hoping that this will improve their speaking skills. We also use dialogues, but it is challenging because of the big number of students with short time. We have only 24 hours of face to face class the whole semester and once a year. 24 hours times two makes it 48 hours only in three years, as in third year they do not study English".

The respondent said that the above issue is very challenging but lecturers try to encourage presentations or sometimes dialogue. They also encourage group discussions by giving a topic to discuss or sometimes lecturers encourage story telling.

"You require them to tell story but it does not take long. Because we have very limited time. We have really short time to improve the four skills we are talking

about”.

One respondent specified that he uses direct method while teaching speaking and this method stipulates what a thing represents without translating it in mother tongue. He gave an example saying that if someone says “this is a pen”, a student sees the pen. There is no need to translate how to say it in Kinyarwanda. The same respondent said that you can even use drawing or dictation. Some sentences are dictated to students and then, students can speak. When students say a word wrongly, the lecturer can correct students’ errors and when words are corrected, students are able to improve in terms of speaking. Respondents expressed that it is really hard to encourage students to speak English outside the classroom. Lecturers said that they encourage students by giving them some tasks including speaking exercises in English. For instance, students are tasked to prepare public speaking or panel discussion, and this is done when they go home. In free time they meet and prepare group discussion and will present in the classroom. However, lecturers confirmed that they still have challenges as it is hard to control students outside learning.

Two lecturers indicated that learning a language is demanding. For this reason, wherever students are, they have to keep learning. To this point, Lightbown & Spada, (2001) advised that learners need to interact with native speakers of English and to take part in various events using English language. They are encouraged to listen to the radio, English news and native speakers as well. Learners can even search for difficult vocabulary in dictionaries. Further, students are required to watch different TVs that use English like CNN, Aljazeera and they may talk to different people with different accent but respondents said that to control these activities is not easy as they are not with students. Sometimes students are asked to watch a movie and make a summary to present the following day. However, students copy from Google and do not paraphrase text as confirmed by one respondent. One respondent said that most of the times, students receive different activities via e-mail or Moodle platform while they are outside the institution, and are given the deadline of presenting the feedback.

Respondents explained the most important components to consider while teaching English speaking skills. Six respondents (60%) talked about pronunciation with various reasons. If you pronounce something wrongly, people may lose meaning of the pronounced words. Pronunciation is defined as the manner a sound or many sounds are made Richards, & Schmidt, (2013) and covers the way speakers produce clear language when they speak. For example, when lecturers are teaching English sounds, they give student tasks like dialogues, sketches, debate or any other communicative activities to check whether they are good at pronouncing some words. Their feedback is needed to help students improve pronunciation. Some words are written in the same way but pronounced differently. For

instance, the word “desert” has two meanings but is pronounced differently. While differentiating the pronunciation of this word, intonation and stress are emphasized and phonetic and phonology have to be considered. Thus, this helps students to communicate correctly so that the message passes through. Further, lecturers emphasize pronunciation by asking students to repeat the said word. Similarly, one lecturer said that he teaches phonetic transcription and uses computer to help students to hear the right pronunciation. Students repeat the pronounced words but given the context and the number of students, this exercise cannot work satisfactorily.

Vocabulary is also very important in the learning/teaching of any language. One respondent gave an example of a customer and a waiter in a restaurant. If the customer says he/she wants to eat roast meat and the waiter does not know what roast means, he/she may continue asking what the customer wants and this is the consequence of not mastering vocabulary. Therefore, to develop students’ speaking skills, lecturers first need to know the right words in the target language. A study conducted by Thornton and Houser (2005) on two students learning vocabulary revealed that the one using mobile devices performs better than the student learning the same vocabulary in a classroom. From vocabulary development, students understand meaning and pronunciation of words that are necessary for communication. If they understand what another person is saying and they know what vocabulary to respond with, they are halfway to effective communication.

Grammar also occupies an important place allowing the learner to speak a language. Grammar is a description of the rules that govern how sentences are formed in a given language and attempts to explain why a sentence is acceptable (Thornbury, 1999). For this reason, mastering grammar helps learners to use tenses and structure sentences correctly. In addition, grammar helps the speaker to convey information clearly. Another respondent reported that all components are very necessary and for this reason, lecturers must seek to improve each and every component which is related to these skills with particular attention to listening and speaking. One of the informants added that there is no preference among components, what the respondent simply do is to develop students’ fluency in order to know how to combine words, to make sentences and to communicate fluently. Speaking fluency is something that naturally develops as children go through school, as they are using and practicing speaking skills every day. Also, reading widely is a good way to improve fluency as it introduces children to new vocabulary and reinforces their knowledge of spoken language. The more fluent the students are in English, the more interesting, exciting and insightful conversations they can hold.

All respondents equal to 100% confirmed that the new technologies MALL and CALL can be helpful to increase vocabulary, pronunciation, fluency and accuracy. However, one of respondents confirmed that he uses these new technologies while teaching English lesson inside and outside the institution. Respondents said that practice makes perfect. The more you listen to something, the more you assimilate it. Using devices, manipulators find some programs rich in teaching English speaking skill such as audiovisual materials. The way words are pronounced is different from how a first language speaker of English pronounces them because natives of a language speak naturally. That is why Wallace and Walberg (2004) advised that learners need to know how speakers differ from one another and how particular circumstances influence different forms of speech and they can learn how speaking styles affect listeners. For instance, when you encourage students to use their phone or tablets to download audiovisual activities from YouTube and download some of the scripts, these activities may be very helpful. Activities one respondent assigns to students are for example how to use speaking skills for invitation or apology. Students can also use internet or any other website that provide listening activities and learn how people use those expressions. One respondent said that he helps students to use new technologies sometimes in classroom, using computer and encourages them to listen to a native speaker's pronunciation. But outside the institution students are not helped. The respondent who use new technology in teaching English module in and outside the institution explained it in the following words. "I initiated this methodology not from the beginning when I reached the HLL, but in the middle. We sometimes have workshops with some organizations of teachers I belong to and we learn best practices from one another. Teachers from native speaker or those who studied abroad share with us this experience. I download and send audios or videos to students' WhatsApp group to learn some vocabulary as well as pronunciation from native speakers".

The same respondent said that these new technologies may increase English components. If students access language lab or have access to their own computer or laptops, it is a good opportunity. If they are looking for English materials or when they are chatting with colleagues in English, they definitely learn. The respondent confirmed to benefit from the access students have on these devices and task them some activities to deal with.

According to Respondents, challenges may result from either learners or lecturers. For instance, some learners not committed in learning, when they are not controlled or monitored, they are distracted. Students may be interested in listening to other programs different from the given tasks like using the devices for leisure means. Even though many students have devices like mobile phone, some of them cannot afford the devices,

appropriate for learning. The idea of respondents is supported by
 Moreover, internet bundles are expensive and if students do not have good network to download activities from internet, this may be a challenge. Thornton & Houser (2003) support respondents stating that among the challenges one may mention the cost imposed by both telecommunications for access and mobile devices price. In addition, Respondents said that the use of new technologies requires strong internet network, whereas network does not reach the whole country. The same view is from Corlett et al., 2005 who say that battery life and slow downloading are other constraints related to the use of mobile devices for learning English. Another challenge is that students may not understand native speakers' accent or understand every single vocabulary. Further, the fact that Kinyarwanda, as the mother tongue, is used in the whole country, it is another factor that can lead to the failure of learning speaking English skills outside the institution. Finally, in some HLLs of Rwanda it is strictly prohibited to use telephones or other devices in the classroom. This can challenge the use of MALL and CALL inside the classrooms and students lack the chance to benefit from native speakers voice.

On the side of lecturers, there are insufficiency of ICT devices, insufficiency of internet network and computer illiteracy for some. Further, ignorance about ICT facilities in teaching languages and lack of motivation to use digital communication channels is another challenge. Moreover, lecturers may not be able to follow up on or identify students' challenges during their learning process. Also, at the university, there is no well-equipped language laboratory which can really facilitate students to be familiar with language learning. In addition, lecturers may resist in using new technologies or they may be less performing than some learners and manipulation of those technological tools. Finally, lecturers may lack a suitable methodology of using new technologies.

Thus, ten respondents from seven HLLs found in different areas of Rwanda, proposed strategies to overcome challenges that may be observed in teaching English speaking using MALL and CALL such as: Monitoring and controlling tasks given to students. For instance, lecturers may give students a limited time to do activities in order to control them, and it is better to mark that activity. This will help them to be focused. Financial assistance also must be provided by the government, institution or parents. Students may also support themselves if they get jobs and buy megabytes to be used in learning or doing tasks. Also, teachers need training in digital teaching in order to develop awareness of the global move towards ICT use in various daily activities to help them think of using appropriate digital devices confidently. To respondents' point Chinnery (2006) clarified that the success in using mobile technologies depends on the teachers'

capacity to handle them. Another strategy is having well equipped language laboratories as confirmed by respondents. However, using devices is not enough; students and lecturers can have personal commitment which is very important in learning a language. “No matter how you understand and whatever you understand, personal commitment is very important. Otherwise, it cannot work,” said one respondent. In laboratory students may have access to their own screen and if they are given a link, they can download an assigned task and deal with the individual or group work. Even outside the classroom, students may keep communicating with their lecturers, and be guided on how they can benefit from the materials downloaded. In addition, the government may help learners in both public and private institutions to get devices and bundles. One respondent said that students from public institutions are more helped by the government than students from private institutions, and think that even parents may help their children.

“There have been programs where learners in public institutions were given computers in all level of studies from primary to HLI. My son is studying at the former KIST he got a computer and it is helping him. Even parents can do their best to provide these tools to their children”.

HLIs also may buy devices for lecturers teaching English and regular trainings of teachers may be provided. Lecturers must keep on updating their skills and knowledge about using those new technologies to adapt well to the situation.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

From the results obtained, MALL and CALL are new technologies that may contribute a lot to improving English skills in general and English speaking skill in particular. However, the new technologies do not replace the usual role of lecturers. The most important components that can be taught to promote the speaking skill identified are among others: pronunciation, fluency, accuracy and vocabulary. In HLIs of Rwanda, the current methodology used in teaching English does not encourage students to speak English. challenges identified in this study include a big number of students in class, few hours assigned to teaching and learning English, lack of native speakers' voice and the use of Kinyarwanda, the mother tongue, in all areas of Rwanda.

Leaders from HLI should allocate a manageable number of students in classes of English and equip the institution with laboratories. They should also allow the use of telephones in the classroom for the learning purpose. Further, HLI should facilitate lecturers teaching English, by buying suitable devices and providing strong connection in and outside the institutions and regular trainings of lecturers should be

provided. Lecturers should monitor tasks assigned to students. Lecturers should have personal commitment and willingness to cope with the use of new technologies. Moreover, students should consider the time of studying as a serious moment and forget other distractive activities. Finally, students should keep on speaking English even outside the classroom. Parents and guardians should help learners from HLIs to get devices and bundles.

References

- Abbasova, M., & Mammadova, N. (2019). The Role of Digital Technology in English Language Teaching in Azerbaijan. Retrieved from <http://webmail.khazar.org/bitstream/20.500.12323/4018/1/The%20Role%20of%20Digital%20Technology%20in%20English%20Language%20Teaching%20in%20Azerbaijan.pdf>. Accessed on September 19, 2021.
- Alidou, H., & Brock-Utne, B. (2011). Teaching practices—Teaching in a familiar language. *Optimising learning, education and publishing in Africa: The language factor*, 159-185.
- Banegas, D. L. (2009). Content knowledge in teacher education: Where professionalisation lies. *ELTED Journal*, 12, 44-51.
- Block, D. (2003). *The social turn in second language acquisition*. Georgetown University Press, 3240 Prospect Street, NW, Washington, DC 20007.
- Brock-Utne, B., Desai, Z., & Qorro, M. A. (2005). *Researching the language of instruction in Tanzania and South Africa*. African Minds.
- Cakir, I. (2015). Opinions and Attitudes of Prospective Teachers for the Use of Mobile Phones in Foreign Language Learning. *Online Submission*, 6(3), 239-255.
- Chaney, A., & Burk, T. L. (1998). *Teaching Oral Communication in Grades K-8*. Boston: Ellyn & Bacon.
- Chhabra, P. (2012). Use of E-Learning tools in teaching English. *International Journal of Computing & Business Research*, 3, 2229-6166.
- Chhabra, P. (2012). Use of E-Learning tools in teaching

English. *International Journal of Computing & Business Research*, 3, 2229-6166.

[%20Policies.pdf](#). Accessed on August 2, 2021.

Chinnery, G. M. (2006). Going to the MALL: Mobile assisted language learning. *Language learning & technology*, 10(1), 9-16.

Kuning S. D. (2019). *Technology in teaching speaking skill*. Journal of English Education E- ISSN, 2621-3680 Literature and Linguistics P- ISSN, 2621-3672.

Corlett, D., Sharples, M., Bull, S., & Chan, T. (2005). Evaluation of a mobile learning organiser for university students. *Journal of computer assisted learning*, 21(3), 162-170.

Lantolf, J. P. (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

LeClerc, J. (2008). Rwanda. L'ame'nement linguistique dans le monde. Retrieved from <http://www.tlfq.ulaval.ca/axl/afrique/rwanda.htm>. Accessed on April 3, 2009.

Coulthard, M., & Conklin, C. N. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis*. Routledge.

Lightbown, P. M. and Spada, N. (2001). Factors Affecting Second Language Learning. In Candlin, C. N., and Mercer, N. (Ed.), *English Language Teaching in Its Social Context: a reader*. London: Routledge.

Du, X. (2009). The affective filter in second language teaching. *Asian Social Science*, 5(8), 162-165.

Long, M. H., & Doughty, C. J. (2003). SLA and cognitive science. In C. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.), *the handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 866-870). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Gove, A. and Cvelich, P. (2011). *Early Reading: Igniting Education for All. A report by the Early Grade Learning Community of Practice*. Revised Edition. Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute.

Martins Kremer, M., & Valcke, M. (2014). Teaching and learning in English in higher education: a literature review. In *6th International Conference on Education and New Learning Technologies* (pp. 1430-1441). IATED.

Hazarika, Z. (2017). Exploring the impact of technology in teaching English: *TESOL in the context*. European Journal of English Language and Literature Studies. Vol.5, No.10, pp.19-28, December 2017.

MINEDUC, (2008). Education sector strategic plan 2008–2012. Retrieved from https://www.mineduc.gov.rw/fileadmin/user_upload/Mineduc/Publications/ESSP/3_Education_Sector_Strategic_Plan_2008-2012.pdf. Accessed on September 19, 2021.

John, C. M. (2019). English Language Teaching Evolution from Traditional Classroom Teaching to Use of Technology in Classrooms International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering (IJITEE) ISSN: 2278-3075, Volume-8 Issue-8S3, June 2019.

Motteram ed G. (2013). *Innovations in learning technology for English language teaching* British Council (London) Retrieved from https://www.research.manchester.ac.uk/portal/files/38535355/FULL_TEXT.pdf

Kagwesage, A. M. (2013). Coping with English as Language of Instruction in Higher Education in Rwanda National University of Rwanda, Rwanda & Linköping University, Sweden International Journal of Higher Education Vol. 2, No. 2; 2013.

Munyankesha, P. (2004). Les défis du plurilinguisme officiel au Rwanda. Analyse sociolinguistique. Unpublished Ph.D., the University of Western Ontario (Canada), Canada.

Kiernan, P. J., & Aizawa, K. A. Z. U. M. I. (2004). Cell phones in task based learning-Are cell phones useful language learning tools? *ReCALL*, 16(1), 71-84.

Mwaura, P. (2008). Shift from French to English likely to affect region. *The Nation*, 17, 3.

Kozma, R. B., & Isaacs, S. (2011). *Transforming education: The power of ICT policies*. Unesco. Retrieved from <http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/FIELD/Dakar/pdf/Transforming%20Education%20the%20Power%20of%20ICT>

Niyibizi E., Sibomana E., Parmal A. (2019), learning to teach writing through a distance education programme: Experiences of

- Rwandan secondary school English teachers. *Reading & Writing - Journal of the Reading Association of South Africa* ISSN: (Online) 2308-1422, (Print) 2079-8245.
- Nkubito, J. de D., Uwababyeyi A. (2017). Peacebuilding through Language Mentorship in Rwanda's Primary Education: Challenges facing key stakeholders. *Rwanda Journal of Arts and Humanities*, Volume 2 (2), 2017.
- Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English Language Teaching Teacher's Text Book*. McGraw-Hill.
- Nzitabakuze, C. (2012). Implementation of the English medium policy in Rwandan primary schools: a case of Gasabo district, Rwanda. Unpublished Masters Dissertation, Kenyatta University, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Pakula, H.M. (2019). Teaching Speaking. *Apples - Journal of Applied Language Studies* Vol. 13, 1, 2019, 95-111.
- Pearson, P. (2014). Policy without a plan: English as a medium of instruction in Rwanda. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 15:1, 39-56.
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (2013). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Routledge.
- Samuelson, B. L., & Freedman, S. W. (2010). Language policy, multilingual education, and power in Rwanda. *Language Policy*, 9(3), 191-215.
- Sfard, A. (1998). On two metaphors for learning and the dangers of choosing just one. *Educational researcher*, 27(2), 4-13.
- Sibomana, E. (2010). *Challenges faced by postgraduate French speaking students who are learning in English: a case study of Rwandan students in the School of Education at the University of the Witwatersrand* (Doctoral dissertation, University of the Witwatersrand). Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/39667318.pdf>. Accessed on September, 22, 2021.
- Smith, K., & Craig, H. (2013). Enhancing the autonomous use of CALL: A new curriculum model in EFL. *CALICO Journal*, 30(2), 252-278.
- Tabaro, C. (2015). Rwandans' motivation to learn and use English as a medium of instruction. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 5(2), 78-85.
- Taylor, N., & Robinson, N. (2019). Secondary education in sub-Saharan Africa: Teacher preparation and support—Literature Review. *Johannesburg, South Africa: Jet Education Services*.
- Thorburn, S. (1999). *How to teach grammar* (Vol. 3). Harlow: Longman.
- Thornton, P., & Houser, C. (2003). Using mobile web and video phones in English language teaching: Projects with Japanese college students. *Directions in CALL: Experience, experiments & evaluation*, 207-224.
- Uwizeyimana, V. (2018). *An investigation into the effect of mobile-assisted language learning on Rwandan university students' proficiency in English as a foreign language* (Doctoral dissertation, Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University). Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322791354_An_investigation_into_the_contribution_of_mobile-6.
- Wallace, T., Stariha, W. E., & Walberg, H. J. (2004). *Teaching speaking, listening and writing*. International Academy of Education.
- Webb, V. (2003). The role of language in economic development. *Wolff, H, Ekkehard. (Ed.) Tied Tongues. The African Renaissance as a challenge for language planning. Münster: LIT Verlag*, 61-84.